







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



BINGHAM'S WORKS,

*With the Quotations in the Original Languages, instead of merely the References as originally given.*

---

Just published, in NINE VOLUMES, 8vo. price £5. 8s. neatly bound in cloth,

THE WHOLE WORKS

OF

THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM,

INCLUDING

ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ,

OR THE ANTIQUITIES

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

CAREFULLY CORRECTED ;

WITH THE

QUOTATIONS IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES AT LENGTH,

*Instead of merely the References as formerly given,*

A NEW SET OF MAPS OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,  
AND LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

---

LONDON:—WILLIAM STRAKER, 443, WEST STRAND.

---

THE "Origines Ecclesiasticæ" of the learned and industrious BINGHAM has been long deemed indispensable to every Student anxious to ascertain the construction and platform of the Primitive Christian Church. At the present time, especially, a correct knowledge of the subject he so ably discusses is interesting, not only to the Ministers, but to every Member of the Protestant Church.

The following Testimonies, selected from numerous others which could be adduced, will serve to shew the estimation in which he is generally held by all parties :—

AUGUSTE, in his Introduction to *Handbuch der Christlichen Archæologie*, p. 11, (*Leipzig*, 1836), says, The English clergyman, *Joseph Bingham*, remarkable for his profound learning, and his spirit of unprejudiced enquiry, was the first that published a complete Archæology, and one worthy of the name.

"Opus ipsum Binghami tam egregium est, ut merito inter libros, quibus Antiquitates Ecclesiasticæ universæ enarratæ sunt, principatum teneat, sive ad rerum copiam atque apparatus; sive ad earum explanationem animum advertere velimus. Commendat illud se accuratori ordine, argumentis solidis; sive testimoniis, quæ ex ipsis fontibus hausta ac diligenter adducta sunt, perspicuitate atque aliis virtutibus. Ac quanvis auctor, iis addictus, qui in Anglia pro episcoporum auctoritate pugnant, ad horum sententias veteris ecclesiæ instituta trahat; animi tamen moderationem, quum in his rebus versatur, ostendit ac si quæ corrigenda sunt facile fieri potest emendatio."

WALCHU *Bibliotheca Theologica*, vol. iii. p. 671.

The *Quarterly Review*, in an article on Christian Burial, says, "This is traced by Bingham with his usual erudition;" and in speaking of

psalmody in the early Christian Church, “of this Bingham produces abundant evidence.” And again, in an article on the Architecture of Early Christian Churches, “much information on this subject is collected in the ‘Origines Ecclesiasticæ’ of Bingham, a writer who does equal honour to the English Clergy and to the English Nation, and whose learning is to be equalled only by his moderation and impartiality.”—Vols. xxi. xxvii. xxxviii.

“Let Bingham be consulted where he treats of such matters as you meet with, that have any difficulty in them.”

DR. WATERLAND'S *Advice to a Young Student*.

“This is an invaluable Treasure of Christian Antiquities, and deserves the first place in works of this kind: the plan and the execution do equal honour to the learning and industry of the Author.”

ORME *Bibliotheca Biblica*.

“A vast body of information respecting the first Christian Churches, and full of valuable learning on the Early State of the Church.”

BICKERSTETH.

“The Reverend and learned Mr. Bingham, in that elaborate work of his, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*,” &c.—WALL *on Infant Baptism*.

It is also recommended to be studied by Bishops Blomfield, Van Mildert, Tomline, Randolph, and Coleridge; by Dr. Burton, and in the Tracts for the Times publishing at Oxford.

To those unacquainted with the value of the work, it may be useful to give an analysis of the Twenty-three Books, of which the “Antiquities” is composed:—

- I. Of Christianity in general; the Names and Orders of both Clergy and Laity.
- II. The Laws of the First Councils.
- III. Of the Inferior Clerical Laws.
- IV. Of the Election and Ordination of the Clergy; Qualifications, &c.
- V. Clerical Privileges, Immunities, and Revenues.
- VI. The Laws and Rules of their Lives, Services, Behaviour, &c.
- VII. Of the Ascetics.
- VIII. Of their Councils, Churches, &c.
- IX. Of the Divisions into Provinces, Dioceses, and Parishes; with the Origin of these Divisions.
- X. Of the Catechisms, and first use of Creeds.
- XI. On the Administration of Baptism.
- XII. On Confirmation.
- XIII. Of Divine Worship in the Ancient Congregations.
- XIV. Of the Service of the Catechumens.
- XV. Of the Communion Service.
- XVI. Of the Unity and Discipline of the Church.
- XVII. Of the Exercise and Discipline among the Clergy.
- XVIII. Of the Penitential Laws and Rules for doing Public Penance.
- XIX. Of Absolution.
- XX. On the Festivals.
- XXI. On the Fasts.
- XXII. On the Marriage Rites.
- XXIII. On the Funeral Rites.

With Four Dissertations. In the first three, those things only briefly described in his “Antiquities” are more fully explained. In the fourth, he defends the English Homilies, Liturgy, and Canons, from domestic adversaries, and particularly the French Reformers.

To this Edition is subjoined, at the foot of each page, in full, *the Greek and Latin Authorities to which Bingham appeals*, in lieu of merely the References as given in former Editions. This valuable addition will save much time to those Scholars who possess the very numerous Works referred to, and much expense and trouble to those who have not access to extensive Libraries.

# COLLIER'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

OF

## GREAT BRITAIN.

The **SIXTH VOLUME** will be ready in November, and the succeeding Volumes monthly, till completed.

---

*Just published in 8vo., price 10s 6d, neatly bound in cloth, and lettered, Volume V. of*

### **THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY**

OF

### GREAT BRITAIN,

FROM THE FIRST PLANTING OF CHRISTIANITY

TO THE

REIGN OF CHARLES THE SECOND;

With a brief account of the Affairs of Religion in Ireland.

BY

**JEREMY COLLIER, M.A.**

---

Juvat integros accedere fontes  
Atque haurire.

---

*WILLIAM STRAKER* has just published the **THIRD VOLUME** of

A NEW EDITION OF

**COLLIER'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF GREAT BRITAIN,**

With a Life of the Author, the Controversial Tracts connected with the History, Notes, and an enlarged Index.

The work will be completed in nine volumes octavo, uniform with the new edition of **BINGHAM'S WORKS**, price 10s 6d each volume to Subscribers.

The **SIXTH VOLUME** will appear in November, and the succeeding Volumes monthly till completed.

---

**SUBSCRIBERS ARE MOST RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED TO FORWARD THEIR NAMES IMMEDIATELY, EITHER DIRECT TO**

**WILLIAM STRAKER, 443, WEST STRAND,**

**OR THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE BOOKSELLERS.**

COLLIER'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY was originally published in two volumes, folio, between the years 1708 and 1714. As a vast treasury of interesting information respecting the rise and progress of our British Church, it stands unrivalled. It has been extolled by divines of all orders, for its immense compass of investigation, and its nice minuteness of detail. Like the celebrated work of Bingham, this elaborate composition of Collier, must be regarded as a grand national monument of ecclesiastical learning, without which, no episcopal or clerical library can have any pretensions to completeness. To quote the words of a quaint writer, "Bingham and Collier are the very sun and moon of Ecclesiastical erudition." The fact is, however, too well known to need quotations to support it; our best Church historians have borrowed largely from their pages, but too often without acknowledging the extent of their obligations.

In consequence of the increased demand of late years made for Collier's Ecclesiastical History, the old folio edition has become extremely scarce and expensive. The publisher therefore determined to meet the frequent applications made to him for the work, by preparing a new edition worthy of the public attention. It is expected that the FIFTH VOLUME will appear in the course of October, 1840, and each subsequent volume in each succeeding month till the work be complete.

Collier's Ecclesiastical History is thus criticized in the *Biographia Britannica*. "As the scheme of this work was in itself of large extent it required a great knowledge in divinity, history, and antiquity, and a very assiduous application to the perusal of records and manuscripts as well as a vast variety of ancient and modern authors; so the performance itself demonstrates very great care to have been taken, in all these respects. The method in which this history is written is very clear and exact, his authorities are constantly cited by the author, his remarks are short and pertinent, and with respect to the Dissertations that are occasionally inserted, they are such as tend to illustrate and explain those perplexed points of which they treat, and contribute thereby to the clearer understanding of the narration. The style is very uniform and grave, which is the more remarkable, because the author in his other writings has shewn as lively a fancy, and as much quickness of wit as any writer of his own time. But he knew this would be improper here, and therefore it is with great judgment avoided. He speaks modestly and respectfully of most of the historians who went before him, and if he is any where severe, he takes care that his reason shall go along with his censure. His own peculiar sentiments with respect to religion and government may in some places be discerned, but taking the whole together, it will be found as judicious, and impartial a work as the world, in doing justice to his talents, could have expected it."

"There are only two writers of the genuine history of our church, who deserve the name of historians, Collier the Nonjuror, and Fuller the Jester." *Bp. Warburton's Directions to a Student in Theology.*

The work has been likewise warmly recommended by the leading periodicals of our own times. The *British Magazine*—The *British Critic*—The *Church of England Quarterly*, the *Quarterly Review*, &c. have justly extolled its merits.

## LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES ALREADY RECEIVED.

- Anstey, Rev. A. Worcester College  
 Adeock, Rev. Halford H., B. A. Ilmberstone, Leicestershire  
 Abrains, Mr. Bookseller, Oxford, 4 copies  
 Anderson, Rev. J. S. M. Kemp Town, Brighton  
 Andrews, Messrs. Booksellers, Bristol  
 Acland, Arthur H. Dyke, Esq. Wollaston House, Dorchester  
 Audland, Rev. W. F. Queen's College, Oxford  
 Andrews, Mr. J. Murdan Ash School, near Ongar, Essex
- Bayly, Rev. W. H. Midhurst  
 Beaufort, Rev. D. A. Sandhutton, Thirsk  
 Blackburn, Rev. Rob. Brazen Nose Coll.  
 Bridges, Sir Harford Jones  
 Blackhall, Rev. H. Christ Church  
 Bain, Mr. Haymarket  
 Barraclough, Mr. Bookseller, Cambridge  
 Bohn, Mr. James, King William-street, 2 copies  
 Bulley, Rev. F. Magdalen Coll. Oxford  
 Brown, Mr. jun. Bookseller, Leicester, 3 copies  
 Browne, Rev. Tho. Clements, Wellington, Somerset  
 Bagot, George Talbot, Esq. Exeter College, Oxford  
 Bage, Rev. James, Lincoln  
 Boissier, Rev. P. E. Malvern Wells  
 Baynes and Son, Paternoster-row  
 Bruce, Mr. 17, King's-parade, Chelsea  
 Bartlett, Mr. James, Blandford  
 Blakiston, Rev. R. Chichester  
 Bellamy, Rev. J. W. Merchant Taylors' School  
 Bund, Rev. T. H. B. Trinity College, Cambridge  
 Bennett, Rev. A. M. South Cudbury, Somerset  
 Burnett, Stewart J. M.D. Billesden Vicarage, near Leicester  
 Bird, Rev. G. Colchester  
 Blomfield, Rev. G. B. Stevenage  
 Burton, Mr. Bookseller, Ipswich  
 Bird, Rev. G.  
 Bryant, Mr. Bookseller, Gloucester  
 Butterfield, Rev. J., M. A. Bradford, Yorkshire  
 Bayley, Rev. A. Edgcott, Banbury
- Curteis, Rev. J. Shelton Rectory, Long Stratton, Norfolk  
 Cotton, Rev. W. C. Christ Church  
 Clements, J. Esq. Oriel  
 Cornwall, Rev. A. G. Ashcroft House, Kingscote  
 Chesshyre, Rev. W. J. Worcester  
 Chandler, Rev. J. S. Witley  
 Carey, Rev. C. Peasmore, Newbury  
 Carey, Rev. Hewitt, Christ Church, St. Pancras
- Cross, Mr. John, Bookseller, Leeds  
 Child, Mr. Bookseller, Worcester  
 Collison, Rev. F. St. John's, Cambridge  
 Coleridge, The Rev. D. Helston, Cornwall  
 Chamberlain, Rev. T. Christ Church, Oxon  
 Currie, Rev. James  
 Coelran, Mr. John, 108, Strand  
 Collis, Rev. J. D. Worcester College, Oxford  
 Chaffers, Rev. T. Brazen Nose College, Oxford  
 Clerk, W. Esq. Trinity College, Oxford  
 Curry, W. jun., and Co., Booksellers, Dublin, 6 copies  
 Currer, Miss, Eshton Hall, Yorkshire  
 Combe and Crossley, Booksellers, Leicester, 4 copies  
 Compton, J. Esq. Merton Coll. Oxford  
 Crossley, J. Esq. Manchester  
 Carlton Club, The  
 Cosser, W. M. Esq. Trinity Coll. Oxford
- De Tessier, G. F. Esq. C. C. C. Oxon.  
 De Tessier, A. Esq. C. C. C. Oxon.  
 Dawson, Jonathan, Esq. Exeter College, Oxon.  
 Dalton, Rev. W. Wolverhampton  
 Deighton, Messrs. Booksellers, Camb. 12 copies  
 Dearden, Mr. Bookseller, Nottingham  
 Darling, Mr. James, Little Queen-street, 3 copies  
 Day, Rev. C. Tredegar-square, Stepney  
 Dixon, Rev. John, Vicar of Brotherton
- Eaton, Messrs. and Son, Booksellers, Worcester, 4 copies  
 Exeter, the Very Rev. the Dean of, Exeter  
 Esteourt, Rev. Edgar Eden, Badgeworth, Gloucestershire
- Fox, Rev. Octavia, Master of the College School, Worcester  
 Fellowes, J. L. Esq. Shotesham Rectory, Norwich  
 Fox & Son, Messrs. Booksellers, Pontefract  
 Foxtan, Rev. G. L. Worcester  
 Fitzgerald, Rev. A. O. Fledborough Rectory, Tuxford  
 Fox, Rev. T., D.D. Provost of Queen's College, Oxford  
 Freeland, F. E. Esq. Chichester
- Grey, Hon. & Rev. F. R. Buxton  
 Graham, Mr. W. Bookseller, 5 copies  
 Grapel, Mr. W. Bookseller, Liverpool  
 Gladstone, W. E. Esq. M. P.  
 Grantham, Clerical Book Society

- Green, Mr. Bookseller, Leeds  
 Grant and Bolton, Messrs. Booksellers, Dublin  
 Gibson, Rev. John, Pelham Vicarage, Buntingford  
 Gibbings, Rev. Rich. A.M. Trinity Coll. Dublin  
 Greene, Rev. J. M. Lincoln Coll. Oxford  
 Gordon, Rev. Osborne, Ch. Ch. Oxford  
 Gough, Geo. S. Esq. M.A., T. C. Dublin  
 Grant and Son, Booksellers, Edinburgh
- Haigh, Rev. Daniel, Great Marlow  
 Hawkins, Rob.S. Esq. Jesus Coll. Oxford  
 Howson, J. S. Esq. B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge  
 Horsley, Rev. J. W. Pluckley, near Charing, Kent  
 Harrington, Rev. Rich. Rectory, Old Northampton  
 Hervey, the Rev. Lord A. Ickworth  
 Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly  
 Holden, Rev. Rose, Worcester  
 Hotham, W. F. Esq. Ch. Ch. Oxford  
 Henn, Rev. W. Garough, co. Londonderry  
 Hardwick, Rev. C. Gloucester  
 Hall, Rev. W. R. 45, Portland Place
- Ives, Right Rev. L.S. D.D., LL.D. Bishop of North Carolina
- Jeanes, Mr. Bookseller, Exeter
- Kitson, J. F. Esq. Exeter Coll. Oxford  
 Kent, Rev. Geo. D. jun. Rector of Sudbrooke  
 Knowles, Mr. John L.  
 Knibb, Mr. Bookseller, Colchester
- Langley, Rev. Thomas B. A. Incumbent of Landago  
 Lusk, John, Esq. Glasgow  
 Leeds Library, Leeds  
 Lewis, Rev. David, Fellow of Jesus College  
 Law, Hon. and Rev. W. S. Whitechurch, Canonieorn  
 Low, Rev. R. Dungannon Fort, Waterford  
 Leslie, Mr. Great Queen-street.  
 Legge, Hon. and Rev. W. Ashtead  
 La Primaudaye, Rev. C. J. St. John's College, Oxford  
 Lewis, Morgan Peter, Esq. Exeter Coll.  
 Lloyd, Rev. Howell Wm. Jesus College  
 Lewis, Evaff, Esq. Jesus College
- Maleolm, Rev. H. Eekington, Derbyshire  
 Maskell, Rev. W. Mapperton House, Beaminster
- Moor, Rev. J. H. C. Clifton, Warwickshire  
 Muskett, Mr. Bookseller, Norwich  
 Morgan, Rev. John, North Carolina, U.S.  
 Morton, M. C. Esq. Exeter College  
 Mason, Rev. W. Normanton  
 Menzies, Rev. F. Fellow of Brasenoso  
 Medley, Rev. John, St. Thomas's Vicarage, Exeter  
 Morris, Rev. T. E., Christ Church, Oxon  
 Morris, Rev. J. B., Exeter College, Oxon  
 Murray, Rev. A. Crescent, Clapham  
 Mackenzie, James, Esq. Doune Terrace, Edinburgh  
 Menzies, Rev. F. Brazen Nose College, Oxford  
 M'Ewan, A. Esq.  
 Milliken and Son, Booksellers, Dublin  
 Morrice, W. D. Esq. St. John's College, Cambridge  
 Mason, Mr. Bookseller, Chichester, 2 copies  
 Morrison, Rev. Mr.  
 Marriott, Rev. C. Principal of the Diocesan College, Chichester  
 Montgomery, Rev. R. F., St. Judes, Glasgow  
 Murray, Rev. W. Colchester
- Northcote, Spencer, Esq. C. C. College, Oxford  
 Nevins, Rev. W. Wilton House, near Ross
- Oswell, Edw. W. Esq. Christ Church, Oxon.  
 Ogle, Mr. Robert, Bookseller, Edinburgh, 3 copies  
 Ogle & Son, Messrs. Booksellers, Glasgow
- Paine, Cornelius, jun. Esq. Canonbury  
 Paine, Mr. Duke Street, Adelphi  
 Parker, Mr. J. H. Bookseller, Oxford, 20 copies  
 Palk, Rev. W. H. Ashcombe, Devon.  
 Portal, Melville, Esq. Christ Church, Oxon.  
 Phillott, Johnson, Esq. Bath  
 Palgrave, Sir Francis  
 Pole, Rev. Reginald Chandos, Radborne Rectory, near Derby  
 Prevost, Rev. Sir George, Stinchcombe, Dursley  
 Pearson, Rev. Charles, Knebworth Rectory, Welwyn, Herts  
 Pearson, Rev. W. H. St. Nicholas's Rectory, Guildford  
 Pearson, Hugh, Esq. B.A. Baliol Coll. Oxford  
 Phillott, Rev. W. H. Charterhouse  
 Pritchard, Mr. Library, Builtb, Breconsh.  
 Pocock, Rev. Nicholas, Queen's College

- Rusher, Mr. Bookseller, Banbury  
 Russell, Rev. F. Trinity Parsonage, Halifax  
 Rudd, Rev. L. H. Wick, near Pershore  
 Russell, Jesse Watts, Esq.  
 Roberts, Rev. G. Vicar of Monmouth  
 Ridsdall, Rev. G. E. Dilton Priors, Bridgenorth  
 Robertson, Rev. F.
- Smith, Rev. J. Vice-President of Trinity College, Oxford  
 Stamp, Rev. John S. Sheffield  
 St. Aubyn, Rev. Rich. Lime Grove, Putney  
 Simpson, Rev. H. Vicarage, Wellingboro' Sidgwick, Rev. W.  
 Stevenson, Mr. Bookseller, Cambridge  
 Stewart, Mr. Bookseller, King William Street  
 Strong, Mr. W. Bookseller, Bristol  
 Smithson, Mrs. Bookseller, Malton  
 Simms and Son, Booksellers, Bath  
 Sheddon, Samuel, Esq. Pembroke Coll. Oxford  
 Spencer, Rev. W. P. Starston, Norfolk  
 Stead, Rev. Alfred, Ringsfield Rectory  
 Sunter, Mr. Bookseller, near Beccles, York, 2 copies  
 Scott, Rev. Robt. Duloe Vicarage, Liskeard  
 Squance, Mr. Bookseller, Exeter  
 Smith, Rev. Edward, Bocking  
 Smirke, E. Esq.  
 Sherlock, Rev. Harold H., M.A. Ashton-in-Winwick  
 Stanfield, Messrs. Booksellers, Wakefield  
 Sparke, Rev. J., Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge  
 Sibthorp, Rev. R. Waldo, Ryde, Isle of Wight  
 Stokes, G. Esq.  
 Smith, Rev. H. R. S.
- Taylor, Mr. Bookseller, Brighton, 2 copies  
 Talboys, Mr. D. A. Bookseller, Oxford, 6 copies  
 Todd, Dr. 26, Parliament Street  
 Tireman, Rev. W. H. Magdalen Coll. Oxford
- Twisleton, Rev. C., Woodlands, Kenilworth  
 Travis, Rev. W. J. Trinity College, Cambridge  
 Trench, Rev. R. C. Botley, near Southampton  
 Turner, Mrs. Lee Place, Godstone, Surrey  
 Thurlow, Rev. John, Houghton le Spring, Durham  
 Trollope, Rev. Arthur  
 Trevelyan, Rev. E. O., Hungerford Vicarage  
 Turnbull, W. B. D. D., Esq. Advocate, Edinburgh
- Utterton, Rev. J. S. Dorking
- Woolcombe, Louis, Esq., Exeter Coll. Oxford  
 Woods, Rev. G. H. West Dean near Midhurst  
 Wallace, Rev. G. Canterbury  
 Williams, Rev. G. King's College, Cambridge  
 Walters, Mr. Bookseller, Rugeley  
 Walter, J. Esq. Exeter Coll. Oxford  
 Woolcombe, Rev. H. Christ Church, Oxford  
 West, Hon. R., B. A. Baliol Coll. Oxford  
 Weston, Rev. H. Worcester  
 Walker, Rev. Edward, Langton Rectory  
 Wason, J. Esq. Stroud, Gloucestershire  
 Ware, Rural Deanery Book Club  
 Wackerbath, Rev. F. D. Peldon  
 Woolcombe, G. Esq. Ch. Ch. Oxford  
 Wilson, Rev. R. F. Hursley  
 Weguelin, Rev. W. A. South Stoke, near Arundel  
 Weare, Rev. T. W. Christ Ch. Oxon.  
 Wilson, Thos. Esq. Bath  
 Walters, Mr. Bookseller, Rugeley  
 Wilkinson, Rev. T. Exeter  
 Wordsworth, C. F. Esq. Magdalen Hall  
 Wakefield Clerical Book Society  
 Walker, Mr. W. Strand  
 Wilberforce, Rev. Henry, Bromsgrove, Christchurch  
 Wilson, Rev. Daniel, Vicar of Islington

Just published, by WILLIAM STRAKER,  
Handsomely printed in Octavo, price 9s. 6d. cloth, lettered,

**ORIGINES BRITANNICÆ;**  
OR, THE  
**ANTIQUITIES OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES.**

With a Preface, concerning some pretended Antiquities relating to Britain ;

BY THE  
RIGHT REV. EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, D.D.  
LATE LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

In 2 vols. small 8vo. price 14s.

**SERMONS ON DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE;**

BY THOMAS TUNSTALL HAVERFIELD, B.D.

RECTOR OF GODDINGTON; CHAPLAIN TO H. R. H. THE DUKE OF SUSSEX; AND  
ALTERNATE MORNING PREACHER AT ST. ANNE'S, WESTMINSTER.

↳ *Either Volume may be had separately.*

*Freemason's Quarterly Review,*  
*June 30, 1835.*

"These Sermons are distinguished by a beautiful piety, conveyed in no less beautiful language. The doctrines of Christianity are advanced and illustrated with an eloquence that carries to the bosom of the reader a firm conviction of the great truth, awakening gratitude and admiration at the wonderful beneficence of the Almighty."

*Literary Gazette, May 16, 1835.*

"Marked by genuine piety, great good sense, and an effective style, these Sermons deserve highly of the Christian world, to which their own merits will recommend them far more powerfully than any encomium of ours."

*British Magazine.*

"Mr. Haverfield writes gracefully, and often powerfully: the Sermons on 'Recognition in a Future State' will amply repay perusal."

*Hampshire Advertiser, May 19, 1838.*

"We have much pleasure in recommending to our readers these excellent discourses: they are evidently the offspring of a vigorous and amiable mind, bent entirely upon the faithful and active discharge of the pastoral duties. They breathe the spirit of genuine piety in a chain of no common eloquence. The great truths of our holy religion are brought forward in a manner equally striking and impressive."

*Conservative Journal, March 16, 1839.*

"It is rarely we have read Sermons with so much pleasure: they are eloquently and beautifully written, and contain a clear and faithful enunciation of the great doctrines of the gospel. They are well adapted for clerical, family, and general perusal, and deserve to be widely known."

*Preparing for Publication,*

**A CATALOGUE**

OF

**A VERY EXTENSIVE COLLECTION OF BOOKS**

IN

**British and Foreign Theology,**  
**ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, &c. &c.**

ON SALE BY

**WILLIAM STRAKER, 443, WEST STRAND.**

Clergymen and Gentlemen desirous of receiving the same, are respectfully requested to transmit their Names to the Publisher.



PROSPECTUS  
OF A  
NEW CHURCH HISTORY  
OF THE  
BRITISH EMPIRE,

FROM THE REIGN OF CHARLES THE SECOND TO THE PRESENT TIMES.

---

MR. BARHAM, the Editor of "COLLIER'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY," begs leave to announce his intention of writing, by way of continuation, *The Ecclesiastical History of the British Empire, from the reign of Charles the Second to the present times.* If the design meet with encouragement, this work will consist of nine octavo volumes, to be published quarterly, at the rate of 10s. 6d. per volume. Those who feel inclined to patronize and subscribe for this work, will be good enough to communicate their names to Mr. Straker, 443, West Strand, London; or to any Bookseller in town or country.

It is desirable to premise that this publication will be conducted on a principle of catholicity, it being the Editor's wish to promote religious charity, and mitigate, as much as possible, the hostilities of sects and parties. It will, however, be composed not so much of original matter as selections from the several authors who have already illustrated the subject. By thus bringing to a common point of union the ecclesiastical fragments of distinguished writers, and allowing them to speak for themselves, the work will combine a certain authority and variety, not easily attainable by other methods. The Editor is convinced that *such a publication is a decided desideratum in sacred literature, for at present there exists no independent history of the British Church of recent times.* This defect has been eloquently animadverted on by Mr. Dowling, in his excellent Introduction to the Study of Ecclesiastical History. In the Preface of the Ecclesiastical and University Annual Register the same deficiency is thus noticed:—"Since the period of the Revolution 1688, the affairs of our holy establishment have been treated with indifference and neglect by all our historians." In attempting to supply the perpetual demand made by the public for such a work, the Editor dares not flatter himself with any idea that his publication will exhaust a subject so interesting, so laborious, and so complicated; he will be satisfied if his volumes fulfil their own design, as popular commentaries on the ecclesiastical affairs of the nine more recent reigns. If, in this regard, they be found to combine the best information scattered over the pages of Echard, Burnet, Lingard, Hansard, Rapin, Tindal, Harris, Warner, Fry, Haweis, Dodd, Butler, Hume, Smollett, Short, Lathbury, Southey, Brown, Hallam, Mackintosh, Carwithen, Grant, Wade, and various foreign writers, they will not be useless or displeasing. And if they shall prepare the way of ecclesiastical annalists who have more time to devote to the critical investigation of such topics as are too lightly touched, or altogether omitted, they will be entitled to more than one leaf from the laurels of their successors.

This Day is published, Price 2s. 6d.

# THE ADAMUS EXUL OF GROTIUS ;

OR,

## THE PROTOTYPE OF PARADISE LOST.

NOW FIRST TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN,

By FRANCIS BARHAM, Esq.

LONDON: SHERWOOD, GILBERT, & PIPER; SIMPKIN & CO.; WHITTAKER & CO.;  
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The 'Adamus Exul of Grotius,' of which a well-executed translation has just appeared in the Monthly Magazine, is certainly well worth the attention of the literary world. Mr. Francis Barham, the translator, has achieved an interesting object, by ascertaining a genuine copy of this work; and we have read with pleasure every line of a composition, which so clearly establishes itself as the prototype of the noblest poem in the language, Milton's 'Paradise Lost.' Never did the genius of the blind old schoolmaster shine more brilliantly, than when we contemplate the manner in which it soared and expanded itself from the suggestive ground, which, from its importance and merit, ought certainly to be separately published."—*Literary Gazette*.

"This work is one of the greatest literary curiosities of national interest which has appeared for many years. Notwithstanding the extraordinary merits of the Latin original, which received the highest suffrage from the first scholars in the age of Milton, the authentic editions of the drama had become extremely scarce. Bishop Douglas and Dr. Johnson, nearly a century ago, sought in vain for this masterpiece of Grotius, long celebrated as the prototype of Milton's 'Paradise Lost.' At length Mr. Heber, who spent his life and fortune in the collection of rare books, procured two copies dated 1601. These copies of the drama having fallen into Mr. Barham's hands, he translated it into English blank verse, and published it in the *Monthly Magazine*, where it first attracted our attention, and elicited our most favourable opinion. It is now republished in a distinct form, with an historical introduction. On a re-perusal of Mr. Barham's translation, we feel ourselves called upon to confirm our original statement as to its merits. Connected as this long-lost work of Grotius is with the history of 'Paradise Lost,' and compelled to adopt the medium of blank verse in its translation, a comparison with Milton's great epic forces itself upon the reader; but Mr. Barham passes triumphantly through the ordeal. We are necessarily reminded of Milton, but not to the disadvantage of the translator, whose flowing periods, force of language, and poetical diction, sustain him well in the dangerous current on which he has perilled his fame. In a national point of view, also, this work must particularly commend itself to our countrymen, who will read the *chef d'œuvre* of Grotius with increased pleasure, from its affording them a clue to the thoughts which inspired some of the noblest flights of our immortal Milton."—*Morning Herald*.

"The first paper is one of the deepest interest to every admirer (we had almost said, idolater) of John Milton—and who is not?—especially of 'Paradise Lost;' for it is the commencement of the 'Adamus Exul of Grotius,' the renowned and often heard of 'Prototype of Paradise Lost,' which has hitherto been a sealed book, except to scholars, but which is 'now first translated from the Latin' [into English blank verse] 'by Francis Barham, Esq.' Thus English readers will not only have an opportunity of perusing a work long well known to them by name, but of judging for themselves how far Milton was indebted to any predecessor for the idea of his extraordinary poem. There are some very interesting prefatory remarks to the translation, in the course of which it is observed, 'that it was not to the ancients only that Milton was indebted; he availed himself equally of the moderns, and without doubt the 'Adamus Exul of Grotius' furnished Milton with that seed of thought and passion, which afterwards bloomed out in that 'bright consummate flower,' the 'Paradise Lost.' And in this translation, Mr. Barham has endeavoured, he declares, to retain something of that Miltonic cadence in blank verse which has been so highly eulogised by Elton. By the publication of this translation, the public will be enabled to decide whether the tragedy of 'Adamus Exul' is not the more probable source of Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' than 'Andreini's Adam,' an Italian drama, to which such honour has been allotted by Voltaire and Hayley; or the 'Paradiso Perso,' defended by Pearce, &c. . . . . The translation of the 'Adamus Exul' of Grotius, 'the Prototype of Milton's Paradise Lost,' is completed, and many parts are distinguished by power of thought and dignity of style. It is a work of great interest to the literary world, and to those who are curious in tracing the sources from which renowned authors derive the plans of their own productions, or borrow ideas and expressions."—*Morning Advertiser*.

AN  
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN.



AN  
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN,

*Chiefly of England,*

FROM THE FIRST PLANTING OF CHRISTIANITY, TO THE END OF  
THE REIGN OF KING CHARLES THE SECOND;

WITH A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE  
AFFAIRS OF RELIGION IN IRELAND.

COLLECTED FROM THE BEST ANCIENT HISTORIANS, COUNCILS, AND RECORDS,

BY

JEREMY COLLIER, M.A.

NEW EDITION,

WITH A LIFE OF THE AUTHOR, THE CONTROVERSIAL TRACTS CONNECTED  
WITH THE HISTORY, NOTES, AND AN ENLARGED INDEX, BY

FRANCIS BARHAM, ESQ.

Juvat integros accedere fontes,  
Atque haurire. LUCRET.  
Nec studio, nec odio.

IN NINE VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR

WILLIAM STRAKER, 443, WEST STRAND.

MDCCXLI.

LONDON  
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

# CONTENTS

OF

## THE FIFTH VOLUME.

### PART II.—BOOK III.

A dissolution of the greater monasteries, 1.—The charge of immoralities too generally laid, and carried too far, 1.—Cromwell applied to, to save the abbeys, but without success, 6.—A list of the commissioners for visiting abbeys, 7.—The methods made use of to suppress religious houses, 7.—The monks of Charterhouse hardly used, 8.—The abbot of St. Alban's incomplicant, 9.—The lord chancellor Audley treats with the abbot of Athelny, 9.—Large pensions offered for resignation, 10.—Convent seals taken away from some of the abbeys, 10.—Reports of war and public danger made the dissolution of the abbeys less regretted, 15.—An act for regulating precedency, 16.—An act for settling the abbey-lands upon the crown, 16.—Sir Edward Coke's remark of the disappointment of the kingdom in what was promised by the court, 16.—The nobility have large promises made them of abbey-lands, 17.—Cromwell's advice, 18.—The religious houses pulled down, 18.—Remarks upon the dissolution of the abbeys, 18.—The abbeys granted to the crown, with their privilege of being discharged from the payment of tithes, 23.—The pope's granting appropriations, a great misfortune to the Church, 23.—Exempted abbeys returned to the jurisdiction of the ordinary, but not without a clause of exception, 24.—The abbots of Reading, Colechester, and Glassenbury, executed for incomppliance, 25.—The suppression of the abbeys censured, 25.—Pretended precedents for dissolution, 26.—Mitred bishops, 27.—The old valuation of their abbeys, 27.—The lord Herbert's reflection upon their dissolution, 28.—The abbeys serviceable to the public upon several accounts, 28.—Histories mostly written by the monks, 29.—The founders of abbeys suffered by the dissolution, 29.—The scandalous destruction of abbey libraries, 30.—Bale's declaration upon Leland's Journal, 31.—The king's coronation oath, 32.—Pensions allowed the religious, 33.—A committee of religion assigned to no effect, 35.—The Six Articles argued in parliament, 36.—The act of the Six Articles, with the penalties, 37.—The king sends the duke of Norfolk, &c. to Lambeth, to countenance the archbishop, 39.—A clash between Cromwell and the duke of Norfolk, 40.—Cranmer ill supported by his adherents, 43.—Some accommodating articles, assented to by Luther, Melancthon, and some German princes of their communion. They allow the papacy under certain qualifications, 44.—The Six Articles complained of, 48.—The religious allowed to purchase, but not to inherit, 48.—An act enabling the king to erect new bishoprics, 48.—A list of the sees the king intended to erect, 49.—How the scheme happened to fail, 49.—A declaration of the faith, &c. of the English nation, 50.—Several persons attainted in parliament without being heard, 50.—An unproved censure upon our

historians, by the author of the "Reformation of the Church of England," 52.—Free use of the Scriptures allowed private persons, 52.—Latimer and Shaxton resign their bishoprics, 53.—The prosecutions in Scotland upon the score of religion, 53.—The clergy and the temporalty in courts of justice, 54.—Cardinal Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrew's, 54.—Articles against sir John Bothwick, 54.—The king of Scots refuses an interview with king Henry, and why, 56.—The king's marriage with Anne of Cleve, 56.—The king of Scots' reasons for not dissolving the monasteries, 58.—The king resolves to part with his queen, 59.—Cromwell's fall, 59.—Cromwell sent to the Tower for high treason, 60.—Crimes charged upon Cromwell in the bill of attainder, 61.—Cromwell dean of Wells, 62.—The king breaks the marriage with Anne of Cleve, 63.—The convocation declares the marriage void, 64.—Their sentence confirmed in parliament, 65.—The lady Anne complies with the proceedings, 65.—An act for moderating the penalties of the six articles, 65.—An act concerning the declaration of the Christian religion, 66.—The order of the knights of St. John of Jerusalem suppressed, 67.—An act concerning marriages and degrees of consanguinity, &c. 68.—An act concerning tithes, 68.—Persons holding several errors excepted from the general pardon, 70.—Lord Cromwell executed, 70.—His character, 70.—Cromwell no Lutheran, 73.—Several attainders, 77.—A farther account of Dr. Barnes, 78.—Jerome maintains passive obedience, 79.—Barnes, his conference with the bishop of Winchester, 79.—Barnes, Gerrard, and Jerome suffer in Smithfield. Three others executed with them, for denying the king's supremacy, 80.—The declaration of Barnes, Gerrard, and Jerome, 80.—Barnes, his request to the king, 81.—He and the other two suffer with great resignation and constancy, 82.—Six new bishoprics erected, 82.—Bible printed in a large volume, 83.—The king's progress into Yorkshire, 85.—Queen Catharine Howard beheaded, 86.—The bishopric of Chester dis severed from the province of Canterbury, 86.—A review of the translation of the Bible proposed in convocation, but miscarries, 87.—The king directs to the reforming the missals, &c., 89.—A motion to empower lay chancellors to execute Church censures rejected, 89.—Scots defeated at Solway, 90.—Death of James V. of Scotland, 90.—The heats of some of the preachers, 94.—Plays forbidden to be acted in churches, 94.—An act restraining the use of the Bible to certain degrees, 95.—Questions concerning the sacraments, 97.—An account of the "Necessary Erudition," 98.—The article of faith, 98.—The "Necessary Erudition" supplemental to the "Institution" in several articles, 99.—Of free-will, 99.—Of good works, 100.—The difference between the "Erudition" and the "Institution," 101.—A comparison between the two books, 105.—The ceremonies of the Church examined, 105.—Archbishop Cranmer's opinion overruled in the "Erudition of a Christian Man," 124.—A match proposed between prince Edward and the queen of Scots, 125.—A treaty of marriage broken by cardinal Beaton, 126.—A remarkable clause in an act relating to oaths, 127.—Archbishop Cranmer charged with heresy, 128.—He is preserved by the king, 129.—He is ill treated by the privy council, 131.—A concert discovered against him, 133.—A mitigation of the rigour of the act of the Six Articles, 133.—The regal style for Ireland enacted, 134.—Some abbey lands may be held in sockage, 134.—An act for reviewing the canons, 134.—Scotland harassed by the English, 135.—Boulogne taken by king Henry, 136.—A litany in English, 136.—The death of Lee, archbishop of York, 136.—The oaths for renouncing the pope, 136.—An oath somewhat implicit, 137.—The French miscarry in their attempt upon the English coast, 138.—The king's letter to archbishop Cranmer, to forbid creeping to the cross, &c., 138.—The archbishop's answer, 139.—He draws an extract out of the canon law, 140.—A draught of the book, entitled "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum," 141.—The king's letters-patent to pass it into law, 141.—This instrument not signed, 141.—Wishart's preaching and trial, 142.—He consecrates the holy eucharist, 145.—And suffers with resolution, 145.—Remarks upon some part of his behaviour, 145.—Cranmer's translation of the Liturgy for a procession, 147.—Chantries, colleges, &c. granted to the king, 148.—Seventy manors alienated from the archbishop of York, 150.—And several from the sees of Canterbury and London, 150.—The king's ecclesiastical authority mentioned in comprehensive terms, 150.—The king's last speech to his parliament, 151.—The



universities address the king to preserve their estates, and succeed in their application, 153.—Cardinal Beaton assassinated, 154.—A horrible assertion in Fox, 154.—The conspirators fortify the castle, and stand on their defence, 155.—Knox, his going to them not defensible, 156.—Knox goes too far in his sermon against the Church of Rome, 157.—The articles against him and John Rough, 158.—They have a friendly dismissal from the sub-prior, 159.—John Rough leaves the garrison for their licentiousness, 159.—The castle surrendered, 160.—Peace between England and France, 160. Books prohibited by proclamation, 161.—Bishop Shaxton's submission, 161.—Mrs. Askew and three others executed for religion in Smithfield, 163.—The queen in danger for arguing against the king's opinion, 163.—She submits, and recovers the king's favour, 164.—The duke of Norfolk attainted, and the earl of Surrey beheaded, 165.—The king dies, 166.—Somewhat of his character, 166.—The king's injunction to Bonner, 168.—His benefactions, 168.—The stews suppressed by king Henry, 169.

---

#### BOOK IV.

The executors to the late king's will, 176.—The earl of Hertford chosen protector, 177.—The bishops take out new commissions, 179.—A creation of noblemen designed by the late king, 181.—Spiritual preferments given to secular men, 182.—The funeral of the late king solemnized at Paris, 183.—His will overlooked with relation to himself, 183.—Edward VI. crowned, 183.—The archbishop's speech at this solemnity, 184.—The lord chancellor turned out, and why, 185.—The lord protector holds his office by patent, 186.—The great power granted the privy-council, 186.—The rigour of the Six Articles abated, 188.—A regal visitation, 188.—Homilies composed, 188.—Some homilies drawn up by Cranmer, 188.—Images pulled down without authority, 189.—Gardiner's complaint upon this score, 189.—The protector's answer, 189.—Bishop Gardiner's letter to Ridley in defence of holy water, 190.—His letter to the protector to dissuade alteration in religion, 191.—He complains of the ridiculing Lent, 192.—The protector's answer, 192.—Dr. Smith's recantation, 193.—Winchester's arguments against alteration in religion, 193.—The bishop's jurisdiction inhibited, 194.—The latitude of the visitors' commission, 194.—The Church lamentably impoverished, 195.—The condition of vicarages worse than formerly, 195.—The bishops disposed for a farther reformation, 196.—This design opposed by the bishop of Winchester, 197.—Winchester's letter to the protector, and to Cranmer, 197.—The king's injunctions, 199.—Particular injunctions delivered by the visitors to the bishops, 203.—Bidding of prayer, 204.—Several preachers recant some of their former opinions, 204.—Bishop Gardiner's letter to one of the visitors against compliance, 205.—His reasons for insisting on the constitution, 206.—The protector levies forces, and prepares for an expedition against Scotland, 207.—A fair correspondence with England and France endeavoured, 208.—The French king's obsequies solemnized in London, 208.—The protector's letter to offer the Scotch a cessation of arms, 208.—The battle at Pinky near Musleborough, 209.—Bonner demurs to the injunctions, 210.—He makes an absolute submission, but is sent to the Fleet, 211.—Images removed in London, 211.—The bishop of Winchester committed to the Fleet, 212.—His letter to the protector, 212.—He charges Erasmus's Paraphrase with contradiction to the Homilies and Injunctions, 212.—Unsound opinions in Erasmus's Paraphrase, 213.—The bishop's plea before the privy-council, 216.—His answer to the king upon the subject of absolute government, 217.—The bishop of Winchester confined till the prorogation of parliament, 219.—Bishop Tunstal dismissed the council-board, 219.—Heylin's remark on the disposition of the members of parliament, 219.—A convocation held, 220.—The lower house of convocation move to sit in parliament, 221.—

The clergy anciently part of the house of Commons, 221.—A resolution of the lord chancellor and judges, 222.—The clergy claim a right of examining bills relating to religion, &c., 224.—The penal statutes, touching religion, repealed, 224.—A repeal of 31 Hen. VIII. cap. 8, and 34 Hen. VIII. cap. 23, 225.—A statute against irreverent speaking of the holy sacrament, 225.—The bishop or chancellor, &c., to assist at the trial of such offenders, 227.—The holy eucharist to be given in both kinds, excepting in cases of necessity, 227.—The bishops to be nominated by the king's letters-patent, without congé d'élire, 227.—The ancient method of electing bishops, 228.—Fees to be paid by a bishop, 229.—Powers and privileges of a bishop, 230.—Process in spiritual courts to be made in the king's name, 230.—The bishops not under the penalty of 1 Edw. VI. cap. 2, 230.—Proviso in favour of the bishops, 231.—Statutes against vagabonds levelled against the monks, 232.—An act for uniting parishes and pulling down churches in the city of York, 233.—An act for the dissolution of chantries, &c., 233.—This bill opposed by Cranmer and other bishops, 233.—The intention of the founders of these houses, 234.—The reasons for dissolving them, 235.—Orders of the privy-council for this year, 236.—A committee, &c., for examining the divorce of the marquess of Northampton, and whether it was lawful to marry again, 239.—Judgment given for the marquess, 241.—An order of the council against candles, palms, &c., 241.—Cranmer's mandate to Bonner, 242.—An order of council for removing all images out of churches, 242.—The visitors' injunctions to the deanery of Doncaster, 243.—Bishop Latimer's complaint of the invasion of the patrimony of the Church, 244.—The declension of the universities, 245.—The chantry-lands misemployed, 245.—A committee of bishops, &c., draw up an order for administering the holy eucharist under both kinds, 246.—Their answer to several questions relating to the holy eucharist, 247.—A form drawn up by the bishops for communicating in both kinds, 254.—A proclamation for conformity to the office, 255.—A letter of the privy-council to all the bishops for the same purpose, 256.—Private confession examined, 258.—Dr. Hammond's sense upon this subject, 258.—Erasmus recommends auricular confession, 258.—Public penance done in the ancient Church for crimes confessed only to the priest, 259.—The manner of penance, 260.—Not restoring public penance a misfortune upon the Church, 261.—This discipline not altogether disused before the Reformation, 261.—The power of "the keys" more than declarative, 261.—The commissioners dispatched to seize the chantries for the king, 263.—The dissolution of St. Stephen's Chapel and St. Martin's-le-grand, 263.—The dean and chapter of Westminster alienate more than half of their lands, 263.—Bishop Gardiner's affairs farther embroiled, 264.—The protector prescribes him the heads of his sermon, 265.—He refuses to comply, and is sent to the Tower, 265.—His apology, 265.—Disputes and diversity of practice in the ceremonies of the Church, 269.—A catechism set forth by Cranmer, 269.—Orders for drawing up a book for divine service, 271.—Remarks upon the ancient liturgies: St. James's liturgy, 272.—The liturgy supposed written by Clemens Romanus, 272.—St. Basil's liturgy, 273.—St. Chrysostom's liturgy, 274.—The Roman missal, 274.—The Mozarabic and Gallican liturgies, 274.—Those who drew up the English liturgy had regard to primitive practice, and declined unnecessary innovation, 275.—Divine service in the language of the country the custom of the ancient Church, 276.—Father Simon considered upon this argument, 278.—A brief account of the first reformed liturgy, 280.—The Introites, 282.—The form of the bread to be consecrated, 282.—Wafers consecrated for the holy eucharist, 283.—Public baptism, 284.—Private baptism, 284.—The Catechism, 285.—Anointing at Baptism and Confirmation, 285.—The Visitation of the Sick, 285.—Anointing the sick person, 286.—The Burial of the Dead, 286.—Prayers for the dead a general custom of the Church, 288.—Authorities for this point, 288.—The inoffensiveness of the practice, 290.—Bucer's objections considered, 290.—Communion at burials, 293.—This office kept up in the Latin translation of queen Elizabeth's Common Prayer-book, 294.—Distribution of charity at funerals, 294.—The invocation of the descent of the Holy Ghost, 294.—The holy eucharist a sacrifice, 295.—Some ceremonies set aside, and some retained, and why, 297.—Haddington besieged, 302.—The Scottish queen conveyed to France, 302.—The English not successful in war with Scotland, 303.—

An act to make the marriage of priests lawful, 304.—Many of the clergy privately married before the Reformation, 305.—All persons prohibited preaching, 306.—An act for an uniformity of prayer and administration of the sacraments, 306.—A proviso for the universities, 307.—Another for the use of the Psalms in metre, 307.—Psalmody a primitive and general custom, 308.—An act for the true payment of tithes, 310.—A dark and ambiguous clause, 311.—An act for abstinence from eating flesh upon vigils and other fasting days, 312.—The antiquity of the Lenten fast, 313.—A bill for reviving ecclesiastical jurisdiction thrown out, 310.—Champney's recantation, 315.—Ash-ton's recantation, 317.—Cranmer entertains foreign divines, 317.—A brief account of the Interim, 317.—The lord admiral Seymour attainted of high treason, 321.—He denies the charge at his death, 323.—Somerset-house built, 324.—The new liturgy mostly complied with, 325.—An insurrection of the commons in several parts of the kingdom, 326.—The demands of the Devonshire rebels, 327.—The king's answer, 328.—The archbishop's answer, 329.—The siege of Exeter raised, 331.—The remonstrance of the Norfolk rebels, 331.—The marquess of Northampton goes against them without success, 332.—Dr. Parker preaches loyalty to them, 332.—Cheek's discourse to the rebels, 333.—They are routed by the earl of Warwick, 333.—The French attack the English, 334.—Peter Martyr disputes publicly at Oxford, 334.—His questions, 335.—Martyr's letter to Bucer concerning his disputation at Oxford, 336.—Bucer's answer, 337.—Bucer's definition of the holy eucharist, 339.—Calvin's confession of faith with reference to the holy eucharist, subscribed by Bucer and others, 339.—How the Fathers expressed themselves upon this subject, 340.—The king's letter to Bonner, 342.—The lady Mary writes to the council for liberty of conscience, 343.—Their answer, 343.—The emperor appears in her behalf, 344.—A proclamation against plays, 345.—Injunctions sent by the king to Bonner, 345.—The matter of the sermon prescribed this bishop, 346.—Ridley blamed by the protector for his incomppliance at Cambridge, 348.—He justifies his conduct, 348.—Bonner cited before the commissioners, 348.—He defends himself against the main article of the charge, 350.—The witnesses purge themselves from the charge of confederacy, 351.—Bonner's farther defence with respect to the king's authority in his nonage, 352.—His farther exceptions, 353.—He exhibits an information against his informer, Latimer, 354.—A farther declaration of his loyalty, 354.—He receives harsh language from sir Thomas Smith, 354.—And makes a warm return, 355.—He appeals to the king, 355.—He is deprived, 356.—The grounds of his sentence, 357.—Remarks upon his deprivation, 357.—The bishops not deprived by the emperors in the cases proposed, 358.—The sense of the councils of Antioch and Calcedon, 360.—Bonner's case farther considered, 360.—The duke of Somerset sent to the Tower and impeached, 362.—The articles of the impeachment, 363.—Calvin's letter to the protector, 363.—His cavils against the English Liturgy, 364.—Against praying for the dead, 364.—Against chrism and extreme unction, 365.—Honest zeal against licentiousness, 366.—His judgment concerning the regale, 367.—Bishop Gardiner's letter to the lords for his enlargement, 369.—Cardinal Pole hinders his own promotion to the popedom, 369.—An act for calling in the old service-books, and destroying images, 371.—Nothing in the first reformed Common Prayer-book but what is evidently grounded upon the Word of God, 371.—The bishops complain their jurisdiction was all taken from them, 372.—Thirty-two persons nominated to review the ecclesiastical laws, 373.—The submission of the duke of Somerset, 374.—Bonner petitions his appeal may be admitted, but without success, 374.—The earl of Warwick declares for the Reformation, 375.—An act to empower a committee of bishops, &c., to draw up an ordinal, 375.—The forms of ordination in the ancient Church, 376.—The apostolical constitutions, 376.—The fourth council of Carthage, 377.—The pretended Dionysius, 377.—The Greek Church, 378.—The essentials in ordinations, 379.—The rites in the ancient ordinals, 379.—Remarks on the supposed difference in the English ordinals, 381.—The meaning of being moved by the Holy Ghost, 382.—Orders not accounted valid by the ancient Church unless received from a bishop, 382.—The objection against the reformed ordinal not considerable, 384.—A peace with France and Scotland, 384.—Joan Butcher burnt for heresy, 385.—The king very unwilling to sign the warrant for her execution, 385.—John A-lasco settles in England, and has a

church allowed him with extraordinary privileges, 386.—Hooper nominated to the see of Gloucester, 387.—He scruples wearing the episcopal habit, 387.—Peter Martyr's answer to his objections, 388.—Bucer's letter to Hooper upon the same subject, 391.—Hooper confined to his house, and afterwards sent to the Fleet, 393.—Latimer's sermon, 393.—A public disputation at Cambridge, 395.—Some of Bucer's principles, 395.—Bucer's animadversions upon the English Common Prayer, 397.—His concessions, 397.—His objections, 398.—Bucer's censures restrained, 406.—Bucer's book concerning the kingdom of Christ, 407.—He precautions the king strongly against sacrilege, 408.—Church lands not to be exchanged without an equal value returned, 409.—A reproof of the hypocrisy, &c. of some gospellers, 410.—He proposes a provision for the poor, 412.—Marriage allowed after divorce, 413.—And after monastic vows, 414.—Rules for the education of youth, 415.—He advises the reforming the merchants, 415.—He moves for explaining the laws, and publishing them in English, 416.—And proposes some regulations of the magistracy, 416.—A recital of some crimes which deserve capital punishment, 417.—Ridley's visitation, 418.—The king's letter for changing altars into tables, 419.—The reasons for this alteration, 420.—Bishop Gardiner further examined, 421.—Articles enjoined him to subscribe, 421.—His bishopric is sequestered, 422.—He is deprived, and more closely imprisoned, 423.—Day, bishop of Chichester, committed to the Fleet, 423.—The judges' opinion concerning a spiritual office, 425.—The see of Exeter voided, 425.—Great alienations of bishops' lands, 425.—The submissions of Dr. Oglethorpe and Dr. Smith, 426.—Bucer's death, 427.—The libraries at Westminster and at Oxford almost destroyed, 427.—Hooper gets over his scruples, and is consecrated, 428.—Endeavours to bring the princess Mary to the Reformation, but without success, 429.—The king cannot be prevailed with to allow her the exercise of her religion, 430.—An alliance with France, 432.—The Common Prayer-book reviewed, 433.—Some difference between the first and second liturgies, 435.—Archbishop Cranmer draws up a book of articles of religion, 437.—The sweating sickness, 438.—The lady Mary solicits the king and council for the exercise of her religion, 439.—She is refused, 441.—A misunderstanding between the duke of Somerset and the earl of Warwick, 442.—A creation of honours, 443.—The duke of Somerset sent to the Tower, 443.—The queen regent of Scotland honourably received, 443.—The duke of Somerset indicted at Guildhall, 444.—He is tried by his peers, 445.—The charge against him, 446.—The duke's defence, 447.—Sir Edwark Coke's remarks upon the indictment, 447.—The branch of the statute with which the duke was most pressed, 449.—The king's letter to Fitzpatrick concerning the duke's trial, 449.—He is acquitted of high treason, but found guilty of felony, 450.—Remarks upon his trial, 451.—His speech upon the scaffold, 452.—The people in a panic, and why, 452.—Fox's observation upon this fright, 453.—The duke's character, 454.—The lord chancellor Rich resigns the broad seal, 455.—It is given to the bishop of Ely, 455.—Secular employments, whether inconsistent with a spiritual character, 455.—Bishop Burnet's objections considered, 456.—Adam Wallace tried for heresy in Scotland, 460.—He is condemned, and burnt at Edinburgh, 462.—Prior Marshall's preaching on the Lord's Prayer, 462.—Friar Tottes's heterodox and whimsical paraphrase upon the Lord's Prayer, 462.—The question determined against Marshall at the synod of Edinburgh, 463.—The reviewed Common Prayer-book authorised by act of parliament, 464.—An honourable testimony given by the parliament to the first Common Prayer-book, 464.—The ordinal confirmed by this statute, 465.—An act for making overseers for the poor, 465.—Holidays and fasts settled by act of parliament, 466.—A proviso for a liberty of working in several cases, 467.—An act against quarrelling in churches, 467.—A case debated by the judges upon this statute, 468.—Marriage subsequent to a contract with a third person void without a formal divorce, 469.—Married priests set upon the same foot of advantage with other subjects, 472.—An act concerning usury, 474.—The bishopric of Westminster dissolved, 474.—A bill concerning simony miscarries, 474.—A bill brought in against the bishop of Durham, but miscarries, 475.—The articles passed in the convocation, 476.—A satire upon the dissoluteness of manners, 477.—Provisions in London for the poor, 477.—The new Common Prayer-book

executed, 478.—Sternhold and Hopkins's translation of the Psalms, 478.—They are rather permitted than allowed, 478.—A brief account of the book drawn up for a body of ecclesiastical laws, and entitled "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum," 479.—The sacraments, 481.—Idolatry, witchcraft, &c., 481.—Qualifications of preachers, 481.—Marriage, 481.—The prohibited degrees of marriage, 482.—The punishment of adultery, 482.—Desertion and absence, 483.—Divorce allowed in several cases, 483.—The penalty of prompting to licentiousness, 484.—An admonition to patrons, 484.—The penalty of presenting upon a simoniacal contract, 485.—The examination of those admitted to benefices, 485.—Natural children barred spiritual promotions, 486.—What disadvantage of person are incapacities for the priesthood, 486.—The manner of purgation, 486.—Preventions of licentiousness, 487.—Dilapidations, 488.—Alienations, 488.—Elections, 488.—The corrupt practices of lay-patrons, 488.—Regulations of divine service, 488.—Rules for psalmody, 489.—Sacraments not to be administered in private chapels, 489.—The business of rural deans and archdeacons, 490.—The bishop's office, 490.—Regulations for the bishop's family, and the rest of the clergy, 490.—The method and business of synods, 491.—Certain persons disabled from making wills, 492.—Disobedience to parents, how punished, 493.—Commutation seldom allowed, 493.—The power of binding and loosing granted by our Saviour to the Church, 493.—The manner of re-admitting penitents to communion, 495.—The form of absolution, 496.—Depredations upon vacant bishoprics, 497.—The king threatens to seize the charter of the city of London, 498.—Bishop Ridley's discourse with the princess Mary, 498.—The bishop of Durham deprived, 500.—The death of the antiquary Leland, 500.—The bishopric of Durham dissolved, 501.—Crown lands diminished, and the king in debt, 502.—A commission to seize church-plate and ornaments throughout the kingdom, 503.—The plate, &c. brought in from St. Peter's, Westminster, and St. Paul's, 505.—A catechism published, 506.—Trade settled with the czar of Muscovy, 507.—The crown settled upon lady Jane Grey, 507.—The archbishop, overruled by the judges, signs the instrument, 510.—Another instrument signed by council to adhere to the settlement, 510.—The king's death, 511.—His character, 511.—Christ Church, St. Bartholomew's, St. Thomas's Hospital, and Bridewell settled for the relief of the poor, &c., 513.—A complaint of the rapacities and disorders of this reign, 515.—Roderick Morse, or Brincklow, his satire upon avarice and sacrilege.—The king seems to have been bred under some prejudices, 518.



AN  
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN.

PART II.—BOOK III.

THERE were several surrenders of the greater monasteries made the last year. This affair was carried on with all the application imaginable; insomuch that by the beginning of this year almost all the religious houses were resigned to the crown. This being a very extraordinary revolution both in Church and State, it will not be amiss to open the scene, to enlarge upon the circumstances, and acquaint the reader with the detail of this surprising emergency. To assist this project, and make it go down the better with the people, the monasteries had a heavy charge of disorder and immorality brought against them. That the narratives of this kind were swelled beyond truth and proportion, may well be suspected from the mercenary temper of some of the visitors, who begged for this employment, as hath been observed already; besides, that several of the religious houses had a fair reputation, appears from authentic records, some of which I shall give the reader.

HENRY  
VIII.  
155.

*A dissolution of the greater monasteries.*  
1539.

*The charge of immoralities too generally laid, and carried too far.*

To begin: John Apprice, upon his visitation of the abbey of St. Edmondsbury, in Suffolk, acquaints Cromwell—“ That the visitors had nothing to except against the abbot’s regularity: but it was reported, he diverted himself too much at cards and dice, was too expensive in building, and turned several farms into copyholds, and spent too much time in his country houses. The visitors charged him farther with being

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. E. 4.  
fol. 120.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

addicted to superstitious ceremonies; that is, he practised the religion then established. As for the convent, Apprice declares they could draw little or nothing from them. But this silence he attributes to pre-instruction and concert. It is true, he adds, that some of the monks confessed great numbers of women frequented the abbey; but mentions no disorder amongst them. The relics, viz. coals that roasted St. Lawrence, the parings of St. Edmund's nails, archbishop Becket's boots, &c. seemed the heaviest part of the charge."

*The Commissioners' Letter to Cromwell in behalf of the Priory of Catesby.*

156.

Ibid.  
fol. 209.

"In this letter they make a report of the pious and inoffensive behaviour of the prioress and nuns: that the house was very discreetly managed, and very serviceable to the poor of the neighbourhood. They desire Cromwell, that the king may be addressed to preserve the house. This letter is subscribed by three commissioners: Edmund Knightly, John Lane, and George Gifford."

*A Letter from the King's Commissioners in behalf of the Nunnery of Pollsworth, in Warwickshire: July the 28th, 1537.*

Ibid.  
fol. 210.

"In this letter, subscribed by six commissioners, Cromwell is strongly solicited that the abbey might stand. To prevail with him, they give a great character of the abbess and nuns. That both by general fame, and inquiry into the house, they found the rule of the institution exactly observed. That in case the nunnery should be suppressed, the town would be ruined, and six or seven score persons thrown out of their livelihood."

*Commissioner Gifford's Letter to Cromwell in behalf of the Priory of Woolstrop, in Northamptonshire: June the 19th, 1537.*

"Gifford takes notice, that himself and some of those joined in commission with him, had formerly written to the chancellor of the augmentations, in behalf of the abbey of St. James, and priory of Catesby, in Northamptonshire; that the king was displeased with this solicitation, and charged them



with receiving money for interposing in this affair. And here, after a protestation of his integrity, he proceeds to beg Cromwell's favour for the priory of Woolstrop. He acquaints him that the prior was an unexceptionable person, managed the revenues of the house to advantage, and was remarkable for hospitality and relieving the poor. That the priests of the convent lived up to their character, and spent their leisure hours in embroidering, transcribing, making their own clothes, carving, painting, &c. He added, the charity of the house was such, that it would be a very gracious and meritorious act in the king to let it stand. And that for this good office Cromwell would not only have the prayers of the convent, but the benefit of the devotions of the people four or five miles round. At the close of the letter, he calls God to witness the truth of this report."

HENRY  
VIII.Ibid.  
fol. 214.

By this letter, it appears the fate of the abbeys was irrevocably fixed: the king's passions ran so strong for a dissolution, that he would scarce endure the report of a fair character given the religious. Though, after all, the learned Sir William Dugdale is of opinion, that the ruin of the abbeys was no original thought of the king's. It is more reasonable to believe it was the suggestion of some ambitious men, who projected vast advantages to themselves. And if wealth and titles are such, without regard to the manner of coming by them, they were not mistaken in their aim. To mention some more applications in favour of the monasteries.

*A Letter from Mr. Arundell, a Cornish Gentleman, to Cromwell, to preserve the Abbey of Cliffe, in that County.*

"He informs the vicar-general, there were seventeen priests, all of them remarkable for their hospitality and regular behaviour. They offer the king a thousand marks to compound against dissolution."

Ibid.  
fol. 257.

*Thomas Bedyll's Letter to Cromwell: January the 15th,*  
27 H. 8.

"Here this visitor gives Cromwell an account of the condition of the abbey of Ramsey. He informs him the abbot and convent were remarkable for their loyalty, and all other parts

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of a regular life. He mentions their exemption from episcopal jurisdiction by king Edgar's charter, and suggests from thence an advantage for the king's supremacy. At taking leave, he desires a commission from Cromwell to visit the unexamined houses in the diocese of Lincoln: this, he is so frank as to say, would be very much for his commodity."

Ibid.  
fol. 294.

*A Letter of Thomas Lord Lawarr to Cromwell.*

"He desires Cromwell to use his interest with the king, that the priory of Boxgrave might not be suppressed. And if this request could not be granted, that he might be tenant to the land, in regard the house was founded by his ancestors. He concludes with a promise of giving Cromwell satisfaction."

Ibid.  
fol. 234.

*The Abbess of Godstowe's Letter to Cromwell: November the 5th, 1537.*

"She complains of the menacing and ill treatment of doctor London, one of the visitors: that he had misreported her to the king, and charged her with embezzling the goods, and committing waste upon the nunnery. She desires to be called to an account, denies the charge, and offers to justify her conduct in every particular."

Ibid.  
fol. 238.

*A Letter of the Abbot of Rewly, in Oxfordshire, to Cromwell, in behalf of his Abbey.*

[I shall give it the reader in his own words.]

"Right honourable, and my singular good master, my duty remembered, I humbly commend to you, glad to hear of your health, wealth, and prosperity, the which I pray Jesu long to continue to your heart and desire, &c. thanking your mastership for your great kindness showed to me at all times: whereas it pleased you that so soon I should come to your speech, with so little expense in lying at London, and also for your good and gentle words, kind and loving friendship, not having for the same pleasure or commodity of me as yet, trusting by some special gift of grace to acquit it tenfold: and whereas I had a letter sent me, that our monastery should be given to Mr. Archard, your servant, and that it was also in the com-

mission, I submit myself full and whole to your mastership, as all my refuge, help, and succour is in you; glad of my voluntary mind to be bound in an obligation of an hundred pounds to be paid to your mastership, so that our house may be saved; although it be converted into the use of a college, to have both learning and learned men go forward therein. I was loth to attempt your mastership any farther, since I had such gentle answers; unless the great rumour of the town and university compelled me, because of the aforesaid gift to the aforesaid Mr. Archard, beseeching your mastership's kind letter against the surveyor's letter coming to discharge them; that it may be as a shield or buckler to defend me; that you may get you a memorial to be prayed for for ever. And thus Almighty Jesu send your mastership long life and much honour.

HENRY  
VIII.

157.

Ibid.  
fol. 269.

NICHOLAS, by the grace of God,  
Abbot of Roy Alleyne."

Upon this occasion it may not be improper to take notice that, at the beginning of these alterations, Cromwell had written circular letters to the abbots of the greater abbeys, assuring them against the apprehension of a dissolution. And here, amongst other things, he acquaints them from the king, that except the lesser religious houses had made a free and voluntary surrender to his majesty, his grace would never have received the same.

Ibid. fol. 68.

*A Letter of the Abbot of Hewlin, in vindication of himself and his Convent: Feb. the 10th, 1533.*

"He takes notice the person to whom he writes was somewhat surprised at the incomppliance of his house: but to justify his behaviour in not surrendering, he puts them in mind the abbey was dedicated to God Almighty's service, and to be spent in distributions of charity, and that these ends were honestly answered. That since they had given no occasion for a dissolution, they thought themselves not obliged to resign. But understanding the king and the lord privy seal, Cromwell, were displeas'd with this part of their conduct, he promises his utmost to bring his brothers to conformity."

Ibid.  
fol. 270.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*A Letter from the Prioress and Sisters of Legburne to the Founder, to intercede with the King that the House might not be suppressed: 29 H. VIII. 1537.*

“To move the king to continue the nunnery, she acquaints the founder they were ready to stand the test of an examination: that they did not fear the visitors could find any ground of complaint against them, either with respect to their hospitality or behaviour.”

Ibid.

There are several other fair testimonials of the regularity of the religious houses to be seen upon record in the augmentation office, but what I have mentioned may be sufficient.

The abbots of Croyland, Leicester, and the prior of Burlington, endeavoured to preserve themselves from the storm, as mariners do, by throwing part of their goods overboard: that is, they endeavoured to sweeten the court with presents. The prior of Canterbury, and the abbey of saint Edmondsbury, to mention no more, tried this expedient with Cromwell. By the prior of Canterbury's letter to Cromwell, it appears that house paid an annual gratuity of ten pounds to Cromwell, which they now augment to twenty, by a new instrument, to him and his son. The house likewise promises the reversion of two farms to two of Cromwell's servants, to be nominated by himself.

Ibid. fol. 34.  
57. et alibi.

The abbot of Bury settled an annuity of ten pounds upon Cromwell, and another of the same value upon his son, as appears by an instrument under the seal of the convent.

See Records,  
num. 12.  
*Cromwell  
applied to,  
to save the  
abbey, but  
without  
success.*

We see here were strong applications made to Cromwell: he was looked upon as a person of the greatest ascendant, as the mover of this new machine. They endeavoured to work him upon the topics of justice and honour, of regard to the country, and pity to the poor. They plied him with testimonials, with presents and promises, but all to no purpose: he had more prevalent motives, more tempting views on the other side. In short, no rhetoric, either in language or acknowledgments, could make an impression: he was “like the deaf adder, that refuseth to hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely.”

Besides the charge of immorality, there were several other finesses made use of to carry on the ruin of the abbeyes. To

mention some of them. In the vacancy of the greater houses, such persons were elected as were disposed to comply with the court measures; these abbots had instructions to persuade the monks to surrender. And here, it seems, they were so active and successful in their post, that, within two years, they brought the monks in several convents to their bent, and prevailed for a resignation. Things being thus ripe for the king's purpose, commissioners were sent down to take the surrenders. The list of them, besides those already mentioned, is as follows: Robert, earl of Sussex; sir John Saint Clere, sir William Pirton, sir Henry Farrington, knights: and Richard Devereux, late friar; Anthony Fitzherbert, afterwards one of the justices of the Common Pleas; John Gage, William Leyland, John Williams, Thomas Mildmay, — Jobson, Richard Cromwell, Robert Southwell, William Parr, Henry Polsted, John Antony, John Grevil, Simon Mountfort, Thomas Holt, Roger Wigston, Robert Burgoin, Richard Pollard, Philip Parys, John Smith, Edward Carne, Richard Gwent, William Berners, John Arnold, and Richard Pawlet. These gentlemen were great managers, and well qualified for their employment: they left no stone unturned to drive on their projects, and bring their business to a point. When they found the abbots indisposed for their purpose, they tempted them with the promise of large pensions during life. This bait succeeded with the abbot of Hales in Gloucestershire, with the abbot of Ramsey, and the priors of Ely and Gisborn. To make the precedent work upon others, the pliancy of these men was highly commended to the lord Cromwell; and the obsequiousness of some was so far encouraged, as to be honoured with a commission to destroy the rest. This, for instance, was part of the prior of Gisborn's preferment.

On the other hand, when they proved untractable upon motives of conscience or honour, they were highly complained of for their disobedience to the lord Cromwell. Thus Bedyle, in his letter concerning the nunnery of Sion, has nothing to charge the ladies or sisters with, excepting their obstinacy and in compliance; and that they endeavoured to make a party in the house against a surrender, and refused to fortify the king's title with the convent's seal.

This Bedyle, in another letter concerning the priory of

HENRY  
VIII.

*A list of the commissioners for visiting the abbeys.*

Dugdale's Warwickshire, fol. 801. *The methods made use of to suppress religious houses.*

Dugdale, *ibid.* and 802.

Godwin, *Annal.* An. 1539.

Biblioth. Cotton. Cleop. E. 4. fol. 109. June 14, 1537.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

158.

*The monks  
of Charter-  
house hardly  
used.*

Charterhouse, London, acquaints Cromwell with the traitorous behaviour (as he calls it) of several of the monks: for which, as the letter goes on, they were committed to Newgate. This traitorous behaviour, as far as it appears, means no more than their obstinacy against a surrender. Five of them, whose names are mentioned, died of the hardship of their usage. The same severity in the prison, as Bedyle continues, had brought five more to the point of death. This commissioner commends the prior for his honesty, because he was willing to give up the house. He concludes with a politic wish, that the revenues of the monastery might be popularly and unexceptionably employed: because, by its lying in the capital of the kingdom, it might occasion an unserviceable report if it was either kept in the king's hands or granted to a foreign use. Many of these Carthusians, as our learned Church historian relates, "were executed for their open denying the king's supremacy." Now, after having owned this, I am somewhat surprised to find the reverend author charging those who wrote before him with misrepresentation. His words are these:—

"There is one calumny that runs in a thread through all the historians of the popish side, which not a few of our own have ignorantly taken up; that many were put to death for not swearing the king's supremacy. It is an impudent falsehood; for not so much as one person suffered on that account." With submission, how does this appear? Was there not an act which made it high treason to refuse the oath of supremacy? This gentleman is sensible of it. Now when the monks were complained of as disaffected to the government; when such a strong persecution was drawn upon them; when the king and the chief ministers were so warm upon the dissolution-project; when the case stood thus, is it not highly probable the oath was tendered to those religious who appeared refractory to the king's pleasure? Now if some of them refused to comply, as we find they did, we may believe they were prosecuted for high treason. And if they chose rather to fall under the heaviest penalties than swear this new supremacy, might they not fairly be said to deny it? To deny it, I say, when they chose to suffer death rather than own it? And then we may easily imagine the indictment ran that they had renounced the king's supremacy. But what made them discover so dangerous a sentiment? In all likelihood, nothing

Ibid.  
fol. 217.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 241.

Id. p. 351.

28 Hen. 8.  
cap. 10.  
Bp. Burnet,  
ibid.

but the test of the oath put to them. For we do not find the monks over-hardy in exposing themselves, or that they either printed or preached against the regal supremacy. From hence we may pretty reasonably infer, it was their refusal of the oath which proved fatal to them. To return to the visitors.

HENRY  
VIII.

Dr. Lee and William Peters acquainted Cromwell with their disappointment at the abbey of St. Alban's; they informed him of their summoning the abbot before them; they complained of him for breaking the king's injunctions, for dilapidations, and other instances of negligence and exceptionable management; then they opened his grand crime, and proceeded to mention his obstinacy, notwithstanding the highest threatening. One argument they used to press him to a surrender was the great debt contracted upon the house; that, for this reason, either no person would accept the preferment, or else the next successor would take it only upon the view of putting it into the king's hands. But it seems the abbot was not of their opinion. And therefore, lastly, they desire such directions from Cromwell that their proceedings may be managed in such a manner as may make least noise, and be most inoffensive to the country. However, to make sure work, they think it most advisable to proceed to extremities: that this method may probably shake the abbot's constancy, and work him to compliance in hopes of a pension.

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. E. 4.  
fol. 217.  
*The abbot of  
St. Alban's  
incompliant.*

Ibid. fol. 43.

Pensions, it seems, were batteries which played with success upon the mercenary tempers of some of the religious. This expedient was not forgotten by the courtiers. The lord-chancellor Audley managed this way: he employed an agent to treat with the abbot of Athelny; the offer was an hundred marks per annum pension; but the abbot thought the terms too low, and refused to surrender. This lord had tampered with the abbot of St. Osythes, in Essex, and brought him to his expectation; and, to make way for a grant of the abbey of Walden, in the county last mentioned, besides giving in a slender valuation of the estate, he takes care it might be remembered that he had disoblinded his reputation, and brought a great deal of infamy upon himself in serving the king, and seems to think the abbey no more than a fair consideration for damages sustained.

*The lord  
chancellor  
Audley  
treats with  
the abbot of  
Athelny.*  
Ibid.  
fol. 113.Ibid.  
fol. 231.Ibid.  
fol. 197.  
Dugdale,  
p. 802.

To proceed: The abbot of Feversham, to preserve himself

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

from dissolution, insisted on the antiquity of the monastery ; that it was founded by king Stephen ; that the bodies of this prince, his queen, and his son, were there interred ; that the design of the foundation was to pray for the souls of these royal benefactors. But neither those in this world nor those in the other had interest enough to prevail. Where the difficulties stuck upon principle, and were not easily removed, the commissioners took care to gain the superiors of the religious, and those who were most likely to sway their practice. Thus the nuns of Sion were solicited to compliance by the bishop of London and their confessor. These spiritual directors, after several other persuasives, told them plainly that they were bound in conscience to submit to the king's pleasure.

Id. p. 802.

*Large pensions offered for resignation.*

Augmentation-office.

When large pensions, which were sometimes given, and well paid too, failed of success, they applied to menacing and rigour. Thus some religious were frightened by being charged with dilapidations and other particulars of mismanagement : for whether the articles were true or not, they had not always the courage to stand the shock, and bear up against the visitors. The late injunctions were likewise contrived pretty severe. This made some of the monks tired with the cloister, and afforded exceptions to the conduct of the house. Thus some abbots were deprived and others more manageable put in their room.

Dugdale's  
Warwick-  
shire, p. 302.  
*Convent  
seals taken  
away from  
some of the  
abbeys.*

Ibid.

Farther : the commissioners took the convents' seals from some houses. This was, in a manner, laying close siege to them. Thus their communication and provision were in a great manner cut off ; they could neither make leases or sell their jewels. By this means the paying their debts and supplying their occasions were oftentimes impracticable ; and thus the garrison was reduced at last, and starved into a surrender. The canons of Leicester were threatened to be prosecuted for adultery and sodomy ; but their submission, it seems, wiped off the blemish, or at least compounded for the punishment. Dr. London made no scruple to tell the nuns of Godstow, that, " since he found them obstinate, he would dissolve the house in spite of their teeth ;" and yet the whole matter was so managed as if nothing rough or compulsive had been offered, but that the king had been courted to accept the monasteries ; and if any religious gave out that their surrenders were involuntary, a mark of dislike was set upon them.

Biblioth.  
Cotton. E.4.  
fol. 131.  
159.

Dugdale's  
Warwick-  
shire, p. 302.



When by this management the resolution of no small number of abbeyes was shaken, they served for a precedent to the rest. That the case was thus, appears by the date of their surrenders: for the treatment they foresaw from the visitors, and the unexpected compliance of so many of the fraternity, embarrassed their motions, and put them to a stand. They were amazed to the last degree, and perfectly at a loss which way to disentangle themselves. Some of them, as hath been observed, made trial of the prevalence of money, and offered to compound upon no slender proposals. Thus the abbot of Peterborough offered the king two thousand five hundred marks, and the visitor-general, Cromwell, three hundred pounds for the purchasing his favour. Those abbots who appeared with a more stubborn honesty, who refused to break their oath, and betray their trust, by a resignation, were handled very roughly. Thus the stiffness of the abbot of Fountains in Yorkshire, is said to have brought the storm upon him. The commissioners drew up a charge against him, for taking some jewels belonging to the monastery into his custody. This, by an unusual rigour of expression, was called theft and sacrilege. In short, he was pronounced perjured, deposed, and had a private resignation wrested from him. These instances of hardship will run higher by and by; in the meantime, no interest or intercession signified anything. Bishop Latimer moved strongly, that two or three of these religious houses might be left in every county for pious uses. But Cromwell, as my lord Herbert speaks, (by the king's permission) invaded all. This minister, as the noble historian goes on, played all the engines that were likely to do execution. And thus, by menacing and presents, by promises and persuasions, and by all the articles which were likely to batter the constancy, and prevail upon the passions of mankind, he brought the abbots to a surrender, and made himself master of his project. If they proved untractable, and stood upon their right, they were terribly hampered, either with the injunctions, or some act of parliament. Saunders pretends, the form of the surrenders was prescribed, and proper agents pitched upon to bring the houses to a compliance. I shall transcribe one or two of these instruments for the reader.

HENRY  
VIII.Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. 4.  
fol. 205.Ibid.  
fol. 114.  
Dugdale, ut  
supra.Ibid. Herbert,  
p. 442.  
Saunders de  
Schism.  
Anglic.  
p. 195.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Augmenta-  
tion-office.

*The Surrender of the Warden and Friars of St. Francis, in  
Stanford.*

“ For as moche as we the warden and freers, of the howse of Saint Frances in Standforde, comenly called the Gray-Freers in Standforde, in the county of Lincolne, do profoundly consider that the perfeccion of Christian lyving dothe not conciste in the dome ceremonies, weryng of the grey cootte, disgeasing ourselfe after strange fashions, doking and beekyng, in gurdung ourselfes with gurdle full of knots, and other like papistical ceremonies, where we have byn moost principally practysed, and misselyd in times; but the very tru waye to please God, and to live a true Christian man, wytheout all ypocrasie, and fayned dissimulation, is sincerely declaryd unto us by our master Christe, his evangelists and apostles. Being myndyd hereafter to folowe the same, conformyng ourselfe unto the will and pleasure of owr supreme hedde under God in erthe, the kinges majesty; and not to follow henceforth the superstitious tradicions of any forineycall potentate, or poore, with the mutual assent and consent, doe submyt ourselfes unto the mercye of owr saide soveraygne lorde. And withe like mutuall assent and consent, doe surrender, and yelde up unto the hands of the same, all owr saide howse of Saynte Frances in Standforde, comenly callyd the Greye Freers in Standforde, withe all lands, tenements, gardens, medowes, waters, pondyards, feedings, pastures, comens, rents, reversions, and all other our interest, ryghtes or tythes, apperteyning unto the same; mooste humbly beseechyng his mooste noble grace, to dispose of us, and of the same, as best schall stonde wythe his mooste graciouse pleasure. And farther, freely to graunt unto every one of us his licens undre wretyng and seall, to change our abites into secular fassion, and to receive such manner of livynges, as other secular priestes comenly be preferryd unto. And we all faythfully schall pray unto Almighty God, long to preserve his mooste noble grace wyth encrease of moche felicitie and honor.

“ And in witness of all and singular the premisses, we the said warden and covent of the Grey Freers in Standforde, to these presents have put owr covent sceall the yeght day of

Octobre, in the thyrtythe yere of the raygne of owr mooste HENRY  
VIII.  
soverayne king Henry the yeght.

“Factum Johannis Schemy, Gardian.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Robards.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Chadwort.  
Per me Fratrem Ricardum Pye.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Clarke.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Quoyte.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Garman.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Yong.  
Per me Fratrem Johannem Lovell.  
Per me Fratrem Willicium Tomson.”

The surrender of the abbey of Battlesden, in Bedfordshire, is much to the same tenor, and therefore shall be omitted. But the form signed by the prior and convent of St. Andrews, Northampton, is couched in a more renouncing and mortifying strain. I shall transcribe part of it :

See Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. Records, book 3. p. 150. Augmentation-office. Fuller, book 6. p. 320.

“But as well we as others our predecessors, called religious persons within your said monastery, taking on us the habite of outward vesture of the said rule, onley to the intent to lead our liffes in the ydle quyetnesse, and not in the vertuose exerceyse, in a stately estimation, and not in obedient humylyte, have undre the shadowe or color of the saide rule and habite, vaynely, detestably, and also ungodly, employed, yea, rather devowered the yerely revenues yssuing and comyng of the said possessions, in continual ingurgitations and farcynges of our carayne bodyes, and of others, the supportares of our voluptuose and carnal appetyte, with other vayne and ungodly expensys ; to the manyfest subvertion of devocion, and clenenes of lyvyng, and to the mooste notable slaunder of Christ’s holy evangely, which in the form of our professyon, we did ostentate, and openly devaunt to kepe moost exactly ; with-drawyng thereby from the symple and pure minds of your grace’s subjects, the onely truth and comfort which they oughte to have by the true faith of Christ, and also the devyne honor and glory, only due to the glorious majesty of God Almighty, steryng them with all perswasions, ingynes, and polyee, to dedd images, and counterfett reliques, for our dampnable lucre :

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

which our mooste horryble abominations and execrable persuasions of your grace's people to detestable errours, and our long coveted ypocrisie, cloked with fayned sanctity; we, revolving dayly, and continually pondering in our sorrowfull harts, and thereby perceiving the botomlas gulf of everlasting fyre redye to devowre us, if persysting in this state of lvyng, we shulde depart from this uncertyn and transitory liffe, constrained by the intollerable anguyshe of our conscience, called, as we trust, by the grace of God, who wold have no man to peryshe in synne, with harts moost contrited and repentante, prostrate at the noble feet of your moost royal majesty, moost lamentably doe crave of your highness, of your abundant mercy, to grant unto us moost grievous against God, and your highness, your most gracious pardon, for our saide sondry offences, omysions, and negligences, comytted as before by us is confessed, against your highness, and your most noble progenitors. And where your highness, being supreme hedd, immediately after Christ, of his Church, in this your roialme of England, so consequently generall and onely reformator of all religiouse persons there, have full authority to correct or dyssolve at your grace's pleasure, and liberty, all covents and religious companyes abusing the rewles of their profession. And moreover to your highness, being our soveraygn lord, and undoubted fownder of your said monastery, by dissolution whereof apperteyneth only the oryginal title, and propre inherytance, as well of all other goods moveable and unmoveable, to the said monastery in any wyse apperteyning or belonging, to be disposed and employed, as to your grace's most excellent wysedeme shall seme expedient and necessary.

“Per me Franciscum Priorem.

Per me Johannem Sub-priorem.

Per me Johannem Pette.

Per me Jo. Harold.

Per me Tho. Smith.

Per me Tho. Golston.

Per me Rob. Mártin.

Per me Jacob. Hopkins.

Per me Ric. Bunberry.

Per me Tho. Barly.

Per me Will. Ward.

Per me Tho. Atterbury.

Per me Will. Fowler.”

It is somewhat strange the charge of immorality should run so high against the religious in general, since no longer than four years ago, the greater monasteries had so fair a testimony of their behaviour from the parliament itself. Amongst other instances of disorder, the abbots are some of them charged with coining: but this, upon consideration, will be found no fault; for not only the archbishop of Canterbury, but some of the great abbeys, had the privilege of a mint. The abbey of Reading, in Berkshire, particularly, had the grant of coinage inserted in their charter, by their founder, king Henry I. The archbishop of York, the bishop of Durham, and the dean of St. Martin's-le-Grand, had the same privilege.

The lord Herbert is of opinion, the king's title to the religious houses was not founded either upon statute, or claim of right; he chose rather to insist on voluntary surrender, or forfeiture: however, the proceedings, as hath been observed, having been somewhat singular, it was thought proper to get them confirmed by act of parliament. To this purpose he issued out his writ of summons: the session began April twenty-eight, one thousand five hundred and thirty-nine.

In the meantime, there were very serviceable reports spread throughout the kingdom. It was said cardinal Pole was soliciting several princes to draw a kind of crusade upon king Henry. The late truce between the emperor and the French king, made this news not altogether impossible. The credibility improved by the king's dispatching several people of quality to visit the ports, and by his own progress soon after for that purpose. Upon general alarms and advices of danger, forts were erected, the fleet equipped, and musters taken all over the kingdom. It is true, the lord Herbert, who relates all this, does not point upon the place of any formidable preparation, or discover the enemy either by sea or land. However, the scene looked busy and black upon the people, threw in an amusement, and made them drop their concern at the suppression of the abbeys. They hoped the charge of the war would be supported by the crown, and their own pockets spared by such an expedient. But all this noise of an invasion was looked on as no better than management and mystery, by a great many: it was a strain, they said, of a party, to colour the practice, and carry on the design. There was a melancholy account of the ruin of religious houses transmitted beyond sea.

HENRY VIII.

27 Hen. 8.  
cap. 28.  
Dugdale's  
Monast.  
vol. 1.  
p. 1048.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 190.  
Dugdale's  
Monast.  
vol. i. p. 417.  
Spelm. Con-  
cil.

14 Henry 8.  
cap. 12.  
17 Edw. 4.  
cap. 1.  
See Davis's  
Reports.  
"Le Case  
de mixt  
Moneyes."

*Reports of  
war and  
public dan-  
ger made  
the dissolu-  
tion of the  
abbeys less  
regretted.*

Id. p. 443.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

The methods for bringing this matter about, the razing stately buildings, laying churches and chapels in rubbish, the profane scrambling of some of the visitors, and the lamentable disappointment of the country, made a tragical relation. The rest of Christendom stood at gaze at the English court, and were surprised to astonishment. The king's necessities were too faint a colour to discharge the imputation. The censure went deep, and the scandal spread, notwithstanding this allegation.

*An act for  
regulating  
precedency.*

The parliament was now sitting, and the bill passed for regulating the precedency of the lords of parliament: and here we meet with a recital of the king's being supreme head of the Church of England: and that for the "good exercise of the said most royal dignity and office, his highness hath made Thomas lord Cromwell, and lord privy seal, his vicegerent for good and due ministration of justice, to be had in all causes and cases touching the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for the godly reformation and redress of all heresies and abuses in the said Church." And in consequence of this delegation, the act gives Cromwell place of the archbishop of Canterbury.

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 10.  
Statutes at  
Large.  
161.

The next act relating to the Church conveys all the religious houses, colleges, and hospitals, dissolved or to be dissolved hereafter, to the king, his heirs and successors, for ever. The preamble sets forth, that sundry abbots, priors, abbesses, and prioresses, &c., have given the king their "manors, lands, &c., of their own free and voluntary minds, good wills, and assent, without constraint or compulsion of any manner of person or persons," &c.

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 13.  
*An act for  
settling the  
abbey-lands  
upon the  
crown.*

This bill, we may observe, was drawn with great care, to prevent the suspicion of hard usage and forced surrenders. To make it pass the better, a prospect of vast advantage was opened to the subject: the reader shall have the detail in sir Edward Coke's words:—

*Sir Edward  
Coke's re-  
mark of the  
disappoint-  
ment of  
the king-  
dom in what  
was pro-  
mised by the  
court.*

"On the king's behalf," saith this learned gentleman, "the members of both houses were informed in parliament, that no king or kingdom was safe, but where the king had three abilities: first, to live of his own, and able to defend his kingdoms upon any sudden invasion or insurrection; secondly, to aid his confederates, otherwise they would never assist him; thirdly, to reward his well-deserving servants. Now, the project was,

HENRY  
VIII.

if the parliament would give unto him all the abbeyes, priories, friaries, nunneries; and other monasteries, that for ever, in time then to come, he would take order that the same should not be converted to private use: but, first, that his exchequer, for the purposes aforesaid, should be enriched; secondly, the kingdom be strengthened by the maintenance of forty thousand well-trained soldiers, with skilful captains and commanders; thirdly, for the benefit and ease of the subject, who never afterwards, as was projected, in any time to come, should be charged with subsidies, fifteenths, loans, or other common aids; fourthly, lest the honour of the realm should receive any diminution by the dissolution of the said monasteries, there being twenty-nine lords of parliament of the abbots and priors that held of the king ‘per baroniam,’ that the king would create a number of nobles. The said monasteries were given to the king by the authority of divers acts of parliament; but no provision was therein made for the said project, or any part thereof; only ‘ad faciendum populum,’ these possessions were given to the king, his heirs and successors, to do and use therewith his and their own wills, ‘to the pleasure of Almighty God, the honour and profit of the realm.’

27 Hen. 8.  
cap. 28.  
31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 13.  
32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 14.  
32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 23.  
34 Hen. 8.  
cap. 16.  
37 Henry 8.  
cap. 34.

“Now, observe the catastrophe. In the same parliament of 32nd Henry VIII., when the great and opulent priory of St. John’s of Jerusalem was given to the king, he demanded and had a subsidy, both of the laity and clergy; and the like he had in 34th Henry VIII.; and, in 37th Henry VIII., he had another subsidy; and, since the dissolution of the aforesaid monasteries, he exacted great loans, and against law received the same.” Thus far sir Edward Coke.

Coke’s Institut. pt. 4.  
fol. 44.

To bring the houses to a farther disposition for passing the bill, the nobility were promised large shares in the spoils, as sir William Dugdale phraseth it. They had the prospect either of free gifts, easy purchases, or very advantageous exchanges. The lay gentry were likewise promised a considerable rise, both in honour and estate. Neither were they disappointed in their expectation: for no small part of the abbey-lands were granted to the laity before the sitting of this parliament. This was done by the advice of the visitor-general Cromwell. The parcelling these lands out amongst a great many proprietors was the only way, as he told the king, to clinch the business, and make the

Dugdale’s Warwickshire, p. 802.  
*The nobility have large promises made them of abbey-lands.*  
Rot. Pat. An. 30 Hen. 8.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Ld. Herbert,  
p. 376.  
Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 513.  
*Cromwell's  
advice.*  
Dugdale,  
p. 303.

settlement irrevocable. Fox makes this suppression of abbeys a principal part of Cromwell's commendation; but, by the favour of this martyrologist, Cromwell's advising the king to part with the abbey-lands is not altogether covered from exception: for, by conveying these lands into a great many hands, the crown was disfurnished, and the promise of maintaining a great army out of these revenues made impracticable. In short, the public was quite disappointed by this expedient, and the necessity of taxes continued as great as ever. Besides, Fox might have considered that the monastic life is no part of popery: for popery, to take it rightly, means nothing more than the encroachments and innovations of the court of Rome. But it is well known there were monks, both in the East and West, before these grievances appeared; and now, to say nothing more, there are monasteries in the Greek Church where the pope is disowned. However, it must be said, Cromwell's thought was politic enough for his purpose. The pulling down the buildings, likewise, of the religious houses, was not ill contrived for the new establishment. This was carefully done in most places. To give an instance: when the abbey of Leicester was surrendered, Cave, one of the commissioners, informed Cromwell that himself and the other visitors had made sale of the ornaments of the church, amounting to two hundred twenty-eight pounds, besides the plate, lead, bells, &c. From hence he proceeds to desire this vicar-general's order for defacing the church and other superstitious buildings. The ruin of the monasteries giving a new face to the kingdom, and appearing so very extraordinary, it may not be improper to make a few remarks upon so great an alteration.

Dugdale's  
Warwick-  
shire, p. 803.  
*The reli-  
gious houses  
pulled down.*

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. E. 4.  
fol. 215.

*Remarks  
upon the dis-  
solution of  
the abbeys.*

By what hath been related already, it is pretty plain the lives of the religious were not so irregular as some authors represent them. But, granting this charge had been true, it would have been no sufficient reason to have seized their estates. If insoberity and misbehaviour were sufficient grounds for forfeiture, —if ill living, and not answering the ends of an estate, would justify the dispossessing the owner, —property would be very precarious, and the English tenures slenderly guarded.

For if we consider the matter closely, all Christians are bound to strict living, to discipline, to large distributions of charity, little less than the monks. They are false to the engagement of baptism if they manage otherwise. The monas-



tie institutions were principally designed to revive the piety of the ancient Christians, and bring up practice to the rule of the Gospel. HENRY VIII.

Farther: if degeneracy and misbehaviour were the grand motives for dissolution, why were they not put under a better management? Why had they not some trial for reformation? *Fleury on the manners of the Christians.*  
 If unnecessary expense, and omission of kindness to the poor,—if luxury and license are good reasons to change the owner, and determine the estate,—if this will hold, we should have strange transferring of titles. At this rate, it is to be feared, some people would have a very slender claim to their abbey-lands. 162.

But if immorality, or misspending of revenue, is no sufficient reason for defeating of titles, why did the monasteries suffer? Why must the Church be dispossessed upon this score? Why were those monasteries which were unexceptionable in their management, which were charitable to the poor and hospitable to the rich,—why were these involved in the common fate, and condemned to dissolution with the rest? By the evidence of records, there were many more righteous monasteries in England than righteous men in Sodom. However, this over-balance of merit could not divert the calamity, nor preserve them from ruin. Thus we see how much the mercies of God are greater than those of men! Justice below is sometimes blind upon mysterious motives, strikes without distinction, and sweeps away the innocent with the guilty.

If the monks were tied to greater strictness than others, are not the owners of abbey-lands bound to take their estates with the conditions annexed? I do not say they are bound to the whole compass of their institution,—their tonsure or their habit, their celibacy or retirement, cannot reasonably be expected;—but are they not obliged to the more significant duties for which these houses were first endowed? Are not these secular grantees bound to the most substantial part of the founder's will? Are they not under the tie of being more frequent in their devotions, more guarded in their conduct, more remarkable in their charity, than other people? That the parliament in Henry VIII.'s time was somewhat of this opinion, is plain. Why else did they oblige the proprietors of abbey-lands to extraordinary degrees of hospitality? If strict living, sober hospitality, and serviceableness to the poor, are 27 Henry 8. cap. 28.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

accounted incumbrances, the abbey-lands seem chargeable with them : for, though princes' charters and acts of parliament may convey a legal title, yet that they can destroy the force of consecrations, dispense with the meaning of the founders, and defeat the design of the original grant, is farther than I can discover. Acts of parliament have, without question, authority to overrule claims, and extinguish titles, and govern the courts of justice. But are not some things above the reach of the legislature ? Can a statute unconsecrate a church, enact Sunday no holy-day, or sacrilege no sin ? Is not God Almighty capable of property ? If we must answer in the affirmative, how can an estate dedicated to his service and vested in him be taken away without his consent ? Which way can the intention of the donor, and the main design of the conveyance, be overlooked and defeated ? Regularity and largeness of mind, therefore, are the least that can be expected from the abbey-proprietors. These, it may be, are the lowest requisites to make such alienations inoffensive to them.

And, therefore, when those who enjoy these religious estates rack their tenants, or overlook the poor,—when they exhaust themselves in pomp or licentiousness,—when anything of this happens, the intention of the pious settlement is lamentably disappointed, the misapplication is doubly criminal ; and, without reformation, it is much to be feared the curse of the founders will light upon them. To be better enabled to ridicule virtue, to browbeat religion, or set a fashion in vice, is wide of the design of a religious foundation. Those, therefore, who are possessed of these lands, should be particularly careful in these matters.

It is said the monasteries, colleges, &c., were of a royal foundation ; and, therefore, the taking them away was only a resumption of grants from the crown. To this it will be answered, the assertion is wide of matter of fact ; and that many of the abbeys, &c., were founded by bishops and temporal lords, and some by subjects of lesser quality.

Besides, all the estates in the kingdom were grants from the crown, as appears from the tenures ; and yet it would have been looked upon as an arbitrary attempt to have taken them away : for a gift is a translation of right, extinguishes the title of the donor, and vests the property in another.

But this alienation of abbey-lands was made by act of parlia-

ment: that is true; and therefore it was a legal ousting. But then, it will be asked, if a great part of the temporal lords, and others of the rich laity, had been thrown out of their estates by a statute,—if this had happened, the question is, Whether such proceedings would not have been thought an instance of rigour, and a mysterious exercise of authority? Had they been thus impoverished, without treason or felony to deserve it, it may be the legality of the form, and the pleasure of the legislators, would hardly have reconciled them to such usage. They could not have argued against the force of the law, but the friendship of those that made it would not have been so clear.

HENRY  
VIII.

Farther: the endowments of the Church were settled upon important considerations,—for the honour of God, for the advancement of learning, for the interest of eternity;—and, therefore, in acts of resumption, the Church hath been particularly excepted.

Lastly, the rights and liberties of the Church had been confirmed in thirty parliaments. This made some people think it strange that king Henry VIII.'s parliaments should be of so very different a sentiment from those in former reigns. It hath been observed these methods of proceeding were no strong recommendation of what was well done in ecclesiastical matters.

Had the English laity not enriched themselves with the spoils of the Church, the Reformation would have had a clearer complexion, and been better understood by the rest of Christendom; but when Protestancy had such a face of interest,—when men got manors and townships by renouncing the pope,—when people of slender pretensions made estates out of their orthodoxy, and shot up into title and figure,—when the Church was stripped of her revenues, and maimed in her jurisdiction,—when changes in religion were carried on by revolt and civil commotion, as it happened in France, Scotland, and the Low Countries,—when they saw discipline laid asleep, learning decay, and license increase,—these were discouraging circumstances. This made the moderate papists stand off from the precedent. They chose rather to submit to the encroachments and bear with the innovations of the court of Rome, than adventure the enfranchising themselves; and though I do not commend them for their caution, yet I believe the motives to their acquiescence are not ill guessed. And thus the excessive claims of the court of Rome, the indefensible doctrines and practices of that communion, which probably might have been

Rot. Parl.  
E. 4. et lib.  
See the  
book concerning  
the Rights and  
Privileges of  
the Clergy,  
&c., transcribed  
from the Parliament  
Rolls by arch-  
bishop Laud,  
and remaining  
in the library at  
Lambeth.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

cleared in most places of the Latin Church, are by such methods as these, it may be, more fixed and established than ever.

It was somewhat unhappy, the laity seemed to stand so much to the point of interest, made a "gain of their godliness," and built so many fortunes out of the ruins of the Church. This, how well soever it might be meant, carried an appearance of design, and gave a discouraging prospect to other countries. Whereas, had they planted their zeal against the superstition in the monasteries, and let the revenues alone: had the rust been rubbed off, and the metal left behind: had these religious been brought back to the primitive standard: had they been mended in their manners and belief, without forfeiting their estates; the conduct of the whole business would have been more intelligible. Nay, had the number been retrenched, and the revenues translated to public and pious uses: had there been more bishoprics erected, and better endowed: had the abbeys dissolved been turned into public schools and seminaries of learning; into hospitals for invalids; into provisions for disabled soldiers and seamen; for the poor worn out with labour and age; for orphans and widows; for gentlemen and tradesmen unfortunate without their own fault: had half the monasteries been thus disposed of, the loss of them would not have been regretted; the community would have found their account in it, and the purity of the intention been more visible.

I do not deny, but that there might be sincerity at the bottom; and that the courtiers might be governed by good meaning, and public regards. All that I say is, the disinterestedness of the matter doth not lie so open to common view: but then we are to consider, that the inside of some things is sometimes most valuable. Some people's actions, like rich mines, are less promising upon the surface: and when it happens thus, every body hath not force enough to dig down to the treasure, and reach the honesty of his neighbour's intentions<sup>1</sup>.

However, it must be confessed, there were several shocking circumstances in the reigns of Henry VIII., and his children. For to see churches pulled down, or rifled; the plate swept off the altar, and the holy furniture converted to common use, had no great air of devotion. To see the choir undressed, to make the drawing-room and bed-chamber fine, was not very

<sup>1</sup> The keenness of this satire must have been remarkably annoying to Burnet and his disciples.

primitive at first view. The forced surrender of abbeys, the maiming of bishoprics, and lopping the best branches of their revenues; the stopping impropriated tithes from passing in the ancient channel; these things are apt to puzzle a vulgar capacity: unless a man's understanding is more than ordinarily improved, he will be at a loss to reconcile these measures with Christian maxims, and make them fall in with conscience and true reformation!

HENRY  
VIII.

To proceed: by the act of dissolution above-mentioned, where the abbeys were discharged of the payment of tithes, the king, and all the grantees or purchasers of the crown, are likewise to enjoy those lands without paying tithes. The impropriated parsonages are also conveyed to the king, his grantees, and purchasers, by this act. By the drawing of the bill, it appears, the king designed to alienate the abbey-lands from the crown; and that the courtiers and others had a clear prospect of enriching themselves by the dissolution. The penning the statute in this manner, I suppose, made sir Edward Coke take the freedom to say, that the furnishing the exchequer, the maintaining a great army upon the king's revenue, and discharging the subjects for ever from the burden of taxes, were only specious pretences thrown out, "ad faciendum populum<sup>1</sup>."

*The abbeys granted to the crown, with their privilege of being discharged from the payment of tithes.*

The transferring the privilege of not paying tithes from the convents to the lay proprietors, and not returning the impropriations to the parishes on which they were first settled, was no small hardship on the Church. The dismembering the tithes and glebes from the parochial priests, and annexing them to monasteries, was a modern encroachment, which defeated the original settlement, and was no better than downright popery; for it was the popes who made these appropriations, and broke in upon the ancient practice. However, the religious character of the monks, and their having several priests to supply the cure, gave some pretence for these alienations. But the laity have no character for a plea of this nature; they are in no condition to perform the sacerdotal office, nor discharge any of those duties for which the Church was endowed. What a lamentable maintenance is reserved for the vicars in many places, is too well known: the question is, whether those of the laity, who detain the impropriated tithes, and starve the benefice, are not to answer for the consequent mischief; that

*The pope's granting appropriations, a great misfortune to the Church.*

<sup>1</sup> Wittily translated, "to do the people."

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

is, for the defects which are like to happen in the qualifications of the parish priest; for the insignificance of his interest and character; for the disadvantages in conduct, discipline, and learning; for the ignorance and immorality of the people under his cure? The expostulation in Malachi is very remarkable: and how far the application will hold, ought seriously to be considered. “Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me: but ye say, wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation. Bring all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house,” &c. Farther,

Mal. iii. 8,  
9, 10.

All abbey-lands are, by this statute, put within the survey of the court of augmentations, excepting such as come to the crown by attainder.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 261.  
*Exempted  
abbeyes  
returned to  
the jurisdic-  
tion of the  
ordinary,  
but not with-  
out a clause  
of exception.*

Lastly, All the abbeyes, &c. which before the dissolution were exempted from episcopal jurisdiction, are by this act restored to the inspection and government of the ordinary. This, as is very worthily observed, had been a great happiness to the Church, had it not been for this clause: “that the king might appoint others to visit them:” thus the benefit was partly lost, and the old misfortune returned in a great measure: for, as the learned historian continues, many of the purchasers of these lands had the privilege of visiting the churches and chapels formerly exempted, thrown into the conveyance, from whence great disorders have followed. For thus the bishops are barred the exercise of their jurisdiction over these churches: and thus, both priest and people have oftentimes made an ill use of their legal discharge: for not being liable to the discipline of their diocesan, they are apt to strike out into license and disorder. Thus those who were disaffected to the hierarchy, sometimes censure the prelates for overlooking those instances of scandal, which they cannot punish without running against the statute. This abuse, which began upon papal exemptions, continues still unprovided with an effectual remedy.

164.

Had it not been for this statute, the surrenders might very well have been questioned: for the abbots and convents were but trustees and tenants for life: what right could they then have to convey away all their lands, and dissolve their corporation? Besides, some of them are said to have been used with duresse, and frightened into compliance. The abbey of Woburn seems to have fallen under this disadvantage, as appears by their sub-

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 233.

mission to the king. In this instrument they mention a charge of high treason, and other crimes, from which they endeavour to purge themselves. However, rather than contest any farther with the king, they submit to a surrender, having before acknowledged his supremacy. In the close of their submission, they come towards a petition they may be continued, and their abbey re-granted to them.

HENRY VIII.

The learned bishop Godwin observes, there were but three abbots who had courage enough to maintain their conscience, and run the last extremity: these were the abbot of Colchester, Hugh Farringdon of Reading, and Richard Whiting of Glassenbury. It seems neither bribery nor terror, nor any other dishonourable motives, could prevail upon these men. To reach them therefore another way, the oath of supremacy was offered them, and upon their refusal, they were condemned for high treason. Thus, Beach, abbot of Colchester, was executed at that town, and Farringdon at Reading, with two priests, Rug and Oinion: Whiting of Glassenbury, an old man, was tried at Wells, dismissed the court and suffered to go at large: and thus being upon his return to his monastery, and not suspecting any farther misfortune, he is said to have been seized, dragged to a hill called Tor, near Glassenbury, and hurried out of the world, without being allowed the liberty of taking leave of his convent, which he earnestly desired. Two monks, Roger Jacob, and John Thorn, were executed with him: they were charged with giving him ill advice, and bringing him to such an obstinate inflexibleness.

Cotton.  
Libr. Cleop.  
E. 6. fol. 39.*The abbots of Reading, Colchester, and Glassenbury, executed for in-compliance.*

Saunders makes a more tragical relation of this matter, that Whiting was sent for up to London, that upon declining to sign a surrender, his papers were searched, and a tract against the king's divorce found amongst them; that when he came to Wells, he was so far from the apprehension of a trial, that he went voluntarily into the court, and offered to take his place upon the bench. But Saunders being an historian of slender credit, I shall go on with him no farther. These three abbots were not executed till December this year; but I have mentioned them now for the resemblance of the matter.

Godwin,  
Annal.  
An. 1539.Sanders de  
Schism.  
Anglic.  
p. 199.

To proceed: this suppression of abbeyes was generally disliked. Besides, the manner of disposing of the estates was not clear in point of equity to every body. Some people were of opinion, the lands belonging to religious houses should have

*The suppression of the abbeyes censured.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

reverted to the founders, or fallen to the lords of whom the lands were held, by way of escheat. But this last title could have no pretension, because the ancestors of these superior lords had confirmed the endowments of the abbeys: but the heirs of the founders, it is thought, might have recovered the lands notwithstanding the surrenders, had their claim not been barred by act of parliament. The king was displeased with Cranmer, and the other bishops of his party, for not falling altogether into his measures. These prelates could not be brought to a thorough complaisance in parliament. They were willing the abbeys of royal foundations should return to the crown: but for the rest, they insisted upon their being turned into hospitals, schools, and such other establishments of public service. It was thought the king's resentment of this in-compliance brought him to the thought of the Six Articles, of which more afterwards.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. fol. 261.

Strype.  
Cranmer's  
Life from  
Fox's MSS.,  
p. 72.  
*Pretended  
precedents  
for dissolu-  
tion.*  
4 Hen. 5.  
Rot. Parl.  
Rastal. Tit.  
Monas-  
teries.

Selden's  
Hist. of  
Tithes.  
c. 13. p. 396.

To make this general dissolution less surprising, there were some precedents which smoothed the way, and looked towards the present business. Of this kind, were the pope's suppressing the order of the Templars, the dissolution of the priories-alien in the reign of Henry V.; to which we may add, the religious houses lately suppressed by cardinal Wolsey. Though none of these instances came fully up to the point. For great part of the Templars' estates in England, were settled on the knights Hospitalers. The priors-alien's lands were disposed of, as Selden informs us, to ecclesiastical corporations, and those dissolved by cardinal Wolsey, converted to a resembling use: as to the priories-alien, none of them were dissolved by Henry V.'s parliament, excepting those cells which were not conventual, but depended on foreign monasteries. These monks having their main interest in another country, besides the suspicion of a dangerous correspondence, conveyed a great part of the profit of their houses to their convents beyond sea, and for this reason were reckoned a kind of nuisance to the commonwealth.

Before I take leave of this part of the history, it may be expected I should give some account of the mitred abbeys, of the revenues, of the serviceableness of these religious houses to the state, and of some inconveniences consequent upon the dissolution.

And first of the mitred abbots: these sat all in the house of Lords, and voted there. They held of the king "in capite



per baroniam;” their endowment being at least an entire barony, which consisted of thirteen knights’ fees. Thus they were advanced to the state and honour of spiritual lords, as appears by the abbot of Tavistock’s patent, who was made a mitred abbot in the beginning of this reign.

HENRY VIII.

See Records, num. 43.

The number of the mitred abbots are reckoned twenty-seven by Fuller, twenty-eight by the lord Herbert, and twenty-nine by sir Edward Coke. The lord Herbert’s list is as follows: St. Alban’s, St. Peter’s, Westminster, St. Edmondsbury, St. Bennet’s of Holm, Berdsey, Shrewsbury, Crowland, Abingdon, Evesham, Gloucester, Ramsey, St. Mary’s in York, Tewkesbury, Reading, Battle, Wincheomb, Hide by Winchester, Cirencester, Waltham, Malmesbury, Thorney, St. Augustine in Canterbury, Selby, Peterborough, St. John’s in Colchester, Coventry, Tavistock, St. John’s of Jerusalem and Glassenbury are omitted. The valuation extracted from Speed, may be seen in the records.

Coke 4. Instit. fol. 44. Mitred bishops.

See Records, num. 44.

Besides these, there were four nunneries, Shaftsbury, Barking in Essex, St. Mary’s Winchester, and Wilton, which held of the king by an entire barony, but the abbesses were not summoned to parliament, upon the score of their sex. However, they had writs directed to them, “ad habendum servitium suum,” that is, to send their quota of soldiers into the field, in proportion to their knights’ fees.

Rot. Pat. 5 Edw. 1. Dors. in 11. Rot. in Scutag. ejus An. M. 7. Fuller, p. 294.

There were other abbeys, though of lesser quality, yet of wealthier endowments than several of the parliamentary abbots, I shall mention six.

165.

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>ob.</i>	<i>q.</i>
1. Fountaines, Richmondshire .	1173	0	7	1	0
2. Lewes, Sussex . . . . .	1691	9	6	0	1
3. St. Werburgh’s, Cheshire .	1073	17	7	1	0
4. Leicester . . . . .	1062	0	4	1	1
5. Merton, Surrey . . . . .	1039	5	3	0	0
6. Furnace, Richmondshire . .	969	7	1	0	0

The old valuation of their abbeys.

To these we may add the nunnery of Shaftesbury, valued at 1329*l.* 12*s.* 3*d.* Barking in Essex, and Sion in Middlesex, fell not much short of the revenues of Shaftesbury, the rents of either of them amounting to more than 1000*l.* per annum. The abbeys suppressed in England and Wales were six hundred

Fuller’s Ch. Hist.

Cambd. Brit.

and forty-five, as Cambden reports: but the list of them taken out of the court of First Fruits and Tenths, mounts the number to seven hundred and fifty-four. And therefore it is likely the hundred and ten hospitals dissolved, were thrown into the catalogue. The yearly revenue is computed at 135,522*l.* 18*s.* 10*d.* Besides this, the money raised out of the stock of cattle and corn, out of the timber, lead and bells, out of the furniture, plate, and church ornaments, amounted to a vast sum, as may be collected from what was brought off from the monastery of St. Edmundsbury. From hence, as appears from records, five thousand marks of gold and silver, besides several jewels of great value, were seized by the visitors. All which, saith the Lord Herbert, being by some openly called rapine and sacrilege, I will no way excuse. And here this noble historian cannot help lamenting the ruin of so many pious foundations: establishments which afforded so handsome a provision to persons of a contemplative, devout, and retired temper. As to the revenues of the abbeyes, they were sometimes undervalued by the visitors, in hopes it may be of an easier grant or purchase: and therefore, in all likelihood, upon rack-rents and modern computation, the lands would rise to near twenty times as much.

The advantages accruing to the public from these religious houses were considerable, upon several accounts. To mention some of them: the temporal nobility and gentry had a creditable way of providing for their younger children. Those who were disposed to withdraw from the world, or not likely to make their fortunes in it, had a handsome retreat to the cloister. Here they were furnished with conveniences for life and study, with opportunities for thought and recollection, and over and above passed their time in a condition not unbecoming their quality. The charge of the family being thus lessened, there was no temptation for racking of tenants; no occasion for breaking the bulk of the estate to provide for the younger children. Thus figure and good housekeeping were maintained with greater ease, the entireness of the estate, and by consequence, the lasting of the family, better secured. It is true, there were sometimes small sums given to the monasteries for admitting persons to be professed; but, generally speaking, they received them gratis. This they thought most

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. E. 4.  
fol. 381.

*The lord  
Herbert's  
reflection  
upon their  
dissolution.*  
Ibid. Herbert,  
p. 444.

Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 6.  
p. 295.

*The abbeyes  
serviceable  
to the public  
upon several  
accounts.*

advisable, to cultivate an interest with persons of condition. By this means, they engaged great families to appear for them, upon occasion, both at court and in parliament. HENRY VIII.

The abbeys were very serviceable places for the education of young people: every convent had one person or more assigned for this business. Thus the children of the neighbourhood were taught grammar and music without any charge to their parents. And in the nunneries, those of the other sex learned to work, and read English, with some advances into Latin, and particularly the nunnery at Godstow, in Oxfordshire, was famous upon this account, and for breeding young gentlewomen and others to improvements proper to their condition.

Farther, it is to the abbeys we are obliged for most of our historians, both of Church and State: these places of retirement had both most learning and leisure for such undertakings: neither did they want information for such employment. For not to mention several episcopal sees were founded for the cloister, the mitred abbots, as we have seen, sat in parliament, and not a few of the religious had a share in the convocation. It is not denied but that they were some of the best landlords. Their reserved rents were low, and their fines easy: and sometimes the product of the farms, without paying money, discharged the tenants in a great measure. They were particularly remarkable for their hospitality. The monasteries were, as it were, houses of public entertainment for the gentry that travelled: and as for their distributions of charity, it may be guessed from one instance. While the religious houses were standing, there were no provisions of parliament to relieve the poor: no assessment upon the parish for that purpose. But now this charge upon the kingdom amounts, at a moderate computation, to 800,000*l.* per annum<sup>1</sup>.

*Histories mostly written by the monks.*

Besides this rent-charge, as it were, drawn upon the whole nation by the dissolution, the ancient nobility suffered considerably. For the seizure and surrender of the abbeys, being confirmed to the crown by act of parliament, the services reserved by the founders were extinguished of course. To mention some of them: the abbeys that held by knights' service, were bound to provide such a number of soldiers as their estates required, and to furnish them for the field at

*The founders of abbeys suffered by the dissolution.*

<sup>1</sup> Of late years the poor-rates have averaged 5,000,000*l.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

their own charges: thus their men were to appear at the musters, and attend the heirs of their founders, or such benefactors who had settled a knight's fee upon them.

Secondly. Where they held by knights' service, they were bound to contribute towards a fortune for marrying their lord's eldest daughter. And, thirdly, To pay a sum of money to defray the expense of knighthood, when that distinction was conferred upon the founder's eldest son.

Lastly. The founders had the benefit of corrodies: that is, they had the privilege of quartering a certain number of poor servants upon the abbeys. Thus people that were worn out with age and labour, and in no condition to support themselves, were not left to starving or parish collections, but had a comfortable retreat to the abbeys, where they were maintained without hardship or marks of indigence during life. It is granted, where these corrodies were altered into payment, and discharged for an annual sum of money, there the interest continued, after the dissolution, and the money was paid by the exchequer. But the corrodies continued in kind, fell with the abbeys. For in the clause for saving the "rights, titles, and interest of the founders and patrons of abbeys, their heirs and successors, rents, services, rent seeke, and all other services and suits are only excepted."

166.

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 13.  
*The scandalous destruction of abbey libraries.*

Another misfortune consequent upon the suppression of the abbeys, was an ignorant destruction of a great many valuable books: most of the learned records of that age were lodged in the monasteries. Printing was then but a late invention, and had secured but a few books in comparison of the rest. The main of learning lay in manuscripts, and the most considerable of these, both for number and quality, were in the monks' possession. But the abbeys, at their dissolution, falling oftentimes into hands of those that cared only for the estates, the libraries were miserably disposed of. The books, instead of being removed to royal libraries, to those of cathedrals, or the universities, were frequently thrown into the grantees' possession, as things of slender consideration. Now these men oftentimes proved a very ill protection for learning and antiquity. Their avarice was sometimes so mean, and their ignorance so undistinguishing, that when the covers were somewhat rich, and would yield a little, they pulled them off,

threw away the books, or turned them to waste paper. Thus many noble manuscripts were destroyed, to a public scandal, and an irreparable loss of learning. HENRY  
VIII.

John Bale, the centurist, a man remarkably averse to popery, and the monastic institution, remonstrates against this barbarity, in pretty strong language, to king Edward VI. The reader shall have it in his own words:—

An. 1549.  
Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 6.  
p. 335.  
*Bale's de-  
claration  
upon Le-  
land's  
Journal.*

“Covetousness was at that time so busy about private commodity, that public wealth in that most necessary respect, was not anywhere regarded. A number of them which purchased those superstitious mansions, reserved of those library books, some to serve their jakes, some to scour their candlesticks, and some to rub their boots, and some they sold to the grocers and soap-sellers, and some they sent over sea to the bookbinders, not in small numbers, but at times whole ships full. Yea, the universities of this realm are not all clear in this detestable fact: but cursed is the belly which seeketh to be fed with such ungodly gains, and so deeply shameth his natural country. I know a merchant man (who shall at this time be nameless) that bought the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings price; a shame it is to be spoken. This stuff hath he occupied instead of grey paper, by the space of more than these ten years, and yet he hath store enough for as many years to come. A prodigious example is this, and to be abhorred of all men which love their nation as they should do. Yea, what can bring our realm to more shame and rebuke, than to have it noised abroad, that we are despisers of learning? I judge this to be true, and utter it with heaviness, that neither the Britons under the Romans and Saxons, nor the English people under the Danes and Normans, had ever such damage of their learned monuments, as we have seen in our time. Our posterity may well curse this wicked fact of our age, this unreasonable spoil of England's most noble antiquities.”

Fuller breaks out into a passionate declamation upon this occasion, complains that all arts and sciences fell under this common calamity. How many admirable manuscripts of the fathers, schoolmen, and commentators were destroyed by this means? what number of historians, of all ages and countries?

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

The holy Scriptures themselves, as much as these gossellers pretended to regard them, underwent the fate of the rest. If a book had a cross on it, it was condemned for popery, and those with lines and circles were interpreted the black art, and destroyed for conjuring. And thus, as Fuller goes on, divinity was profaned, mathematics suffered for correspondence with evil spirits, physic was maimed, and a riot committed on the law itself.

The king was very bountiful, not to say profuse, in parting with these abbey-lands, of which Fuller gives several instances. To mention one or two: he tells us he made a grant to a gentlewoman of a religious house, for presenting him with a dish of puddings which happened to oblige his palate. This historian adds, he played away many a thousand a year belonging to the monasteries: and, particularly, that Jesus bells, hanging in a steeple not far from St. Paul's, London, very remarkable both for their size and music, were lost at one throw to Sir Miles Partridge. And those monasteries which passed from the crown by sale or exchange, were granted upon very unequal and slender considerations: but of this more hereafter.

And that the reader may make a fuller judgment of these and other resembling proceedings, I shall subjoin this king's coronation oath. It is as follows:—

“The king shall swear, that he shall keep and maintain the lawful right, and the liberties of old time granted by the righteous Christian kings of England to the holy Church of England, not prejudicial to his jurisdiction and dignity royal: and that he shall keep all the lands, honours, and dignities and freedoms of the crown of England, in all manner whole, without any manner of minishment, and the rights of the crown hurt, decayed, or lost, to his power shall call again into the ancient estate: and that he shall endeavour himself to keep unity in his clergy and temporal subjects, he shall according to his conscience in all his judgments, minister equity, and right, and justice, and shewing, where is to be shewed, mercy: and that he shall grant to hold the laws and approved customs of the realm lawful, and not prejudicial to his crown or imperial jurisdiction, and to his power keep them, and affirm them which the nobles and people have made and chosen with his consent; and the evil laws and customs wholly to put out, and

Stow's  
Survey of  
London in  
Faringdon  
Ward with-  
in, &c.  
Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 6.  
p. 336, 337.  
Ibid.  
p. 341.  
*The king's  
coronation  
oath from  
copy taken  
by Selden  
from the  
Cotton li-  
brary, and  
interlined  
with the  
king's hand.*

stedfast and stable peace to the people of his realm keep, and cause to be kept, to his power, in that which honour and equity do require.”

HENRY  
VIII.

To return: as to the religious dislodged and thrown out of their estates by the dissolution, the king did not send them altogether unprovided into the world. They had pensions during life allowed for their maintenance. These pensions were secured to them by patents under the broad seal, and registered in the court of augmentations. This clause of “tempore dissolutionis illius, et diu antea” was inserted in the patent. And thus a great many young people, who were lately professed, were left to shift for themselves, and excluded the benefit of this provision. Those, likewise, who were preferred to any ecclesiastical dignity or benefice, at the dissolution of their house, had no pension: which maintenance was likewise to determine with those that had it, upon their promotion to any church preferment of equal value. This, as Fuller observes, was a temptation to the king and chancellor to prefer monks of mean qualifications to good livings: for by such a provision, the exchequer was discharged of taking any farther care of them. The patents for these pensions were all drawn in the same form, as to substance; I shall transcribe one of them for the reader.

*Pensions allowed the religious, but with some exceptions.*

167.

See Records, num. 45.

Besides these pensions, which were well paid, the monks had some advance-money to equip them for the world, and supply their necessities, till their pensions became due. This bounty-money generally bore the proportion of a fourth part to their annuity. The nuns' maintenance seldom rose to more than four pounds per annum pension, and forty shillings in hand, when they quitted the cloister. What share of the abbey-lands was settled on the endowments of bishops' sees newly erected, and other public benefactions, shall be related afterwards.

Fuller's Ch. Hist. book 6. p. 343. 346.

About this time archbishop Crammer addressed the king for a farther reformation.

He intreats the king would graciously please to weigh the following considerations.

“First. That no important business, especially matters of religion, ought to be concluded without mature deliberation.

Biblioth. Cotton. Cleop. E. 5. fol. 50.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“Secondly. How ill both provincial and even general councils have succeeded, when men have attempted to decree any thing as of divine authority, without a clear warrant from the Holy Scriptures, or from consequences evidently inferred from thence.

“Thirdly. That all Christendom is now furnished with learned men, who are competent judges in this controversy, and able to pronounce what doctrines are agreeable to Scripture, and what not.

“Fourthly. To what pitch of boldness men are now arrived? What intemperate freedoms they take in writing against great princes? With what disrespect they treat a sovereign character? How they argue upon the level? and mind only the cause, without taking notice of the quality of the person.

*This resolution seems levelled against Luther.*

“Fifthly. That both men of the new learning, as they are called, and those who adhere to the papacy, agree that priests are not forbid to marry by the word of God: this both parties allow, though they are well aware many expositors of Scripture have written otherwise.

“Sixthly. That it is not possible all learned men should be of one mind, as long as the cockle and the wheat, the godly and the ungodly, are mixed together.

“Seventhly. That variety of opinions has sometimes occasioned useful discoveries, and truth hath been struck out of clashing and opposition. Thus, for example, the usurped authority of the bishop of Rome has been brought into view.

“Lastly. There are other unmentioned opinions, which are no less likely to obstruct the blessing of uniform belief in your grace’s dominions. For instance, whether the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of purgatory and invocation of saints? Whether any unwritten verities, conveyed by oral tradition, are necessary to be believed? Whether these are to be looked on as supplemental articles? Or whether, on the other side, we are not bound to believe any farther than what is delivered in the inspired writings, or can be made good by direct inference from some plain text? Whether there is any other satisfaction besides that of Christ? Whether the will is furnished with such a degree of strength and freedom, as to dispose itself to grace ‘de congruo?’ Whether the kissing our Saviour’s image, in honour of him, is forbidden in Scripture? And generally, whether images may be made use of in any



other manner, than what is mentioned in your grace's injunctions?

HENRY  
VIII.

“Whether, in consideration of the premises, your highness may please to suspend your judgment for some time? Not to pronounce the marriage of priests against Scripture, but rather to command silence to both parties under a penalty.

“And in case what I have offered does not prevail with your highness to demur, that then your majesty would please to order, that the question touching the marriage of priests, may be openly disputed before indifferent judges, in both universities. That the arguments of those who hold the question on the negative side, may be delivered to the other party twelve days before the dispute begins: that by this means, those who maintain the affirmative may be the better prepared to answer the objections. That these latter, in case they fail in the contest, and have judgment given against them, shall be obliged to lose their lives for their miscarriage. But if the other side, who argue against the marriage of priests, happen to sink in the controversy, they shall forfeit nothing, only it will be then desired, that your highness will please to allow your subjects the liberty that God hath given them.”

As to the precise time when these considerations were sent to the king, it is hard to determine: however, by the circumstances, we may come something near in the chronology. For by the archbishop's mentioning the king's injunctions, it is plain this paper must have been written after the year 1536. And by his suggesting a disputation touching the lawfulness of priests' marriage, we may conclude this address was made before the year 1539, when the Six Articles were enacted.

To return to the business of the parliament. The lord chancellor acquainted the upper house, that the king being most desirous to put an end to all controversies about religion, and bring his subjects to an uniform belief, had commanded him to move that a committee might be appointed for examining the difference of opinions, to draw up articles for an agreement, and make their report to the house. The lords agreed to this motion, and named Cromwell the vicegerent, the two archbishops, the bishops of Durham, Bath and Wells, Ely, Bangor, Carlisle, and Worcester, for a committee. These lords were ordered to finish this union scheme with all expedition. The

May 5,  
1539.

*A committee  
of religion  
assigned to  
no effect.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

sentiments of the archbishop of Canterbury, of Cromwell, of the bishops of Ely and Worcester, being different from the other five, this affair came to no point. And thus, after eleven days' debate, the matter was taken out of their hands.

168.

For now the duke of Norfolk acquainted the lords, that the committee had made no progress, and that there was little prospect of the business succeeding this way : he offered therefore some articles to their lordships' consideration ; that these, after they had been examined by the house, might be passed into an act. The articles are as follow<sup>1</sup> :

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. I.  
p. 256.  
*The Six Arti-  
cles argued  
in parlia-  
ment.  
Absque tran-  
substanti-  
atione.  
Journal  
Procer.*

“ First. Whether in the holy eucharist Christ's real body is present without any transubstantiation ? ”

It seems, provided the corporal presence had been established, they would have left the manner undetermined.

“ Secondly. Whether the laity are to communicate in this sacrament under both kinds ?

“ Thirdly. Whether by the law of God priests are allowed to marry ? ”

“ Fourthly. Whether the vows of chastity, made either by men or women, ought to be observed by the law of God ?

“ Fifthly. Whether by the law of God private masses ought to be celebrated ?

“ Sixthly. Whether auricular confession should be retained.

Archbishop Cranmer argued boldly in the house against these articles, three days together : but what arguments he made use of does not appear. That they were not unbecoming a person of his learning and character, may be conjectured by the king's sending for a copy of them. And notwithstanding the freedom taken by the archbishop in his debate, he did not lose the king's favour. His majesty looked on him as a man of probity, and one that had courage to deliver his mind. Some, on the other side, thought him particularly interested against the third article, upon the score of his being married.

Lord Her-  
bert, p. 448.

The parliament, after a short prorogation, sitting on the thirtieth of May, the lord chancellor acquainted the house, that not only the spiritual lords, but the king himself had taken a great deal of pains in the articles above-mentioned :

● <sup>1</sup> I have ventured to arrange these “ six bloody articles of the bloody statute ” according to the usual order.

that now, at last, the matter was brought to an issue, and settled. He moved therefore, in the king's name, that a bill might be read for the punishing such as should offend against this provision: the lords appointed the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Ely and St. David's, and doctor Petre, a master of chancery, and afterwards secretary of state, to draw one bill; and the archbishop of York, the bishops of Durham and Winchester, and doctor Tregonnel, another master of chancery, to draw another. When both these bills were ready, a day was set to lay them before the king. The draught made by the archbishop of York, and those joined with him, was most approved: however, the matter hung in debate from the first until the seventh of June, when it was brought into the house, and read the first time. It was carried through the house of lords with dispatch; for on the tenth it was engrossed, and read the third time. The king would have had the archbishop of Canterbury leave the house, since he could not vote for it; but after a decent excuse, he told the king he thought himself bound in conscience to stay there, and shew his dissent. This bill passed smoothly with the house of commons, for on the fourteenth it was finished and sent up to the lords; and on the twenty-eighth it was signed by the king. The preamble sets forth, "That whereas the king's most excellent majesty is, by God's law, supreme head immediately under him of this whole Church and congregation of England, intending the conservation of the same Church and congregation, in a true, sincere, and uniform doctrine of Christ's religion, calling also to his blessed and most gracious remembrance, as well the great and quiet assurance, prosperous increase, and other innumerable commodities, which have ever ensued, come, and followed of concord, agreement, and unity in opinions, as also the manifold perils, dangers, and inconveniencies, which have happened heretofore in many places and regions, especially of matters of Christian religion; and therefore desiring, that such an unity might and should be charitably established in all things touching and concerning the same, as the same, so being established, might chiefly be to the honour of Almighty God, the very author and fountain of all true unity and sincere concord, and consequently redound to the commonwealth of this his highness's most noble realm, and of all his loving subjects and other residents and inhabitants of, or in the same: hath therefore caused and commanded this his most high court

HENRY  
VIII.Journal  
Procer.*The act of  
the Six Arti-  
cles, with  
the penalties.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of parliament, for sundry and many urgent causes and considerations, to be at this time summoned, and also a synod and convocation, of all archbishops, and bishops, and other learned men of the clergy of this realm, to be in like manner assembled.”

The preamble continues, that the Six Articles were debated in convocation as well as parliament, in both which places it was finally agreed and resolved :

“ First. That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ’s mighty word (it being spoken by the priest) is present really under the form of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary : and that after the consecration, there remaineth no substance of bread or wine, or any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and man.

“ Secondly. That the communion in both kinds is not necessary ‘ad salutem’ by the law of God, to all persons : and that it is to be believed and not doubted of, but that in the flesh, under the form of bread, is the very blood, and with the blood, under the form of wine, is the very flesh, as well apart as though they were both together.

“ Thirdly. That priests, after the order of priesthood received, as afore, may not marry by the law of God.

“ Fourthly. That vows of chastity, or widowhood, by man or woman, made to God advisedly, ought to be observed by the law of God ; and that it exempteth them from the liberties of Christian people, which without that they might enjoy.

“ Fifthly. That it is meet and necessary, that private mass be continued and admitted in this the king’s English Church and congregation, as thereby good Christian people, ordering themselves accordingly, do receive both godly and goodly consolations and benefits : and it is agreeable also to God’s law.

“ Sixthly. That auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the Church of God <sup>1</sup>.”

169.

“ The penalty for writing, preaching, or disputing, against the first article, is to suffer the judgment and execution of a heretic convict, without the customary allowance of abjuration,

<sup>1</sup> Rapin attributes the contrivance of the six articles to Gardiner, who intimated to the king that it was the only means to hinder a league being formed against him.

and to forfeit all estate, real and personal, as in cases of high treason.

HENRY  
VIII.

“ And those who declared against any of the five other articles, either by writing or otherwise, were, for the first offence, after legal conviction, to forfeit all their goods and chattels to the king, and all other branches of their real estate during life, and to suffer imprisonment at the king’s pleasure. The second offence is enacted felony, with the consequent pains and forfeitures.

“ The act proceeds to a retrospection, and pronounces the marriages of priests, and of those women who had vowed either single life or widowhood, to be void and of none effect ; and that the ordinaries, upon the discovery of such engagements, were to proceed to a divorce ; and that such priests and women, who for the future should cohabit, were upon conviction to suffer as felons.

“ Farther : all parsons, vicars, and curates, are enjoined to read this act once a quarter. And lastly, there is a proviso that the vows of chastity should not be construed to bind any person but such as were one-and-twenty years of age when they entered into this engagement, and that, without being overawed by any force or compulsion : but priests are barred the benefit of this clause, which seems somewhat unnecessary, because their age at their entering into these orders would have barred the plea of the proviso.”

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 14.  
Statutes at  
Large.

This act gave satisfaction to those who were apprehensive of farther innovations upon the received doctrines, screened the king from the suspicion of proceeding to excess of reformation, and made the dissolution of the abbeys less regretted. And here we are to observe, that the persons prosecuted for offending against any branch of this statute were to be tried by a jury, before such commissioners as the king should nominate, of which the archbishop or bishop, his chancellor or commissary, was to be one.

The king, to relieve Crammer under the mortification of this act, sent for him, and gave him the assurance of his favour ; and, to make him the more easy, he ordered the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, and the lord Cromwell, to dine with him at Lambeth.

*The king sends the duke of Norfolk, &c. to Lambeth, to countenance the archbishop.*

These lords, according to their instructions, acquainted him with the regard the king had for him, commended him for the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

learning, elocution, and prudent management shown in his opposition against the bill above-mentioned; that his manner in this debate was so unexceptionable and engaging, that he had no reason to be apprehensive of ill offices from those of the contrary opinion; that cardinal Wolsey lost even his friends by his haughtiness and self-conceit; but that this archbishop, by his piety and obliging behaviour, gained the esteem of his adversaries, and that in points of the nicest concern. And here Cromwell added, that Crammer was particularly happy in the king's good opinion: for, let the information against him have never such strong colours, the king threw it off, without farther notice, at the first hearing. Whereas, if either himself or any other of the privy-council was complained of, his highness's custom was to inquire thoroughly into the matter. Upon this the duke of Norfolk told Cromwell that nobody knew the difference between the humours of Crammer and Wolsey better than himself: "for, my lord," says he, "you were for some time in the cardinal's service." Cromwell, resenting this as a reflection, answered with something of warmth, that, notwithstanding he belonged to Wolsey, he never liked his management so well as the duke seems to have done: "for," says he, "my lord, you promised to wait on him to Rome, and serve him in the admiral's post in case he had been chosen pope;" and then mentioned how many florins he was to receive for his salary. The duke swore this was a lie, and broke out into some other rough expressions; and though Crammer interposed, stopped the progress of the quarrel, and prevailed with them to part like friends, yet the disobligation was not forgotten, nor the friendship heartily recovered. This story is misrelated by bishop Burnet, to Cromwell's advantage. Cromwell fell into another misfortune by miscalculating upon Bonner's disposition. Crammer and this lord, it seems, took him for an enemy to the old superstition; and, upon this confidence, lent him their interest to promote him, first to the see of Hereford, and thence to London. At this time the king's privy-council broke into two divisions: Crammer, Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, and Cromwell, were at the head of one party, and endeavoured to check the rigour and stop the prosecution upon the late act; the duke of Norfolk, and Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, were of a quite different sentiment, and pressed the king to severities against those who could not come up to

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 513.  
*A clash  
between  
Cromwell  
and the Duke  
of Norfolk.*  
Antiq. Brit.  
p. 333.  
Hist. Re-  
form, pt. 1.  
p. 265.

Bp. Burnet.

the established belief. When Bonner perceived the king's inclinations swayed by the duke of Norfolk and Gardiner, he deserted Cranmer, as some say, and Cromwell, and went over to the other side.

HENRY  
VIII.

Ibid.

Our learned Church historian observes, "this bishop took a strange commission from the king. Whether the other bishops," continues this author, "took such commissions I know not, but am certain there is none such in Cranmer's register.—After Bonner had taken this commission, he might well have been called one of the king's bishops."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 267.

As this learned historian observes, the contents of Bonner's commission were extraordinary, for it begins thus: "Quandoquidem omnis jurisdictionis autoritas, atque etiam jurisdictionis omnimoda, tam illa quæ ecclesiastica dicitur quam secularis, a regia potestate, velut a supremo capite, et omnium infra regnum nostrum magistratuum fonte et saturigine, primitus emanavit, sane illos qui jurisdictionem hujusmodi antehac non nisi precario fungebantur, beneficium hujusmodi sic eis ex liberalitate regia indultum, gratis animis agnoscere, idque regie munificentie solummodo acceptum referre, eique quoties ejus majestati videbitur, libenter concedere convenit."

That is, "that the king is the fountain of all manner of jurisdiction and authority, as well ecclesiastical as secular; and that those who formerly exercised this jurisdiction did it only in a precarious manner, and upon royal courtesy; and that therefore it ought to be returned whenever his majesty shall please to call for it; and that since the lord Cromwell, knight of the garter, vicegerent and vicar-general, to preside, manage, and direct in all ecclesiastical causes, was so far employed in matters concerning the State, that he was not at leisure to discharge the function of a viceregent, and manage the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, wholly delegated to him by the king, supreme head of the Church of England, &c."

170.

Because Cromwell was thus busy and could not be every where, nor execute the office of an universal superintendent, for this reason the king, as the instrument continues, gave Bonner a commission to execute all the branches of the episcopal authority under his highness. For the purpose he has a royal license to ordain within the diocese of London, to visit

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the dean and chapter of St. Paul's, and all other colleges, hospitals, monasteries, clergy, and laity, within his district. He had likewise a power given him to hear causes and to give sentence in the spiritual courts, to exercise discipline and inflict censures according to the directions of law and the degrees of the criminal's offence, and, in short, to execute every thing belonging to the authority and jurisdiction of a bishop.

And after the king had thus declared himself patriarch in his dominions, claimed all manner of spiritual authority, and pronounced the bishops no more than his delegates at pleasure,—after this, these words are thrown into the commission, to give it the more passable complexion: “*Præter et ultra ea quæ tibi ex sacris literis divinitus commissa esse dignoscuntur.*”

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 1.

Now, with submission, this clause seems to come in too late, and is utterly inconsistent with the former part of the commission: for, if the king is the fountain of all manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction,—if his lay-vicegerent might lawfully supply the room of all the bishops in England, provided he were at leisure and able to do it in person,—if the bishops, in the execution of their office, are only the king's representatives and revocable at pleasure,—if these affirmations are all defensible, as the commission sets forth, then, without question, the hierarchy can have no jurisdiction assigned in the New Testament, nor any authority derived from our Saviour.

But if the Church is a distinct and entire society,—if, in pure spirituals, she is constituted independent of all the kings on the earth,—if she is furnished with powers sufficient to answer the ends of her charter,—if these powers were settled by our Saviour upon the Apostles and their successors to the world's end,—if the hierarchy can make out this title, then I must crave leave to think those who suggested the draft of this instrument were no great divines.

See my  
Ch. Hist.  
pt. 1. p. 257.

But how extraordinary soever this commission may seem, it was certainly complied with, and that by other bishops beside Bonner. For instance, Cranmer took out one of the same tenor and form from king Edward VI. Now, if Bonner was so much to blame for complying to this latitude, the same imputation must fall upon Cranmer: to which we may add, that this was not the first commission of this kind taken out by Cranmer: for, as our historian observes, the order of council made in the beginning of the reign of king Edward VI.

Bp. Burnet,  
Hist. Re-  
form. pt. 2.  
p. 6.  
Id. Records,  
num. 2.  
p. 90.



requires the bishops to take out new commissions of the same form with those they had taken out in king Henry's time, only with this difference, that there is no mention made of a vicar-general in these commissions, there being none after Cromwell advanced to that dignity. If no such commission, as this learned gentleman remarks, taken by Cranmer from king Henry be found in his register, it doth not follow he took out no such instrument: for his register is imperfect in many places. To speak clearly, he took out such a commission from king Henry some years before Bonner: for, from the collections of Dr. Yale, the learned Harmer cites a transcript of this commission, agreeing exactly with that of Bonner above-mentioned, to which this note is subjoined: "Tales licentias acceperunt Thomas archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, mense Octobri 1535; Edwardus archiep. Eborac.; Johannes episcopus Lincoln., 13 Octob. 1535; Johannes episcopus London., 19 Octob. 1535; Stephanus episcopus Winton., eodem anno; Cuthbertus episcopus Dunelm., 10 Novemb. 1535," &c. Now, this Dr. Yale, being an eminent advocate in Doctors' Commons in Cranmer's time, and afterwards principal registrar and vicar-general to archbishop Parker, must be owned an unexceptionable evidence for this point. Farther: our learned historian has misreported Bonner, in saying he was one of the popish party at this time, and took out his commission to serve that interest: for Fox has given several instances to prove that Bonner, till the fall of Cromwell, was a zealous promoter of the Reformation, which is likewise afterwards confessed by our historian.

To proceed: Now, Cranmer had a difficult post to manage. His aim was to push the Reformation to a farther progress; but here, besides the pretended disappointment in Bonner, he had reason to be discouraged by those who continued firm to the cause. His instruments were disproportioned to the work; and his adherents, if they are rightly represented, unprepared to discharge their part: for, in the words of our learned historian, "the other bishops, that adhered to Cranmer, were rather clogs than helps to him. Latimer's simplicity and weakness made him be despised; Shaxton's proud and litigious humour drew hatred on him; Barlow was not very discreet; and many of the preachers whom they had cherished, out of an unbridled forwardness of temper, that would not be managed by politic and prudent measures, were flying at several

HENRY VIII.

Bp. Burnet, Hist. Reformation, part 1. p. 267.

Harmer, p. 52.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 299. Cranmer *ill supported by his adherents.*

Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 255.

things that were not yet abolished. Many complaints of this kind were brought to the king." Thus we see these men wanted either light or discretion, and were either ill or under-qualified.

To give check to this mismanagement, Cromwell wrote to some of the bishops by the king's directions. In his letter to Richard, bishop of Chichester, he puts this prelate in mind of his being the king's principal minister in all matters relating to the clergy. Upon the strength of this commission, he proceeds to press the bishop to execute the purport of the king's letters, for the avoiding of contrarities and novelties in doctrine; and, on the other side, to stop the liberty of those who preached up the pretended authority of the bishop of Rome.

His letter to the bishop of Landaff is to the same effect.

In the beginning of this year, Luther and Melancthon, together with some princes and states in their communion, came to an agreement upon several articles. By this recollection they seem to have been sensible of reforming too far from the Church of Rome; and they were willing to own the necessity of episcopal government, to explain some contested points, and relax in several articles of the Augustine confession. This draft, which I transcribed from the Cotton library, runs thus:—

Cotton.  
Cleop. V.  
fol. 302.  
Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. E. 4.  
fol. 1.

Cleop. 5.  
fol. 288.

171.

*"A Copy of such things as Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, with certain Cities and Princes of Germany, their adherents, have admitted, March, anno 1539:—"*

*Some accommo-  
dating  
articles,  
assented to  
by Luther,  
Melancthon,  
and some  
German  
princes of  
their com-  
munion.  
They allow  
the papacy  
under cer-  
tain quali-  
fications.*

"First, we confess, that there ought to be a policy in the Church, and a regimen; in the which there must be bishops, who shall have the power of the examen and ordination of the ministrations of the same, for to exercise the jurisdiction of the same; who shall diligently foresee, that the churches committed to them may be truly instructed with pure and sincere doctrine.

"We admit that it is good and convenient, that in the Church there be a bishop of Rome, that may be above other bishops, who may gather them together, to see the examination of the doctrine, and the concord of such as do teach discrepancies in the Church. But we admit not the pomp, riches, and pride of the bishop of Rome, who would make realms subject unto him: the which things do neither help nor promote

the Gospel, because the king, who hath right thereto, may and ought to rule the same.

“ We confess, that, as concerning choice of curates, holy-days, and ceremonies, there might an agreement be made easily, if there could be a concord in the doctrine of the Church, and not such discrepency as there is. For if there were a concord of doctrine in the Church, we should not think it reasonable to divide us from the Church; seeing that it is not possible that the world can stand without ceremonies, and man’s constitutions: whereby it should not need to divide us from the other, and to bring up new and unaccustomed constitutions: seeing that all innovation without necessity ought to be eschewed, and that there is no peril to use a mean in the observation of the said ceremonies and men’s constitutions, so that the doctrines be purely handled.

“ We judge it to be profitable, that confession and rehearsal of sins be made in the church: for taking the same away, the doctrine of remission of sins, and of the power of the keys, should be offuscate and taken away; seeing that in the confession, amongst other things, the people ought to be taught whence comes the remission of sins; provided that there be honest fashion to instruct the persons that be shriven, and that the consciences be not overlaid with rigorous and exact rehearsal of all sins.

“ We believe that justification is made by faith, because there be no works whereby we may satisfy, or obtain remission of sins: yet nevertheless, the same faith that justifieth us, ought not to be idle, but adorned with good and godly deeds.

“ We confess that the free-will, holpen with the Holy Ghost, may do somewhat, whensoever we will withdraw from sin.

“ We confess, that after the remission of sins, the Holy Ghost is given to the man, from the which he departeth again as soon as he committeth any deadly sin.

“ We use the fashion accustomed in the office of the masses; for what shall avail a change of ceremonies without necessity? but we admit not the privy masses, which are the occasions of sundry abuses, because there is an open fair or market for celebration of masses.

“ We believe thus concerning the supper of the Lord, that like as Christ in his last supper did give unto his disciples his

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

true body to be eaten, and his blood to be drank, for spiritual meat and drink, so he gives daily to us his disciples and loyal men, as often as we keep the supper according to the form commanded, 'accipite et comedite,' his true body and blood to be eaten and drank. And this is the mind of the three evangelists, and of St. Paul, and so their words do sound clearly; wherefore, away with all such erroneous interpretations as are made upon the same words.

" We be taught that Christ did give unto his disciples his body and blood under both species and kinds; and that therefore we ought to observe the same, as we do indeed. But because the one species has by man's constitutions been forbidden by the bishop of Rome, there might be a remedy found without peril or danger; so that he that would, might have both species, and that there should be a prohibition made, that the one should not insult against the other.

" Seeing that it appears by the holy doctors, that the holydays and feasts of saints have been accustomed to be observed, as we see as yet some holy canons on that matter: and not, that there is made in the same any mention of their invocation: but only by the same, that they be proposed unto us for an example to learn to follow their life and conversation. Yet nevertheless, seeing by some custom the intercession of saints ought to be admitted, then there should be prayers made unto God, that it might like him to hear them by the intercession of some saint: we affirm for a certainty, that the saints do continually intercede for the Church; albeit, the Christian man ought to be taught, that they shall not convert the same hope to the saints, which they ought to have unto God.

" We do not reject images of Christ, and of saints, but the adoration made to them; whereof idolatry is sprung.

" Also, we damn not the monkery, or life of such as be closed in the cloisters; but only the trust that some men have put in the regular observation. Also, we reject the vows that have been made upon such things as men cannot observe: yet nevertheless, we will not that monasteries should be put down for the same, but that they may be turned into schools, in the which, good doctrine should be taught; and that the pope may dispense with the vows. So that it were free for every man to keep, or not keep them; and so the same should be much to

the quiet and tranquillity of mind, and the vows should not be the snares of malice.

HENRY  
VIII.

“ That the marriage of priests should be in the pope’s hands, who might admit the same ; and the concubinate of many should be forbidden, for we see few chaste : but if the law to not contract should have place, then for to avoid slander, there should be none advanced to the dignities ecclesiastic, but grave persons, and of full age.

“ We think it best to dispute of purgatory, and pardons, in the schools, rather than in the pulpit, to dispute the same publicly, without any profit ; so that the markets and bargains thereof shall be avoided. For we do reject in those things, and others, where we do not agree, rather the abuse, than the thing itself ; the which, nevertheless, may be discussed and amended by councils lawfully assembled.”—At the close of the articles, these words follow : viz.

172.

“ The Zuinglians and Œcolampadians have not yet received these articles : but the simple people shall be easily reduced, and we trust they shall shortly be conformable thereto.

“ Luther has revoked all his books, wherein there be any things contrary to these articles ; and hath retracted them with his own hand, and acknowledged his faults.”

Thus we see Luther, and a considerable party of those of his sentiment, came to a recollection. They considered their first motions were somewhat too strong, and that the heat of disputation, and the stiffness of the court of Rome, had raised their passion, and driven them towards the other extreme. I grant these articles are not in Sleidan : but their passing the test of so great an antiquary as sir Robert Cotton, and being lodged in his library, without any mark of disadvantage, is a strong recommendation of their authority. Besides, the English speaks them as old as the date they pretend to : Whether they were drawn up here by some reconciling hand, transmitted to Luther and Melancthon, and agreed by them ; or whether they were formed and concerted in Germany, and translated into our language, is uncertain. However, this accommodating scheme fell short of an establishment ; from whence we may conclude there was a majority, or at least some powerful interest against it.

To return to the parliament. The act of the Six Articles was looked on as no small grievance. To be forced under the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*The Six  
Articles  
complained  
of.*

highest penalties to follow a parliamentary resolution in matters of faith, was complained of as a great hardship upon conscience. Belief is not in every man's power: terror and extremities are none of the most likely ways to make way for proof, and form a new persuasion. Men do not love to be dragged into religion: to lie under a necessity of being either a martyr or an hypocrite, they thought singular usage. To be menaced with such severities, is apt to overrule the choice, fright a man out of his sentiment, and make him decline a thorough examination of the point. For if our creed is prescribed us under pain of death, how dangerous will it be to go through with our inquiry? And on the other side, if we take our religion upon content, how can we be assured we are not mistaken? Besides, if Turks and heathens should force their subjects to a compliance with their infidelity, upon the same forfeitures, what a discouragement would this be against turning Christian.

Lord Her-  
bert, p. 447.  
*The religious  
allowed to  
purchase,  
but not to  
inherit.*

There was an act passed this parliament, that all religious persons, now dismissed from the monasteries, might have the common privilege of purchasing or suing, they might also be sued: but here they were not perfectly returned to the birth-right of persons unprofessed; for they are barred by a proviso from claiming any estate of inheritance: but since many of them were forced into the world, and turned out of a comfortable maintenance, this clause of disabling them from inheriting, was thought somewhat severe.

31 Hen. 3.  
cap. 6.  
Statutes at  
Large.  
May 23.  
*An act  
enabling the  
king to erect  
new bishop-  
rics.*

Farther, a bill was brought into the house of Lords by Cromwell, for empowering the king to erect new bishoprics. It was penned at court, and therefore it is no wonder to find some hard expressions bestowed on the monasteries. The preamble sets forth, "that the idleness and immorality of the religious was not unknown; that therefore, their houses might be turned to a more serviceable account, that the Scriptures might be better set forth, children bred to learning, and scholars maintained in the universities; old servants disabled, furnished with a support; alms-houses better provided; Greek, Hebrew, and Latin lectures encouraged with good salaries; exhibitions given, &c. For these public reasons the king thought it necessary that more bishoprics, collegiate and cathedral churches, should be erected in the room of the monasteries dissolved.

"By the enacting part of the statute, the king is authorised

by his letters-patent under the great seal, to erect what number of new sees, to settle the endowments, the extent of the districts, to govern the translations, and to appoint such other regulations as to his most excellent wisdom should be thought necessary."

HENRY VIII.

There is a rough draft under the king's hand in the Cotton library. In the same paper, there is likewise a list of the sees he intended to found, with the abbeys where they were to stand. This memoir is under the king's hand in the following order :

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 9.  
Statutes at Large.  
Clcop. E. 4.

Essex . . . . .	Waltham.	
Hartford . . . . .	St. Albans.	
Bedfordshire, and } . . . .	{ Dunstable,	A list of the sees the king intended to erect.
Buckinghamshire, }	{ Newenham,	
	{ Elveston.	
Oxford, and } . . . .	{ Osney, and	
Berkshire, }	{ Thame.	
Northampton, and } . . . .	{ Peterborough.	
Huntingdon, }		
Middlesex . . . . .	Westminster.	
Leicester, and } . . . .	{ Leicester.	
Rutland, }		
Gloucestershire . . . . .	St. Peter's.	
Lancashire . . . . .	{ Fountains, and the arch- deaconry of Richmond.	
Suffolk . . . . .	Edmondsbury.	
Stafford, and } . . . .	{ Shrewsbury.	
Salop, }		
Nottingham, and } . . . .	{ Welbeck,	
Derby, }	{ Worksop,	
	{ Thurgarton.	
Cornwall . . . . .	{ Launceston,	
	{ Bodmin,	
	{ Wardreth.	

Thus we see a noble design was struck out : if it be inquired how it came to miscarry, it may be answered, the king was disabled from executing this project : he quickly exhausted himself upon the courtiers : the measure of his bounty was no

*How the  
scheme hap-  
pened to fail.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Ld. Herbert,  
p. 461.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 268.  
See Records,  
num. 47,  
from Paper-  
office.

less extraordinary than the manner of his acquisition; inso-  
much, that he may be almost said, to have snatched with one  
hand, only to throw away with the other.

Thus, the best part of the scheme died under thought, and  
came to nothing.

About this time a discourse was drawn by some single  
hand, entitled, "A Declaration of the Faith, and a Justifica-  
tion of King Henry VIII. in matters of Religion; or, a  
Summary Declaration of the Faith, Uses, and Observations in  
England."

173.

*A declara-  
tion of the  
faith, &c. of  
the English  
nation.*

The design of this apology is to justify the English nation  
from the charge of deserting the Catholic Church. It is like-  
wise a defence of the administration: the author endeavours  
to prove the king had not given way to arbitrary measures,  
or done any thing unwarrantable by law or equity. The paper  
deserves the reader's view; however, it is not altogether with-  
out mistakes. For the apologist affirms, mortuaries were  
wholly taken away by act of parliament, whereas, they were  
only regulated. He argues faintly for the suppression of  
religious houses, and contradicts matter of fact. He says the  
king would not dissolve some of the monasteries, which is  
another mistake. The story about Becket's death is false;  
and his satire upon that archbishop's management indefensible.  
Bishop Fisher and sir Thomas More are unhandsomely re-  
membered: the latter is called a jester, and the other a  
glorious hypocrite. If the author is right in what I am going  
to mention, this paper was published before the bills of  
attainder passed. For he affirms that neither peers, nor  
commoners, were ever condemned in this reign without legal  
process.

*Several per-  
sons at-  
tainted in  
parliament  
without being  
heard.*

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 359.

This parliament several attainders passed without suffering  
the parties to make their defence. This our learned Church  
historian complains of, as "a breach of the most sacred and  
unalterable rules of justice: and a blemish never to be  
washed off, nor capable of any excuse." The marchioness of  
Exeter and the countess of Sarum fell under these severities.  
The first is charged with abetting sir Nicholas Carew in his  
treasons: to which is added, that divers other abominable  
treasons had been committed by her. The latter is charged  
with entering into criminal engagements with her son the  
cardinal. It does not appear by the journal that any wit-

May 10,  
1539.



nesses were examined; but that after the third reading, Cromwell produced a coat of white silk, found by the lord admiral amongst the countess of Salisbury's clothes: that upon this coat the arms of England were wrought on one side, and the rebels' standard on the other. This was urged as presumptive evidence that she approved the rebellion. Three Irish priests were likewise attainted for conveying letters out of Ireland to the pope and cardinal Pole; sir Adrian Fortescue was attainted for endeavouring to raise rebellion; and Thomas Dingley, knight of St. John's of Jerusalem, and Robert Granseter, merchant, for soliciting several foreign princes to make war upon the king, and assist the lords Darcy and Hussie in their rebellion; two gentlemen, a Dominican friar and a yeoman, were attainted for saying, "that venomous serpent, the bishop of Rome, was supreme head of the Church of England;" and, lastly, two priests, another gentleman, and a yeoman, were attainted for treason in general, without the mention of any crime in particular. Thus sixteen persons fell under the act; and if any witnesses were examined, in order to their conviction, it was either in the Star-chamber or before the privy council: for the journals mention no evidence in the parliament-house.

HENRY  
VIII.  
Journal  
Proccr.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 360.

As to the countess of Salisbury's case, the lord Herbert relates from records that several bulls were found at Cowdrey, which he supposes was then the countess's house. That the parson of Warblington conveyed letters from her to the cardinal her son: and that she forbid all her tenants to have the New Testament in English, or any other new book privileged by the king. However, as this noble historian goes on, it appears this lady was allowed a hearing, though he does not say where: for he adds, notwithstanding she was seventy years old, her behaviour was full of spirit and well supported; and that she refused to make any confession: but, notwithstanding this silence, the proof brought against her was judged sufficient. Fortescue and Dingley suffered on the tenth of July. The countess lived by reprieves two years, and was then executed. The marchioness of Exeter had gentler usage, survived the king, and died a natural death. In November the abbots of Reading, Glassenbury, and Colchester, already mentioned, were attainted of treason. What the particulars were, our learned Church historian confesses he cannot tell;

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 447.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

for the record of their attainders is lost. But, as he goes on, "some of our own writers deserve a severe censure, who write it was for denying the king's supremacy. Whereas, if they had not undertaken to write the history without any information at all, they must have seen that the whole clergy, and especially the abbots, had over and over again acknowledged the king's supremacy."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 239.  
*An un-  
proved cen-  
sure upon  
our histo-  
rians, by the  
author of  
the "Re-  
formation  
of the Church  
of Eng-  
land."*

But how does it appear our historians are mistaken? Has this gentleman seen the abbot of Colchester's indictment, or perused his record of attainder? He confesses no: how then is his censure made good? He offers at no argument beyond conjecture; he concludes the abbot of Colchester had formerly acknowledged the king's supremacy, and from thence infers he could not suffer now for denying it. But do not people's opinions alter sometimes, and conscience and courage improve? Did not bishop Fisher and cardinal Pole at least, as this author represents them, acknowledge the king's supremacy at first? And yet it is certain they afterwards showed themselves of another mind to a very remarkable degree. To give another instance: Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, had solemnly renounced the pope's authority; but notwithstanding all this disclaiming, "there were violent presumptions, that he had secretly reconciled himself to the pope, and entered into a correspondence with him." To which we may add, that many of the bishops and clergy, who had owned the regal supremacy in this reign, refused that length of compliance to queen Elizabeth. Besides, the abbot of Colchester, who submitted to the supremacy, and he that suffered for denying it, were not the same person. For the first, in his submission, subscribes himself Thomas Abbas; but the name of him that is executed was John Beach. Farther: does not he himself tell us, that "many of the Carthusians were executed for their open denying the king's supremacy?" And why then might not some of the abbots have the same belief and fortitude with others of their fraternity?

Id. p. 251.

Wharton,  
Hist. de  
Episc. et  
Decan.  
Londin.  
p. 292. in  
Append.  
Stow's  
Annals,  
p. 577.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 241.  
*Free use of  
the Scrip-  
tures al-  
lowed pri-  
vate persons.*

About this time a proclamation was published for the free use of the Scriptures. It is true the English Bible had been set up in churches a year since, but now private persons had leave to buy and read it at home. This liberty was probably granted at the instance of archbishop Cranmer. The letters-patent inform us, the management of this affair was entrusted

to the lord Cromwell. The instrument sets forth: "The king was desirous of his subjects' improvement in the knowledge of their duty to God and himself. That the most likely means for attaining this end was to allow them the free use of the Bible in their mother-tongue; that because different translations may occasion dispute and error, especially amongst people of obstinate and presuming tempers; therefore the lord Cromwell was ordered to take care that no person, without his authority, should print any Bible in the English tongue during the space of five years."

HENRY  
VIII.  
Nov. 13,  
1539.

174.

To proceed. Those who were inclined to a reformation were apprehensive of rough usage from the Six Articles, though this act was not pressed close till Cromwell's death; however, Latimer and Shaxton, bishops of Worcester and Salisbury, are supposed to have resigned their bishoprics upon this score. They were not willing, it may be, to have a share in the execution of this act, or countenance the severity of it.

Rot. Pat.  
31 Hen. 8.

*Latimer and  
Shaxton  
resign their  
bishoprics.*

To strike off a little, and give a brief account of the Church in Scotland. Last year Hieronimus Russel, a grey friar, and one Kenedy, a young man of Aire, were informed against for heresy at Glasgow; and because Dunbar, the archbishop, was thought to exceed in lenity and moderation, two or three other clergymen, of more bigoted tempers, were sent for from Edinburgh to manage at the trial. Archbishop Spotswood doth not tell us what the articles were, only that Kenedy was willing at first to have denied the charge, and disentangled himself. But being encouraged by Hieronimus's behaviour, he recollected his spirits, and resigned cheerfully to the event.

Lord Her-  
bert, p. 49.  
*The prosecu-  
tions in  
Scotland  
upon the  
score of  
religion.*

The friar is said to have made a learned defence; but being answered with railing and reproach, he returned some rough language, and saluted the court in their own way. The archbishop of Glasgow was very averse to these methods of rigour: such extremities, he said, were unserviceable to religion; he thought it therefore much the best way not to destroy men's lives, but to apply to some milder expedient. The assistants from Edinburgh told him, that if he set up any new precedents of gentler usage, and refused to be governed by the capital of the kingdom, they could not esteem him the Church's friend. Thus, it seems, the archbishop's prudence and good nature were overruled, and he gave way to the burning sentence.

Russel and Kenedy behaved themselves with great piety and

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Spotswood's  
Hist. of the  
Church of  
Scotland,  
p. 67.

resolution at the stake, and went through the execution without any signs of surprise or disorder.

About this time George Buchanan was committed for some satirical verses against the Franciscans: but he made his escape and got into France. This Buchanan was an extraordinary genius, and a great master of the Latin tongue, as appears from his poems and history.

And now prosecutions for religion in Scotland were very frequent; for James Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrew's, being disabled with age, had resigned, as it were, his post, and put the government of the Church into the hands of his nephew the cardinal. Some few years past, this prelate and the clergy had a contest with the king: they complained of a tax laid upon them for the entertainment of the college of justice. The dispute was carried on to an appeal to Rome. But before they had gone far in that court, the matter was compromised: and here it was agreed, the lords of the session should consist of fourteen ordinaries with a president; seven of the spirituality and seven of the temporality: but with this advantage to the first division, that the president was always to be a prelate. This accord was confirmed by an act of Parliament, A. D. 1537.

*The clergy  
and the tem-  
poralty in  
courts of  
justice.*

*Cardinal  
Beaton  
archbishop  
of St. An-  
drew's.*

The archbishop of St. Andrew's died two years after, and nominated the successors to his preferments: he left the archbishopric of St. Andrew's, and the abbey of Aberbrothock, to the cardinal his nephew. The king, who had a great esteem for the old archbishop, allowed this disposal.

The cardinal, soon after his promotion, discovered himself of a warm and prosecuting temper. To stop the progress of those who opposed the established religion, he brought a great appearance of quality, both clergy and laity, to St. Andrew's. And here, in the cathedral, he made a speech to acquaint them with the increase of heresy, how the Catholic faith was insulted: that heterodoxy was openly maintained and too much encouraged in the king's court: particularly he mentioned one sir John Bothwick, who had been cited to St. Andrew's for dispersing heretical books, and holding several opinions contrary to the doctrine of the Roman Church. The articles were these:—

*Articles  
against sir  
John Both-  
wick.*

“ First. He held the pope had no more authority than any other bishop.

“Secondly. That papal indulgences and pardons were designed only to abuse ignorant people, and signified nothing.

HENRY  
VIII.

“Thirdly. That it is lawful for bishops and priests to marry.

“Fourthly. That the heresies, commonly called the heresies of England, and their new liturgy, were a commendable reformation, and ought to be followed by the rest of Christendom.

“Fifthly. That the people of Scotland were misled by the clergy out of the profession of the true faith.

“Sixthly. That churchmen ought not to enjoy any temporalities.

“Seventhly. That the king ought to seize the estates of the Church, and convert them to other pious uses.

“Eighthly. That the Church of Scotland ought to be governed by the English model.

“Ninthly. That the canons and constitutions of the Church were repugnant to the law of God, and by consequence of no force.

“Tenthly. That the monastic orders ought to be suppressed.

“Eleventhly. That he took the liberty of reading heretical books written by Melanethon, Œcolampadius, and Erasmus.”

Sir John Bothwick appearing neither in person nor proxy, the charge was taken for confessed. Upon this he was declared a heretic, his goods confiscated, he was burnt in effigy, and all persons prohibited to entertain or relieve him under the penalty of excommunication.

Sir John being informed of these proceedings, retired into England, where he was well received by king Henry, and honoured with a public character to the Protestant princes in Germany. Thus far archbishop Spotswood. But notwithstanding sir John Bothwick did not think it safe to stand his trial at St. Andrew's, the articles were transmitted to him by a friend. By his answer to the charge related by Fox, it appears he was much mistaken in some points: particularly in asserting that the clergy ought not to have any property or temporal jurisdiction. But the weakness of this pretence has been sufficiently exposed already; besides, sir John, as to the manner of his defence, is extremely foreign to the character of a Christian. He is very coarse and intemperate in his satire, and flies out into the last excesses of railing.

May 23,  
1540.See my  
Ch. Hist.  
pt. 1. p. 661.  
175.  
Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 605. et  
deinc.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

To break through the order of chronology a little, and proceed somewhat farther with the Scottish affairs: king Henry, some years before, sent the bishop of St. David's into Scotland, to present his nephew with some English books, and particularly with the "Institution of a Christian Man:" but that prince was not disposed to make any alteration in religion. Some time after, the lord William Howard was sent to the Scotch court to desire an interview between the two kings at York. This motion was agreed to, the time set, and an equipage prepared for the journey. But the cardinal and clergy being apprehensive of ill consequences, endeavoured to break the appointment. They told the king, there was a great deal of danger of putting himself in the king of England's hands; that he would in all likelihood meet with the misfortune of king James I. and be kept prisoner in England: that by taking this step, his friendship would be suspected by the emperor and the French king; and, which was chiefly to be regarded, by entering into such a confidence with an excommunicated prince, he must necessarily fall under the pope's displeasure. Notwithstanding this remonstrance, the king resolved to keep his word, and set forward for England. For not to appear at York, and disappoint his uncle upon so solemn an occasion, might draw a war upon him, which his exchequer was in no condition to deal with. The clergy perceiving where the matter pinched, besides some advances in hand, made an offer of fifty thousand crowns per annum, in case any war should happen, representing, withal, that by the forfeiture of heretics' estates, a hundred thousand crowns more would accrue to his majesty. Upon the strength of these expectations, the king was prevailed upon to decline the interview, and send an excuse to his uncle. From this time his highness was entirely managed by the cardinal and his party, and ordered a strict prosecution of persons suspected for heresy.

To return to England: the lord Cromwell, who perceived his interest at a stand, and the other party gaining upon the king, projected the marriage between his master and the lady Anne, the duke of Cleve's sister. This minister observed, the king was much swayed by his queens, as long as his fancy continued. He thought, therefore, the most effectual expedient to preserve himself and his friends, was to bring on an alliance with some of the princes of Germany. The emperor had pro-

*The king of  
Scots re-  
fuses an  
interview  
with king  
Henry, and  
why.*

A. D. 1540.  
Spotswood,  
p. 71.

*The king's  
marriage  
with Anne  
of Cleve.*

posed Christiana, duchess of Milan, to the king; and king Francis had offered him the choice of any French lady: but both these overtures came to nothing. This made the king hearken to Cromwell's suggestion, and think of engaging with Anne of Cleve. The treaty was begun with duke John, her father, but some difficulties intervening, it broke off. Upon her father's death, the treaty for a match with England was revived with duke William, her brother. The lady's picture was drawn by Hans Holbein, and sent over hither. But this famous painter was too ceremonious, and very much exceeded the life. The king being pleased with the portrait and alliance, concluded the match, and soon after the lady was sent over with a splendid equipage. His majesty, upon the sight of her at Rochester, was much disappointed in her person. He dissembled his disgust notwithstanding, and treated her with the customary regard. Having proceeded thus far, he thought it too late to disengage, and therefore resolved to marry when the difficulty of the pre-contract between this lady and the duke of Lorraine's son was disentangled. The lord Cromwell was charged with the clearing this business. He told the king, that an instrument for releasing the covenants of marriage between the lady Anne and the duke of Lorraine's son, was brought over. But whether Cromwell was guilty of an omission, or deceived by the duke of Cleve's agents, is somewhat uncertain: for it seems the German ambassadors could produce no such instrument. But to give the king what satisfaction was in their power, Olesleger offered to remain a prisoner until a revocation of the contract was sent over. This failure in what was expected, made the king complain of ill-usage; however, the matter was referred to the council-table. Here the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Durham delivered their opinion, that if nothing but a contract had passed between them, the renunciation above-mentioned would void the articles, and return them to their former liberty. As to the manner of this revocation, each of the parties were to declare their release before persons of quality, and public notaries. And that their protesting the articles void in this solemn manner, would be a sufficient discharge in law. The duke of Cleve's commissioners undertook a form of this kind in writing, procured from their master and the duke of Lorraine's son, should be put in the king's hand; and the same declaration

HENRY  
VIII.Ld. Herbert,  
p. 434, 435.

Id. p. 453.

*He was one  
of the com-  
missioners.*Jan. 16,  
1539-40.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Id. p. 454.

was made by the lady, at his majesty's instance. Things being thus far advanced, the king told Cromwell there was now no remedy or evasion, and therefore he must of necessity "put his neck in the yoke." Thus the next day, he married her with the usual solemnity at Greenwich, and resolved to enter into a confederacy with the princes of Germany, provided religion could be tolerably agreed.

The latter end of this year, sir Ralph Sadler, secretary of state, was sent ambassador to James, king of Scotland. After a present of some horses for a recommendation, his instructions were to bring Beaton, cardinal and archbishop of St. Andrew's, into disfavour with that prince. For this purpose, the cardinal's letter to the pope, couched in terms not servicable to the writer, being intercepted in England, was shown at the Scottish court: but this design of lessening the cardinal's interest made little impression upon king James. The other branch of the ambassador's charge was, to persuade the king of Scots to make seizure of the abbeys: that this expedient would be a great addition to the revenues of the crown. The king generously replied, the monasteries were ready to answer any intimations of his pleasure for a supply; and therefore he had no occasion to destroy their establishment. He added, a great many of these houses managed to commendation, and if there were any abuses in the rest, they might be easily reformed.

*The king of  
Scots' reason  
for not dis-  
solving the  
monasteries.*

Ibid. p. 445.

176.

It is possible this prince might consider, farther, that if the abbeys were dissolved, it would be expected he should follow king Henry's precedent, and convey the greatest part of these estates to his courtiers, and other secular men. That unless they were thus gratified, the temporalty might think themselves disappointed, and losers by the change. That being thus balked, they might sympathise too far with the unfortunate religious, abet their pretensions, and occasion a commotion in the government.

On the other hand, if the lands of the monasteries were granted to his lay-subjects, he might foresee the sense of the benefaction would be quickly worn out. Such bounty would be looked on as the reward of service, and the title laid in the merit of the grantee. It would be very much a question whether the heirs of the abbey-lands would be so compliant with the crown, and part so easily with their money as the



monks had usually done. The sending for loans might probably be looked on as arbitrary demands, and invasions of property: and though the squeezing a defenceless order would, it may be, go off in a jest, or pass for a public convenience; yet such an experiment upon men of title and interest, of steel and stomach, might prove dangerous in the operation: it was upon this prospect, it is likely, in concurrence with other motives, that king James was not in a disposition to go into his uncle's measures. And thus, when the emperor Charles heard of the fate of the English abbeyes, and into what channels their revenues were turned, he is reported to have said, that now the king had killed the hen which laid him the golden egg.

To return to England: it seems the new queen had neither agreeableness of person or conversation to engage the king's affections: for how well qualified soever she might be for discourse in her own country, that advantage was lost here, for she understood no language but Dutch: and as for music, which was the king's inclination, it was not any part of the breeding of her father's court. Besides, the instrument for disentangling the pre-contract was either not shown the king, or came short of giving satisfaction. It is granted it was transmitted hither, to Olesleger, the duke's commissioner, but it was not lodged with the records of state, but only found amongst Cromwell's papers after he was apprehended. In short, the king was resolved to part with his queen, and destroy Cromwell, who advised the bringing them together. It was not long since the king had loaded him with titles and advancement in office; made him knight of the Garter, earl of Essex, and lord chamberlain of England. But Cromwell having gone so deep in making this match, and flourished, it is likely, too much upon the lady's person, his fate was determined. This minister was pushed from his station with little regret. The nobility grudged so much greatness to so mean a birth. The bishop of Winchester, and those of his interest and persuasion, hated him for projecting the dissolution of the abbeyes, and acting so vigorously in it. As for the reformers, he signed the instrument for their punishment, and had a share in the prosecution, and therefore could have no great expectations from that quarter: besides, his counsels were thought oppressive, both to the clergy and laity: for notwithstanding the

*The king  
resolves to  
part with his  
queen.*

*Cromwell's  
fall.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

prodigious treasure which flowed into the exchequer, from the dissolution of the abbeyes—or at least might have run into that channel, had the course been well directed,—notwithstanding this, and a subsidy of four shillings in the pound, given by the clergy, he had wrested one-tenth and four-fifteenths from the laity, against the grain of the parliament. These circumstances of his condition and management made him universally hated. The king, therefore, thought his ministry no longer necessary, but gave way to the complaint of his enemies. Now it was no difficult undertaking to form a charge against a person who had acted in so many public posts, and been concerned in such a complication of business.

June 15.  
A. D. 1540.

The king, being furnished with articles and evidence against Cromwell, ordered the duke of Norfolk to arrest him at the council-table. Cromwell drew a presage of his ruin from the person employed: for this duke was uncle to the lady Catherine Howard, who began now to draw the king's inclination.

*Cromwell  
sent to the  
Tower for  
high treason.*

When the news was spread of Cromwell's commitment to the Tower for high treason, the people gave public and ill-natured signs of their being pleased with his misfortune. The king perceiving the gust of the generality, that the hardships suffered, and the wrong steps in the administration, were thrown upon this minister, he proceeded in the divorce, and his business in parliament, without much reserve or hesitation.

Cromwell was attainted of high treason in parliament, without being brought to his answer. This method was thought extremity of justice, to speak softly; but the former proceedings of this kind, and most other severities of the government, being imputed to his suggestions, he had little compassion. Archbishop Cranmer showed his friendship heartily on this occasion, and made a generous effort to disengage Cromwell, as appears by his letter to the king on this lord's behalf.

June 14.

He acquaints his majesty, “how much he was surprised at Cromwell's being put under an arrest for high treason. That the obligations of this minister to his majesty being so extraordinary, his security resting wholly on the crown, and his inclination upon all occasions so apparent to serve his master, his misbehaviour to such a degree was a most amazing relation.” The archbishop continues, “that he thought Cromwell loved his majesty no less than God Almighty; that he always

made his majesty's pleasure the rule of his conduct, and valued no man's displeasure to serve his master; that, in his opinion, no king of England ever had a minister better qualified in point of prudence, application, and integrity, than Cromwell; that if king John, Henry II. and Richard II. had been furnished with such a counsellor, he believes they would never have miscarried, and been so traitorously deserted. I loved him," says the archbishop, "as a friend; but chiefly for the distinguishing regard he always discovered for your highness; but now, if he is a traitor, I am sorry I misplaced my affection, and took him into any share of confidence; and am very glad his treason is detected. But then I am extremely concerned upon another account; for who can your highness trust, if he has deceived you? Alas! I lament your highness's misfortune, and am perfectly at a loss in whom you may confide: but shall never cease to beg of God Almighty to send your highness a counsellor in his place, so well qualified for your service, both in abilities and inclination, as ever I thought this person to have been."

HENRY  
VIII.

This is the substance of Cranmer's letter, as it was copied by Lord Herbert from the original. This letter, though written in time, and with great frankness, was not prevalent enough to preserve Cromwell. For three days after, the bill of attainder was brought into the house of Lords, where it passed in two days: it stuck longer with the Commons, but at last it was agreed to by both houses, and had the royal assent.

Ibid. p. 447.

June 17.

177.

The act sets forth, "that Cromwell had presumed to discharge several persons committed for misprision of treason: that he had received several bribes, and for that consideration, granted licenses to carry money, corn, horses, and other things, out of the kingdom, contrary to the king's proclamation: that he had traitorously usurped part of the king's prerogative, and issued forth commissions to several persons, upon urgent and weighty affairs, without the king's knowledge or consent: that he had procured many heretical books to be translated into English: that he had openly maintained, that it was lawful for every Christian man to administer the sacrament of the altar, as well as the priest: that he had misbehaved himself in his office of vicegerent, screened heretics from

*Crimes  
charged  
upon Crom-  
well in the  
bill of  
attainder.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

punishment, obstructed their reformation, and written to the sheriffs to set them at liberty, upon a false suggestion of an order from the king: that having strengthened his interest, by debauching his majesty's subjects, and thinking himself in a condition to maintain his treasons and heresies by plain force, on the last of March, in the thirtieth year of the king's reign, when complaint was made to him of Barnes, and some other new preachers; amongst other things, to the same effect, he traitorously delivered himself in these words: that 'if the king would turn from it, yet I would not turn; and if the king did turn, and all his people, I would fight in the field in mine own person, with my sword in mine hand, against him and all others:' and then, and there, most traitorously pulled out his dagger, and held it up, with these words: 'or else this dagger thrust me to the heart, if I would not die in that quarrel against them all. And I trust, if I live one year, or two, it should not be in the king's power to let it if he would.' And then, swearing a great oath, and throwing up his arm in a menacing posture, he said, 'I will do so indeed.' He is likewise charged with enriching himself by oppression, bribery, extortion, and delusive promises. And that having raised a great fortune, by such indirect and scandalous practices, he had treated the nobility with great disregard and contempt. And being put in mind of the condition to which the king had advanced him, the last of January, the thirty-first year of the present reign, in the parish of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, in Middlesex, he publicly declared, 'that if the lords would handle him so, he would give them such a breakfast as never was made in England, and that the proudest of them should know.' For all which treasons, and heresies, he was attainted to suffer the pains of death, and to forfeit all his lands, goods, and chattels to the king's use, of which he had been possessed the last day of March, in the thirtieth year of his majesty's reign, or since. To this bill there is a proviso added, that this attainder should work no prejudice to the bishop of Bath and Wells, or to the dean and chapter of that cathedral."

Rot. Parl.  
32 Hen. 3.  
See Bp.  
Burnet's  
Records,  
book 3.  
p. 187.  
*Cromwell*  
*dean of*  
*Wells.*

To understand this proviso, we are to take notice, that Cromwell, when lord privy seal was his highest title, was elected dean of Wells. This was done by bishop Clerke's interest, at the king's recommendation. The bishop seems very much

pleased, that Cromwell had this dignity: because so great a man's being dean, he conceived, would strengthen the interest, and protect the privileges of that Church. But if this was bishop Clerke's opinion, he miscalculated upon the issue; for Cromwell procured exchanges of land, and broke in upon the endowments of that see and chapter.

HENRY  
VIII.

To return. Upon this attainder, Fox takes the freedom to observe, that as general councils have sometimes been mistaken, in matters of weight relating to religion; so princes and parliaments may be sometimes misinformed, by men of design, and mal-intentioned. And to affirm this, is no reflection upon the government and legislature.

Biblioth.  
R. Harley,  
Armig.

The lord Herbert is more reserved in his remarks, and will not pretend to justify where the law condemns: however, he seems to believe, that those dangerous words, said to be spoken by Cromwell, did not proceed from any treasonable meaning: but that, being some unguarded expressions, they were misreported, or misapplied.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 514.

Our learned Church historian ventures farther in Cromwell's justification, and makes no difficulty to affirm, "that from these particulars in the act, the reader will clearly see, why he was not brought to make his answer, most of them relating to orders and directions he had given, for which, it is very probable, he had the king's warrant." But to say this, is to stick a remarkable blemish upon the king, to make the parliament flexible to a lamentable degree, and arraign the proceedings of the highest court of justice; and all this, without sufficient proof to warrant the censure.

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 457, 458.

About this time, John Clerke, bishop of Bath and Wells, was sent ambassador to the duke of Cleves, to acquaint him, that the instrument for nulling the pre-contract between Anne of Cleve and the duke of Lorraine's son, had been examined in parliament, and declared insufficient for the purpose. That therefore his majesty was resolved to break the marriage. In the meantime, the king ordered the duke of Suffolk to acquaint the queen with this resolution. She had been lately removed to Richmond, upon pretence of better air. The lady was extremely surprised at the delivery of this message. After some recollection, and recovering her spirits, she discoursed with this lord, and was, at last, persuaded to comply with the terms proposed; first, "to refer the matter of the pre-contract to

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 279.  
*The king  
breaks the  
marriage  
with Anne  
of Cleve.*

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 458, 459.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Ibid.

the decision of the English clergy : secondly, to drop her title of queen, and take that of the king's adopted sister."

On the seventh of July, the case was brought before the convocation, opened by the bishop of Winchester, and a committee appointed to consider it. The bishops of Durham and Winchester, Thurlby, and Leighton, dean of York, were ordered to examine witnesses: the next day they received the king's deposition, with a long declaration of the whole matter under Cromwell's hand. It was likewise deposed by the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord chancellor Audley, the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, "That when the queen was brought to Greenwich, at her first arrival, the king desired to be informed, whether the promises made by the duke of Cleve, to clear the espousals between the queen and the duke of Lorrain's eldest son, were performed. For satisfaction in this matter, the king deferred the solemnizing his marriage two days: that upon the king's laying this affair before the council, they found this matter not disentangled. That no writing was brought over to satisfy this question. That upon the score of this disappointment, the marriage had been declined, if the king's inclination had not been over-ruled by the solicitation of the duke's agents. These persons promised, that their master would shortly send over an authentic instrument, and put the matter out of all doubt. But when the writing came to the king's hand, it rather raised new scruples, than removed the old ones. So that now the espousals between the queen and the duke of Lorrain's eldest son, might be taken for a contract 'de præsentî.'" The rest of the depositions turned chiefly upon the king's disaffection to the queen's person. The evidence being laid before the convocation, they came to an unanimous vote for nulling the marriage, and declared the king and the lady Anne perfectly discharged from the engagement. One argument, besides those already mentioned, was drawn from the want of consummation: but here, as it is well observed, the convocation seems to have forgotten what was urged on the king's behalf ten years before: that consent, without consummation, completed a marriage. But it is supposed, that many of the members being canonists, supported their judgment by precedents in the canon law; concluding, it may be, they might use the same liberty which had formerly been taken by the court of Rome.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1.  
Records,  
book 3.  
num. 17, 18.

Regist.  
Cranmer,  
fol. 141.  
178.

*The convocation declares the marriage void.*

See Records,  
num. 48.  
July 9.  
Extracts of  
Convoc.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 281.

But after all, the reasons on which their sentence is founded are not very cogent ; and therefore I cannot help saying, they appear to have been too much governed by the will of their prince.

On the tenth of July, the archbishop of Canterbury reported the proceedings of the convocation, in the house of Lords: the bishop of Winchester delivered the instrument of the clergy's decision in writing, and dilated on the reasons upon which it was founded. The Lords, being satisfied with this representation, sent Cranmer and Gardiner to acquaint the Commons with what had passed. The next day, the lord chancellor, the duke of Norfolk, the earl of Southampton, and the bishop of Winchester, were dispatched to the queen: she appeared not at all disconcerted at the news; it may be the manner of this disengagement reconciled her more to it: for besides the privilege of being declared the king's adopted sister, these lords assured her, his highness would give her precedence next to his queen and daughters, and settle her in an estate of three thousand pounds per annum. And over and above, she had the liberty either of living in England, or returning home when she thought fit. She accepted the terms, acquainted the king with her compliance in a letter, and signed in the style suggested: she was farther prevailed on to write to her brother, the duke of Cleves. In this letter, she reports the judgment of the convocation, owns the justice of the process, that her honour was preserved, that she was well used in England, and desired to remain there; in the close, she requests her brother not to break off his correspondence, or maltreat the English court; for that might prove unserviceable to her. Lastly, She promised these lords, that all the letters she received from her brother, or any other person, should be shewn to the king. The day following, a bill was read for annulling the marriage, and passed both houses without any difficulty; the act recites the judgment of the convocation, and makes it high treason to maintain either by writing or any other overt act, that the pretended marriage between the king and the lady Anne of Cleve is good and binding.

To proceed to some other statutes of this parliament, relating to the Church. A bill passed for moderating the rigour of the Six Articles, relating to the marriage of priests, or their cohabiting with other women. And here the capital punish-

July 11.  
*Their sentence confirmed in parliament.*

*The lady Anne complies with the proceedings.*  
Id.  
Collections, &c. book 3. p. 200.  
Id. Herbert, p. 459.

32 Hen. 8. cap. 25.  
Statutes at Large.  
*An act for moderating the penalties of the Six Articles.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 10.

*An act  
concerning  
the de-  
claration of  
the Christian  
religion.*

ment was mitigated to a forfeiture of goods, chattels, and lands, during life.

Another bill was passed, touching the state or declaration of the Christian religion, by whom it was to be drawn up, and who was to determine the meaning of any controverted point. The preamble sets forth, "that his highness, in virtue of his ecclesiastical supremacy, had taken all imaginable care to establish the prosperity of the Church of England, and to procure the blessings of union in that society. His highness likewise considering, that sundry heretical, erroneous, and dangerous opinions have been spread amongst his subjects, disordered them in their belief and practice, disposed them to animosities among themselves, to the damage of the commonwealth, and the danger of their souls, without timely remedy; to prevent such mischiefs, his highness has ordered the archbishops, and several bishops of both provinces, together with a considerable number of doctors in divinity, of the best reputation for learning and discretion, to draw up a form of the principal articles of our faith; adding withal, an explanation of such other points as by his grace's advice, counsel, and consent, shall be thought needful and expedient. They were likewise commissioned to deliver in a form of all the lawful rites and ceremonies for divine service, to be observed within this realm. And because this matter was so important, and required the utmost thought and deliberation, they were not tied in the performance to this session, but might take what length of time soever shall be allowed them by the king, with the advice of the privy council. By the enacting part, all determinations, declarations, definitions, resolutions, &c., made according to God's word, and Christ's gospel, by the archbishops, bishops, and committee of doctors, above-mentioned, or by the whole clergy of England, upon any point of the Christian faith, or touching rites and ceremonies, when confirmed by his majesty's letters-patent under the great seal, shall be in every point and circumstance fully believed, obeyed, and performed to all purposes, intents, and constructions, by all his majesty's subjects, under the penalties therein to be comprised; provided always, that nothing shall be done, ordained, defined, or provided by authority of this act, which shall be repugnant or contrariant to the laws and statutes of this realm."

32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 26.  
Statutes at  
Large.



This proviso perplexes the statute, seems to recal the powers already granted; and upon any dispute, brings the last resolution of the question to the temporal courts. For as our learned Church historian observes, "it was one of the great designs both of the ministry and lawyers at this time, to draw all ecclesiastical matters to the cognizance of the secular judge."

HENRY  
VIII.Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 233.

179.

*The order  
of the  
Knights of  
St. John of  
Jerusalem  
suppressed.  
32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 24.*

The famous hospital of the knights of St. John of Jerusalem, which had hitherto outridden the storm which fell upon the abbey, was now involved in the fate of the rest. "For the dissolution of this wealthy society, these reasons," as lord Herbert words it, "were chiefly pretended: that the knights of Rhodes or St. John of Jerusalem exported great sums of money yearly out of the kingdom; that they abetted the usurpations of the court of Rome, maintained the pope's supremacy; that they had defamed the king and his subjects, and endeavoured to draw an odium upon the public proceedings for discharging the pretended authority of the court of Rome; that the isle of Rhodes, from whence these religious knights took their name and establishment, was surprised by the Turks; and, lastly, that the revenues of the house would be better spent in defence of the kingdom, than any longer enjoyed by such a disaffected fraternity."

By the body of the statute, all the lands belonging to the knights of St. John of Jerusalem, both in England and Ireland, are granted to the crown, and put within the survey and jurisdiction of the court of Augmentations. And here, with the rest of their estates, all parsonages, tithes, and pensions, belonging to their house, were conveyed to the king. However, sir William Weston, prior, and several others of the brothers, had considerable pensions during their lives settled by the act. For instance, sir William Weston had an annuity of a thousand pounds per annum; sir John Rawson, knight, prior of Kilmaynan in Ireland, had an annuity of five hundred marks; Clement West's annuity was two hundred pounds; George Ailmer, another of the brothers, had an annual pension of an hundred pounds during life. There are several other annuities of the same value; but many of them were no more than ten pounds. Besides this annual allowance, all the brothers had an assignment of part of the goods belonging to the house, proportioned at the king's pleasure. "Thus," says lord

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Ed. Herbert,  
p. 461.

Herbert, “fell the ancient and pious order, not without much scandal abroad, both to the king and government.” The endowment was vast, as may be concluded only by considering the pensions. However, the king was not long the richer by the dissolution: for his majesty, being diverted with the tilting and entertainment of several noblemen and other persons of condition, rewarded them with a grant of a great part of the lands of this priory.

*An act concerning marriages and degrees of consanguinity, &c.*  
Id.

The act concerning marriages and degrees of consanguinity shall be next. The preamble sets forth, “that many marriages had been nulled formerly by the bishop of Rome, upon pretence of pre-contracts, or other degrees of kindred not prohibited by the law of God; it is therefore enacted, that, after the consummation of the marriage, no allegation of a pre-contract, or any degrees of kindred but those excepted in the law of God, should be pleaded to annul and void such an engagement; for these pretences,” as the act continues, “had been often made use of only when the parties, or one of them at least, grew weary, and were willing to disengage.”

32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 38.

This act, making pre-contracts no good reason for breaking a marriage, drew a censure upon the king for parting with queen Anne Boleyn upon this score. Some, it is possible, thought the king procured the passing this bill to wipe off the blemish on the lady Elizabeth’s birth, and to open a way to her succession to the crown: for now the ground upon which she was made illegitimate was by implication declared unwarrantable. Another branch of this act, allowing all marriages excepting in the degrees of consanguinity and affinity prohibited in Scripture, was supposed a provision for removing impediments against the king’s marriage with Mrs. Catherine Howard: for this lady being cousin-german to Anne Boleyn, the nearness of the alliance would embarrass the king’s design by the canon law.

32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 45.  
*An act concerning tithes.*

This session, the court of first-fruits and tenths was erected. There was likewise an act for the payment and recovery of tithes. The act is charged with two provisos: first, “that no person shall be sued or otherwise compelled to pay tithes for any manors, lands, tenements, or other hereditaments, which by the laws and statutes of this realm are discharged or not chargeable with the payment of any such tithes.

“It is farther provided, that nothing in this act shall bind

the city of London and suburbs to pay their tithes and offering otherwise than they ought, or should have done before the making this act."

The preamble sets forth, "that many persons in few years past, most contemptuously and commonly presuming to break in upon the laws of the realm, have made no scruple to refuse the payment of the lawful and accustomed tithes of corn, hay, pasturage, oblations, &c.; that they have been the more encouraged to this indirect practice because divers lay-persons having parsonages, vicarages, and tithes, conveyed to them and their heirs, cannot by the course of the ecclesiastical laws of the realm sue in the ecclesiastical court for the wrongful detaining the said tithes or other duties, nor can have any remedy by the common laws of this realm for this purpose.

"It is therefore enacted, that every person shall set out and pay his tithes according to the custom of the parish where they are due; that offenders shall be convented before the ordinary, and the cause tried in the ecclesiastical courts; that, in case any of the parties shall appeal from the judgment of the spiritual courts, the appellants shall pay costs to the other party; and that those persons who shall refuse to pay their tithes, pursuant to the award above-mentioned, shall be bound by two justices of the peace to obey the ordinary's sentence."

32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 7.

Upon this statute Fuller takes the freedom to remark, that, since the king had lately set so singular a precedent in suppressing abbeys and alienating tithes from the primitive intentment, it was no wonder to find the subjects strike out into some imitation; especially "because it seemed unreasonable," as he goes on, "that they should receive wages who did no work, and the hire of the labourers in the vineyard should be given to lazy lookers on." This statute, though made in favour of lay-impropriators, was serviceable to the clergy: for, though the benefit of the Church was not principally in view, the concurrence of interest and the parity of the case made it applicable.

Fuller's Ch.  
Hist. b. 5.  
p. 236.

At the end of this session there was an act of grace, in which several persons of quality, monks, and priests of both parties, are excepted. Those likewise who held the following erroneous principles are excepted, viz.—

"That infants ought not to be baptized,—and, if baptized, to be re-baptized when they come to years of discretion; that

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*Persons  
holding  
several  
errors ex-  
cepted from  
the general  
pardon.*

32 Hen. 8.  
cap. 49.

*Lord Crom-  
well exe-  
cuted.  
July 28.  
His cha-  
racter.*

it is not lawful for a Christian to exercise any office or post in the commonwealth ; that human laws ought not to be obeyed ; that it is not lawful for any Christian to take an oath before a judge ; that Christ assumed none of the flesh of the Blessed Virgin ; that those who sin after baptism cannot be recovered by repentance ; that the manner and time of every man's death is so irrevocably determined by God Almighty, that it is not in the power of any mortal to alter it." These heterodoxies, mentioned in the act, were most of them held by the then Anabaptists.

Some few days after the dissolution of this parliament, the lord Cromwell, earl of Essex, was brought to the scaffold, and executed on Tower-hill. This minister was without question of great natural parts, and of a more than ordinary talent for business : for he came into the world with no advantage of circumstances : his father was a blacksmith at Putney, near London. Notwithstanding this discouragement of birth, his industry and force of genius made way for his advancement. He found opportunities in his youth to travel, and learn some languages. He served some time in the field under Charles, duke of Bourbon ; and was a sentinel at the sacking of Rome. Soon after, he quitted the military profession, returned into England, and was entertained in cardinal Wolsey's family. Here he behaved himself to commendation enough, was at last the cardinal's secretary, and, when that prelate fell, the king preferred him to his service. During his ministry he gained a great share in the king's favour by suggesting the dissolution of the abbeyes, and bearing hard upon the jurisdiction of the clergy. He said the driving the monks out of the cloister was only returning them to labour and a lay character, which was no more than their first business and pretension. As for the rules of their institution, and their particular austerities enjoined them, he pretended they might practise all this discipline and self-denial without the forms of monastic confinement. But this way of talking looked like superficial and mercenary reasoning in the opinion of other persons of learning and thought. In short, his governing himself upon these notions, and soliciting the king to manage by this scheme, brought him under a general odium, and occasioned his ruin. He is said to have carried his greatness with wonderful temper and moderation. But the learned historian, by what he has

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 462.  
Bp. Burnet,  
p. 264.

already reported of Cromwell, seems to have disabled himself for this commendation. For instance, Cromwell's letter to Shaxton, bishop of Sarum, is stiff, prescribing, and full of his vicegerency. By the loftiness of his style, one would think he had forgotten the bishop's character, and his own slender qualifications: for, as this gentleman observes, "all the learning he had, was, that he had got the New Testament in Latin by heart." The same learned historian delivers himself thus: "I shall here add a reflection upon Cromwell's misfortune, which may justly abate the loftiness of haughty men." Now, if he did not believe Cromwell a man of this temper, his remark is altogether foreign. "The day after," says this historian, "that Cromwell was attainted, being required to send the king a full account under his hand of his marriage, which account he sent, he concludes it with these abject words: 'I, a most woeful prisoner, ready to take the death when it shall please God and your majesty, and yet the frail flesh incites me to call to your grace for mercy, and grace for mine offences: and thus Christ save, preserve, and keep you. Written at the Tower, this Wednesday, the last of June, with the heavy heart and trembling hand of your highness's most heavy and most miserable prisoner and poor slave, Thomas Cromwell.' And a little below that, 'Most gracious prince, I cry for mercy, mercy, mercy!'"

HENRY  
VIII.

Ibid.

Id. Records,  
book 163.Bp. Burnet,  
Records,  
book 3,  
p. 193.Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 231,  
232.

Id. p. 277.

Farther: Cromwell is likewise charged by this historian with promoting the bills of attainder. "Cromwell's ruin," says he, "was now decreed: and he who had so servilely complied with the king's pleasure in procuring some to be attainted the year before without being brought to make their answer, fell now under the same severity." However, that he was against the prosecution of those called heretics, must be granted; that he was of no sanguinary exterminating spirit, is plain by the act of attainder; but, when the king's command pressed him close, he was not firm enough to hazard his interest or his person: a prospect of danger made him give way, sign a commission for the trial of heterodoxy, and read the sentence for delivering the convict to the secular magistrate. Joscelin and Fox bestow a great deal of panegyric upon him. The first reports that no person was more faithful to the king, more grateful to his benefactors, and more generally friendly and benevolent, than this minister. It is likewise said, no "bribery could be fastened

Antiquit.  
Brit. p. 234.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 285.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
p. 233.

on him." Now, whether all these good qualities belong to him in so sovereign a degree may bear a question : for, in his speech upon the scaffold, he acknowledged he had offended the king, and asks him forgiveness. As to gratitude, he seems to have failed in one instance, if our historian is not mistaken : for, out of a compliment to Craumer, he drew a parallel between the archbishop and Wolsey, to the reproach of the cardinal his master. And, lastly, that Cromwell was not so clear from taking bribes as bishop Burnet supposes, appears from the pensions and presents he received from the abbeyes, though he advised the suppressing them, and, as Joscelin confesses, exerted his interest for that purpose.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 265.

Brit. p. 332.

The charge against him for being concerned in bills of attainder is of the hardest kind. To endeavour the taking off some of the weight of this article, I shall cite a passage from sir Edward Coke. This learned gentleman puts a question, "What the reason should be that our historians do all agree in this, that Cromwell suffered death by a law which he himself had made? For answer hereof, I had it of sir Thomas Gawdy, knight, a grave and reverend judge of the King's Bench, who lived at that time, that king Henry VIII. commanded him to attend the chief justices, and to know whether a man that was forthcoming might be attainted of high treason by parliament, and never called to his answer. The judges answered, that it was a dangerous question, and that the high court of parliament ought to give examples to inferior courts for proceeding according to justice, and no inferior court could do the like; and they thought that the high court of parliament would never do it. But being by the express commandment of the king, and pressed by the said earl of Essex to give a direct answer, they said, that, if he be attainted in parliament, it could not come in question afterwards, whether he were called or not called to answer. And, albeit their opinion were according to law, yet might they have made a better answer : for, by the statute of Magna Charta, cap. 29, 5 Ed. III. cap. 9, and 28 Ed. III. cap. 5, no man ought to be condemned without answer, &c., which they might have certified. But 'facta tenent multa quæ fieri prohibentur.' The act of attainder passed by parliament did bind, as they resolved. The party against whom this was intended was never called in question; but the first man, after the said resolution, that was so attainted, and

181.

never called to answer, was the said earl of Essex : whereupon that erroneous and vulgar opinion amongst our historians grew, that he died by the same law which he himself had made." Thus far sir Edward Coke. And if sir Thomas Gawdy's story would hold, it might possibly be somewhat serviceable ; but the attainders of the countess of Salisbury, and others mentioned in the journal of the house of Lords, shake the credit of this relation.

HENRY  
VIII.  
Coke's In-  
stitut. pt. 4.  
fol. 37.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 359,  
360.

By the way, sir Edward Coke doth not say, Cromwell was the first that was attained in parliament without being brought to an answer, but that he was the first after this resolution of the judges. That he was not absolutely the first, besides the instances above-mentioned, appears from sir Edward Coke himself, who acquaints us, that Elizabeth Barton, Edward Boeking, and others, were several years before attained in parliament, their crimes being out of the reach of the common law.

Coke's In-  
stit. pt. 3.  
fol. 14.  
marg.

Id. 245.

Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
p. 233.

Tertul. de  
Coron.  
Milit.  
Fuller, *ibid.*

Cromwell no  
Lutheran.

"By what Cromwell spoke at his death, he left it much doubted of what religion he died ; but," as the learned author goes on : "it is certain he was a Lutheran : for his praying in English, and that only to God, through Christ, without any of those tricks that were used when those of the Church of Rome died, showed he was none of theirs." Thus Fuller has likewise two arguments, to prove Cromwell no papist. First, he used no "superstitious crossing of himself." But if making the sign of the cross be a superstitious usage, as this historian insinuates, then all the Christians in Tertullian's time were tainted with superstition. But Cromwell "desired no prayers for him after his death," therefore, he was no papist. But if prayers for the dead imply popery, then not only the primitive Church, but our reformation was popish too : for, during the greatest part of the reign of Edward VI., prayer for the dead formed part of our liturgy, as will be farther observed afterwards. I readily grant, Cromwell was no papist at his death : but then, it is pretty plain, he was no Protestant neither. This, I think, may fairly be collected from part of his dying speech, which runs thus : "And now, I pray you that be here, to bear me record, I die in the catholic faith, not doubting in any article of my faith, no, nor doubting in any sacrament of the Church. Many have slandered me, and reported, that I have been a bearer of such as have maintained evil opinions, which is untrue.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Ibid.

But I confess, that like as God, by his Holy Spirit, does instruct us in the truth; so the devil is ready to seduce us, and I have been seduced; but bear me witness, that I die in the catholic faith of the holy Church." Now is it not evident by these expressions, that Cromwell died in the communion of the then Church of England; that is, in the religion professed by king Henry VIII.? He disowns his having encouraged those who maintain evil opinions. Now evil opinions, he knew the audience would interpret no otherwise, than opinions contrary to the doctrines established: he explains himself farther, confesses his having been seduced, but that now he had recovered himself, and died in the catholic faith of the holy Church.

July 23.

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 462.

Thus, in a letter to the king, he utterly denied the charge of heresy, and that he was no sacramentary, &c. The meaning of this letter was, without doubt, to preserve his life: but how could such a protestation be serviceable to this purpose, unless by removing the suspicion of heterodoxy, and persuading the king, he was of the same belief with his highness? His praying on the scaffold only to God, is no proof of his being a Lutheran. For by this reason, bishop Fisher, who wrote against Luther, may be a Lutheran too. For, at the execution of this prelate, we do not find he made any application to angel or saint. To take leave of Cromwell: Stow reports, from his own knowledge, that this lord used his father very ill, and took away part of his freehold in a very arbitrary manner. But then, he does not forget to commend him for his large charity: for he tells us, he had often seen above two hundred persons, plentifully relieved twice a-day, at the lord Cromwell's gate<sup>1</sup>.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 235.

Stow's  
Survey of  
London,  
p. 187.

<sup>1</sup> The following is the account given by Lingard of the fall of Cromwell. "The unfortunate marriage had already shaken the credit of Cromwell: his fall was hastened by a theological quarrel between Dr. Barnes, one of his dependents, and Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. In a sermon at St. Paul's-cross, the prelate had severely censured the presumption of those preachers, who, in opposition to the established creed, inculcated the Lutheran tenet of justification by faith without works. A fortnight later, Dr. Barnes, an ardent admirer of Luther, boldly defended the condemned doctrine from the same pulpit, and indulged in a scurrilous invective against the bishop. The king summoned the preacher before himself and a commission of divines, discussed with him several points of controverted doctrine, prevailed on him to sign a recantation, and enjoined him to preach on the same subject a second time on the first Sunday after Easter. Barnes affected to obey. He read his recantation before the audience, publicly asked pardon of Gardiner, and then, proceeding with his sermon, maintained in still stronger terms the very doctrine which he had recanted. Irritated by this insult, the king committed him to the Tower, with Gerrard and Jerome, two preachers, who, placed in similar circumstances, had thought proper to follow his example.



During the sessions of parliament, there were several others attainted: to mention some of them, Richard Fetherstone, HENRY  
VIII.

“It was generally believed that Henry’s resentment against Barnes would beget suspicion of the orthodoxy of the minister by whom Barnes had hitherto been protected; and so confidently did Cromwell’s enemies anticipate his disgrace, that his two principal offices, those of vicar-general and keeper of the privy seal, were already, according to report, shared between Tunstal, bishop of Durham, and Clarke, bishop of Bath, prelates of the old learning, who had lately been introduced into the council. The king, however, subdued or dissembled his suspicions; and, to the surprise of the public, Cromwell, at the opening of the parliament, (12th April, 1540,) took his usual seat in the house of lords, and delivered a royal message. ‘It was,’ he said, ‘with sorrow and displeasure that his majesty beheld the religious dissensions which divided the nation: that, on the one hand, presumption and liberty of the flesh, on the other attachment to ancient errors and superstitions, had generated two factions, which reciprocally branded each other with the opprobrious names of papists and heretics; that both abused the indulgence which, of his great goodness, the king had granted them of reading the Scriptures in their native tongue, these to introduce error, those to uphold superstition; and that, to remedy such evils, his majesty had appointed two committees of prelates and doctors, one to set forth a pure and sincere declaration of doctrine, the other to determine what ceremonies ought to be retained, what to be abolished; had strictly commanded the officers of the crown, with the judges and magistrates, to put in execution the laws already made respecting religion; and now required the aid of the two houses to enact penalties against those who should treat with irreverence, or explain rashly and erroneously, the Holy Scriptures.’

“The vicar-general now seemed to monopolise the royal favour. He obtained a grant of thirty manors belonging to suppressed monasteries: the title of earl of Essex (the last earl, Henry Bouchier, had been killed by a fall from his horse, March 12) was revived (April 13) in his favour; and the office of lord chamberlain was added to his other appointments. He continued, as usual, to conduct in parliament the business of the crown. He introduced two bills vesting the property of the knights-hospitallers in the king, and settling a competent jointure on the queen; and he procured from the laity the almost unprecedented subsidy of four-tenths and fifteenths, besides ten per cent. on their income from lands, and five per cent. on their goods; and from the clergy a grant of two-tenths, and twenty per cent. on their incomes for two years. This was the first clerical subsidy, which, though granted in convocation, was confirmed by parliament. The object was to make such subsidies liable to be levied by distress, which before were levied by censures in the spiritual courts. So far indeed was Cromwell from apprehending the fate which awaited him, that he committed to the Tower the bishop of Chichester and Dr. Wilson, on a charge of having relieved prisoners confined for refusing the oath of supremacy, and threatened with the royal displeasure his chief opponents, the duke of Norfolk, and the bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Bath.

“But Henry, in the mean time, had ascertained that Barnes was the confidential agent of Cromwell; that he had been employed in secret missions to Germany: and that he had been the real negotiator of the late marriage with Anne of Cleves. Hence the king easily persuaded himself that the insolence of the agent arose from confidence in the protection of the patron; that his vicar-general, instead of watching over the purity of the faith, had been the protector of heretics; and that his own domestic happiness had been sacrificed by his minister to the interests of a religious faction. He now recollected that when he proposed to send Anne back to her brother, he had been dissuaded by Cromwell; and he moreover concluded, from the sudden change in her behaviour, that his intention of procuring a divorce had been betrayed to her by the same minister. The earl seems to have had no suspicion of his approaching fate. On the morning of the 16th of June he attended in his place

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Thomas Abel, and Edward Powell, priests, and William Horne, yeoman, were attainted for denying the king's supremacy, and in the house of lords: at three the same afternoon he was arrested at the council-board on a charge of high treason."

The following account of his impeachment is from Mackintosh. "A bill to attain him of high treason was read a first time on the 17th of June, on which day he took his place as earl of Essex, and vicegerent of the king, in the royal character of supreme head of the Church. So far was the accused from being heard in his own defence, that in two days more—viz. on the 19th—the bill was read a second and third time, passed unanimously, and sent down to the house of commons. On the 29th of June it came back from the commons, and was once more passed by the lords without a dissentient voice. He was charged by the bill of attainder with heresy and treason: the first, because he favoured heretical preachers, patronised their works, and discouraged informations against them; the second, because he had received bribes, released many prisoners confined for misprision of treason, and performed several acts of royal authority without warrant from the king, but more especially because he had declared, two years before, 'that if the king would turn from the preachers of the new learning, yet he, Cromwell, would not, but would fight in the field in his own person, with his sword in his hand, to defend it against the king himself.' But the condemnation of a man unheard is a case in which the strongest presumptions against the prosecution are warranted. That he was zealous for further reformation is certain: that he may have used warm language to express his zeal, that he may have transgressed the bounds of official duty to favour the new opinion, are allegations in themselves not improbable; but as we do not know the witnesses who gave testimony,—as we do not even know whether there were any examined,—and, indeed, know nothing but that he was not heard in his own defence,—it is perfectly evident, that whether the words or deeds ascribed to Cromwell were really his or not, is a question, without any decision on which the judicial proceedings (if they deserve that name) may be pronounced to be altogether void of any shadow of justice. Cranmer, in a very earnest and persuasive letter, endeavoured to obtain from the king the preservation of Cromwell's life. The archbishop, like Atticus, never forsook his friends in their distress; but, like that famous Roman, he too often bent the knee to their oppressors.

"The character of Cromwell may be estimated from the following extracts from a memorandum-book of that minister, published by Mr. Ellis:—

"Item—the abbot of Reding to be sent down to *be tried and executed* at Reding, with his complices.

"Item—the abbot of Glastonbury to be tried at Glaston, and also *to be executed* there, with his complices.

"Item—to advertise the king of the *ordering of maister Fisher* (the bishop).

"Item—to know his pleasure touching maister More (sir Thomas More).

"Item—when maister Fisher shall go.

"Item—to send unto the king by Raffe the behaviour of maister Fisher.

"To send *Gurdon* to the Tower, to be *rakked*."

"The execution of Cromwell, though an act of flagrant injustice, was for a time popular. The most active conductor of a wide system of confiscation must do much wrong, besides what is involved in the very nature of rapine. He must often cover his robberies by false accusations and unjust executions. He treats the complaints of the spoiled as crimes. He excites revolt, and is the author of that necessity which compels him to punish the revolters. He connives at the atrocities of his subalterns; for with what face can the leader of a gang reprove banditti for the injustice and cruelty which are the cement of their discipline and the wages of their obedience?"

"Cromwell," says Hume, "endeavoured to soften the king by the most humble supplications, but all to no purpose: it was not the practice of that prince to ruin his ministers and favourites by halves; and though the unhappy prisoner once wrote to him in so moving a strain as even to draw tears from his eyes, he hardened himself against all movements of pity, and refused his pardon. The conclusion of Cromwell's

adhering to the bishop of Rome. By another bill, Gregory Butolph, Adam Damply, Edward Brindeholme, clerks, and Clement Fillpot, gentleman, were attainted for adhering to the bishop of Rome, corresponding with cardinal Pole, and endeavouring to surprise Calais. By the same act, Barnes, doctor of divinity, Gerrard and Jerome, priests, were attainted of heresy. The act sets forth, "they had conspired to set forth many heresies, and presuming themselves men of learning, had expounded the Scriptures, and wrested them to an heretical construction: that having formerly abjured, they were now incorrigible heretics." Thus they were condemned to be burnt, or to suffer any other death at the king's pleasure.

HENRY VIII.  
*Several attainders.*  
 Id. p. 74.  
 Fuller's Ch. Hist. p. 232.  
 Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 361.

Id. p. 297.

The act, taking notice of a recantation, it will be proper to lay it before the reader; it runs thus:

"I confess with heart, that Almighty God is nowise author, or causer of sin or any evil, and therefore, whereas Scripture saith, 'induravit Dominus cor Pharaonis,' and such other texts of like sense, they ought to be understood, 'quod Dominus permisit eum indurari,' and not otherwise; which agrees with many of the ancient interpreters.

"Secondly, That whensoever I shall offend my neighbour, I must be reconciled to him before I can obtain remission of sin. And in case he has offended me, I must forgive him as I expect forgiveness from God.

"Thirdly, That good works mentioned in Scripture, and done by a penitent and true reconciled Christian, are profitable to salvation.

letter ran in these words: 'I, a most woeful prisoner, am ready to submit to death when it shall please God and your majesty; and yet the frail flesh incites me to call to your grace for mercy and pardon of mine offences. Written at the Tower with the heavy heart and trembling hand of your highness's most miserable prisoner, and poor slave, Thomas Cromwell.' And a little below, 'Most gracious prince, I cry for mercy, mercy, mercy!' When brought to the place of execution, he avoided all earnest protestations of his innocence, and all complaints against the sentence pronounced upon him. He knew that Henry would resent on his son those symptoms of opposition to his will, and that his death alone would not terminate that monarch's vengeance. He was a man of prudence, industry, and abilities; worthy of a better master, and of a better fate. Though raised to the summit of power from a low origin, he betrayed no insolence or contempt towards his inferiors; and was careful to remember all the obligations which, during his more humble fortune, he had owed to any one. He had served as a private sentinel in the Italian wars, when he received some good offices from a Lucquese merchant, who had entirely forgotten his person, as well as the service which he had rendered him. Cromwell in his grandeur happened at London to cast his eye on his benefactor, now reduced to poverty by misfortunes. He immediately sent for him, reminded him of their ancient friendship, and, by his grateful assistance, reinstated him in his former prosperity and opulence."

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“ Fourthly, That laws and ordinances made by Christian governors, ought to be obeyed, not only for wrath, but for conscience sake.”

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 37.  
*A further  
account of  
Dr. Barnes.*

These propositions were subscribed by Robert Barnes, William Jerome, and Thomas Gerrard.

182.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 518. et  
deinceps.  
An. 1536.

This Barnes had formerly been brought into trouble upon the score of his preaching and opinion. During Wolsey's ministry, he had reflected, in a sermon at Cambridge, upon the cardinal's port and equipage. The cardinal told him, this state and magnificence could not well be dispensed with by a person in his station; that it was necessary to support his character, and the reputation of the government. Barnes not relishing this reason, was unwilling to retract his invective: but Gardiner, the cardinal's secretary, and Fox, afterwards bishop of Winchester, being his friends, prevailed with him to give satisfaction, and abjure some opinions charged upon him. He was afterward delated upon other articles, and in danger of being burnt; but counterfeiting himself lunatic, got off into Germany. Here he made an acquaintance with Luther, Melancthon, and other divines: he was likewise known to the duke of Saxony, and the king of Denmark. Fox, bishop of Hereford, ambassador at Smalcalde, sent him into England, where he was kindly entertained by Cromwell. By his interest, the correspondence with the Germans was in some measure kept up. He was first employed in the business of the king's marriage with the lady Anne of Cleve. But this lady's person proving unacceptable, was, it may be, one occasion of Barnes's disgrace.

Bp. Burnet,  
p. 295.

Fox, *ibid.*

But other accidents concurred to Barnes's misfortune. This year, in Lent, bishop Bonner appointed him, Gerrard, and Jerome, to preach at St. Paul's Cross; this it seems, was done as a mark of respect, and to oblige Cromwell; but Gardiner sent Bonner word, he intended himself to preach at St. Paul's Cross on Sunday. In his sermon, he spent some strokes of satire against new teaching: complained that the devil had taught some people to throw off confession, fasting, and other instances of discipline and penance. About three weeks after, Barnes took the same text, but spent his discourse in maintaining the opposite doctrine. Besides this, he gave himself the liberty of making some bold indiscreet reflections upon Gardiner's person. He played upon his name, and brought a jingling comparison or two, which were short, both in sense

and breeding. Gerrard and Jerome preached much the same doctrine, but without falling foul upon any person. Jerome had been charged with preaching against the magistracy, but he explained himself to a very defensible and honest meaning. He affirmed, “that if the laws of princes are consistent with those of God Almighty, we are bound to obey them; but in case the prince is wicked, and commands a contradiction to revealed religion: when this happens, we are to submit and suffer, and not apply to the expedient of resistance.”

HENRY VIII.

*Jerome maintains passive obedience.*

Fox, vol. 2. p. 524.

To return to Barnes: though Gardiner seemed to bear the affront with great temper and neglect, his friends thought it necessary to solicit for reparation. To this purpose they complained to the king of Barnes's intemperate language: how ill he had used Gardiner, who was both a great prelate and a privy counsellor. Fox reports one circumstance otherwise, and saith Gardiner complained to the king himself. But let this be as it will, Barnes was reprimanded for his misbehaviour, and ordered to ask the bishop of Winchester's pardon. They were likewise to argue the point of justification. Upon this article, Barnes had maintained, that “though God requires us to forgive our neighbour, as a condition of forgiveness from him, yet God must forgive us first, before we forgive our neighbour; for else it would be sinful to forgive our neighbour: for St. Paul tells us, ‘whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.’” By this foreign and uncatholic construction of the text, it appears, Dr. Barnes was none of the greatest divines. The next day, Gardiner and Barnes had another conference: at the conclusion, the latter made his submission, asked the bishop's pardon, and desired to be under his instructions. The bishop very frankly passed over the former affront, entertained Barnes as his companion, and offered him a pension of forty pounds a year: Barnes accordingly went to the bishop's house: but hearing the people talk to his disadvantage, and discoursing with some men of learning, he grew weary of this close correspondence, and disengaged with the bishop.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 296.

*Barnes, his conference with the bishops of Winchester.*

Rom. xiv. Fox, vol. 2. p. 525.

The king was displeased with Barnes's management, and ordered him, Gerrard, and Jerome, to renounce their opinions. They promised satisfaction, and made their recantation above-mentioned. But this, it seems, was but a force upon their judgment, for they retracted their recantation in the pulpit. Upon this they were sent to the Tower, and attainted of heresy

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Barnes,  
Gerrard,  
and Jerome  
suffer in  
Smithfield.  
Three others  
executed  
with them,  
for denying  
the king's  
supremacy.

Ibid. p. 529.

The decla-  
ration of  
Barnes,  
Gerrard,  
and Jerome.

in parliament. On the thirtieth of July they were brought to Smithfield, with three others of a different persuasion, Abel, Fetherstone, and Powel. These were attainted, for owning the pope's supremacy, and denying the king's. One of each was put upon a hurdle; the papists were hanged, drawn and quartered, and the other three burnt. This was an odd spectacle, and looked like fanciful severity. Insomuch, that a Frenchman who was there, being surprised at the conduct of the government, told his friend in Latin, "They had a strange way of managing in England; for those who were for the pope are hanged, and those against him burnt."

When Barnes came to the stake, he declared his belief to the company, and having been charged, it seems, with some anabaptistical opinions, and particularly, with our Saviour's not taking flesh of the blessed Virgin, he disclaimed that heresy. As to good works, he affirmed, they could be no foundation for merit, because of the blemishes and imperfections with which they were mixed, and therefore, he rested only on the passion of our Saviour. However, to prevent misconception, he declares, that those who do not practise virtue, and do good works, shall never come to heaven: "we must do good works, (says he,) because God has commanded us, and to recommend our religion, but not for any plea of desert."

From hence he proceeds to vindicate his preaching concerning the Catholic Church: that he had always treated that article, and honoured that society, in as high terms of regard as the Scripture would give him leave. And here he spoke very reverently of the blessed Virgin. Being asked his opinion touching invocation of saints, he told them, he believed they were in heaven, and that their memories ought to be honoured, as far as the permissions of revelation: but since the Scriptures do not command us to address them, he could not warrant any such application. And whether the saints prayed for us, or not, was more than he knew, but if they did, he told the sheriff, he hoped to be praying for him, and all the Church militant, within half an hour. After this, he asked the sheriff, if he knew upon what articles he was to suffer: then put the same question to the company; and whether any person had been led into error by his preaching? But receiving no answer: "I understand," says he, "I am condemned for heresy by an act of parliament; I pray God to forgive all those who have been

instrumental in this matter, and particularly the bishop of Winchester, if any way concerned." Then he went on to pray for the king's prosperity, that his reign might be long, that his son, prince Edward, might succeed him, and finish those things begun by his father. And whereas he had been reproached for preaching sedition and disloyalty, he told them, they were all bound to obey their prince, not only for wrath, but for conscience sake: and more than that, if the king should command a repugnancy to the law of God, they ought not to resist him, though it might be in their power.

HENRY  
VIII.

183.

Then he requested the sheriff, to acquaint the king, that he desired the grant of five things; "First. That his highness would please to bestow the abbey-lands, or part of them at least, for the relief of his poor subjects, who had very great need of such a maintenance. Secondly. That the king would please to take care, that marriage might be more honourably treated, and those engagements better performed. That men might not be permitted to part with their wives upon slight pretence, and then keep a scandalous correspondence with other women: and that those unmarried, might not be suffered in licentious practice. Thirdly. That common swearers might be punished. Fourthly. That the king would make farther advances in the reformation, and take his directions from the Holy Scripture: and, fifthly, that his highness would be particularly careful not to be imposed on by unorthodox preachers, and ill counsel."

Ibid. p. 527.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. I. p. 298.  
*Burnes, his  
request to  
the king.*

Jerome made a resembling declaration, repeated the Creed, professed his belief of every thing contained in the Old and New Testament, prayed for the king, and recommended charity, and general kindness, in a very Christian pathetic manner; and gave the company a caution, not to rely upon their performances, but on the satisfaction of our Saviour's passion.

Gerrard, after a recital of the articles of the Christian faith, and speaking much to the same purpose with the other, declared his abhorrence of all errors and heresies, in case, either by negligence or mistake, he had maintained any such: and if any rashness of conduct, or vehemence of temper, had obliged, or misled any person, he intreated their forgiveness. Notwithstanding, he said, he had used his best endeavours to inform himself rightly, and do his duty to God and the king.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

But if he had undertaken any thing too big for him, and mis-carried in the execution, he desired God would pardon his presumption.

*He and the other two suffer with great resignation and constancy.*  
Fox, p. 529.

These three persons, having saluted each other with all the tenderness of friendship, were fastened to the stake, and suffered with the patience and fortitude of the old martyrs.

By the act of attainder, upon which they were burnt, it appears, the parliament had, for once, taken the cognizance of religious belief from the bishops' courts, and made themselves judges of heresy.

This year, upon a complaint made, that some servants of the bishop of Ely had published a translation of Melancthon's book against the six articles, an order was sent down from the council to seize their papers: and in case the bishop was suspected to be concerned in this matter, the messengers were ordered to search his study.

Council Book. Conventions, Acta Publica, &c. tom. 14. p. 705. *Six new bishoprics erected. The charter for erecting Chester into a bishopric, bears date August 4, 1541. That for Gloucester, September 3, the same year. Peterborough charter is of the same date with Gloucester. The bishopric of Bristol was erected June 4, 1542. And that of Oxford, September 1, the same year. Aug. 5. Godwin de Præsul. Angl. Conventions, Acta*

About this time, the king founded an Hebrew lecture at Cambridge, with a salary of forty pounds per annum, to be paid out of the rents of the abbey of Westminster. And soon after, this monastery was turned into a bishop's see, &c., with a deanery, twelve prebends, with officers for a cathedral and choir. There were five more afterwards erected, viz., Chester, Gloucester, Peterborough, Oxford, and Bristol; and though there is more than a year's difference between some of the foundations, yet for the affinity of the matter, I mention them together. The charter of their foundation sets forth, that the king desires nothing more, than that true religion, and the right worship of God Almighty, may be restored to its primitive vigour and perfection, which had suffered very much by the degeneracy of the monastic profession: his majesty's intention being to retrieve the practice of religion, to provide for good instruction from the pulpit, and the right administration of the sacraments, that discipline and regularity might be encouraged, young people bred to learning, and those disabled by age and public service, furnished with necessaries, the poor maintained, ways and bridges kept in repair, and all other offices serviceable to religion and the commonwealth, better performed, had erected the abbey of Westminster into an episcopal see, and nominated Thomas Thirleby, dean of the Chapel Royal, for the bishop. The instruments for the foundation of the five other sees ran in the same form.



And here it may not be improper to take notice of a mistake concerning the year when the bishopric of Chester was founded, which was not done till two years after the time supposed by our learned historian. This see was not erected, as himself afterwards relates, till the year one thousand five hundred and forty-one. And therefore the commission granted to the bishop of Chester, for taking the surrender of the monastery of Hammond, in Shropshire; this commission, I say, was granted to the bishop of Lichfield, that place being within his diocese, and he commonly called, both in writing and discourse, bishop of Chester. The reason of this way of speaking was, because Chester had formerly been a bishop's see, from whence it was translated to Lichfield. About this time the cathedrals founded for priories were turned into deaneries and prebends. These were Canterbury, Winchester, Ely, Norwich, Worcester, Rochester, Durham, and Carlisle.

HENRY VIII.  
Publica, &c.  
tom. 14.  
p. 717 to 754.  
Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. Records, book 3. p. 246.  
Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 263.  
Bp. Burnet, p. 263. compared with p. 300. and Records, book 3. p. 149.

But these endowments fell much short of the king's former scheme, and Cranmer's project. This archbishop, it seems, aimed at a provision for the setting up Greek, Hebrew, and divinity lectures: and that a great number should be bred to learning and devotion in the cathedrals: and that thus the bishop might have a sort of seminary to furnish his diocese. But now the king had disabled himself by the excess of his bounties, and parted with too much of the abbey-lands, for such an establishment.

This year, the Bible, printed in one thousand five hundred thirty-seven, was reprinted into a larger volume; it was translated mostly by Tindal, with the assistance of Coverdale, afterward bishop of Exeter. Tindal suffering for his religion in Flanders, before he had gone through the whole work, the Apocrypha was translated by John Rogers, with the addition of some marginal notes. This was called Matthew's Bible, to make it pass the better, because Tindal lay under the imputation of unsound opinions. This impression for the large volume was revised by Coverdale, who compared the translation with the original, and corrected several places. And now, to make it less offensive, the notes were omitted, and a preface of Cranmer's added, which I suppose is the reason of calling it his Bible.

Bible printed in a large volume.

Bale Cent.

Soon after the publishing this impression, bishop Bonner set up six Bibles in his cathedral of St. Paul's. He fastened an

184.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

admonition to the pillars to which the books were chained. "In this paper, he puts them in mind they ought to prepare themselves with devotion and humility for their better edification, not to make any expositions upon the text, not to read aloud, nor in time of divine service or sermon; that they were not to appear in great numbers for this purpose, nor fall into disputes and clashing with each other. That in case they continued their former misbehaviour, and refused to comply with these directions, he should be forced, against his will, to remove the occasion, and take the Bible out of the church."

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 25.

These Bibles set up in St. Paul's by Bonner, were published this year by Tonsal and Heath, bishops of Durham and Rochester; who by the king's order reviewed Coverdale's translation, and made what correction they thought fit. Thus doctor Durell reports the matter, and refers to the first page of the Bible for proof.

Durell.  
Vindic.  
Eecles.  
Anglic.  
c. 27.

This year the cathedral of Canterbury was changed from prior and monks into dean and chapter.

Cranmer,  
Regist.  
fol. 69.

To go back a little. In the beginning of this year, a commission was issued to the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, St. David's, Carlisle, Hereford, and Rochester, to try one Alexander Seaton, a Scotch priest, complained of to the privy-council, for maintaining and preaching several heretical and damnable opinions. By this commission the archbishop of Canterbury was to be one of the quorum. It is dated the twentieth of April, A.D. 1540, and countersigned Thomas Cromwell. Some of his opinions, as they stand in Fox, are, that he denied the freedom of the will, pronouncing people under a perfect impotency to make any advances towards virtue. He affirmed likewise, that good works had nothing of merit in them, nor had the least concurrence towards our justification. But then to the question, whether good works shall be rewarded or not, he answers affirmatively, and explains himself towards an orthodox construction: "Good works," says he, "shall be rewarded with eternal glory, but not upon the score of merit, for they deserve nothing: but because God has engaged to consider them thus far, and he will not fail in his promise." Besides this, which was the main of his charge, he was delated likewise for affirming, private masses and prayers for the dead did the souls departed no service. For these assertions he

was ordered to bear a faggot and recant at St. Paul's-Cross, which he did accordingly.

This year, Sampson, bishop of Chichester, was sent to the Tower: he was committed, as our learned Church historian reports, upon suspicion of correspondence with the pope. But here some evidence for this relation seems to have been necessary; for Fabian, Hall, and Stow, acquaint us, this bishop was imprisoned for relieving some poor prisoners who had been confined for denying the king's supremacy. By this account, this prelate's crime was no more, at the hardest, than an incautious charity.

To proceed. The act concerning the Six Articles was closely prosecuted in several places, and particularly in the diocese of London, where not a few persons were ruggedly handled in the bishops' courts. Upon the same charge, three were burnt at Salisbury, one of which was a priest, who had quitted his profession, and turned player: notwithstanding this misbehaviour, he had, it seems, a serious sense of religion, choosing rather to run the last hazard, than own transubstantiation, and therefore Fox sets him down for a martyr.

This year, another insurrection broke out in Yorkshire, but this was crushed before it made any formidable advances. Sir John Nevil, Lee a gentleman, and one Tattersal a clothier, with about eleven others, were executed for heading this commotion. Soon after, Margaret, countess of Salisbury, was executed in the Tower. She refused to lay her head down on the block, and suffered with great courage. She was the last Plantagenet of the legitimate line.

The late disturbance in Yorkshire occasioned the king's progress thither: his majesty had two things in his view. He hoped, by appearing in the country, and examining the temper of the people, to extinguish the remains of the rebellion.

He had likewise a design to expose counterfeit miracles, and discourage pilgrimages. To which we may add an expectation of meeting his nephew, the king of Scotland. This prince promised his uncle an interview; but for some reasons already mentioned, declined the performance, notwithstanding the great preparations made for his reception. This disappointment was deeply resented by the king of England, who projected a revenge. King James, understanding upon what ill terms he stood with his uncle, sent an ambassador with his excuse. He

HENRY  
VIII.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 535, 536.  
Bp. Burnet,  
p. 361.

Harmer,  
p. 61.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 531.

A. D. 1541.  
April.

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 468.  
*The king's  
progress  
into York-  
shire.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Ld. Herbert,

p. 649.

Queen  
Catharine  
Howard  
beheaded.

Lord Her-  
bert, p. 470.

Bp. Burnet,  
p. 311, et  
deime.

The bishopric  
of Chester  
dissevered

from the  
province of  
Canterbury.  
33 Hen. 8.  
cap. 31.

33 Hen. 8.  
cap. 8.  
Statutes at  
large.

33 Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.

Irish Sta-  
tutes.

33 Hen. 8.  
cap. 12.

185.

likewise desired their former correspondence might be revived, which motion being refused by king Henry, his nephew levied men, and prepared for his defence.

The king, who thought himself very happy in his last marriage, was much surprised at the news of the queen's misbehaviour; she was charged with being false to his highness's bed, attainted for high treason, and beheaded. When she was brought to the scaffold, she confessed she had lived disorderly when single, but utterly denied her being guilty of any disloyalty, or scandalous commerce, after marriage. The lady Jane Rochfort, Culpeper, Deeram, &c., were attainted by the same act, and suffered with her.

This parliament, an act passed for the dissevering the bishopric of Chester, and Isle of Man, from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, and annexing them to the province of York. There was likewise an act against conjuration, witchcraft, and enchantment; and here it is enacted, "That if any person should dig up, or pull down any crosses for corresponding with spirits, to discover stolen goods, or to hurt any one in their person or estate, or work them to any unlawful passion of love, that then the principals and abettors should be deemed felons, and be barred the privilege both of clergy and sanctuary."

This year, the parliament was held at Dublin, in Ireland: the first statute raises king Henry's title from lord, to king of Ireland, and makes it high treason to refuse that style to the crown of England. Notwithstanding the enacting this title, the preamble acknowledges, that the king and his progenitors had all manner of regal jurisdiction and authority, and were in right and reality kings of that island.

There was likewise an act passed for recovering of tithes. It is both for form and substance much the same with that passed the year before at a parliament in England.

Farther. Another bill passed in the Irish parliament for erecting vicarages. The preamble begins thus:—

"Whereas, as well the church of Kilmaynam is a parish church, and has been appropriated and united to the late hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, within this land of Ireland; and also divers other parish churches within the said land, likewise appropriated to the said late hospital, and to other monasteries, religious houses, and hospitals now dissolved; having no vicar endowed within the same parish churches, within

which parish churches divine service was done, maintained, and kept, and the cure served by the late religious persons of the same hospital, monasteries, and religious houses. And forasmuch as the said hospital, monastery, or religious houses be now lawfully dissolved, and come into his majesty's hands, whereby there is no person certain appointed to do, maintain, or keep the same cure, minister sacraments and sacramentals, to the parishioners, &c. In remedy of this inconveniencce it is enacted, That sir Anthony Saintleger, knight, deputy to the king's highness; John Allen, his grace's chancellor; William Brabazon, his majesty's vice-treasurer of this land; sir Jarald Aylmer, knight, his grace's chief justice of the Pleas before himself to be holden; sir Thomas Luttrell, chief justice of the Common Pleas, with two more judges, the master of the Rolls, the king's serjeant, and the attorney-general, or any nine, eight, seven, or six of them; whereof the lord deputy, the lord chancellor, the vice-treasurer, and chief justice were to be four, are empowered to erect and incorporate a vicarage in every parish church belonging to the religious houses lately dissolved. And here the portion of tithes, oblations, and other profits, are left to the discretion of these commissioners, with this proviso, that the whole endowment must not exceed the value of thirteen pounds six shillings and eightpence Irish. The king was likewise to have the presentation to all the vicarages." 33 Hen. 8. cap. 14. Irish Statutes.

And here in this statute, as it happened, there is not one bishop or clergyman nominated with the rest of the commissioners for settling this affair, in which religion and the Church were not a little concerned.

To go from the Irish parliament to the English convocation, where the review of the translation of the Bible was proposed. Here Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, to check the design, as it is supposed, read a catalogue of the Latin words collected out of the New Testament: suggesting, that for the significance of the terms, and the weight of the matter, they ought either to remain untranslated, or else rendered into English with the least alteration. The words are these: ecclesia, penitentia, pontifex, ancilla, contritus, holocausta, justitia, justificate, idiota, elementa, baptizare, martyr, adorare, dignus, sandalium, simplex, tetrarcha, sacramentum, simulaerum, gloria, conflictationes, ceremonia, mysterium, religio, Spiritus Sanctus, Spiritus, merees, confiteor tibi Pater, panis proposi-

*A review of the translation of the Bible proposed in convocation, but miscarries.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

tionis, communiō, perseverare, dilectus, sapientia, pietas ; presbyter, lites, servus, opera, sacrificium, benedictio, humilis, humilitas, scientia, gentilis synagoga, ejicere, misericordia, complacui, increpare, distribueretur orbis, inculpatus, senior, Apocalypsis, satisfactio, contentio, conscientia, peccatum, peccator, idolum, prudentia, prudenter, parabola, magnifico, Oriens, subditus, didrachma, hospitalitas, episcopus, gratia, charitas, tyrannus, concupiscentia, sicera, apostolus, apostolatus, egenus, stater, societas, zizania, Mysterium, Christus, conversari, profiteor, impositio manuum, idololatria, Dominus, Sanctus, confessio, imitator, pascha, innumerabilis, inenarrabilis, infidelis, paganus, commilito, virtutes, dominationes, throni, potestates, hostia.

Some of these terms, it may be, were somewhat shocking in a translation ; and therefore Gardiner would have covered them in the original, and kept them concealed from vulgar inquiry. In the carrying on this review, the books of the New Testament were divided amongst the bishops : for instance, archbishop Cranmer had St. Matthew ; Longland, bishop of Lincoln, St. Mark ; Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, St. Luke ; Goodrick, bishop of Ely, St. John ; and so the rest. By this method the bishops were, in a manner, masters of the undertaking, and might defer the performance to what time they pleased.

To expedite the review, therefore, archbishop Cranmer acquainted the house, it was the king's pleasure the translation of the Old and New Testament should be examined by both universities. This motion was much disliked by the house ; all the bishops, excepting Ely and St. David's, protesting against it. They alleged, " the universities were much sunk from their former considerableness. That matters were carried by a majority of young men ; that without maturity of judgment, there was no relying upon the result : and, in short, that the learning of the nation lay mostly in the convocation." Cranmer replied, " he was resolved to refer the review to the universities, and be governed by the orders of the king his master. However, by this disagreement, the business dropped."

This convocation the archbishop moved, that candles, silk habits, and other ornaments, might be taken away from images ; that missals, and other liturgical books, might be reformed ; and that the names of the popes, and that of archbishop

Fuller, from  
the Records  
of the Con-  
vocation.

Becket, might be expunged. That this reformation was not made this year, appears by the archbishop's acquainting the house next year, that it was the king's pleasure that all mass-books, antiphoners, and portuasses<sup>1</sup>, should be examined over again, and reformed from all mention of the bishop of Rome's name; from all apocryphas, feigned legends, collects, versicles, and responses: and that the names and memories of all saints, which are neither mentioned in the Scriptures, nor by authentic doctors, should be deleted in the same books and calendars. And that the service should be compiled out of the Scriptures, and other authentic doctors. And here the clergy are blamed for their negligence in not expunging and omitting such things and names, as by his majesty's injunctions and proclamations were commanded to be struck out and cancelled.

Upon this, it was ordered that the examination and correction of the said service-books should be committed to the bishops of Sarum and Ely, each of them taking three of the lower house to their assistance. But the lower house waived their privilege of furnishing a committee, and rested the matter with the bishops.

To return to the former year: a bill designed for an act of parliament was sent from the lord chancellor to the upper house of convocation, and read there. The purport of it was, that bishops' chancellors might be married, and empowered to suspend and excommunicate, and to publish all Church censures, as priests do: and that they, and their registraries, should have their offices for term of life, with sufficient fees and salaries from the ordinaries to support their families: and that an officer deputed, having the king's seal or patent, should continue during life.

This bill being wholly disliked by the bishops, they moved the lord chancellor that it might not be read in parliament. And thus the chancellor, it is likely, thinking the request not unreasonable, the matter was laid aside.

It was ordered in the upper house, that every Sunday and holyday throughout the year, the curate of the parish, after the Te Deum and Magnificat, should read to the people one chapter of the New Testament in English, without exposition; and when the New Testament was read over, then should begin

HENRY VIII.

Feb. 17.  
A. D. 1541-2.  
Feb. 21.  
A. D. 1542-3.  
*The king directs to the reforming the missals, &c.*

Extracts from the Convocation Book, fol. 65 and 67.

186.

March 10,  
A. D. 1541-2.  
*A motion to empower lay chancellors to execute Church censures rejected.*

Feb. 21,  
A. D. 1542-3.

Id. fol. 67.

<sup>1</sup> "Portuas," (a word said to be derived from "portez-vous,") a manual breviary: variously spelt portas, portus, porthose, portuos, and porthuse.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the Old. This convocation business was managed at some distance of time; but I thought it most proper to mention it together.

1542. Dec.  
*Scots de-  
feated at  
Solway.*

The king of England being provoked with his nephew's breaking the interview at York, levied an army, which, under the command of the duke of Norfolk, entered Scotland; and after having ravaged the country, countermarched to Berwick. The Scotch, to make reprisals, advanced with a body of fifteen thousand into England, by the west marches; but these troops were defeated at Solway, by a handful of men, under the command of Musgrave, Dacres, and sir Thomas Wharton. This disgrace sat heavy upon the king of Scots' spirits, and threw

*The death of  
James the  
5th, king of  
Scotland.*

him into a mortal distemper. He died at Falkland, in the two-and-thirtieth year of his age. Some few days before his death, he received the news of his queen's being delivered of a daughter at Linlithgow. The cardinal, hearing the king was dead, is said to have practised with one Balfour, a priest, to forge a will. By this pretended instrument, the king had put the administration into the hands of the cardinal, the earls of Huntley, Argyle, and Murray, during the young queen's minority. This will was immediately published in Edinburgh. But the body of the nobility believing it a counterfeit, made choice of the earl of Arran for regent.

Spotswood,  
p. 71.  
Regist. Bon-  
ner, fol. 39.

To go back to England: this year Bonner, bishop of London, published his injunctions. I shall abstract them for the reader.

Bonner's  
Injunctions.

First. His clergy are enjoined to observe all orders set forth by the king's authority, and to provide themselves either a written or printed copy of everything of this kind.

Item. That every parson, vicar, or curate, was every day to read a chapter in the Bible, with some approved comment upon it; beginning with the Gospel of St. Matthew, to the end of the New Testament; that they should take care to charge their memory with what they had read, and be prepared to give the bishop, or any of his officers, an account of their proficiency.

Item. That they procure themselves the book called "The Institution of a Christian Man; or, the Bishops' Book," and that they study it, pursuant to directions given them by their ordinary.

Item. That being absent from their benefices, according to



the permissions of law, they suffered no priest to undertake the cure, unless first presented to the bishop, or his officers, and allowed by them.

Item. That every parson, &c., shall exhort his parishioners in the pulpit, once a quarter, not to make clandestine marriages, and that the parents, or some relation or friend, may be present at the contract, and record the form.

Item. That no parsons, vicars, &c., presume to marry any persons married before, without being sufficiently informed of the decease of the wife or husband of the parties.

Item. That parsons, vicars, chantry-priests, &c., shall teach their parishioners' children to read : taking but moderate rates of those that are able to pay.

Item. That they endeavour to make up differences, promote good correspondence, and exhort the parishioners to pass over injuries, and forgive each other.

Item. That those who display their malicious temper, disregard the authority of their curates, and make their confession to foreign priests, should not be admitted upon the testimonials of such confessors, nor allowed to receive the communion in their own parish, until they have changed their conduct, and submitted to confession to their own curates.

Item. All parsons, &c., are enjoined to warn ale-house-keepers and viutners, within their parishes, not to suffer any gaming or drinking in the time of divine service, under pain of excommunication, and being farther punished by the laws of the realm.

Item. That all curates shall, in the pulpit, twice every quarter, declare the seven deadly sins, and the Ten Commandments, that the people may be fully instructed in their duty to God and their neighbour.

Item. That all priests appear in the habit of their function.

Item. That all parsons, &c., exhort their parishioners, both in the pulpit and elsewhere, to avoid swearing and cursing, railing and detraction, adultery and fornication, gluttony and drunkenness. And to present those notoriously guilty of those crimes at every visitation.

Item. That no priest shall give himself the liberty of any unlawful diversion, or go to ale-houses or taverns, excepting in cases of necessity.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Item. That no parsons, vicars, &c., shall suffer any plays, games, or interludes in their churches or chapels.

Item. That no sermon composed by other men, within this two or three hundred years, should be made use of; but that the preacher should raise his discourse upon the gospel or epistle of the day: that in this exposition they are not to strike out into singularities, or notions of their own invention; but to explain the text agreeably to the sense of some Catholic doctor allowed in the Church of England. They were likewise enjoined to explain the ceremonies of the Church, not to run out into intemperate heat and passion, and rail against those of a different opinion; but to recommend virtue and declaim against vice, without personal reflections. They are farther enjoined, to instruct the audience in the prayers used by the Church, either commonly, or upon particular occasions: to let the people into the meaning of the sacraments, to open the force and significancy of them, and with what solemnity and devotion they ought to be received. They were to avoid entertaining the people with fabulous relations, or histories of suspected credit: and when the preacher had enlarged upon the text, to what length he thought fit, he was then to abstract the substance, and repeat the most material passages in few words, and reinforce his reasoning with what supplemental arguments he thought fit.

187.

Item. That no parson, vicar, &c., shall permit any person under the degree of a bishop to preach in their churches or chapels without a special license from the king or the ordinary, which the person was to produce before he had the liberty of the pulpit.

Our learned Church historian, in his remarks upon these injunctions, tells us, "That in the time of popery there had been but few sermons but in Lent; that the pulpit discourses on the holy days were spent in panegyrics on the saints, and magnifying of relics. It is true in Lent," he observes, "there was a more solemn and serious way of preaching, but there was not that pains taken to inform the people of the hateful-ness of vice and excellency of holiness, or the wonderful love of Christ, by which men might be engaged to acknowledge and obey him; and, in short, that the people had been little acquainted with the fundamentals of Christianity."

HENRY  
VIII.

Now this gentleman, with due regard to him, goes too deep in his censure; there was a better provision for the instruction of the people than he seems aware of; neither were the bishops so negligent in discharging their function as this representation supposes. That our historian has overloaded the indictment, appears from the canons of Otho and Othobon, and the constitutions of archbishop Peckham. By these provisions the bishops were obliged to reside upon their cathedrals and instruct their flock. The parish priests are likewise enjoined to preach frequently, to instruct the audience in the fundamentals of religion, to explain all the articles of the Christian faith and the Ten Commandments: to discourse upon the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins, the seven principal virtues, and the seven sacraments. Upon these main heads of faith and practice they were bound to preach once a quarter, and oftener if occasion should require; and that they might not run off from the point and mistake in their composures, the council under Peckham has defined the lines, and formed a short discourse upon each head, and laid down such directions that they could not easily ramble or miss their way. Now the latest of these provisions was made in the reign of king Edward I. Farther, by the constitutions of John de Thoresby, archbishop of York, the parochial clergy are enjoined to preach frequently to their parishioners, and explain the articles of faith in the English tongue. At the close of which injunctions, there is a remarkable exhortation directed to the people, "To here Goddys service every Soneday with reverence and devocioun; and seye devoutly thy Pater Noster, &c., and here Goddys lawe taught in thy modyr tonge. For that is better than to here many massys." If we come nearer the Reformation, we shall find preaching more frequent than this historian supposeth. For Dr. Litchfield, rector of All Saints, Thames Street, London, left three thousand and eighty-three sermons in his own hand, and preached by him. And can we imagine all these discourses could be delivered in Lent? Bradley, the suffragan bishop of Norwich, spent many years in travelling that diocese for the business of preaching; Dr. Colet, dean of St. Paul's, constantly preached or expounded the Scripture; and Dr. Colinwood, dean of Lichfield, preached in that cathedral every Sunday for many years together.

See my  
Ch. Hist.  
pt. 1. p. 423.  
433. 481.  
A. D. 1360.

*Dr. Litch-  
field died in  
the year  
1447.  
Bradley  
died in the  
year 1492.*

Harm. p. 56.

Our learned historian takes notice, "That none were to

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Bishop Bur-  
net, p. 317.

preach without a particular license from the king or his diocesan, and that the small number of good preachers was the occasion of this restraint." But this is plainly mistaking the matter: for the parochial clergy were under no necessity of procuring such licenses for their own cures. The injunction, as far as they are concerned, was not to suffer any stranger to preach in the parish without producing the licenses above-mentioned. The historian goes on in his remark and tells us,

Ibid.

"That to supply the slender qualifications of parish priests, a book of homilies was printed, in which the Gospels and Epistles of all the Sundays and holidays in the year were set down, with a homily to every one of these, which is a plain and practical paraphrase on these parcels of Scripture. And that these were to be read to the people by such as were not licensed to preach."

A. D. 1542.

That the parish priests are not barred preaching, hath been observed already. I grant a book of homilies, of the same contents mentioned by this historian, was published, with a monopoly patent to Richard Bankes: but then this was printed in 1540, two years before the setting forth Bonner's injunctions. Our historian infers from the manner of these homilies, that the "compiler of them was a man both of good judgment and learning."

Ibid.

This gentleman, I perceive, took the book for the work of a single hand; but the title-page tells us, it was "drawn forth by diverse learned men, for the singular edification and commodity of all good Christian persons, and in especial of priests and curates."

*The heats of  
some of the  
preachers.*

As to the licensed preachers, their business was to travel the country, to discourse upon controversial points, and settle the belief of the audience. These men, it seems, sometimes indulged their passions, and played their invective too strongly against the opposite party. These sallies occasioned frequent complaints to the king. To guard, therefore, against malice, or bad memory in the informers, the preachers wrote their discourses and read them. And from hence the reading of sermons grew customary in England. And thus the worth of the matter makes amends for the coldness of the delivery, and what is lost in the sound is gained in the sense.

*Plays for-  
bidden to be  
acted in  
churches.*

To proceed. The injunctions take notice of the acting of plays in churches, than which nothing could be a greater

profanation and abuse. These representations were made by some of the gossellers. The subject of the entertainment was the immoralities and disorders of the monks and clergy: they took the liberty likewise to ridicule their religious worship. The mob were pleased with these theatrical shows, in hopes, it may be, of being set free from discipline and restraint. The clergy complained, as they had reason, against such licentious sport; this, they said, was the way to let in atheism, and make all religion a jest. For if people were allowed to burlesque devotion, and make themselves merry with the ceremonies of the Church, they would proceed to farther extremities, and laugh the nation out of their creed at last. The judicious, and better sort of reformers, disliked these courses, but the politicians of that party countenanced this license, and made great use of it: and upon what motives they went is not difficult to discover.

HENRY VIII.

Ibid. p. 318.

Extracts of Convoc. fol. 65.

188.

This year, at a parliament begun the 22nd of January, an act passed relating to the decision of controversies in religion. The preamble sets forth, "That many seditious and ignorant people had abused the liberty granted them for reading the Bible, that great diversity of opinions, animosities, tumults, and schisms, have been occasioned by perverting the sense of the Scripture. To retrieve the mischiefs arising from hence it is enacted, that a certain form of orthodox doctrine, consonant to the inspired writings and the doctrine of the Catholic and apostolic Church, shall be set forth as a standard of belief, that Tindal's false translation of the Old and New Testament, and all other books touching religion in the English tongue, contrary to the articles of faith, or that summary of doctrine published by the king in one thousand five hundred and forty, or any time after during his majesty's reign, shall be suppressed, and forbidden to be read in any of the king's dominions.

*An act restraining the use of the Bible to certain degrees.*

"All printers and booksellers are prohibited printing or vending any of the said books. The exposing the doctrine of the religion established, in plays or ballads, is likewise prohibited under deep forfeitures and imprisonment. All books likewise impugning the holy sacrament of the altar, or maintaining the damnable opinions of the anabaptists, are prohibited under forfeitures and fines. The reading the Bible is likewise

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

prohibited to all under the degrees of gentlemen and gentlewomen." After this follows a proviso of some liberty. "That it shall be lawful for all persons whatsoever to read or teach all such doctrine as is or shall be set forth by his majesty since the year of our Lord 1540. And also the psalter, primer, Pater Noster, Ave, and Creed, in English. And if any spiritual person shall preach or maintain any thing contrary to the doctrines above-mentioned, he shall recant for his first offence, abjure for his second, and bear a faggot; and upon a farther relapse shall be adjudged an heretic, suffer the pains of burning, and forfeit all his goods and chattels."

34 Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.  
Statutes at  
Large.

There are two favourable provisos upon this act: first, the chancellor of England, generals and officers in the field, the king's justices, the recorders of any city or town, the speaker of the parliament, and all other officers, justices, and ministers, which have been accustomed to declare any good or virtuous exhortations in any assemblies, may use any part of the Bible as they have done formerly, with this limitation, that they did not raise any discourse contrary to the doctrine set forth, or to be set forth, by his highness.

To understand the meaning of this proviso we are to observe, that it was usual for the lord chancellors, judges, recorders, &c., to take a text for their speeches upon public occasions.

By another proviso it is enacted, that the king might alter or set aside the act or any part of it.

Our learned Church historian takes notice of another act passed this parliament, which made way for the dissolution of colleges, hospitals, and other foundations of that nature. "The courtiers," as he continues, "had been practising with the presidents and governors of some of these houses, to resign them to the king. The resignations were penned in the same style with the surrenders of monasteries. Eight of these instruments were procured and enrolled. But the progress of this design was checked by the local statutes of most of these foundations." For, by these provisions, no president or any other fellows could make any such deed of alienation without the consent of the whole society. But such an unanimous concurrence was not easily gained. All such statutes are now nullified, and none for the future to be sworn to them. Thus this gentleman has discovered the court compass, and what sort of

Bishop Bur-  
net, pt. 1.  
p. 314.

motives had the ascendancy upon the practice of many of the great men of this reign.

HENRY VIII.

A.D. 1543.

The next year, a book called "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christened Man" was published by the king's order. This book was designed for a rule of religious belief, of which we have a general intimation in the act just mentioned. By Bonner's late injunctions, it is plain this "Necessary Erudition" was unpublished some part of the year 1542: for, by one of the articles, Bonner enjoins the curates to provide the "Institution of a Christian Man." Now, the "Erudition" being a review and alteration of the "Institution" in several points, we may conclude that, if the "Erudition" had been published, the clergy would never have been obliged to have procured the "Institution" for the instruction of their parish: from hence we may reasonably infer the "Necessary Erudition" was not drawn up by a committee of the clergy in the year 1540, as our learned historian supposes<sup>1</sup>. For how can we imagine so finished and instructive a performance, a book designed for public use and settling controversies, should lie by thus long? I grant that branch relating to the doctrine of the sacraments was examined in the year mentioned by this learned historian. This may be proved from Thirleby elect of Westminster's having a share in this business: for the patent for founding this see is dated on the seventeenth of September, in the thirty-second of Henry VIII., which was the year of our Lord 1540. His consecration followed two days after. From hence we may conclude, the questions touching the sacrament were debated some little time before Thirleby's consecration. To finish the account of this matter: the queries relating to the seven sacraments were given out to the two archbishops, the bishops of London, Rochester, and Carlisle, of Durham, Hereford, and St. David's. The other divines were Thirleby, Dr. Robertson, Day, Redmayn, Cox, Leighton, Symmons, Tresham, Coren, Edgworth, Oglethorp, Crayford, Willson, and Robins. When their answers were returned, two were appointed to compare them, and draw an extract of the particulars, as to their agreement or disagreement. One of these thus appointed wrote in Latin, and the other in English. The original answers of the two archbishops, the bishops of London.

Bishop Burnet, pt. 1. p. 256

Bishop Burnet, pt. 1. Records, book 3. num. 23. *Questions concerning the sacraments, when debated.* Godwin, de presul. Angl.

<sup>1</sup> The fact is, that the committee occupied three years, from 1540 to 1543, in the preparation of this work.—Vile "Dodd's Church History," by Tierney.

Rochester, and Carlisle, and the Drs. Day, Robertson, Redmayn, Cox, Symmons, Leighton, Tresham, Coren, Edgworth, and Oglethorp, are upon record; but the papers given in by the bishops of Durham, Hereford, and St. David's, and the elect of Westminster, by the Drs. Crayford, Willson, and Robins, though mentioned in the extracts, are not to be met with.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
See Records,  
num. 49.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 289.

189.

An account  
of the "Necessary Erudition."

Having premised this, I shall proceed to a farther account of the "Necessary Erudition." To begin with the king's preface. Here his majesty sets forth, "That in order to the bringing off his subjects from superstitious practices, he had published the Scriptures in the English tongue: that though this expedient was not without its effect, yet some people, out of a spirit of pride and contention, had wrested the holy text, and given rise to disputes, and diversity of opinions: that to recover the people to orthodoxy and union, he had set forth this summary of religion, with the advice of his clergy: that it had been viewed and approved by both houses of parliament." After this, the king proceeds to the subject of the "Necessary Erudition," mentions the articles, and shows the reason of the order in which they stand. He takes notice, "that the Church consists of two sorts of men, some to instruct, and the rest to be instructed: that it is necessary for the first division to read and study the Scripture: but as to the laity, the reading the Old and New Testament is not so necessary for all of that class: that liberty or restraint in this matter is to be referred to the laws and government: and the legislature now lately had barred several ranks reading the Bible."

From this passage, it is evident, the book was not published till after the act made in the 34th of this reign.

The "Necessary Erudition" begins with a declaration of faith. "This theological virtue, they tell us, is to be understood in two senses. First, for a belief of the being of God, and the truth of his revelations." In this sense, faith is the gift of God. Faith in the second acception is considered in conjunction with hope and charity. This faith is professed by every Christian at his baptism. And here, to prevent an over-reliance on bare belief, it is added, that all God's promises are suspended upon conditions, and suppose our endeavours to obedience. That where we are said to be justified by faith, we are to take faith in this latter sense. And because a certain assurance of

The article  
of faith.



being of the number of the predestinate, is maintained by some persons, therefore, to keep people from avoiding the extremes of presumption and despair, or resting too much upon their own thoughts and persuasion, the book tells us, this question is undetermined in Scripture: that though we have no reason to doubt God's promise, yet since the will is mutable, and the frailty of human nature apt to be surprised, we ought not to live under too strong a confidence, but to manage with caution and vigilance, considering the force of the enemies we have to deal with, always remembering the words of the apostle, "that a man cannot be crowned, unless he strives lawfully."

Before I go farther, I shall observe to the reader, that the "Necessary Erudition" is supplemental to the "Institution" in some articles. For notwithstanding the "Institution" mentions faith, free-will, and good works, in some short incidental passages, yet there are no distinct discourses upon any of these three heads.

*The "Necessary Erudition" supplemental to the "Institution" in several articles.*

Upon the article of free-will, the "Necessary Erudition" maintains this faculty is not extinguished by Adam's fall. This assertion is supported by these plain texts of Scripture. "Be not overcome of evil."—"Neglect not the gift which is in thee."—"Love not the world," &c.—"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."—Now these exhortations, if a man had no power to make use of them, would be to no purpose. But though we are not under an absolute independency, yet this faculty is disabled by the sin of our first parents. The force of the mind in paradise was much greater than afterwards. When Adam and Eve were in the state of innocency, they were possessed of an independency of thought: the superiority of their reason was such, that they could check the animal impressions without trouble, call off their thoughts from unserviceable objects, and govern their inclinations at pleasure. Under this condition, the practice of virtue was natural and easy, and it was no more troublesome to obey, than to miscarry. But since the fall of Adam, it is impossible to please God without supernatural assistance. The propensions to duty are grown faint, and the bent of the will lies mostly towards sensual advantage. Thus, without the succours of grace, it is impossible either to begin well, or to make any progress in a course of obedience. This inability of mere nature, and the necessity of a divine interposition, is proved from Scripture. "Without me ye can do

*Of free-will.*

Rom. xii.  
1 Tim. iv.  
1 John ii.  
Mat. 19.

John xv.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
John vi.  
2 Cor. iii.

nothing.”—“No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me, draw him.”—“We are not sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves.”—However, notwithstanding this disadvantage of our condition, we ought to make the most of our remaining powers, we ought to co-operate with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and exert ourselves; we are likewise not to throw our misbehaviour upon any thing but our own neglect; for God is not wanting in sufficient provision, nor anywise the author of sin. And here the clergy are particularly admonished to guard in their public discourses: to avoid running into extremes on either side; and neither to deny the freedom of the will on one hand, nor the necessity of grace on the other.

*Of good works.*

Upon the article of good works, the book begins with the explication of the terms: that under this notion, not only outward practice, but inward disposition, regularity of desire, and religious temper are comprehended: and that indeed, the state and furniture of the mind is chiefly to be regarded in this case. And here the superstitious observances of the monks, and resting too much upon will-worship, uncommanded service, and outward performance, are mentioned with censure. To this is added, that living tolerably by the directions of the law of nature, though it may have some claim to temporal rewards, yet is not available to eternal happiness, without faith in Christ. As to those good works which commence upon preventing grace, and are done in faith and charity, though they are not without mixture and alloy, and fall short of perfection; yet their defects are supplied by the merits of Christ's passion, and God of his goodness is pleased to accept them for a full obedience; and under this notion they are in some measure meritorious and instrumental in making us happy.

190.

Works of penance are likewise said to be somewhat serviceable towards justification. For instance: when a sinner, upon recollecting the law of God, is struck with remorse of conscience, and ashamed of his misbehaviour; when he laments his ingratitude, applies to prayer, and endeavours to recover himself, and procure his pardon; when he goes through a course of discipline and mortification; he cannot but be said to make some advances towards justification. If, therefore, he goes on in this godly method, continues his devotion, and begs farther assistances of grace, he may be assured of the remission of his sins, obtain the blessing of justification, be enabled for

farther improvement in the service of God, and come up to an acceptable pitch of virtue, which, before he is justified, is plainly impracticable. And though such works of penance are required as preparatory conditions of forgiveness, yet justification and pardon of sins are the free gift of God, and bestowed on us without any valuable compensation.

Farther, the maintaining the necessity and value of good works, is no lessening of the grace of God. For all such commendable actions are the effects of divine grace. Our merits, as St. Austin speaks, are but the gifts of God; therefore, we have no reason to boast of our performances, or value ourselves upon the regularity of our conduct. However, we are bound to improve upon the divine bounty, and make the most of our talent. For to this end, as the apostle assures us, our Saviour came into the world; "that denying ungodliness and worldly lust, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this world. Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." And elsewhere, the same apostle declares, "that every one must receive the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad."

HENRY  
VIII.

Tit. ii.

2 Cor. v.

The article of purgatory is much the same with the "Institution:" the "Erudition" says, "We are not to make use of the name of purgatory, nor dispute or reason about it;" which is much the same language with the "Institution."

The "Erudition" differs in some places from the "Institution." For instance: Christ's descent into hell, which is the fifth article in the "Institution," is the fourth in the "Erudition." And here, though hell is taken in the worse sense, yet the design of our Saviour's coming thither, is more briefly and generally handled. In the article of our Saviour's sitting at the right hand of God, both books mention his intercession; but the "Erudition" adds an explanatory caution concerning the mediation of the saints: that notwithstanding the intercession of the Church militant and triumphant is serviceable for the rest of their brethren, yet all this benefit is only in virtue of the mediation of Christ our head.

In the article of the Catholic Church, the "Erudition" endeavours to refine upon the "Institution," makes kings heads of the particular churches in their dominions, and gives them the superintendency in reference to the appointing of bishops.

*The difference between the "Erudition" and the "Institution."*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

In the communion of saints, touching the communication of good works from one member, to the benefit of the whole body, the "Institution" dilates more against the pope's privilege of dispensing the treasure of the Church, than the "Erudition." In the last article, the "Institution" declares good men are made happy, not upon the score of their own performances, but through the mercy of God, and the passion of Christ; of which in this place, the "Erudition" mentions nothing.

To go on to the doctrine of the sacraments. First. In the article of penance, the "Erudition" adds, upon the institution touching the usefulness of confession to a priest, "that such application is serviceable for awakening the penitent's conscience; to make him sensible of the degree and danger of his guilt; what a glorious condition he is fallen from, by breaking his baptismal engagements; and how heartily he ought to abhor himself for failing in his duty to so great a benefactor." The "Erudition" lays the same stress upon sacerdotal absolution with the "Institution," and maintains, that as is there is no admission into the Church but by the sacrament of baptism, so after the commission of sin, penance is the only way for recovery. "Where priestly absolution cannot be had," says the "Erudition," "the penitent may be safe without it." This is not denied, but rather supposed, by the "Institution."

Under the sacrament of the altar, the "Erudition" speaks plainly for transubstantiation, which the "Institution" doth not. But now we are to observe, the Six Articles were enacted; and farther, that Cranmer and his party, who opposed the passing the Six Articles, were overruled in the composing this "Necessary Erudition." The "Erudition" insists on the sufficiency of receiving under one kind, of which there is not a word in the "Institution." The "Erudition" likewise takes notice, that priests used to receive only under one kind, except when they consecrate.

Under the head of orders, the "Erudition" makes orders one of the Seven Sacraments, and defines it a gift of grace for administration in the Church; that it is conveyed by consecration and imposition of the bishop's hands; that in the beginning of Christianity, this character was given by the apostles. The proof is drawn from the epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus. The words are these: "Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by

prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery ;” or “the authority of priesthood,” as this book translates it. “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain elders in every city, as I have appointed thee.”—“Lay hands suddenly on no man.”

HENRY VIII.

<sup>2</sup> Tim. i.  
<sup>1</sup> Tim. iv.  
 Tit. i.

<sup>1</sup> Tim. v.

From the original and conveyance of ecclesiastical power, the “Erudition” proceeds to the settling other circumstances. And here it is declared, that the nomination, election, or appointment of ecclesiastical ministers, is not prescribed and determined by the word of God. That this matter is left wholly to the constitution and laws of particular countries, made with the consent of the chief magistrate. That the functions of the clergy consist in preaching and administering the sacraments, in the power of binding and loosing ; that is, in giving absolution, and admitting the penitent to Church communion, and excommunicating those who refused to be reclaimed. It is likewise part of the business of the clergy to pray for the universal church, and particularly for those committed to their charge ; to which is added, that notwithstanding the office of priests and bishops takes in this extent of direction and government, yet it is not defensible for any of them to execute any part of this function, excepting in such manner and under such limitations as the ordinances and laws of every Christian realm shall permit them so to do.

From hence the “Erudition” proceeds to describe the qualifications of priests and bishops, from the epistles of Timothy and Titus. The heresy of the Donatists, who made the sacraments of no force, when administered by immoral persons, is likewise censured : and here the virtue of these conveyances of grace is said to depend upon the Divine institution, and not on the qualifications of the bishop or priest. After this, there is mention made of the appointment of deacons, to which is subjoined, that the Scripture speaks expressly of no more than the two orders of priests and deacons ; but that other inferior degrees, such as sub-deacons, exorcists, &c., were added to the former by the primitive Church. That St. Austin takes notice of all the lower orders, and with what ceremonies and solemnity they were conferred in his time. Under those called priests or presbyters in the New Testament, this book supposes the episcopal character was meant : for that these two orders were distinct and subordinate, is plain from this “Erudition,”

<sup>1</sup> Tim. iii.  
 Tit. i.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

which tells us in express terms, that the office and ministration of bishops is instituted and described in the New Testament. The disproof of the pope's supremacy, is much the same with that in the "Institution."

In the doctrine of confirmation the books are both agreed; and, under extreme unction, the "Erudition" adds that we should not rely too much upon this remedy.

Upon the sacrament of matrimony the "Institution" and "Erudition" discourse after the same manner; only, concerning the indissolubleness of lawful marriages, they differ something in the expression. The "Institution" affirms, that, where there was any original impediment to begin this relation by the laws of God and holy Church, there they may proceed to a divorce; but the "Erudition," speaking to this point, instead of the laws of holy Church, changes the expression to "the laws of every realm."

Upon the second commandment both books declare against expensive ornamenting of images, and that the money would be better bestowed upon relieving the poor.

Under the fifth commandment the "Institution" mentions the spiritual parents before the civil; but the "Erudition" ranges the civil first,—that is, next after the natural.

Passive obedience, without limitation or exception of cases, is enjoined by the "Erudition," no less than by the "Institution." In touching the authority of the hierarchy the "Erudition" treats tenderly, and leaves out the word "govern," mentioned in the "Institution." However, the sacerdotal jurisdiction, as we have seen, is proved from the same texts of Scripture in both.

The "Erudition," in the preliminary notes on the Lord's Prayer, sets forth that it is very requisite unlearned people should pray in their mother tongue; that, by putting up their petitions in a language they best understand, their devotion would be assisted, and they would be more fervent and intent upon the matter they were about. This passage is wanting in the "Institution." As to the sacraments, the "Erudition" makes baptism, the holy eucharist, and penance, necessary, no less than the "Institution;" but does not insist so much on their preference to the other four. To return: the exposition on the Lord's Prayer, in both books, is unexceptionable and instructive; but, having nothing controversial or uncommon, I shall pass it over.

The exposition of the Apostles' Creed abounds with excellent matter. There is a large paraphrase on every article, with practical inferences at the close. The style of both books is strong, affecting, and suited to a common capacity. To add a word or two by way of comparison: the "Erudition" manages with less latitude, bends to the Six Articles, and, in some points of controversy, drives farther into the doctrines of the Roman communion. This book doth not maintain the hierarchal authority so unexceptionably, but gives in to an overbalance for the regale. In a word, where the "Erudition" differs from the "Institution," it seems mostly to lose ground, to go off from the primitive plan, and reform backwards. Besides, this last book does not stand upon so strong an authority as the former. The "Institution," as we have seen, was the act of the whole clergy, and subscribed by both houses of convocation; but the "Necessary Erudition," as our learned historian observes, was drawn up only by a committee of the king's nomination. It is true the preface tells us it was approved by the lords spiritual in parliament; but this may possibly amount to no more than a majority in the upper house.

HENRY VIII.  
A comparison between the two books.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 236.

About this time, as may be reasonably collected, the rites and ceremonies of the Church were brought under a review, and a *rationale* drawn up to explain the meaning and justify the usage. "The alterations in the missals and breviaries were so inconsiderable," says our Church historian, "that there was no occasion for a new impression: for, by the rasures of Becket's office, and some other saints, struck out by the king's injunctions,—by these, and some other deletions, the old liturgic books were allowed to serve. It is possible it was thought the change of the mass-books, and others of that kind, might have been too great a charge upon the parishes; and, it may be, the people might have fancied their religion changed, and a new worship put upon them, if the service-books had been taken away. But, whatever was the reason, the people had their old rituals continued, and the churches were furnished with no new books for divine service during this reign."

The ceremonies of the Church examined.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 1. p. 291.

To this sense our learned historian delivers himself; but, notwithstanding this remark, there was a new impression of the liturgy, "*secundum usum Sarum*," which was an office for divine service best known, and farther used than any of the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

rest. It is printed with corrections and deletions, with the king's patent of privilege. The title-page stands thus:—

“Portiforium secundum usum Sarum, noviter impressum, et a plurimis purgatum mendis. In quo nomen Romano pontifici falso ascriptum omittitur, una cum aliis quæ Christianissimo nostri regis statuto repugnant. Excusum Londini per Edvardum Whytchurch, 1541. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.”

And having mentioned the rationale, I shall give the reader a transcript of it from the Cotton library. The title is this:—

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop.  
E. 5.  
fol. 259.

“*Ceremonies to be used in the Church of England, together with an Explanation of the meaning and significancy of them:—*

*An original.*

“Though it be very truth, that there is a great difference betwixt the commandments and works expressed by Scripture necessary for a Christian man's life and salvation, and rites and ceremonies devised by men,—because the works contained in Scripture are the express commandments of God, which may not be infringed, taken away, or exchanged by any man,—and the other said rites and ceremonies are appointed and ordained by man, which, upon causes reasonable, may from time to time, by governors and men of authority, be altered and changed,—yet such ordinances, rites, and ceremonies, devised by such as are in authority, for a decent order, quietness, and tranquillity, ought (all abuses and superstition clearly taken away) to be with all reverent obedience observed by the people, not as works, or workers for their salvation, but as godly policies and ordinances, made and devised by Christian governors, to the intent—as St. Paul saith, Cor. i. 14—that things should be done in a Christian congregation with an honest reverence and decent order: and therefore, to the end that this Church of England may be comely and quietly ordered and well instructed, it is thought meet and convenient that the orders, ceremonies, and rites following, should be in the same Church honestly, obediently, and reverently kept and observed.

192.

“*The Church.*

“And, first of all, to have a common house for Christian people, which we call the Church, is very necessary, that there



they may come together where the Word of God is preached, the sacraments are ministered, and prayers—as well of the people as the minister's—to Almighty God are made, both for them that be alive and also for them that be departed in the faith of Christ: wherefore it is convenient that place, and the altars there, be sanctified, washed, and prepared with prayers.

HENRY  
VIII.

“ ‘Sanctified,’—that is to say, separated from all profane uses, and dedicated to the end before rehearsed. And, therefore, no Christian person should abuse the same, either by eating, drinking, buying, selling, playing, dancing, dicing, or with any other profane or worldly matter: for all soberness, quietness, and godliness, ought there to be used.

“ ‘Washed,’—to admonish all Christian people to wash inwardly their own hearts and consciences, which be the living temples of God, before they shall approach to the use of any holy mystery there.

“ ‘Prepared with prayers,’—that the sacraments there ministered may be acceptable to Almighty God; and that it may please him to hear the humble and devout prayers of his people there, and that all things there done and heard by them may be to the commodity and wealth of their souls.

“ *The Church-yard.*

“ And, albeit that a glorious sepulture is not profitable to the wicked man, and an evil sepulture hurts not the good man, yet to put us in remembrance of death, that we may leave sin and wickedness, and to testify our faith and hope of the resurrection of our bodies, therefore it is convenient that the Church-yard, for a place of common burial for Christian people, should be sanctified and hallowed; and if it chances the same to be polluted, we think it convenient to be reconciled again. And the sepultures of Christian men, with good and godly prayers now used, and other ceremonies belonging to the same, are very laudable and convenient.

“ *The Rites and Ceremonies observed about the Sacrament of Baptism.*

“ First, the catechism which goes before the baptism. And it is as much as to say, a teaching, or an instruction: for, in the primitive Church, when that many came to the Christian faith at the years of age and discretion, it was used that such,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

before they were admitted to baptism, should be taught the articles of the Christian faith, and the sum of the Christian religion, and should promptly and readily render the same to their pastor or curate; which were yet to be used, if that any such would desire to receive baptism; but, in baptism of infants, which for lack of age cannot be instructed, the priest shortly expresses there such instructions, and then charges the godfathers and godmothers farther to teach the child or children, when they come to lawful age; and then beginneth to make a cross upon the forehead of the child that is offered to be baptized, in token that he is come to be professed, and totally to be dedicated to Christ crucified, whom he will never be ashamed before men openly to confess and knowledge.

“Then he makes another cross upon the breast; from whence cometh the belief signifying, that it is not enough to confess Christ with mouth openly, unless he does stedfastly believe in heart inwardly.

“And, therefore, the minister prays Almighty God to take away the blindness of his heart, and to make him apt to receive grace given him in baptism. And then he puts hallowed salt into his mouth, to signify the spiritual salt, which is the Word of God, wherewith he should be seasoned; that thereby the filthy savour of sin should be taken away, preserving him from corruption, and making him a meet apt vessel to continue in the moisture of wholesome and godly wisdom; and, therefore, the minister prays that he may be replenished with heavenly food, and that he receiving this grace of baptism, may obtain everlasting reward.

“Then the minister makes the sign of the cross on the child’s forehead, adjuring the devil to depart, and no more to approach him, but to knowledge his sentence of damnation, and to give glory unto God, and to Jesus Christ, which triumphed upon the cross over him in his own person, praying that this child now purged from the wicked spirit, may be the sanctified temple of the Holy Ghost.

“After this is read the gospel taken out of St. Matthew xix., beginning, ‘Oblati sunt Jesu pueri.’ Wherein is shewed, that the oblation of young children is acceptable unto Christ, of whose Church, without baptism, they cannot be made members: wherefore the people, according to this example, offer their children to the minister to be baptized.

“ Then the minister wets with spittle the noise thurles<sup>1</sup> and ears of him that shall be baptized, putting us in remembrance of the miracle of the deaf and dumb wrought by Christ, who looking up into heaven, puts his spittle with his fingers to his ears, and touching his tongue, saith, ‘Ephphatha,’ that is to say, ‘Be opened,’ and so he healed him; signifying thereby the grace and godly influence descending from heaven, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost, opens our nose to take the sweet odour and savour of the knowledge of Christ, and our ears to hear his word and commandments.

“ Then the minister exhorts the godfathers and godmothers, with all others that are present. to pray to God that the child may worthily receive the blessed sacrament of baptism, to the honour of God, to the salvation of the soul, and confusion of our ghostly enemy, the devil: and so the minister, and all they together, say the Pater Noster.

193.

“ Then immediately the minister makes the sign of the cross in the right hand of the infant, which cross should in all our lifetime admonish us valiantly to defend, resist, and withstand the crafty assaults of our enemy the devil, and all our corrupt and perverse affections and desires. And so blessing the child in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, takes it by the right hand, and bids it enter into the Church, there to be admitted as one of Christ’s flock and congregation; and so proceeds to the font. And there entering towards the baptism: First, inquisition is made of the name of him that is to be baptized, to the intent, that by giving him his name, he may now profess himself to a new master, Christ: for of old custom, such professions were made by such inscriptions, and giving in of their names.

“ Then there follows a stipulation made under prescript words, the minister demanding certain questions, and he that is baptized, or his sureties, making answer to every question or demand, particularly. Which demands, questions, and answers (to the intent the godfather, with others then present, may know what is a Christian man’s profession at his baptism) we think it very convenient and meet to be uttered hereafter in the English tongue.

“ And first, to the interrogation of the minister: ‘Forsakest

<sup>1</sup> Noise thurles, nostrils, from the Saxon *nas thyrp*, nose hole, to thirl (now spelt thrill) signifies to perforate.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

thou the devil?' He, or his sureties for him, answers; 'I forsake him.' The minister saith, 'And all his works?' It is answered, 'I forsake them.' The minister saith, 'And all his pomps and vanities?' The answer is, 'I forsake them.'

"After this, the minister anoints the child with holy oil, upon the breast, and betwixt the shoulders behind: which unction upon the breast, signifies that our heart and affections should be wholly dedicated to Christ, and established in a perfect faith in his mercy, which the oil doth commonly signify in Scripture: and the anointing between the shoulders, with the sign of the cross, signifies, that we should be bold and strong to bear the cross of our Lord; and patiently to sustain such cross of persecution, trouble, and affliction, as our most merciful Lord shall lay upon us.

"Then farther, the minister makes inquisition of the belief of him that is to be christened; saying, 'Believest thou in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?' It is answered, 'I believe.' The minister sayeth, 'Believest thou in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord,' &c. The answer is, 'I believe.' The minister sayeth, 'Believest thou in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and after death to have everlasting life?' The answer is, 'I believe.' All which promise and profession of renouncing the old errors, and believing, and embracing the truth made in baptism, every Christian man ought to have in his often remembrance.

"And after this, the minister sayeth unto him that is to be baptized, these words, 'What askest thou?' It is answered, 'Baptism:' the minister demands farther, saying, 'Wilt thou be baptized?' It is answered, 'I will.' For there is no man saved against his will, but willingly. For as man by his own free will, obeying the serpent, did perish; so when God calls by grace, by the conversion of his own mind, every man truly believing and intending to work, is saved. Then the minister calls the child by the name, and baptizes it in the 'name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;' (putting it into the water of the font, and taking it out again; or else pouring water upon the infant) whereby the person christened, has not only remission of all his sins, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, but also by the same is signified the death and resurrection of Christ, the only cause of our health and salvation: and more-

over, that we should daily mortify our desires, and corrupt affections; and so washed from sin, walk in a new, pure, and godly life and conversation.

HENRY  
VIII.

Then after this baptism, he is anointed with holy chrism on the head, as the supreme and principal part of man; signifying thereby, that he is made a Christian man by the head of his congregation. And that he is anointed with the spiritual unction of the Holy Ghost; that by his assistance and grace, he may obtain everlasting life.

“Then he that is baptized, is clothed in a white vesture, in token of his manumission and freedom from the former captivity of the devil: and it signifies also a Christian purity and innocency, which after the washing away of the spots of his old sin, he ought studiously to conserve and keep, and so to come to the presence of Christ at the day of judgment, and reign with him in glory everlasting.

“Finally. The minister puts a candle-light in the right hand of him that is baptized, in token that he should through all his lifetime, shew before all men a light of good example, and godly works; that he may be always in readiness with the saints to meet our Lord, and receive the fruition of everlasting joy.

“*Ministers.*

“The ceremonies, observances, and prayers, said and done in the consecrations of bishops, and giving orders to priests, deacons, subdeacons, and other inferior ministers, as heretofore has been accustomed and as it is devised in the books called pontificals, (all manner of things concerning the pretended and usurped power of the bishop of Rome abolished and utterly put aside; and the king’s most right and true supremacy, with all things to the same in any wise appertaining and belonging always preserved and obeyed) be very laudable and expedient to be used; for by these ceremonies and observances, every man in his order, state and degree, is admonished what appertains to their offices. And let prayers be made to God, that they truly, sincerely, and devoutly, may use the ministration to them committed, to God’s honour, spiritual comfort of themselves, and all other Christian people.

“*Service of the Church.*

“The service used in the Church, daily in some places, or

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

194.

upon the Sundays and other feasts in all places ; that is to say, Matins, Prime, Hours, Evensong, and Compline, whereof the most part is of Scripture, as the Psalms, and many times the Legends, (certain things added by man well reformed) are very expedient and godly ; both for that the ministers pray, and give thanks to God for themselves, and for the people : and also, that by the example of their prayers, they move and excite the people to pray with them. And therefore, for the adorning of the same service, surplices, copes, and other vestures in the doing thereof, are very laudable and comely.

“ The sober, discreet, and devout singing music, and playing with organs used in the church, in the service of God, are ordained to stir up, and move the people to the sweetness of God’s word ; the which is their song. And by that sweet harmony, both to excite them to prayers and devotion ; and also to put them in remembrance of the heavenly triumphant Church, where is everlasting joy, with continual laud and praises to God.

“ *Ceremonies used in the Mass.*

“ Forasmuch as divers go about to reprehend the mass, and as much as in them is to withdraw Christ’s flock from hearing thereof, taking it as a thing of little or small value ; and the ceremonies of the same for a mocking and a mumming, calling them also dumb ceremonies. Therefore, to the intent that the mass may be the more regarded, and the mouths of such as calumniate and reprehend the same, stopped ; it is to be understood, that the mass is a remembrance of the passion of Christ, whose most blessed body and blood is there consecrated, and the ceremonies thereof are not dumb ; but they be expressives and declaratives of the same passion, to the intent that by such signs and ceremonies, they that be present thereat, may the better be admonished and reduced into the memory of the same. And,

“ First. It is to be understood, that the priest is a common minister in the name and stead of the whole congregation ; and as the mouth of the same, not only renders thanks to God for Christ’s death and passion, but also makes the common prayers, and commends the people and their necessities in the same to Almighty God.

“ The priest therefore, when he shall say mass, says it not

in his common apparel, which he daily uses ; but puts upon him clean and hallowed vestments, partly representing the mysteries which were done at the passion ; partly representing the virtues which he himself ought to have that celebrates the mass. And,

“First. He putteth on the amice, which as touching the mystery, signifies the veil, with which the Jews covered the face of Christ, when they buffeted him in time of his passion : and, as touching the minister, it signifies faith, which is the head, ground, and foundation of all virtues ; and therefore, he puts that upon his head first.

“Secondly. He puts upon him the albe, which as touching the mystery, signifieth the white garment, wherewith Herod clothed Christ, in mockery, when he sent him to Pilate.

“And as touching the minister, it signifies the pureness of conscience, and innocency he ought to have, especially when he sings the mass.

“The girdle, as touching the mystery, signifies the scourge with which Christ was scourged.

“And as touching the minister, it signifies the continent and chaste living, or else the close mind which he ought to have at prayers, when he celebrates.

“The stole, as touching the mystery, signifieth the ropes or bands that Christ was bound with to the pillar, when he was scourged.

“And as touching the minister, it signifieth the yoke of patience ; which he must bear as the servant of God ; in token whereof he puts also the phanon<sup>1</sup> on his arm, which admonisheth him of ghostly strength, and godly patience, that he ought to have, to vanquish and overcome all carnal infirmity.

“The overvesture, or chesible, as touching the mystery, signifies the purple mantle that Pilate’s soldiers put upon Christ, after that they had scourged him.

“And as touching the minister, it signifies charity, a virtue excellent above all other.

“The minister, the which shall celebrate in the beginning, comes forth, as from some secret place to the midst of the altar, signifying thereby that Christ, who is the high-priest, came from the secret bosom of his Father into this world, to offer sacrifice for man’s redemption.

<sup>1</sup> The fanon or fannel, mappula or manipulus, is a towel or handkerchief, the term is sometimes applied to the pendant of a bishop’s mitre.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“And albeit, that that sacrifice be a sufficient price and redemption for all the world; yet it is not efficient or effectual, but only to them which knowledge themselves with penance to be sinners, whom he came to justify; as he sayeth himself, ‘Non veni vocare justos, sed peccatores.’

“Therefore the minister in the beginning, teacheth all men by his confession, to humiliate and knowledge themselves sinners, and ask remission, to the intent they may be the more apt to participate of that high mystery. ‘Nam justus in principio accusator est sui.’

“Then after this followeth, ‘Kyrie Eleison, et Christe Eleison,’ which be words of desire, and to pray God for mercy; which mercy we cannot have of our deserts, but of God’s goodness, and Christ’s merits only. And therefore the minister, proceeding to the midst of the altar, renders the glory unto God; singing the angels’ hymn and song, ‘Gloria in excelsis Deo,’ i. e. glory be unto God in heaven: whereby we be learned, not only to know that we receive all our benefits of God, being bound to give him thanks for them; but also the means whereby we receive them, which is by the mediation of Christ, that is both God and man; by whom the Father is pleased and reconciled, angels and men agreed.

“Then this song done, the minister and people with salutations, exhort each other to prayers, in which he prays as well for the multitude, as for himself; and therefore it is called Collecta, and it is directed to the Father, and commonly concluded in these words, ‘per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum,’ &c., which sheweth and declareth unto us, that we be only heard by Christ, and that our prayer is by him valuable, and by ourself without him of no value. And when the prayer is ended, the people express their desires and minds to be heard, and answer Amen; which signifies, so be it.

“After that prayer made, then the priest, as a meet minister to teach the people, reads the Epistle, which is a lesson taken out of the Old and New Testament, and it precedes the Gospel, and prepares the mind thereunto; like as St. John prepared unto Christ, and the old law unto grace. And Christ sent the disciples unto divers places to preach before his coming; whereby the people shall be more apt to receive the heavenly doctrine of the gospel, and with a true faith believe the rewards and benefits promised in the same.



“ Next to the Epistle, ensues the Graill<sup>1</sup>; the which teacheth also such wholesome doctrine, as was taught before in the Epistle; that they, proceeding in virtue by degrees, may proceed from virtue to virtue, until such time as they may see Almighty God in his glory: and therefore follows the song of gladness, called the Hallelujah, i. e. Laud ye God. Both to admonish us to remember God with a glad mind, and also with such mind to prepare ourselves to the hearing of the Gospel, and the joyful promises of the same.

“ Then follows the Gospel, which is a glad message or tidings; for in it is contained the glad news of our salvation; the which the angels showed to the shepherds at Christ’s coming: saying, ‘*Ecce evangelizo vobis gaudium magnum;*’ and therefore the Church, with light, and other ceremonies of gladness and peace, reads it to the people, standing up diligently to hear the same; declaring, thereby, their prone and ready minds that they have to the doctrine of the Gospel.

“ And forasmuch as faith springeth of the word of God, therefore divers days, the Church (after the Gospel read) pronounces with a loud voice the Creed, expressing the faith with her mouth, which before she conceived in her heart, according to St. Paul’s saying, ‘*Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore autem confessio sit ad salutem.*’

“ Then follows the Offertory, whereby we learn to prepare ourselves, by God’s grace, to be an acceptable oblation to him, to the intent we may be partakers of the blessed sacrifices which Christ offered for us upon the Cross.

“ At which time the minister, laying the bread upon the altar, makes the chalice, mixing the water with the wine; signifying, thereby, how that blood and water ran out of Christ’s side in his passion; and admonishes us of the inseparable coupling and joining of Christ and his Church.

“ Then, after the Offertory done, the priest washes his hands, knowledging himself not to be so clean, but that he has ever need more to be washed, according to the saying of David, ‘*Wash me, Lord, more and more from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin.*’

“ Then after follows a prayer, secretly said, which is called the Secret of the Mass, and that signifies Christ’s secret and privy conversation, which he kept with his disciples, a little before

<sup>1</sup> Graill, gradual.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

his passion. For after the determinate sentence of death, conspired by Caiphas and the Jews against him, he walked no more amongst them openly, but amongst his disciples secretly.

“ Next after the secret follows the Preface, which is a prolocution or prayer, which goes before the most reverend consecration of Christ’s body and blood, preparing the minds of the faithful people to the reverence of the same ; and moving them to erect their hearts to Almighty God ; giving him thanks for his inestimable benefits, with desiring that their voice joined with the company of angels, in one consent of laud and praise, proceeding as well from the Church triumphant as militant, unite and knit together, may, without end, sing this seraphical hymn, ‘ Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,’ to the laud of the blessed Trinity, whose glory replenishes heaven and earth.

“ Then after this Preface follows the Canon, which is said secretly of the priest, not because it is unlawful to be heard, read, or known of the people (as some fancy), but that it is expedient to keep silence and secrecy at the time of such a high mystery ; and that both the priest and people may have the more devout meditations, and better attend about the same.

“ Then the priest begins to represent, in this sacrifice of the mass, the most painful and bloody sacrifice once offered for our salvation upon the cross, and prays the Father to accept these gifts prepared for the consecration ; and inclining his body, makes a cross upon the altar, and kisses it, signifying, thereby, the humble inclining and obedience of Christ to his Father’s will, to suffer his passion upon the altar of his cross for our salvation.

“ And then following the example of Christ, the high bishop, which, approaching the time of his passion, gave himself to prayer ; so also, according to the apostle’s doctrine to Timothy, the minister gives himself to prayer : First. In general for the universal Church, of the which he desires peace and preservation. Secondly. For princes and rulers that govern the same. Thirdly. For all Christian and faithful people, remembering specially in his memento, such as charity most binds, and time suffices him so to do, making an honourable mention also of saints which be departed. And first, of our Lady, the twelve apostles, and as many martyrs, which, either by their bodily presence, preaching, or their bloodshedding in their lifetime, did bear witness and testimony to Christ’s passion, joining them, as it were, both in one communion and participation of

Christ's death and merits, which hath deserved as well grace to the one as glory to the other, desiring God by their prayers to protect and defend the whole congregation of all Christians.

“ And after certain prayers and petitions made for the people, and also that the oblation may be acceptable unto God, he proceeds with all reverence to the consecration.

“ First. Of the bread, taking it in his hands, and giving thanks, following the example of Christ ; by virtue and power of whose words, the substance of bread is turned into the substance of the body of Christ.

“ And likewise the substance of wine into his precious blood, which he lifteth up, both that the people with all reverence and honour may worship the same, and also to signify thereby, partly Christ's exaltation upon the cross for our redemption, which was figured by the serpent set up by Moses in the desert, and partly signifying that triumphant advancement and exaltation whereto God the Father, because of his passion, has exalted him above all creatures, bidding the people to have it in remembrance as oft as they shall do the same. After the which, the priest extends and stretches forth his arms in form of a cross, declaring thereby, that according to Christ's commandment, both he and the people not only have fresh remembrance of the passion, but also of his resurrection and glorious ascension.

196.

“ And so he proceeds to the second memento, in which he prays for them that be dead in the faith of Christ, and sleep in peace, that it might please God to grant them a place of refreshing, light and peace. Then he joins himself with the people, knocking himself upon his breast, thereby teaching them, that he and they both be sinners, and have need of mercy and grace purchased by Christ's passion, and desireth Almighty God to give a society with the holy apostles and martyrs, not as an esteemer of their merits, but as a merciful granter of remission, and that by Christ, by whom he works and grants all these benefits ; wherefore all honour and glory is to be rendered to him by Christ, and with Christ, the Holy Ghost being knit in unity to them.

“ And then expressing with a loud voice, how this honour and glory is due to God, he saith, ‘ per omnia sæcula sæculorum,’ i. e. perpetually ; the Church answering Amen.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“ The priest then, to the intent that he may the more worthily receive the blessed body and blood of Christ, both to the comfort and strength as well of him as of them that be present, saith the Pater Noster, asking of God this heavenly and celestial bread, with deliverance from all evils, and increase of quietness and peace; and so discovering the chalice, in token that Christ would the fruit of his passion to be opened and manifest to all the world, takes the host and breaks it, and divides it, in token of the distribution of it amongst his disciples at his last supper, and the breaking of his body at the time of his passion: at which supper, above all things, he commends to them peace and charity, saying, ‘*Pacem meam do vobis, pacem relinquo vobis.*’ And therefore the minister takes the kiss of peace from the blessed sacrament, and sends it to the people, saluting each other in ‘*osculo sancto,*’ as biddeth St. Paul, admonishing them thereby of the fraternal and mutual peace and concord which they ought to have; without which peace and concord, this communion or sacrament of common union, is to them nothing profitable, but much to their hurt.

“ Then saith the priest thrice, ‘*Agnus Dei,*’ &c. advertising us of the effects of Christ’s passion; whereof the first is, deliverance from the misery of sin. The second is, from pain of everlasting damnation; wherefore he saith twice, ‘*miserere nobis;*’ i. e. have mercy on us. And the third effect is, giving everlasting peace, consisting in the everlasting fruition of God; wherefore he saith, ‘*Dona nobis pacem;*’ i. e. give us peace.

“ Then follows the commixtion of the body and blood of Christ together, signifying the joining together of his body and soul at the resurrection, which before were severed at the time of his passion.

“ And albeit there be two consecrations, yet there is but one sacrament, containing under the form, the holy body and blood of Christ inseparably.

“ Then follows the Communion, which is an exciting or a moving to the people to laud and praise God. And because in the primitive Church, when devotion was fervent, divers used many times to receive it together with the priest; therefore, in the prayer called the Post-communion, the priest, in

the name of them all, prays and renders thanks unto God for their spiritual refection, 'per Dominum nostrum,' by whose passion exhibit, the mass has its strength and efficacy. HENRY  
VIII.

"Then the priest eftsoons turning his face to the people after the Salutation, says these words, 'Ite, missa est,' i. e. Go ye, the mass is ended. And in that he bids them go, is signified, that we ought to follow Christ in his holy life, and always be going from virtue to virtue, and not to stand and tarry in the worldly pleasures, but diligently to hasten to life everlasting. And that we may be of the number of them to whom it shall be said, 'Venite benedicti,' i. e. Come, ye blessed of my Father, and receive the kingdom, &c. ; the priest gives us at our departure sometimes the benediction in the name of the whole Trinity ; signifying that last benediction which Christ gave to his disciples in the mount of Olives, when he ascended to his Father, where he sits on his right hand a continual intercessor for us, to whom be all laud and praise for ever. Amen.

"The Sundays are to be continued and employed in the service of God, to hear his word preached, to give thanks unto him for the benefits we receive daily. And that day is much to be regarded, both for the antiquity, and also for that it is a memorial of Christ's resurrection, whereby we ought to be stirred to erect our minds from earthly things, to heavenly contemplations of Christ's glorified nature ; by that conceiving also a certain hope of our resurrection and eternal glory.

"The feasts of our Lord, divers times in the year, received and approved as holy and solemn days, are to be kept in their accustomed veneration and solemnity, as well for the sundry causes before rehearsed, as also for that they represent unto us the manifold and inestimable benefits of our redemption. As the incarnation of Christ, his apparition, passion, resurrection, ascension, the sending down of the Holy Ghost, and such other.

"The feasts of saints, as divers of our blessed Lady, of the apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, such as are not abrogated, or otherwise ordered by the high governor, are to be used in godly exercise and due veneration, according to the approved custom. Because, that in those days we remember the high gifts of God in them ; and for those not only to glorify him, but also to pray him that we may have the like

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

grace here to follow their example of godly living, and at the last attain with them the everlasting life, and the state that they be in.

“ Bells are ordered to call the ministers and people to the church in times convenient ; admonishing them to come to the preaching of the word of God, the ministration of the sacraments, the divine service and prayer in the church for the time used : to give knowledge to our Christian brother or sister departed this world, that both we may call to remembrance our own mortality, and also be moved with charity to pray for them so departed.

197.

“ It is convenient the bishops, and all other such as have orders, and continue in their ministrations, for an honest difference, to be known from other persons, should not only wear certain manner of vestures, and outward raiment ; but also, for a like difference, to have, according to their order and degree, a convenient crown, with other honest tonsure in their head.

“ It is laudable and convenient, that (except sickness, or any other reasonable impediment, or let) every bishop, priest, and others having orders, and continuing in their administration, shall daily say divine service (i. e.) Matins, Prime, Hours, Evensong, and Compline ; and such as are bishops and priests, divers times to say mass ; and that they may say it oftener, they ought to pray for grace, and dispose themselves accordingly.

“ Bearing candles on Candlemas days, is a very good usage in memory of Christ, the spiritual light, of whom Simeon did prophesy, as is read in the church that day.

“ Fasting certain times and days in the year, as abstinence in Lent, and other times received and appointed to be kept, and not changed and abrogated, is very laudable, and without a just and reasonable cause to the contrary, ought to be observed according to the custom of this realm. For though the manner of fasting, and certain days of fasting are not expressed in Scripture ; yet we ought to fast by the teaching of the Scripture, as it appears in many places of the same, both of the Old and New Testament. For it is a godly exercise, both to subdue and mortify the fleshly appetites, and also to make the person more apt to pray. And therefore our master Christ, for our example, not only fasted, but also does teach us, that when we fast we should beware of hypocrisy.

“The giving of ashes upon Ash-Wednesday, with these words, ‘Remember, man, that thou art ashes, and to ashes thou shalt return,’ is to put us in remembrance in the beginning of Lent, of our frail nature, and uncertainty of this life. Wherefore, it were very good and convenient to express the same in English, to the understanding of unlearned persons.

HENRY  
VIII.

“The covering of the cross and the images in Lent, with the uncovering of the same at the resurrection, signify not only the darkness of infidelity, which covered the face of the Jews in the Old Testament, but also the dark knowledge they had of Christ, who was the perfection and end of the law; and not yet opened until the time of his death and resurrection.

“And the same partly is signified by the veil which hid the secret place of the ‘sanctum sanctorum’ from the people; and in the time of Christ’s passion was opened, that all men might see it, and have a ready entrance thereunto. The Holy Ghost signifying thereby, as saith St. Paul, that the day of holiness was not yet opened, so long as the first tabernacle was standing; nor the way of life, as the prophet saith, was known before.

“Bearing of palms on Palm-Sunday, is done in memory of the receiving of Christ into Jerusalem a little before his death, that we may have the same desire to receive him into our hearts.

“The service upon Wednesday, Thursday, and Good-Friday, differs from other service in the year. And the Church useth then lamentable and mourning ceremonies, reading the lessons of the lamentation of Jeremy, signifying an heaviness, for so much as the Jews at that time travelled, and sought by all means to apprehend Christ and bring him to his death. And the same service is called ‘Tenebræ,’ because that Christ walked then not openly as he was wanted to do, but kept himself secretly with his disciples in a city called Ephraim, till it pleased him willingly to come and suffer his passion for our salvation.

“The candles, in those nights, first lighted, and then put out at every Psalm and Lesson, signify the manifold gifts given by the holy prophets before the coming of Christ, which at this time were darkened; for the world was then in an infidelity, and the cruel Jews did not only put the former prophets to death, but also then they practised the death of Christ, the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

end of all prophets, which shortly after they accomplished to their confusion and our salvation.

“ Upon Shier-Thursday<sup>1</sup>, as we call it, most principally it is to be considered, that our Saviour did institute the most blessed sacrament of thanks; for then he gave to his disciples his most blessed body to eat, and his most precious blood to drink, the very same that after was betrayed for us, and put to death, rose and ascended: he washed also the same day the feet of his disciples, teaching humbleness, and very love and charity, by his example.

“ Oil and chrisam are this day consecrated, which signifies principally the imperial and priestly dignity of Christ, and his being anointed with the spiritual unction of the Holy Ghost above all creatures, admonishing us of our state and condition: for as of chrisma Christ is named, so of Christ we are called Christians.

“ And, secondly, it signifies defacing and abolishing of the rites and consecrations of the old law, which were done in oil. And therefore at this time the old oil is burnt and destroyed, and new consecrated, signifying thereby our new regeneration in Christ, and holy inunction which we have by his Holy Spirit.

“ It is a laudable custom the same day to wash the altars, and to prepare with all cleanness the places where the most blessed sacrament shall be ministered. And also to be for us a remembrance, that as those things inanimate are washed and cleansed for that purpose; so we ought much more to prepare and wash our minds and consciences at all times, and especially at this time, for the more worthy receiving of the same most high sacrament.

“ Upon Good-Friday is renewed yearly the remembrance of the blessed passion; wherefore, that day, amongst other godly ceremonies to be continued, is the creeping to the cross, where we humble ourselves to Christ before the same; offering unto him, and kissing of the cross, in memory of our redemption by Christ upon the cross.

“ And that day is prepared and well-adorned the sepulchre, in remembrance of his sepulchre, which was prophesied by the prophet Esaias to be glorious. Wherein is laid the image of the cross, and the most blessed sacrament; to signify, that there was buried no corpse or body that could be putrified, or

<sup>1</sup> Mandati dies, Mandy or Maunday Thursday.



corrupted, but the pure and undefiled body of Christ, without spot of sin, which was never separated from the Godhead. And therefore, as David expressed in the fifteenth Psalm, it could not see corruption, nor death could not detain or hold him, but he should rise again to our great hope and comfort. And therefore the Church adorns it with lights, to express the great joy they have of that glorious triumph over death, the devil, and hell.

HENRY  
VIII.  
198.

“ Upon Saturday, Easter even, is hallowed the font, which is as it were vestigium, or a remembrance of baptism, that was used in the primitive Church. At which time, and Pentecost, there were used in the church two solemn baptizings, and much concourse of people came unto the same.

“ The first was at Easter, because the mystery of baptism agrees well to the time. For like as Christ died and was buried, and rose again the third day, so by putting into the water is signified our death to sin: and the immersions betoken our burying and mortifying to the same. And the rising again out of the water declares us to be risen unto a new life, according to the doctrine of St. Paul. (Rom. vi.)

“ And the second solemn baptizing (i. e.) at Pentecost, was because that then is celebrated the feast of the Holy Ghost, which is the worker of that spiritual regeneration we have in baptism. And therefore the Church uses yet to hallow the font also at that time.

“ Upon Easter-day, in the morning, the ceremonies of the resurrection are very laudable, to put us in remembrance of Christ's resurrection, which is the cause of our justification. And that as Christ being our head, was the first among the dead which rose never to die again; so all Christian men being his members, do conceive thereby to rise from death of sin to godly conversation in this life; and finally, at the day of judgment, when the bodies and flesh of all mankind shall by the operations of God be raised again, to rise with him to everlasting glory.

“ General processions, and other particuar processions, with the Litanies and other prayers, are very laudable; wherein we pray to Almighty God for the health, prosperous estate, and victory of our prince; for the wealth of the realm, and for the temperance and pureness of the air to man's health: and also for the increase of grain, grass, and other fruits growing

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

upon the earth for the sustenance of man. In which procession, we use to follow the cross and image of our Saviour, not only praying unto God for our necessities, whose image we do follow, but also professing ourselves as true Christian people, ready to bear our cross with Christ, willingly to suffer all troubles and afflictions laid upon us for the love and cause of our Saviour, like as he suffered for us. And so as his servants, soldiers, and men of war, we follow his banner for the remembrance of him, declaring our proneness and readiness in all things to follow and serve him; provided always, that in all processions the manner of praying appointed by the king's injunctions be observed.

“The accustomed benedictions of bishops or priests, of old time used in the church, are very laudable: for as ministers and pastors of the flock of Christ for that whole people, where they have their administrations, they pray to Almighty God, that it may please him to bless the people (i. e.) to give them his goodness and grace in all their necessities, both for the body and soul: making a cross, to signify in whose name they bless, and by whom they ask the same gift of God.

“Holy water and holy bread be two godly ceremonies, and to be continued in the Church: the one to put us in remembrance of our baptism, and of the blood of Christ for our redemption sprinkled upon the cross; and the other to put us in remembrance that all Christian men are one mystical body of Christ, as the bread is made of many grains and yet but one loaf,—and to put us in remembrance also of receiving of the holy sacrament and body of Christ in right charity, which, in the beginning of Christ's Church, men did oftener receive than they do now.”

*Archbishop  
Cranmer's  
opinion  
overruled in  
the "Erudi-  
tion of a  
Christian  
Man."*

By archbishop Cranmer's answer to the “Seventeen Questions,” it appears his opinion of Church power was extremely wrong and unprimitive. He makes the government of the Church and the functions of the hierarchy altogether precarious, and entirely depending on the pleasure of the civil magistrate. These Erastian tenets, as they are now called, were quite different from a paper signed by him some few years before. It is called “A Declaration of the Functions and Divine Institutions of Bishops and Priests.” Here the independency of the Church in matters purely spiritual is main-

tained without ambiguity or reserve ; and the doctrine touching the sacrament of orders is penned to the same sense, and in a manner to the same words, with the “ Institution of a Christian Man.” This “ Declaration ” was signed by Cromwell, the two archbishops, eleven bishops, and four-and-twenty divines of character. It is subscribed by Edward Hereford and John Rochester : from whence it is plain it must have been drawn up between the year 1536 and the beginning of the year 1538 : for John Hilsley, bishop of Rochester, was not consecrated till 1536 ; and Edward Fox, bishop of Hereford, died May the 8th, 1538.

HENRY  
VIII.  
Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. E. 5.  
fol. 45.

Godwin de  
Presul.

But notwithstanding Cranmer was so unhappy as to change his opinion, as appears by his answer to the questions above-mentioned, yet he was overruled by a majority of the bishops, who set forth the “ Erudition of a Christian Man.” And more than that, he seems to have recovered his former sentiment ; for he subscribed the “ Erudition,” countenanced it in his diocese, and checked Joseph, a clergyman, who took the liberty to preach against it.

At the defeat of the Scots at Solway, several of the nobility were taken prisoners, and brought up to London, and put into the hands of some English lords, and other persons of distinction, where they were entertained with great freedom and honour. The archbishop of Canterbury had the earl of Cassilis, the duke of Norfolk the earl of Glencairn, not to mention the rest. These Scotch noblemen being treated to satisfaction, and hearing of their king’s death, suggested a match between prince Edward and their young queen, with a promise of their interest to bring it about. The king being pleased with the proposal, dismissed them upon the security of hostages, and presented them richly at their going off. Not long after, the king sent sir Ralph Sadler to Scotland, to solicit the marriage and conclude a peace. There were likewise Scotch ambassadors despatched to the English court. In short, after some difficulties adjusted, the marriage treaty was signed by the Scotch ambassadors. But, upon their return, the queen-mother, the cardinal, and all the Scotch clergy were displeased with what was done. Particularly the cardinal discovered his aversion to the alliance in so remarkable a manner, that it was thought fit to confine him till the ratification of the marriage was settled, and hostages promised for performance of articles. But the car-

Bp. Burnet,  
p. 289.  
Memorials  
of Cranmer,  
p. 100.

*A match  
proposed  
between  
prince  
Edward  
and the  
queen of  
Scots.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
A treaty of  
marriage  
broken by  
cardinal  
Beaton.

dinal bribed his keeper, made his escape, and embroiled the whole matter. And now acting under the countenance of the queen-mother, he gained the assistance of the clergy, by representing they were in danger of ruin from the other party. He prevailed that the hostages should not be sent into England, and occasioned ill-usage being put upon our ambassador. The king of England, who had reason to be displeas'd with this breach of articles, laid an embargo upon the Scotch merchantmen, and resolv'd to declare war against that nation.

The queen-mother and the cardinal apply'd to the French court to fortify their interest, and desired that king to convey over Matthew Steward, earl of Lennox, acquainting him this lord was very considerable in his country, and averse to Hamilton's party. The viceroy being inform'd of the earl of Lennox's voyage, endeavour'd to get the young princess, but was prevented by the cardinal.

The earl of Lennox, upon his arrival in Scotland, levied four thousand men, and gain'd his point upon the earl of Arran. By a treaty between them, the young queen was put into the custody of four of Lennox's creatures, and soon after crown'd.

The viceroy being thus disappointed, and over and above not very popular, was contented to be gain'd by the cardinal, and wholly govern'd by him.

King Henry, being inform'd of the change in the Scotch administration, demand'd the person of the young queen, alleging his apprehension of her being convey'd to France. The Scots refusing to part with her, war was declar'd by our king, and preparations made for that purpose. But of this no more at present.

July, 1543.  
Ed. Herbert,  
p. 486. 495.

This year our king broke with France, and sign'd a treaty with the emperor. And about the same time he was married to the lady Catherine Parr, the relict of the lord Latimer.

The king being acquaint'd that several persons were burnt for religion at Windsor, seem'd displeas'd with the rigorous execution of the law. Whether he thought such methods of severity unsuitable to the Christian religion, or whether he was apprehensive his government would lie under hard imputations by holding on this course, is not easy to determine. But whatever the motive was, it was plain his mind was alter'd; for he gave his pardon to sir Thomas Cardine, sir Philip Hobby, and some others, who had fallen under the forfeiture of the Six

Articles. And for a farther proof of a gentler persuasion, he withdrew his favour from the bishop of Winchester ; this prelate being represented of a prosecuting temper.

HENRY  
VIII.  
1d. p. 503.

On the fourteenth of January the parliament sat at Westminster, and continued till the nine-and-twentieth of March following. The first act relates to the succession, in which there is a remarkable clause. "The act mentions two statutes made in the 28th year of this reign, to exclude the usurped authority and jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome; that to give the king an assurance of the fidelity of his subjects, they were obliged to swear a renunciation of the papal supremacy, and that each of the statutes above-mentioned, enjoined a several oath." But these provisions, it seems, falling short of satisfaction, there is a supplemental clause added in the statute before us. The words are these: "Forasmuch as in both the said oaths, mentioned in the said several acts, there lack full and sufficient words, whereby some doubts might rise: therefore, be it enacted by authority of this present parliament, that from and after the last day of this session, all and every such person and persons, which be ordered and limited by the said several acts, to take the said oaths mentioned in the same acts, shall from thenceforth, in lieu and place of those two oaths, take and swear this corporal oath, according to the tenor ensuing. And that they, which have already sworn the other foresaid oaths, or any of them, shall take and esteem it of the same effect and force, as though they had sworn this<sup>1</sup>."

A. D. 1543-4.

*A remarkable clause in an act relating to oaths.*

35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.

"In the former oaths," this statute sets forth, "there lacked full and sufficient words." This oath, therefore, seems to supply the defects, by extending the matter. Now if a parliament can charge the conscience deeper, and throw a supplemental clause upon an oath taken seven years before, the question will be, whether a man can tell what he swears to? And whether this might not prove a discouragement against taking parliamentary oaths? Because, though a man may know the extent of such a solemn engagement at present, yet he cannot foresee with what addition it may be loaded by the legislature for the time to come. And then the question will be, whether this does not look like taking religion upon content, and resigning to a parliament with implicit belief, in things of the most solemn nature. The refusal of this oath is made high treason, but

I M. 1.

<sup>1</sup> A most extraordinary device for catching consciences.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

this statute being since repealed, the subject cannot be affected with the extraordinary clause above-mentioned.

*Archbishop  
Cranmer  
charged with  
heresy.*

During this session, one sir John Gostiek, knight of the county for Bedfordshire, made a speech in the house against archbishop Cranmer, charged him with encouraging novel opinions, and stated that his family was a nursery of heresy and sedition. Bishop Gardiner is supposed to have been at the bottom of this business. This speech of Gostiek's being of the nature of an impeachment, several lords of the privy council moved the king, that since Cranmer lay under an imputation of so high a nature, he might be dismissed the board, and committed to the Tower, till inquiry was made into the truth of what was commonly reported. The admitting the archbishop to the privy council, they said, would discourage information.

*Antiquit.  
Brit. p. 334.  
et deince.*

In the mean time a report was spread, that the king had determined Cranmer's ruin, that he would quickly be brought to the scaffold, and share Cromwell's fate. It seems his enemies had so much the ascendant at court, that most people thought it would be next to impossible for him to disentangle himself. But the king happening to penetrate the matter, found there was more art than truth in the clamours against Cranmer. His majesty one evening after supper, upon pretence of diverting himself upon the water, ordered his barge to be rowed to Lambeth side. Some of the archbishop's servants acquainting their lord with the king's being there, he came to the shore to pay his regards, and invite the king to his palace. The king bid him come into the boat, and sit close by him, and entertained him with a long discourse in private.

200.

Amongst other things, the king, to sound Cranmer the better, complained, that since Cromwell's death, the kingdom had been very much embroiled with heresy and faction; that it was to be feared, these different persuasions and animosities might be attended with dangerous consequences, and break out at last into a civil war. That therefore, such disputes about conscience and religious belief, ought to be silenced. For this purpose he was resolved to search after the grand incendiary, and take him off by some exemplary punishment. That this, in the opinion of several of the prelates and other lords, was the proper method to put a stop to the mischief. Upon this he asked Cranmer, what his opinion was of this resolve? The archbishop, though he guessed the meaning of the question, answered

frankly, and without any appearance of concern, that his highness had pitched upon a serviceable expedient, and that the rest of the heretics ought to undergo the same punishment with their leader; only he desired the king would not charge those with heresy who grounded their belief upon the inspired writings. Upon this answer the king came closer, and said, "I am informed by a great many hands, that you are the grand heresiarch; that it is you who encourage heterodoxy; and that were it not for your counterpaces, the Six Articles had not been so much disliked, and contested in your province. I desire therefore, you would deal clearly, and discover yourself upon this matter." The archbishop told his highness he was still of the same opinion he had declared himself, when the bill was passing; however, he had done nothing against the act. Then the king, putting on an air of pleasantry, asked him whether his bed-chamber would stand the test of the Articles? The archbishop, notwithstanding he was sensible marriage was death in a priest, told the king he was married before his promotion to the see of Canterbury, that he entered into this relation during his embassy at the emperor's court: however, to prevent falling under the penalty of the statute, he had parted with his wife, and sent her to her family in Germany. This answer, without evasion or reserve, pleased the king. And now being fully persuaded of Cranmer's probity, he pulled off the mask, and began to assure him of his favour: he told him the severity of the act was not levelled against him, and then mentioned the information preferred against him, and those who pretended to make it good.

*He is preserved by the king.*

The archbishop desired the charge might be carried on through the forms of law; for he was not afraid of standing the utmost inquiry. The king, who was still more confirmed of the archbishop's sincerity, told him he should put the cause into his hand, and trust him with the management. Cranmer replied, such a favour would be censured by his adversaries, and interpreted to a partiality in his highness. He desired therefore, his majesty would be pleased to nominate some other judge. However, the king had so strong an opinion of Cranmer's honesty, that he did not question the fairness of his conduct, though in a case in which himself was so nearly concerned. Being dismissed by the king with this unexpected confidence, he ordered Dr. Cox, his vicar-general, and Hussey, his principal

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

registrary, to go down to Canterbury, and make a thorough inquiry into the practice of those who had informed against him, to find out the men, and trace the progress of the plot : but this vicar-general and the registrary moving slowly, and trifling, as it were, over their commission, were suspected of unfriendly intentions.

On the other hand, the opposite party pressed for Cranmer's confinement, and that he might be brought to answer the charge of heresy. The king yielded at last so far to their importunity, as to consent that in case they could make proof of any one crime of the archbishop's against Church or State, he should be sent to prison. Next day they were in expectation of gaining their end. The king, who resolved to preserve Cranmer, and was willing to discover the foul play, seemed to countenance the prosecution, and let his enemies go the whole length of their design against him.

But now the matter being come to a crisis, it was time to interpose. The king therefore sent one Mr. Denny, a gentleman of his privy chamber, and one of Cranmer's friends, about midnight, to Lambeth: his business was, to order the archbishop to come immediately to the king. His majesty told him, that the province of Canterbury, and almost the whole kingdom, being overrun with heretical opinions, he was solicited by almost all the privy council to commit him during the process; for without such a confinement the evidence would be stifled, and it was impossible to go to the bottom of the matter: for as the privy council suggested, all this heterodoxy was owing to several foreigners of learning entertained in his family. "This motion," says the king, "of the privy council, I have agreed to; to-morrow it is to be put in execution, and I desire to know your sense of the reasonableness of it."

Cranmer returned the king thanks for pre-acquainting him with this resolve, declared himself not unwilling to go to prison and abide a trial: that not being conscious of any pretended misbehaviour, he had rather stand the event of a judicial inquiry, than lie under the load of unreasonable suspicion. He only desired, that since his orthodoxy was called in question, he might have learned and indifferent judges assigned him.

The king, instead of commending him for his courage and integrity, told him his willingness to go to prison, and resting so much upon his innocence, argued his simplicity; "for," says



he, "if you are once eclipsed, and hurried into a gaol, there will be knaves enough to inform against you; which, as long as you have your liberty, and your character stands entire, will not have the confidence to say a word: and therefore, since you have not the discretion to consult your own honour and security, I will undertake that part, and preserve you myself. To-morrow you will be sent for by the privy council, charged with heresy and ordered to prison. Your way is, to plead that since you have the honour to be one of the board, you may receive the same treatment which they would desire in the same case; that those who inform against you may be brought before the council; and then, provided you cannot disprove their evidence, you are willing to go to prison: and in case you are refused this reasonable request, make your appeal to me, and give them a sign you have an authority for such an application:" upon this the king took a ring of great value off his finger, gave it Cranmer, and discharged him.

HENRY  
VIII.

The next morning there were messengers sent to Lambeth to summon the archbishop to the privy council. When he came there he was refused admittance into the council-chamber: at which the courtiers attending thereabouts were much surprised. When Dr. Butts, one of the king's physicians, heard of this usage, he came to the archbishop to show his regard, and keep him from being insulted. This doctor, being soon after sent for by the king, told him he had seen a very unusual sight. "What is the matter?" said the king. "Sir," said he, "there is a strange revolution in archbishop Cranmer's quality: he is sunk from a metropolitan to a footman; for I have seen him wait amongst the liveries about an hour in the lobby, before the council-chamber." "What!" says the king, "does the privy council treat the primate of all England in such a contumelious manner?" And, upon this, a gentleman was immediately sent to order the board to let the archbishop into the council-chamber. At his coming in he was saluted with a heavy accusation: that the king and the council had received information of the kingdom's being infected with heresy; that this dangerous mispersuasion was propagated by himself and his family; and that, till the rise and progress and the whole detail of this misfortune was thoroughly examined, it was thought necessary to confine him in the Tower. Cranmer desired the informers, the evidence, and all the furni-

*He is ill  
treated by  
the privy-  
council.*

201.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

ture of legal proof, might be produced; that he might have the liberty of defending himself before the board. For he could not help thinking it hard measure, that a primate of England, and privy-counsellor, whose integrity had never been called in question, should be haled to prison upon bare suspicion; that, by such an ignominious treatment, people would be apt to presume him guilty; and, by this means, he might suffer when the cause came farther on. He alleged several other reasons for gentler usage; but, perceiving argument and entreaties signified nothing, he told them he was sorry to find himself disappointed in his expectations of equity, and that now he was obliged to appeal to the king from those he had so long sat with at the board, and lived with in a friendly correspondence. Having said this, he delivered them the king's ring, acquainting them that, by this sign, their order for his commitment was superseded. When they came with Cranmer before the king, they were smartly reprimanded by his highness. He told them "he was sorry to find his privy council so much wanting in prudence and decency. What could put them upon so foreign a fancy as to shut the archbishop out of the council-chamber, and let him wait in the passage like a valet? He would gladly know whether any of them would be contented to be handled with such disrespect himself?" And then, clapping his hand upon his breast, he swore "he was more obliged to Cranmer than any man living, and that no prince could have better proofs of his integrity; and, therefore, he expected that all those who pretended an affection to him and his service should treat the archbishop with all imaginable regard."

The rest of the board finding they had mistaken their measures, and being awed to silence, the duke of Norfolk replied, "that the board had no design of doing any harm to the archbishop of Canterbury; their meaning, in moving for his commitment, was only to give his innocence the fairer trial; that the process might proceed with a more unexceptionable appearance; and that, after the falsehood of the articles had been fully disproved, he might be discharged with a greater advantage to his reputation." To this the king returned, "I will not suffer Cranmer, nor any person I have a value for, to be thus harassed, and run this risk for clearing their reputation. But I perceive there are some misunderstandings and animosities amongst you, which, unless they are quickly laid down, I

HENRY  
VIII.

shall be forced to interpose and quiet them myself." Upon this, the king went off with an air somewhat disturbed, and the privy council saluted Cranmer with the customary marks of friendship and ceremony. Cranmer, having escaped the snare, passed over the injury without the least resentment; and, from this time forwards, had so great a share in the king's favour, that nothing farther was attempted against him.

Cox and Hussey being dilatory in executing their commission, as hath been observed, the king sent Dr. Lee privately to Canterbury to examine the matter, and make his report of what he could discover, in favour of the archbishop or against him. Lee, consulting with those who wished well to the Reformation, was directed to search the houses of some priests of a contrary persuasion. And here, letters, written by the secretary of Gardiner, the bishop of Winchester, made a discovery. The import of them was to raise the interest of their party upon Cranmer, and bring on a prosecution. The king, perceiving the impeachment of Cranmer to be nothing else but plain concert and disaffection, began to cool in his esteem, and withdraw his fancy from the men of that complexion; and, laying the whole scheme before Cranmer, advised him to take care how he conversed with such people. He would likewise have had Gardiner's letters read in the parliament-house; but Cranmer, not willing to come to an open rupture with the duke of Norfolk and his party, prevailed with the king to conceal them.

*A concert  
discovered  
against him.*

Cranmer's interest being thus established, the prosecution upon the "Six Articles" began to slacken, and those inclined to the Reformation had better usage: for now the archbishop, finding the juncture somewhat favourable, argued against the severity of that sanguinary act in the parliament-house, pressed for a mitigation of the penalty, and that no honest and well-deserving subject might be obnoxious to such extremities, and destroyed merely for acting with a good conscience.

*A mitigation  
of the  
rigour of the  
act of the  
Six Articles.*

And, notwithstanding Cranmer was deserted by the bishops of Worcester, Chichester, and Rochester, who had promised to stand by him and second his motion, yet his reasoning and resolution made such an impression upon the temporal lords and the king, that they agreed to moderate the rigour of the statute. Thus, it was enacted, "that no persons should be committed or molested for any presentment or indictment upon

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the 'Six Articles,' but upon such presentments and indictments as were made by the oaths of twelve men before such commissioners as are mentioned in this act and referred to in another. The prosecution was likewise to be made within a year after the offence was supposed to be done." It was likewise enacted, "that no person should be arrested or committed before indictment, unless in some few cases; and that if any preacher should speak any thing in his sermon or lecture against the statute of the 'Six Articles,' he was to be informed against, or indicted, within forty days, or else discharged from being liable to any prosecution."

35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 5.  
Statutes at  
Large.  
35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 3.  
202.

*The regal  
style for  
Ireland  
enacted.*

By another statute, passed this session, the regal style for Ireland, which the king had lately assumed, was confirmed to the crown.

A loan lent to the king was likewise discharged by act of parliament. In the preamble of the statute it is said, amongst other things, "that the reforming and extinguishing many damnable and dangerous schisms, opinions, and arguments, sprung and risen in the Church of England, and also of Ireland, had been expensive to the crown."

By an act made in the 27th of this reign, it was provided that in all grants of abbey-lands, a tenure by knight's service "in capite," and a rent of the tenth part of the yearly value should be reserved to the crown. But by this parliament the king is empowered to change the tenures of knights' services "in capite" into sockage or free burgage at pleasure; provided the yearly rent of the tenth part was reserved, and the estate granted or sold to the subject did not exceed the value of forty shillings per annum.

*Some abbey  
lands may  
be held in  
sockage.*

35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 14.

The crown was plainly a loser by this act: for knight-service draws marriage, relief, and ward. Besides, by sinking the knight-service in sockage, the cavalry was weakened, and the king less able to defend himself against any revolt or invasion.

*An act for  
reviewing  
the canons.*

The last act I shall mention gave the king an authority to name two-and-thirty persons, sixteen clergy, and sixteen lay, to review the canons. And here it is expressly provided, "that till such time as the king's majesty and the thirty-two persons have accomplished and executed the effects and contents afore rehearsed and mentioned, that such canons, constitutions, and

HENRY  
VIII.

ordinances, synodal or provincial, or other ecclesiastical laws or jurisdictions spiritual as be yet accustomed and used here in the Church of England,—which necessarily and conveniently are requisite to be put in ure and execution for the time, not being repugnant, contrariant, or derogatory to the laws or statutes of the realm, nor to the prerogatives of the regal crown of the same, or any of them,—shall be occupied, exercised, and put in ure for the time, within this or any other the king's majesty's dominions ; and that the ministers and due executors of them shall not incur any damage or danger for the due exercising the foresaid laws ; so that, by no colour or pretence of them, or any of them, the minister put in ure any thing prejudicial or in contrary of the regal power, or laws of the realm, any thing whatsoever to the contrary of this present act notwithstanding."

The beginning of this summer the war with which the Scots were threatened broke out. The king equipped a fleet of two hundred sail, with land-men on board, commanded by the lord Lisle. This admiral debarked ten thousand men at Leith. The town was taken without opposition, and the soldiers found much more plunder than was expected. From hence, after three days, they marched to Edinburgh, where the governor, the cardinal, and many of the nobility, were posted with six thousand horse and a considerable body of foot. However, upon the sight of the English troops, they thought fit to retire. The burghers offered to surrender upon articles for carrying off their effects, and that the English would not burn the town. These conditions were refused by the lord Lisle, and the town taken by storm, sacked, and burnt. However, they found the castle too difficult an undertaking. When they had ravaged the country thereabouts they countermarched to Leith, where, after having destroyed the town and spoiled the haven, they re-embarked. This rough treatment passed upon the Scots for breaking the articles of marriage, and insulting the king's ambassador.

May 4.  
A. D. 1544.  
*Scotland  
harassed by  
the English.*

Godwin,  
Annal.

The earl of Lennox, being disappointed in his expectation of marrying the queen-mother, and meeting with some other mortifications in Scotland, retired to king Henry with the earl of Glencairn's eldest son, and some other persons of quality. The king, by a formal treaty, engaged to support the earl of Lennox

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Godwin.  
Annal.

against the earl of Arran and cardinal Beaton; and gave him the lady Margaret Douglas, his niece, by whom he had issue Henry, lord Darnley, the father of king James I.

July 14.  
*Boulogne*  
taken by  
king Henry.

The king, who was now preparing for an expedition against France, raised the value of money, and embased the coin. Soon after his landing at Calais he besieged Boulogne, which was surrendered after less than two months' siege. Before his entering upon this campaign he ordered a litany, or procession, to be set forth in English. The occasion of this order is said to have proceeded from the wars and divided condition of Christendom.

*A litany in*  
*English.*

Amongst other things, the king, in his letter to the archbishop, takes notice, that the prayers being formerly in an unknown tongue, made the people negligent in coming to church. The archbishop's mandate is dated on the eighth of June. The king, at his going off, had put the administration in the queen's hands. This, as the lord Herbert thinks, was done for a check upon the Roman Catholics: this princess being supposed of a different persuasion. The archbishop of Canterbury, the earl of Hertford—afterwards duke of Somerset, the lord-chancellor Wriothlesley, Thirleby bishop of Westminster, secretary Petre, and the lord Parre of Horton, were commissioned to assist the queen, and direct her councils. About the middle of September the emperor and the French king concluded a peace at Crespie; and the king of England, after a successful campaign, returned home.

Regist.  
Tunstal,  
fol. 40.

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 511.  
October 1.

Sept. 13.  
*The death of*  
*Lee, arch-*  
*bishop of*  
*York.*

This year Edward Lee, archbishop of York, departed this life. He sat thirteen years, and served the king in several embassies. His epitaph speaks very much to his advantage, with respect to learning, conduct, and regularity. He is likewise said to have been acceptable to all sorts of persons, and remarkably kind to the poor. He was succeeded by Robert Holdgate, a monk of the order of Sempringham, and translated thither from Landaff. At his consecration he took the following oath for renouncing the pope: "I, Robert, archbishop of York elect, having now the veil of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction of the see and bishop of Rome clearly taken away from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that neither the see nor the bishop of Rome, nor any foreign potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, or authority, within this realm, neither by God's law, or by any just law or means; although, by suf-

Godwin, de  
Presul.  
Angl.

*The oaths*  
*for re-*  
*nouncing*  
*the pope.*

ference and abusions in times past, they aforesaid have usurped and vindicated a feigned and unlawful power and jurisdiction within this realm, which hath been supported till within these few years past.

HENRY  
VIII.  
203.

“Therefore, because it might be deemed and thought thereby, that I took or take it for just and good, I therefore do now clearly and frankly renounce, forsake, refute, and relinquish that pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction both of the see and bishop of Rome, and all other foreign powers—and that I shall bear faith, truth, and true allegiance to the king’s majesty, and to his heirs and successors declared, or hereafter to be declared, by authority of the act made in the session of the parliament holden at Westminster on the 14th day of January, in the thirty-fifth year, and in the act made in the twenty-eighth year of the king’s majesty’s reign—so help me God, all saints and the holy evangelists.”

Regist.  
Cramer,  
fol. 309.  
Id. fol. 315.  
323.

Kitchen, bishop of Landaff, swore the same oath at his consecration; and so did Farras, of St. David’s, in the next reign.

Nicholas Heath and Bonner, upon their promotion to their respective sees of Rochester and London, took an oath to the same purpose, but with some remarkable distinction. It runs thus:—

“Ye shall swear, that ye shall never consent nor agree that the bishop of Rome shall practise, exercise, or have any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power within this realm of England, or any other the king’s dominions: but that ye shall resist the same at all times, to the utmost of your powers. And that from henceforth ye shall accept, repute, and take the king’s majesty to be the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England. And that to the cunning, wit, and uttermost of your powers, without guile, fraud, or other undue means, ye shall observe, keep, maintain, and defend the whole effects and contents of all and singular acts and statutes, made and to be made within this realm; in derogation, extirpation, and extinguishment of the bishop of Rome and his authority; and all other acts and statutes made and to be made in reformation and corroboration of the king’s power, as supreme head in earth of the Church of England.” &c.

*An oath  
somewhat  
implicit.*

Regist.  
Cramer,  
fol. 259.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

To proceed: the king standing upon ill terms with France and Scotland, and having exhausted himself with the late expeditions, was solicitous about furnishing the exchequer for the public service. For this purpose, the demand of a benevolence was thought most expedient. The Londoners were tried first, and here two of the aldermen, Richard Read and William Roach, were somewhat heavy in complying with the king's occasions. To take off the ill impression of this precedent, Read, an old man, and unpractised in the military profession, was forced to serve in the field against the Scots; where he was taken prisoner, and put to a high ransom. As for Roach, he was informed against for misbehaving himself before the privy council, committed to prison, where he lay several months, and was at last discharged with great difficulty; and, as some say, obliged to part with a sum of money for his liberty.

Godwin,  
Annal.

This summer the French, to revenge the disgrace of the last campaign, and recover Boulogne, blocked up that town, prepared a great fleet, and threatened England with a descent: but these preparations were disappointed, and signified little. And as the English stood upon the defensive in the south, so they made an offensive war in the north of the island. The forces commanded by Ralph lord Evers, and sir Brion Laiton, burnt Jedborough and Kelso, and harassed the neighbouring country: and finding the governor retired with his forces, they marched farther into the country, and continued their depredations until they fell into an ambuscade, and were defeated at Aneram.

*The French miscarry in their attempt upon the English coast.*

Id.

Ld. Herbert.

This year the king made some farther advances in the reformation, as appears by his letter to the archbishop of Canterbury: it relates to several superstitious and unwarrantable customs, touching vigils, and creeping to the cross. I shall give it the reader in the king's own words:—

*The king's letter to archbishop Cranmer, to forbid creeping to the cross, &c. Jan. 24, 1545.*

“ Forasmuch as you, as well in your own name, and in the name of the bishops of Worcester and Chichester, and other our chaplains and learned men, whom we appointed with you to peruse certain books of service, which we delivered unto you; moved us that the vigil, and ringing of bells all the night long upon Allhallow-day at night, and the covering of images in the churches in the time of Lent; with the lifting up of the



veil that covereth the cross upon Palm Sunday, with the kneeling to the cross the same time, might be abolished and put away for the superstition, and other enormities and abuses of the same. First. Forasmuch as all the vigils of our Lady and the apostles, and all other vigils, which in the beginning of the Church were godly used; yet for the manifold superstition and abuses which afterwards did grow by means of the same, they be many years past taken away, throughout all Christendom; and there remaineth nothing but the name of vigil in the calendar; the thing clearly abolished and put away, saving only upon Allhallow-day at night, upon which night is kept vigil; watching and ringing of bells all night long. Forasmuch as that vigil is abused, as other vigils were; our pleasure is as you require, that the said vigil shall be abolished as the others be, and that there shall be no watching or ringing but as be commonly used upon other holydays at night. We be contented and pleased, also, that the images in the churches shall not be covered as hath been accustomed in times past, nor no veil upon the cross, nor kneeling thereto upon Palm Sunday, nor any other time. And forasmuch as you make no mention of creeping to the cross, which is a greater abuse than any other; for there you say, ‘Crucem tuam adoramus Domine,’ and the ordinal saith, ‘procedant clerici ad crucem adorandam nudis pedibus,’ and after followeth, in the same ordinal, ‘ponatur crux ante aliquod altare, ubi a populo adoretur;’ which, by your own book, called ‘A Necessary Doctrine,’ is against the second commandment. Therefore our pleasure is, that the said creeping to the cross shall likewise cease from henceforth, and be abolished, with other the abuses before rehearsed: and this we will and straitly command you to signify to all the prelates and bishops of your province of Canterbury; charging them in our name to see the same executed, every one in his diocese accordingly.”

HENRY  
VIII.

A. D. 1545.

204.

To make this order practicable, and rightly understood by the people, the archbishop suggested what he thought necessary upon this occasion. I shall give the reader part of his letter to the king.

“Nevertheless in myn opinion, when such things be altered or taken away, there should be set forth some doctrine

Paper-officc.  
The arch-  
bishop's  
answer.  
Jan. 24,  
1524.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

therewith which should declare the cause of the abolishings or alterations, for to satisfy the consciences of your people: for if the honouring of the crosse, as creeping and kneeling thereto, be taken away, it shall seem to many that be ignorant, that the honour of Christ is taken away, unless some good teaching be set forth withal to instruct them sufficiently therein; which, if your majesty command the bishops of Worcester and Chichester, with other your grace's other chaplains to make, the people shall obey your majesty's commandment willingly, giving thanks to your majesty if they know the truth, which else they would obey with murmurations and grudgings. And it shall be a satisfaction to all other nations, when they shall see your majesty do nothing but by the authority of God's word, and to the setting forth of God's honour, and not the diminishing thereof. And thus," &c.

The archbishop added a postscript to his letter, in which he acquaints the king, "how the dean and chapter of Canterbury were forced upon the alienation of their lands. That all this ravage was made under colour of his highness's commands; but that he was sure other men, and not his majesty, had gotten their best lands. He begs, therefore, that when his majesty shall please to take some of their estates, they may have a letter from his highness to be assured the motion comes from their sovereign: that without such notice, the dean and chapter may be sworn not to make any alienation. For as the case stands now, everybody that hath a mind to their lands, moves first they may be conveyed to your majesty, not that those estates should be lodged in the crown, but granted away from your grace's cathedral to themselves."

This letter, amongst other proofs, shows the disposition of too many people, what scrambling there was for the Church estates, and how much the loaves of the reformation were valued above the doctrine.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2.  
Records,  
p. 237.  
*He draws  
an extract  
out of the  
canon law.*

The bishop of Winchester being sent on an embassy to the emperor, archbishop Cranmer seized the opportunity, and endeavoured to go forward with the reformation. He was sensible the canon law, which governed the spiritual courts, wanted a review. The supremacy of the Roman see, the pope's power to absolve subjects from their allegiance, the infallibility of his decrees, his superiority over general councils, and several

other indefensible pretensions were maintained, and extravagantly overflourished in Gratian's "Decretum," and other collections of that kind. And of this Cranmer had some pains to inform himself, and extracted several passages out of the canon law.

HENRY  
VIII.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2.  
Records,  
p. 257.

To ripen the matter, and bring the design to execution, the archbishop prevailed with the king to pass the act, by which his majesty was empowered to name two-and-thirty persons to examine the canons, and give them what new form they thought fit. The act passed, as hath already been observed, the persons were nominated, the scheme drawn out, and the business brought to a conclusion. Cranmer waited on the king at Hampton Court, acquainted him the draught was finished, and wanted only his highness's authority to make it law. By the way, the conduct of this affair, and the nomination of the persons, were mostly referred to Cranmer. In short, an instrument in the form of letters-patent was drawn up for the king to sign. But it seems his highness received advice from the bishop of Winchester, that in case the king proceeded to any innovation of this kind, the league now concerting with the emperor would miscarry. And thus it is probable, for reasons of state, the king refused the signing the instrument: however, that the reader may be acquainted with the contents, I shall insert it in the Records. And to mention a word or two of it here, the instrument sets forth, "That the supremacy due to him and his ancestors, and usurped for several ages by the bishop of Rome, had been recognised by all the states of the realm: that it was one branch of the office of a prince to superintend religion, to maintain the Catholic faith, and promote the honour of God Almighty: that he had been very solicitous to discharge this part of his duty, and to remove those customs which were unserviceable to the Christian Church: that since the bishop of Rome had adulterated the ancient belief, embroiled the public, and made an invasion upon the royal prerogative, he thought it necessary to annul his regulations, and discharge all his laws and constitutions; and that he thought this a serviceable expedient to prevent a revival of his authority. And that the English Church might not suffer for want of rules and stated measures for discipline and government, he had furnished them with this book in the room of the canon law, and requires all his subjects, both in

*A draught  
of the book,  
entitled  
"Reformatio  
Legum  
Ecclesiasticarum."*

See Records,  
num. 50.  
Ed. Herbert,  
p. 529.  
*The king's  
letters-  
patent to  
pass it into  
law.*

*This instru-  
ment not  
signed.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

schools, colleges, and spiritual courts, to act pursuant to the orders prescribed in it.

The mentioning of abbots in the letters-patent is no mark of forgery; for notwithstanding the monasteries were dissolved, the bishop of Norwich, not to mention any others, had the style of abbot. This matter was dropped till the next reign, when it was revived at the archbishop's suggestion; and till that time I shall mention it no farther.

About this time, several persons were prosecuted in Scotland for reading the New Testament in English. Cardinal Beaton, who was then at the head of both Church and State, seems to have been a person of a rugged disposition, and would make no allowance for latitude of persuasion. This prelate being informed that Mr. George Wishart had preached against the received doctrines, endeavoured to apprehend him. This Wishart was a gentleman of the house of Pittarrow in Mernis. Archbishop Spotswood gives him the character of a person of learning, elocution, and exemplary life. He had studied for some time in the university of Cambridge, and returned home with a design to propagate his improvement: he preached publicly against some popish doctrines at Dundee and Montrose, made proselytes and drew a great audience after him. Being discouraged at Dundee by one of the principal burghers, he quitted the place, and presaged the misfortune of the inhabitants: from hence he went to Glasgow, where he was in danger of being seized by the archbishop, but was protected by Alexander, earl of Glencairn, who offered him the cathedral pulpit; but Wishart declined putting such a hardship upon the archbishop, and chose rather to preach at the market-cross. Hearing the town of Dundee was afflicted with a great mortality, he returned thither, preached to the occasion, and endeavoured to support them under the calamity.

When the plague went off, he prepared for his journey to Edinburgh. Here he had promised to meet some gentlemen of the west, and offered the clergy a conference. He preached in his way at Leith and Haddington, and from thence went to Ormeston, where he was apprehended at the laird's house: the governor having sent a party of horse to seize him. The laird at first refused to deliver him, hoping by gaining time he might make his escape. But upon earl Bothwell's giving his promise, his life should be safe, and that it should not be in the cardinal's

205.

*Wishart's  
preaching  
and trial.*

power to do him any injury, Wishart desired the laird to open the gate, upon which the earl renewed his parole of honour for his security. But at the queen-mother's and the cardinal's instance, this lord parted with him: he was first conveyed to the castle of Edinburgh, and afterwards to St. Andrew's.

HENRY  
VIII.

Spotswood.

He was now in the cardinal's hands, who pressed for his trial, and summoned the bishops to meet him at St. Andrew's.

The archbishop of Glasgow advised an application to the governor, to commissionate some laymen of quality to sit with them upon the bench, and countenance the process. The governor refused the motion, and advised the delaying the trial till he came thither, telling the cardinal withal, that in case he precipitated matters, and proceeded to extremity, Wishart's blood should be laid to his charge. The cardinal foreseeing dilatory methods were likely to work the prisoner's escape, replied with some warmth, that the reason of his writing to the governor, was not for want of his authority, but only that he was willing to have the State's concurrence with the discipline of the Church: but since that was refused, he should act as he thought convenient.

Upon this, Wishart was served with a citation to appear the next day, and answer to the charge of sedition and heresy. Wishart being their prisoner, took this form for a jest, since it was in their power to bring him before them when they pleased.

The next day the cardinal and prelates met in the abbey-church, where the prisoner was brought by the captain of the castle. John Windram, the sub-prior, a man of learning, and inclined to the reformation, was ordered to preach. He preached upon the thirteenth of St. Matthew, concerning the "sower." He interpreted the ill seed to heresy, which he defined an "erroneous opinion directly repugnant to the word of God, and pertinaciously defended." From hence proceeding to mention some things which gave rise to heresy, he said, "the ignorance and negligence of those who had the cure of souls, was the principal cause." And after laying down some rules for the discovery of heresy, he said, "that as the touchstone was made use of, for distinguishing gold from counterfeit metal, so the word of God, was the proper test for the trial of heresy." He concluded his discourse with saying,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“that heretics might be lawfully put to death by the magistrate.”

After sermon, the articles against Wishart were read. Before he returned any answer, he desired he might be permitted the repeating the doctrine he had taught since he came into Scotland. And here he told them he advanced nothing but what was comprehended within the compass of the Decalogue, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's-Prayer. From hence he went on to represent the manner of his preaching; but this being thought foreign to the business, he was treated with ill language, and ordered to answer directly to the charge.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 617.

The articles are eighteen, and too long to transcribe. In the ninth article, he is charged with affirming, that every layman is a priest. This opinion he is so unhappy as to defend, and misconstrues the text in the Revelations, and St. Peter's first epistle, where Christians are called “a royal priesthood,” and our Saviour is said to have “made us kings and priests.”

Revelations.  
1 Pet. ii.  
*He is not  
orthodox  
throughout.*

The tenth article objects his denying the liberty of the will. To this his answer, though not altogether erroneous, is crude, to speak softly, and not well expressed.

1 Tim. iv.  
3, 4.

In the eleventh article, he is accused with maintaining, that it is as lawful to eat flesh on Friday as on Sunday. Here he confesses the charge, and misinterprets St. Paul, to support his opinion. As to the other articles, he either denied them, or made good his tenets. But foreseeing the issue, he offered to appeal from the court to more indifferent judges. He desired to be tried by the Holy Scriptures, and that some of the temporality might sit upon the bench, “because,” says he, “I am my lord governor's prisoner.” This appeal being looked on as altogether irregular and unprecedented, he was pronounced a heretic, and had judgment to be burnt the next day.

Spotswood,  
p. 80.

Next morning the bishops sent two friars to acquaint him he must die, and to ask him, if he was disposed for confession. He told them, “he had no business with friars: but if they were inclined to gratify him, he desired he might speak with the learned person that preached the day before.” This being granted, the sub-prior came, and discoursed with him a good while. And at last, he asked Wishart, “If he would receive the holy eucharist;” he answered, “Most willingly, provided he might have it administered under both kinds, pursuant to

our Saviour's institution. Upon this the sub-prior went to the bishops, spoke favourably of the prisoner, and desired to know if his request might be granted. The cardinal demurred to the question : and after having debated the matter with the rest of the bishops, answered in all their names, " that it was not reasonable an obstinate heretic, judicially condemned, should partake of any spiritual benefit." It is not said what Wishart replied, when the message was brought of his being denied the sacrament ; but the captain of the castle going then to breakfast, asked the prisoner to eat with him. He accepted the civility, and desired the captain, with great solemnity of expression, to be silent a little till he had made a short exhortation, and blessed the bread : he discoursed about half an hour upon our Saviour's passion, and the institution of the Lord's Supper, exhorting the company to live answerably to the Christian religion. Then giving thanks, he broke the bread and gave every one a piece : and having tasted the wine, he put the cup into their hands, exhorting them to a thankful remembrance of our Saviour's death, in this his communion with them. Then desiring the prayers of the company, he concluded with another thanksgiving, and retired to his chamber.

HENRY  
VIII.

206.

*He consecrates the holy eucharist.*

He was carried to the place of execution with a guard, and had bags of gunpowder hung about him. When he came to the stake, he desired the people not to be discouraged from hearing God's word, by his sufferings. It seems he had been charged with the Arabian heresy<sup>1</sup>, and that the soul slept till the day of judgment. This heterodoxy, he said, " was a calumny upon him, and that he was assured his soul should be immediately with his Saviour." In short, he suffered with great resignation and fortitude. And when the captain of the castle spoke friendly to him, and bid him recommend himself to God, he replied in these words : " This flame has scorched my body, yet hath it not daunted my spirit : but he (meaning the cardinal) who from yonder high place beholds us with such pride, shall within few days, lie in the same as ignominiously, as now he is seen proudly to rest himself."

*And suffers with resolution.*

Id. p. 62.

To say something of this gentleman by way of character : he appears to have been a person of an exemplary life : and that nothing but impulse of conscience, regard for truth, and

*Remarks on some part of his behaviour.*

<sup>1</sup> The heresy of the Arabici in the third century. They asserted that the soul is material, and were refuted by Origen.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Heb. v. 4.

charity to his countrymen, put him upon preaching, and made him clash with some of the established opinions. His opposition to the clergy does not seem to have been governed by secular views. His design, as far as may be guessed by his practice, was to recover the people from error, and put them in a safer way to eternal happiness. Notwithstanding this, he was not without a mixture of mistake and disadvantage: for not to mention his preaching without a canonical authority, his consecrating the eucharist, and exercising the most solemn part of the sacerdotal function, looks wholly indefensible. He is charged with usurping the priest's office without authority: he does not deny the fact, but excuseth himself by an erroneous opinion, maintaining, that all Christians are priests, and that by consequence there is no distinction between laity and clergy. This principle is both repugnant to Holy Scripture, and destructive of all spiritual society. For as the State cannot subsist, if every man should meddle with the government, and pretend a right to make himself a magistrate; so neither can the Church go on where the privileges of the hierarchy are invaded and made common. The bishops and priests are spiritual magistrates, and unless their privileges are guarded, and their powers unencroached on, the body will be dissolved of course, and every thing fall into confusion: for without distinction between the governors and governed, the being of any society is impracticable. Farther, Wishart pretended to the gift of prophecy, but worked no miracles to prove his claim, either to that distinction, or the office of the priesthood. Besides, his predicting the cardinal's death at his execution, and giving hard language, is not altogether intelligible; and whether this prediction did not occasion the cardinal's murder, may bear a question. Now, how far purity of intention, the spirit of martyrdom, and resigning to death and torture for conscience sake, which seems to have been Wishart's case,—how far these may atone for human frailties, and breaking through the discipline of the Church, I shall not take upon me to determine; but from the mercies of God, we have reason to hope the best. But then no fervency of devotion, no advantage of character, ought to justify an error, or set up miscarriage for a precedent. On the other side, the prosecuting this person to the stake, was an instance of an excessive and unwarrantable rigour, which was looked on as a barbarity, even in a heathen magistracy:



and how these sanguinary methods were disliked by the ancient Church, I have shewn in the first part of this work.

To come back to England. The last year, as hath been observed, the king ordered the translating the Litany into English: he had since, it seems, given some farther instructions to Cranmer about that matter, as appears by the archbishop's letter, which runs thus:

HENRY  
VIII.

{  
Ch. Hist.  
p. 356. 617.

“It may please your majesty to be advertised, that according unto your highness's commandment sent unto me by your grace's secretary, Mr. Paget, I have translated into the English tongue, so well as I could, in so short a time, certain processions to be used upon festival days; if after due correction and amendment of the same, your highness shall think it so convenient. In which translation, forasmuch as many of the processions in the Latin were but barren, (as me seemed) and little fruitful, I was constrained to use more than the liberty of a translator: for in some processions, I have altered divers words, in some I have added part, in some taken part away: some I have left out whole, either for because the matter appeared to me to be little to purpose, or because the days be not with us festival days. And some processions I have added whole, because I thought I had better matter for this purpose, than was the procession in Latin; the judgment whereof I refer wholly to your majesty. And after your highness has corrected it, if your grace commands some devout and solemn note to be made thereunto (as is to the procession which your majesty has already set forth in English) I trust it will much excite and stir the hearts of all men to devotion and godliness. But in my opinion, the song that shall be made thereunto, should not be full of notes, but as near as may be, for every syllable a note, so that it may be sung distinctly and devoutly, as in the Matins, and Even-Song, Venite; the hymns Te Deum, Benedictus, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, and all the psalms and versicles: and in the mass, Gloria in Excelsis, Gloria Patri, the Credo, the Perficte, the Pater Noster, and some of the Sanctus and Agnus. As concerning the Salve Festa Dies, the Latin note, as I think, is sober and distinct enough. Wherefore I have travelled to make the verses in English, and have put the Latin note unto the same. Nevertheless, those that be cunning in singing, can make a much

*Cranmer's  
translation  
of the Li-  
tany for a  
procession.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

207.

*The sentence  
is the mean-  
ing in the  
archbishop's  
language.  
Paper-office.*

more solemn note thereto. I made them only for a proof, to see how English would do in a song. But because my English verses want the grace and faculty which I could wish they had, your majesty may cause some other to do them again, that can do the same in more pleasant English and phrase. As for the sentence, I suppose that will serve well enough. Thus Almighty God preserve your majesty in long and prosperous health and felicity.

“Your Grace’s

“Most bounden chaplain and beadsman,

“From *Bechesburn*,

“Oct. 7, 1545.

“THO. CANT.”

*Chantries,  
colleges, &c.  
granted to  
the king.*

In November, this year, the king’s last parliament sat: the business of calling the lords and commons together, was the raising of money. The lord Herbert thinks, the king’s necessities were very pressing, otherwise they would not have been supplied by so extraordinary an expedient: for now colleges, free chapels, chantries, hospitals, fraternities, guilds, and the maintenance for stipendiary priests, with all their manors and other estates, were sacrificed to the crown, and dissolved. Thus these foundations, which were made for the benefit of learning, for the relief of the poor, and the service of those who were deceased, which were strengthened with the privilege of corporations, and intended for perpetuity, lost the lastingness of their settlement, and lay all at the king’s mercy. The great expenses of the wars with France and Scotland were alleged as motives to this bill. The mismanagement of the governors of the colleges, &c. was likewise insisted on: the act sets forth, that the revenues of the colleges, hospitals, chantries, &c. were misemployed, and that the giving them to the crown, was the way to make them serviceable to the uses for which they were intended. These endowments being thus put into the king’s hands, were to be in the order and survey of the court of

37 Henry 8. augmentation.  
cap. 4.

Now without great submission to the wisdom of the legislature, some people would almost be at a loss upon this occasion: for when purgatory, though somewhat refined, was the national belief, as it was all the time of king Henry VIII.: when prayer for the dead was reckoned a significant service: when this prince left money in his will to pray for his soul: when this was the general persuasion, it is somewhat surprising,

that chantry-lands should be taken away. The chantry-lands, I say, which were given for the benefit of the dead, and settled, as it were, upon the other world. But some people were resolved to venture the condition of their ancestors, and leave them to shift as well as they could: and as popes have often taken money to let souls out of purgatory, so the king took land, one would almost think, to keep them in.

HENRY  
VIII.

That this prince believed purgatory—that is, that departed souls were capable of receiving benefit from the prayers and charities of the living—appears farther, from his answer to bishop Latimer upon this argument.

The bishop amongst other things, urged this text, “In the place where the tree falls, there shall it be.” To this the king replied in these words: Eccles. xi. 3.

“This text in itself, speaking but of a stick, doth not deny purgatory, nor the example of a dead stick can well, without great forcing, be attributed to a soul repentant, not yet having his full judgment. And if you will turn it to a lively stick, then it seemeth me, that it will make much against your purpose: for a lively stick, may chance with falling, to grow, though not suddenly, and so come to perfection of its fruit. So may the soul of man (by this example) departing hence to purgatory in right faith, grow there towards his perfection, abiding the day of judgment.”

Upon the bishop's urging the text, “Beati quorum, Blessed is he whose unrighteousness is forgiven, and whose sin is covered.” To this the king answers with somewhat of emotion and surprise. “Jesus! how do you descant on this psalm, and also on St. Austin! you would make folk believe, that this was meant against purgatory, when the very text declares nothing but the beatitude and happiness of them that have their sins hid and forgiven. Herein do you show your carnal wit, which in preaching you dispraise so much.” Psal. xxxii.

This parliament there was an act for punishing those who took above ten in the hundred interest for money lent. There was likewise an act for settling the tithes in London, in proportion to the rent of the houses. Biblioth. Cotton. Cleop. 5. fol. 132. 37 Henry 8. cap. 12.

By another act, threescore and ten manors are assured to the crown belonging to the archbishopric of York. The act Seventy manors alienated

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
from the  
archbishop  
of York.

mentions archbishop Holgate had sold and conveyed all these manors to the king the year before. It is said Holgate had several lands, tenements, and other hereditaments, in exchange, but not so much as one manor is mentioned. It is observed, the Church in this reign, the next, and queen Elizabeth's, made generally ill bargains with the crown, and bartered at Glaucus's disadvantage<sup>1</sup>. But then as these princes bought very cheap of the prelates, they sold with the same frankness to their favourites.

37 Hen. 8.  
cap. 16.  
And several  
from the  
sees of Can-  
terbury and  
London.

By this statute it appears, Cranmer had conveyed about a dozen manors and parks to the crown, which sales are now confirmed. "Bonner, bishop of London, had likewise sold, given, and granted to the king, the manors of Chelmsford and Craundon, with the park of Craundon, with all their appurtenances. This manor and park of Craundon, the king had granted to sir William Peters. The king's title and sir William's, are secured by this statute. Farther; doctors of civil law, whether married or unmarried, are enabled to exercise all manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all censures and coercion appertaining, or any way belonging to the same."

The king's  
ecclesiastical  
authority  
mentioned  
in compre-  
hensive  
terms.

This statute sets forth, "that archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from his royal majesty. And that his majesty is the only undoubted supreme head of the Church of England and of Ireland, to whom, by holy Scripture, all authority and power is wholly given, to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct vice and sin whatsoever, and to all such persons as his majesty shall appoint thereunto."

37 Henry 8.  
cap. 17.

Lastly, a bill passed "for the union of two churches not above a mile distant, provided the yearly value did not exceed six pounds in the king's books." But here there is a proviso, that no union or consolidation should be made in any city or town corporate, without the consent of the mayor, sheriffs, and commonalty.

37 Hen. 8.  
cap. 21.  
Dec. 24.  
A. D. 1545.  
208.

At the prorogation of the parliament, the speaker of the house of Commons made a speech to the king, to which the king returned an answer: now this being his last speech and his last parliament, and over and above remarkable for the matter, I shall give the reader part of the substance of it.

<sup>1</sup> Glauci et Diomedis permutatio.

“The king commends the speaker for his elocution, and for the panegyric he had run upon his highness; letting him know, that he did not apply those good qualities to himself, but looked on them only as suggestions to endeavour and improvement. From hence his highness proceeds to acquaint the parliament how kindly he took the confidence they treated him with, and the trust they reposed in him, by granting him the chantries, &c. and referring all those endowments to his disposal. Here he promises to spend the revenues according to the design of the settlement, and that neither learning, the Church, nor the poor, should receive any damage. And that unless he managed in this manner, he should no ways answer the expectations of the public, nor the character of a Christian prince.”

HENRY  
VIII.  
*The king's  
last speech to  
his parliament.*

Ed. Herbert,  
p. 534.

“Here was a solemn engagement,” says bishop Godwin, “*cæterum promissorum fidem nondum exsolutam videmus*. The event did not come up to the promise.”

Godwin,  
Annal. ad  
An. 1545.

To return to the king's speech: he lets them know “the treasure they had supplied him with should always be ready for the defence of the kingdom, and his person ventured, when occasion required: and, after having returned them thanks for giving such proofs of their affection to his service, he recommends friendship and good correspondence with each other. He puts them in mind how sensible he is of the misunderstandings and animosities amongst them; and that there is scarcely any such thing as good humour and general kindness to be met with. St. Paul tells us, ‘Charity is kind, charity envies not, charity vaunts not itself, is not puffed up,’ and so on; but what signs of charity,” says the king, “are these, when one calls another heretic and anabaptist, and the other returns the language of papist and hypocrite? This want of a benevolent disposition will hinder us from acting with that union and heartiness which is required. The occasion of these animosities is partly to be charged upon you who are the spiritual guides and fathers of the Church: for, if I know a man who lives in adultery, I must conclude him a libertine and a debauchee; if I see a man brag of any advantage, I cannot help thinking him tinctured with pride. I am every day informed that you of the clergy are declaiming against each other in the pulpit. And here your charity and discretion is quite lost in vehemence and satire:

1 Cor. xiii.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

some are too stiff in their old ‘mumpsimus,’ and others too busy and curious in their new ‘sumpsimus.’ Thus the pulpits are, as it were, batteries against each other: the noise is hostile and ruinous, and few preachers are qualified with that benign temper expected from their character. Can I suppose you governed by principles of charity while you manage thus? That is impossible. Alas! how can we expect the poor people should live friendly with their neighbours, when they have such unhappy precedents of discord and dissension in those that teach them? They expect light from your instruction, and you throw nothing out but smoke and darkness. I desire this misconduct may be rectified, and that both in precept and example you may answer to your office: otherwise I shall be obliged to correct this misbehaviour, and put an end to these divisions in a more unacceptable way: which, if I should neglect to do, I should fail in the discharge of my commission, and prove false to that trust which God has pleased to put in my hands.

“ And though the spirituality are in some fault for breaking into parties, and living upon ill terms with those of their own business, yet you of the temporality do not stand clear of envy and ill nature: for you rail on the bishops, defame and misreport the priests, and treat the preacher with contumely and ill language. Now, is not all this a breach of good behaviour, a contradiction to decency, and a trespass upon order and government? If you find a bishop or any other preacher mislead his audience, inform against him to us or any of our council,—to us, to whom God has delegated the authority to reform such disorders; and do not set up yourselves for judges of controversy, nor lay so much stress upon your vain expositions and fantastical opinions. In such sublime matters you may easily mistake. It is true you are allowed to read the Holy Scriptures, and to have the Word of God in your mother-tongue; but then this permission is only designed for private information, and the instruction of your children and family. It was never intended for mooting and dispute, nor to furnish you with reprimanding phrases and expressions of reproach against priests and preachers: and yet this is the use a great many disorderly people make of the privilege of having the Scriptures. I am extremely sorry to find how much the Word of God is abused, with how little reverence it is mentioned, both with respect to place and occasion; how people squabble about the

sense; how it is turned into wretched rhyme, sung and jangled in every alehouse and tavern: and all this in a false construction and counter-meaning to the inspired writers. I am sorry to perceive the readers of the Bible discover so little of it in their practice: for I am sure charity was never in a more languishing condition, virtue never at a lower ebb, nor God never less honoured and worse served, in Christendom. I must therefore recommend to you the same duty I mentioned first. As Christianity makes you brothers, answer that relation to each other. Let the majesty and goodness of God make a suitable impression upon your minds; and then I do not question but that affection and good correspondence, of which I reminded you before, will always continue between you and your sovereign."

HENRY  
VIII.Ed. Herbert,  
p. 534. et  
deince.

And thus, after having pressed the execution of the laws, the king signed the bills, and the session ended.

The universities were much alarmed, as they had reason, to find their foundations in such a precarious condition, and lying wholly at the disposal of the crown. Cambridge was the first which addressed the king for his favour. They begged his protection of their estates: and that they might not be made a prey to ignorance and avarice. Oxford was likewise not long behind in their application. Dr. Cox, the prince's preceptor, wrote to Secretary Paget to the same purpose. He acquainted this minister how much the kingdom was unfurnished with schools and preachers, with houses, and maintenance for orphans. And since the chantries, &c. were granted to the king, he requested a competent provision might be made for the clergy, for fear poverty should drive them upon flattery, and the old superstition. "I do not mention this," says he, "as if I questioned the king's goodness, but because there are so many hungry, rapacious wolves that are ready to swallow chantries, cathedral churches, universities, and a thousand times as much, if it lay in their way." Adding in the close that "posterity will be amazed at us." From hence, it appears, the young prince was in the hands of no ill instructor.

209.

*The universities address the king to preserve their estates, and succeed in their application.*

The universities succeeded in their address, and were quickly put out of their pain, as appears by their letter of thanks to the king, for preserving them in their former condition. However, two of the professions were in danger of being re-

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

moved, the king once having thoughts of placing all the civilians in one college, and the physicians and surgeons in another. But this resolve was dropped: and as to the king's inclination, he was so far from lessening those famous seminaries of piety and learning, that he rather promoted their interest. However people beyond sea were not a little surprised at the parliament's putting these celebrated societies in such circumstances of hazard. For beside the great usefulness of these bodies, their revenues could not be alienated or turned to a foreign use without great disregard, to say nothing more, to their founders: to their founders, who settled their estates for the service of God, for public ornament and education. And, to prevent invasion, laid heavy curses upon those who should defeat the settlement, and disappoint the design of the donation.

Id. p. 537.

Cardinal  
Beaton  
assassinated,  
May 29th,  
A. D. 1546.

The beginning of the next year there was an attempt concerted by five or six Scotch gentlemen against the life of cardinal Beaton. The haughtiness and rigorous temper of this prelate made him generally unbeloved: besides, the conspirators thought themselves particularly injured by him. In short, they entered the castle by surprise, knocked early in the morning at the cardinal's chamber, and demanded entrance. The cardinal perceiving there was no appearance of friendship or respect, refused to admit them: but upon their calling for fire, and threatening to burn him in his lodgings, he began to treat: and after they had given him a promise to do his person no harm, he opened the door. And now the opportunity presenting, they broke through honour and articles, rushed in with their swords drawn, and barbarously murdered him.

Spotswood,  
p. 83.  
Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 621.

Fox says, "These gentlemen were stirred up by the Lord to murder this archbishop in his bed." Does the Lord, then, stir up men to wrest the sword out of the magistrate's hand, and execute their private revenge in blood and slaughter? Is breach of faith and stabbing a nobleman in his bed an argument of heavenly impulse? Did these men work any miracles in proof of their commission to take away the cardinal's life, and dispense with the sixth commandment: Nothing of this kind is pretended: Fox calls it murder, and yet says they were stirred up by the Lord. This is strange to astonishment! To what extremes of distraction are people sometimes hurried by prejudice and passion! Archbishop Spotswood, though he

A horrible  
assertion in  
Fox.



disliked the cardinal's practice, though he represents him of unbounded ambition, and barbarously cruel in his prosecution of what was called heresy, yet he condemns the fact, and reports that few of the assassins escaped an extraordinary judgment. However, some people disaffected to the cardinal, were so unaccountable as to commend the action, and offered to join the conspirators, but the bigotry of these men is justly censured by the historian.

HENRY  
VIII.

Spotswood.

On the other side, the religious and clergy declaimed against the murder with all the circumstances of aggravation, and painted it in the blackest colour imaginable. The bishops applied to the governor for justice without delay. Upon this the assassins were summoned to appear in court, and abide their trial; they taking no notice of the order, were declared rebels. The ecclesiastical judges, who were not backward in doing their part, solemnly excommunicated the murderers, and all that should entertain or support them.

The governor, in the mean time, nominated John Hamilton, his natural brother, to the archbishopric of St. Andrew's: the election was passed by the canons, and confirmed by pope Paul III. This was no juncture to object the illegitimacy of the gentleman's birth. The court of Rome were willing to oblige the governor for fear of a defection from their see. Thus the bulls were expedited: and both the governor and the archbishop pressed to exert their zeal in prosecuting the murder, and revenging the contempt of religion.

And now the castle was besieged from August to January, but with little success: for the passage by sea being open, and the garrison declaring for king Henry, they were constantly supplied with provisions from England. Before I proceed farther, it will be necessary to observe, that upon the news of the cardinal's death, the assassins were reinforced with about seven score gentlemen and others, who entered the castle the day after the murder: one John Rough, who had been the governor's chaplain, came to them, and preached to the garrison.

*The conspirators fortify the castle, and stand on their defence.*

The governor being apprehensive their correspondence with England might draw ill consequences, was prevailed with to offer them terms. The besieged closed with the overture, and capitulated upon the following articles:—

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“ First. That the governor should procure their absolution from the pope: and that, until the instrument was returned, hostilities should cease, and the garrison continue in the castle.

“ Secondly. That themselves and their abettors should be pardoned in form by the governor: and enjoy all their rights and privileges, of which they were possessed before the murder was committed.

“ Thirdly. That the besieged should give hostages for evacuating the castle as soon as they received their absolution from Rome.”

210.

1d.

Thus the governor stooped to the rebels, and agreed to conditions of disadvantage. But it seems neither side were very sincere: the governor and the queen-dowager sent to France for a squadron of men-of-war to batter the castle, and block up the haven. On the other side, the besieged kept on their engagements with king Henry.

*Knox, his  
going to  
them not  
defensible.*

After the conditions were signed, and the siege raised, John Knox came into the castle, and preached among them: this looked like countenancing the murder, and abetting their defiance of the government. Spotswood strains to fetch off John Knox, and vindicate his memory: but after all, he confesseth his practice was scarce allowable, and that he had been wiser in keeping away. However, his not going in with them at the murder, nor coming until the government had given them articles, were circumstances of extenuation: thus, though he cannot blanch the liberty, nor make the blemish disappear, he gives it a somewhat better complexion. Now, besides the assassinating the cardinal, these men, by corresponding with king Henry. were no better than rebels in form. Knox, therefore, would have done well to have laid open their crime, pressed them to repentance, and to break off their criminal engagements. But notwithstanding he preached stoutly against popery, I cannot find but he was silent upon the other argument.

The capitulation being signed, and the governor retired, John Rough preached boldly at St. Andrew's against the received doctrines, and was much frequented. John Anand, the dean, undertaking this preacher, Knox interposed, and

offered to maintain his discourse : particularly that the present Church of Rome was farther degenerated from apostolic purity, than the Jewish synagogue was from the Mosaic institution, when they consented to the death of our Saviour.

HENRY  
VIII.

Knox being called on to make good his assertion, preached in the parish church the next Sunday : he took his text out of the seventh of Daniel. From these words, and the rest of the chapter, he took occasion to discourse of the beast which was to rise upon the destruction of the Roman empire. This

Verse 24,  
25.

beast, he said, was the Church of Rome : that all the marks assigned by Daniel belonged to that see, and to no other society whatever. From hence he went on to discourse concerning Antichrist : that under this denomination we were not to understand a single person, but a collective body with a wicked head. He was very positive in applying the description of Antichrist to the Church of Rome, and charged them with opposition both in life and doctrine to our blessed Saviour. He fancied the first branch was proved by the immorality of the popes and clergy. The second, consisting of contrariety of doctrine, he endeavoured to make good by comparing their clashing with the Scriptures in the article of justification, and laying too much stress upon the condition of works. Farther, he maintained a contrariety in the laws and constitution of the Roman communion, to those of our Saviour. He makes his instances in the observation of holydays, forbearing flesh in Lent, and forbidding marriage to the clergy. At last he came to the marks of the beast, one of which was, " He shall speak great words against the Most High : " this note of Antichrist he thought was verified upon the Church of Rome, in the pompous and superlative titles given to the pope : such as vicar of Christ, successor of Peter, head of the universal Church, most holy, most blessed, infallible, &c. He made, likewise, the business of pardons and indulgences, and saying masses for the relief of souls in purgatory, another mark of Antichrist.

*Knox goes too far in his sermon against the Church of Rome.*

Spotswood,  
p. 35.

John Major the sub-prior, the canons, friars, and the whole university, were at this sermon. But Knox was so far from being overset with the audience, that he challenged them to a disproof of any part of his discourse. The archbishop being informed of this liberty, reprimanded the sub-prior : and wondered the others could be so passive under heresy and schism.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Upon this the sub-prior recollected his spirits, and cited Rough and Knox to answer several articles drawn out of their sermons: they are these:

“First. That no mortal can be head of the Church.

“Secondly. That the pope is Antichrist, and by consequence no member of Christ’s mystical body.

“Thirdly. That no man is allowed to form a religion from his own invention, but bound to adhere close to the direction of revelation, without any thing of supplement or alteration.

“Fourthly. That the sacraments of the New Testament ought to be administered pursuant to the institution of our Saviour, and the practice of the apostles, and that no circumstance ought to be added to, or taken from them.

“Fifthly. That the mass is downright idolatry, and a profanation of the Lord’s Supper.

“Sixthly. That there is no such state as purgatory, either for punishing or refining departed spirits.

“Seventhly. That prayers for the dead are to no purpose, and to pray to them idolatry.

“Eighthly. That bishops, unless they preach themselves, forfeit their character and jurisdiction.

“Ninthly. That tithes are no appropriate revenue to the clergy ‘*jure divino*.’”

Archbishop Spotswood endeavours to clear Knox from this last assertion. He does not know but John Rough might advance something of this kind: but as for Knox, he vouches his sermons, and other tracts, in his vindication. Here, Knox speaks plainly for the other side of the question, and calls it, “rank sacrilege to rob the Church of its tithes.” It is true, continues the archbishop, “a great many of these times were displeas’d with the raking and avarice of some churchmen.” To disappoint this temper, they set up an opinion, that tithes did not belong to the church by divine right; but then the archbishop believes they were governed more by passion than judgment in this matter: and that these doctrines were advanced to caress the people, to make themselves popular, and lessen the interest of the clergy.

To proceed. Knox appearing before the consistory gave the sub-prior a sort of compliment for his orthodoxy, and

*The articles preferred against him and John Rough.*

desired him either to confute their tenets, or otherwise to recommend them with his authority to the people. The sub-prior answered, he came there to argue, and not to determine; and therefore he was ready to reason a little upon the power of the Church: "This society," says he, "hath in my opinion, a clear authority to appoint rites and ceremonies for the more solemn administration of the sacraments: and for heightening the devotion of the people, with respect to other parts of divine service." To this Knox replied, "That no man in the worship of God might appoint any ceremony, giving it a signification to his pleasure." This assertion, which is altogether wrong, disturbed one Arburnet, a grey friar, to that degree, that the heat of his temper and aversion transported him to a worse extreme on the other hand; for it seems, in the vehemence of the contest, he denied the apostles had received the Holy Ghost, when they writ their epistles. The sub-prior reprimanded this religious, and after a little dispute dismissed Rough and Knox; advising them in a friendly manner to be cautious what doctrine they delivered in public.

211.

*They have a friendly dismission from the sub-prior.*

Before the meeting broke up, the clergy consulted how to keep the people from deserting their communion. It was at last resolved that those of the university and abbey, who were best qualified, should preach in the parish churches on Sundays: they were to avoid controversy in their sermons, and insist only upon points of practice. Thus John Knox was barred preaching on Sundays: however, being under the protection of the cannon of the castle, he ventured to mount the pulpit on other days, and had no disturbance; but John Rough, disliking the libertinism of the garrison, took his leave, retired into England, and was preferred to a benefice near Hull, by the archbishop of York.

*John Rough leaves the garrison for their licentiousness.*

To conclude this story. About the beginning of June the next year, the pope's absolution was delivered, and the garrison required to deliver up the castle pursuant to the articles. The soldiers complained of a defect in the bull, and carped at the expression, "remitterimus crimen irremissibile." It was answered, that clause was inserted only to heighten the crime, and that the absolution was good notwithstanding. This did not satisfy the garrison; they still objected that the condition was broken, and resolved to stand on their defence.

Soon after this, the French fleet arrived, the siege was

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*The castle  
surrendered.*

Id. p. 63.

June 7,  
A. D. 1546.

*Peace  
between  
England  
and France.*

Ld. Herbert,  
p. 540. et  
deinc.  
June 14.

Id.

renewed, and the castle battered by sea and land. There was likewise a mortality amongst them: and thus being in no condition to wait their relief from England, they were forced to surrender almost at discretion. The French carried off the garrison, together with the cardinal's rich furniture and treasure. When the French were gone, the castle was demolished by the government: for by the canon law, they said, those places are to be razed where a cardinal is slain. However, this was but a colour: the true reason was, for fear the English should enter the fort and keep it. This, though it happened a year after the first siege, I have mentioned together, for the unity of the relation.

To come back to England: the king, finding a decay in his constitution, and that he was not likely to last long, inclined to put an end to his disputes with the neighbouring princes, and provide for the security of his successor: he was sensible the deep minority of the prince his son would call for circumstances of repose. This consideration, it is thought, disposed him to a peace with the French king, which was concluded at Campe near Calais. The Scotch were comprehended in this treaty. Amongst other articles, Boulogne was to remain in the possession of the English till the French king had paid two millions of crowns *de soleil*. Upon the whole, this town of Boulogne was exceedingly expensive: for, as the lord Herbert proves from records, the taking and keeping it cost the king 1,342,000*l.*, and upwards. The benefit was by no means answerable; for, as the noble historian continues, it served for nothing but a landing-place, which might be had at Calais.

When the peace was proclaimed in London, there was a pompous procession: and the best silver crosses, and richest copes, were made use of for the greater solemnity. This is observed to have been the last time these religious ornaments were publicly used. For soon after the king took them out of the churches, and lodged them in the treasury and wardrobe. The reason of this unusual alienation appeared to have been only the then apprehension of a new war with France.

Monsieur d'Annebault, the French ambassador, and king Henry, had some discourse about concerting a reformation in both kingdoms. It is said both princes had agreed to change the mass into a communion in their respective dominions: that they designed to move the emperor to the same measures,

and in case he refused, to make war upon him; to this it is added, that archbishop Cranmer was ordered to make a draught of the alterations intended. The credit of this story relies on the testimony of one Morris, Cranmer's secretary. To this Fox subjoins, that the king, in the presence of the earl of Hertford, the lord admiral Lisle, the earl of Bedford, and the lord Paget, gave the duke of Saxony's ambassador an assurance of standing by his master, in case difference of religion was the only quarrel between that duke and the emperor.

HENRY VIII.

Fox, vol. 2. p. 236 and 647.

About this time the king issued out a proclamation to forbid the use of Tindal and Coverdale's translation of the New Testament. The books of Frith, Wickliffe, Joy, Baile, Barnes, &c., are likewise prohibited, and to be delivered to the civil and ecclesiastical officers in order to be burnt. The penalty of offending against this proclamation is imprisonment, and corporal punishment at the king's pleasure. The criminals were likewise to make such fine and ransom as his majesty, or four of his privy council, should set upon them.

Id. p. 587.

Regist.

Bonner,

fol. 86.

*Books prohibited by proclamation.*

July 3.

Farther, all printers of English books, ballads, or plays, are commanded to put their names, and the names of the authors, to the said books or pamphlets; and to present the first copy to the mayor of the town, and not suffer any of the copies to be dispersed till two days after. Lastly, all persons are prohibited to sell or publish any English books printed beyond sea, upon the subject of religion, without a special license from the king.

Soon after this proclamation, the books of the authors above-mentioned were burnt at Paul's-cross by the order of the bishop of London.

The reason of suppressing these books was, it is thought, to discourage that excess of satire and intemperate language which was too common in the writings of these men. The king was likewise of opinion they had gone indefensible lengths in opposition to the Church of Rome: he designed therefore to proceed with more temper in his reformation, and keep closer to the pattern of antiquity.

About this time Nicholas Shaxton, who had some years since resigned the bishopric of Sarum to avoid compliance with the statute of the Six Articles, altered his sentiment, and made his submission in form: the articles are these.

Id. Herbert,

p. 569.

Bishop

Shaxton's

submission.

212.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“ First. Almighty God, by the power of his Word, pronounced by the priest at mass in the consecration, turns the bread and wine into the very natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ; so that, after the consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine, but only the substance of Christ, God and man.

“ Secondly. The said blessed sacrament, being once consecrated, is and remaineth still the very body and blood of our Saviour Christ, although it be reserved, and not presently distributed.

“ Thirdly. The same blessed sacrament, being consecrate, is and ought to be worshipped and adored with godly honour, wheresoever it is; forasmuch as it is the body of Christ inseparably united to the Deity.

“ Fourthly. The Church, by the ministration of the priest, offers daily at the mass, for a sacrifice to Almighty God, the self-same body and blood of our Saviour Christ, under the form of bread and wine, in the remembrance and representation of Christ’s death and passion.

“ Fifthly. The same body and blood which is offered in the mass is the very propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the world; forasmuch as it is the self-same in substance which was offered on the cross for our redemption: and the oblation and action of the priest are also a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving unto God for his benefits, and not the satisfaction for the sins of the world: for that is only to be attributed to Christ’s passion.

“ Sixthly. The said oblation or sacrifice, so by the priest offered in the mass, is available and profitable both for the quick and dead; although it lies not in the power of man to limit how much, or in what measure, the same doth avail.

“ Seventhly. It is not a thing of necessity, that the sacrament of the altar should be ministered unto the people under both kinds of bread and wine: and it is no abuse that the same be ministered to the people under the one kind; forasmuch as in each of both the kinds, whole Christ’s both body and blood are contained.

“ Eighthly. It is no derogation to the virtue of the mass, although the priest do receive the sacrament alone, and none other receive it with him.



“Ninthly. The mass used in this realm of England is agreeable to the institution of Christ; and we have in this Church of England the very true sacrament, which is the very body and blood of our Saviour Christ, under the form of bread and wine.

HENRY  
VIII.

“Tenthly. The Church of Christ did, doth, and may lawfully order some priests to be ministers of the sacraments, although the same do not preach nor be admitted thereunto.

“Eleventhly. Priests, being once dedicated unto God by the order of priesthood, and all such men and women as have advisedly made vows unto God of chastity or widowhood, may not lawfully marry after their said order received or vows made.

“Twelfthly. Secret auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained, continued, and frequented in the Church of Christ.

“Thirteenthly. The prescience and predestination of Almighty God, although in itself it be infallible, induceth no necessity to the action of man, but that he may freely use the power of his own will or choice, the said prescience or predestination notwithstanding.

“I, Nicholas Shaxton, with my heart do believe, and with my mouth do confess, all these articles to be true in every part.”

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 100.

Soon after this bishop's submission, Anne Askew, a young gentlewoman of condition, was prosecuted for denying the corporal presence, and burned in Smithfield with Nicholas Otterden, a priest, John Lasells, a gentleman belonging to the court, and John Adlam, a tailor.

*Mrs. Askew and three others executed for religion in Smithfield.*

Fox and Fuller.

It is no wonder these persons lost their lives for their disagreement to the established belief: the king was now in a rigorous disposition touching these matters. The queen herself ran no small hazard upon this score. She began now to countenance those who declaimed against the abuses of the Church of Rome: she thought herself so thoroughly informed in points of religion, that she ventured to undertake the controversy and engage the king. This was no acceptable discourse: the king was never pleased with contradiction; this humour increased with his age; besides, religion was a tender point: he had given great proof of his sufficiency, and had

*The queen in danger for arguing against the king's opinion.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

been much complimented by learned men for his attainments this way. He had likewise an ulcer in his leg, which soured his humour, and made him more difficult to deal with.

This freedom of the queen's was represented to disadvantage by Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. He put the king in mind, that by declaring herself thus openly against the received doctrines, and disputing against the Six Articles, she had discovered the slender regard she had either to the act or the late proclamation. Upon this the king gave this bishop and Wriothesley, the lord chancellor, leave to draw up articles against her. They worked immediately upon this permission, and brought the draught to the king, who made no scruple to sign it. And now her ruin was almost finished, and her enemies wanted only a warrant for carrying her to the Tower, but an accident disappointed their expectations. The lord chancellor put the articles signed by the king in his bosom: this paper happened to be dropped, was taken up by one of the queen's servants and brought to her. This being a surprising misfortune, the queen was perfectly overset with the news, and lamented her condition in a very sensible and disconsolate manner. The king hearing how much she was perplexed, first sent his physicians, and after came himself to her apartment: and finding the distemper lie in her mind, he applied the proper remedy, and gave her an expectation of gentle usage. And thus, being restored to a tolerable degree of ease and health, she went the next night, with her sister the lady Herbert, to the king's bed-chamber, where she was well received.

213.

And here, after some little time, the king entered upon the subject of religion, and endeavoured to draw the queen towards a dispute: but being apprehensive of the tendency of this argument, she excused herself upon the disadvantages of her sex and judgment, and answered, that in this, and all other matters, she was ready to resign herself to his majesty's wisdom: "Not at all, by St. Mary!" says the king; "you are grown a doctor, Kate, and better qualified to give, than receive directions." To this the queen replied, "that what she had offered upon this head, was done rather to divert his majesty, to relieve him under his pain, and make him forget his indisposition, than to pretend to any opinion of her own. Besides, by proposing objections, she hoped to be better informed by his majesty's

*She submits,  
and recovers  
the king's  
favour.*

learned resolution of the case." "And is it so, sweetheart?" says the king; "then we are perfect friends again." Her enemies, who knew nothing of this turn of favour, prepared the next day to convey her to the Tower, pursuant to the king's warrant. The hour being come, the lord Wriothesley appeared with forty of the guards. The king and the queen happened to be then talking pleasantly in the garden: the king giving the lord chancellor a severe look, called him to him at some distance from the queen. His majesty's discourse was altogether angry and expostulating: and at last he gave this lord some names of reproach, and commanded him out of his presence. The queen perceiving the king's humour ruffled, and lord Wriothesley dismissed with disgrace, entreated for his pardon. The king only answered, "that she, poor soul, did not know how little that lord deserved that good office from her." And thus, by the providence of the papers being dropped, and her seasonable submission, she escaped the snare. Though after all, some people fancied it was not the king's intention to make use of the rigour of the law; but only to fright her from reading prohibited books. On the other hand, if there was nothing of earnest at the bottom, it was thought a severe jest to be put upon a queen; especially on such an agreeable and obsequious consort. The bishop of Winchester, who was looked on as one of her greatest enemies, fell under the king's disfavour soon after; as appears by his submission on record. Though it must be said, that paper does not mention the ground of the king's displeasure. Notwithstanding this submission, the bishop never recovered his former situation in the king's fancy, as may be collected by his being left out in the king's last will; whereas, formerly he had been nominated one of his executors and councillors to his son king Edward VI.

Ld Herbert,  
p. 560.  
Id.

Towards the latter end of this year, the duke of Norfolk, and his son, the earl of Surrey, were committed to the Tower for high treason. The earl of Surrey, no lord of parliament, was tried by an inquest of commoners at Guildhall, and found guilty. This earl, by being discharged from the command of the army in France, and having the earl of Hertford put over him, dropped some passionate expressions, importing a dislike of the privy council; not without slanting insinuations of misconduct in the king. But these sallies of discontent could not reach his life: that which undid him, was the quartering the arms

*The duke of Norfolk attainted, and the earl of Surrey beheaded.*

Godwin,  
Annal.  
Jan. 13.  
A. D. 1546-7.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of Edward the Confessor with his own. This was swelled to a charge of high treason, and interpreted to be a design of grasping at the crown. He vouched the heralds in his justification; but the bench, it seems, would not allow of their decision, though within their own business. And thus a verdict was brought in against him, and he was beheaded about a week after upon Tower-hill: he was a person of a lively genius, great courage, and unusual improvements in learning.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 347.

Jan. 27.  
Jan. 12.

Id. p. 346.

*The king  
dies.*

The duke his father was attainted by act of parliament: had he been tried in the customary method by his peers, it was thought he would have disengaged himself. The creation of the prince of Wales was the cause assigned for the meeting of this parliament: but the attainting the duke of Norfolk was conjectured the true reason. His grand crime was the quartering the arms of Edward the Confessor. Archbishop Cranmer, between whom and the duke there had been no friendly correspondence for some time, absented himself from the house upon this occasion. In short, the bill of attainder passed, though the duke had done his utmost to dispose the king towards clemency, and prevent this rigour, by his late submission. It may be, no subject had more merit to plead than this nobleman: he had gained a victory over the Scots, been successful against the French; and suppressed the rebellion in Yorkshire. However, the king, who, as our learned historian observes, never hated or ruined any one by halves, signed a warrant for his execution the next morning. But his majesty dying in the night, the lieutenant could not act upon the warrant: and thus the duke of Norfolk very narrowly escaped.

See Records,  
num. 51.

*Somewhat  
of his cha-  
racter.*

Having already mentioned the king's will, I shall transcribe that part of it which relates to religion: from hence the reader may discover his opinion concerning invocation of saints, prayers and alms, in behalf of the dead.

As to other matters in the will, I shall only take notice that the crown was devised to the princess Mary, in case prince Edward died without lawful issue: from hence, Saunders collects the king had no ill opinion of his marriage with Catherine of Spain. But this reasoning will not hold; for, by this argument, we may infer the king believed his marriage with Anne Boleyn lawful, because the princess Elizabeth stands next to Mary in the will for the succession. But the king being married to Mrs. Boleyn, living queen Catherine, either the

first or the second marriage must of necessity be unlawful. And that the reader may not be surprised at the disposal of an hereditary crown by will, we are to consider, that the king was expressly enabled for this purpose by an act of parliament, in which act the crown is settled upon the lady Mary, provided prince Edward left no lawful issue: archbishop Cranmer, and Tonsal, bishop of Durham, were two of the sixteen executors and councillors of State, nominated in the will.

HENRY  
VIII.35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.

214.

Saunders reports, the king, some little time before his death, was inclined to reconcile himself to the see of Rome. That he discovered his mind to some of the bishops, and asked their advice concerning the manner. Who these bishops were he doth not tell us, only in general, that they were afraid of declaring their sentiments, and durst not trust the king: they suspected the question might be put to ensnare them.

Saunders de  
Schism. Ang-  
lic.

But Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, as this historian goes on, is said to have advised the king to call a parliament, and lay the matter before them; and provided he had not time for such an expedient, he should then publish his intention in writing: that when the performance was impracticable, the bare desire would be acceptable to God Almighty: that when Winchester went out of the presence, the other courtiers, who were afraid of refunding the church estates, scattered the king's scruples, and brought him off his former resolve. But this must rest upon Saunders's credit. It is said by others, that when the king understood the physicians gave him over, he turned his thoughts to the other world, and sent for Cranmer, who was then at Croydon. But when the archbishop came to Westminster, he found the king speechless: upon Cranmer's exhorting him to trust in God's mercy through Christ, and desiring some sign of such a reliance; the king is said to have pressed the archbishop's hand, and soon after expired. He lived fifty-five years and seven months, and reigned thirty-seven years, nine months and six days.

Jan. 23.  
A.D. 1546-7.  
Ld. Herbert,  
p. 510.

As to the character of this prince, it may be collected in a great measure from the foregoing history; therefore I shall say the less of it here.

Amongst other blemishes, he is taxed with cruelty: for proof of this imputation some historians give a list of those put to death in his reign. In this bloody catalogue, they mention two queens, one cardinal, besides Pole, who was attainted:

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Id. p. 572.

dukes, marquesses, earls, and earls' sons, twelve; barons and knights, eighteen: abbots, priests, priors and monks, seventy-seven: besides great numbers of more private condition, both Papists and Gospellers, who suffered for their religion. Covetousness is another dark quality with which he is charged: and here perhaps it is no easy task to disengage him. The seizing the abbey and chantry lands, and venturing through all the imprecations of the founders, is a strong presumption of loving money too well. Besides, what motive excepting this can be assigned for his wresting so many manors from the sees of Canterbury, York, and London: particularly for obliging the dean and chapter of Canterbury to part with what lands either himself or his courtiers had a mind to? Cranmer, as hath been observed, remonstrated against this usage, and unless he had been heartily menaced, would never have given up the wealthy lordship of Otford in Kent.

*The king's  
injunction  
to Bonner.*

I shall mention another instance, which looks remarkably this way. It is the king's injunction to Bonner, bishop of London, not to enter upon any of the lands, nor to receive any of the profits of the bishopric, until a suit depending in chancery between Bonner and the earl of Hertford was ended.

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 70.  
36 Hen. 8.  
Jan. 21.

In this injunction it is suggested, that the bishop of London hath demised his whole bishopric to the said earl, under the penalty of ten thousand marks, to be levied upon his goods and chattels to the king's use.

The bishop is enjoined not to present or collate to any benefice or preferment belonging to his see. The same injunction is directed to the dean and chapter.

The next year, the eighth of July, there is a revocation of this injunction; "Quibusdam certis de causis jam nos moventibus," &c., as the words run. The meaning of which is (as may be reasonably conjectured) that the bishop, and dean and chapter, had either paid a fine, or parted with some of their lands to compound the controversy. In short, if the king had treated his temporal lords as he did the spiritual, and seized the estates of the laity upon no stronger colours, it is probable they would have complained somewhat louder under the injustice.

*His bene-  
factions.*

But then it must be said, he did something by way of reparation. For besides his endowing the six new sees already mentioned, he founded a great many grammar-schools with

good salaries to the masters. He likewise founded lectures in both universities; where those who read in the faculties of divinity, law, and physic, were encouraged with a considerable settlement. The same countenance was likewise given to the professors of Greek and Hebrew. Farther, he confirmed cardinal Wolsey's college of Christ-church, in Oxford, and built and endowed the famous Trinity-college, in Cambridge. He conveyed Grey-friars, now called Christ-church, and the hospital of St. Bartholomew, in London, to that city, for charitable uses: to which we may add, his finishing King's-college Chapel, in Cambridge. Lastly, he maintained a great many young scholars in foreign countries. It was his custom to choose one or more every year of the most promising parts out of both universities, and breed them beyond sea. Sir Thomas Smith, secretary of state to queen Elizabeth, was one of the last thus educated. These men, though they had no commission, furnished the king with intelligence, and acquainted him with the public motions of Christendom. And it must be said to his commendation, that he encouraged learning in the disposal of his church preferments; most of the bishops of his time being men of distinction this way<sup>1</sup>.

HENRY VIII.

Fuller Heylin.

Cambd. Eliz.

Another circumstance of advantage to his memory, was the suppressing of the stews. They were houses inhabited by scandalous women, and allowed by the state. There were sixteen of them distinguished by signs. They were called stews, because the place at first was furnished with ponds for preserving fish, and making them more clean and palatable.

*The stews suppressed by king Henry.*

Cambden, Brit. Middlesex.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lingard concludes this momentous reign with the following lucid view of its most important events:—

“Of the king's conduct during his sickness we know little. It is said, that at the commencement, he betrayed a wish to be reconciled to the see of Rome; that the other bishops, afraid of the penalties, evaded the question; but that Gardiner advised him to consult his parliament, and to commit his ideas to writing. He was constantly attended by his confessor, the bishop of Rochester, heard mass daily in his chamber, and received the communion under one kind. About a month before his death he endowed the magnificent establishment of Trinity-college, in Cambridge, for a master and sixty fellows and scholars; and afterwards re-opened the church of the Grey-friars, which, with St. Bartholomew's hospital, and an ample revenue, he gave to the city of London.

“Of his sentiments on his death-bed nothing can be asserted with any degree of confidence. One account makes him die in the anguish of despair; according to another he refused any spiritual aid till he could only reply to the exhortation of the archbishop by a squeeze of the hand; while a third represents him as expiring in the most edifying sentiments of devotion and repentance. Not only the dangerous state in which he lay, but also his death, were carefully concealed from the knowledge of the public; and the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
215.

In the reign of king Henry II., there were several regulations made to correct the malignity of these infamous entertainments. I shall mention some of them.

parliament, ignorant of the event, met and transacted business after the usual manner. Three days were employed by the earl of Hertford to secure the person of his royal nephew at Enfield, and to arrange with his associates the plan of their subsequent proceedings. On the fourth the chancellor announced to the two houses the death of Henry, read to them an extract from the will respecting the government of the realm during the minority of his successor, and then, declaring the parliament dissolved, invited the lords to pay their respects to the new king. That prince was the same day conducted to the Tower, and proclaimed by the style of Edward VI., king of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, and of the Church of England and also of Ireland, in earth the supreme head.

“ To form a just estimate of the character of Henry we must distinguish between the young king, guided by the counsels of Wolsey, and the monarch of more mature age, governing by his own judgment, and with the aid of ministers selected and fashioned by himself. In his youth the beauty of his person, the elegance of his manners, and his adroitness in every martial and fashionable exercise, were calculated to attract the admiration of his subjects. His court was gay and splendid: a succession of amusements seemed to absorb his attention: yet his pleasures were not permitted to encroach on his more important duties. He assisted at the council, perused the despatches, and corresponded with his generals and ambassadors; nor did the minister, trusted and powerful as he was, dare to act till he had asked the opinion, and taken the pleasure, of his sovereign. His natural abilities had been improved by study; and his esteem for literature may be inferred from the learned education which he gave to his children, and from the number of eminent scholars to whom he granted pensions in foreign states, or on whom he conferred promotion in his own. The immense treasure which he inherited from his father was perhaps a misfortune, because it engendered habits of expense not to be supported from the ordinary revenue of the crown; and the soundness of his politics may be doubted, which, under the pretence of supporting the balance of power, repeatedly involved the nation in continental hostilities. Yet even these errors served to throw a lustre round the English throne, and raised its possessor in the eyes of his own subjects and of the different nations of Europe. But as the king advanced in age his vices gradually developed themselves: and after the death of Wolsey they were indulged without restraint. He became as rapacious as he was prodigal; as obstinate as he was capricious; as fickle in his friendships as he was merciless in his resentments. Though liberal of his confidence, he soon grew suspicious of those whom he had ever trusted; and, as if he possessed no other right to the crown than that which he derived from the very questionable claim of his father, he viewed with an evil eye every remote descendant of the Plantagenets, and eagerly embraced the slightest pretexts to remove those whom his jealousy represented as future rivals to himself or his posterity. In pride and vanity he was perhaps without a parallel. Inflated with the praises of interested admirers, he despised the judgment of others, acted as if he deemed himself infallible in matters of policy and religion, and seemed to look upon dissent from his opinion as equivalent to a breach of allegiance. In his estimation to submit and to obey were the great, the paramount, duties of subjects; and this persuasion steeled his breast against remorse for the blood which he shed, and led him to trample without scruple on the liberties of the nation.

“ When he ascended the throne there still existed a spirit of freedom, which on more than one occasion defeated the arbitrary measures of the court, though directed by an able minister, and supported by the authority of the sovereign; but in the lapse of a few years that spirit had fled; and, before the death of Henry, the king of England had grown into a despot, the people had shrunk into a nation of slaves. The causes of this important change in the relations between the sovereign and his subjects may be found,



“First. No stewardholder was permitted to open his doors, or receive any persons on holy-days.

HENRY  
VIII.

not so much in the abilities or passions of the former, as in the obsequiousness of his parliaments, the assumption of the ecclesiastical supremacy, and the servility of the two religious parties which divided the nation.

“I. The house of peers no longer consisted of those powerful lords and prelates who in former periods had so often and so successfully resisted the encroachments of the sovereign. The reader has already witnessed the successive steps by which most of the great families of the preceding reigns had become extinct, and their immense possessions had been frittered away among the favourites and dependants of the court. The most opulent of the peers under Henry were poor in comparison with their predecessors; and, by the operation of the statute against liveries, they had lost the accustomed means of arming their retainers in support of their quarrels. In general they were new men, indebted for their present honours and estates to the bounty of Henry or his father; and the proudest among the rest, by witnessing the attainders and executions of others, had been taught to tremble for themselves, and to crouch in submission at the foot of a master whose policy it was to depress the great, and punish their errors without mercy, while he selected his favourites from the lowest classes, heaping on them honours and riches, and confiding to them the exercise of his authority.

“1. By the separation of the realm from the see of Rome the dependence of the spiritual had been rendered still more complete than that of the temporal peers. Their riches had been diminished, their immunities taken away; the support which they might have derived from the protection of the pontiff was gone; they were nothing more than the delegates of the king, exercising a precarious authority determinable at his pleasure. The ecclesiastical constitutions, which had so long formed part of the law of the land, now depended on his breath, and were executed only by his sufferance. The convocation indeed continued to be summoned; but its legislative authority was no more. Its principal business was to grant money; yet even these grants now owed their force, not to the consent of the grantors, but to the approbation of the other two houses, and the assent of the crown.

“2. As for the third branch of the legislature, the commons of England, they had not yet acquired sufficient importance to oppose any effectual barrier to the power of the sovereign; yet care was taken that among them the leading members should be devoted to the crown, and that the speaker should be one holding office or high in the confidence of the ministers. Freedom of debate was indeed granted; but with a qualification which in reality amounted to a refusal. It was only a ‘decent’ freedom; and, as the king reserved to himself the right of deciding what was or was not decent, he frequently put down the opponents of the court by reprimanding the ‘varlets’ in person, or by sending to them a threatening message.

“It is plain that from parliaments thus constituted the crown had little to fear; and though Wolsey had sought to govern without their aid, Henry found them so obsequious to his will that he convoked them repeatedly, and was careful to have his most wanton and despotic measures sanctioned with their approbation. The parliament, as often as it was opened or closed by the king in person, offered a scene not unworthy of an Oriental divan. The form indeed differed but little from our present usage. The king sat on his throne: on the right-hand stood the chancellor, on the left the lord-treasurer; whilst the peers were placed on their benches, and the commons stood at the bar. But the addresses made on these occasions, by the chancellor or the speaker, usually lasted more than an hour; and their constant theme was the character of the king. The orators, in their efforts to surpass each other, fed his vanity with the most hyperbolical praise. Cromwell was unable—he believed all men were unable—to describe the unutterable qualities of the royal mind, the sublime virtues of the royal heart. Rich told him, that in wisdom he was equal to Solomon, in strength and courage to Samson, in beauty and address to Absalom; and Audeley declared, before his face, that God had anointed him with the oil of wisdom above his fellows, above the other kings of the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“Secondly. No single woman was to be kept against her will, but dismissed whenever she discovered any desire of reforming her practice.

earth, above all his predecessors,—had given him a perfect knowledge of the Scriptures, with which he had prostrated the Roman Goliath,—a perfect knowledge of the art of war, by which he had gained the most brilliant victories at the same time in remote places,—and a perfect knowledge of the art of government, by which he had for thirty years secured to his own realm the blessings of peace, while all the other nations of Europe suffered the calamities of war.

“During these harangues, as often as the words ‘most sacred majesty’ were repeated, or as any emphatic expression was pronounced, the lords rose, and the whole assembly, in token of respect and assent, bowed profoundly to the demi-god on the throne. Henry himself affected to hear such fulsome adulation with indifference. His answer was invariably the same: that he laid no claim to superior excellence; but that, if he did possess it, he gave the glory to God, the author of all good gifts: it was, however, a pleasure to him to witness the affection of his subjects, and to learn that they were not insensible of the blessings which they enjoyed under his government.

“II. It is evident that the new dignity of head of the Church, by transferring to the king that authority which had been hitherto exercised by the pontiff, must have considerably augmented the influence of the crown; but, in addition, the arguments by which it was supported tended to debase the spirit of the people, and to exalt the royal prerogative above law and equity. When the adversaries of the supremacy asked in what passage of the Sacred Writings the government of the Church was given to a layman, its advocates boldly appealed to those texts which prescribe obedience to the established authorities. The king, they maintained, was the image of God upon earth: to disobey his commands was to disobey God himself; to limit his authority, when no limit was laid down, was an offence against the sovereign; and to make distinctions, when the Scripture made none, was an impiety against God. It was indeed acknowledged that this supreme authority might be employed unreasonably and unjustly; but, even then, to resist was a crime: it became the duty of the sufferer to submit; and his only resource was to pray that the heart of his oppressor might be changed, his only consolation to reflect that the king himself would hereafter be summoned to answer for his conduct before an unerring tribunal. Henry became a sincere believer in a doctrine so flattering to his pride; and easily persuaded himself that he did no more than his duty in punishing with severity the least opposition to his will. To impress it on the minds of the people, it was perpetually inculcated from the pulpit: it was enforced in books of controversy and instruction; it was promulgated with authority in the ‘Institution,’ and afterwards in the ‘Erudition of a Christian Man.’ From that period the doctrine of passive obedience formed a leading trait in the orthodox creed.

“III. The two great parties, into which religious disputes had separated the nation, contributed also to strengthen the despotic power of Henry. They were too jealous of each other to watch, much less to resist, the encroachments of the crown. The great object of both was the same: to win the favour of the king, that they might crush the power of their adversaries; and with this view they flattered his vanity, submitted to his caprice, and became the obsequious slaves of his pleasure. Henry, on the other hand, whether it were through policy or accident, played them off against each other: sometimes appearing to lean to the old, sometimes to the new, doctrines; alternately raising and depressing the hopes of each, but never suffering either party to obtain the complete ascendancy over its opponent. Thus he kept them in a state of dependence on his will, and secured their concurrence to every measure which his passion or caprice might suggest, without regard to reason or justice, or the fundamental laws of the land.”

We may add to these remarks of Lingard a few of the conclusions of Mackintosh: “It was chiefly,” says he, “by its relation to the infant reformation of religion that this reign became a period of great importance in the general history of Europe. The last

“Thirdly. None of these panders were allowed to entertain any nun or married woman.

HENRY  
VII.

twenty years of it are to be considered as a time of transition from popery to protestantism. It must be owned that it required a vigorous, and even a harsh hand, to keep down all the fear and hatred, all the conscientious but furious zeal of Catholics and Gospellers, the whole mass of passion and of interest which were stirred up by so prodigious a revolution in human opinion.

“An ecclesiastical dictatorship might have been excused in a time full of peril. At the beginning the Protestants (even if we number all the anti-papists among them) formed a small, though intelligent and bold, minority. They grew stronger by degrees, as opinions and parties which are the children of the age naturally do. Their strength lay in the towns on the southern and eastern coasts, and among the industrious classes of society. In the northern and midland provinces, and in the mountains of Wales, far removed from commerce with the heretics of Flanders and Germany, the ancient faith maintained its authority. At the end of this reign it is still doubtful whether the majority had changed sides. Henry had few qualifications for a nmpire. But it was a public service that he restrained both factions, and kept the peace during this dangerous process. Had he been only severe and stern, instead of plunging into barbarism and butchery, his services might be commended, and some allowance might be made for the necessity of curbing uncivilized men by rough means.

“Had the Protestant party risen against him they must have been vanquished, and he would have been driven back into the arms of Rome. The iron hand which held back both parties from battle was advantageous to the Protestant cause, humanly speaking, only because the opinions and institutions which spring up in an age are likely to be the most progressive. His grotesque authority as head of the Church, his double persecution of Romanists and Lutherans, his passion for transubstantiation, and his abhorrence of appeals to a court at Rome, may be understood, if we regard his reign as a bridge which the nation was to pass on its road to more complete reformation. This peculiar character was given to the latter portion of his reign by the combined power of his adherence to the Catholic doctrines, and of his impatience of papal authority, by the connection of this last disposition with the validity of his marriages and the legitimacy of his children; by the manifold and intricate ties which at various times blended the interest of each religious party with the succession to the crown; an object which the recent remembrance of the war of the Roses might render very important to any prince, but which became the ruling frenzy of Henry's mind. The reformers needed the acquisition of one great state for the stability and solidity of their reform. They gained England. As soon as the hand was withdrawn which held the statesmen and the people dumb, the Reformation was established. England continues to this day to be the only power of the first class which maintains the reformed doctrines.

“Eleven months before the decease of the English monarch, Luther breathed his last in his native town of Eisleben, which he had not visited for many years. He died of an inflammation in his chest, which cut him off in twenty-four hours, in the sixty-third year of his age. His last moments were placid, and employed in prayers for the well-being of the Church, now more than ever threatened by the Roman pontiff, supported as he was by the great council of his followers convoked at Trent. It ought not to be doubted by a just man, of whatever communion, that Martin Luther was an honest, disinterested, and undaunted man, magnanimous in prosperous as well as adverse fortune, without the slightest taint of any disposition which rested on self as its final aim, elevated by the consciousness of this purity in his motives, and by the humble desire to conform his mind to the model of supreme perfection, and to adapt his actions to the laws which flowed from the Source of all Good, through reason and through revelation. On the other hand, it must be allowed that his virtues were better fitted for revolutions than for quiet; that he often sacrificed peace and charity to trivial differences of opinion, or perhaps unmeaning oppositions of language; and that his scurrilous and merciless writings, as a controversialist, both manifested and excited very odious passions. But

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“Fourthly. They were not allowed to sell bread, ale, fish, meat, coals, or any provisions.”

Stow's  
Survey of  
London,  
p. 449, and  
Annal.

the object of his life was religious truth; and, in the pursuit of this single and sublime end, he delivered reason from the yoke of human authority, and contributed to set it free from all subjection, except that which is due to Supreme Wisdom—whose service is perfect freedom.

“The tales propagated against this great man prove his formidable power. He was said openly to deride all that he taught, to have composed hymns to his favourite vice of drunkenness, to disbelieve the immortality of the soul,—nay, even to have been an atheist. He was represented to have been the fruit of the commerce of his mother with a demon,—a fable which, in the end of the seventeenth century, writers of some reputation thought it necessary to disavow. Notes of his table-talk, published many years after his death, and then perhaps very inaccurately, continued to furnish the viler sort of antagonists with means of abuse, in the ardent phrases which fell from him amidst the negligence of familiar conversation.

“At the moment of his death, Lutheranism was established only in Scandinavia, and in those parts of Germany which had embraced it when it was first preached. The extent, however, of its invisible power over the minds of men was not to be measured by the magnitude of the countries where it was legally predominant. Bold inquiry, active curiosity, excited reason, youthful enthusiasm, throughout every country of Europe, in secret cherished a Lutheran spirit. Henry, as we have seen, was impelled, by a singular combination of circumstances, to prepare the way in England for embodying that spirit in a civil establishment. Calvin, who was called by his eminent contemporaries, the greatest divine since the Apostles, had now spread the seeds of reformation throughout France. Had Luther survived a few years longer, he would have seen the second and more terrible eruption of the reformation in the civil wars of France, in which the Protestant party maintained their ground for thirty years, and obtained a partial establishment for near a century, though they were finally doomed to defeat and dispersion. In Italy, most well-educated men, who were not infidels, became secret Protestants. The Inquisition did not entirely exempt the Spanish peninsula from innovation. If one hundred thousand or fifty thousand Protestants suffered for religion in the Netherlands during the government of Charles V., we can desire no better proof of the prevalence of the reformation in these rich and lettered provinces. Already monarchs, now become absolute, began to apprehend that the spirit of inquiry would extend from religion to civil government, or, in their language, prove as fatal to the State as to the Church. Such, at a much earlier period, were the fears with which the insurrection of the German peasants had filled the mind of sir Thomas More. The intention of quelling this general revolt of the minds of men by a confederacy of princes, although not fully unfolded, was, we are told, one of the motives of the treaty of Francis I. with Charles V., which preceded the last peace between France and England. But points like these are long discussed among statesmen, and acquire some steady place in their minds, before the perils grow large enough and come near enough to be contemplated with practical seriousness, and long before they are felt to make urgent demands on rulers for the security of the commonwealth against the threatening tempest. At the death of Henry VIII. the preponderance of visible force in the scale of establishment was immense; and even the moral force of the State and the Church retained its commanding posture, and its aspect of authority, at the moment when its foundation in opinion was silently crumbling from beneath it. It is easy to blame this want of foresight after events have taught knowledge. But contemporary statesmen would have acted unwisely, if they were to be influenced in their deliberations concerning present events by probabilities of future danger so uncertain, even from their distance, as to be beyond the scope of the active politician, who is never to forget the shortness of his foresight, and the moral duty of walking warily when he cannot see clearly. It was not wonderful that the masters of Europe should adjourn the consideration of perils which still seemed to belong more to speculation than to practice, and of a religious revolution which, in

And farther, those women who died in these houses, were barred Christian burial, and interred in a distant place from the parish church, called the Single-woman's churchyard. Thus, notwithstanding their toleration, they were under restraints, and had marks of discountenance set upon them. HENRY VIII.

In the one-and-twentieth year of king Henry VII., the stews were shut up for some time. They were afterwards opened, but reduced from sixteen to twelve. But king Henry VIII., in the thirty-seventh year of his reign, put an end to these infamous liberties. The panders, with all their equipage, were turned out by sound of trumpet, and their houses assigned to people of regular conversation. Thus we see, notwithstanding some exceptionable sallies, and the rigour of his government, he was not without a mixture of good qualities. Fabian.

the course of thirty years, had gained no outward dominion in the more cultivated parts of Europe, except a small number of German cities and principalities."

AN  
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN.

PART II.—BOOK IV.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

217.

1547.

King Ed-  
ward VI.'s  
Journal,  
Cotton  
Library,  
Nero, c. 10.

EDWARD VI. only son to Henry VIII. by Jane Seymour, daughter to sir John Seymour, succeeded his father. He was born at Hampton-court, October the twelfth, 1537: the queen, his mother, dying the day after. The archbishop of Canterbury, the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, were his godfathers. He was under the ladies' care for the first six years; afterwards, doctor Cox and Mr. Cheek were his preceptors for languages and other parts of learning. There were preparations made for creating him prince of Wales, duke of Cornwall, and count palatine of Chester; but this solemnity was prevented by his father's death. This young prince discovered an extraordinary genius, and his attainments in learning were far beyond the expectations from his age: but of this no more at present.

His uncle, the earl of Hertford, and sir Anthony Brown, were dispatched by the council to acquaint him with the late king's death, and conduct him to town, where, on the 31st of January, he was proclaimed king. He was received at the Tower with the customary marks of regard.

*The ex-  
ecutors to  
the late  
king's will.*

Upon the opening the late king's will, there were sixteen nominated for executors: the government of the prince's person, and the administration was likewise put into their hands, till the king was eighteen years old. I have already observed, the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Durham had the honour of this trust. The other fourteen were the lord

Wriothesley, lord chancellor; lord St. John, great master; the lord Russell, lord privy seal; the earl of Hertford, lord great chamberlain; the viscount Lisle, lord admiral; sir Anthony Brown, master of the horse; sir William Paget, secretary of state; sir Edward North, chancellor of the court of Augmentation; sir Edward Montague, chief justice of the Common Pleas; Justice Bromley, sir Anthony Denny, and sir William Herbert, chief gentlemen of the privy chamber; sir Edward Wotton, treasurer of Calais; and doctor Wotton, dean of Canterbury and York. In executing the will, and governing the public affairs, the majority of these were equivalent to the whole number. They had one very remarkable branch of power: for instance, if the lady Mary, the lady Elizabeth, or any other person named for the succession, happened to marry without the consent of the majority of the privy council, they were to forfeit their title to the crown.

EDWARD  
VI.

Fuller,  
p. 246.

For the honour of the government, and the better management of affairs, it was proposed that one of these sixteen might have a title distinguished from the rest. But then the lustre of this dignity was not to be conveyed with any addition of power. This motion was opposed by the lord chancellor, who expected the weight of business would fall upon his office; for the archbishop of Canterbury, who by his place had the fairest pretension, was neither good courtier nor statesman; nor had any inclination for secular employment; and therefore the chancellor could have no apprehension of competition from that quarter. He insisted, therefore, that the will might be punctually executed, without latitude or alteration: that the late king designed the executors should have an equal share in trust and power, and that the making any preference in title or degree would be a breach in the appointment. But the chancellor finding his interest overweighed by the earl of Hertford, dropped his opinion, and consented with the rest. Thus the board agreed, that one of the sixteen should have a raised title, and be called "protector of the king's realm, and governor of his person." The next point was quickly settled; and the choice, by an unanimous concurrence, fell upon the earl of Hertford. Thus he was solemnly proclaimed protector and governor of the king's person. This dignity and trust were not conveyed without an express condition, "that he should not do any act but by the advice and consent of the other execu-

Bp. Burnet,  
p. 302.

218.

*The earl of  
Hertford  
chosen pro-  
tector.*

Bp. Burnet  
Hist. of the  
Reform.  
pt. 2. p. 5.

tors, pursuant to the late king's will." One reason for pitching on this nobleman was, the nearness of his relation to the king. He was his uncle by the mother's side, near in blood, but without any prospect upon the crown; so that there was not a dangerous ground for ambition to work on. This promotion of the earl of Hertford was censured, as a departure from the late king's will. From hence it is plain the privy council was formed, and the administration carried on, by the directions of this will: it was likewise enrolled, and queen Mary founded her title partly on this authority, as will be seen afterwards. However, Lethington, secretary of Scotland, in his letter to sir William Cecil, secretary of state to queen Elizabeth, pretends it was not signed by king Henry VIII. and by consequence not legally executed, pursuant to the statute of 35 Henry VIII. cap. 1. The reason of Lethington's excepting to the authority of this will is, because the younger branch of the royal family is preferred to the elder, and the crown settled upon the house of Suffolk, in exclusion of that of Scotland.

This will, to make it firm in law, ought to have been signed with the king's own hand. That it wanted this necessary circumstance, Lethington endeavours to prove first, by affirming that the king, some considerable time before his death, never used to sign anything with his own hand: for the truth of this, the Scotch secretary appeals to Cecil's knowledge. He adds, secondly, that when the king in his sickness was pressed to put his hand to the will, he refused to do it. He affirms, farther, that when the king was almost at the point of death, one William Clark put a stamp to the will by the order of some persons well known both to Lethington and Cecil. To prove this forgery, for so Lethington calls it, he desires the depositions of the marquis of Winchester and Northampton, the earl of Pembroke, secretary Petre, sir Henry Neville, sir Maurice Berkley, and several other persons of distinction belonging to king Henry's court, may be taken and enrolled in Chancery. He likewise urges my lord Paget's evidence in the house of Lords in queen Mary's reign. But, by the way, the lord Paget's testimony, as Dyer reports it, is short of the point, because the stamp there mentioned refers only to the bill for attainting the duke of Norfolk. Lastly, Lethington presses the original may be inspected: and though some, to

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Heylin,  
Hist. Re-  
form. King  
Edward VI.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1.  
Records,  
book 3.  
num. 30.

Dyer, Rep.  
fol. 93.



disserve the queen of Scots' title, pretend the original will was made away in queen Mary's time, in favour of the house of Scotland, yet he hopes Providence hath preserved this instrument to silence that calunny, and bring truth to light. To fortify Lethington's allegations, sir Thomas Craig affirms, that Clark, above-mentioned, declared openly before queen Mary, before her privy council and the parliament, that he put the seal or stamp to the will, after king Henry had lost the use of his understanding.

EDWARD VI.  
See Craig's Book of the Succession in answer to Doleman. p. 334. 345.

On the other side, if the will was thus defective, and lay so much exposed to disproof, it is somewhat surprising the lords of king Edward's council should risk their reputation so far, and venture their being called to an account, for acting upon an illegal warrant. I shall not pretend to interpose my opinion, but leave the matter to the reader's judgment. I have heard say, the original will is now in the custody of Mr. Le Neve, at Westminster. If this be so, the inspecting the instrument will decide the question<sup>1</sup>. To proceed: there was now an apparent division of the kingdom into two parties. One of them were willing religion should continue upon the present footing; the other pressed for a farther reformation. The lord chancellor headed the first, and the protector the latter.

On the second of February, the protector was declared lord treasurer and earl marshal, the late king's will was ordered to be enrolled, and a copy of it, under the great seal, given to every one of the executors. The bishops were likewise required to take out new commissions of the same tenor with those of the late reign. Cranmer set the first precedent; he is said to have petitioned for a revival of his jurisdiction; and that, as he had exercised the functions of an archbishop during the former reign, so that authority determining with the late king's life, his present majesty would please to intrust him with the same jurisdiction. That Cranmer addressed the crown for this purpose and in this form, we may reasonably conclude, both from the singularity of his opinion, and especially from Bonner's practice, from whom such a compliance might be less expected. This bishop, it is certain, took out such an instrument in the beginning of this reign. The commission sets forth that Bonner had made application to king Edward for an

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2, p. 6. Feb. 7. A.D. 1546-7. *The bishops take out new commissions.* Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer.

<sup>1</sup> An inspection of the will was made in the reign of Anne: but the signature discovered was not supposed to be in the king's handwriting.—Vide "Tindal's Rapin."

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 102.

authority to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction. As to other things, the instrument runs in the same form with those commissions taken out by the bishops in the late reign.

These commissions were granted only “durante bene placito,” so that the king might recal their jurisdiction, and strike their character dead when he pleased. The historian remarks that this precarious grant was only to serve the necessity of the juncture, and keep the bishops from relapsing to their old superstition; that afterwards this heavy yoke was made lighter, the “bene placitum” clause omitted, and the bishops enabled to hold their sees during life.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 6.

But that matters were not thus mended, appears from this learned author, both in his records, and in the body of his history: where it is plain that the bishops, through the whole course of king Edward’s reign, were upon their good behaviour for their office, and had the express clause of “quamdiu se bene gesserint” put in their patent.

Id. pt. 2.  
p. 213. and  
Records,  
p. 257.

219.

The learned historian last-mentioned will have it, that by the letters-patent it is clear “that the episcopal function was acknowledged to be of Divine appointment, and that the person was no other way named by the king, than as lay-patrons present to livings.”

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2.  
p. 213.

It is granted the clause in the commission, “per et ultra ea quæ tibi ex sacris literis divinitus commissa esse dignoscuntur,” does import a Divine authority: but then this acknowledgment is so weakened and confined as to the exercise, by other clauses in the letters-patent, that without the king’s license the powers in the episcopal character would signify little. To speak clearly, the commission seems embarrassed and inconsistent.

Regist.  
Cranmer,  
fol. 28.

For, first, it is plainly affirmed in this instrument, “that all manner of authority and jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as civil, is originally derived from the crown.” If this assertion holds, the power of the keys must be lodged with the secular magistrate: and if so, what independent right can the bishops have for the exercise of their function? How can they make any claim to a charter of government from our Saviour? Or what pretence can they have to admit or exclude from Church communion upon this footing? And if their pretensions to govern must fail thus far, the powers, supposed by the letters-patent to be given them in Holy Scripture, must be of slender con-

sideration. Farther, the learned historian's saying, the person appointed by the king's letters-patent was no otherwise named than as lay-patrons present to livings, is somewhat surprising; for did ever lay-patrons pretend to give a commission in their presentations for the exercise of the priest's function? Does the clerk govern his cure, and execute his office in the patron's name, and by virtue of his authority? If this cannot be made good, the case is no ways parallel; for the bishops, by the letters-patent, were to give orders, and exercise all other branches of spiritual jurisdiction as the king's delegates, and upon the strength of his authority.

EDWARD  
VI.

To proceed: it was ordered in the late king's will, that all grants, gifts, or promises made by him and not perfected, should be executed and performed. To satisfy this clause, Fuller. secretary Paget, sir Anthony Denny, and sir Wm. Herbert, were required to declare their knowledge of the king's intention upon this head. The reason of these three gentlemen being called on was, because the king had used them with the greatest confidence.

Paget informed the council, that upon the attainders of the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Surrey, the king told him he intended to dispose of their estates to deserving persons, and create several peers to supply the rooms of noble families extinct. That upon the duke of Norfolk's desire that the king would settle all his forfeited lands upon the prince, the king closed with the compliment, and resolved to reward his servants some other way. Secretary Paget, by the king's order, drew up a list of this intended creation, where the persons, honours, and assignments, were particularly mentioned. The earl of Hertford was to be earl marshal, lord treasurer, and duke of Somerset; and his son to be earl of Wiltshire, with 800*l.* a year of land, and 300*l.* a year out of the next bishop's lands that fell void; the earl of Essex to be marquess of Essex; the viscount Lisle to be earl of Coventry; the lord Wriothsley to be earl of Winchester; sir Thomas Seymour, the protector's brother, a baron and lord admiral; sir Richard Rich, sir John St. Leger, sir William Willoughby, sir Edward Sheffield, and sir Christopher Danby, were to be barons: these gentlemen were likewise to have estates settled on them to support their titles. The book where these favours were entered was delivered to the king, but his death happening soon after, there was nothing done, excepting the above-

*A creation  
of noblemen  
designed by  
the late  
king.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

mentioned provision in the will, which had a reference to this business. The book being vouched by Paget, Denny, and Herbert, the executors resolved to perform what the king intended. But being apprehensive of a war with the emperor and the French king, they did not think it advisable to part with any of the king's treasure, or lessen his revenues. However, since title without a proportionable estate had more of burthen than real advancement, they cast about for a practicable expedient, and resolved upon the sale of the chantry lands.

The council having so great a share themselves in this assignment of wealth and honour, their forwardness was much disrelished. It was thought they were too intent upon their own interest, and that their pretensions this way ought to have been postponed till the king came of age.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 8.

In the late king's book, where the settling of estates upon this new creation was specified, the earl of Hertford had a promise of six of the best prebends that should fall in any cathedral, two of which were afterwards, at his request, changed for a deanery and treasurership. The disposing of ecclesiastical preferment to secular men may possibly seem somewhat odd, but it was not uncommon at that time. The lord Cromwell, as hath been observed, was dean of Wells, and many others of the laity had spiritual promotions without cure bestowed on them. To make them deans and prebendaries was a farther step, and less capable of excuse, for these dignitaries were designed for a standing council to the bishop, and obliged to several duties in the cathedral peculiar to the priestly function. Prebends and deaneries were always reckoned the revenues of the Church, designed as encouragements for industry and learning, and rewards for those who had distinguished themselves in public service. To say the clergy mismanaged in these promotions, is wide of the purpose, supposing the charge was true. For since the law had appropriated these preferments to the spirituality, they could not be otherwise disposed without straining the constitution. The remark of our learned historian upon this practice is very significant; his words are these: "They," meaning the courtiers, "minded nothing more than the enriching themselves, and took a certain course to make the mischief perpetual by robbing the Church of those endowments and helps it had received

*Spiritual  
preferments  
given to  
secular men.*

from the munificence of the founders of its cathedrals, who were generally the first Christian kings of this nation; which, had it been done by law, would have been a thing of very ill consequence; but as it was done, was directly contrary to Magna Charta and to the king's coronation oath." EDWARD VI.

Id. p. 9.

On the fourteenth of February the late king's body was removed to Shene with the usual solemnity, and the next day to Windsor, and there interred in a vault near his consort queen Jane, pursuant to the instructions in his will. His funeral was likewise solemnised in Notre Dame Church in Paris by the French king's order. This was an instance of a generous regard, considering king Henry died excommunicated by the pope. This respect was returned to king Francis's memory by the English court soon after, though not at the same hazard: 220.

*The funeral of the late king solemnized at Paris.*

The late king in his will had settled six hundred pounds per annum upon the dean and canons, to find two priests to say masses for his soul in St. George's Chapel, where he was buried. He had likewise left an establishment for four solemn obits, every year, a maintenance for poor knights, &c., which the reader may see in the records. The alterations in religion which immediately followed, made part of the king's will insignificant. The court did not believe any applications of the living could be serviceable to the dead; and thus the masses, obits, and charities, designed to relieve him in the other world, were dropped, notwithstanding his solemn charge to the contrary. Saunders will have this a judicial misfortune upon king Henry, for defeating the wills of so many founders of chantries and religious houses. Heylin, Hist. Reform. p. 23.

*His will overlooked, with relation to himself.*

When the funeral was over, the peers above-mentioned were created. The protector was duke of Somerset; Parr, earl of Essex and marquess of Northampton; Dudley, viscount Lisle, was earl of Warwick; the lord Wriothesley, earl of Southampton: sir Thomas Seymour, the king's uncle, was created lord Sudley, and high-admiral; sir Richard Rich was made lord Rich; sir William Willoughby, lord Willoughby of Parram; sir Edmund Sheffield, lord Sheffield of Butterwike. The rest in the list above-mentioned declined the honour of a title. Saunders de Schism. Anglic. Feb. 17.

*Stow's Annals.*

Three days after, the king was solemnly crowned at Westminster, by archbishop Cranmer, and a general pardon granted,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

with an exception of these six persons, the duke of Norfolk, Edward, lord Courtney, eldest son to the marquess of Exeter, cardinal Pole, Dr. Pate, Mr. Foskew, and Mr. Throgmorton.

There was a new form ordered by the privy-council for regulating the coronation ceremonies, which being somewhat different both from the preceding and following reigns, I shall insert it in the records. One material circumstance, as our learned Church historian observes, was the manner of the archbishop's demanding the people's consent for owning the king, which yet, as he expresseth it, "was done in such terms as should demonstrate he was no elective prince."

See Records,  
num. 52.  
The Coro-  
nation.

*The arch-  
bishop's  
speech at  
this so-  
lemnity.*

Instead of a sermon at the coronation, archbishop Cranmer made a speech to the king to the following effect: "In the first place he declares the king's right to govern did not depend upon any engagement at his coronation: that his crown being given him by God Almighty, could not by a failure in the administration, be forfeited either to Church or State. That notwithstanding the archbishops of Canterbury had commonly crowned his predecessors, yet it was never at their liberty to admit or refuse them for their sovereigns; neither did the privilege to perform this ceremony, give them any right to put terms upon their kings, or dispose of their crowns at pleasure."

This was said by way of censure of the extravagant pretensions of the court of Rome.

To go on with the archbishop's speech; he takes notice—

"That the solemn ceremonies at a coronation are significant, but not absolutely necessary: they serve to put princes in mind of their duty to God, but are no addition to their character; for it is not so much the oil which makes them God's anointed, as the power and jurisdiction given them from above. It is because they are placed in their station by God's appointment, and assisted with his grace for the better discharge of their office. Neither the bishop of Rome, or any other see, have any authority to bring kings under articles; however, it is the part of the bishop who officiates in this solemnity, to remind princes of what God expects from them; and here the archbishop suggests, the king, being God's vicegerent, and Christ's vicar in his own dominions, was obliged to follow the precedent of Josias, to take care the worship of God was under due regulations, to suppress idolatry, remove images, and dis-

charge the tyranny of the bishop of Rome : to reward virtue, and punish vice, to protect the innocent, and relieve the poor : to execute justice, and discountenance violence. These things," says the archbishop, "I am bound by my function to lay before your royal highness ; yet I must openly declare before God and this noble assembly, that in case your majesty should fail in any or all these particulars, I have no commission to pronounce you deprived."

EDWARD VI.

Not long after the coronation the broad seal was taken from the earl of Southampton, and given to the lord St. John. This lord, as hath been observed, disagreed in matter of religion from the protector and his party. They were willing therefore on the first opportunity to remove him from his post ; and it was not long before they had a handle for their purpose. The chancellor designing to reserve himself wholly for state affairs, had lately put the great seal to a commission directed to sir Richard Southwell, master of the rolls, John Tregonnel, esq., master of chancery, John Oliver and Anthony Bellasis, clerks, masters of chancery : by virtue of this deputation, three or two of these masters were empowered to represent the lord chancellor, and execute his office in as full a manner as if himself were in court ; only their decrees were to be signed by him before their enrolment. This authority being granted without any warrant from the protector and council, was censured as a high presumption ; besides the persons nominated being two of them canonists, the common lawyers looked upon it a discouragement to their profession. Upon this they remonstrated against the lord chancellor at the council-board. The council ordered the judges to examine the commission with the complaint against it. The judges delivered their opinions that the chancellor had forfeited his place, after which resolution the broad seal was taken from him. These proceedings are said to be "summary and severe, beyond the usage of the privy-council, and without the common form of legal processes. But the council's authority had been raised so high by 31 H. 8. cap. 8. that they were empowered sufficiently for matters of that nature." Thus our learned Church historian. But, with submission, if the privy-council had no other warrant to support their proceedings than this act, it is pretty plain they exceeded their authority. For this statute, in the first place, relates only to proclamations.

Foxes and Firebrands, part 2. from Archbishop Usher's Collection. *The lord chancellor turned out, and why ?* March 6 A. D. 1546-7.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 19. and Records, p. 56.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Secondly. It is expressly provided, "that none of the king's liege people should have any of their inheritances, lawful possessions, offices, &c., taken from them." Which word office brings the lord chancellor's case fully within the saving of the statute.

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 8.  
Statutes at  
Large.

*The lord  
protector  
holds his  
office by  
patent.*

March 13.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 17.  
and Records,  
p. 96.

The lord protector, who stood hitherto upon the choice of the rest, procured a patent for his office. By this means, he seemed to act upon a higher authority, and was less encumbered with restraint. This commission, amongst other things, sets forth, "that the protector might be furnished with a council for his aid and assistance, his majesty did by the advice of his uncles and others, nobles, prelates, and wise men, accept of these persons for his counsellors: the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord St. John, president, John lord Russel, lord privy seal, William, marquess of Northampton, John, earl of Warwick, great chamberlain of England, Henry, earl of Arundel, lord chamberlain, Thomas, lord Seymour of Sudley, admiral, Cuthbert, bishop of Durham, Richard, lord Rich, sir Thomas Cheyney, treasurer of the household, sir John Gage, comptroller of the household, sir Anthony Brown, master of the horse, sir William Paget, and sir William Petres, secretaries of state, sir Ralph Sadler, master of the wardrobe, sir John Baker, knight, Dr. Wotton, dean of Canterbury and York, sir Anthony Denny and sir William Herbert, gentlemen of the privy chamber, sir Edward North, chancellor of the court of augmentation and the revenues of the crown, sir Edward Montague, chief justice of the Common Pleas, sir Edward Wotton, sir Edmund Peckum, cofferer, sir Thomas Bromley, one of the justices of the King's Bench, and sir Richard Southwell."

*The great  
power  
granted the  
privy-coun-  
cil.*

By this patent the protector had an authority to take as many into the council as he thought fit. "The protector and the council were likewise empowered to act, as it were, at discretion, and do whatever they thought serviceable to the government, without incurring any penalty or forfeiture from any law, statute, proclamation, or ordinance whatsoever." I have given a list of the names of them that sat at the board with all this power and privilege, because of the great share they had in the direction of Church affairs. And here the protector had a negative vote upon the rest. His consent was necessary to all resolutions of the board: on the other side, he



EDWARD  
VI.

was not obliged to call the whole number upon any debate, but only to advise with so many as he thought convenient : and all this authority was vested in him, until the king was eighteen years of age. Thus a main branch of king Henry's will was evidently overruled ; for first, Wriothsley, late lord chancellor, is struck out of the list by this patent ; secondly, by the late king's will these sixteen counsellors therein specified, or the major part of them, were entrusted with the government of the king and kingdom ; and in case any of them died during the king's minority, the whole power was to continue in the survivors. The young king is likewise charged "on pain of his father's curse," to be directed and governed both in his public and private affairs, by the advice of this privy council, till he had completed the eighteenth year of his age. Now this will stood upon the foot of an act of parliament ; by virtue of which, the king was enabled to settle the crown either by letters-patent, or his last will, under such conditions as he thought fit. The late king's will being thus set aside, and the government put into other hands by the protector's patent, the legality of the proceedings looks somewhat mysterious. To affirm this change, being made "by the major part of the executors, was still warrantable by the will, which devolved the government on the whole number, or the major part : " the affirming this, doth not come up to a sufficient defence ; for it is of the nature of trusts not to be transferred : by such a liberty the disposition of the person entrusting is disappointed, and the trustees do not answer to their promise. He that makes a will puts persons in trust out of a particular confidence he has in them ; if therefore, after their consent to act, they resign their power, they disappoint the intention of the will, and fail in their engagements to the deceased. Farther, it doth not appear that the major part of the king's executors agreed to this alteration. Had this been done, the patent would most probably have mentioned it ; for such a consent, considering the king's minority, would have given a more plausible colour ; but the commission says no such thing, either expressly, or in terms of equivalence. It is only said in the patent, that the king, "by the consent of his uncle and others, the nobles, prelates, and wise men of England, had formed the privy council in the manner above-mentioned." By this commission, the lord Wriothsley or Southampton is not only left out, but the number is increased

Fuller,  
p. 249.  
35 Hen. 3.  
cap. 1.*The late  
king's will  
seems set  
aside by this  
patent.*Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 19.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

from sixteen to twenty-six. Now it can hardly be supposed the majority of the executors should consent to the abridgment of their own power, to raise the protector so much above themselves, and choose in eleven new members in his interest, to weigh down their privilege. Besides, it does not appear they had any liberty for such a compliance. There is no clause in the will for this latitude: no authority to increase their number, and take in others to the partnership of their trust. But no more of this.

*The rigour  
of the Six  
Articles  
abated.*

However, by this alteration the rigour of the government was abated, the persecution upon the Six Articles was stopped, and people were more at liberty to profess their belief. Thus the prisons were opened, and those who had been forced to quit the kingdom recalled. Amongst these the most eminent were Miles Coverdale, afterwards bishop of Exeter, John Hooper, afterwards bishop of Gloucester, John Filpot, and John Rogers: the first of which was preferred to the archdeaconry of Winchester, and the other made prebendary of St. Paul's.

Heylin,  
p. 34.

*A regal  
visitation.*

The privy council projecting a farther reformation, resolved upon sending commissioners into all parts of the kingdom, by way of visitation. These visitors consisted of a mixture of laity and clergy, and had six circuits assigned them. Every division had a preacher, whose business it was to bring off the people from the remains of superstition, and dispose them for the intended alterations. And to make the impression of their doctrine more lasting, they were to lodge some homilies, lately composed, with the parish-priest. The argument of these discourses was first concerning the use of the Scriptures. Secondly, of the misery of mankind by sin. Third, of their salvation by Christ. Fourth, of true and lively faith. Fifth, of good works. Sixth, of Christian love and charity. Seventh, against swearing, where perjury is particularly loaded. Eighth, against apostacy. Ninth, against the fear of death. Tenth, an exhortation to obedience. Eleventh, against whoredom and adultery. Twelfth, against strife and contention about matters of religion. These homilies are drawn up mostly by archbishop Cranmer. The design of them was to furnish the less learned part of the clergy, and to suggest matter and direction to those better qualified.

*Homilies  
composed.  
Holinshead,  
p. 979.  
222.*

*Some homi-  
lies drawn  
up by Cran-  
mer.*

Heylin,  
Bp. Burnet.

The gospellers, as they were then called, presuming on the countenance of the court, overran the motions of the state,

and ventured to reform without public authority. This year doctor John Harley, of Magdalen-college, in Oxford, preaching in Lent, declaimed with a great deal of vehemence against the pope and the old tenets: the majority of the university being displeas'd with this freedom, brought him before the vice-chancellor, where his sermon not passing the test, he was sent up to London to be tried for heresy, but the Protestant interest prevailing at court, those who were to inform against him thought it best not to appear; and so he was privately discharged. When this news was brought to Oxford, the Protestant party discovered their opinion, and under the pretence of taking away the remains of superstition, took a great deal of unjustifiable liberty in churches and chapels.

Of this we have another instance, in bishop Gardiner's letter to one captain Vaughan. In the beginning he takes notice, that by an order of council to the justices of peace, "no change was to be made upon the laws and regulations of the late reign:" this order of the council was dated February the twelfth last past. From hence the bishop proceeds to complain to this gentleman, that he was informed the images of our Saviour and the saints "had been pulled down at Portsmouth with great outrage and contempt, the figure of our Saviour run through, and an eye bored out. That these heats went farther than the excesses of the Lutherans in Germany: that Luther wrote a book in vindication of the lawfulness of images: and that himself, when ambassador in Germany, had seen images standing in churches, where Luther was most admired." After this, he proceeds to urge the common arguments in defence of such representations: "that they suggested the history of the Gospel to the unlearned, and assisted them instead of books: that since the far greatest part of the kingdom could not read, the taking images away would deprive them of one means of instruction, and increase their ignorance."

This letter was sent by Vaughan to the protector, who, in his answer to the bishop, "commends him for his learning and zeal against innovation; but then gives a caution against being too warm in his application this way; that unseasonable remedies and over-driving matters might increase the disorder: that when images served only for memory, they might be let alone; however, as to the main, he looked upon such a provi-

EDWARD  
VI.

*Images pulled down without authority.*  
Wood. Hist. et Antiquit. Univers. Oxon. lib. 1. p. 265. Cotton Library, Titus, B. 2. May 4, 1547.  
*Gardiner's complaint upon this score.*

Fox, 719.

Vol. 2.  
p. 712.  
*The protector's answer.*  
Ibid.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Page 139.  
et deince.

sion as a dangerous liberty." The rest of his letter being mostly spent against Gardiner's arguments, I shall waive the recital, and refer the reader to the former part of this work.

This year, in Lent, Ridley, afterwards bishop of Rochester, preached a controversial sermon at court: the bishop of Winchester being one of the audience, and not altogether pleased, wrote him a letter upon some part of the discourse.

In the first place he commends Ridley for his approbation of the doctrine established in the late reign, "and particularly for disproving the pope's pretended authority;" but then Ridley having declared his dislike of images and holy water, Gardiner endeavours to justify the received usage. His arguments for images I shall pass over, for the reasons above-mentioned. But what he advances in defence of holy water being somewhat new, I shall give the reader part of it. Ridley had denied this ceremony could have any force for driving away devils. In answer to this, Gardiner cites a passage out of the "Historia Tripartita," where the bishop Marcellus is said to order his deacon, Equitius, to "throw consecrated water upon an ill apparition in Jupiter's temple. That the devil could not stand against this application, but immediately vanished. That our Saviour had promised the Church that 'in his name they should cast out devils.' That the force of this effect is to be attributed to the name of God. Notwithstanding this, the question is, whether the element of water may not be instrumental in conveying this supernatural virtue. In proof of the affirmative, he urges the hem of our Saviour's garment, the spittle and clay laid upon the eyes of the blind, and St. Peter's shadow curing those that come under it. From hence he proceeds to a modern instance of our king's curing the falling sickness, and other distempers, by cramp rings. Now as the metal of gold and silver can have no natural causality to produce such an effect, yet by the prayer of consecration it is raised to the force of a means, and made a conveyance of the blessing: by parity of reason, water, when the preparatory ceremonies of the Church have passed upon it, may be, as it were, a vehicle for a miraculous remedy. The bishop takes notice, farther, that Ridley had insinuated the true Church was known only to God; however, he explained himself afterwards inoffensively, and corrected the crudeness of the expression, by saying this society was to be

Bishop  
Gardiner's  
letter to  
Ridley in  
defence of  
holy water.

looked for in the visible Church, to which appeals in cases of controversy ought to be made.”

About this time, the bishop of Winchester wrote to the protector, to dissuade alterations in religion. He complains “Barlow, bishop of St. David’s, had preached against the doctrines settled in the late reign, disturbed people’s minds with novelties, and raised unseasonable disputes. To make good this allegation, he enclosed a copy of the sermon. He suggests to the protector, the king’s minority was a very improper juncture for awakening controversy: that if the bishop of St. David’s was so fully persuaded of the serviceableness of his notions, and so much for erecting a new fabric, he would advise him to pitch upon his ground, and draw his model, and prepare his materials, but not to fall upon building till the king was a major, and the times better settled. That he humbly conceived it was his grace’s interest to check the forwardness of projecting men. And since he was entrusted with the protection of the king and kingdom, it would be much for his honour to maintain religion and the laws in the present circumstances; that when the king came of age he might put the Church and State into his majesty’s hands, in the same good condition he found them. That innovation in worship or belief would necessarily embroil the public, and draw disturbance along with it: that his grace, being at the helm, would be particularly embarrassed and uneasy; that the miscarriages would be imputed either to his concurrence, or want of precaution: that if the bishop of St. David’s is countenanced in his controversial humour, allowed to set up for a champion, and enter the lists in a martial equipage, there will be more indiscreet seconds, and more pressing to the combat than his grace would approve.” This letter is dated the last of February, and by the bishop’s dissuading the Scotch expedition till the king was of age, it is evident it was written in the first year of this reign.

In May following, this bishop sent the protector another letter: here he takes notice of a seditious book, as he calls it, written by Bale, entitled, “An Elucidation of Anne Askew’s Martyrdom.” He endeavours to drive this Bale to an absurdity, and run him upon contradiction. This author had lately published Luther’s death in English, in which he recommends this German divine for a saint, and bestows a great deal

EDWARD VI.  
 Fox, vol. 2.  
 p. 722.  
*His letter to the protector to dissuade alteration in religion.*

223.

A.D. 1546-7.

Feb. 28.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of panegyric on his memory. "Now, (says Gardiner,) Luther always maintained the real presence of Christ's natural body in the sacrament of the altar, which article was positively denied by Anne Askew: thus," continues Winchester with an air of raillery, "Bale's saints must differ and dispute in heaven, if they do not happen to meet by the way, and compound the article." In the course of the letter he complains of "the insufferable liberties of the press, of the stage, and the pulpits: and particularly that a scandalous ballad called 'Jack of Lent,' was lately published. That the duties of self-denial, the discipline of the holy season, and the solemn preparations for Easter, were turned to a jest, and exposed in doggrel. That notwithstanding these men pretend to combat superstition, and refine us to a more spiritual worship, yet it is plain their drift must be all for liberty and the animal life. They would fain have the privilege of talking and doing what they please, and unless their pens and tongues are kept under restraint, the authority of the Church will be lost; the distinctions in the State confounded; and we shall all be reformed in a little time, to license, luxury, and levelling." The bishop argues for the keeping Lent from the practice of the Church, from our Saviour's fasting forty days, and from the public benefit consequent upon Lenten provision, and encouraging the fishery. He takes notice farther, that the protector had ordered a Lent diet for the king.

*He complains of the ridiculing Lent.*

May 21,  
A. D. 1547.

Fox, p. 715.

*The protector's answer.*

The protector in his answer to the bishop's letter, commends his concern for the public, and for guarding against innovation. But as to his remonstrance he tells him, "that printers, players, and preachers too, will sometimes exceed their bounds, and talk more than their share." He gives the bishop a gentle rebuke for insinuating, as if all these disorders were occasioned by his connivance, and to be put to his account. He charges Gardiner with omissions and partiality in his complaint; that he had been passive and silent in other cases of equal importance. Particularly, that he had spent none of his satire against Dr. Smith's book, in which the king's supremacy was opposed, and the pope's usurpations countenanced.

By the way, this Dr. Smith, master of Whittington-college in London, and divinity reader at Christ's-church in Oxford, had published two books; in one of which he undertakes the

defence of the mass, and in the other endeavours to prove that “unwritten verities ought to be believed under pain of damnation.” These books he lately retracted in a sermon at St. Paul’s Cross, and mortified himself so far, as to own that he had taught not only error, but heresy, both from the press and pulpit.

EDWARD  
VI.  
*Dr. Smith’s  
recantation.*  
May 15.

Holinshed,  
Heylin.

To return to the protector’s letter; who in the close vindicates himself from the charge of remissness, lets the bishop know the public tranquillity might suffer by excesses of fear and jealousy, as well as too much patience; and that he hoped when his majesty came of age he should deliver the government to him with improvement rather than disadvantage.

Fox, p. 717.

On the sixth of June, the bishop of Winchester wrote again to the protector: here he mentions “the bishops being forbidden preaching, excepting in their cathedrals: this restraint he covertly censures, and says he never knew it done in his time. From hence he goes on to touch upon images, and pleads for no more regard to such representations than is prescribed by the late king’s ‘Necessary Erudition,’ &c. He conceives the king’s honour is somewhat concerned, to acquiesce in the present state of religion. To do otherwise would be a reflection on his father’s memory, and imply that prince was defective in knowledge or integrity. He suggests it would be dangerous for the bishops to innovate or unsettle anything in the Church. That the king when he came of age might call them to an account: and that it is likely they might find the laws very unfriendly to them for venturing so far. That the pope would make his advantage on such conduct. The court of Rome would say, every new government would bring us a new religion. If we give faith and worship another face, and alter that which was settled in the late reign by an unanimous concurrence, the papists will charge us with fluctuating and uncertainty; and that we are never sure of understanding the Scripture in a true sense. That any novelties of this kind would be remarkably disserviceable to the reputation of the archbishop of Canterbury, and bishop of Durham. That people would wonder these eminent prelates, who were made standing members of the privy-council, and put in so high a place of trust by the late king, should so soon forget their old knowledge in Scripture, set forth in the ‘Necessary Erudition,’ and advise a change.”

*Winchester’s  
arguments  
against  
alterations  
in religion.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
224.

Notwithstanding Gardiner recommends the abiding by the "Necessary Erudition" so earnestly; yet in his letter to Ridley, above-mentioned, he declares he had no share in composing that book, nor was privy to it till it was finished.

As to Dr. Smith, he acquaints the protector, that he neither liked his books, or his recantation. To proceed :

Before the visitors set forward, the archbishop sent his mandate by virtue of the king's letter, to the bishop of London : it was to give notice to the provincial bishops not to visit their respective dioceses, nor exercise any spiritual jurisdiction, nor preach any where but in their cathedrals : and that none of the clergy should preach in any place without the king's license, excepting in their own collegiate and parochial churches. The king's letter of this tenour was directed to the archbishop of York. This inhibition was taken off June the third, because the visitation was deferred for some months, as appears by a citation, dated August the twentieth, in which instrument the bishop of London is cited to appear before the visitors on September the fifth. Besides the restraint of this

May 14,  
A. D. 1547.

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 105.  
Cotton  
Library,  
Titus B. 2.

*The bishop's  
jurisdiction  
inhibited.*

mandate, there was a particular inhibition, directed to the bishop of London by the king's commissaries, for a general and regal visitation. By this inhibition the bishop's whole jurisdiction is laid asleep, and himself reserved with a citation to appear before the visitors. And, which makes the case somewhat more extraordinary, the visitors are most of them laymen. They have a large compass of jurisdiction in their instrument, and are empowered to visit the clergy and laity, to have all sorts of faculties, licenses, and endowments laid before them, to examine the clergy's titles, and to inquire into the practice of the spiritual courts, and inspect, as it were, every part of the bishop's function. The reader may see the instrument in the Records.

*The latitude  
of the  
visitors'  
commission.*

See Records,  
num. 53.

It hath been already observed, that none of the clergy were to preach excepting on their own cures, without the king's license. The reason of this restraint was to hinder those who opposed the intended Reformation from spreading their opinions, and haranguing where they pleased. Whereas those of the Protestant sentiment might move at large, have the countenance of a royal authority, and make proselytes as they were able ; but that which chiefly discouraged this design was the lamentable poverty of the clergy. The tithes of impropriated



livings being now in lay-hands, reduced the Church to a very unfurnished condition. Besides, several cowardly incumbents had alienated the best part of their benefices. "Thus there was very little encouragement left for those who should labour in the work of the Gospel." "And though many projects were thought on for remedying this great abuse, yet those were all so powerfully opposed, that there was no hopes of a remedy till the king should come of age, and be able by his authority to procure the churchmen a more proportioned maintenance." At present the benefices were generally very small, so that in many places three or four livings would scarcely afford a competent provision for one incumbent.

EDWARD  
VI.

*The Church  
lamentably  
impover-  
ished.*

"It is said, while the abbeys stood, the abbots allowed those whom they appointed to serve the cure in the churches belonging to them a small stipend, or some little part of the vicarage tithes."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 26.

Id. p. 24.

Notwithstanding this remark, the vicar's maintenance was not so slender before the Reformation as since. In former reigns, the fees of sacraments, sacramentals, diriges, &c., were very considerable. Before the Reformation, the bishops could increase the allowance of the vicars, out of the tithes of the benefice, to what proportion they pleased. And thus, if the first endowment was too strait, they had an authority from the constitution to give the vicar a relief. By a statute made in the reign of king Richard II. it is enacted, "That because divers damages and hinderances oftentimes have happened, and daily do happen, to the parishioners of divers places by the appropriation of benefices of the same places: it is agreed and assented, that in every license from henceforth to be made in the chancery of the appropriation of any parish church, it shall be expressly contained and comprised, that the diocesan of the place, upon the appropriation of such churches, shall ordain, according to the value of such churches, a convenient sum of money to be paid and distributed yearly of the fruits and profits of the same churches, by those that will have the said churches in proper use, and by their successors, to the poor parishioners of the said churches, in aid of their living and sustenance for ever, and also that the vicar be well and sufficiently endowed."

*The condi-  
tion of  
vicarages  
worse than  
formerly.  
15 Rich. 2.  
cap. 6.*

By another act in the reign of king Henry IV. this statute is confirmed. It is likewise enacted, "That if any church be

4 Hen. 4.  
cap. 12.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

appropriated by license of the said king Richard, or of our lord the king that now is, sithence the said fifteen years, against the form of the said statute, the same shall be duly reformed according to the effect of the same statute, betwixt this and the feast of Easter next coming. And if such reformation be not made within the time aforesaid, that the appropriation and license thereof made, be void and utterly repealed and annulled for ever.—And that from henceforth, in every church so appropriated or to be appropriated, a secular person be ordained vicar perpetual, canonically institute and induct in the same, and convenably endowed by the discretion of the ordinary to do divine service, and to inform the people and keep hospitality there. And that no religious be made in any way vicar in any church so appropriated, or to be appropriated by any means in time to come.”

Ryves, his  
vicar's plea.

These statutes being not repealed, the bishops have still the same right, as doctor Ryves has proved to satisfaction. But whether the exercise of such an authority now, would not be overruled by the temporal courts, is another question. To proceed: by the statutes above-mentioned, it is plain the vicar was not left to the courtesy of the abbot or religious houses, to whom the church was appropriated. No, the provision for the vicars was referred to the bishops' discretion. Thus, in many places, half the tithes of all kinds, the profits of all sacraments and sacramentals, were settled upon the vicarages: and in some places they were endowed with an annual pension in money. That vicarages stood in this condition of advantage, appears sufficiently from the bishops' registers, and other ancient records. As for those impropriated livings which have now no settled endowment, which are not called vicarages, but either perpetual or arbitrary curacies: these churches belonged formerly to those religious orders who served the cure in their own persons: after the dissolution of the abbeys, they came into laymen's hands, who hired curates at the cheapest rate they could bargain: and at present it is to be feared the matter is little mended.

225.

Harmer,  
p. 66.  
*The bishops  
disposed for  
a further  
reformation.*

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 25.

To go on: Cranmer, being now delivered from that too awful subjection he had been held under by king Henry, resolved to go on more vigorously in purging out abuses, as our learned historian expresses it. He had the countenance of the protector's authority, who appeared wholly in his design.

He had also several bishops in his interest : in which number we may reckon Holgate of York, Holbeach of Lincoln, Gooderick of Ely ; and particularly Ridley, who was consecrated to the see of Rochester in September this year. Latimer, likewise, late bishop of Worcester, though he declined the exercise of his character, and seemed to affect a private life, yet declared for Cranmer's party, and assisted him with his talent in preaching.

EDWARD  
VI.

On the other side, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was for making a stand upon the old ground. He thought the Reformation was sufficiently carried on in the late reign, and was by no means for refining any farther. This prelate was supported with a considerable interest, both in the clergy and others. He was much shocked at the forwardness of archbishop Cranmer, and complained of the imposition of new homilies. He wrote to the protector to acquaint him that the archbishop's reasons for setting forth the homilies were not satisfactory. Cranmer urged a resolution of the convocation held in the year 1542 : "that the bishops and clergy then assembled agreed to draw up some discourses for public instruction, and prevent the spreading of error occasioned by ignorant and indiscreet preachers." To this Gardiner replied, "the late king, by publishing a form of belief, had superseded the use of this expedient." For proof of this, he refers the protector to his answer to Cranmer's letter.

*This design  
opposed by  
the bishop of  
Winchester.*

*Winchester's  
letter to the  
protector,  
June 10,  
1547.*

In this answer he seems much surprised at Cranmer's affirming the late king was seduced, and that he knew who managed his highness, in setting forth that which Winchester calls "The King's Majesty's Book." By this Cranmer meant the "Necessary Erudition for a Christian Man." This was that provision which Gardiner hinted to the protector had made the homilies unnecessary.

*Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 1.  
And to  
Cranmer.*

But to return to Gardiner's answer to Cranmer : he tells the archbishop, "this book was owned as the 'King's Book,' and authorised by the whole parliament : that his grace of Canterbury complied with the use of this book all the late reign, ordered it to be read in his diocese as the 'King's Book,' and commanded one Joseph not to preach against it. This length of compliance," continues Winchester, "I conceive your grace would not have gone, if you had not believed the doctrine of this 'Necessary Erudition' to have been sound

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

and serviceable. And if the book contains truth, a man cannot be said to be seduced to it, but from it. If your grace had found any dangerous heterodoxies in it, I conceive you would have declared your dissent at first, and not have had a share in passing it through the kingdom: for you know 'we ought to obey God rather than man.' Since, therefore, your grace has lived four years in the profession of the doctrine of that book, and raised no scruples during the late reign, I cannot but wonder to find you affirm in your letters, just after our late sovereign's death, that his highness was seduced."

Foxii MSS.  
Append. to  
Cranmer's  
Memoir,  
p. 73.

Here some of the letter is wanting. In the remaining part he tells the archbishop, "that the king's minority is a very improper season for attempts of this nature; that the government ought to be smoothly managed, and not disturbed with novelties in religion; that, notwithstanding some pretend the late king had but imperfect views in matters of doctrine, yet our better way is, to go to heaven after him with one eye, than by striving for another to run the hazard of losing both. It is a dangerous thing to use too much freedom in researches of this kind. If you cut the old channel, the water is apt to run farther than you have a mind to: if you indulge the humour of novelty, you cannot put a stop to people's demands, nor govern their indiscretions at pleasure. There is no end in humouring the desire of novelty. Some are for one new thing, and some are for another, till they have nothing old but their folly left them. We have seen how lamentably the boors embroiled Germany upon this principle. To prevent such confusion, such errors in belief, such civil distractions amongst ourselves, the late king put a restraint upon private fancy, and ordered a form of belief and practice for public use. Thus his highness hoped he had left us in possession of truth and repose."

The rest of the letter relates to the controversy upon the article of justification. But what was Gardiner's opinion in this matter I shall waive at present.

This bishop's opposition to the public measures was resented at court, and drew a storm upon him, as the reader will see by and by. In the mean time I shall proceed to the business of the visitors. The injunctions delivered by these commissioners are printed, either at length or abstracted, in Fox, Fuller, Heylin, and Sparrow. However, since every reader may not be furnished with these books, since the history is concerned in

the recital, I shall give a summary view of the articles. In doing this I shall change the order a little, and throw the resembling matter together.

EDWARD  
VI.

“ I. All ecclesiastical persons are to observe the laws for abolishing the pretended power of the bishop of Rome, and maintaining the king’s supremacy. Upon these subjects they were to preach four times a-year, that the people might be rightly informed, and govern themselves accordingly. *The king’s injunctions.*”

“ II. Once a-quarter they are to dissuade the people from their superstitious fancies touching pilgrimages, praying to images, &c. ; and, instead of these unserviceable and dangerous applications, they are to exhort their audience to the exercises of faith, mercy, and charity.

“ III. And images that have been abused with pilgrimages and offerings are ordered to be taken down and destroyed. That no more wax candles should be burnt before any image : however, two tapers upon the high altar before the sacrament were to remain still, to signify that ‘ Christ is the very light of the world.’ ” And here they are to put their parishioners in mind that images serve only for instruction, and to refresh the memory with the virtues of the person represented.

“ IV. That every holiday, when there is no sermon, the Pater Noster, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, shall be read in the pulpit.

226.

“ V. And parents and masters are enjoined to breed their children and servants either to learning, or some useful and honest employment.

“ VII. Within three months after this visitation, the Bible of the larger volume in English, and, within twelve months, Erasmus, his ‘ Paraphrase on the Gospel,’ was to be provided, and conveniently placed in the church for the use of the people.

“ XX. And that every ecclesiastical person under the degree of a bachelor of divinity shall provide for himself the New Testament in Latin and English, with Erasmus’s paraphrase. And that the bishops and their officers shall examine the parochial clergy upon their proficiency in the study of the Holy Scriptures.

“ VI. And those who are dispensed with by statute for non-residence, shall get learned curates to supply their places.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

“XIV. That all ecclesiastical persons who are non-resident, and able to spend 20*l.* per annum or more, shall distribute the fortieth part of their revenue amongst the poor of the parish.

“XV. That all ecclesiastical persons shall allow a competent exhibition to as many scholars in one of the universities as they have 100*l.* per annum in Church preferments.

“XVI. A fifth part of their benefices was to be laid out on their mansion-houses, or chancels, until they were well repaired.

“VIII. That no ecclesiastical persons go to ale-houses or taverns without business and necessity. And here likewise they are forbidden spending their time at cards, dice, or any unlawful diversion.

“IX. They are to examine such as come to confession in Lent, whether they can repeat the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and Ten Commandments, in English. And that unless they are thus far acquainted with the fundamentals of religion, they ought not to be admitted to the blessed sacrament of the altar.

“X. None is admitted to preach unless sufficiently licensed.

“XI. If they have heretofore magnified pilgrimages, relics, worshipping of images, or any such superstitious practice, they are now obliged to a public recantation of such opinions.”

By the way, the ill use of images, and the superstition of pilgrimages, is fully remedied by the “Institution” and “Necessary Erudition” published in the late reign.

“XII. They are to present such as they perceive are hinderers of the Word of God in English, and the abettors of the bishop of Rome’s pretended power.

“XIX. That no person shall alter any fast-day, or change the form and order of common prayer or divine service, any otherwise than is specified in these injunctions.

“XXI. And that in time of high mass, he that says or sings the same, shall read the Epistle and Gospel in English, and one chapter at matins immediately after the lessons: and at even song, after Magnificat, one chapter of the Old Testament. And that when nine lessons are to be read in the church, three of them shall be omitted with the responds; and at even song the responds, with all the memories, shall be likewise omitted.”

By the “memories” we are to understand the anniversary commemoration of deceased persons. This was done at the return of the day of their death, and commonly mentioned under the name of “obits.”

EDWARD  
VI.

“XXVI. Every dean, archdeacon, prebendary, &c., being a priest, is to preach twice a year at least in some church belonging to his preferment.

“XXVII. The clergy are to caution their people against incomppliance with the ceremonies of the Church, and on the other side to avoid the excesses of superstition.

“XXV. That those who are maliciously affected, and discover themselves in a state of enmity with their neighbours, should not be admitted to the holy communion till the controversy is made up and they are openly reconciled.

“XXIII. That to avoid disputes formerly occasioned by people claiming precedency in processions, no procession for the time to come shall be used about the church or church-yard: but immediately before high mass, the Litany shall be distinctly said or sung in English; and here none were to go out of the church without just occasion, and no bells were to be rung, excepting one before sermon.

“XXVIII. All shrines, coverings of shrines, tables, candlesticks, trindels, or rolls of wax, paintings, and other monuments of feigned miracles, were to be taken away and destroyed. The curates were likewise to exhort their parishioners to follow this example in their respective houses.

“XXIV. That the holy day should be wholly spent in religious service, in hearing the Word of God, in private and public prayer, in confession of sin to God, in receiving the communion, visiting the sick, and putting an end to animosities and quarrels.”

This article is not without one reserve of liberty. For the curates are obliged to instruct their parishioners, that in harvest time it is lawful for them to work on holy days, and preserve the blessings of the year sent them by Providence; and that to forbear working out of scrupulosity upon such occasions, would be highly displeasing to God Almighty. Under the holy day mentioned in this article, Heylin will have the Sunday comprehended. He argues pretty closely from a statute towards the latter end of this reign, in which the Sunday is mentioned amongst the rest of the festivals with a

5, 6 Edw. 6.  
cap. 3.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

clause of allowance for working in harvest, or at other times when necessity shall require. He urges farther, that not only the country but the court were allowed to do business upon this day: he recites an order of the king to this purpose, viz., "That the lords of the council should, upon Sunday, attend the public affairs of this realm, dispatch answers to letters for good order of state, and make full dispatches of all things concluded the week before. Provided always that they be present at common prayer, and that on every Sunday night the king's secretary should deliver him a memorial of such things as are to be debated by the privy-council in the week ensuing." And thus by the words of the statute, and the practice of the court, this historian believes the meaning of the article in the injunctions may be easily collected. But whether these permissions of the State do not indulge too far; whether they are to be reconciled with the customs and constitutions of the Church or not, is another question, of which no more at present.

Heylin,  
p. 33.

To go on with the injunctions, *Idem*, it is ordered that a register book be kept in every parish for weddings, christenings, and burials.

227.

"XXIX. That a strong chest be provided to receive the charity of the people, and the money distributed, at proper times, to the poor before the congregation, and that a decent pulpit be provided.

"XXXII. That in regard a sufficient number of preachers are wanting, the curates shall read homilies set forth already, or which shall be set forth by the king's authority.

"XXXVI. And that when any homily or sermon shall be delivered, the prime and hours shall be omitted.

"XVIII. That none bound to pay tithes shall detain them under pretence the curates have been negligent in their office.

"XXXIII. And whereas many indiscreet persons are observed to contemn and abuse priests, upon the score that some of them are but slenderly qualified; yet inasmuch as their function is appointed by God Almighty, his majesty charges all his subjects to treat them with regard for their characters' sake.

"XXXI. And because the buying and selling of benefices is execrable before God, the incumbent guilty of any simoniacal contract shall be deprived of his living, and made incapable of any other spiritual promotion. The patron likewise, who sells



a presentation, or makes his profit out of it by any indirect agreement, shall forfeit his title for that turn, and the living shall lapse to the king.” EDWARD VI.

The penalty in this article, though reasonable enough, is a strain upon the constitution; for here the king disposeth arbitrarily of property, and ousts the subjects of their patronage, to which they had a right by common law. The statute made in the late reign, by which the king's proclamations are of the same force with an act of parliament, will do no service in this case: for here, the inheritances, rights, and possessions of the subject are expressly saved. To return:

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 8.

“XXII. To prevent sick persons falling into despair, the curates are admonished to furnish their memories with such comfortable texts of Scripture as set forth the mercies and goodness of God Almighty toward all persons, that apply for pardon with faith and repentance.

“XXX. That priests shall not be obliged to visit women in child-bed, unless they are dangerously sick: nor to fetch any corpses except they be brought to the church-yard.

“XXXIV. That no persons, whether they understand Latin or not, shall make use of any other primer to pray with, but that which was set forth by king Henry VIII. That all graces before and after meat be said in English; and no grammar taught in schools, but that recommended by authority.

“XXXIX. That chantry-priests teach young people to read and write.”

These injunctions were to be read once a-quarter.

Besides this general provision, there were other injunctions drawn up for the bishops. These directions of the king and council were delivered by the commissioners in their visitation. The purport of them was that,

“They (the bishops) should, to the utmost of their power and understanding, see the king's injunctions above-mentioned, exactly observed in all places of their diocese. *Particular injunctions delivered by the visitors to the bishops.*

“That they should preach four times a-year at least: once in the cathedral, and three other times within their jurisdiction, as they should think most convenient: this was not to be omitted without a fair and justifiable excuse.

“Farther, they were forbidden to ordain any persons, excepting those who had studied the Holy Scripture to some apparent proficiency: and where neither this qualification, nor

that of regular behaviour was wanting, orders were not to be refused.

“ Lastly, the bishops were enjoined not to preach any thing contrary to the doctrine, lately set forth in the king’s homilies; not to license any persons whom they had reason to suspect for incomppliance: and when they were informed of any preacher offending against the premises, they were to bar him the pulpit, and revoke his license.”

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 657.

*Bidding of  
prayer.*

There was also a form of bidding prayer prescribed by the visitors; it was to be used by all preachers, either before or in their sermons, as they thought fit. The last part of it differing from what is used at present, runs thus:

“ You shall pray for all them that be departed out of this world in the faith of Christ, that they with us, and we with them, at the day of judgment, may rest both body and soul with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.”

Heylin,  
Hist. Re-  
form, p. 37.

And here, because the beads, or form of bidding-prayer, prior to the Reformation, may not be unacceptable to the reader, I shall insert it amongst the records.

See Records,  
num. 54.

To make way for the injunctions, and give a precedent to the rest of the kingdom, the Compline being the close of the evening service, was sung in the king’s chapel in English on Easter Monday. The tendency of the times, and the inclinations of the court being understood, several learned men retracted their opinions, whether out of conscience or temporizing, is best known to themselves. For instance, besides Dr. Smith, Dr. Pern, afterwards master of Peterhouse in Cambridge, preaching in London at St. Andrew’s Undershaft, on St. George’s-day, affirmed the “ figures of our Saviour and the saints were to be worshipped,” but on the seventeenth of June following, he preached counter-doctrine in the same church, declared himself mistaken, and that he was sorry for what he had delivered. One Dr. Glasier was somewhat forwarder, and more remarkable; for immediately after Lent, he not only maintained in a sermon at St. Paul’s Cross, “ that Lent was no divine institution,” but went farther, and affirmed that “ abstinence from flesh was no obligatory observance. That Lent was only a politic provision of the State, and therefore, people might break it at pleasure.” This being palatable doctrine, and too much encouraged by the juncture, the preacher came into no

*Several  
preachers  
recant some  
of their  
former  
opinions.*

trouble about this sermon; people being thus encouraged by precept and connivance, went much too far in liberty and indulgence, and therefore, to prevent excesses of this kind, the king set forth a proclamation, and commanded abstinence from flesh, for the following Lent.

EDWARD  
VI.

Heylin,  
p. 39.

Bishop Gardiner being a prelate of figure, there were pains taken to persuade him to submit to the injunctions. To this purpose, sir John Godsolve, one of the visitors, had argued with the bishop, pressed him upon the point of interest, and suggested the danger of non-compliance. Gardiner, after some recollection, sends Godsolve a letter upon this subject. It is written in a strain becoming a Christian bishop, and therefore, it may not be improper to abstract part of it.

228.

He tells this gentleman “that notwithstanding his personal failings, he had not broke God’s laws or the king’s, either in getting, or keeping his bishopric. Now if he could quit his see, as inoffensively as he had managed the other two parts, he should hope his life not ill passed over. How to manage this third act, as he calls it, and go handsomely off the stage, must be his main business. Provided this point is secured, he should not be solicitous about the rest, nor be more concerned to see the bishopric taken from him, than himself from the bishopric. I am,” says he, “already, by nature, condemned to death: no man can reverse this sentence, nor so much as procure me a reprieve; thus, there is a necessity of leaving my bishopric to the disposal of the crown. I have been obliged already to leave a pleasant seat at London: and as I have quitted some conveniences already, so I am prepared to resign all. There is no disadvantage in changing for the better; now truth and honesty are more valuable to me, than all the wealth of the kingdom. To speak my mind, and act as my conscience directs, are two branches of liberty I can never part with. Integrity in speech and action are entertaining qualities: besides, they will stick by a man when every thing takes its leave, and therefore, I must not resign them upon any consideration; and the best of it is, if I do not throw them away myself, no man can force them from me; but if I give them up, then I am ruined by myself, and deserve to lose my bishopric. This would be sport to some people that would gladly be in my place, but I do not intend to give them that malicious pleasure. What homilies and injunctions will be brought to me I cannot

*Bishop  
Gardiner’s  
letter to one  
of the  
visitors  
against  
compliance.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

tell; such as the printers have sold, I have read and considered, and therefore, am the better prepared how to behave myself when the visitors come hither: and here I intend to speak clearly to the case, and support the character of a Christian without cowardice or reserve. The benefit of the king's laws are every Englishman's right, and therefore, bishops ought not to lose their share in the common advantage. I intend to behave myself like a good subject, and pay a just deference to the constitution. Now all this is very consistent with an humble petition, not to be forced upon anything contrary to my duty to God, and the tenor of an act of parliament. With this resolution I have acquainted the council, with a request not to be forced upon any unacceptable protestation: which protestation, if matters come to extremity, I cannot decline without scandal and prevarication. My lord protector, in one of his letters, bid me not be too apprehensive of hardship: indeed, I know him and several lords of the council so well, as not to fear they will do me any harm for insisting upon the constitution, and keeping close to the laws of God and the realm: I shall never reproach these lords so far, as to suppose they will make me suffer upon this score. You know, (continues the bishop,) the force of an act of parliament; what danger hangs over a man's head that will venture through it; for this you may recollect several instances, and that the breach of an act of parliament, would not shelter a man from the forfeiture of treason, though the stretch was made by the king's express order."

Ex MS.  
Col. C. C.  
Cantab.  
*His reasons  
for insisting  
on the con-  
stitution.*  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. book 1.  
Records,  
num. 13.  
31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 8.

The reason of Gardiner's insisting so much upon the constitution, both in this letter and some others to the protector, was because the religion professed in the late reign was established by law. It is true the king's proclamation was in some cases made of the same force with an act of parliament; but then such proclamations were to be proclaimed, and posted up by the sheriff, or some other officer, in market-towns. Besides, by an express clause the king's proclamation was not to overrule any act in being. Now, we do not find the injunctions of Edward VI. were either proclaimed in the manner above-mentioned, or supported by any proclamation. Besides, the statute of the "Six Articles" was afterwards made in the same parliament in which the bill passed for giving the king's proclamation an unusual sway: from whence we may probably con-

31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 14.

clude the king's proclamation could not have any force to disable this latter statute. Farther: two or three years after this, in the late reign, there was another act passed against innovation in religion. By this act no books are to be published contrary to the doctrine determined, or to be determined, by the king, under considerable forfeitures; and if any spiritual person should teach contrary to the premises, he was to abjure, or suffer as a heretic. Now, the late king, with the consent of the clergy, had set forth the "Necessary Erudition" as a rule of faith and practice. This book, we see, stood upon the bottom of an act of parliament; but the homilies and injunctions, now set forth by the king and council, clashed with the "Necessary Erudition," opposed some part of the doctrine, and altered the usages recommended by that book. Thus Gardiner, conceiving himself under the protection of the constitution, made a bold stand against the council, and refused to comply with the homilies and injunctions.

The court, who, it is thought, might have something farther than religion in view, did not think it advisable to venture the cause upon disputation, and rely wholly upon arguments. They might be apprehensive, that, unless the disagreement between Rome and England was carried to a wider distance, the breach might possibly be closed, and that such a union might prove unfriendly to their Church estates. On the other hand, they were not assured whether any farther alterations in doctrine and worship would be well received. The minority of the prince was a circumstance of disadvantage; and how far the people would be passive under a new face of things was not easy to conjecture. To guard against the worst, it was thought fit to be furnished with forces to awe the opposite party, and prevent them from giving disturbance; and, as an army was a seasonable provision, there wanted not a colour to raise it. A marriage, as hath been observed, was agreed in the late reign, between the young queen of Scotland and the present king; but the Scots failed in their articles. The protector and the council, therefore, resolved to bring them to reason. For this purpose men were levied, a fleet equipped, and the veteran troops at Boulogne and Calais embarked for England. The protector likewise had several regiments of Walloons and Germans in his pay: not that he had a better opinion of their

EDWARD  
VI.  
34, 35  
Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.

Godwin,  
Annal.

Id. ad An.  
1547.

229.

*The protector levies forces, and prepares for an expedition against Scotland.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Heylin,  
Hist. Re-  
form. p. 40.  
*A fair cor-  
respondence  
with Eng-  
land and  
France en-  
deavour'd.*

courage; but because he might believe them more ready to execute any harsh service at home, if occasion required.

For a farther security, he took care to keep a fair correspondence with the neighbouring princes. Doctor Wotton, dean of Canterbury, was dispatched to the court of Vienna: the chief business of his embassy was to prevail with the emperor to keep firm to the alliance made with England in the late reign, and not to come to any closer union with France. But more especially he was to solicit his imperial majesty to declare himself an enemy to the Scottish nation, excepting those in the English interest.

To bring the French to a friendly disposition, a proclamation was issued to restore all such ships and goods which had been taken from them, since the death of king Henry. To oblige that court farther, the English council paid a particular regard to the memory of king Francis I. This prince died on the 22d of March last, and on the 19th of June a dirige was sung for him in all the churches in London. The choir of St. Paul's was hung with mourning, and no other circumstance of state or solemnity omitted. The archbishop of Canterbury, with eight other bishops, in their richest pontifical habits, sung a mass of requiem, and a sermon was preached by doctor Ridley, elect of Rochester.

To go on: the forces for the Scotch expedition being drawn together, the protector, who was their general, marched to the borders. The fleet, which cruized along the coast and attended the army, was commanded by the lord Clinton. The protector entered Scotland on the third of September, and being willing to make up the quarrel, wrote a letter to the earl of Arran, governor of that kingdom.

He desired the Scots would "consider the war was begun between two Christian nations: that the English projected nothing farther than a just and honourable peace, which all good people should endeavour to promote: that now there was a happy opportunity of bringing both nations to a lasting friendship, by the marriage of their princess. That this alliance has been courted by the English, and solemnly promised by the Scotch nobility: that the protector was surprised to find them desert so public an engagement, and apply to force, the issue of which is not only doubtful, but commonly calami-

*The French  
king's ob-  
sequies  
solemnized  
in London.*

Id.

*The pro-  
tector's letter  
to offer the  
Scotch a  
cessation of  
arms.*

tous, even to those that conquer. That it was not to be supposed their queen would always live single: if not, where could she engage better than with a powerful prince, who governed upon the same island, and spoke the same language with herself? They were not insensible that intermarrying with foreigners was attended with inconveniences, a fact much better to read in English history than prove by experiment." Thus it appears the demands of the English court were very reasonable: "however, he was so far from thirsting after Christian blood, that provided he perceived the Scots inclined to an accommodation, he would relax in some points, and soften the articles; the Scots should have the liberty of educating the queen in their own country, till she came to a marriageable age, and could choose her husband herself by the advice of her nobility. That in the mean time there should be a cessation of arms, the queen not conveyed beyond sea, nor any matrimonial alliance made, either with the French or any foreign prince. Now provided the performance of all this was solemnly promised, he was ready to retire peaceably, and counter-march into England; to make restitution for damages done, and refer the matters to indifferent judges."

EDWARD  
VI.

The Scots were thirty thousand effective men, and near double the number of the English: the generals, relying on the superiority of their forces, and imagining the protector's offer had more of fear than friendship, refused to hearken to any terms, and would not so much as suffer the protector's letters to be read in a council of war. They were apprehensive, it seems, the reasonableness of the proposal might work upon the officers, and disincite them to a battle. Thus, being confident of victory, they spread a report that nothing less would content the English than having the queen put into their hands, and that they would never give over the war till they had conquered the country. The Scots, being enraged with this story to the last degree, were impatient to charge the enemy. But those of their commanders who had more thought than passion, were of opinion it was by no means prudent to hazard a battle: that the English were already somewhat distressed for want of forage, that they could neither retreat through so many defiles, nor break through the Scotch entrenchments without great disadvantage. However, the main of the Scotch army was so elated with the fancy of vic-

Godwin,  
Annal.  
*The battle  
at Pinkey,  
near Mustle-  
borough.*

Sept. 10.  
A. D. 1547.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

tory, that good advice was lost upon them. Thus they marched out of a well-fortified camp, and gave the English their wish: in short, the armies charged near Musleborough. The Scots, having maintained the fight for some time, were quite broken, quitted their artillery, and retired in the utmost disorder. The Scots lost fourteen thousand men, with their cannon and baggage, and had fifteen hundred taken prisoners; amongst which were several of the nobility, and a great many gentlemen of quality.

Id. Stow's  
Annal.

The remainder of the Scotch army retired to Stirling, and left the country to be overrun by the English. The protector marched to Leith the next day, put garrisons in several places, plundered Edinburgh, uncovered the abbey of Holyrood-house, and carried off the lead and the bells. But he neither took the castle of Edinburgh nor moved forward to Stirling, where the queen lay with the debris of the army. It was thought, the consternation was such, that no place would have held out against him. But some private reasons, it seems, pressed his return, and made him slip the opportunity of finishing the war, which, had he followed his blow, might have been effected without much difficulty. However, it must be said he had done enough to raise his reputation, and gain a great deal of honour: his success was not only very considerable, but very cheap to the English, there not having been above sixty men lost in the expedition. At his coming away, he received a message from the queen and governor of Scotland: the business was to propose a treaty: the protector accepted the overture, and appointed Berwick for the place, and left the earl of Warwick to treat with the Scotch commissioners: the earl expected their coming, but nobody appeared, for the offer was no more than an amusement to gain time, and concert measures with France.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 34.  
Sept. 29.

230.

Id.

While the protector was absent in Scotland, the visitors went their circuit, and met with a smoother business than they expected. Most of the bishops resigned to the council, and acquiesced in the injunctions. On the fifth of September the commissioners sat in St. Paul's cathedral, to examine the dean and chapter, and reform the ceremonies at discretion. Bishop Bonner was cited, and the injunctions and homilies tendered: he offered to comply, but not without a reserve, in these words:—"I do receive these injunctions and homilies with

Stow's  
Annal.  
Bonner  
demurs to  
the Injun-  
ctions.



this protestation, that I will observe them if they be not contrary and repugnant to God's law, and the statutes and ordinances of the Church."

But after some recollection, he addressed the king for leave to make a more implicit and unconditional submission, which was done before his majesty and the privy council, in the form following:—

EDWARD VI.

Council Book, fol. 110.

*He makes an absolute submission, but is sent to the Fleet.*

"Whereas I, Edmund, bishop of London, have at such time as I received the king's majesty's, my most dread sovereign lord, injunctions and homilies at the hands of his highness's visitors, did unadvisedly make such protestation, as now, upon better consideration of my duty of obedience, and of the ill example that may ensue to others thereof, appeareth to me neither reasonable nor such as might well stand with the duty of an humble subject; forasmuch as the same protestation, at my request, was then by the register of that visitation enacted and put in record, I have thought it my bounden duty not only to declare before your lordships, that I do now, upon better consideration of my duty, renounce and revoke my said protestation, but also most humbly beseech your lordships, that this my revocation of the same may likewise be put in the same records for a perpetual memory of the truth: most humbly beseeching your good lordships both to take order that it may take effect, and also that my former unadvised doings may, by your good mediations, be pardoned of the king's majesty.

"EDMUND LONDON."

Heylin, p. 31.

This submission, though as full as required, yet not being made without hesitancy and demurring, was not accepted for full satisfaction. The bishop, though pardoned in the main, was punished by imprisonment for his first incompletion. He was committed to the Fleet, and kept there till the 17th of November following. During his restraint, the Litany was sung in his cathedral in the English tongue, and the epistle and gospel read at high mass in the same language. At his being enlarged, the figures of our Saviour, of the blessed Virgin, and St. John, and all other images in St. Paul's, and the other churches in London, were taken down, as Heylin relates. If so, Bonner seems resolved to make amends for his former stiffness, and go beyond the order of the council. For the

Heylin, p. 42.  
*Images removed in London.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

injunctions did not oblige him thus far, they only enjoin the removing images which have been abused with pilgrimages, unwarrantable worship, but provided they served only for memory and instruction, they recommend their use, and allow them to stand. Bellasseer, archdeacon of Colchester, and Gilbert Bourn, archdeacon of London and Essex, were no less forward in complying with the visitors, and executing their orders.

But bishop Gardiner was not of so ductile a temper: he seems to have thought himself in the right, and had something of courage to maintain his sentiment. He had expressed his dislike of the visitation; it is probable he might except against the character of the commissioners, being most of them laymen: but the men and the manner was not all his objection, it seems he was shocked with the matter too. For, being examined at the council-board, he declared himself not altogether satisfied with the homilies and injunctions, and therefore, could not promise compliance through the whole books. Upon this the council sent him to the Fleet.

Sept. 25.

*The bishop of Winchester committed to the Fleet.*

Soon after his commitment, the protector being returned to London, bishop Gardiner wrote to him, and sent him his reasons why he could not give the council satisfaction. He acquaints him that "the injunctions delivered by the visitors ordered the use of two books, the Homilies and Erasmus's Paraphrase. Now these books," says he, "have no harmony of doctrine in them, they differ in material articles? The Homilies make justification depend wholly on faith, exclusive of charity: but Erasmus's Paraphrase affirms that justification requires both these qualities, and that faith must have love or charity joined with it.

*His letter to the protector.*

*He charges Erasmus's Paraphrase with contradiction to the Homilies and Injunctions.*

"The homily of Salvation maintains that remission of sins is accepted of God for perfect justification. The doctrine of the parliament (meaning the 'Necessary Erudition,') teaches us that justification, as to the compass of the notion, includes more parts than remission of sins, and that though remission of sins is in some sense a justification, yet the entireness of that idea is not comprehended in it.

"The book of Homilies reckons palms, candles, and the panis benedictus, or holy bread, amongst popish superstitions and abuses. But the 'Necessary Erudition,' authorized by the parliament, recommends the use of these ceremonies; which

is likewise done by the injunctions now set forth. The homily of Salvation cites St. Chrysostom unfairly, and translates that 'faith,' which is 'hope' in the original. Now truth," says Gardiner, "is able to maintain itself, and has no need of false suggestion. Such mysterious management does but disserve a cause, and give the enemy advantage." From hence, the bishop proceeds to acquaint the protector with Erasmus's opinion.

EDWARD  
VI.

"If we are," says he, "to govern our belief by Erasmus's authority, he will tell us, that the doctrine of 'sola fides justificat,' or that we are justified by single and solitary faith, is no better than rank poison. The denying the invocation of saints, of the pains in purgatory, and the necessity of good works, are likewise ranged by this author under the same class of destructive errors. And elsewhere, Erasmus, after having drawn a parallel between the state of the primitive and present Church, concludes with this remark, that if St. Paul were now living, he would indeed censure the misbehaviour of men, but not condemn the doctrine and constitution of the modern Church. This," says he, "was Erasmus's judgment in the latter part of his life.

231.

"As to his Paraphrase upon the New Testament, the studying of which is enjoined the parish priests by the Injunctions: this book was written twenty-six years since, before the author was come to a full maturity of judgment. Indeed this Paraphrase is so crudely and uncautiously managed, that the allowing it a free passage may probably give ill men a handle not only to disturb the Church, but embarrass the State.

*Unsound  
opinions in  
Erasmus's  
Paraphrase.*

"For instance: those texts of Scripture, which are commonly urged for obedience to princes, Erasmus expounds in a manner out of all force and significancy: so that if his authority may pass, they will take but little hold of people's consciences. His Paraphrase is not like other expositions of Scripture, where the author speaks as from himself; no, Erasmus takes the liberty to discourse in our Saviour's person, and that of the inspired writers, and sometimes throws in a supplemental clause of his own. For instance, where our Saviour commands us to 'render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's,' from whence we truly infer the emperor had a right to command several things from the subject; here

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Erasmus puts in an 'If;' 'If there be any thing due to them:' thus he glosses away the meaning of the text, by throwing in a condition wholly unmentioned by our Saviour. "I have the English translation," continues the bishop, "by me, and shall transcribe the passage for your grace: the words are these; 'render therefore unto Cæsar, if any things appertain unto Cæsar. But first of all render unto God the things that appertain unto God.' Meaning that it is no hurt unto godliness, if a man being dedicate unto God, do give tribute unto a profane prince, although he owed it not.

"I shall not trouble your grace with any more citations upon this head, though in general I may affirm, the Paraphrase takes a very unwarrantable freedom with princes, omits nothing that may weaken their character, and give an unserviceable idea of civil government. As for bishops, he treats them with great respect, calls them no less than evangelical princes, whereas the supreme magistrate is mentioned in no better style than that of profane prince. He likewise commends archbishop Becket for proceeding to censures against the king for detaining the manor of Oxford.

*Here the  
Paraphrase  
mistakes  
matter of  
fact.*

"It is likely the translator might have omitted this passage: but Erasmus his pen was very untoward in these days.

"Farther, the Paraphrase maintains that Christians can challenge nothing but charity or love from their neighbours, and can make no claims of debt or right upon each other. This is an extraordinary assertion, and hath an immediate tendency to destroy the obligation of laws, and make the duties of relations, and civil life, signify little. Here Erasmus contradicts the tenor of Scripture, and asserts a plain untruth. Thus your grace may see what dangerous positions he advances with respect to the State.

"The subject of religion is not at all better handled. Here things of the last importance are expressed without truth or discretion. I shall give your grace some few instances.

"The sacrament of the altar is mentioned by him in unprimitive and unguarded language. He calls it holy bread, and a symbol; and in short, makes use of such terms which might, if it were possible, as our Saviour speaks in another case, 'deceive the very elect.' But to do Erasmus justice, when he was farther advanced in years, he writes with more caution,

mentions the sacrament of the altar with all imaginable reverence, comes up to the doctrine of the Church, and complains of those who would interpret him to another meaning. EDWARD  
VI.

“Farther, the Paraphrase allows a man who had parted with his wife for adultery, the liberty of marrying with another. The Paraphrase gives bishops and priests leave to marry. And here Erasmus pretends the Apostle intended to describe the qualities required in the wives of priests and bishops. But here the paraphraser mistook himself. For St. Paul knew that if a bishop or priest was once married, he must take his wife with all her faults, for then it would be too late to tell what she should be; for when the bargain is once made, neither St. Paul nor St. Peter can mend her. And if bishops have the privilege of changing their wives, till they answer the description Erasmus puts upon the Apostle, they would be wonderfully envied by other people. But I affirm, St. Paul did not discourse of bishops’ wives in the text. I write there-  
fore with an air of raillery to give your grace a stronger image of the absurdity of the gloss.”

<sup>1</sup> Tim. iii.  
v. 11.

But here the bishop uses too much levity upon a Scripture argument: besides he wrests the text, and reasons extravagantly. For the apostle’s describing a wife’s duty, does not give the husband the liberty of a divorce in case she fell short in any circumstance: at this rate no relation could have any firmness; but children might change their parents, and subjects their governors, whenever they failed in the offices and returns justly expected from them.

“The Paraphrase,” as the bishop goes on, “calls the keeping a concubine a small fault. I leave your grace to consider the consequence of this doctrine.

“The Paraphrase seems to make no degrees in virtue and vice, but maintains, that unless a man rises to the top of goodness, he must be stark naught: and in this he both contradicts truth and the homilies.

“The Paraphrase wrests the Scripture upon the subject of tithes, and clashes with the Injunctions where they are ordered to be justly paid.

“Thus I have recounted to your grace some of a great many faults in the original, and which Erasmus himself must answer for. As to the English translator, he has likewise his particular miscarriages. His faults are sometimes to be charged

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
232.

upon ignorance, and sometimes on design: he chops and changes, leaves out, and puts in, at pleasure. And here for every falsehood I have written to your grace, I am willing a hundred pounds fine should be set on my head, that I may lie here like a beggar, till my rents have answered it. What I offer is under my hand, and in case I deserve it, may be alleged as a record against me."

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Vespas. D.  
18.  
Life of  
Archbishop  
Cranmer.

The bishop proceeds to urge the danger of the laws, in case he should comply with the Homilies and Injunctions. And here he acquaints the protector "how the judges have been often fined, for acting against the laws, though at the king's command: that the lord Tiptoft lost his head, and cardinal Wolsey was ruined upon this score." From hence he goes on to relate what passed between him and the council at his commitment. "That at first he promised to receive the Injunctions as far as he was bound by the laws of God and the realm: that being pressed to a more direct answer, and menaced with harsh consequences, he endeavoured to disengage himself as far as his conscience would give him leave. To this purpose he told the council it would be three weeks before the visitors could reach his diocese. That in the meantime he was willing to go to Oxford, and debate the question. This motion being refused, he desired a conference with some learned men at his house in London. This request being likewise denied, he desired the council to consider, that as yet he had not been put to the proof, nor actually refused compliance; the visitors as yet having not been with him. That he thought it a hardship to be sent to prison, for a bare declaration of his dislike of the Homilies and Injunctions: that the interval of three weeks might possibly inform his conscience farther, and make him change his resolution: and then his case would be the same with the son in the Gospel, who told his father 'he would not go into the vineyard, but afterwards repented and went.' This not giving satisfaction to the council, he went quietly to prison without expostulations; being resolved with St. Paul, 'to forget what is past,' not to tax the government with rigour, or prefer a complaint against any body. That being sent for by the archbishop of Canterbury, to the dean of St. Paul's house, and brought thither by the bishop of Lincoln, they entered into dispute, but Cranmer's arguments fell short of conviction. And here the homily of Salvation, penned by

*The bishop's  
plea before  
the privy-  
council.*

Crammer, was the subject of the conference. He desired the archbishop, the bishops of Lincoln and Rochester, Dr. Cox, and Mr. Aire then present, to produce any ancient father, affirming, that faith excluded charity in the office of justification. That this doctrine is point blank against the express words of Scripture. That to go against such evidence in the inspired writings, without so much as one father to support the singularity, was a dangerous liberty. He goes on in his apology, and alleges 'that he never advised any person, not so much as his chaplains, to dispute against the Homilies and Injunctions.' However, the publishing these books in the king's name, by his grace the protector's direction, was somewhat particular, and that his grace was not well used. For the king, he was too young to understand them. And as for his grace, it was well known the late expedition afforded him no leisure to read them. After this, he urges an objection of no small weight. 'If an order of council,' says he, 'is an authority of the highest kind, and must be obeyed without pleading or reserve; then I desire to know in what condition the legislature stands? And whether the act which discharges us from our obedience to the bishop of Rome, may not be over-ruled by the board?' That the king when a major, will expect the same extent of prerogative, which was used by his council in his minority. And therefore that the precedents of this kind may be pleaded for oppression, and prove subversive of the liberty of the subject. That in the late reign, when he had the honour to sit at the board, he found the council much surprised, when the king proposed any thing to be done against an act of parliament. And here he tells the protector a story, 'how the lord Cromwell put him upon answering an ensnaring question: it was at Hampton Court. 'My lord of Winchester,' says Cromwell, 'answer his majesty whether the king's pleasure is not a law? I think we have a maxim for it in the civil law,' 'quod principi placuit,' &c. 'The king perceiving me at a stand,' continues the bishop, 'pressed me to declare my opinion. I told his highness I had read indeed of such absolute governments; but that in England, I humbly conceived, the constitution, and temper of the people to be such, that it would be more serviceable for his majesty to make the law his will, than his will the law.' Afterwards, when Cromwell fell out with Gardiner, he played him foul play, charged

EDWARD  
VI.

Gal. v. 6.  
James ii. 17.

*His answer  
to the king  
upon the  
subject of  
absolute  
government.*

*Not in the original*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

him with his own suggestion, and turned the question upon him."

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 1.

In the close of the letter, the bishop complains of "uneasy confinement: and in another letter, that he was neither allowed to speak with any body, nor the benefit of a physician." This letter is dated from the Fleet the 14th of October.

233.

In another letter to the protector, he renews his complaint of harsh usage in prison: "that he was not allowed the conversation of friends, the convenience of servants, nor so much as a chaplain to pray with him; he remonstrates against the rigour of archbishop Cranmer's proceedings: that he did not do well to apply to force, to borrow the protector's authority to carry on the controversy, and support his opinions by committing those to prison who argued against him: that he thought it an unprecedented hardship to be thus confined without breaking any law; he mentions one of Cranmer's arguments to prove that 'only faith' justifies; it stands in this form: 'We are justified by faith, without all works of the law: charity is a work of the law, therefore we are justified without charity.' This argument Gardiner undertakes to answer at his peril, provided Cranmer would send it under his hand. Farther, he takes notice, that whether faith justifies exclusive of charity or not, signifies nothing as to practice: because all men are justified in the sacrament of baptism. And since we have all received the advantage of justification in our infancy, when we were in no condition to dispute about the means, to what purpose is it to start the question, and lay so much stress upon the point of belief afterwards."

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 5 and 6.

Upon this occasion Fox calls Winchester "an insensible ass;" and "that he had no feeling of God's Spirit in the matter of justification." But here the historian seems to fail extremely in decency and temper, and to have forgotten the Apostle's command for putting away "all bitterness and evil speaking; and that unless a man bridles his tongue, his religion is vain." I mention this, because a vein of satire and coarse language runs through his "Martyrology."

Eph. iv. 31.  
1 Pet. ii. 1.  
James i. 26.

To proceed: In another letter to the protector, which is the last I shall mention, bishop Gardiner complains of his being "denied the privilege of assisting in parliament; and that, by his confinement, those whom he used to nominate for the house of Commons were likewise forced to be absent;" and,

172, vi. 53-4 ]  
242, ii. 471.



lastly, he desires the liberty of appearing in the house of Lords, where he intends to open the controversy, and argue with the archbishop of Canterbury.”

EDWARD  
VI.  
Fox, p. 8.

But all this reasoning and expostulation was not prevalent enough to procure his liberty. It was thought proper to keep him confined till the session of parliament was over. Had this bishop appeared in the house, it is probable he might have given the court party some trouble, perplexed their measures, and, it may be, overset Cranmer in the dispute about justification. The archbishop, and those of his persuasion, founded themselves upon the fourth chapter to the Romans, and the third to the Galatians. But it is plain by the tenour of these epistles, that, by “faith,” we are to understand the “new covenant,” or the terms required in the Gospel: in contradistinction to the observances of the Mosaic law, which, in the language of the Scripture, are called “works.” However, Cranmer and the Lutherans had a pious meaning at the bottom of their notion. They conceived the mercy of God and the merits of our Saviour were more advanced by resting the point wholly upon belief as to the act of justification. Neither did they exclude the necessity of regular practice. So that, upon the whole, the controversy seems to lie more in terms and language, than in meaning and substance.

On the fourth of November the parliament met, and sat to the twenty-fourth of December. It was continued by prorogation, from session to session, through this whole reign. The broad seal was lately given to the lord Rich; and sir John Baker, chancellor of the court of first-fruits and tenths, was speaker in the house of Commons. To smooth the way to the business concerted, Gardiner, as hath been observed, was kept in prison; and Tunstal, bishop of Durham, a prelate of great learning and moderation, dismissed the council-board. The reason of his removal, it is probable, was to weaken his character, and make his opposition less significant in the house of Lords. The members of parliament, as Heylin relates, though of different sentiments with regard to religion, yet agreed in a common principle, to strike in with the juncture, and take care of themselves: for though, as this historian goes on, a great number of the lords and commons were inclined to the doctrines of the late reign, yet they were willing to give way to such acts as widened the breach between the English and Roman com-

Bishop  
Tunstal dis-  
missed the  
council-  
board.

Heylin's  
remark on  
the disposi-  
tion of the  
members of  
parliament.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

munion. The present nearness in doctrine they were afraid might end in a reconciliation with the pope; and that such measures would prove dangerous to their estates gained from the Church. As for the rest, whose business was either to make or improve their fortunes, they came prepared without question to close with such a reformation as served best for their purpose. This seems pretty evident by the tendency of some of the acts, which, in Heylin's opinion, seem to overlook the concern of religion, and aim at private interest in a very remarkable manner.

Heylin's  
Hist. Re-  
form. p. 48.  
Nov. 5.  
A. D. 1547.  
A convoca-  
tion held.

The next day after the sitting of the parliament, a convocation was held at St. Paul's, in which John Taylor, dean of Lincoln, was prolocutor.

Sitting

In the third session it was agreed the prolocutor should carry some petitions to the upper house. Before I mention these, I am to observe that archbishop Cranmer, in his speech at the opening of the convocation, put the clergy in mind of keeping close to the rule of the Scriptures, of advancing farther in the Reformation, and throwing off some unprimitive remains; but the terror of the "Six Articles" making an impression upon the majority, and being a check upon the freedom of their debates, Cranmer prevailed with the king to dispense with the penalties of that statute.

Antiquit.  
Brit. p. 339.

In this convocation it was unanimously agreed by the lower house that the communion should be administered in both kinds.

Convocation  
Journals,  
fol. 71.

To return: the petitions above-mentioned of the lower house to the archbishop and bishops were these:—

Nov. 22.

"First. That the ecclesiastical laws might be reviewed and published, pursuant to a statute made in the 35th year of the late reign.

"Secondly. That the clergy of the lower house of convocation may be admitted to sit in parliament with the house of Commons, according to ancient usage.

"Thirdly. That the performance of the bishops and others, who, by order of the convocation, have spent some time in reviewing and correcting the offices for divine service, may be laid before the house.

"Fourthly. That the rigour of the statute for the payment of first-fruits may be moderated; and that the clergy may have

some allowance made them for maintenance and defraying expenses in the first years of their preferment.”

EDWARD VI.

C. C. C. C. Library Synodalia. Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. Records, p. 120. Journal of Convocation, fol. 71.

In their petition to the upper house, for admittance into the parliament, they “insist upon the clause of ‘Præmunientes,’ in the king’s writ; and the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom.”

If this request was denied, they desired “that no bills, in which the Christian religion, the persons, estates, or jurisdiction of the clergy, are concerned, may pass without the assent of the clergy.”

That the lower house of convocation, in their request for sitting with the commons in parliament, insisted upon nothing more than being restored to ancient privilege, appears by the king’s writ, directed to every bishop: in which summons the bishop is first required to appear in person, at the time and place prefixed for the parliament. The writ in this respect is the same in substance with those sent to the temporal peers. After this follows the premunitory clause, in which the bishop is commanded “to give notice to the (prior or) dean and chapter of his cathedral church, and to the archdeacons, and all the clergy of his diocese, that the prior, dean, and archdeacons, in their own persons, the chapter by one and the clergy by two proper proxies sufficiently empowered by the said chapter and clergy, should by all means be present at the parliament with him, to do and consent to those things which by the blessing of God, by their common advice, happened to be ordained in the matters aforesaid: and that the giving this notice should by no means be omitted by him.”

*The lower house of convocation moved to sit in parliament.*

234.

*The clergy anciently part of the house of Commons.*

If the bishop happen to be beyond sea, and in no condition to execute the king’s writ, the summons was sent to his vicar-general, and by him the clergy of the diocese had the same notice to come to parliament as if the bishop had been at home.

Pryn’s Register, pt. 1. p. 7, 8.

Id. p. 9.

In the vacancy of a see the writ was directed to the dean and chapter, as guardians of the spiritualities: and thus the clergy were always assured of being summoned to parliament.

Id. p. 11.

The bishop, having received the king’s writ, communicated it to his diocese, by transmitting copies to the prior or dean, and archdeacons. To this there was a mandate annexed, importing that, “by virtue of his majesty’s writ, he premonished them.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

and by them the chapter and clergy, that themselves in person, and their chapter and clergy by their proctors, should take care to be present at the day and place mentioned in the king's writ, for the ends and purposes required of them."

The bishops used sometimes to command their clergy to make a return of what they had done upon the writ and mandate. This certificate was to be sent to the bishop, some time before the session of parliament. The clergy having promised obedience in their return to their diocesan, the bishop certified the king what he had done pursuant to his command: and of this we have an instance as low as the reign of king Henry VIII.

The clergy, thus summoned to parliament by the king and diocesan, met for the choice of their proxies. For this purpose the dean or prior held his chapter, and the archdeacon his synod. The representatives, being chosen in these assemblies, were sent up to the parliament, with procuratorial letters from the chapter and clergy, to give them an authority to act in their names, and on the behalf of their electors.

These letters were, for the most part, addressed to the king, though sometimes they began with a general application to all persons whom it might concern; but still the substance of them was to make, ordain, and appoint the persons who were sent by them, "their proctors to appear on their behalf in parliament; there to treat with the prelates, and great men of the realm, of the things to be debated there for the interest of the king and kingdom, and to consent to what should be agreed to on their behalf; and to engage themselves to stand by what their proctors should do, under the caution or forfeiture (many times) of all their goods."

There were usually two copies of these procuratorial letters delivered to every proxy: one of these was to be kept by this representative, and the other put into the hands of the clerk of parliament in order to be enrolled.

That the lower clergy formerly sent their representatives to parliament, may be proved by a famous resolution in Bird and Smith's case, in the reign of king James I. Here the lord chancellor Edgerton; Popham, chief justice of England; Coke, chief justice of the Common Pleas; and Fleming, chief baron, besides other things, resolved that the canons of the Church made by the convocation and the king, without a parliament,

Bishop  
Wake's  
State of  
the Church,  
&c. p. 5.  
Id. in Ap-  
pend. ad  
An. 1539.

Id.

See Records,  
num. 59.  
*A resolution  
of the lord  
chancellor  
and judges.*  
Regist.  
Arundel,  
pt. 1.  
fol. ult.

Trin. 4  
Jac. 1.  
More's  
Reports,  
fol. 781. et  
deinc.

shall bind in all ecclesiastical matters no less than an act of parliament. As a medium to prove this, they affirm the convocation was once part of the parliament. And since the lower clergy were parted from the house of Commons, they carried their share of legislature along with them into the convocation. They found their resolution, farther, upon a celebrated precedent of both houses of parliament, 21 Henry VIII. Where, after a full debate in a conference, it was resolved, that when the convocation makes canons concerning matters within their jurisdiction, they are binding to the whole realm.

To proceed: records of the procuratorial letters above-mentioned, run up as high as king Edward I. Through how many reigns afterwards the representatives of the lower clergy acted with the temporal commons in parliament, is not easy to determine. It is probably conjectured, that about the time of king Henry VI. this usage began to be discontinued, and quite dropped by degrees. The clergy themselves are thought to have contributed towards the parting with this privilege. It seems they looked on their parliamentary attendance as a kind of burthen, and therefore were not unwilling to be disengaged.

But whether they were in the right, or not, is another question.

Though the lower clergy seem not to have come to parliament for more than two hundred years last past, the kings, notwithstanding, have still continued to keep on their right in the writ of summons, which has been executed by the bishops. The premunitory clause is still the same it was three hundred years since, excepting the alteration of priors into deans. There are several records to prove that the bishops' mandates were sent to the deans and archdeacons; that prectors were chosen, and empowered to act for their electors to the end of the reign of king Henry VII. There are likewise instances to prove that the same practice was kept on from the period last-mentioned, to the year 1640. This premunitory clause being still inserted in the bishop's writ of summons, it is concluded they may legally execute it, pursuant to ancient custom, if they think fit.

To proceed to another branch of the petition of the lower house of convocation: that is, that matters of religion may be debated in their house: that by this means the case may be

EDWARD  
VI.

Heylin's  
Tracts,  
fol. 103, 104.  
Bp. Wake's  
State of the  
Church,  
p. 6.

Dr. Atter-  
bury's  
Rights,  
Power, &c.  
of an Eng-  
lish Convo-  
cation.  
Append.  
num. 11.  
Bp. Wake's  
State of the  
Church, p. 6.  
Ibid.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

fully discussed, the controversy cleared, and the consciences of people well settled. They likewise desire, as hath been observed, that no statutes in which religion, the interest and jurisdiction of the clergy are nearly concerned, may be enacted till the lower house of convocation have at least examined the bill and reported their reasons upon it. To prove the lower clergy not ill-founded in this request, I shall insert a paper in the records, drawn up by a very learned hand, and lodged in the Paper-office, from whence I transcribed it. The design of it is to prove, that matters relating to the doctrine and government of the Church, ought to be determined by ecclesiastics: and here the reader will find the imperial constitutions, the parliament rolls, and other valuable authorities cited to this purpose. It is penned by way of answer to certain objections.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2.  
Records,  
p. 113.  
235.

*The clergy  
claims a  
right of  
examining  
bills relating  
to religion,  
&c.*

See Records,  
num. 56.  
Sess. 5.  
Nov. ult.

Farther; a form delivered by the archbishop of Canterbury, for the receiving the holy eucharist under both kinds, of bread and wine, was read in the lower house of convocation, and subscribed by the prolocutor and some others. And in the next session, this order was unanimously agreed by all then present, being sixty-four. At the same time eight of the members were appointed to draw up a parliament-bill for the payment of tithes in cities, in the same manner as was done in London.

Sess. 6.  
Dec. 2.

In the last session a motion was made, that all canons, laws, usages, &c. which forbid any person to marry upon the score of priesthood, or vow of religion, might be declared void and unobligatory. This proposition was subscribed by fifty-three in the affirmative, and twenty-two in the negative.

C. C. C. C.  
Library  
Synodalia.

I shall now go on to the business of the parliament, and mention those statutes which relate to religion. I shall begin with the act for repealing several statutes concerning treason. By this statute "all acts of parliament concerning religion and opinions, that is to say, as well the statute made in the fifth year of the reign of the king's noble progenitor king Richard II.: and the statute made in the second year of the reign of king Henry V.: and the statute also made in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of king Henry VIII., concerning punishment and reformation of heretics and Lollards: and the statute made for the abolishing of diversity of opinions, in certain articles concerning Christian religion, commonly called the Six Articles, made in the thirty-first year of king Henry VIII.: and also

*The penal  
statutes,  
touching  
religion,  
repealed.*

EDWARD  
VI.

the act of parliament made in the thirty-fourth year of the said king Henry VIII., touching or in any way concerning books of the Old and New Testament in English, and the printing, selling, and retaining of English books or writings, and reading, teaching, preaching, or expounding, of Scripture. And also, another statute made in the parliament holden at Westminster in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of the late king Henry VIII., concerning the qualification of the statute of Six Articles: and all and every other act or acts of parliament concerning doctrine or matters of religion, and all and every branch, article, sentence, and matter, pains and forfeiture, contained in any of the same acts of parliament, shall from henceforth be repealed and utterly void, and of none effect."

1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 12.

By this repeal, Heylin observes, that all people had the liberty of reading the Scriptures, of being in a manner their own expositors, of forming their religion, and openly declaring their opinions as they thought fit. But here this learned historian is something mistaken. For, notwithstanding the statutes against Lollardy and unsound opinions were nulled, the rigours of the common law were still in force. Now, by the common law, as the learned Fitzherbert affirms, the punishment of heresy was burning. And of executions of this kind, we shall have several instances in this reign.

Heylin's  
Hist. Re-  
form. p. 48.De Nat.  
Brev.

Farther, by this statute last mentioned, an act made in the thirty-first year of king Henry VIII., by virtue of which, the king's proclamations set forth by the advice of his privy council, were to be obeyed as though they had been made by authority of parliament; and another act made in the thirty-fourth year of the late reign, to fortify the statute of the thirty-first, were both repealed. From whence, it appears, our learned Church historian's observation will not hold; where he says, "the great changes of religion in the nonage of king Edward VI., were grounded on the authority of this thirty-first of king Henry VIII.:" for this act, we see, was repealed before the great alterations in doctrine and worship were established.

*A repeal of*  
31 Hen. 8.  
cap. 8. and  
34 Hen. 8.  
cap. 23.1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 12.Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 1. p. 264.  
pt. 2. p. 40.  
*A statute*  
*against*  
*irreverent*  
*speaking of*  
*the holy*  
*sacrament.*

The next remarkable act relating to the Church is a penal statute against irreverent speaking of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. The preamble, in all likelihood drawn up by some of the bishops, after having mentioned the solemnity of the institution of this sacrament, sets forth that "some arrogant and contentious people have, either out of

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

wickedness, or want of learning, because of certain abuses heretofore committed of some in misusing thereof, condemned in their hearts and speech the whole thing, and contemptuously depraved, despised, or reviled the same most holy and blessed sacrament, and not only disputed and reasoned irreverently of that most high mystery, but also in their sermons, preachings, readings, lectures, communications, arguments, rhymes, songs, plays, or jests, name and call it by such vile and unseemly words, as Christian ears do abhor to hear rehearsed. For reformation whereof, it is enacted by the king's highness, with the assent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and of the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that whatsoever person or persons, from and after the first day of May next coming, shall deprave, despise, or contemn, the said most blessed sacrament by any contemptuous words, or by any words of depraving, despising, or reviling; or whatsoever person or persons shall advisedly in any other way contemn, despise, or revile the said most blessed sacrament, contrary to the effects and declaration abovesaid, that then he and they shall suffer imprisonment of their bodies, and shall make fine and ransom at the king's will and pleasure."

1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 1.

See Heylin's  
Hist. Re-  
form. p. 49.

Thus, we see an intemperate zeal against popery, carried some people to an excess of profaneness: they ran from one extreme of adoration, to another of contempt and frenzy, and abused the holy sacrament in language not fit to repeat. Bishop Ridley frequently reproved these ungodly sallies; but it seems the people were ungovernable, and the disease grown too strong for a Church remedy; and therefore, it was thought fit to apply to the assistance of the civil legislature.

Journal of  
the House  
of Lords.  
Dec. 27.  
A. D. 1547.

236.

Now, considering the insolence of these people was so rampant and intolerable, it is somewhat strange, the penalty of the act should be so long deferred. The bill passed both houses on the twentieth of December. But the statute was not to inure till the first of May following; so that they had four months before the act could reach them. It is true, the king issued out a proclamation to check the licentiousness of these new bigots, but the force of proclamations, we see, was in a great measure disabled by the statute of repeal.

The offenders against this statute touching the holy sacrament were to be tried before the justices of peace at the quarter



sessions. And here the justices are ordered to direct a writ in the king's name, to the bishop of the diocese, in which the offence was committed, that either himself, his chancellor, or some other learned person deputed by him, might be present at the trial, sit upon the bench, and make part of the court.

EDWARD VI.  
*The bishop or chancellor, &c. to assist at the trial of such offenders.*

By the last branch of the statute it is declared, that "the ministering the blessed sacrament unto all Christian people under both kinds of bread and wine, is more agreeable both to the first institution of the said sacrament of the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and also more conformable to the common use and practice both of the apostles and the primitive Church, by the space of five hundred years and more after Christ's ascension, than the receiving under the form of bread only: and also, that it is more agreeable to the first institution of Christ, and to the usage of the apostles, and the primitive Church, that the people being present, should receive the same with the priest, than that the priest should receive it alone: it is therefore enacted, that the said most blessed sacrament shall be commonly delivered and ministered unto the people within the churches of England and Ireland, and other the king's dominions, under both kinds of bread and wine, except necessity otherwise requires."

*The holy eucharist to be given in both kinds, excepting in cases of necessity.*

By the "case of necessity" we are to understand, sudden and dangerous sickness, when wine cannot be provided, nor the sick person pass comfortably into the other world without receiving the sacrament. Lastly,

"It is enacted, that a day before the celebration of the sacrament, the priest should exhort the congregation to prepare themselves; and at divine service before the administration declare the great benefits promised to worthy receivers, and the danger of presuming to come unqualified."

The statute concludes, "that this restoring the ancient practice with reference to the holy sacrament should not be interpreted to the condemning the usage of any church out of his majesty's dominions."

The next statute makes a change in the manner of choosing bishops, and transfers the election wholly from the deans and chapters to the crown. The preamble, in the first place, alleges the inconveniences of the former elections, from the circumstances of delay and expense. After this, it is said in the preamble, "that the said elections are in very deed no

1 Edw. 6. cap. 2.  
*The bishops to be nominated by the king's letters-patent, without congré d'élire.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

elections, but only by a writ of congé d'élire have colours, shadows, and pretences of election: that they serve to no purpose, and seem derogatory and prejudicial to the king's prerogative royal, to whom only appertains the collation and gift of all archbishoprics, and bishoprics, and suffragan bishops within his highness's dominions. It is therefore enacted, that for the future, no congé d'élire shall be granted, nor any election be made by the dean and chapter, but that the archbishopric or bishopric shall be conferred by the king's nomination in his letters-patent."

1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 12.

I have had occasion to observe already, that those who draw the parliament-bills are sometimes mistaken in matter of fact. And of this we have an instance in the parliament before us: for in the statute of repeal, king Richard II. is styled the progenitor of the present king, whereas, it is certain king Richard left no issue. It is said likewise, that the customary choice of bishops by the chapters was in reality no election. The preamble, we must suppose, means they were in a manner thus insignificant since the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII. cap. 20. For by this statute, in case the dean and chapter refused to elect, the king was empowered to nominate a person for the see by his letters-patent. But before this act, the election of bishops in the English Church was lodged, in great measure, in the hands of the chapters. For proof of this, I shall refer the reader to the first volume of this work. And to what has been there delivered, I shall now subjoin a more particular account of the ancient method of electing bishops in the English Church.

Ch. Hist.  
p. 213. 306.  
328. and  
Records,  
num. 37.

*The ancient  
method of  
electing  
bishops.*

Upon the vacancy of the see, the canons or chapter fixed a day for the election. To this purpose an instrument was drawn up, setting forth the day when the bishopric became void, together with the manner of its being so, whether by death or otherwise. If by death, then, after the late bishop was buried, those of the chapter upon the spot appointed the time, and gave notice to their absent members to appear at the election. When the day was come, the chapter put it to the question, Whether they should elect by majority of votes, or refer the choice to a committee? When this point was settled, they proceeded to the election, pursuant to the ancient canons and constitutions of the Church.

When the election was made, it was publicly declared to the

people, and the hymn “Te Deum” was sung, and the person elected carried in a chair to the high altar: and, sometime after this, the question was put to him whether he consented to the choice. Upon his answering in the affirmative, he was presented to the metropolitan with the instrument of his election. There were likewise letters of proxy, signed by the chapter or convent, to be delivered to the archbishop, to satisfy him the persons who came to request the consecration of the elect were duly authorized.

EDWARD VI.

In this record there is no mention of any *congé d'élire*, which, in the modern applications of the chapter for confirmation and consecration, is never omitted.

Biblioth. Cotton. Cleop. E. 6. fol. 142. See Records, num. 47. *No mention is made of congé d'élire.*

Besides, by the instrument's suggesting, that, according to the holy canons, the see ought not to be vacant above three months, and that the time of the election was governed by this appointment, from hence it is pretty evident the chapters in those days did not think themselves under a necessity of electing by a *congé d'élire*; and of this I have given an instance in the former part of my history.

To return to the statute, in which there is a proviso for securing the fees customarily paid by the bishops to the king, the archbishops, and their officers and servants. What these fees and expenses were formerly, I shall not examine; but how they stand at present, the reader may see in the following account.

Paper-office.

Fees to be paid by a bishop without a commendam:—

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	
Imprimis, for the signet, privy-seal, great seal,				<i>Fees to be paid by a bishop.</i>
for the <i>congé d'élire</i> . . . . .	11	0	0	
Item, for the royal assent . . . . .	11	0	0	237.
Item, the confirmation dinner, &c. . . . .	5	0	0	
Item, fees at Bow-church at the confirmation . . . . .	0	10	0	
Item, for the consecration-dinner at Lambeth, and fees to the archbishop's servants . . . . .	110	0	0	
Item, gloves for the consecration . . . . .	48	0	0	
Item, fees to be paid to the register of the vicar-general belonging to sundry persons . . . . .	42	10	0	
Item, fees to be paid at court at the doing of homage . . . . .	51	0	0	
Item, to the gentlemen of the chapel . . . . .	2	0	0	

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Item, fees of restitution to the temporalities of the bishopric . . . . .	27	0	0
Item, to be given to him that soliciteth these suits to his majesty . . . . .	20	0	0
Item, fees for a testimonial of the election and consecration, and a proxy to be installed . . . . .	2	0	0
Item, to the king's trumpeters . . . . .	1	0	0
	<hr/>		
	331	0	0
	<hr/>		

*Powers and  
privileges  
of a bishop.*

What functions, what extent of privilege and jurisdiction, were comprehended in the episcopal character before the restraints from the regale began in the reign of king Henry VIII., may be collected by an extract out of Sprozzius, which I transcribed from the Paper-office.

See Records,  
num. 58.

To go on with the statute. "It is enacted that all summons, citations, and other processes of archbishops and bishops, which used to be sent out in their own names, shall be made in the name and with the style of the king, as it is in writs original or judicial at the common law: and that the test thereof be in the name of the archbishop or bishop. And that every bishop or person exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, shall have the king's arms engraven on their seals of office. The penalty for contravening the statute is imprisonment at the king's will and pleasure."

*Process in  
spiritual  
courts to be  
made in the  
king's name.*  
1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 2.

This act was repealed in the first of Mary, sess. 2. cap. 2. After which time the bishops formed their process in their own name, and under their own seals, according to ancient usage. But by the 1 Jac. I. cap. 25., the aforesaid statute of Mary I. cap. 2. is expressly repealed; whereupon it was inferred and objected in parliament, 4 Jac. I., that immediately from and ever since the making the acts of 1 Jac. cap. 25. the act of 1 Mar. cap. 2. was repealed. Thus the repeal being repealed, the act first repealed was in force. And, therefore, all the bishops which, after the act of the 1 Jac., had used their own names and seals, and not the king's arms and the king's name, were within the danger of the 1 Edward VI. cap. 2.

*The bishops  
not under  
the penalty  
of 1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 2.*

To this objection the following answer, which gave satisfaction, was returned, viz. : by 25 H. VIII. cap. 20. entitled, "An act for restraining annates and first-fruits, &c., and election

of bishops, &c.” It was enacted in the last clause but one, “that bishops should be obeyed according to their names, titles, degree, and dignity, and do and execute in every thing as they might heretofore at any time have done.” Now this clause is directly contrary to the said act of 1 Ed. VI. cap. 2., and, therefore, by making the act of the 1 Ed. VI. cap. 2., this clause of 25 H. VIII. was repealed. But afterwards, by the 1 Eliz. cap. 1., the said act of 25 H. VIII. cap. 20. is revived with all clauses and sentences thereof; so as before the making the 1 Jac. cap. 25. the statute of 1 Ed. VI. cap. 2. had two bars and repeals. The first was the act of 1 Mar. cap. 2; the second was the reviving of 25 H. VIII. cap. 20., which was done by the 1 Eliz. cap. 1. The first bar and repeal, which was the act of queen Mary, was taken away by 1 Jac. cap. 25; but the second bar and repeal, which was the act of 1 Eliz. cap. 1. which revived the act of 25 H. VIII. cap. 20., stands still in force. And the act of 25 H. VIII. cap. 20. being in force, the act of 1 Ed. VI. cap. 2., which, in the forementioned clause, is directly contrary to 25 H. VIII. cap. 20., cannot be in force. To which may be added, that this statute of 1 Ed. VI. cap. 2., for so much as concerns a præmunire, is repealed by 1 Mar. sess. 1.

EDWARD  
VI.

This bill, concerning the making bishops by the king's letters-patent above-mentioned, was committed to the archbishop of Canterbury. Upon the second reading it was committed to some of the judges. Before it had gone through both houses, another bill, concerning the style and terms to be used in ecclesiastical courts, was brought into the house of Lords, passed, and sent down to the house of Commons on the thirteenth of December. At last both these bills were drawn into one, and sent up by the Commons on the twentieth of the same month, and signed by the king. The act, besides what has been already observed, sets forth, “that all authority of jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, is derived from the king's majesty as supreme head of these churches, and that all courts ecclesiastical within the two realms are kept by no other power and authority, either foreign or within the realm, but by the authority of his excellent majesty.”

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Cleop. 6.  
fol. 96.  
Nov. 5.  
A. D. 1547.

Journal of  
the House  
of Lords.  
*Proviso in  
favour of  
the bishops.*

1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 2.

Upon this ground it is enacted, that all processes in ecclesiastical courts are to be formed in the king's name, as hath been already related. However, there is a proviso in the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

statute for faculties and dispensations granted by the archbishop of Canterbury, and for all collations, institutions, inductions, letters of order, or dimissories, which were to pass under the archbishop and bishops' own names and seals, as they had formerly done.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 43.

By this act great advantages were taken to disparage the Reformation, as subjecting the bishops wholly to the pleasure of the court. "And," as our learned Church historian farther observes, "the extreme of raising the ecclesiastical power too high in the times of popery, had now produced another, of depressing it too much. For seldom is the counterpoise so justly balanced, that extremes are reduced to a well-tempered mediocrity."

Id. p. 49.

*Statutes  
against  
vagabonds  
levelled  
against the  
monks.*  
1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 3.  
Statutes at  
Large.

This parliament made a statute against vagabonds, by which it is enacted, "that any man, or woman, not being disabled by age, accident, or sickness, and not having lands or other means sufficient to maintain them, who wandered up and down idly for three days together without offering themselves to labour and employment, such persons being brought before two justices of peace, were to be slaves two years to the person that brought them, and be marked with the letter V." Now by the several provisos against clerks convict of this offence, it is plain the act was levelled against monks and friars who went about the country to get entertainment, and furnish themselves with conveniences. Many of these religious had but narrow pensions, and those of late not well paid, as appears by a proclamation issued out for satisfying their demands this way. Now it was thought a hardship by some people, that the monks, who had a creditable education, being bred to learning, and many of them persons of condition, should be tied to the labour, and come under the penalties of common servants, and be treated no better than the lowest of the people. And this usage seemed the more particular, because they had been lately thrown out of plentiful estates, and made a considerable figure in the kingdom. Besides, some of them came to London to solicit for their pensions. It is said that such journeys were only a colour: and that their business was to give the people ill impressions, and practise against the state. To this it may be answered, that there were acts already in being for the punishing such misbehaviour.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 45.

*An act  
for writing*

Another act made this session takes notice in the preamble,

that the city of York, formerly well inhabited, and furnished with good livings for learned incumbents, was now much decayed, insomuch that many of the cures could not afford a competent maintenance. To remedy this inconvenience, the mayor and recorder, the ordinary, and six justices of peace, are empowered to unite as many parishes, and pull down as many churches, as they shall think convenient: and here the materials of these superfluous churches, as they are called, are to be employed for the repairing other churches and bridges, and for the relief of the poor.

EDWARD VI.  
parishes and pulling down churches in the city of York.

1 Edw. 6. cap. 9.

If it is inquired by what means the city of York sunk thus low from its former condition, the most probable way of accounting for this declension is the late dissolution of the monasteries. For these estates being parcelled amongst a great many people who lived elsewhere, the trade of the town must fail of course; the inhabitants grow less numerous, and by consequence the livings which consisted, as the statute takes notice, in personal tithes and offerings, be proportionably lessened.

The last act I shall mention is that which gave the chantries, colleges, &c., to the crown. This bill began in the house of Lords, where the passing it was contested, the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of London, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Hereford, Worcester, and Chichester. voting against it. Archbishop Cranmer insisted strongly that the dissolving these chantries, colleges, &c., might be postponed till the king came of age: that by this delay the reasons of the dissolution would be better answered, and the lands preserved for the improvement of the royal revenues: that during his majesty's minority, there would be danger of alienating the estates, and wasting the treasure arising from these endowments. The archbishop had likewise a farther view for the benefit of the Church. The clergy were much impoverished by impropriated tithes falling amongst the laity, which should in all reason have been returned to the Church; things standing thus, Cranmer had no prospect of retrieving the misfortune but by respiting the dissolution of the chantries until the king was a major. Provided he could make the matter rest till that time, he did not question the pious disposition of this prince might be prevailed on to bestow these foundations upon the parochial clergy, who were now lamentably reduced: and thus far, without

Dec. 6. A. D. 1547. An act for the dissolution of chantries, &c. This bill opposed by Cranmer and other bishops.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 45.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

question, the rest of the above-mentioned bishops concurred with him. But the courtiers who pushed the bill were actuated by different motives; they wanted estates to their new titles, and had no other way of satisfying their pretensions than by seizing the opportunity, and sharing the chantry lands amongst them, while the government was in their hands. When the bill was sent down to the lower house, it was strongly opposed by some of the members. It was urged that the boroughs could not maintain their churches, nor defray the other expenses of the guilds and fraternities, if the estates belonging to them were granted to the crown. The arguments upon this head swayed the house, and brought them towards a vote against passing that part of the bill in which the guilds were concerned. The burgesses for Lynn and Coventry distinguished themselves most upon this occasion. But these active members were taken off by the court party, upon an assurance given that their guild lands should be restored. Thus dropping their opposition, the bill passed, and the promise is said to have been made good by the protector.

Heylin.  
Bp. Burnet.

37 Hen. 8.  
cap. 4.

It hath been already observed, these chantry lands, colleges, &c. had been granted to the late king, his heirs, and successors. By the act in the late reign, commissioners are named for giving the king possession: who when they had entered upon any part of the lands within their commission, the statute from that instant vests the king and his heirs in those estates. But as it happened, the commissioners did not enter into a great part of the chantry lands in the late king's time, which was the reason of making a new act for this purpose in the reign before us.

*The inten-  
tion of the  
founders of  
these houses.*

And here it may not be improper to acquaint the reader, that the endowment of these chantry lands was for the maintenance of one or more priests, to pray for the souls of their founders. Of these chantries and free chapels, there were two thousand three hundred and seventy-four. They were commonly united to some parochial, collegiate, or cathedral church. The free chapels, though designed for the same purpose, were independent in their constitution, stood without being annexed, and were better endowed. The colleges exceeded these last foundations, both in the beauty of their building, the number of priests, and the largeness of their revenues. But now their fate was determined, and to make the



seizing their estates better understood, the statute sets forth in the preamble, "That a great part of the superstition and errors in Christian religion, has been brought in the minds and estimation of men, by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation, through the death of Jesus Christ, and by devising and phantasying vain opinions of purgatory, and masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed: the which doctrine and vain opinion, by nothing more is maintained and upholden, than by the abuse of trentals, chantries, and other provisions made for the continuance of the said blindness and ignorance."

EDWARD  
VI.  
The reasons  
for dis-  
solving  
them.

1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 14.

239.

By the way, the mispersuasion, with respect to the assistances designed for those deceased, seems in a great measure rectified by the "Institution" and "Necessary Erudition," set forth in the late reign. In both these books, disputes, about the pains suffered by those who died under imperfect qualifications, is forbidden, neither is the name of purgatory to be so much as mentioned. And as for praying for the dead, it was not only part of the divine service at the making of this statute, but continued so in the first reformed liturgy for some time after.

By the settlement of collegiate churches and chantries, there was a provision made for a certain number of poor people; the alms were distributed on the anniversary day of the founders: this charity was secured by a clause in the act: and the commissioners were ordered to assign lands, parcel of the premises, for the maintenance of the distribution.

To proceed. The act promises the estates of these foundations should be converted to "good and godly uses, in erecting grammar schools, in farther augmenting the universities, and making better provision for the poor and needy." But these lands being mostly shared amongst the courtiers, and others of the rich laity, the promise in the preamble was in a great measure impracticable. To proceed to the body of the statute, in which it is enacted, "that all and singular colleges, free chapels, chantries, hospitals, fraternities, brotherhoods, guilds, and other promotions, mentioned in the 37 H. 8. cap. 4., with all their mansion-houses, manors, rents, tithes, churches, patronages, &c., which were not in actual possession of the late king, are granted to his present majesty, his heirs and successors, for ever." All lands, rents, &c., settled for the maintenance

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of any anniversary and obit, are likewise given the crown by this statute. The colleges in both the universities, the chapel of St. George at Windsor, the colleges of Winchester and Eton, together with the cathedral churches, are expressly excepted, and secured in this statute. However, the chantries, obits, and settlements, for lights and lamps in any of the cathedrals, were to fall within the compass of the act. By this statute, "the commissioners are empowered to allow what pension they thought convenient, to those who were turned out of these foundations." By another clause, "all alienations of the lands of bishoprics, deaneries, colleges, archdeaconries, prebends, &c., made to the crown in the late and present reign, are confirmed."

And lastly. "All goods, chattels, jewels, plate, ornaments, and other moveables, being the common goods of such colleges, free chapels, chantries, or stipendiary priests, are conveyed to the king."

*Orders of  
the privy-  
council for  
this year.*

Having now given an account of the parliament and convocation, I shall proceed to the privy-council, who were not altogether unactive in Church affairs. I shall set down the orders of the board for this year, as they stand in the council book.

A. D. 1547.  
July 16.

"An order to the dean and prebendaries of Canterbury, to deliver a silver table, that stood upon the high altar, by indenture, containing the weight of the same, to sir Anthony Aucher.

Council  
Book.  
Ex Biblioth.  
Rob. Harley  
Armig.  
July 29.  
Council  
Book.

"An order to Mr. Aucher, to receive of the chapter of Christ Church, in Canterbury, all such jewels and plate of gold and silver, as they have by our sovereign lord's permission, in their permission, to their church's use; and forthwith to deliver the same by a bill, indented to the officers of the mint, there expressing the several poise and value of the same therein."

It would be difficult to find a law to warrant this extraordinary demand, but the church and the exchequer were low, and the court had occasion for money. To go on :

"A letter was sent by the council to the lord admiral, acquainting him, that whereas it was resolved, the lord great master at his next repair to London, should take order for the punishing those that had taken down images, having no authority so to do, and cause those so taken down, having not been

abused, to be erected again, that forasmuch as it is now considered, that if those should be erected again, it might engender contention amongst the people upon the point, whether they were abused or no; that the said lord admiral now repairing to London, should declare to the said lord great master, it were best not to meddle in the erection of those taken down, until the return of the lord protector. And yet that it should be proceeded to the punishment of the takers down without authority, as it was ordered.”

EDWARD  
VI.  
Sept. 26.  
Council  
Book.

This year, the London apprentices, and the Lollard-mob, over-ran their bounds, reformed to disorder, and insulted the clergy in the streets. To check this license, an order was set forth by the king and council, in the form following :

“Forasmuch as the misorder by the serving men, and other young and light persons, and apprentices of London, towards priests, and those that go in scholars’ gowns, like priests, hath of late, both in Westminster-hall, and other places of the city of London, been so great, that not only it hath offended many men, but also hath given great occasion (if on the parties of the said priests more wisdom and discretion had not been shewed, than of the other,) of sedition and murder, or at the least of such inconveniences as are not to be suffered in common-wealth.—For reformation whereof, the king’s highness, by the advice of his dear uncle, and other his majesty’s council, willeth, and straitly commandeth, that no serving man or apprentice, or any other person whatsoever he or they be, shall use hereafter such insolency and evil demeanour towards priests, as revelling, tossing of them, taking violently their caps and tippetts from them, without just title or cause, nor otherways to use them, than as becomes the king’s most loving subjects one to do towards another.—Upon pain to suffer imprisonment, or other corporal pain, to the example of all others, as to the discretion of the lord protector, king’s majesty’s council, or of the judges before whom the same is proved, seem convenient.

Nov. 12.  
Council  
Book.

“God save the king.”

“The lords of the council received advice by the ambassador in the regent’s court, in Flanders, in how honourable, expensive, and friendly a manner, the lady regent there had

May 14,  
1547.  
Council  
Book.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
240.

caused the obsequies of the late king Henry, (God pardon him) to be performed at Ghent. And likewise how very much displeased her grace was at the scandalous sermon of a friar, who had treated king Henry's memory with a great deal of satire, and black imputation."

A letter of the privy-council to Bonner, bishop of London, takes notice that some people had, either upon a presumption of leave, or the suggestions of their own fancy, ventured to sell the bells, plate, and jewels of several churches. This liberty is blamed by the privy-council, and said to be of ill example. And the bishop is commanded to inquire what ornaments and things of value have been thus seized and sold, and by whom, and to what use the money has been employed.

"The parishioners of Penwith, in Cornwall, rose in tumults against the commissioners, appointed to take an inventory of the church jewels. To pacify this mutiny, the council wrote a letter, to acquaint them, that the intent of this commission was rather to preserve the jewels to the use of the Church, and to prevent their being embezzled, than otherwise.

"By letters from the privy-council to the lord Wharton, and the commissioners appointed for the surrender of Kirke's wall, it appears the master and fellows of that society had been before the council. It is likewise intimated this college had formerly refused to surrender their house. And that the council had once resolved to have punished their disobedience to the king's commissioners, and made them an example, for terror to others. But now they were grown more manageable, bent to a compliance, and seemed sorry for their former stubbornness. Upon these considerations, the council thought fit to continue them upon the premises, till further orders should be taken for their pensions, and disposal of their college. However, in the meantime, an inventory was taken of their goods."

These orders of the privy-council were some of them dispatched before the sitting of the parliament: however, I thought it better to lay them altogether before the reader, than break the thread of the history, by keeping too close to the exactness of time.

In January this year, there was an order of council, relating to the marriage of the marquess of Northampton. This nobleman, who was brother to the queen-dowager, had married

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 111.  
Dec. 17.  
Council  
Book.

May 7,  
A.D. 1547.

Anne Bouchier, daughter and sole heir to the earl of Essex. EDWARD VI.  
 This lady being convicted of adultery, a divorce followed. And to settle the matter more solemnly, and make the marquess a farther reparation, a commission was granted in the beginning of last summer, to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Durham and Rochester, (which was then Holbeke) to Dr. Ridley and others, to the number of ten, of whom six were to be a quorum: their business was to examine, whether the matrimonial relation between the marquess and the lady Anne was not perfectly extinguished: and if so, whether he might not lawfully marry another wife. This liberty was not allowed by the canon laws. And therefore the ecclesiastical courts gave no farther relief than separation from bed and board.

*A committee, &c. for examining the divorce of the marquess of Northampton, and whether it was lawful to marry again?*

The case being new, and of great consequence, Cranmer resolved to examine it with the utmost care, and to go to the bottom of the question: to this purpose he drew a large collection out of the Fathers and other divines.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. Ex MSS. Dr. Stillingfleet.

The reading a great many books, forming arguments, and coming to a resolution, required longer time than the marquess of Northampton was willing to wait. He presumed his interest would carry him through, and therefore without staying for judgment, he publicly married Elizabeth, daughter to the lord Cobham. This was looked on as an irregular step, by the privy-council, in regard his first marriage stood firm in law. Upon his appearing before the board, he alleged that he thought himself discharged by the law of God: that the indissolubleness of marriages depended on the supposition of its being a sacrament: that this restraint was only a branch of the papal constitutions. That the court of Rome being apprehensive such impositions would not easily be borne, had given way to the distinctions of the canonists: and that by these allowances it was no difficult matter to avoid the matrimonial engagement. That the confinements of the English Church were great hardships, if upon the proof of scandalous commerce, the innocent person must either live with the guilty, or be exposed to hazard and temptation: and that one of these circumstances must necessarily follow, if the tie of the marriage continued, and separation was the farthest remedy.

However, since the marquess had precipitated matters, and made his own choice before judgment given, it was ordered

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

that he and his new wife should be parted. Thus the lady was put into the queen-dowager's hands, till the delegates should pronounce upon the case.

Matt. xix.

The arguments on which they founded their sentence, were drawn from Scripture, the Fathers, and the civil law. They argued that our Saviour condemned all marriage upon divorce "excepting in the case of adultery." That this exception is a plain allowance of the case reserved: that our Saviour pronouncing married persons "to be no more two, but one flesh," from hence it follows, that when either of the parties have broken that union by becoming one with another person, the marriage must by consequence be dissolved. Besides, separation without voiding the engagement, is not to be reconciled with what the apostle writes to the Corinthians. Farther, St. Paul putting the case of an unbeliever going off, and relinquishing the marriage, determines that a "brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases." Now if single desertion amounts to a discharge, which seems to be the apostle's meaning, the reasoning from adultery will be still more conclusive.

Cor. vii. 3.

4.

Ibid. 15.

To this it was replied on the other side, that our Saviour's allowing divorce in the case of adultery, was a privilege particular to the Jews. That this indulgence was allowed to soften the rigour of the Mosaic law, by which this crime was capitally punished in the woman. To prove this liberty peculiar to the Jews, it was observed that the Apostle writing to the Gentile Christians at Rome and Corinth, declares the wife "bound by the law to her husband, as long as he lives," without any exception of cases: and that other general rule pronounced by our Saviour, "whom God has joined together, let no man put asunder," was alleged to prove the matrimonial tie indissoluble. To this it was answered, that these texts thus interpreted, proved too much, and condemned separation from bed and board, no less than dissolving the relation. That our Saviour left the wife at liberty to part with her husband for adultery, though by the law of Moses, only the adulterous wife, and the person who debauched her, were to suffer death; but the husband guilty of such an offence was not capitally punished: by this provision of our Saviour therefore, with respect to the woman, they inferred the marriage was evidently dissolved by adultery.

Rom. vii. 2.

Matt. xix. 6.

241.

From hence they proceed to the testimony of the fathers, which, because there is no reference to examine the citations, I shall forbear to mention. EDWARD VI.

By the civil law, if the man could prove his wife a strumpet, a poisoner, or procuress, he might have judgment for a divorce. And if a woman could convict her husband of murder, poisoning, of breaking up or robbing of graves, she had the same remedy: and after the divorce was once pronounced, either of the injured persons were at liberty to marry. And thus, by the constitution drawn up from the ecclesiastical courts in this reign, when adultery was proved upon either of the parties, the innocent person was not barred from marrying at discretion.

III. Cod.  
Theod.  
tit. 16.  
lex. 1.

Ref. Eccles.  
Leg. p. 25.  
*Judgment given for the marquess.*  
Bp. Burnet, pt. 2, p. 58. and Records, book 1, p. 125.

To return: the question was divided into eight branches, and put to some learned men, who returned their answer in favour of the marquess of Northampton's second marriage. Pursuant to this resolution, sentence was given for this lord, and his second lady permitted to cohabit with him. However, four years after, he was advised to bring in a bill into the parliament-house for confirming this judgment, of which more afterwards.

In the latter end of January, the archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Bonner, bishop of London, to forbid the use of some ceremonies formerly practised. The letter is in these words:—

“This is to advertise your lordship, that my lord protector's grace, with advice of others the king's majesty's council, for certain considerations them thereunto moving, hath fully resolved that no candles should be borne upon Candlemas-day, nor also from henceforth ashes or palms used any longer. Wherefore I beseech your lordship to cause admonition thereof to be given in all parish churches throughout your diocese with all celerity; and likewise unto all other bishops that be hereabouts, that they may do the semblable in their dioceses before Candlemas-day. And as for other bishops that cannot have knowledge so soon, you may give them knowledge hereof at more leisure, so it be done before Ash-Wednesday. Thus fare your lordship well, your loving friend,

*An order of the council against candles, palms, &c.*

T. CANTUAR.

Regist.  
Bonner, fol. 110.

“Lambeth, Jan. 27, 1547.”

The reason of the archbishop requiring Bonner to acquaint

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the provincial bishops is, because the bishops of London being deans of the episcopal college are obliged to execute the mandates of their metropolitan, and transmit his orders to the suffragans of the province. And therefore, though Bonner had no inclination for services of this kind, he could not decline them without entangling himself, and falling under censure.

*Cranmer's  
mandate to  
Bonner.*

However, he ventured to demur a little to the execution; upon which the archbishop writes another letter to remind him that it was not so much his order as that of the privy council. Neither was there any inconsistency (as it seems Bonner had objected) between this injunction, and the king's proclamation lately set forth.

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 111.

The purport of the proclamation was to forbid all persons making any alterations in the rites and practice of the Church, either by putting down the old, or bringing in any new ceremonies without public warrant. That all such singularities, all such private and unauthorised fancies, were arguments of pride, displeasing to God Almighty, and tended to the disturbance of Church and State. All clergymen were likewise forbidden to preach in any place excepting their own cures, unless licensed by the king, his highness's visitors, the archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of the diocese. But notwithstanding all innovation is forbidden, there is a clause in the proclamation to screen those from punishment who should omit or refuse the "bearing of candles on Candlemas-day, taking ashes on Ash-Wednesday, creeping to the cross, bearing palms, or taking holy bread or holy water, or omitting those other rites and ceremonies concerning religion, which the archbishop of Canterbury, by his majesty's command, with the advice of the privy council, has declared, or shall hereafter declare, to the other bishops, by his writing under seal, may be omitted or changed."

Feb. 6.  
A. D. 1547.

*An order of  
council for  
removing  
all images  
out of  
churches.*

Before this order could reach the remote parts of the kingdom, it was followed by another concerning images. These, it seems, had either not been removed so far as the injunctions required, or, which is more likely, the council advanced to a resolve of throwing them all out (whether abused or not), without distinction. Their letter to the archbishop is to this effect. They take notice, "that by one article of the king's injunctions, all images which at any time had been abused, with pilgrimages, offerings or censings, should be taken away.



That the execution was contested in several parts of the kingdom. That some people were so positive in their superstition, that the evident abuse of images was not thought a sufficient motive to part with them: that the matter of fact was likewise questioned, and a great deal of squabbling in many places, whether images had been abused or not. That disputes of this kind, unless obviated in time, would probably proceed to farther inconveniences: and that the kingdom is scarcely anywhere quiet, excepting where these occasions of disturbance are wholly taken away. That the Catholic Church made use of no representations of this kind for many years: and that by no means it is convenient the living images of Christ should fall into misunderstandings about those which are inanimate; especially since they cannot be said to be any necessary circumstances in divine service. For these reasons, the archbishop is required to issue out his mandate for the taking them down everywhere with all expedition." The letter is subscribed by

EDWARD  
VI.

“ EDWARD SOMERSET. ANTHONY WINGFIELD.  
HENRY ARUNDEL. JOHN RUSSELL.  
THOMAS SEYMOUR. WILLIAM PAGET.”

The king's commissioners, in their late visitation, were somewhat particular in their directions to the clergy and laity within the deanery of Doncaster. By their exceeding the injunctions, it seems they had somewhat of a discretionary commission. I shall mention some of their orders to the clergy. They enjoin them to teach their parishioners that fasting in Lent, and at other times of abstinence, is no more than a mere positive or human law: that the civil magistrate may change the times, or dispense with the austerities: and therefore that all persons who have either sickness, other necessity, or license, may, within the bounds of temperance, eat what they please without scruple of conscience.

*The visitors' injunctions to the deanery of Doncaster.*

242.

Item. Before high mass is said or sung at the high altar, the English suffrages for the prosperity of the king's affairs, and the recommending his subjects to the divine protection, were audibly to be read.

Item. Every Sunday, at the time of the priest's going about the church with holy water, he was to speak the following

Bishop Burnet, pt. 2.  
Records,  
p. 126.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

sentence in three or four places where he might be best heard by the congregation :—

“ Remember Christ’s blood-shedding, by the which most holy sprinkling of all your sins, you have free pardon.”

*This holy  
bread was  
not conse-  
crated.*

In like manner, before the distribution of the holy bread he was to pronounce these words :—

“ Of Christ’s body this is a token ; which on the cross for our sins was broken ; wherefore of his death if ye will be partakers, of vice and sins you must be forsakers<sup>1</sup>.”

The clerk, in like manner, is ordered to bring down the pax, and standing without the church-door, say these words aloud to the people :—

“ This is a token of joyful peace which is betwixt God and men’s conscience : Christ is alone the peace-maker which straitly commands peace between brother and brother.”

By the way, the pax was a piece of wood, or metal, with the figure of our Saviour upon it : when the holy kiss mentioned by St. Paul was left off upon prudential motives, the use of the pax was brought in, carried about the church, and offered all the people to kiss.

1 Cor. xvi.  
20.

This first year of the king’s reign, bishop Latimer appeared publicly, and exercised part of his function. He preached in January at Paul’s Cross, and the Lent after, before the king, in the Privy-garden. In some of his printed sermons, he complains, “ the holy revenues were seized by the rich laity ; that the incumbent was only a proprietor in title : that chantry priests were presented to several cures, to excuse the patrons from paying their pensions : that many benefices were let out in fee-farms by secular men, or else given to their servants as a consideration for keeping their hounds, hawks, and horses : and, lastly, that the poor clergy were reduced to such short allowance, that they were forced to go to service : to turn clerks of the kitchen, surveyors, receivers, &c.” Thus God was dishonoured in his ministers, the church disserved, and

Stow’s  
Annal.  
Bishop  
Latimer’s  
complaint of  
the invasion  
of the patri-  
mony of the  
Church.

Latimer’s  
Sermons,  
p. 38, 71, 91,  
114, 241.

<sup>1</sup> This sentence was evidently composed in rhyme, to make a stronger impression on the memories of the people.

religion disgraced. However, there was no redress to be had: all this outrage and injustice was generally connived at by the great men: for, as the learned Heylin observes, which way could they go about to rectify these disorders without condemning themselves?

EDWARD  
VI.

Neither were the universities in any better condition: they lay under the last degree of discouragement, as appears by Ascham's letter to the marquess of Northampton. He complains there was scarce any sort of motive left for study: that learning had neither wealth nor respect to draw the fancy: that for these reasons, improvement in science was impracticable to poor people: and as for the wealthy, they had no stomach to drudge for attainments so little regarded: that unless men's hopes were revived by considerations of interest and figure, the most promising geniuses would miscarry, and the country sink to the last degree of ignorance.

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 61.  
*The declension of the universities.*

One Leaver, a learned man of Cambridge, makes a resembling remonstrance at St. Paul's Cross. He applies himself boldly to the courtiers; tells them the university was not much the better for the five lectures founded by the late king: that they had been false to their trust, and enriched themselves with revenues settled upon that learned society: that before they had the disposal of the king's bounty, there were in Cambridge two hundred that studied divinity to considerable improvement; but that now the university was lamentably thin and dispirited.

Ascham's  
Epist. lib. I.  
p. 406.

The university of Oxford had no better fortune: the chantry-lands designed by the act for provision for poor scholars, were divided amongst the courtiers, and the salaries settled upon the lectures unpaid. In short, most of the religious foundations which at the dissolution of their houses should have been employed for the augmentation of the king's revenues, the maintenance of the poor, and the encouragement of learning, were swallowed by men of a very uncommendable character; who, as the historian speaks, seem to have been born for the destruction of sense and conscience; who, in regard they were laymen, could have no pretences to the endowments of the Church: for since they were incapable of performing the sacerdotal office, with what justice could they lay hands on the estates settled on that function? However, all the reason and remonstrance of good men could not prevail with them to balk their avarice,

Wood, Hist.  
et Univ.  
Oxon.  
p. 206.  
*The chantry-lands mis-employed.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Ibid.

nor hinder them from settling their sacrilege upon their posterity.

And having mentioned Ascham's report of the condition of the university of Cambridge, I shall add something in general concerning the course of their studies, as it is represented by the same hand. In one of his letters to the archbishop of Canterbury, he takes notice that the study of the canon law, and school-men, began to be disused: that they formed their system of divinity upon the holy Scriptures and the writings of St. Austin: that languages and the belles-lettres began to be in vogue: that Plato, Aristotle, and Tully, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, together with the Greek poets of the first class, were much their inclination. Afterwards, he complains in general of the discouragements the university lay under; that the men of long standing were mostly gone off; and that parts and learning were generally overweighed by favour, and recommendations from great men.

Ascham's  
Epist. lib. 2.

243.

*A committee  
of bishops,  
&c., draw  
up an order  
for adminis-  
tering the  
holy eucha-  
rist under  
both kinds.*

The latter end of this winter a committee of divines were commanded by the king to draw up an order for administering the holy eucharist in English under both kinds, pursuant to the late act of parliament. The commission was directed to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Ely, Lincoln, Chichester, Hereford, Westminster, Rochester; Dr. Cox, almoner to the king, and dean of Christ Church; Dr. May, dean of St. Paul's; Dr. Taylor or Tyler, dean of Lincoln; Dr. Heynes, dean of Exeter; Dr. Robertson, afterwards dean of Durham, and Dr. Redmayne, master of Trinity college in Cambridge. These were the persons who afterwards made the first liturgy: and therefore, Heylin is of opinion they were now employed for the business above-mentioned. The learned bishop Burnet from a manuscript of Dr. Stillingfleet gives a different list, on which we ought rather to rely, for Heylin speaks only upon conjecture: the names are these, the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishops of London, Durham, and Worcester, Norwich, St. Asaph, Salisbury, Coventry and Lichfield, Carlisle, Bristol, St. David's, Ely, Lincoln, Chichester, Hereford, Westminster, Rochester, together with all the doctors above-mentioned.

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 57.

These prelates and divines, before they came to a resolution concerning the form for the administration in both kinds, considered the present practice of the Church. and broke the

question into several divisions. And here it was settled that every one in the commission should give his answer in writing.

EDWARD VI.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2, p. 61.  
Bp. Burnet, ex MSS.  
Dr. Stillingfleet.

“ QUESTION I.

“ Whether the sacrament of the altar was instituted to be received of one man for another, or to be received of every man for himself ?”

Upon this question they are all agreed that this holy sacrament was instituted to be received of every man for himself, and not of one man for another ; but here it must be said the bishop of Durham is not quite so clear as the rest for the latter part of the question.

*Their answer to several questions relating to the holy eucharist.*

“ QUESTION II.

“ Whether the receiving the said sacrament of one man does avail and profit any other ?”

Here Canterbury, and St. David's, and the two Drs. Cox and Taylor, hold the negative part of the question. The rest, excepting Carlisle and Bristol, agree in a middle sense : they affirm the receiving this holy sacrament signifies nothing as to another person, any farther than that all good works done by any member of the Catholic Church are in some measure serviceable to the whole body, by virtue of the union and communication which run through this spiritual society. I observed Carlisle and Bristol were more express. The first, whose name was Aldrich, distinguishes between the act of the receiver and the oblation of the sacrifice made by the priest. If the receiver comes unqualified, he hurts himself, and it may be, does no service to any other person ; but the offering and distribution of the holy sacrament, by the common minister, is beneficial to present and absent, living and dead.

A. D. 1547-8.

Bush, bishop of Bristol, endeavours to prove the celebration of the holy sacrament serviceable, not only to the receivers, but the whole Church. To this purpose he quotes these words of St. Cyprian : “ Quanquam fidelissimus et devotissimus frater noster, inter cetera sollicitudinem et curam suam eum fratribus in omni obsequio operationis impertitur, qui nec illic curam corporum—scripsit ac scribit ac significat mihi dies quibus

Epist. 6.  
lib. 3.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

in carcere beati fratres nostri ad immortalitatem gloriosæ mortis exitu transeant et celebrentur, hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum, quæ cito vobiscum, Domino prosperante, celebrabimus. Ita enim docuit Apostolus Christi, unus panis et unum corpus multi sumus omnes, qui de uno pane et de uno calice participamus. Nec loquitur de his solis, qui eo tempore Corinthi conveniebant, et sacramentum ab unius sacerdotis manu recipiebant, verum potius de seipso tunc procul a Corintho agente, et Corinthiis ipsis omnibusque in Christum credentibus, ubi tandem constituti essent, quos omnes significat unum esse corpus qui toto orbe de uno pane communicantes participarent.”

### “ QUESTION III.

“ What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass ?”

The reader shall have Canterbury’s answer in his own words, viz.—

“ The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass is not so called because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people, (for that was done but once by himself upon the cross ;) but it is so called because it is a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the cross.”

Holbeck, and Ridley, and Ferrars, bishops of Lincoln, Rochester, and St. David’s, declared themselves much to the same effect. The Drs. Cox and Taylor seemed to go somewhat lower, and make the oblation in the holy eucharist mean nothing more than prayer, thanksgiving, and the remembrance of our Saviour’s passion. The rest—that is, Holgate, archbishop of York; Heath, bishop of Worcester; Reys, of Norwich; Parfew, of St. Asaph; Tunstal, of Durham; Salcot, *alias* Capon, of Salisbury; Gooderick, of Ely; Sampson, of Coventry and Lichfield; Day, of Chichester; and Skip, of Hereford; together with Lincoln and Carlisle—agree in a counter sense. They affirm, “ the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass is the presenting the very body and blood of Christ to God the Father, under the form of bread and wine; that these eucharistic elements are consecrated with prayer and thanksgiving for the universal Church, and in remembrance of our Saviour’s passion.”

And here the bishop of Carlisle is somewhat more strong and singular. His words are these: "The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass is even the same which was offered by Christ on the cross, ever and everywhere abiding and enduring of like strength, virtue, and power. The difference is, that, on the cross, Christ, being there both priest and sacrifice, offered himself visibly; and in the mass, being likewise both priest and sacrifice, offers himself invisibly by the common minister of the Church, who, in the name and stead of the whole faithful congregation, offers and presents as he is commanded by Christ."

EDWARD  
VI.

“QUESTION IV.

“Wherein consists the mass by Christ’s institution?”

Here Canterbury, Salisbury, Lincoln, Ely, Rochester, Bristol, and St. David’s, are of the same opinion. They affirm the mass by Christ’s institution consists in those things which are mentioned in the evangelist, Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv., Luke xxii., I Cor. x. and xi., Acts ii. York adds John vi. to the former texts; but seems to come towards the sense of transubstantiation. Cox and Tyler are somewhat more explicit, and make the mass consist in the distribution of the body and blood of Christ in memory of his passion.

244.

“QUESTION V.

“What time the accustomed order began first in the Church, that the priest alone should receive the sacrament?”

To this Canterbury answers thus: “I think the use that the priest alone did receive the sacrament, without the people, began not within six or seven hundred years after Christ.” Lincoln’s answer is much the same, only he gives reasons, and dilates a little. Rochester differs from these two only as to the time, and seems to grant somewhat more of antiquity to the custom.

York is somewhat singular in his answer, and relies upon a forged decretal epistle. He affirms, “the customary order, that priests should receive the sacrament alone, began about the time of Zepherinus, who, when the common people had left their daily and frequent communion, ordained that they should

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

communicate at the least once a-year, which was at Easter :” which ordinance was confirmed by Innocent III. Rochester alleges some of these spurious authorities for a contrary purpose. London, Worcester, Hereford, Norwich, Chichester, St. Asaph, and Durham, are uniform in their sentiment. They do not pretend to found the practice upon any constitution ; but refer it to the decay of the primitive fervour, and the abatement of devotion in the people, who, when they absented themselves from the sacrament, the priests were forced to receive it alone. The bishop of Durham explains himself farther, and observes that at first the people received the holy eucharist every day, afterwards thrice a-week, then on Sundays only ; and, devotion growing more languid upon the course of time, the intervals of the solemnity were still more distant, and the people received no oftener than thrice a-year, that is, at the festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide.

“ QUESTION VI.

“ Whether it be convenient that the same custom continue still within this realm ?”

Here Canterbury and Rochester are for reviving the primitive usage, as founded upon Scripture, and declare against solitary communion. The rest of the bishops determine the other way. They wish the priest might have some of the congregation to receive with him at every mass : however, if the coldness of their devotion makes them decline communicating, they think it both lawful and convenient that the priest should say mass and receive the sacrament alone. Dr. Cox seems to be of the same opinion, in case the people cannot be prevailed with to communicate with the priest.

“ QUESTION VII.

“ Whether it is convenient that masses satisfactory should continue, and priests hired to sing mass for souls departed ?”

Canterbury answers, “ he thinks it not convenient that satisfactory masses should continue.” Rochester and Dr. Cox agree with the archbishop. London, Hereford, Worcester, Norwich, Chichester, and St. Asaph, join in the same answer. They



affirm the question before them is not couched in the language of the school-men: however, they believe the priest, praying in the mass for the quick and dead, and officiating in other circumstances of the sacrament, may lawfully receive a maintenance upon this score. EDWARD VI.

Durham affirms, "all priests, when they say mass, are bound to pray for the whole Catholic Church, both in this world and in the other, though they are not under promise or agreement of receiving money for this purpose. Nevertheless, as St. Paul speaks, 'since the people are made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.'"

Rom. xv. 27.

Lincoln goes a middle way, and argues for his opinion. He cites the epistle to the Hebrews to maintain the full satisfaction of the sacrifice upon the cross: "that Christ by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us, and that by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;" that the keeping up satisfactory masses, in the notion received, seems to import a deficiency in the redemption upon the cross; and that the Apostles wanted either learning or benevolence in their instructions. "It is true," says he, "Naucerus informs us Gregory III. ordered the priests to pray and offer for the dead; but though ancient writers mention this as part of the priest's office, yet they never allow of contracts and money considerations for this purpose."

Heb. ix. 12.  
and x. 14.

The bishop of Ely delivers himself to this sense: he owns praying for the dead is a commendable, primitive, and uninterrupted custom, and seems to have some ground in Scripture; and for this he appeals to the testimonies of St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin, and others. But to say mass for money, by way of commerce and exchange, as if there was a just proportion between the prayer and the money, between the performance and the reward, managing thus, as it were, by way of articles, looks, he thinks, like simoniacal covetousness. And yet all this must be understood within a due reserve for those texts of Scripture where the labourer is said "to be worthy of his hire:" "and the Lord has ordained that they that preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel."

Luke x. 7.  
1 Cor. ix. 14.

The bishop of Carlisle affirms, that if any thing or action of the priest is interpreted to a full satisfaction of sins, venial or

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

245.

mortal, he knows no authority in proof of such an assertion ; neither is he willing to grant that priests are hired by way of bargain to say mass for souls departed. He would rather have it, that the praying for the living and dead is part of the Church-service ; that it is performed by the priest as a branch of his function, without any regard to the advantage of his pocket. However, he thinks the clergy ought to be considered for these ministrations. Then, as to the perfect and plenary satisfaction for all sins, that is only to be attributed to our Saviour's passion. However, those who go into the other world, charged only with some lesser faults unrepented, he hopes may be relieved by the eucharistic sacrifice and the prayers of the Church : and for this he cites St. Austin, St. Jerome, &c. " Pro non valde malis propitiaciones fiant, et de levioribus peccatis, cum quibus obligati defuncti sunt, possunt post mortem absolvi," &c.

#### "QUESTION VIII.

" Whether the Gospel ought to be taught at the time of the mass, to the understanding of the people being present ? "

Here London and Durham are of one opinion. They do not think it necessary a sermon should be preached at every mass, though they grant the frequent use of such instruction is very commendable. The rest speak somewhat higher for this practice, and seem to make it in a manner necessary.

#### "QUESTION IX.

" Whether in the mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand ? "

To this Canterbury answers, he thinks it convenient to use the vulgar tongue in the mass, excepting in certain secret mysteries, concerning which he is unresolved at present. York agrees with him, but without any hesitation concerning the mysteries.

London, Hereford, Chichester, Worcester, Norwich, and St. Asaph, pronounce they think it not convenient the whole mass should be in English.

Durham's answer looks the same way. He affirms that Latin being the common language of the western liturgies, he

thinks the continuance of it ought to be kept on, especially as to the more mysterious part of the service. He conceives the majesty of religion would suffer and grow cheap, if the most solemn part of it should be understood by the audience. Notwithstanding this singularity, he believes the translating several prayers, for informing the understanding, and exciting the devotion of the people, might be a serviceable expedient. EDWARD  
VI.

Lincoln's answer disagrees with Durham. This bishop insists upon the apostles' authority and reasoning, to prove the public service ought to be in a tongue the people understand, without which they are not in a condition to say amen. He adds that, long after the apostles' times, the liturgies continued in the language of the country. 1 Cor. xiv.

Ely reinforces Lincoln, by producing instances. "This was the custom," says he, "in Dalmatia, in St. Jerome's time. And afterwards, when Cyril applied to the court of Rome for the same usage in Selavonia, the case being debated in the consistory, and the motion opposed by a strong party, a voice was heard as it were from heaven: 'Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum, et omnis lingua confiteatur ei;' and thus the decision was made in favour of Cyril." However, Ely concludes with a proviso for altering his mind upon better information.

Carlisle observes, that the publishing the holy Scriptures in English in the late reign, was first thought inconvenient, and afterwards allowed by the advice of the clergy; and that for his part he was ready to follow authority, and submit his understanding to his superiors.

Rochester declares for the mass in the vulgar language, and that the people have a right to understand the Church service; which way else can they answer the priest, as they did in St. Cyprian's time, "Habemus ad Dominum?" that is, We lift them up unto the Lord. However, upon the authority of St. Basil and the counterfeit St. Dennis, he thinks it would not be inconvenient if the words of consecration were secreted, or spoken low.

Bristol is of opinion, that saying the whole mass in English would bring a singularity upon the English Church, and make her differ from the rest of Christendom.

## "QUESTION X.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

"When the reservation of the sacrament, and the hanging up of the same first began?"

To this question we have only the answers of Canterbury and Lincoln. The first believes the reservation of the sacrament began six or seven hundred years after Christ, and that the hanging it up hath still less antiquity. The latter cites Polydore Virgil, for a decree of pope Innocent III., in which the reserving the sacrament was ordered, that it might be always ready for the benefit of sick persons. This decree was confirmed by Honorius III., who added a clause for keeping it "in loco singulari, mundo, et signato." He likewise commanded the priest to instruct the people to make a low reverence at the elevation, and when it was carried to the sick. As for the hanging the sacrament over the altar, the bishop of Lincoln affirms it a custom of a later time, and not yet universally received.

Bishop Burnet, pt. 2. Records, p. 133. et dcinc. ex MSS. Dr. Stillingfleet.

Whether these questions were debated before the late statute, for communicating under both kinds, is somewhat uncertain, for by that act the priests are not restrained from consecrating, though none of the congregation communicated with them.

This committee of bishops and divines moved gently in the reformation. They were willing to satisfy the court and the act of parliament; and at the same time find out such a temper as might not be shocking to the old persuasion. Thus by the form they drew up, the office of the mass continued as formerly in the Latin tongue, to the end of the canon. After this an exhortation in English was made to those who intended to receive the holy eucharist. It began with these words: "Dearly beloved in the Lord, the coming to this holy communion," &c.; then followed the Invitation: "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins," &c. From hence the office proceeds to a general Confession, to the Absolution, and the comfortable sentences out of holy Scripture; and from thence to the prayer, "We do not presume to come to this table." These prayers were the same which are still used by the Church of England. After this the holy eucharist was given in both kinds, first to the clergy, then to the people, with

*A form drawn up by the bishops for communicating in both kinds.*

these words, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life; the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life." The congregation received kneeling, and were dismissed with a blessing.

The day before the receiving the communion, the priest made an exhortation to prepare the people for the solemnity; it is much the same with that now in our liturgy, only after the direction concerning confession, it is added, that such as made choice of the customary confession to the priest, should not censure those who thought a general confession to God sufficient; and that those who confessed only to God, should not be shocked with those who applied to auricular confession; that in things not prescribed in holy Scripture, or settled by authority, every man ought to follow his own conscience, without condemning a different practice in others. The bread was such as had been formerly used, and broken into two or more pieces, and the people were taught the quantity, whether more or less, made no difference to the benefit. And lastly, there was no elevation after consecration.

EDWARD  
VI.

246.

Heylin's  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 58.  
L'Estrange's  
Alliance of  
Divine Of-  
fices, p. 339.  
et deince.

This form being approved by the privy council, was published with the king's proclamation on the eighth of March. The proclamation sets forth, "that the office was drawn up to preserve a due regard for the holy sacrament; that such high mysteries might not be approached with undue qualifications, dishonoured by diversity of usage, or profaned by undecent address. The subjects are commanded to conform to this order, that the king may be encouraged to proceed in the progress of the reformation; and here they are enjoined to wait the public direction, and not to overrun authority: that such unwarrantable forwardness was the way to retard their wishes, and disappoint them in what they expected."

*A proclamation  
for  
conformity to  
the office.*

The next clause is somewhat extraordinary, and therefore I shall give it in the words of the proclamation. "We would not," says the king, "have our subjects so much to mistake our judgment, so much to mistrust our zeal, as though we either could not discern what was to be done, or would not do all things in due time. God be praised, we know both what by his word is meet to be redressed, and have an earnest mind with all diligence and convenient speed, to set forth the same." &c.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

The king was but ten years old in October last, and therefore to suppose him a judge in controversy thus early, and make him say he knew what was fit to be done, was somewhat extraordinary. People would not easily believe that a prince so much within his childhood should be furnished with learning, and grown up to that maturity of judgment, as to be in a condition to pronounce upon articles of faith, and to settle the discipline and worship of the Church. This is a performance which requires a very penetrating and enlightened understanding. To determine these points, all the advantages of age and improvement are no more than necessary. Farther: by the proclamation it appears, the people in many places were very ungovernable and tumultuary, and thought themselves wise enough to strike out a scheme of religion; and thus presuming on their abilities, they practised upon their private fancies, and had not patience to stay the leisure either of Church or State. To prevent this disorder, to make the devotions of the people uniform, and recommend these beginnings of the reformation, a sufficient number of copies of the office above-mentioned was transmitted to the bishops, with a letter of direction for the disposal. The council's letter, drawn up by archbishop Cranmer, runs thus:—

Paper-office,  
March 15,  
A.D. 1547-8.

*A letter of  
the privy  
council to all  
the bishops  
for the same  
purpose.*

“ After our most hearty commendations unto your lordships, where, in the parliament late holden at Westminster, it was amongst other things most godly established, that, according to the first institution and use of the primitive Church, the most holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ should be distributed to the people under the kinds of bread and wine; according to the effect whereof, the king's majesty minding, with the advice and consent of the lord protector's grace, and the rest of the council, to have the said statute well executed in such sort, as like as it is agreeable with the Word of God, so the same may also be faithfully and reverently received of his most loving subjects, to their comforts and wealths, hath caused sundry of his majesty's most grave and well-learned prelates, and others, learned men in the Scriptures, to assemble themselves for this matter, who, after long conference together, have, with deliberate advice, finally agreed upon such an order, to be used in all places of the king's majesty's dominions, in the distribution of the said

most blessed sacrament, as may appear unto you by the book thereof, which we send herewith unto you; albeit, knowing your lordship's knowledge in the Scriptures, and earnest good will and zeal to the setting forth of all things, according to the truth thereof, we be well assured, you will of your own good will, and upon respect to your duty, diligently set forth this most godly order here agreed upon, and commanded to be used by the authority of the king's majesty, yet remembering withall the crafty practices of the devil, who ceaseth not by his members to work by all ways and means the hinderance of all godliness, and considering farther that a great number of the curates of the realm, either for lack of knowledge cannot, or for want of good mind, will not be so ready to set forth the same as we could wish, and as the importance of the matter and their own bounden duty requireth; we have thought good to pray and require your lordships, and never the less in the king's majesty, our most dread sovereign lord's name, to command you, to have an earnest, careful, and diligent respect, both in your own person and by all your officers, and ministers also, to cause these books to be delivered to every parson, vicar, and other curate within your diocese, with such diligence as they may have sufficient time well to advise, and instruct themselves for the distribution of the most holy communion, according to the order of this book, before this and Easter time, and also that they may be by your good means well directed to use such good, gentle, and charitable instruction, of their weak, simple, and unlearned parishioners, as may be to all their good satisfaction, as much as may be; praying you to consider that this order is set forth to the intent there should be in all parts of the realm, and amongst all men, one uniform manner quietly used: the well executing whereof, like as it shall stand very much in the diligence of you and others of your vocation, so we eftsounds require you to have an earnest respect thereunto, as you tender the king's majesty's pleasure, and will answer for the contrary.

247.

"T. CANT.

R. RYCHE CANCELL.

WM. ST. JOHN,

J. RUSSELL,

H. ARUNDELL,

WM. PETRE,

ED. NORTH,

EDWARD WOTTON."

Those who adhered to the doctrines and practices received.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*Private  
confession  
examined.*

Bp. Burnet,  
Pt. 2. p. 6.

James v. 16.

1 Pet. v. 5.  
*Dr. Ham-  
mond's sense  
upon this  
subject.*

1 Cor. xiv.  
33.

Hammond  
in loc.

*Erasmus re-  
commends  
auricular  
confession.  
Erasm. Ex-  
omologesis  
seu modus  
confitendi.*

were disgusted at this order: they were disturbed to find confession left indifferent; and apprehensive the people would go too far in this liberty, and avoid the mortification of discovering their conscience. They observed our Saviour had given the apostles and their successors, the power of "binding and loosing;" and that St. James exhorts Christians, "to confess their faults one to another." However, our learned Church historian affirms, "it is certain that confession to a priest is no where enjoined in the Scripture." But the famous Dr. Hammond seems of a different sentiment: and to prove that by "confessing to one another," is meant confession to a priest, he observes that the king's manuscript has the particle *οὕν*, 'therefore'<sup>1</sup>. That this plainly refers the exhortation to the fourteenth verse, where the sick person is directed to call for the "Elders of the Church," that they may "pray over" him, and anoint him with oil, in order to his recovery. This the most learned Dr. Hammond proves farther from the context, and nature of the matter. To warrant this construction, we have a parallel place in St. Peter, where the apostle commands us to "be all subject one to another." Now to strain this up to the letter, must destroy all government and distinction in the Church: and which is more; it is big with inconsistency and contradiction, for it makes every body both a subject and superior, with respect to the same person, and at the same time: "but God," as St. Paul speaks, "is not the author of such confusion." To be subject therefore "one to another," can mean nothing else, than that persons who are placed in a private and inferior station, ought not to affect a levelling humour, but submit to order and authority. And thus, by parity of reason, the text in St. James, "of confessing one to another," must be understood. And to fortify this exposition, and bring it up to the case in hand, he observes, that by the elders of the Church, to whom this confession is to be made, the ancients understand bishops or priests. However, it does not follow it is always necessary: in some cases, it may only be counsel and not reach to precept.

That auricular confession is attended with advantage, seems not ill proved by Erasmus: I shall mention a little of his

<sup>1</sup> This particle is not sanctioned by other MSS. which read simply *Ἐξομολογήσθε ἀλλήλοις*, *confitemini alii aliis*. "The confession here mentioned (says Doddridge) is plainly spoken of as mutual."



EDWARD  
VI.

reasoning upon this subject. In the first place he takes notice, that pride is the main principle of revolt and disobedience. By this unhappy quality a man is apt to rest his conduct wholly on his own strength, and depend upon himself for his happiness: humility, therefore, which makes him distrust his abilities, and resign to the divine appointments, is the first step towards a recovery: the making a discovery of our lives, opening our minds, and laying even our thoughts before a priest, must be a mortifying exercise, and cannot be done without some conquest upon pride. The shame of repeating this discipline makes a man more guarded in his practice, and is a sort of preservative against a relapse. Besides, the penitent, by laying the state of his conscience before a priest, is better acquainted with the degrees of his guilt, and the danger of his miscarriage. To this he adds, when the disease is known, the cure is more practicable, and the remedies may be better directed.

To proceed. It is said, that in the primitive Church "there was no obligation to confess secret sin, since all the canons were about public scandal." But this reason doth not seem strong enough to support the assertion; for it is certain public penance was sometimes assigned to private confession. That those who confessed privately, were ordered to do open penance, without being obliged to publish their particular miscarriage, appears from St. Basil. "Adulterio pollutas mulieres et confitentes ob pietatem — publicare quidem patres nostri prohibuerunt, eas autem stare sine communione jusserunt donec impleretur tempus pœnitentiæ." And from the fifty-eighth canon of this Father, it is plain that these women were excused the discipline of the flentes, audientes, et substrati; and immediately ranged amongst the consistentes to prevent the discovery of their crime. Farther; it is well known that before the time of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, public penance was used in the eastern as well as in the western Churches. For the better regulation of this discipline, a person was chosen to inspect the state of the penitents, and receive their confessions. To this office Sozomen tells us, it was customary to appoint some priest eminent for his prudence and regular behaviour; but

Bp. Barnet,  
pt. 2. 65.  
*Public penance done in the ancient Church for crimes confessed only to the priest.*  
34 Can. ad Amphiloeh.

Morinus de  
Pœnitent.  
lib. 2. c. 19.

Socrates,  
lib. 5. c. 19.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Sozom.  
lib. 7. c. 16.

especially one who was remarkable for his secrecy<sup>1</sup>. Now to what purpose should this latter qualification be thought so necessary in a penitentiary, if confessions were not delivered as secrets? And accordingly we find that person of quality, who occasioned the change of discipline in the Church of Constantinople, confessed to none but the priest, though she was at the same time openly penitent. Now since private confession was thus customary in the ancient Church, since there was a person particularly appointed for this purpose, we must conclude it was then thought a very serviceable expedient. As

*The manner  
of penance.*  
Hieron.  
Epitaph.  
Fabiola.

to the manner of penance for great crimes, the persons enjoined it, applied themselves to the archpriest and penitentiary, who took their names in writing: after this, on the first day of Lent, they appeared at the church-door, in a poor torn habit, for this was then their mourning dress. Having entered the church, the bishop strewed ashes on their head, and gave them sackcloth to wear; then putting themselves in a posture of prostration, the bishop, with the clergy and people, kneeled down and prayed for them: then the bishop, making an exhortation, to affect them with a due sense of their crime, and preserve them from despair, drove them out of the church, and shut the door. In short, they were not in many cases admitted to communion, without running through a long course of extraordinary abstinence, and a great many other instances of discipline and mortification. They were abridged in almost all the entertainments and conveniences of life, and passed their time worse than common poverty could have used them.

Sozom.  
lib. 7. c. 16.  
Tertull. de  
Penitent.  
Cyprian,  
passim.

248. Their habits and devotions, their retirement, and public appearances, were all of them apparent signs of unusual severity, of sorrow and submission. And these exercises of humiliation were sometimes continued for several years. For instance, St. Basil assigns two years penance for theft, seven for fornication, eleven for perjury, fifteen for adultery, twenty for murder, and the whole life for apostacy. These humiliations had an admirable effect upon the Christians of those times. And as the Apostle speaks in a like case, "What carefulness did it work in them? What clearing of themselves? What indignation? What fear," &c.

Basil, Ep. 3.  
Can. ad  
Amphiloch.  
c. 56, 58, 59.  
61, 64, 73.

2 Cor. vii. 11.

<sup>1</sup> Sozomen is so full of pieces of information of this kind, that he deserves an English translation.

In after ages, when the primitive fervour went off, when people were more ready to run riot, and grew less governable under miscarriage, the discipline of the Church was relaxed, and too much indulgence allowed to pilgrimages and crusades. However, misbehaviour was remarkably called to an account in the English Church, as appears by the penitentials of the archbishops Theodore, and Egbert, and by that other drawn up in the tenth century.

EDWARD  
VI.

Our learned Church historian observes, “the not restoring public penance, when private confession was left in a manner indifferent, was censured as a great defect. That this was to discharge the world of all outward restraints. That endeavours were used to revive the ancient discipline, though without success:” that which made this matter impracticable, without the concurrence of the civil authority, was “the total disuse,” as he continues, “of all public censure.” But this, under favour, is somewhat mistaking matter of fact. For we have several remarkable instances to persuade us, that public discipline was all along kept on foot in the English Church: for instance; St. Dunstan excommunicated a licentious count, and refused to admit him to communion, though absolved by the pope, till he had made his submission, and gone through the penance prescribed. For the detail of this case, I shall refer the reader to the former part of this work. Farther, archbishop Chicheley, in the reign of king Henry VI., obliged the lord Strange and his lady to public penance, for countenancing a quarrel in the church. To this I may add, the instance of Jane Shore, in Richard III.’s time: and Camden in his “Remains,” mentions a priest, who carrying a taper in his hand upon the same occasion, had the text; “Let your light so shine before men,” profanely applied to him. Now if quality and priests were thus exposed for their crimes, and put upon these unacceptable exercises, we cannot conclude that public censure was so much disused, as to make it a practice perfectly new to the nation, as our learned historian supposes it. As for the power of “binding and loosing,” he says, “it was thought by many to be only declarative.” If by declarative he means the priests have no force in their commission to absolve a penitent, and that the absolution pronounced by a lay-man, is of the same significaney; if this is the meaning, what construction can we make of our Saviour’s words to the apostles; “As my Father hath sent me, so send I you. Whosoever sins

Spelman, de  
Concil.  
vol. 1.  
Hittorpius  
de Offic.  
Divin.  
Morin. de  
Peniten.  
My Eccles.  
Hist. p. 118.  
*Not restoring public  
penance a  
misfortune  
upon the  
Church.*  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 67.

*This discipline not  
altogether  
disused be-  
fore the Re-  
formation.*  
Eccles. Hist.  
p. 197.

Id. p. 646.

Stow, An-  
nal. p. 449.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 67.  
*The power of  
“the keys”  
more than  
declarative.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
St. John xx.  
21, 23.

ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” And can we imagine that words so plain in the expression, and so solemn in the occasion, are void of weight and signification ? Not to mention the right they imply of admitting into the Church, and excluding from it ; not to mention this, they must amount to this meaning at the lowest, that those who neglect this ordinance of God, and refuse to apply for absolution to persons thus authorised, shall not have their sins forgiven them, though otherwise not unqualified. And thus to put a resembling case, a malefactor cannot have the benefit of the prince’s pardon, unless it passes the seals, and runs through the forms of law. It is granted the form was anciently deprecatory, both in the Latin and the Greek Churches, as appears by the “Ordo Romanus,” the penitential of Egbert, and the “Euchologion.” But all these forms suppose the power of the keys, and that bishops and priests are particularly commissioned for this purpose.

Hittorpius,  
Morinus de  
Penitent.

Our learned Church historian takes notice “that the formal absolution, given by the priest in his own name, ‘I absolve thee,’ was a late invention to raise their authority higher :” but this remark seems somewhat too severe, for the forms of absolution, though never so indicative and absolute, are always to be construed in a deprecatory sense : indeed the thing is pretty plain in itself, for no priest ever pretended to absolve in his own name, and by virtue of an independent authority. No ; the power is supposed to be borrowed, and the office exercised by a delegated jurisdiction. Had the Church of England been of this gentleman’s opinion, that the form, “I absolve thee,” had any thing of interest and unwarrantable design in it, she would not have prescribed it in her visitation of the sick.

Id. lib. 3.  
cap. 22.

To proceed. Notwithstanding the difference of opinions, the new Communion-book was received over England, without any opposition. Thus bishop Burnet. But Heylin reports the matter somewhat differently : he acquaints us the bishops were not equally disposed to a compliance : that Gardiner of Winchester, Bonner of London, Voyesie of Exeter, and Sampson of Coventry and Lichfield, were more backward than the rest : that many of the parochial clergy were no less disinclined to the order ; that they endeavoured to draw an odium upon the government, misrepresented the king, and alarmed the people with the apprehension of unprecedented impositions : and that no less than half-a-crown would be exacted for every

Pt. 2. p. 68.

marriage, christening, and burial. To prevent ill impressions of this kind, a proclamation was published, that none should be allowed to preach, but those who were licensed under the seals of the lord protector, or the archbishop of Canterbury.

In the beginning of March last, the king's commissioners were dispatched into all the counties, to take a survey of all colleges, free chapels, chantries, &c., within the compass of the late statute. And now the free chapel royal of St. Stephen's Westminster, was disincorporated. It was founded for thirty-eight persons, a dean, twelve canons, thirteen vicars, &c. The rents were then valued at a thousand eighty-five pounds ten shillings and five pence per annum. The chapel was afterwards turned to a house for the commons in parliament.

The college of St. Martin's-le-Grand, near Aldersgate in London, fell at the same time. It was founded in the Conqueror's reign for a dean and secular canons, and had the privilege of a sanctuary. The present king granted the liberties and precincts of this foundation to the church of Westminster. The dean and chapter, it seems, misbehaved themselves under the king's bounty: they pulled down the church, sold the materials, and leased out the ground for five marks a year to one Keble of London. The site is exempted from the jurisdiction of the lord mayor and sheriffs, and governed by officers assigned by the chapter of Westminster.

For this sacrilege, the church of Westminster, as Heylin reports, was quickly called to a severe reckoning. The lord protector thought there was no necessity for having two cathedrals so near one another as those of London and Westminster. He fancied the dissolution of the latter, as being lately founded, would be least regretted. Now, the revenues and buildings of Westminster were vast and magnificent. The dissolution gave a tempting prospect to the protector. This nobleman, it seems, had a project of building a palace with the materials of the abbey. Benson, the first dean of the Church, being apprised of the protector's fancy, was glad to compound, to preserve the society. To this purpose, a lease of seventeen manors in the county of Gloucester, for ninety-nine years, was made to Thomas lord Seymour, the protector's brother. And to secure their interest farther, and purchase protection and good humour, another present of almost as many manors and farms, was passed in a lease of the same length, to sir John Mason, for the protector's use. Thus Benson preserved the deanery, with

EDWARD  
VI.

April, 24.  
A. D. 1548.

Heylin's  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 59.

*The commis-  
sioners  
dispatched to  
seize the  
chantries for  
the king.*

249.

Stow's  
Survey of  
London,

Id.

*The disso-  
lution of St.  
Stephen's  
Chapel and  
St. Martin's-  
le-Grand.*

Hist. Ref.  
p. 60.

*The dean  
and chapter  
of Westmin-  
ster alienate  
more than  
half of their  
lands.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

some remains of revenue. However, he was by no means pleased with his conduct in the expedient. He had in the last reign been instrumental in the surrender of the abbey, and had now empoverished the foundation to a very remarkable degree: these considerations sat heavy upon his spirits, and occasioned his death soon after: He was succeeded by Dr. Cox, the king's almoner, dean of Christ Church in Oxford, and chancellor of that university. These foundations of St. Martin, and St. Stephen, being richer, and something more remarkable in their story than the rest, I thought it not improper to insist a little upon them.

Id.

About this time complaints were brought to court, of bishop Gardiner's disaffection to the king's proceedings. That since his being discharged from the Fleet in January last, he had failed in his promise of compliance, and had shown himself particularly troublesome in the case of images. The council were informed that he had ordered all his servants to be privately armed: that he had spoken disrespectfully of the preachers sent down by the protector and the rest of the board: that he had cautioned the people to avoid these new divines, and adhere to the doctrines formerly received. Being again sent for by the council, and charged with several articles, he was dismissed a second time upon promise of inoffensive behaviour. However, this was no full discharge, for he was confined to his house in London. And here he fell into another relapse, exceeded his bounds, and tampered in public business without authority. And now receiving another reprimand from the protector and council, he promised compliance once more, and because he understood he had been represented to disadvantage, he offered to declare his sentiment in the pulpit, and purge himself upon the points objected. In short, St. Peter's day was assigned him to preach before the king. The protector suspecting he might go too far in controversy, occasion new scruples, and unsettle the audience, sent his secretary Cecil to him on the twenty-seventh of June, and the day after wrote to him himself. In this letter he acquaints him, "he had ordered Cecil to let him know he was to forbear insisting on the controverted points, relating to the sacrament of the altar and the mass." To this, Winchester's answer to Cecil, was, "that he could by no means wave the mention of these articles: that the holy eucharist and the mass, were the principal parts of the Christian religion: that these things have

*Bishop Gardiner's affairs further embroiled.*

Fox, vol. 2,  
p. 711.

been already so publicly discoursed, the bishop's silence would be interpreted to cowardice, and indifferency: that he was resolved to speak the truth, and questioned not giving the protector satisfaction. And that he could have wished his grace would not have interposed in matters of religion: that the conduct of this affair was entrusted with the bishops, and that in case of miscarriage, the blame ought to lie upon them."

EDWARD  
VI.

The protector being disgusted with this answer, charges Winchester in the king's name, not to preach upon the controversy above-mentioned; but to spend his discourse upon the articles prescribed; to press obedience to the government, and dilate upon the motives to virtue and good living. As for the points of controversy, they were to be reserved for a public consultation. The protector goes on, that his directing the bishop, pointing out his subject, and limiting his discourse, is no more than he can answer from his character: that his intermeddling with business of religion, and endeavouring to retrieve the people from superstition, is no small part of his office: that since he had the concurrence of the majority of bishops, and other learned men, he should not suffer Gardiner, and some few of his sentiment, to disturb the public harmony: and though he did not presume to pronounce upon points of faith, yet when truth was once discovered and settled, he was resolved to appear against those who should oppose it.

*The protector prescribes him the heads of his sermon.*

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. Records, p. 154. Ex. MSS. Coll. C. C. Cant.

The bishop, it seems, did not take the protector for his ordinary in these matters. He ventured to speak of the sacrament of the altar before the king: this gave great disgust: he gave no better satisfaction, in discoursing upon the heads of obedience and government: here, he is said to have misbehaved himself remarkably, and discovered a very seditious temper. The council therefore, despairing of working upon his humour, and breaking his resolution, committed him to the Tower, and ordered the doors of such rooms in his house as they thought fit, should be sealed up.

Fox, p. 712. *He refuses to comply, and is sent to the Tower.*

The bishop of Winchester endeavours to justify himself in the following account. He reports, that being discharged upon the act of pardon, he was required to declare his opinion on the article of justification in the homilies: that having taken a week's time to consider the point, he told the council his conscience would not give him leave to subscribe; upon which he was confined to his house. Afterwards, he was sent for to the

*His apology.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Id. p. 726.  
*To represent  
our Sa-  
vour's  
burial.*

council, charged with bearing palms, creeping to the cross, having a solemn sepulchre in the Church at Easter, and practising some other ceremonies lately abolished. To this he answered, their lordships were misinformed: that he had complied with the public direction, and made use of no other ceremonies than what were allowed by the king's proclamation.

The manner of his preaching upon the holy eucharist was farther objected: and here he was blamed for affirming the body of Christ was *really* present; the word *really* being an unscriptural term. To this he answered, that he did not think there was any occasion for that term, and therefore, forbore the use of it: that he asserted the presence no farther, than the archbishop of Canterbury had done at Lambert's trial in the late reign.

That he declared his mind fully before the council, upon the duty of obedience; told the board, he had preached in his diocese, that the life of a Christian obliges to a state of suffering; that we are to resign to God Almighty; and as to civil governors, we must either execute their will, or submit to their power. Upon this, the protector told him he must stay in town. He was willing to satisfy the pleasure of the council in this particular; but desired the manner might be free and honourable, and that he might not be treated like a malefactor: he complains that one Philpot of Westminster had misrepresented him, and that he had been ridiculed and railed on, in plays, ballads, and lampoons.

He relates, that Mr. Cecil came to him, from the duke of Somerset, and desired him to write the sermon he intended to preach before the king. This he refused, because it was out of custom, and would make him look like an offender.

And whereas he was charged with giving an ill example, he declares he had never done anything against any statute or proclamation, nor denied any due obedience to the king's pleasure, in any instance whatsoever.

Upon his refusing to pen his sermon, and deliver it upon demand in writing, Cecil put two papers into his hand, containing the heads he was to discourse on. It was at his choice either to dilate upon them in his own words, or preach them as they were penned, for his own composition. This the bishop thought a very harsh appointment, and inconsistent both with conscience and honour. He was then brought privately to the



duke of Somerset's apartment, where he found nobody but his grace, and the lord Wiltshire. Here the protector produced a paper, in which several lawyers had given their opinion under their hands, concerning the extent of the regal and episcopal authority, together with the penalties of disobedience. The bishop answered, the opinions of these lawyers could not justify the commanding him to deliver another man's discourse for his own. That if he might speak with those lawyers, he did not question their agreeing with him upon this point. The protector told him, he should speak with nobody, dismissed him with threatening, to the lord great master's lodging, and gave him time to consider only till dinner was over. In the afternoon, secretary Smith was sent to him: he told him he was not tied up precisely to the words of the papers: and that treating upon the matter in general might give satisfaction. This way of managing his sermon was likewise agreed to by the duke of Somerset. To this the bishop consented as to the main.

In short, he took his text out of the gospel for the day, "Thou art Christ," &c. And here he expressed himself very fully upon the abolition of the pope's supremacy: he commended the dissolution of monasteries and chantries; he approved the king's proceedings: he thought images might have been inoffensively used, and yet that the removing them was justifiable enough. He approved the receiving the sacrament in both kinds by the laity, and the taking away that great number of masses satisfactory; and was well pleased with the new order for the communion. But then he maintains the real presence in strong language, "and that the very same body and blood was present in the sacrament to feed us, that was given to redeem us."

But of the king's authority when under age, and of the power of the council during that interval, he is charged with having delivered nothing.

To this the bishop answers, and he answers all along upon oath, that Cecil "seemed much pleased with one saying of his; that is, the bishop had said, 'the king was as much a king at one year old, as at a hundred.'" 'If you touch upon this in your sermon,' says Cecil, 'it will be well taken.' The bishop told him, 'Everybody knew that,' but made him no promise. Cecil put him farther in mind, 'that when he spoke of a king, he must join the concurrence of the council.' To this Winchester returned no answer, but struck off to other discourse. His

EDWARD  
VI.

Matt. xvi.  
16.

Parker's  
MSS. Ex.  
C. Ch. Coll.  
Cant.  
Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 730.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

reason for declining compliance in this point was, because he did not find the Scripture had bound up the king to the advice of his council. Besides, he had heard a report of some secret matter, which gave him farther discouragement: but as to obedience due to the king in his minority, he was always of the affirmative side of the question: he pointed to the king in his sermon, and said, 'he was only to be obeyed,' with other words to that purpose. As to the omissions objected against him, he replies, 'that if there were any such, they must either proceed from defect of memory, or design. That where the case is doubtful, charity ought to make the most favourable construction.' And here he appeals to God, that he intended to deliver himself with all the perspicuity imaginable: that in such cases, ambiguities and reserve are not to be endured: that he had declared in his sermon, that he agreed with everything that was legally done, and had nothing to object against the proceedings of authority: and it was only private and unauthorised innovation, which he did not understand. And, lastly, when he was charged with discoursing upon the mass and the communion, he answers, that when Mr. Cecil advised him, from the duke of Somerset, not to enter upon that controversy, he told him he should forbear discoursing upon the modus of the mystery, or mentioning the term transubstantiation; but of the very presence of Christ's most precious body and blood in the sacrament, which was no disputable matter, he was resolved to preach; he thought himself likewise obliged to treat of the mass: that these were articles of such importance, and so necessary for the king to know, that he would not forbear discoursing upon them, though he was sure to be executed when he came down from the pulpit."

251.

Id. p. 729,  
730.

However, all this was looked on as a lame defence, and Winchester was sent to the Tower, as hath been already observed. His refusing to set forth the authority of the council during the king's minority, was that which disgusted the board most, and occasioned his confinement. It seems it was the opinion of some people that the council could only execute the laws in being; but that the making new orders was not within their privilege; and that the supremacy was to sleep till the king, in whose person it was lodged, was grown a major, and capable of exercising the function. The council would have had Gardiner combat this mistake in the pulpit, but he refused to be explicit

in the matter, and was therefore committed. However, he seems by implication to have come up to the demands of the council; for by maintaining the king had all his royalty in the cradle, and that obedience to him was the present duty of the subject; this by direct consequence was to assert the authority of the council, because all their orders were published in his majesty's name. These things considered, made Winchester's commitment look somewhat severe, and they may be censured as a stretch of law.

EDWARD  
VI.

The rugged usage of this great prelate had not altogether the projected effect; the terror of the example did not work every where. On the contrary, some were rather animated by the bishop's resolution to adhere to the former usages, though it cannot be said they had Gardiner's precedent for this non-conformity. However, there was a great deal of clashing about the ceremonies of the Church, and disagreement of practice in administering the sacrament. Some were full and exact in their obedience to authority; others complied by halves; and some were so obstinate as to continue in their old customs. In some places they ran from the extreme of superstition to that of profaneness: the holy eucharist was mentioned with disregard: the consecrated elements thrown out of the Church, together with many other instances of irreligious outrage.

*Disputes and diversity of practice in the ceremonies of the Church.*

I shall now mention archbishop Cranmer's catechism, entitled "A short Instruction to Christian Religion, for the singular profit of Children and Young People." Whether it was made this year or the last, is not very material. There is another question about the author. Bishop Burnet affirms it to be wholly Cranmer's work; Mr. Strype relates it a German composition: that it was originally written in high Dutch, turned into Latin by Justus Jonas Junior, and that it was only translated into English by the archbishop. But by some things which occur, it is very likely the archbishop took the liberty of throwing in some supplemental passages. For in the title to the preface, it is said to be overseen and corrected by the archbishop. To give the reader part of it. The catechism declaims strongly against images, and argues against the use from the abuse. Besides the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, that of reconciling sinners to God, or penance, is added as a third. The book is full in acknowledging the divine institution of bishops and priests, and wishes the

Register, Petworth, Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 63. *A catechism set forth by Cranmer.* Bp. Burnet, pt. 2, p. 71. Memoir of Cranmer, p. 159.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

canons for public discipline were restored. People are strongly exhorted to private confession; the reason is, because their spiritual guides being informed of the penitents' condition, may be better directed in the exercise of the keys. To be somewhat particular. He insists upon the authority of the Church. His words are: "We must seek remission of sins in the Church of Christ, and desire absolution; that when the true Church by their ministers doth promise us remission of our sins, and here in earth doth absolve us, we may surely trust that in heaven also before God we be absolved and pardoned." And elsewhere he speaks thus: "Wherefore when your sins do make you afraid and sad, then seek and desire absolution and forgiveness of your sins of the ministers, who have received a commission and commandment from Christ himself, to forgive men their sins, and your consciences shall have peace, tranquillity, and quietness."

Fol. 141.

Page 226.

Fol. 229.

And having proved the priest's commission from the twentieth of St. John's Gospel, he makes no scruple to infer, "that whatsoever God's ministers do to us, by God's commandment, are as much available as if God himself should do the same." And elsewhere, upon the same subject, he delivers himself thus: "God has given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the authority of forgiving sin, to the ministers of the Church. Wherefore, let him that is a sinner go to one of them, let him knowledge and confess his sin, and pray him that, according to God's commandment, he will give him absolution.—And when the minister doth so, then I ought stedfastly to believe that my sins are truly forgiven me in heaven." And here the archbishop deserves commendation for pressing the revival of the penitentiary canons, and setting the authority of the hierarchy upon the right footing; from whence it seems plain he had recovered himself from his Erastian notions, as they are now called. But, after all, might he not hold these offices divine in the institution, but secular in the conveyance? that the power of the keys is from our Saviour, but the exercise from the civil magistrate? It is granted this is possible, but since the archbishop does not dilute his assertion in this manner, we ought to interpret him to the fairest sense; to let down his words to so low a meaning as the objection supposes, is to make him give up the authority he appears to maintain. For upon this principle what does the divine institution of the

Id. fol. 228.

sacerdotal function signify, if it lies wholly under the control of the state? What signifies a commission if a man cannot act upon it without leave from a third hand? What is a man the better for having a key if he has no liberty to turn it, to lock or unlock, without a foreign permission? Power without a right to use it, looks like a contradiction, and is at best but a notional advantage. It is a precarious privilege; and, as to practice, lies perfectly at the pleasure of another. For instance: if the hierarchy cannot execute their divine commission without a license from the civil magistrate, then the magistrate may lay an embargo upon their function, and stop the exercise of their character as long as he thinks fit. Thus the design of their mission, and their authority from our Saviour, may be wholly defeated, and turn to no account. To proceed: Cranmer, in his dedication to the king, complains of the neglect of catechizing; that confirmation had formerly been administered too soon; and that people ought to understand the principles of Christianity before they are brought to the bishop to renew their baptismal vow.

EDWARD  
VI.

Notwithstanding these provisions, there was great contrariety in belief and practice. Even some of the licensed preachers did not answer expectation, but declaimed against the king's proceedings no less than the rest. To remedy this inconvenience, the king and council resolved upon the drawing up a public liturgy. This service book, when confirmed in parliament, it was supposed would effect a more general compliance; for then the pretences of defective authority in a privy council would be all out of doors. For this purpose the committee of bishops and divines above-mentioned were ordered to attend the king on the first of September. When they appeared, the king acquainted them with the general scheme and extent of their business, and that he expected the book should comprehend "An Order for Morning and Evening Prayer," together with "A Form of ministering the Sacraments and Sacramentals, and for the celebrating all other public offices." The bishops, &c., who were well inclined to the undertaking, inspected the liturgic books then used in England. The Statute Book mentions four different forms: that is, "The use of Sarum, of York, of Bangor, of Lincoln, besides other diversities in some parts of the service." All these

Bp. Burnet,  
ibid. 252.

*Orders for  
drawing up  
a book for  
divine  
service.*

A. D. 1548.

Heylin,  
p. 64.

2 & 3 Edw.  
6. cap. 1.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

varieties were now to be laid aside, and an uniform office provided for the whole kingdom.

Cardinal  
Bona, *Re-  
Liturg.* lib. 1.  
cap. 8.

The use of stated forms for divine service has been all along the practice of the universal Church. There are liturgies which go under the name of St. Peter, St. Matthew, and St. Mark; but as for that of St. Peter, it was never heard of for the first fifteen hundred years. Besides, it is plainly patched up out of the Roman missal, and the liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, and Chrysostom. The liturgy of St. Matthew, said to be used by the Ethiopians, is of a very obscure and unproved original: and that of St. Mark, said to be composed for the Church of Alexandria, is rejected as a spurious piece by Theodorus Balsamon, who lived in the twelfth century.

*Remarks  
upon the  
ancient  
liturgies,  
St. James's  
liturgy.*

The liturgy of St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, is much better attested; for the Greek Church has all along received it for genuine: and besides, there are very ancient copies of it. The general council in Trullo cites it as an authority to confute those heretics who consecrated the eucharist only in water. Manuel Malaxus, in his *Nomo Canon*, affirms it was used till St. Basil's time. It is mentioned by Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, and by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who has transcribed a great deal of it in his fifth *Katechesis Mystagogica*. However, there lie several objections against it. First, the terms 'Homoousion' and 'Theotokos' are found in it. The first of these terms is said to be unknown till the Nicene council, and the second not used till the council of Ephesus. But these are unsupported assertions; for Athanasius produces several authors to prove that homoousios, or consubstantial, was used before the council of Nice. The famous Eusebius Cæsariensis is of the same opinion, as appears from the testimony of Socrates and Theodoret. And that the blessed Virgin was called Theotokos, or the Mother of God, before the Ephesine council, is plain, from the authority of Evagrius, who condemns Nestorius for his singularity, and affirms the word Theotokos had been used by many of the ancients of the best character.

Bona, *ibid.*

Socrates,  
lib. 1. cap. 5.  
*Theod. Hist.*  
*Eccl.* lib. 1.  
cap. 13.  
*Hist. Eccl.*  
lib. 1. c. 2.

*The liturgy  
supposed  
written by  
Clemens  
Romanus.*  
*Bellar. Lib.*  
*de Scrip.*  
*Eccl.* Bar.  
*Annal.* 102.

To this I shall add the Liturgy reckoned to St. Clement, and extant in the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*. Proclus, St. Chrysostom's successor in the see of Constantinople, will have it that Clemens Romanus had this office dictated to him by the apostles. Bellarmine Baronius and others think it genuine as

to the first form, but not without addition by after ages. That as the apostles' creed was enlarged by the fathers, to guard the articles of faith with a fuller explanation, so, as the circumstance of time required, the liturgies had supplemental prayers and ceremonies put to them. Other learned writers with more probability will not allow the apostolical constitutions so great an original. Epiphanius gives this book a high character, though with some abatement as to the author. He affirms, "Though the book is a suspected authority by some people, yet it is by no means to be censured or rejected; for it gives us a full view of the ancient discipline: neither does it contain any thing that is heterodox or singular, or which carries a repugnancy to the belief or practice of the Church." But then Petavius in his note observes, that the constitutions cited by Epiphanius are different from those eight books now extant; that the apostolical constitutions handed down to us want some of the passages cited by Epiphanius. Notwithstanding this objection of Petavius, the learned cardinal Bona is of opinion they are the same with those mentioned by that father. The cardinal grants, notwithstanding, they may probably have been interpolated, either by the negligence of transcribers, or the foul play of heretics. "But," as he continues, "whoever was the author of these constitutions, it is certain they are of greater antiquity than the council of Nice, and that they comprehend the usages and discipline of the eastern Church, prior to the reign of Constantine, the first Christian emperor." And Peter de Marca gives the author of these constitutions the age of the third century at the lowest.

The next missal I shall speak to is that of St. Basil. It is mentioned with commendation, by Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, by the general council in Trullo, and by a great many of the Greek fathers. The occasion of composing it was this: That upon the abatement of devotion the people grew tired with the length of St. James's liturgy then used in that Church. To remedy this inconvenience, and comply a little with the infirmity of the age, St. Basil abstracted St. James's liturgy, and threw it into a less compass. The learned Goar is of opinion St. Basil drew up two liturgies, and that the shorter of these two was made for public use, received in the Church, and carried down to posterity. This missal of St. Basil is still read in the Greek Church in all the Sundays of Lent, excepting

EDWARD  
VI.Bona, *Rev. Liturg.*  
lib. 1. c. 3.  
Epiphanius,  
*Heres.* 70.  
No. 10.Morinus, *de Sacris Ord.*  
nat. pt. 2.  
p. 20.  
lib. 3. de  
Concord.  
Sacrd. et  
Imper. c. 2.  
*St. Basil's Liturgy.*  
De Traditione Divinae  
Missae.  
Can. 32Eucholog.  
p. 135.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
St. Chrysos-  
tom's liturgy.

Palm Sunday. It is likewise read there on Maunday Thursday, on Easter-eve, and on the eves of Christmas and Epiphany, and on St. Basil's anniversary. The rest of the year the Greek Church made use of St. Chrysostom's liturgy.

This father, as Proclus observes, drew up another: his reasons were much the same with St. Basil's. To make some allowance for the declensions of Christianity; to relieve the weariness of the people, and recommend the Church-service, he drew in the office, and threw it into a new form; and transcribed several passages from St. Basil's liturgy. And here, the reader may please to take notice, that these liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom are not conveyed down without interpolations.

253.

Bona, *ibid.*  
lib. 9.  
*The Roman*  
*missal.*

A word or two of the Roman missal may not be amiss. Now by missals and liturgies is properly understood nothing more than the communion service. As to the author of the Roman missal, pope Innocent I. attributes the usages of the Roman Church to apostolical tradition. Walafridus Strabo affirms the liturgies in the apostles' times were much shorter than afterwards.

Id. lib. 1.  
cap. 6.

Lib. de Reb.  
Eccles.

And here he gives some instances that the angelic hymn was added by Telesphorus, and the introitus by pope Celestin.

The Church of Milan has a Liturgy composed by St. Ambrose. It is different from the Roman in several particulars, too long to remark. Neither is it now in the same form in which St. Ambrose left it.

Bona, *ibid.*  
lib. 7. p. 46.  
et lib. 10.  
p. 65.  
*The Moz-*  
*arabic and*  
*Gallican*  
*liturgies.*

There is another Liturgy called the Mozarabic, formerly used in Spain: it is called the Mozarabic by a wrong pronunciation of mixed Arabic, because when the Moors had conquered the greatest part of Spain, the native Spaniards were mixed and incorporated with them. This Liturgy is of considerable antiquity. Who drew it up first, is not certainly known: cardinal Bona produces a passage out of it, which runs it up to the age of St. Martin, bishop of Tours, who died in the beginning of the fifth century. Others believe it composed by Leander, bishop of Seville, or his brother and successor, Isidore, who lived in the seventh century. Cardinal Bona seems to believe, it was only drawn out to a farther length by Leander and Isidore, and that upon the progress of time it received more additions from others. This Mozarabic liturgy was generally used in Spain, and in Gallia Narbonensis,

Id. cap. 11.



till Gregory VII.'s time: this pope wrote to Alphonſus and Sancho, kings of Caſtile and Arragon, and to the biſhops in their dominions, to recommend the Roman ſervice. To this purpose, he tells them the Roman and Spaniſh miſſals were the ſame at firſt: that the Priscillian and Arian heresies, together with the irruption of the Goths and Saracens, had occasioned the preſent diversity; in ſhort, he prevailed for the introducing of the Roman miſſal: however, the famous cardinal Ximenes has taken effectual care to preſerve the Mozarabic rites. He ordered the miſſal to be fairly tranſcribed, and founded a college of prieſts, who are bound by their conſtitution to ſay the Mozarabic ſervice every day in a chapel belonging to the cathedral at Toledo. The ſame practice is continued in ſeveral pariſhes in that city, and in a chapel at Salamanca.

EDWARD  
VI.

Id. p. 71.

The Gallican Liturgy is probably more ancient than the Mozarabic: there is a copy of it belonging the Chriſtina, queen of Sweden, more than nine hundred years old, as appears by the character: and another in the Vatican, almoſt of the ſame age. The learned Mabillon produces good authority to prove that Muſæus, a prieſt of Marseilles, at the inſtance of his biſhop, Venerius, drew up leſſons and antiphonæ, and that Sidonius, biſhop of Avergne, and the famous St. Hilary of Poitiers, had a ſhare in composing this Liturgy. That the Gallican ſervice was different from the Roman, and much the ſame with the Mozarabic, I have obſerved already: and this, were it farther neceſſary, might be proved more at large.

Id. cap. 12.  
p. 85.  
Eccles. Hist.  
pt. 1.  
*Those who  
drew up the  
English  
liturgy had  
regard to  
primitive  
practice, and  
declined  
unnecessary  
innovations.*  
Mabillon  
de Liturg.  
Gallic.  
lib. 1. c. 3.  
et c. 6.

I hope this ſhort diſcourſe concerning Liturgies, is no unſeaſonable digreſſion. Thus we ſee ſtated compositions for divine ſervice have always been the cuſtom of the univerſal Church. The apoſtles themſelves had a prayer preſcribed them by our Saviour. Miraculous effuſions did not wholly ſupreſede the uſe of a form: but when theſe extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt were recalled, there was much more occaſion for ſettling the parts of divine ſervice, and bringing the public performance under a rule. For this we have the concurrent practice of the Church for the firſt fifteen hundred years.

We do not find the committee of Engliſh biſhops demurred upon this ſubject: or that the queſtion was ever put, whether there ſhould be a form or not? They never thought praying

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

by a book was flat and unaffecting, and no better than stinting the spirit.

To leave all to the liberty of the priest, would have been not only a singular, but dangerous expedient. To trust to an extemporary faculty in our solemn addresses to God, looks like negligence and presumption. What uniformity can there be in the Church upon this liberty? what security is there against irreverence and indiscretion? against failing in orthodoxy or sense? and how can the people join in the public devotion, when they have no opportunity of knowing beforehand what it is? To resolve to say amen to sudden impulse, and unpremeditated expression, is too implicit a resignation.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 73.

This committee of bishops and divines set down this (as is very well observed) for a general rule, not to change anything for the sake of novelty. In this performance they resolved to govern themselves by the word of God, and the precedent of the primitive Church. They considered our Saviour himself formed his institutions of baptism and the holy eucharist, upon a resemblance to the Jewish rites. That this conformity of practice was so much the more remarkable, considering our Saviour was then founding a new Church, and introducing a religion very different from the Mosaic law. That the English bishops, who had no pretence to the extent of our Saviour's authority, nor any design to erect a new Church, were still more obliged to work by the plan of the first ages of Christianity. Their business was only to brighten what had been rusted by time, to discharge the innovations of latter ages, and bring things up to the primitive standard. To this purpose, it was very prudently agreed to make use of none but English help. When Calvin heard of the farther advances of reformation, he offered Cranmer his assistance, but was happily refused by the archbishop. It is true he gave Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, two eminent divines, an invitation to our universities, but the Liturgy, as Heylin proves, was finished before their arrival.

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 65.  
*Divine service in the language of the country the custom of the ancient Church.*

The old service, as has been observed, was all in Latin, excepting the late office for the communion. This was justly looked on as an indefensible practice, and therefore all the offices were drawn up in English. That divine service was anciently performed in the language of each country is confessed by the famous father Simon, in his critical history of

the New Testament. And the learned doctor Lightfoot observes from the rabbies that one or two of the public synagogal prayers were penned in the mother-tongue, particularly that after sermon, because the common people were then present: for this reason, this prayer was composed in Chaldee, that all might understand it. To this father Simon agrees, and acknowledges those prayers which were made in Hebrew, were always interpreted to the people in the vulgar language.

EDWARD  
VI.  
Pt. 2. p. 3.

254.

Father Simon grants, farther, that upon the conversion of the Italians and other Roman colonies to the Christian religion, which was effected in the apostles' time, it was necessary to translate the Bible into Latin, that the people might understand it: and that it was read in the vulgar tongue at their religious assemblies. That the Assyrians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Persians, Armenians, and, in short, all other nations that received the Gospel, took the same care for the common instruction. And if they had the Scriptures in the vulgar language at their religious assemblies, we may reasonably conclude they were allowed to understand the other parts of the service. That when the first Liturgies were composed for the eastern and western Churches, it is well known that Greek was generally spoken in the one, and Latin in the other. And thus we find the ancient Liturgies penned in Greek in the eastern, and in Latin in the western Churches. This very reasonable custom continued amongst other nations afterwards converted. Thus, as cardinal Bona observes, the Muscovites and Moravians have their liturgic books in the Selavonian, that is the language commonly spoken. To this purpose, he cites Johannes Faber, bishop of Vienne, who affirms the Christians, in some parts of Tartary, the Circassians, and in several places of Pontus; the Christians in Servia, Mysia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Volhinia, Podolia, &c., where the Selavonian tongue is spoken, have the divine service in that language. The cardinal goes on and relates that the Mingrelians and Georgians, who live between the Caspian and Euxine, and adhere to the Greek communion, officiate in the language of the country: and that the European Albanians of the Greek Church, who confine upon Dalmatia, have divine service in their mother-tongue. The Copti and Armenians, to mention no more, officiate in the language of their respective countries.

Lightfoot,  
Exerc. on  
1 Cor. xiv.  
p. 784.

F. Simon,  
ibid. p. 2.

Bona, Rer.  
Liturg.  
lib. 1. cap. 9.

Notwithstanding all this authority, and the fourteenth chap-

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*Father Si-  
mon con-  
sidered upon  
this argu-  
ment.*  
Father  
Simon,  
ibid. p. 11.  
14.

ter of the first of the Corinthians, father Simon endeavours to defend the practice of his own communion. And foreseeing the apostle's reasoning in this chapter would press very close, he attempts to prove St. Paul "does not forbid the use of foreign languages in the Church, but only prescribes a rule for the due management of them."

In answer to this, I shall briefly endeavour, as I go along, to prove three things.

First. That St. Paul shows a general dislike of a strange language in the Church.

Secondly. That there were particular reasons for the permission of foreign languages in the apostles' times, which do not reach the latter ages of Christianity.

Thirdly. That father Simon's explication of the apostle's sense, though, allowed, is not sufficient to justify his own communion.

First. St. Paul shows a general dislike of a strange language in the Church, and appeals, as it were, to common sense against it. To cite all the places to this purpose, would be to transcribe the greatest part of this fourteenth chapter. I shall only mention some of them. In the second and fifth verses, the apostle tells us, "That he that speaks in an unknown tongue, speaks not to men but to God, that he edifies (only) himself," *i. e.* the Church receives no advantage by such practice. And verse 9 he adds, "Except ye utter by the tongue things easy to be understood, ye shall speak into the air;" and verse 11, "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaks a barbarian, and he that speaks will be a barbarian unto me;" so that in the apostle's sense we do but throw away our words, talk to no purpose, and lose the benefit of speech, when we do not express our thoughts in intelligible language. And if this be absurd and improper in common conversation, it must be much more so in religious assemblies, where, if anywhere, the use of speech ought to be rational and instructive.

Farther, verse 18, 19, he continues, that he spoke with tongues more than all of them, and yet professeth, "That he would rather speak five words which were generally understood, than ten thousand in an unknown tongue:" and though the Church of Rome seems to think otherwise, yet the reason of the apostle's judgment is very obvious: for how can the under-

standing be informed, the affections warmed and excited, and attention kept up, when a man is unacquainted with his devotions, and for ought he knows the priest may be saying some odd thing instead of a prayer? EDWARD VI.

Secondly. There were particular reasons for the permission of foreign languages in the apostles' times, which do not reach the latter ages of Christianity. That the gift of tongues was one of the miraculous effusions of the Holy Ghost, is beyond dispute: and being an argument of a divine presence, it was proper to make use of them sometimes in the Church to conciliate a greater regard to what they delivered in their interpretations: and especially to convince the Jews and Gentiles that their mission and doctrine were from heaven. Accordingly, we may observe that the apostles, speaking in a variety of unstudied languages, had a mighty influence upon those who heard them; and without doubt made St. Peter's sermon more operative upon their minds: and therefore St. Paul affirms, "That tongues are a sign not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." Acts ii.

But those who neither converse with infidels, nor pretend to inspiration, have none of these apostolical reasons to justify their use of an unknown language. For to hear a man say his prayers in Latin, when all the congregation knows his skill is the effect of study and education, will raise the character of his sanctity very little, and is a sign of nothing more than that for some reasons he has no mind to be understood. Verse 22.

Thirdly. Admitting father Simon's explication to be orthodox and full, this is not sufficient to justify his own communion. He tells us, St. Paul did not blame the Corinthians for speaking or praying in a strange language; "but because they did not translate their sense so as to make themselves intelligible to the congregation." And by way of paraphrase upon verse 17, Page 13.

"Thou givest thanks well, but the other is not edified," he affirms that the apostle urges "the observation of the custom among the Jews, *i. e.* not to read the Scripture or the Liturgy without the assistance of an interpreter." For otherwise he grants the apostle's exhortation applies: "How shall he that occupyeth the room of the unlearned, say amen at thy giving of thanks?" Now these concessions, as has been already observed, condemn the practice of his own Church. For though construing of prayers, when nothing miraculous is 255.

Page 12.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

pretended, is but an odd sort of employment, yet this is more than is done in the Church of Rome. Indeed he is pleased to say, that according to the design of this fourteenth chapter, everything which relates to the instruction of the congregation, is by the Roman Catholics spoken in a language understood by all. Now one would think, by this assertion, the whole service was translated line by line: but upon examination, we shall find that nothing but their sermons are delivered in the vulgar tongue<sup>1</sup>. So that it seems it is not material, in our author's opinion, whether the people understand their prayers or not: though afterwards he grants they cannot say amen, without being better informed. Cardinal Perron found himself very much embarrassed with this difficulty, and endeavours to disengage his Church by saying, that their "proses and sermons, and printed discourses were sufficient to acquaint the people with the meaning of their devotions." But afterwards finding his defence too weak, he does as good as give it up; and advances several reasons to prove the expediency of promoting ignorance, and keeping the Scriptures and public prayers in a language not vulgarly understood.

Replique  
à la Response  
du Roy, &c.  
p. 933.

Id. p. 956.

I shall now proceed to a more particular account of the Liturgy, and point out some of the differences between this first, and the present form.

*A brief  
account of  
the first  
reformed  
liturgy.*

To begin. The morning service has no Confession, nor Absolution: the Lord's Prayer stands first. After the responses, which are the same with ours, Hallelujah was said or sung from Easter to Whitsuntide. Then follows the Invitatory, "O come let us sing unto the Lord," &c. The Psalms are next, which are appointed to be read through every month, in the same order as now. The Lessons are generally the same, though some of them do not come up exactly on the same day. After the Second Lesson at morning prayer, only Zachary's hymn, Benedictus, is appointed. The Collects for Peace and Grace follow that for the Day: but those for the King, the Royal Family, the Clergy and People, were since added. The third Collect in Advent is different from ours, it stands thus:

"Lord, we beseech thee, give ear to our prayers, and by thy gracious visitation lighten the darkness of our hearts, by our Lord," &c.

<sup>1</sup> The Romanists have now indifferently reformed their old practice, by printing the vulgate missals for the use of the laity with translations on opposite columns.

On Christmas-day there are two Collects, two Epistles, and two Gospels. The first Gospel is taken out of the first of St. John, beginning at the nineteenth, and ending at the twenty-ninth verse. The Collects upon Innocent's-day, for the fourth Sunday after Epiphany, and some others, are different in expression, but to the same sense. When there is a sixth Sunday after Epiphany, the same Psalms, Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, are to be used as on the fifth. In the morning at Easter before Matins, our first Anthem, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," &c. is wanting. But then after the third Anthem, the priest says, "Shew forth to all the nations the glory of God," to which the Response is, "And among all people his wonderful works." There are double Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, for Easter-day. The Collect for St. Andrew's-day runs thus :

EDWARD  
VI.

"Almighty God, which has given such grace to thy Apostle St. Andrew, that he accounted the sharp and painful death of the cross to be an high honour, and a great glory : grant us to take and esteem all troubles and adversities which shall come unto us for thy sake, as things profitable for us, towards the obtaining of everlasting life, through Jesus," &c.

There is an holy day in this book for St. Mary Magdalen. It was kept on the twenty-first of July. The Introite is the hundred and forty-sixth Psalm ; the Collect is in these words :

"Merciful Father, give us grace that we never presume to sin through the example of any creature ; but if it shall chance us at any time to offend thy Divine Majesty, that then we may truly repent, and lament the same after the example of Mary Magdalen, and by lively faith obtain remission of all our sins, through the only merits of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." The Epistle is taken out of the thirty-first of Proverbs, beginning at the tenth verse, and taking in the rest of the chapter. The Gospel is taken out of the seventh of St. Luke, it begins at the thirty-sixth verse, and ends with the chapter.

The Gospel for the first Sunday after Christmas begins St. Matthew i. 1, and holds on to the length of ours. The Gospel for the Sunday before Easter, is St. Matthew xxvi. 1 ; whereas ours begins Matthew xxvii. 1. The Gospel for the Tuesday before Easter, begins with Mark xv., and goes through, but ours ends at verse forty. The Gospel for Thursday before Easter begins with Luke xxiii. 1., and takes in the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

whole chapter, whereas ours breaks off at verse fifty. The Gospel for Good-Friday is the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of St. John. The Gospel for Whit-Sunday begins at St. John xiv. 15, and breaks off at verse twenty-two; ours is longer, and goes to the end. On the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, the Epistle is the same with that of the foregoing Sunday: ours has one proper for the day. The Gospel begins with ours, Luke ii. 22, and ends in the middle of verse twenty-seven; but ours continues to verse forty-one.

*The In-  
troites.*

In this reformed Liturgy, the communion service for every Sunday and holy-day begins with an Introite, that is, a Psalm which is said or sung by the choir, whilst the priest goes up to the altar. It is a whole Psalm, and every Sunday and holy-day hath a different one suited to time and occasion: it concludes with the Doxology. The Collect for the day follows the Introite. On Christmas and Easter Sundays there are two Introites, the second comes after the first Gospel.

See Records,  
num. 59.  
L'Estrange's  
Alliance of  
Divines  
Offices.

The office for the Communion follows next. And because the book is very scarce, and the service well worth the reader's perusal, I shall transcribe it at length in the Records. I grant it may be met with by parts in an author not altogether so hard to come at. But this gentleman's design was to compare it with the second Liturgy and other alterations, and make annotations all along upon the progress of the parallel: thus by the scheme of his undertaking he thought himself obliged to take it in pieces, and throw parcels of the Rubrick, of the latter alterations, and his own annotations between. For this reason the view is broken, the Liturgy stands as it were dissected, and by consequence must give the reader much trouble to examine it. To this I may add, that besides the significancy of the matter, the order in which the prayers stand, is no unremarkable circumstance.

*The form of  
the bread to  
be conse-  
crated.*  
256.

By the Rubrick at the end of the office it is ordered that the bread prepared for the communion should be made after one sort and fashion in all churches of the kingdom: that is to say, it was to be unleavened, and round as before, but without any impression, and somewhat larger and thicker than formerly, that it might be conveniently broken into several pieces: and every bread was to be divided into two pieces or more, according to the discretion of the minister, and so distributed.

The learned cardinal Bona observes, from Ernulphus, bishop



of Rochester, who lived in the eleventh century, that the apostles used to consecrate the bread commonly eaten, both as to form and other qualities. And afterwards for many ages, the least proportion for this purpose was as much as could be made of a handful of meal. It was made of the finest flour, somewhat in the form of a crown. This was the practice in the time of Gregory the Great. So that even after unleavened bread became the usage of the Latin Church, it was not made so small as to be incapable of being broken in pieces in proportion to the number of communicants. But afterwards in the eleventh century the custom changed, and indivisible wafers were made, the figure of them was that of a small coin or penny, and, like prince's money, they had our Saviour's effigies with some letters of his name round the circumference. This figure of the consecrated bread was declared against as an innovation, as both Cassander and cardinal Bona relate.

EDWARD VI.  
*Wafers consecrated for the holy eucharist.*

The Rubric continues, "that forasmuch as the pastors and curates within this realm shall continually find, at their cost and charges in their cures, sufficient bread and wine for the holy communion, it is therefore ordered that in recompense of such cost and charges, the parishioners of every parish shall offer every Sunday at the time of the offertory, the just value and price of the holy loaf (with all such money and things as were wont to be offered with the same) to the use of their pastors and curates, and that in such order and course as they were wont to pay the said holy loaf. By the next paragraph, the Rubric appoints that both in all collegiate and cathedral churches, and likewise in all parishes in the country, that some of the people should always communicate with the priest; and therefore one at least of every family in the parish who, according to custom, as their turn came up, were obliged to offer for defraying the expense of the communion, was bound to communicate, or if they provided some other person to offer for them, the person so deputed was to receive the holy eucharist, and by this means," as the Rubric continues, "the minister having always some one to communicate with him, may accordingly solemnise so high and holy mysteries with all the suffrages and due order appointed for the same, and the priest on the week-day shall forbear to celebrate the communion, except he have some that will communicate with him."

Cassander,  
 Liturgica,  
 &c. p. 66.  
 Cardinal  
 Bona, Rer.  
 Liturg.  
 lib. 1. cap. 23.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

The last paragraph in the Rubric stands thus: "Although it be read in ancient writers that the people many years past received at the priest's hands the sacrament of the body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary: yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness; lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the whole realm; it is thought convenient, the people commonly receive the sacrament of Christ's body in their mouths at the priest's hands."

Vide Sozom.  
lib. 8. c. 5.

The Litany stands next to the Communion-office. It is ordered to be sung or said upon Wednesdays and Fridays, in the manner mentioned in the late injunctions. It is the same with our Litany, excepting one clause, in which they pray to be delivered "from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities."

To proceed to the remainder of this Common Prayer Book. And here the reader may please to remember, that I shall take notice of nothing, but what is either omitted or altered in our later liturgies.

Public  
baptism.

In public Baptism a cross was made on the child's forehead and breast: the devil was exorcised to go out, and enter no more into him. The child (if not weak) was thrice dipped, then anointed, and a chrisome or white coat put upon it. This custom of exorcising children, how singular soever it may look to some people now, was the practice of the ancient Church. For this, the testimony of St. Austin, to cite no more authority, is sufficient proof. "Si diabolus," says this father, "non dominatur infantibus, quid respondebunt Pelagiani quod illi exorcizantur?"

August.  
Epist. 105.

That anointing the person baptized was likewise an ancient custom appears from Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and the Apostolical Constitutions.

Tertull.  
de Baptism.  
Cypr. Epist.  
ad Januar.  
Constitut.  
Apostol.  
lib. 3. cap. 15,  
16, 17. et  
lib. 7. cap. 23.  
Private  
baptism.

By the rubric before private Baptism, the priest is enjoined to "warn the people that without great cause and necessity they baptized not children at home in their houses."

This was no more than a necessary caution. And here, I cannot forbear to mention bishop Burnet's very seasonable reflection: he justly complains of the great abuse with respect to this matter, that many think it "a piece of state to have

children baptized in their houses, and so bring their pride with them even into the most sacred performances." To which, I shall add, that were it not for the mercenariness, or want of resolution in some of the clergy, this ill custom might easily be broken.

EDWARD  
VI.

The Catechism is the same with ours, as far as it reaches: I say as far as it reaches, for it ends with the answer to the question, "What desirest thou of God in this prayer?"

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 76.  
*The Cate-  
chism.*

In Confirmation, immediately before the bishop makes a cross upon the forehead of the person confirmed, he uses this prayer:

"Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be thine for ever, by the virtue of thy holy cross, and passion: confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost mercifully to everlasting life. Amen."

*Anointing at  
Baptism  
and Con-  
firmation.*

After the cross made on the forehead, these words are spoken by the bishop: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

This unction was another primitive custom, and in the first ages of the Church used to follow baptism, at a much nearer distance than afterwards.

In the office of Matrimony, the ring, "and other tokens of spousage, as gold or silver, are delivered," and at the priest's blessing the persons married, the sign of the cross is made. The sign of the cross is likewise a very ancient usage. Tertullian observes, that in his time it was a general custom for Christians to make a cross on their foreheads upon every the least remarkable occasion. "Ad omnem aditum et promotum, &c." Thus the heathen Cæcilius in Minutius Felix rallies the Christians for worshipping the cross. This supposes the use of it. But then as to the charge Octavius denies the fact, "nee cruce[m] colimus, nee optamus."

Tertull. de  
Baptism.  
Ambrose de  
iis qui ini-  
tiantur.

Tertull.  
de Coron.  
Milit.  
257.

To go on: in the Visitation of the Sick, when the priest came into the sick person's room, he was to say the hundred and forty-third Psalm. The form of Absolution in this office was to be used in all private confessions. At the Communion of the Sick there is no necessity by the rubric of any communicants to receive with the priest and patient. However, the sick person was exhorted to desire some of his family or neighbours to communicate with him.

*The Visita-  
tion of the  
Sick.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

If the sick person desired to be anointed, the priest did it upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross with this prayer :

*Anointing  
the sick  
person.*

“ As with this visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed : so our heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant of his infinite goodness, that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief, and gladness. And vouchsafe for his great mercy (if it be his blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health, and strength, to serve him, and send thee release of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind. And howsoever his goodness (by his divine and unsearchable providence) shall dispose of thee, we his unworthy ministers and servants, humbly beseech the Eternal Majesty, to do with thee, according to the multitude of his innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sins, and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnal affections, who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly strength, by his Holy Spirit, to withstand and overcome all temptations and assaults of thine adversary, that in no wise he prevail against thee, but that thou mayest have perfect victory and triumph against the devil, sin, and death, through Christ our Lord ; who, by his death hath overcome the prince of death, and with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, evermore liveth and reigneth God, world without end. Amen.”

Anointing the sick with oil in order to his recovery was another ancient custom, and for this, to mention nothing farther, we have the authority of St. Chrysostom, who cites the fifth of St. James, v. 14, for this purpose.

*De Sacerdot.  
lib. 3.  
The Burial  
of the Dead.*

In the office for Burial of the Dead, when the priest throws earth upon the corpse, he says, “ I commend thy soul to God the Father Almighty, and thy body to the ground,” &c.

And the next prayer begins thus : “ We commend into thy hands of mercy (most merciful Father) the soul of this our brother departed ———, that when the judgment shall come which thou hast committed to thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother, and we, may be found acceptable in thy sight, and we may receive that blessing,” &c.

The next prayer stands thus :

“ Almighty God, we give thee hearty thanks for this thy servant, whom thou hast delivered from the miseries of this

wretched world, from the body of death, and all temptation. EDWARD  
VI.  
 And as we trust, hast brought his soul, which he committed into thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest. Grant, we beseech thee, that at the day of judgment, his soul, and all the souls of thy elect departed out of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive thy promises, and be made perfect altogether, through the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

After the second lesson, "Lord have mercy upon us," &c. and the Lord's Prayer, the priest says :

"Enter not, O Lord, into judgment with thy servant.

*Answer.*

"For in thy sight no living creature shall be justified.

*Priest.*

"From the gates of hell,

*Answer.*

"Deliver their souls, O Lord.

*Priest.*

"I believe to see the goodness of the Lord,

*Answer.*

"In the land of the living.

*Priest.*

"O Lord, graciously hear my prayer ;

*Answer.*

"And let my cry come unto thee."

Then follows this prayer :

"O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead, and in whom the souls that be elected after they be delivered from the burden of the flesh, be in joy and felicity : grant unto this thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness ; and when that dreadful day of the resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

glory, then made pure and incorruptible: set him on the right hand of thy Son Jesus Christ, among thy holy and elect, that then he may hear with them these most sweet and comfortable words: 'Come to me, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom which has been prepared for you from the beginning of the world:' grant this, we beseech thee, O merciful Father, through Jesus Christ our Mediator and Redeemer. Amen."

This recommending the dead to the mercy of God, is no innovation of the court of Rome, but a constant usage of the primitive Church. To justify this reformed Liturgy in this point, I shall produce unexceptionable authority. To begin with Tertullian. "Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annuo die facimus," that is, they mentioned the names of the deceased on the anniversary of their death in the prayers of the eucharistic sacrifice. And here, this Father, recounting the use of the cross, the ceremonies in baptism, &c., he adds, "Harum et aliarum hujusmodi disciplinarum, si legem expos- tules Scripturarum, nullam invenies: traditio tibi pretendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix." That is, "If you demand a text of Scripture for these usages, you will find none: the practice stands upon a bottom of tradition; it is confirmed by custom, and one generation follows it upon the credit of that which went before."

*Prayers for the dead a general custom of the Church.*

258.

Tertull. de  
Coron.  
Milit.

*Authorities for this point.*

*Non est quod pro dormi- tione ejus*

*apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua no- mine ejus in ecclesia*

*frequentetur.*

Cyprian,  
Epist. 66.

Edit. Pamel.

The famous bishop and martyr St. Cyprian acquaints us, that one Victor had made Geminius Faustinus, a priest, a guardian in his will. For this reason St. Cyprian gives orders there should be no prayer made for him at the solemnity of the eucharist.

And here he lays down this for a rule, that if any of the faithful should nominate a clergyman in their last will and testament for any guardianship or civil trust, his name should not be mentioned at the eucharistic sacrifice, nor any recommendatory prayer for his repose put up for him at God's altar. His words are these: "Non offeretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur, neque enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece qui ab altari sacerdotes et ministros voluit avocari<sup>1</sup>."

The apostolical constitutions, an authority of the third century, as hath been observed, shall appear next. Amongst these constitutions this prayer occurs:

<sup>1</sup> A very remarkable instance of rigid discipline.

“ Let us pray for our brethren departed in the faith of Christ. EDWARD VI. VI. That the most merciful God, who has received the spirits of the deceased, would forgive all their voluntary and involuntary failings, and that, being restored to the divine favour they may have a place assigned them in the region of the blessed, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the company of those where pain and sorrow and dissatisfaction have no place,” &c.

In the next chapter there is an order for solemnizing the funeral of the dead with divine service : psalms, prayers, and lessons, being appointed for this purpose. The anniversary of the deceased is likewise ordered to be kept ; but then all these friendly offices of the Church are only serviceable to “ those who lived well ; for as to wicked people, if charitable distributions were never so great on their account, they would receive no benefit by them.”

Constit.  
Apostol.  
lib. 3. c. 41.

Ibid.  
cap. 42, 43.

To proceed : St. Ambrose, in his funeral oration for the emperor Valentinian, speaking of this prince and his brother Gratian, has these words : “ Beati ambo, si quid meæ orationes valebunt : nulla dies vos silentio præteribit : nulla inhonoratos vos mea transibit oratio : nulla nox non donatos aliqua precum mearum contextione transcurret : omnibus oblationibus vos frequentabo.” That is, “ If my prayers can prevail, neither of you shall be unhappy : no day shall drop you out of my memory : I shall be sure to give you a regard in every address to God Almighty : the revolution of the night shall not be more constant than my devotion upon your account : and your memory shall never be omitted in the eucharistic oblation.”

Gratian was  
then dead.

Orat. Funeb.  
de Obit.  
Valentin.  
Imp. Edit.  
Erasm.

And in another funeral oration upon the death of his brother Satyrus, he commends his brother’s soul to God Almighty in these words : “ Tibi nunc, omnipotens Deus, innoxiam commendo animam ; tibi hostiam meam offero, cape propitius ac serenus fraternum munus, sacrificium sacerdotis.”

St. Chrysostom, describing the qualifications of a priest, and to what degrees of innocence and virtue he ought to be furnished, tells us, amongst other things, that “ by his office he is a mediator for the universe : that he intercedes with the Almighty in behalf of all mankind, and begs the divine favour not only for the living, but the dead.”

De Sacerdot.  
lib. 6.

St. Austin, in his epistle “ De Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda,” affirms, it was the custom of the universal Church to pray for the dead : upon this assertion he proceeds to reason in defence

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of the usage. "In the Maccabees," says he, "we read of a sacrifice offered for the dead. But if we had nothing of this kind to plead, the custom of all Christendom is a considerable authority; and thus to insist on matter of fact, we find the recommending the dead every where makes part of the priest's devotions at the holy altar."

Universa  
pro Defunctis  
Ecclesie  
supplicare  
consuevit,  
&c. August.  
de Cura pro  
Mortuis Ge-  
rend. Edit.  
Basil.

By the way, though we have good reason to reject the Maccabees from being any part of the inspired writings, yet the testimony of the author as to matter of fact, is unexceptionable enough.

To proceed: in the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, in the old Gallican and Mozarabic missals, in the Ordo Romanus, and in almost all the rest cited by Cassander, we meet with prayer for the dead: the form, though somewhat shorter, is much the same with those in the Apostolical Constitutions. These authorities, though not so unquestionably ancient as the preceding, are, notwithstanding, several of them printed from manuscripts more than nine hundred years old.

Goar. Eu-  
chologion.  
Hittorpius.  
Cassander  
Liturgica,  
&c.  
Bona, Rer.  
Liturg.  
Mabillon  
de Liturg.  
Gallican.  
Thomasius  
Codic.  
Sacrament.  
*The inoffen-  
siveness of  
the practice.*  
De Cura pro  
Mort.  
Gerend.

This custom neither supposes the modern purgatory, nor gives any encouragement to libertinism and vice: not to the latter, for St. Austin with the Apostolical Constitutions affirms, that unless a man dies qualified, that is, unless he has lived tolerably well, he cannot receive any assistance from the prayers of the living. That the ancient Church believed the recommending the dead a serviceable office, we need not question; otherwise, to what purpose was it so generally practised? The custom seems to have gone upon this principle, that supreme happiness is not to be expected till the resurrection: and that the interval between death and the end of the world, is a state of imperfect bliss. The Church might therefore believe her prayers for good people departed, might improve their condition, and raise the satisfactions of this period.

It is probable likewise, the ancients believed, that where a man was regular and pious in the main, some lesser failings might not be accounted for; upon this score, and that some of the rigours of the last judgment might be abated, and some faults, for which they might otherwise suffer in the conflagration, be passed over,—upon these grounds, I say, this usage seems to be founded.

*Bucer's  
objections  
considered.*

Bucer's objections against this practice seem short of satisfaction. He urges this text of St. John: "He that hears my word, and believes on him that sent me, has everlasting life,



and shall not come into condemnation." He likewise cites a passage from the Romans, where it is said, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." But neither of these texts affect the primitive practice. For first, the ancients suppose those, whom they remembered in their devotions, in a safe condition, and that "they were passed from death to life," and were in no danger of "coming into condemnation." His other text, "that whatsoever is not of faith is sin," is no more serviceable than the former. However, he argues from it thus: that nothing can be done in faith, without an express warrant from Scripture, or what stands upon a conclusion evidently inferred from some inspired text; but prayer for the dead stands upon neither of these grounds, and therefore ought to be waved.

EDWARD  
VI.  
John v. 24.  
Rom. xiv. 23.

But the argument seems to proceed stronger the other way: for since prayer for the dead is no where condemned in Scripture, the authority of the Church appears a very good reason to remove scruples, and settle the persuasion of the lawfulness of the thing; which is the meaning of that place in St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. To this purpose, St. Austin tells us, "Quod universa tenet ecclesia nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum, rectissime creditur." That is, "Whatever is held by the universal Church, and always observed without being settled by any conciliary decree, is rightly believed an apostolical tradition." And when we have Bucer, Luther, and Calvin of one side of the question, and St. Austin and the universal Church on the other, it is no great difficulty to discover the casting of the balance.

Bucer,  
Scripta.  
Anglican.  
p. 467, 468.

259.

There is another text urged in favour of Bucer's opinion, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." But this place amounts to no censure, either of the primitive practice, or the reformed Common Prayer-book before us; for it is supposed, both by the ancients and the office last mentioned, that the dead are discharged from the fatigues of this life, that their works follow them, and that they are happy as to the main; however, it doth not follow from hence but that their condition may be improved, and that they may be served in some measure by the assistance of the living. And thus far I have endeavoured to vindicate our first reformers, in retaining the usage of praying for the dead.

De Baptism.  
contra Do-  
natist, lib. 4.  
cap. 15.

Rev. xiv. 13.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Article 22.

I have already observed, prayer for the dead does not imply purgatory; from whence it follows, that though the Church of England condemns the Romish doctrine of purgatory, we cannot from thence infer her dislike of prayer for the dead. Whether or no the petition in the present Litany, "Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers," &c. does not reach the deceased, is a question: there is likewise a prayer in the burial office, which seems to sound to this sense<sup>1</sup>. Now where the Church of England has left her meaning doubtful, I humbly conceive the greatest honour we can do her, is to interpret her to a conformity to the primitive practice.

Homilies  
concerning  
Prayer, pt. 3.

If it is said the second book of homilies declares against praying for the dead: that these homilies are mentioned with commendation in the thirty-fifth article: the Church, therefore, by implication, seems to condemn prayer for the dead;—to this it may be answered,

First. That this homily is principally levelled against the doctrine of purgatory, maintained in the Church of Rome. And to make the most of this discourse, the arguments pretend to go no farther than the insignificancy of such applications; the homily does nowhere assert them dangerous or unlawful.

Article 35.

Secondly. The Church of England's affirming the homilies contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, falls short of vouching every passage in this collection. The homilies may be a good body of instruction as to the main; without being every where exact in the argument, and demonstrative throughout the whole book. And how happy this homily concerning prayer has been in representing St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostome, and St. Augustine upon this subject, I shall leave the learned reader to consider.

If it is objected on the other side, that since the Church of England has not thought fit to speak out, but left her meaning questionable upon this head; therefore it is most prudential to go over to the Church of Rome, where this part of primitive practice is plainly continued;—to this I answer,

First. That since the Church of England has left her meaning doubtful, does it not follow from hence, that her members may construe her to which side of the question they please? Have they not the liberty, upon this ground, to remember

<sup>1</sup> Collier probably alludes to the passage wherein we pray, "that all who are departed in the true faith may have perfect consummation and bliss," &c.

their deceased friends in their devotions or not, as their conscience shall give them leave? Where the point is undecided, what should hinder them from extending the communion of saints to the state of separation, and enlarging their charity to the Church in the other world? There is no need, therefore, of deserting upon this score.

Secondly. We should consider the difficulty of the terms which will be required. That, for instance, we must own a supremacy, 'jure divino,' and founded on succession from St. Peter; we must submit to communion only in one kind for the laity; to transubstantiation and adoration of the host; to worship of images, extending the canon of Scripture, and taking in part of the Apocrypha. Now these, to mention nothing farther, are shocking conditions: supposing the Church of England was chargeable with the omission of a primitive usage, which is more than I affirm; granting this the case, it is much more eligible to adhere to her, than part with her communion upon so remarkable an exchange<sup>1</sup>.

To go on with the Common Prayer-book: at the Burial of the Dead, there is an order for the Communion: I shall only mention what is particular to the occasion. First, the forty-second psalm is said by way of introite. The Collect is now used at burials; it begins thus: "O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life," &c. The Epistle is taken out of the first of the Thessalonians, verse the thirteenth, and the Gospel is the sixth of St. John, beginning at the thirty-seventh verse, and ending at the fortieth.

Receiving the holy eucharist fasting is not without precedents in the primitive Church, as appears by the forty-fourth canon of the council of Carthage. By the canon it is decreed, "that the sacrifice should be offered, that is, the holy eucharist received fasting, excepting on Maundy Thursday: that at all other times of the year, when bishops or any other persons were buried in the afternoon, if the persons officiating had eaten anything that day, the deceased should be recommended to the mercy of God only by prayer, that is, there should be no communion."

Upon this canon, the learned bishop Beveridge cites a passage of St. Austin to prove the custom of recommending the

Beveridge.  
Pandec.  
Canon.  
vol. 1. p. 567.

<sup>1</sup> Our author's arguments in favour of praying for the dead are so far ingenious and plausible, if not sound, as to have gained over many considerable writers to his view of the question.

CRANMER,  
Abp. Cant.  
August. de  
Verb. Apost.  
Serm. 32.  
Pandec.  
Canon.  
vol. 2. p. 207.  
*This office  
kept up in  
the Latin  
translation  
of queen  
Elizabeth's  
Common  
Prayer-  
book.*  
260.

dead to God Almighty upon such occasions. Part of it is to the same sense with the testimony already alleged from this father, only here St. Austin adds, "that the sacrifice of the holy eucharist was offered in their behalf," for a more effectual intercession.

When queen Elizabeth's Common Prayer-book was translated into Latin, in the second year of her reign, this order for a Communion is put into that Burial-office; and that it was not done by mistake or clandestine practice, appears by her majesty's proclamation: "Peculiariorum quædam in Christianorum funeribus et exequiis decantanda adjungi præcipimus, statuto de ritu publicarum precum anno primo regni nostri promulgato, in contrarium non obstante;" that is, some particular observances at funerals we have commanded to be used, the Act for Uniformity, set forth in the first year of our reign, notwithstanding. Thus, by the way, the queen, even in matters of religion, makes no difficulty to overrule the legislature, and dispense with an act of parliament. And by this proclamation we see the two universities, for whom this translation was chiefly intended, had the liberty of a communion at burials, if they thought fit.

L'Estrange,  
Alliance of  
Divine Of-  
fices, p. 303.

*Distribution  
of charity at  
funerals.*  
Id. p. 304.

Farther. It may not be improper to observe, that distributions of charity at burials was customary through all queen Elizabeth's reign. The relief of the poor, was anciently thought no unserviceable office to the person deceased; as the reader may observe from the Apostolical Constitutions above cited. To this purpose we have another testimony from St. Austin, quoted by the learned Beveridge. "Cum verò eorum commendandorum causa opera misericordiæ celebrentur, quis eos dubitet suffragari, pro quibus orationes Deo non inaniter allegantur?"

August. de  
Verb. Apost.  
Serm. 32.  
Pandec.  
Canon.  
vol. 2.  
p. 207.

The Purification of Women stands next to the Burial Office. The woman church'd is to offer her chrisom, and other customary offerings.

Before I proceed farther, I shall briefly observe, that in the Communion Office of this first Reformed Liturgy, the Consecration Prayer invokes the descent of the Holy Ghost; the words are these: "And with thy Holy Spirit and word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood," &c.

*The invo-  
cation of the  
descent of  
the Holy  
Ghost.*

This prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the consecrated elements, is another ancient usage: for instance, it forms part of the Liturgies of St. Chrysostome and St.

Basil: it is in the Gallican Liturgy and the Ordo Romanus, EDWARD VI. and in most of the rest mentioned by Cassander. And to go higher in antiquity, we find it in the Apostolical Constitutions. The order in which the words stand is very remarkable: for in the Consecration Prayer, after the priest has pronounced these words; “This is my body which is broken for many, for the remission of sins.—This is my blood which is shed for many, for the remission of sins:” after these words, which the Church of Rome supposes make a mysterious change in the elements; after these words, at some distance, this prayer follows: “We beseech thee that thou wouldest favourably look upon these gifts, and send thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that this bread may be made the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ, that those who partake of it may be strengthened for good life,” &c. Now this invocation of the descent of the Holy Ghost, to make the elements the body and blood of Christ, being spoken at some distance after the words, pronounced by our Saviour at the institution of this holy sacrament, it is plain the author of the Apostolical Constitutions did not believe the pronouncing the words, “This is my body, and this is my blood,” either trans- or consubstantiated the bread and wine: for if our Saviour had been corporally present, either by changing the elements into his body and blood, or united to them by consubstantiation; if this effect, I say, had followed, upon pronouncing these words, “This is my body,” &c., to what purpose should the descent of the Holy Ghost have been afterwards invoked to make the elements the body and blood of Christ, when, according to the Roman doctrine, they were so already in the most full and wonderful sense imaginable<sup>1</sup>?

Constitut.  
Apostol.  
lib. 8. c. 12.

This prayer for invoking the descent of the Holy Ghost, for the purpose above-mentioned, stands much in the same order in St. Chrysostome’s and St. Basil’s Liturgy, that is, it follows the words of consecration, “This is my body,” &c.

To make one remark farther, the prayer of Consecration in this first Reformed Liturgy, supposes the holy eucharist a sacrificial oblation, as hath been sufficiently proved in a late learned tract. The calling the consecrated elements a sacrifice, is altogether agreeable to the language of the primitive

Gear.  
Eucholog.  
The holy  
eucharist  
a sacrifice.  
The Pro-  
pitatory  
Oblation in  
the Holy

<sup>1</sup> This argument is well worthy attention and examination.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Eucharist,  
p. 93, 94.

Church. To cite some few authorities. Clemens Romanus, in his first epistle to the Corinthians speaks thus: "All those duties which our Lord has commanded us, ought to be performed in proper time, order, and manner, and thus our oblations and solemn devotions ought to be circumstantiated:" *τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*.—And a little after it is said, "those who make their oblations at the time prescribed by our Lord, are acceptable and happy:" and at some distance he continues, "We should be guilty of no small crime, if we should throw those out of their episcopal function, who offer the gifts in a holy unexceptionable manner."

Concil.  
vol. 1.  
p. 143, 149.  
152.  
Iren. lib. 4.  
cap. 32.

Irenæus, who lived in the second century, is full to this purpose. "Our Lord," says he, "reminding his disciples to offer to God first-fruits, took bread, and gave thanks, saying this is my body: he also called the cup his blood, and so taught the new oblation of the New Testament. This institution, the Church receiving from the apostles, continues the same offering every where;" then citing the text of Malachi i. 5—7, and 12, he infers, the prophet has plainly signified, "that the former people the Jews shall cease to offer, but notwithstanding this, a sacrifice shall be offered to God in every place."

Cap. 34.

And a little forward he speaks thus: "The oblation of the Church, which the Lord hath commanded to be offered in all places of the world, is accepted by God as a pure sacrifice." And afterwards in the same chapter, "that not all sacrifices in general are rejected, for there were oblations in the Old Testament, and there are now oblations under the New; there were sacrifices amongst the Jews, and the Church has sacrifices as part of the service performed to God Almighty."

Concil.  
Nicen.  
can. 14.  
Concil.  
Ancyran.  
can. 8.  
Concil.  
Neocæsar.  
can. 13.  
Concil.  
Gang. can. 4.  
Concil. Lao-  
dicen. c. 19.  
Pandec.  
Canon.  
De Sacerdot.  
lib. 6.  
Goar.  
Eucholog.

To proceed. The Apostolical Constitutions calls the holy eucharist a sacrifice in the place above-mentioned, and to the same sense it is called an oblation by the Nicene, Ancyrane, and Neocæsarean councils: to which we may add those of Gangra and Laodicea. St. Chrysostome likewise calls it a "tremendous sacrifice," and St. Cyprian frequently speaks the same language; and in the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostome, in conformity to the manner of expression used by the Fathers, the holy eucharist is called an unbloody sacrifice, which looks like strong evidence against the doctrines of trans-, or consubstantiation.

To return. Those bishops, &c., who drew up the first

Reformed Liturgy, thought fit to give an account, why some ceremonies were laid aside, and some continued. And here they make a distinction between the ceremonies: some they affirm were well formed in the institution, though upon the progress of time misapplied to superstition; others were no better than the product of indiscreet devotion, and zeal without knowledge. These latter, in regard they served rather to make the worship of God more unintelligible, and as it were overlaid religion, were thought fit to be discharged; whereas the ceremonies of the first sort were retained, as a guard and ornament to divine service. The compilers charged the contemptuous neglect of the Church ceremonies, and breaking in upon the order of authority, as a great crime. They say that the appointment of things of this kind, belonged to the governors of the Church: and that private men ought not to presume to draw models, and make appointments for this purpose. They take notice that some people are so much governed by whimsey and self-conceit, that they are for recoinng every thing, and nothing will please them but what is new: but, as they go on, to condemn any thing, merely on the score of its being old, is a great sign of folly. On the other hand, the circumstantial of religion ought rather to be valued for their antiquity; and to prevent misapprehension, they give the people to understand, that the ceremonies unabolished were kept on only for decency and better edification, and not upon any opinion of their being equal to God's law: they had likewise selected such, that were neither dark nor unintelligible, but had light and perspicuity enough to discover their meaning to a common capacity: for this reason they were not so liable to abuse, as others of a more mysterious appearance: and lastly, they pretend to prescribe only to their own people, without any imputation upon the different practice of other countries. And thus this Common Prayer-book was finished, and stood prepared for the civil sanction at the next session of parliament<sup>1</sup>.

EDWARD  
VI.

Some ceremonies set aside, and some retained, and why.

261.

Common  
Prayer-  
book,  
fol. 156.

<sup>1</sup> The peculiar interest and practical importance of Collier's disquisition on the national Liturgy, especially to clerical readers, will be generally acknowledged. Our author has treated the subject much more at large in his celebrated controversy with Dr. Spinkes, which will be noticed hereafter. Meantime we shall borrow a very accurate and extensive illustration of the remarks in the text from a chapter of Dodd's Church History, edited by Tierney: an article which, notwithstanding a few papal prejudices, throws much light on the liturgical reforms of this reign.

"Whilo the ministry," says this Roman Catholic historian, "proceeded no farther than ceremony and discipline in the alterations they made, a great many of the clergy,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

And now a word or two concerning occurrences in the State. And here I shall be very brief, in regard these reigns afford

though they wanted not zeal to support the cause of the old religion, yet thought it prudence to sit down in quiet, imagining, perhaps, that there might be a superfluity and an abuse of ceremonies, especially among the populace and ignorant sort of people; but finding, by degrees, that there was a design in some persons to attack the discipline established over the whole Church, and even to break into the creed of their ancestors, they appeared very uneasy, published several books in defence of the ancient faith, and frequently challenged the opposite party to try the cause by disputation. But 'the court, who, it is thought, might have something farther than religion in view, did not think it advisable to venture the cause upon disputation, and rely wholly upon arguments. They might be apprehensive, that, unless the disagreement between Rome and England was carried to a wider distance, the breach might possibly be closed, and that such an union might prove unfriendly to their Church estates. On the other hand, they were not assured whether any farther alterations in doctrine and worship would be well received. The minority of the prince was a circumstance of disadvantage; and how far the people would be passive under a new face of things was not easy to conjecture. To guard against the worst, it was thought fit to be furnished with forces to awe the opposite party, and prevent them from giving disturbance; and, as an army was a seasonable provision, there wanted not a colour to raise it. A marriage (as hath been observed) was agreed, in the late reign, between the young queen of Scotland and the present king; but the Scots failed in their articles. The protector and the council, therefore, resolved to bring them to reason. For this purpose men were levied, a fleet equipped, and the veteran troops at Boulogne and Calais embarked for England. The protector likewise had several regiments of Walloons and Germans in his pay: not that he had a better opinion of their courage, but because he might believe them more ready to execute any harsh service at home, if occasion required.'

"By these forcible methods, in conjunction with several other motives, capable of working upon the infirmities of human nature, the nation became more susceptible of the impressions in favour of the Reformation; so that, in a little time, the project was set a-foot of a new liturgy, a new ordinal, with a collection of articles, canons, and homilies, which were designed as a standard, both for doctrine and discipline. Wherefore, in the year 1548, the second of Edward VI., a commission was granted by the protector and council, to certain bishops and divines, to draw up a form of prayer, by way of liturgy. The persons in commission were, the two archbishops, the bishops of London, Durham, Worcester, Norwich, St. Asaph's, Salisbury, Lichfield, Hereford, Westminster, and Rochester. Those of this commission among the inferior clergy were, Dr. Cox, Dr. May, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Haynes, Dr. Robertson, and Dr. Redman, all deans, excepting Redman, who was master of Trinity-college in Cambridge. They pretended to work upon the plan of the four rituals hitherto used in England: viz. those of Sarum, York, Bangor, and Lincoln. When this work was completed, many months passed before it obtained a legal establishment; during which time many of the bishops and clergy made use of the ancient liturgy, or mass, in Latin; others took up the new one, which was well concerted to carry on the interest of the Reformation. For no doctrinal point being imposed directly by this new liturgy, this made a great many of the clergy conform to it, who otherwise were great enemies to the reformed doctrine, and hitherto had gone no farther than renouncing the pope's supremacy. By this means many were drawn, unthinkingly, into the snare that was laid for them. For, by reconciling the clergy to a liturgy, which carried a pretty good face, and varied very little, only in certain omissions, from the Latin liturgy, the pill was swallowed with more ease. However, it was far from giving a general content. Catholics made their exceptions against it, both as to the substance and manner. They alleged that it was a bold undertaking, to model anew the liturgy of the universal Church; that the omissions were suspected of a design against the Christian sacrifice; that it was a piece of presumption to affirm (as the act specified) that it was carried on with the aid of the Holy Ghost. 'Some also censured



matter enough in the Church to entertain the reader. This summer the English garrison of Haddington made frequent

EDWARD  
VI.

this provision of a common prayer, because it is said to have been composed by one uniform consentment; and yet four of the bishops, who were in the committee for drawing it, protested against the bill. These were the bishops of Norwich, Hereford, Chichester, and Westminster: while others were in hopes it was only a temporary scheme, to humour a set of men unreasonably disposed for novelties: as, indeed, a great many were, who never rested till it was revised, and many ceremonies, which they esteemed to be superstitious, entirely left out. The truth is, the compilers of this first Common Prayer were so complaisant to the old religion as to retain several practices, which some of their party thought to be inconsistent with the purity of the Gospel. For instance, the cross was ordered upon the head and breast of those that were baptized; as, also, upon the forehead of those that received confirmation. The ceremony of anointing was, for some time, kept up in baptism; as also in extreme unction, if the sick person demanded it. Prayer for the dead was retained as a part of the service, and the liturgy styled a sacrificial oblation. However, most of these and such like ceremonies and practices were soon after discharged, accordingly as the reformers received new lights, and a plausible turn was given to the whole affair. They pretended, that only such ceremonies were discharged as were visibly superstitious, that darkened the Gospel, and were cumbersome to religion; and that they retained such as guarded religion from nakedness and contempt; there being a great deal of difference, said they, between the gaudy attire of popery and the decent dress of the Reformation. But, to speak without passion or prejudice concerning this point, it must be owned, that, although ceremonies are not things of the greatest consequence, yet there may be both inconvenience and danger in permitting every particular Church to act as they please upon these occasions. There is sometimes a great connection between ceremonies and articles of faith; inasmuch, that the former are, as it were, a comment upon the latter, for the instruction of the ignorant, and to keep the mystery alive in their memory. Again, many ceremonies have been consecrated from the earliest times of Christianity for the perpetual use of religion; which, it is to be supposed, are neither ridiculous nor superstitious. The pretence of reforming and purging the Church from certain practices is only a stratagem of the devil, who, in all ages, has stirred up pretended zealots to attack the mystery through the ceremony, and to lop off the branches only with a design to kill the tree. Those that have refined upon the late Reformation afford us a proof of this observation. The Church, by law established, has not given content in the matter of ceremonies. The Dissenters still quarrel with their discipline, and represent it as full of superstition; and some have not been satisfied till they have stripped religion of all its leaves and branches, upon a pretence of making a thorough reformation, and adoring the Lord only in spirit and truth.

“To leave this digression, and return to the account of the Liturgy or Common Prayer: it was first drawn up in the year 1548, and, though frequently made use of, yet not enjoined till a proclamation came forth June 24th, 1549, ordering that no one, for the future, should—so much as in private—make use of any other liturgy, and that the service or mass in Latin should be laid aside. Soon after, it was established by act of parliament, called the Uniformity Act, with severe penalties for non-compliance<sup>1</sup>. Every clergyman, not making use of it in the church-service, was, for the first offence, to suffer half a year's imprisonment, and forfeit a year's profits of one of his benefices; the second offence was deprivation, *ipso facto*, and imprisonment for twelve months; the third offence was imprisonment during life. Thus the Common Prayer stood, from its first establishing, anno 1549, till it was revised and altered in the year 1552. It was revised and altered again under queen Elizabeth, anno 1559; again under king James I., in 1604; afterwards under king Charles II., anno 1662. Several alterations were made at

<sup>1</sup> There is an important error in this passage. The document here called a proclamation, and said to have preceded the act of parliament, was in reality a letter from the council to Bonner, and was written more than five months after the passing of the bill.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

excursions, drove and burnt the neighbouring country, and grew very troublesome to the Scots. The governor, upon his

those times, at the instance of the Dissenters; and, lastly, they attempted to have it revised and corrected in the year 1689, but without success. I will give all the particulars as they fall in with the course of my history.

“The Common Prayer being thus established, the reformers still wanted a standard for doctrine, whereby they might appear, at least, to be united in one belief. To this purpose a kind of committee of divines, under Cranmer’s direction, were ordered to draw up a certain number of articles; for, as yet, the tenets of the old and new religion were so blended together that they made one confused chaos; and though, outwardly, men seemed to be under the same regulation, they were inwardly under a continual distraction, every one being at liberty to carve out a creed for himself: so that it is a difficult matter to determine in what persuasion the generality of the people either lived or died, in those struggling times of the Reformation. When the commissioners had gone through their work, they presented the nation with a system of reformed doctrine, containing forty-two articles; and it was expected that all, that were members of the Reformation, should submit to them, as soon as they had the approbation of the king and council, which they readily obtained. ‘It is not altogether improbable,’ says Dr. Heylin, ‘but that these articles, being debated and agreed upon by the said committee, might also pass the vote of the whole convocation, though we find nothing to that purpose in the acts thereof, which either have been lost, or were never registered. Besides, it is to be observed, that the Church of England, for the first five years of queen Elizabeth, retained these articles, and no others, as the public tenets of the Church, in point of doctrine; which certainly she had not done, had they been commended to her by a less authority than a convocation.’ However, it is certain they never had a parliamentary establishment, and came forth only by royal authority, as they were forged by the committee. Some difference is observable between these forty-two articles and the thirty-nine articles of queen Elizabeth, which has occasioned some contest among the reformers. I may, perhaps, have an opportunity of taking notice of this matter in the course of this history. In the mean time I will proceed and give an account of some other advances made by these reformers.

“Besides this regulation as to doctrine, several things were still wanting as to discipline: for the Church, being now swallowed up by the State, and the canon law, built upon the decrees of popes and councils, being rendered insignificant by the nation’s withdrawing itself from the usual jurisdiction, it was requisite that some sort of ecclesiastical laws should be established that would answer the purposes of the Reformation. This was thought of from the beginning of England’s defection from the see of Rome, and the embryo of a design was prepared in Henry VIII.’s reign; but that prince’s death, and some difficulties that arose in the execution, retarded the project. Those that were of Erastian principles judged the civil magistracy was qualified to make such a provision, and that it was making backward steps in the Reformation to allow a national Church a power of making laws, which they refused to a Church of nations. However, the bishops and clergy were unwilling to appear insignificant upon this occasion; and, therefore, the matter was so compromised, that a certain number of their body, jointly with some learned men of the laity, should compile a collection of laws for the use of the Church; and it was to be performed according to the scheme laid in Henry VIII.’s reign, when it was decreed, by act of parliament, that thirty-two commissioners, one half to be ecclesiastics, the other half laymen, were to finish the said work in three years; and, the mean while, Church affairs were to be managed by occasional laws. The wording of these constitutions was left to a sub-committee of eight persons: viz. Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury; Thomas Goodrick, bishop of Ely, Dr. Cox, the king’s almoner; Peter Martyr; Dr. William May; Dr. Rowland Taylor: to these were joined two laymen, John Lucas, and Richard Goodrick, esquires. And then the polishing of the work was committed to two polite writers, sir John Cheek and Dr. Haddon. The entire collection was completed anno 1552, under fifty-one titles besides an appendix, ‘De Regulis Juris.’ It was called ‘Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasti-

receiving a reinforcement of six thousand men from France, EDWARD VI. levied eight thousand Scots, and joining the foreign forces,

carum.' King Edward VI. happening to die soon after, this notable scheme was knocked on the head, being never confirmed, either by parliament or convocation; and the reformers, at this day, are at a loss for some such sort of a provision, as it appears by the awkward and blundering proceedings of their spiritual courts, where they want standing laws for their direction. I remit the reader to the book itself, if he is curious to be informed of particulars, and shall only mention a few of the articles, which, perhaps, will not be according to the taste of every reformer. For instance, by the third article, apostates, and such as opposed Christianity in general, were to forfeit both life and estate. The eighth article annulled marriages made without the consent of parents or guardians. In the ninth article the Levitical degrees were explained with remarkable severity. The tenth article allows of marriage after a divorce, in the case of adultery, especially the party injured has this liberty: the woman, an adulteress, forfeits her jointure; the husband, an adulterer, is to return his wife's portion, and part with one-half of his substance: and both parties, being guilty, are either to be imprisoned for life or banished. Marriage might be annulled in all cases where the parties were allowed to separate as to bed and board: viz. in attempts of poisoning, implacable hatred, &c. The twenty-fifth article debars heretics from making wills; also, those under sentence of death, perpetual banishment, perpetual imprisonment, strumpets, panders, libellers, and usurers, are declared to be under the same disability.

"Another thing the reformers went upon, was the ordination of their new ministry. During the first and second year of Edward VI., it does not appear that any alteration had been made in the ancient ordinal, or Roman pontifical, excepting the oath of obedience to the bishop of Rome, which had been omitted ever since king Henry VIII. assumed the spiritual supremacy. It was judged convenient, therefore, to set forth a new ordinal, and an act of parliament passed to that purpose January 31st, 1550. The book was drawn up by six bishops, and six others learned in the canon law; but the bishops of Worcester, Durham, Carlisle, Westminster, and Chichester, dissenting from the bill, and not concurring in other matters relating to the Reformation, were soon after deprived. When this ordinal was examined, in the next ensuing reign of queen Mary, it was declared to be insufficient and invalid, as to the purposes of consecrating a true ministry, both the bishops and parliament being of that opinion. The reasons, in general, of its insufficiency, were an essential defect, both as to the matter and form of the episcopal and sacerdotal orders. There was no anointing,—a ceremony always made use of from the earliest times, without which ordination was doubted, and, according to the common opinion, invalid. There was no porrection of instruments, another significative ceremony, generally esteemed to be essential. But, what was still of the greatest moment, there was no form of words specifying the order that was conferred; and particularly, no words or ceremony made use of to express the power of absolving or offering sacrifice. For these, and several other reasons, which I have distinctly mentioned in another place, all the orders conferred according to this new ordinal were looked upon by the Catholics, in queen Mary's reign, to be null and invalid. The authority of the ordinal being previously established by act of parliament, it was afterwards confirmed by another act, anno 1552, whereby the Common Prayer, lately revised, received its approbation<sup>1</sup>.

"I will conclude this article with a word or two concerning certain homilies which were ordered to be read publicly in all the churches. They were first designed to serve instead of sermons, as it was pretended, to hinder preachers from running into unseasonable excursions, and exasperating the opposite party. The first part of the book of homilies was composed in Edward VI.'s reign, and contained twelve lessons; the second part contained twenty-one lessons, and was not published till queen Elizabeth's reign. Several divines of the Church of England do not look upon them as a standard

<sup>1</sup> Courayer and other writers, on the validity of the English ordinations, may serve to refute the inuendoes of this passage.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*Hadding-  
don besieged.*

composed of French and Germans, formed the siege of Haddington. And here the Scotch nobility debated the point of transporting the queen into France, and marrying her to the dauphin. They were divided upon the question. One party suggested, that the taking such measures was the way to bring them under the French power, and entail a perpetual war with England upon the Scotch nation. They thought, therefore, the terms offered by the English were not to be rejected; that by this proposal they should have the benefit of a ten years' truce, without being embarrassed with any uneasy article during that period; that in case either the king of England, or their queen, died within this interval, they were perfectly at liberty, and might manage as they thought fit; and whatever the event might be as to this matter, they looked on time and leisure as circumstances of advantage, and that precipitating matters was most likely to make them miscarry.

A. D. 1548.

*The Scottish  
queen con-  
veyed to  
France.*

The other party, to which the earl of Arran, who was the governor, inclined, opposed this motion, and insisted strongly upon conveying the queen to France. This sentiment prevailed. To execute the resolution, the French fleet weighing anchor at Leith sailed round the isles of Orkney, as if they intended to return home that way; and thus succeeding in their enterprise, and standing clear of the English fleet, they put into the port of Dunbritton<sup>1</sup>, took the queen on board, and landed her in Bretagne: from whence she was honourably conveyed to the French court.

Aug. 20.

The garrison of Haddington being now hard pressed, a reinforcement of three hundred horse and a thousand foot were sent, under the command of sir Robert Bows and sir Thomas Palmer. Godwin mounts these recruits to two thousand. But whatever their number was, they miscarried in the attempt, fell into an ambush, and were almost cut off to a man. Notwithstanding this misfortune, the besieged did their duty with

of their doctrine: first, because they were composed by unknown persons; and, again, they cannot allow of certain assertions advanced by the authors, viz. the demolishing of images, fixing idolatry upon the Church of Rome, and the doctrine of passive obedience to the civil government. 'And therefore,' says Fuller, 'such use these homilies as an upper garment, girting them close unto, and casting them from them, at pleasure.' Others among the reformers insist upon the orthodoxy of these homilies; and, to this purpose, allege the thirty-fifth article of the Church of England, which declares that the books of homilies do contain a godly and wholesome doctrine. Now, whether this expression does extend to all or only to part of those homilies, is left to the reader's judgment.

<sup>1</sup> Dunbritton, *alias* Dunbarton.

great resolution, and defended the town till the earl of Shrewsbury appeared with a body of sixteen thousand men. And now the French quitted the siege, and drew off in good order; on the other hand, the English general, after he had supplied the town with ammunition and provisions, countermarched to Berwick.

EDWARD  
VI.

The enemy, perceiving Haddington was not to be recovered by force, applied to stratagem. To this purpose, Dessie, the French general, imagining the garrison might think themselves secure, upon the score of the siege being lately raised, made a night march with some detached regiments, and appearing before the place at break of day, surprised an outwork, killed the watch, and had entered the town had it not been for the discharge of a cannon, which, being fired through the gate, cut off several of his men, disheartened the rest, and made them retire. This cannon is said to have been discharged by a French deserter, who had reason to expect rough treatment if his countrymen had succeeded. The English garrisons of Hume and Fas Castle were not so fortunate as that of Haddington.

Godwin,  
Annal.  
Stow's  
Annals.  
*The English  
not successful  
in war  
with Scot-  
land.*

At Hume, the enemy, who understood the ground, climbed the rock on the side opposite to the castle; and thus killing the centinels (who, trusting to the strength of the place, were negligent in their duty), made themselves masters of the fort. As for Fas Castle, it was lost in this manner. The governor summoned the neighbouring peasants to furnish him with corn by such a day. Upon this occasion the enemy surprised the fort. The Scotch, on pretence of supplying the garrison, sent their soldiers in the disguise of countrymen; these men, throwing down their burthens at the gate, killed the centinels, and giving the signal to a reserve near at hand, carried the place.

The English were likewise somewhat unfortunate in what was attempted by their fleet.

The lord admiral Seymour commanded in the expedition; he landed first in Fife, at St. Minins, and afterwards in the Mernis, at Montrose; but at both places he was forced to retire, and re-embark his men with considerable loss.

In the beginning of autumn, the earl of Rutland marched to Haddington, with three thousand Germans, together with some English forces levied in the north. This general found the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
262.

October 1.

keeping the town impracticable, without a considerable army upon the spot; for the neighbouring country being wasted, there was a necessity of foraging at a great distance, and by consequence there must be a strong convoy to guard what was gotten. For this reason he razed the fortifications, burnt the town, and brought off the garrison and artillery to Berwick. This is assigned to the next year by Buchanan, but Godwin places it to October this year.

*An act to  
make the  
marriage of  
priests law-  
ful.*

To return to England: the parliament met on the 24th of November. This session had begun on the 15th, in October, but the plague being then in London, occasioned this farther prorogation. The first bill relating to the Church, was to make the marrying of priests lawful: when it was brought into the house of Lords, the bishops of London, Durham, Norwich, Carlisle, Hereford, Worcester, Bristol, Chichester, Llandaff; and the lords Morley, Dacres, Windsor, and Wharton, dissented.

Statutes at  
Large.

The preamble sets forth, "that it is to be wished the clergy would live single, that they might be more at leisure to attend the business of their function; but since it is found by experiment, that there are greater inconveniences another way, and that they are left at liberty by God's law; for these reasons it is enacted, that all canons, constitutions, &c. which prohibited the marriage of the clergy, shall be utterly void. And that no spiritual persons shall be liable to any punishment or forfeiture, upon the account of their marriage." In this statute there is a clause, that no person should have the liberty of marrying without conforming to the ceremonies and orders, set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, &c. From whence it appears, the bill concerning the Common Prayer was passed into a statute, before that relating to the marriage of priests.

Vide Bp.  
Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 88.

This act concerning the marriage of the clergy, went no farther than a permission.

Eccles. Hist.  
p. 191.

To make the provision entire, we shall meet with another act in this reign for legitimating their children; but of that afterwards. That the clergy had the liberty of marriage, no less than the laity; and that neither the Scriptures, nor the primitive Church, put them under any particular restraint, I have proved at large in the first part of this work.

However, for several centuries before the reformation, the

clergy were obliged to celibacy, and particularly those in England, were under a solemn engagement. It is therefore, a mistake to affirm, "they were not by any vow precluded from marriage," for by a canon of the council of Winchester, held under Lanfrank, those who were ordained priests, or deacons, had a form prescribed them for renouncing matrimony.

EDWARD VI.  
*Many of the clergy privately married before the Reformation.*

As to the charge of the licentiousness of the priests, it is to be hoped the historian has set it too high. The greatest blemish of this kind drawn upon the clergy before the reformation, was their entertaining women under the character of concubines: for this practice, they had a license from their bishop. This liberty had an unrespectable appearance, to strangers especially, and had the engagement been no better than the name, would have deserved the hardest censure. But these women, notwithstanding they were somewhat coarsely distinguished, were for the most part their wives, though the canons which forbade the clergy to marry, would not allow them the credit of being so called: the bishops, who were well acquainted with their conduct, gave them licenses for this purpose, and by consequence dispensed with their vow. This, it is probable, they thought no great stretch of authority, considering the prohibition was only a point of ecclesiastic discipline, and an abridgment of latter ages. That this was the case of the Western Church, we are informed by the learned Cassander and others. What reason then have we to think the English clergy should manage with less sense or conscience, than those of their order in other countries? We shall have no reason to fasten this imputation upon them, if we consider that several constitutions of our later provincial councils, are levelled against the clandestine marriages of the clergy. These constitutions were made out of ceremony to the present discipline, and to keep the canons in countenance, but were seldom or never put in execution. To put this matter beyond doubt, archbishop Parker, who has treated this subject at large, relates, that those called concubines to the English clergy, were many of them lawfully married. Thus, to use his own words, "There be no small arguments that some bishops, and the best of the clergy living within the memory of man did continue; and elsewhere, divers of the clergy lived secretly with wives, and provided for their children under the names of nephews, and other men's children; in which manner, lived Bonifacius, arch-

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 92.  
 Spelman's Council. vol. 2. p. 11.  
 See my Ch. Hist. p. 243.  
 Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 89.

Consultat. 23.

Defence of Priests' Marriages, written by an anonymous Author, and published by Archbishop Parker, with some Insertions, p. 529. 334. Harmer, p. 78.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

bishop of Canterbury, and other bishops of old days, and some also of late days, though all the world did not bark at the matter.”

To proceed: to silence the cavils, and make way for the better reception of the Common Prayer, a proclamation was issued out a little before the sitting of the parliament, to bar the use of the pulpit throughout the kingdom: and thus, those preachers who were licensed before, had an embargo laid upon them. Part of the proclamation runs thus:

*All persons  
prohibited.*

“His majesty does inhibit as well the said preachers so before licensed, as all manner of persons whosoever they be, to preach in open audience in the pulpit, or otherwise, by any sought colour or fraud, to the disobeying of this commandment, to the intent that the whole clergy in this mean space, might apply themselves to prayer to Almighty God, for the better achieving of the same most godly intent and purpose, not doubting but that also his loving subjects in the mean time, will occupy themselves to God’s honour, with due prayer in the Church, and patient hearing of the godly homilies, heretofore set forth by his highness’s injunctions unto them, and so endeavour themselves, that they may be the more ready, with thankful obedience to receive a most quiet, godly, and uniform order, to be had throughout all his said realms and dominions,” &c.

Fuller’s  
Ch. Hist.  
book 7.  
p. 338.  
*An act for  
an uni-  
formity of  
prayer and  
administra-  
tion of the  
sacraments.*

The Act for the Uniformity of Divine Service, &c. takes notice in the preamble, “that besides the distinct offices of Sarum, York, Bangor, and Lincoln, there had lately been other different forms of common prayer used in cathedral and parish churches, and that the holy communion, and other sacraments of the Church, had likewise been administered with diversity of ceremonies. That the king and his council had endeavoured to put a stop to this ununiform manner, but without success.

263.

That therefore, to provide a more effectual remedy, his majesty has appointed the archbishop of Canterbury, with several others of the most learned bishops and divines, to draw up an office for all the parts of divine service: that in doing this, they were to have a regard to the direction of holy Scripture, and the usages of the primitive Church: that the performance enjoined the said bishops and divines, was now finished by the aid of the Holy Ghost, and delivered to his highness. It is therefore enacted, &c. that no other book of divine service shall be used in any cathedral or parish church, or other place within his majesty’s dominions. And if any parson, vicar, or other spiri-



tual person, shall refuse to use this Common Prayer-book, or officiate with any other form or ceremonies, or shall preach or speak any thing in derogation of the said book, he was to forfeit a year's profit of one of his preferments, and suffer six months' imprisonment for his first offence. To suffer imprisonment for a whole year, and be deprived *ipso facto* of all his spiritual promotions for the second; and for the third offence, to be imprisoned during life."

EDWARD  
VI.

The statute sets forth farther: "That if after the feast of Pentecost next coming, when the act was to inure; if after this period, the Common Prayer-book should be ridiculed or burlesqued in any plays, ballads, or lampoons, or any parson, vicar, or other minister menaced, or otherwise prevailed with, to officiate in any manner different from the rubric or form prescribed by the said book, that then every such offender shall forfeit ten pounds for the first time, twenty for the second, and all his goods and chattels for the third, and suffer imprisonment during life." And here it is provided, "that every archbishop and bishop, may at their pleasure sit upon the bench, and join with the judges in the trial of such offences."

For the encouragement of learning, it is farther provided, "that the universities may use a Latin, Greek, or Hebrew translation of the said Common Prayer-book, at discretion, the Communion-office only excepted."

*A proviso  
for the uni-  
versities.*

It is likewise provided, "that all and singular lords of the parliament for the third offence above-mentioned, shall be tried by their peers." Since therefore bishops, as sir Edward Coke makes no scruple to grant, are lords of parliament, they are evidently by this statute to be tried by their peers.

Coke's In-  
stitut. pt. 1.  
fol. 97.

The last proviso I shall mention, "makes it lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories or other places," to use openly any Psalms, or prayer taken out of the Bible, at any due time, not letting or omitting thereby the service or any part thereof mentioned in the said book.

2 & 3 Edw. 6.  
c. 1.

This proviso was thrown in, as it is thought, to countenance the Psalms projected to be turned into verse, and to allow the use of them in churches, for we are to observe, these singing Psalms, as they are called, were very much the inclination of the reformed.

*Another for  
the use of  
the Psalms  
in metre.*

Singing of psalms and hymns, we find recommended by the Apostles St. Paul and St. James, and it was practised both

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Ephes. v.  
James v.

*Psalmody a  
primitive  
and general  
custom.*

Basil.  
Epist. 63.  
ad Cler.  
Eccles.  
Neoces.

Socrat.  
lib. 6. c. 8.

Theodoret.  
Hist. lib. 2.  
c. 24.

Mabillon  
Disquisit.  
de Cursu  
Gallican.  
p. 333.

Hittorp.  
p. 637.  
Confession,  
lib. 9. c. 7.

privately, and at church, in the earliest ages of Christianity. Thus Pliny, in his account he gives of the Christians to the emperor Trajan, relates, they used to meet early at the day appointed, and sing a hymn to Christ. "This hymn," he observes, "they sung 'secum invicem:'" the meaning of which phrase may be understood by the way of psalmody in St. Basil's time. This Father tells us, that it was every week the common custom for the people to go to church before day; where after having begun the service with confession, they proceeded to singing of psalms. And here the congregation dividing into two parts, sung by turns. Sometimes one of them whose office it was, set the psalm, as we call it, and the rest sung after him.

Socrates will have it, that the famous St. Ignatius brought in the alternate way of singing. This Father, as the historian reports, had seen a vision of angels sing a hymn to the blessed Trinity, which was the reason of his recommending this manner to his Church of Antioch.

And thus the precedent of this celebrated martyr grew up to a general usage. Socrates observes farther, that St. Chrysostom introduced this way of singing psalms by turns, into Constantinople: that he did it to counterwork the Arians, who endeavoured to recommend their heresy by compositions sung in this manner.

The learned Valesius, in his notes upon Socrates, seems to be at a loss where this historian had his authority, with respect to Ignatius. "For it is certain," says he, "that Flavianus and Diodorus, who lived in the reign of Constantius, were the first who broke the choir into two divisions, for singing the psalms by way of antiphony, and that the custom beginning here, spread to all other parts of Christendom<sup>1</sup>."

Thus the Psalms were sung by turns, by all the people in the church of Milan, when St. Ambrose was bishop, as we may learn from this Father's Exposition upon the first Psalm.

Walafridus Strabo observes, that the famous Hilarie, bishop of Poitiers, composed several hymns: that pope Gelasius did the same in imitation of St. Ambrose: and that Damasus ordered the Psalms should be sung in all churches and monasteries.

As to the church of Milan, St. Austin relates, "that when

<sup>1</sup> Probably the antiphony applied rather to the Hebrew parallelisms explained by Lowth, than to the vulgar division of verses.

the empress Justina drew a persecution upon St. Ambrose, because she could not make him bend to the Arian heresy; when this storm happened, the people watched all night in the church, with a resolution to suffer martyrdom with their bishop. Now to relieve their spirits under this fatigue, and take off the impression of the calamity, St. Ambrose ordered the Psalms should be sung, according to the custom of the Eastern Churches, and that this method continued, and prevailed in most other places.

By a canon made at a synod under Gregory the Great, it appears the singing of psalms in the Church of Rome was very musical and affecting. And here it is hinted the choir did not always live so well as they sung<sup>1</sup>. Austin, though he declares his affections very much raised by the fineness of church music, and that it gave him a very rapturous and refined pleasure: yet in another place he seems almost afraid to trust his passions with so moving a satisfaction, and therefore seems to prefer the plainer method of singing practised by Athanasius, in the church of Alexandria. This bishop ordered the Psalms should be sung with a moderate inflection of the voice, and sound somewhat near common speaking. However, St. Austin seems to say this rather out of excess of scruple than settled judgment; for in the same chapter he tells us, church music is designed for an assistance to human infirmities: that it recommends the exercise of religion: that the sweetness of the notes takes hold of the mind, and makes its way, where the bare repeating of the words would scarcely enter: that sounds have a great ascendant over our passions. And that when they are well tempered, and suited to the occasion, they have a serviceable effect.

Mabillon,  
ibid. p. 387.

Confession,  
lib. 9. c. 4.  
Confession,  
lib. 10. c. 33.

264.

In Afric, and in all other Churches, excepting Spain, the Psalms were sung at the stated hours, both for day and night; but in the Mozarabic offices, especially of later times, there is no psalm in the Rubric either for vigils or vespers.

Mabillon,  
id. p. 391.

To return home. At the beginning of the Reformation, David's Psalms were turned into verse, but extremely to the disadvantage of the original. Hopkins and Sternhold were much better men than poets. Their zeal made them overgrasp their business, and venture without skill or genius. However, the taste of that age was not very nice, which made them pass the better. But notwithstanding this allowance, the

<sup>1</sup> No uncommon charge against choirs.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

management was thought defective in another circumstance; that is, since many of the Psalms have a particular relation to David's successes, and allude to customs and parts of history not commonly understood,—since this is the case, some critics would have had these omitted; because where the meaning was either dark, or the matter did not reach down to Christianity, they could not be so serviceable to devotion<sup>1</sup>.

To conclude with this statute. Some censured this provision of a Common Prayer, because it is said to have been composed with one uniform agreement; and yet four of the bishops who were in the committee for drawing it protested against the bill. These were the bishops of Norwich, Hereford, Chichester, and Westminster. It is true these prelates were not satisfied with every particular of the draught, but as to the main they agreed with the rest. However, the few exceptions they could not get over made them dissent from the whole.

The next statute relating to the Church is An Act for the true Payment of Tithes. The preamble takes notice, that the two statutes made in the late reign for this purpose were short and defective. To supply these omissions, it is enacted, “That all manner of predial tithes shall be justly set out, as of right they have, and ought to have been paid. And that no person shall from henceforth carry away any such or like tithes, which have been paid within the said term of forty years, before he has justly divided and set forth the tithe, or otherwise agreed for the same tithes with the parson, vicar, or other owner, proprietor, or farmer of the same tithes, under the pain and forfeiture of treble value of the tithes so taken and carried away.

“It is also enacted, that any person to whom predial tithes are due may lawfully, either by himself or his servant, view and see the said tithes truly set forth, and carry them off without molestation.

“It is farther enacted, that all persons that have beasts, or any cattle titheable, feeding in any waste or common, where the parish is not certainly known, shall pay their tithes for the increase of the said cattle, to the parson, vicar, proprietor, or farmers of the parish, where the owners of the said cattle dwell.

“And that all barren heaths, or waste grounds, (unless discharged for the payment of tithes by act of parliament) which shall be hereafter improved and turned into arable ground or

<sup>1</sup> This objection was mainly occasioned by their translating the Hebrew verb imperatively much oftener than the grammatical construction requires.

27 Hen. 8.  
cap. 20.  
32 Hen. 3.  
cap. 7.  
*An act for  
the true  
payment of  
tithes.*

meadow, shall, after seven years, pay tithe for the corn and hay growing upon the same.”

EDWARD  
VI.

There is likewise a clause for the payment of personal tithes. And here “it is enacted, that every person exercising merchandise, bargaining and selling, clothing, handicraft, or other art and faculty, being such kind of persons, and in such places as heretofore, within these forty years, have accustomedly used to pay such personal tithes, or of right ought to pay, (other than such as have been common day-labourers) shall yearly at or before the feast of Easter pay for his personal tithes the tenth part of his gains, his charges and expenses, according to his estate, condition, or degree, to be therein abated, allowed, or deducted.”

Then follows a proviso, “That tithe fish shall be paid as formerly;” and likewise that the act shall not extend to London and Canterbury, “or any other town, that used to pay their tithes by their houses.”

As for the remedy, “the persons withdrawing their tithes were to be sued in the ecclesiastical court, and the process governed by the king’s ecclesiastical laws; and in case the party condemned does not obey the sentence, the ecclesiastical judge is empowered to excommunicate him, and after forty days to certify the excommunication to the king in his court of Chancery.

“And if any party, after his being cast in the ecclesiastical court, shall sue for a prohibition, and the suggestion proves false by two witnesses, that then the party against whom the prohibition is brought, shall, within six months after the granting the prohibition, have a consultation awarded by the king’s judges, and recover double costs and damages, to be assessed by the court, where consultation was granted; for recovery of which costs and damages, the party to whom they shall be awarded may have an action of debt, by bill, plaint, or information, in any of the king’s courts of record.”

2 & 3 Edw. 6.  
cap. 13.

As to predial tithes, the bill seems drawn in terms sufficiently plain and decisive; but the clause for those which are personal looks dark and embarrassed. The deducting the expenses according to the estate, condition, and degree of the party, lies open to cavil and exception.

*A dark and  
ambiguous  
clause.*

Thus by the ambiguity of the terms, and the declension of the spiritual courts, this last clause proved little beneficial.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Thus, the clergy in market towns, where there are no predial tithes, have oftentimes but a precarious subsistence. And thus they lie under an unhappy temptation of speaking smooth things, and complying too far with the humour of the people.

There is another act passed this parliament for the abstinence "from eating flesh upon any Friday or Saturday, or the Embering-days, or in any day in the time commonly called Lent, or on any other day as is, or shall be at any time here-  
after commonly reputed a fast-day."

2 & 3 Edw. 6,  
cap. 19.

The preamble, in all probability drawn by some of the bishops, sets forth, "that days and meats are, in themselves, all of the same nature and quality as to moral consideration, and that one has no inherent holiness above another. That the distinction of clean and unclean meats determined with the Mosaic law; and that all sorts of diet may be lawfully used by Christians, provided this liberty is taken without running into excess and contempt of authority. However, since divers of the king's subjects have abused their improvement in knowledge, turned epicures under better instruction, and broken the fasting-days of the Church, with an uncustomary license, considering likewise that abstinence is serviceable to virtue, and helpful to subdue the body to the mind, it is therefore enacted," &c. Besides these motives drawn from religion, there is a politic consideration thrown in; that is, by such abstinence from flesh, the breed of cattle would be increased, and fishery and navigation encouraged.

265.

*An act for  
abstinence  
from eating  
flesh upon  
vigils and  
other fasting-  
days.*

"For the first offence against this act, the forfeiture is ten shillings, and ten days' imprisonment, during which imprisonment, the criminals are not allowed the eating any flesh. The penalty for the second offence is the forfeiture of twenty shillings, and twenty days' imprisonment, and so *toties quoties*, with abstinence from flesh all the time of their confinement."

This act is not to extend to any persons who either had or should have a license from the crown. Those persons, likewise, of infirm constitutions, either upon the score of age or sickness, women with child, or lying in, and all soldiers, are likewise excepted. Those who eat flesh on St. Lawrence or St. Mark's eve, and such as have heretofore been licensed by the archbishop of Canterbury, are exempted from the penalty of the statute.

Since the abstinence enjoined by this act goes chiefly upon

religious motives, it may not be improper just to observe, that fasting has a natural tendency to reduce the senses, and maintain the government of reason. The experiment of hunger is a good expedient to refresh our compassion, and make us more friendly to the indigent.

EDWARD  
VI.

Abstinence is likewise a good sign of humiliation, and a suitable penance for excess and misbehaviour. It is an assistant to devotion, and proper for times of solemnity and distress. Thus the Jews and Ninevites fasted to avert public calamities, and make their applications more acceptable to God Almighty. Thus, in the New Testament, our Saviour foretold his disciples should fast "when he was taken from them;" and elsewhere he lays down rules for this duty, and promises a reward when it is rightly performed. Thus the apostles premised fasting to their imposition of hands upon St. Paul and Barnabas.

Matt. vi.

Acts xiii.

As to the Lent fast mentioned in the statute, it is in all likelihood an apostolical usage. It is mentioned as a general custom by Irenæus, though as to the length of the time, whether this father meant forty days or forty hours is a question amongst the learned. However, in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, he acquaints this prelate all the Churches were not agreed about the length of the time. That some believed themselves bound only to fast one day, some two days, and some more. And thus far he is plainly intelligible. Tertullian is full for the point, and tells us that Good Friday was a public and general fast, for which reason the holy kiss was omitted at the religious assemblies.

The anti-  
quity of the  
Lenten fast.  
Euseb. Hist.  
Eccles.  
lib. 5. c. 24.

Tertull. de  
Orat. c. 14.  
Advers.  
Psych. c. 14.

In another tract he observes, that the Psychici or Catholics held the interval between our Saviour's crucifixion and resurrection as a time of necessary abstinence<sup>1</sup>. These they interpreted the days in which the bridegroom was taken from them, and thought themselves obliged to fast upon their annual revolution. Thus the primitive Christians, as Tertullian represents them, thought themselves indispensably bound to fast on Friday and Saturday in the holy week. But their piety made them go beyond this necessity of precept: for as the same author observes, they extended their Lent by volun-

Id. c. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, when a Montanist, drew a wide distinction between *pnecuma* and *psyche*,—"spirit," and "soul." He calls his Catholic opponents "Psychici," because he supposed them inclined to the carnal and sensual life.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Id. c. 13.  
Orig. in  
Levit. Hom.  
10.

tary discipline, and fasted some days before the bridegroom was taken from them. Thus Origen, mentioning the self-denial and abstinence of the Christians, affirms the Christians spent forty days in their Lenten fasts.

Epiph.  
Expos. Fid.  
No. 22.  
Constit.  
Apost. lib. 5.  
c. 17.

By the fiftieth canon of the Laodicean council, held in the fourth century, it is decreed, that people should be confined to dry diet during the whole time of Lent. And this *xerophagy*, or dry diet, which was no better than bread, salt, and water, as Epiphanius relates, was not to be taken till the evening. However, the Apostolical Constitutions relax a little, and allow the eating of salad.

But all Churches did not think themselves obliged to the same rule, and therefore we find a considerable diversity both as to time and degrees of abstinence. Socrates, who lived in the fifth century, tells us, that at Rome they fasted three weeks before Easter, excepting Saturdays and Sundays. That the Christians in Illyricum, Greece, and Alexandria, began their Lent six weeks before Easter, and called it a quadragesimal fast. That others had a custom different from both the former: they began their abstinence seven weeks before Easter; but then during this period they had abstinence and liberty by intervals, and upon the whole fasted only five days in three of the weeks. And here the historian wonders, that since there was such variety in the length of their abstinence, they should all of them agree in calling it a quadragesimal fast.

Socrat.  
lib. 5. c. 22.

He continues to take notice, that they did not only vary in the number of the days, but in other circumstances of the discipline. Thus some forbore eating anything that had life; others fed upon no animals excepting fish; some indulged themselves farther, and furnished their table with fowl as well as fish: they justified their practice by pleading, both these kinds of animals were extracted from the same element, and created out of the water. Other Christians managed with greater restraints, and would not so much as allow themselves any fruit or eggs. Some went still farther, and fed upon nothing but dry bread, and some even thought this too much. And, lastly, some having fasted until three of the clock, eat anything that came in the way, without scruple and distinction. From this diversity of usage, the historian infers there is no divine precept to state and determine the circumstances: but as to these particulars, the apostles left every Church to

Gen. i.



its liberty, that the merit of the discipline might be raised by having more of choice and inclination.

EDWARD VI.

266.

Socrat. *ibid.*  
A bill for  
reviving  
ecclesiastical  
jurisdiction  
thrown out.

This session a bill was put in for reinforcing the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The setting up the regale to an unusual pitch, in the late and present reign, had very much weakened the authority of the ordinaries. People took advantage of this declension in discipline, and broke out into libertinism and disorder. Great complaints were made of the general dissolution of manners; but the clergy were disabled from giving a check to this mischief. They had nothing left them, in a manner, but their rhetoric in the pulpit; and here they are said to have declaimed against vice with great courage and impartiality. They told the people, that unless they reformed, some terrible vengeance would quickly overtake them. But these discourses had little effect; for the nation was grown almost incorrigible. The temporal lords were jealous of reviving the jurisdiction of the Church. They were unwilling to put the bishops in a condition to suppress immorality, for fear, it may be, they might be brought under discipline, and abridged in their excesses. The plea for laying the bill aside was, that the majority of the bishops and clergy were still popishly affected; that if power were put into such men's hands, they might probably turn it against those who abetted the reformation; and to make their severity pass the better, disguise it under other pretences.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 96.

To go back a little. This year one John Champneys, of Stratford-on-the-Bow, was convented before the archbishop of Canterbury, sir Thomas Smith, Richard Cox, Hugh Latimer, doctors of divinity, and several other persons commissioned by the king, to examine and try the said Champney. He prevailed with to recant his tenets in the form following:

“I, John Champney, of Stratford, in the county of Middlesex, of my pure heart and free will, voluntarily and sincerely acknowledge, confess, and openly recognize, that in times past, I thought, believed, held, wrote, and taught, and presumptuously in my books set forth in my name these errors, heresies, and damnable opinions following:

*Champney's  
recantation.*

“First, that after a man is regenerate in Christ, he cannot sin. Item, secondly, that I have defended the first said article, granting that the outward man might sin, and the inward man could not sin. Thirdly, that the Gospel hath been so much persecuted and hated ever since the apostles' times, that no

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

man might be suffered to follow it. Fourthly, that godly love never falls away from them which be regenerate in Christ, wherefore they cannot do contrary to the commandment of Christ. Fifthly, that it was the most principal of our marked men's doctrine to make the people believe that there was no such Spirit given to man, whereby he should remain righteous always in Christ, which is a most devilish error. Sixthly, that God does permit to all his elect people their bodily necessities of all worldly things.'” That is, those who call themselves God's elect, might quarter upon their neighbour's fortune, and take any thing from him they thought they had need on.

Regist.  
Cranmer,  
fol. 71.

This recantation was sworn by Champneys, after which the archbishop of Canterbury, with the rest of the commissioners' consent, obliged him to swear to the conditions and penance following.

“ First. That the said Champneys shall not, by any means, hereafter teach or preach, nor set forth in any kind, in print or otherwise, any such books that should contain any manner of doctrine without a special license thereunto of the king's majesty, or some of his grace's privy council, first had and obtained. Secondly, that the said Champneys, with all speed convenient, and with all his diligence, shall procure as many of his books as have passed forth in his name, to be called in again and utterly destroyed, as much as in him shall lie. Thirdly, that the said Champneys, on Sunday next, shall attend upon the preacher at St. Paul's Cross all the time of the sermon, and there penitently stand before the said preacher with a faggot on his shoulder.”

“ Deinde dictus Johannes Champneys, Reginaldus Mohun de Cornubia Generosus, et Laurentius Clerke de parochia White Chapel civitat. London Barber, recognoverunt se debere domino nostro regi quingentas libras currentis monetæ Angliæ, sub conditione sequenti :” viz. if the said Champneys shall perform the said penance enjoined as is aforesaid, to be done on Sunday next in manner and form before declared, that then this recognizance to be void, &c. or else to remain, &c.

Ibid.

A. D. 1543.

On the eighteenth of December, this year, John Ashton, priest, being convented before archbishop Cranmer, abjured the following heresies :—

Regist.  
Cranmer,  
fol. 102.

“ First. That the Trinity of Persons was established (he

means first made an article of belief) by the Confession of Athanasius, declared by the Psalm (as he calls it) ‘*Quicumque vult, &c.* i. e. Whosoever will be saved, &c. And that the Holy Ghost is not God, but only a certain power of the Father. Item. That Jesus Christ that was conceived of the Virgin Mary, was a holy prophet, and beloved especially of God the Father. But that he was not the true and living God, forasmuch as he was seen, and lived, hungered, and thirsted. Item. That this only is the fruit of Jesus Christ’s passion, that as we were strangers from God, and had no knowledge of his Testament, it pleased God by Christ to bring us to the knowing of his holy power by the Testament.”

EDWARD  
VI.  
*Ashton’s  
recantation.*

After this recantation, he took an oath to stand to the orders and appointment of the Church, and to submit to whatever penance was enjoined.

This year, in September last, Robert Farrar, doctor of divinity, was consecrated bishop of St. David’s by archbishop Cranmer, assisted by Henry, bishop of Lincoln, and Nicholas, bishop of Rochester. The ceremony was not altogether performed after the old form. This Farrar, as the register informs us, was the first bishop that was consecrated upon the king’s letters-patent, without *congé d’élire* or capitular election.

Regist.  
Cranmer,  
fol. 327.

Archbishop Cranmer being informed that several learned men of the reformation were ruggedly treated in Germany, gave them an invitation into England. Amongst those who were hospitably entertained and encouraged by him, were John Alasco, a Polish nobleman; Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, Paulus Fagius, Peter Alexander, and some others.

*Cranmer  
entertains  
foreign  
divines.*

Soon after their coming over, Fagius was made Hebrew professor at Cambridge, Peter Martyr had the divinity chair at Oxford, and Bucer that at Cambridge. Bucer was a divine of eminence in his country, but being embarrassed by the Interim, he quitted Germany, and complied with archbishop Cranmer’s offer. And here a word or two of the Interim may not be amiss.

267.

Upon the translation of the council from Trent to Bolonia, the emperor Charles V. attempted the settlement of religion by his own authority. To make the motion more smooth, a proposal for this purpose was made at the diet at Augsburg. The choice of persons to manage this undertaking being referred

*A brief  
account of  
the Interim.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

to the emperor, he pitched upon Julius Flugius, Michael Sidonius, and Johannes Islebius. This committee, after long consultation, drew up a reconciling system. This accommodating scheme was several times reviewed and altered, some of the chief of the Protestant divines being called in for their approbation. It was called the Interim, because it was to continue in force till matters were more fully and finally determined by a general council. The heads treated of are these :

Father Paul,  
Hist.  
Council of  
Trent.

“ The book begins with the mention of the state of mankind before and after the fall, of redemption by Christ : from hence, it proceeds to discourse of charity and good works, of a man’s assurance his sins are forgiven him. The case of vows, the power of the pope, the other ministers of the Church, the sacraments, the sacrifice of the mass, the commemoration, invocation, and intercession of the saints, recommending the dead to the mercy of God, the turning the mass into a communion, the point of ceremonies, and the efficacy of the sacraments, were likewise handled. And here, amongst other things, it is determined that those performances which go beyond strict duty, and are commonly called works of supererogation, are particularly valuable : that a man can have no infallible assurance of the pardon of his sins ; and that the consciousness of his own imperfections ought to make him somewhat doubtful in this matter. That the Church has authority to interpret the holy Scriptures, to explain difficulties, and draw conclusions of belief from thence : to exercise jurisdiction, to make constitutions, and determine points of controversy in a synodical way : that there was one bishop appointed to preside over the rest, in virtue of the privilege granted to St. Peter : that the government of the whole Church was entrusted by Christ with this single person, but with a reservation of jurisdiction to the other bishops within their respective dioceses : that the divine assistance was conveyed by confirmation and chrism, to resist the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil : that this sacrament ought to be administered by none but the bishop : that the penitent ought to discover his conscience to the priest, as far as his memory could reach : that fasting, prayer, and alms, are serviceable applications, to disengage people from ill habits, and remove the causes of misbehaviour ; and that they either prevented temporal punishment, or lessened the degrees of it : that anointing was a ceremony practised all along from

Sleidan.  
Comment.  
ad An. 1548.

the age of the apostles: that the design of it was either to restore health, or throw new force and virtue into the mind: and that therefore, it was to be used when the patient's life seemed very much in danger: that matrimony, without consent of parents, ought to be accounted firm and valid: however, children should be publicly cautioned to take their parents' advice in this matter: that Christ instituted the sacrament of his body and blood at his last supper: first, that the faithful might receive it, as a salutary refreshment to the soul: secondly, that it might be offered to God the Father as a memorial of his death: for our Saviour offered two sacrifices; one upon the cross, where he shed his blood; the other, when under the species of bread and wine, he offered his body and blood to the Father, and afterwards commanded his apostles and their successors to continue that representation in memory of him to the world's end: that the great propitiation for the sins of mankind was made upon the cross: but that by the other unbloody oblation, the sufferings of Christ were represented to God the Father, not with an intent to gain another remission of sins, but that our faith may be raised, and the reconciliation already procured by the death of Christ, better applied to us. At this representing sacrifice there ought to be joined an honourable commemoration of the saints, that they may intercede for us, and assist us with their merit: we ought likewise to mention the dead of lower distinctions, and recommend them to the mercy of God.

“It is farther ordered by the Interim, that the old ceremonies should be retained in baptism, such as exorcising the evil spirit, the renouncing form, and chrism: and likewise, that no customary rites should be altered in the celebrating the mass: that in great towns two masses at least should be said every day in all the churches: but that in villages no more than one upon holydays should be required: that the canon of the mass should remain unaltered, and the other offices managed pursuant to the old rubrics: however, if any thing which might give a handle to superstition, had indiscernibly crept in, it was to be taken away. The sacerdotal vestments, the holy plate, crosses, altars, candles, and images, and other ornaments of the church, were to be continued, in respect to antiquity. The breviary prayers, and the customary usage of singing psalms, kept on, and revived, where taken away: the office for the dead was to be performed agreeably to ancient usages, and the saints' days kept.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

268.

1a.

That the day before Easter and Whitsuntide, the water for the font should be solemnly consecrated: that in order to govern the appetite, to give a check to luxury, and dispose the mind for the exercises of piety, abstinence from flesh, and fasting, should be practised on certain days. Lastly, though it were to be wished the clergy would live single, yet since a great many of them are married, and cannot be prevailed with to part with their wives, they were willing to wave compulsion, and wait the determination of a council: and thus, those were likewise tolerated who received the Lord's Supper under both kinds: only a caution was thrown in against censuring others of a different practice: for, as it is added; the body and blood of Christ is wholly contained under each species."

In this form the "Interim" was published, after it had been several times re-examined and touched over again; and thus Bucer had it in its most inoffensive condition. And though it did not go a just length in concessions and abatements, yet there are several material points waived, granted, and explained. There is no mention of transubstantiation; images are only retained for ornament and memory; the bishops, no less than the pope, are said to have their power from Christ for governing their churches; the clergy are allowed marriage, and the cup not denied to the laity. Neither the court of Rome nor the Protestants were perfectly pleased with this reconciling expedient; the one thought it too much, and the other too little. John, brother to Joachim, elector of Brandenburg, addressed the emperor, desired he might be excused compliance, recounted his services to his imperial majesty, and that he served him in the field upon condition of liberty of conscience. The emperor replied, the "Interim" was published by the consent and authority of the diet, and therefore there was no room for indulgence. But this answer made no impression upon that prince. His brother, the elector, was either better satisfied, or more flexible; and so was the elector palatine. The deputies of the cities of the Augustine Confession desired they might consult their principals before they gave in their answer, which was granted them. Woolfgangus Musculus, a divine, finding his conscience in no condition to subscribe the "Interim," retired to the canton of Berne. Brentius, another eminent divine at Halle in Suabia, declared an inconsistency between the "Interim" and the

Holy Scripture. He published a tract for this purpose. This was looked on as a great provocation; and therefore Granvell ordered him to be seized and brought to Augsburg. But Brentius, by the advice of his friends, withdrew, and made his escape. Andrew Osiander quitted Nurenburg, and retired into Prussia. Bucer was sent for to Augsburg, and entertained at the elector of Brandenburg's palace. This prince gave him the "Interim," and desired him to subscribe it. Bucer, after the perusal, told the elector there was too much popery in it for his conscience. This answer disgusted his electoral highness. He had a good opinion of the scheme, and thought it was drawn up with temper and moderation: for under this character it had been represented to him by Islebius. Granvell sent some gentlemen to Bucer to bring Luther<sup>1</sup> to a compliance, with a promise of considerable preferment; but, when this chancellor found his offers rejected, he began to menace; so that, in short, Bucer got home to Strasburg not without some hazard. And here, the bishop pressing conformity to the emperor's edict concerning the "Interim," Bucer and Fagius thought fit to withdraw, and come into England upon the invitations above-mentioned.

Before the parliament was prorogued, Thomas, lord Seymour, admiral of England, was attainted of high treason. There had been a misunderstanding for some time between the protector and this nobleman. This turn of humour is supposed to have arisen on a slight occasion; and that a contest about precedence between their ladies set the two brothers at so fatal a distance: and though our learned Church historian takes this report for a fiction, yet some writers of the first class affirm it matter of fact. This disaffection was heightened, and the breach made wider, by the artifice of the earl of Warwick. This nobleman thought the Seymours stopped the progress of his ambition, and therefore was willing to remove the obstacle.

*The lord  
admiral  
Seymour  
attainted of  
high treason.*

Sir John  
Haywood's  
Life of  
Edw. 6.  
Camden,  
Eliz. An.  
1587.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 54.

In September last, the queen dowager, married to the admiral, died in childbirth. It was to this queen dowager, and not to queen Jane Seymour, that the lady Elizabeth wrote the letter mentioned in the first part of bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation. It was written in July, 1548, and not in 1537, as the historian supposes. To assign it to this year, and report it for the performance of a child not four years old, is to

<sup>1</sup> Luther died Feb. 18, 1546, two years before the "Interim" was published.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

See Records,  
num. 60.

set it beyond all belief, and make it no better than romance. There are several lively turns in the letter, and yet not above the capacity of a princess sixteen years old, which was then the age of the lady Elizabeth. Besides, there is more than one expression in it which show plainly the queen, to whom the letter is addressed, was not then married to a king.

The admiral, being now at liberty, addressed the lady Elizabeth for marriage; but to no purpose. By the way, he was a person of a mounting imagination, strained above the reach of his stature, and carried his hopes much farther than a reasonable pretension. In short, he was sent to the Tower by the council, for practising against the State. I shall mention some of the principal articles drawn up against him. He is charged with "attempting to get the king into his custody, and procure the government of his person; and that he had solicited his majesty to agree to this dangerous motion; that he had pretended he could govern the king's marriage, and dispose of his highness at pleasure; that he had engaged several of the nobility in his faction, and put himself in a condition to raise ten thousand men of his friends and dependents; that he had courted the lady Elizabeth during the queen dowager's life, and after her death; that he gave countenance to pirates, and had a share in the prizes taken from English merchants; that he had discharged several of the principal pirates put into his hands, and made no restitution to the owners of ships and goods when it was in his power."

Council  
Book,  
fol. 236.  
Bp. Burnet,  
Records,  
book 1.  
num. 31.  
Journal  
Proccr.

269.

On the twenty-fifth of February the bill was read for attainting him, and passed without any struggle: all the judges, it seems, delivering their opinion that the articles were treason. This way of prosecuting the admiral, by attainder, looks as if they could not reach him by a common trial. Why else were the customary forms of justice denied, and the prisoner refused to confront the evidence, to disprove their testimony, and make the most of his defence? For this reason the bill stuck in the house of Commons, and several of the members moved the admiral might be brought to the bar, and plead for himself; but, on the 4th of March, a message was sent them from the king, that he thought it not necessary to send for the admiral, and that the lords should come to them and report the evidence they had given in the upper house. Upon this the bill passed by a great majority in the house of



Commons, and was signed the next day by the king. When the council solicited his majesty that justice might be done upon the admiral, he thanked them for their great care, and commanded them to proceed without giving him or the protector any farther trouble. The protector and the archbishop of Canterbury signed the warrant for the execution, with the rest of the council. He was beheaded on Tower-hill. He declared his innocency upon the scaffold, as to any thing of treason, either acted or intended, against the king. This looked like a strong purgation, considering the solemnity of the occasion: however, it seems bishop Latimer had no opinion of this lord's integrity; for, in a sermon preached before the king at Westminster soon after, he went some length of invective against the admiral, and affirmed, that, during this lord's being prisoner in the Tower, he wrote to the lady Mary and lady Elizabeth, to procure the bringing in a charge against the protector, and to revenge his death. But whether Latimer was rightly informed in this matter will bear a question. Cranmer's signing the execution may look like something of a singularity, considering bishops were prohibited to sit in judgment upon any person, either to the loss of life or limb. But this being only a restraint of the canon law, it is likely the archbishop did not think himself obliged by it. But having had occasion to discourse of this matter in the former part of this work, I shall refer the reader thither.

EDWARD  
VI.

Council  
Book.  
See Bp. Burnet, Collect.  
Records,  
book 1.  
num. 32.  
*He denies  
the charge at  
his death.*  
March 20.  
A. D. 1548-9.  
March 29,  
1549.

Stow's  
Annals.

Eccles. Hist.  
p. 245. 248.

Heylin draws a short parallel between the two brothers. The admiral was a man of address, well made, and brave in his person, but not without an allay of haughtiness and ambition. The duke was of a more mild and condescensive temper, more susceptible of impressions, and open in discovering his mind. The historian concludes, if their good qualities had been joined, and their defects discharged, they would both have made an admirable man.

Heylin,  
Hist. Reform. p. 72.

Soon after the execution of the admiral, the protector began the building a magnificent palace. To make room for the structure, he pulled down the houses belonging to the bishops of Worcester, Lichfield, and Landaff, together with the parish church dedicated to the blessed Virgin. The bishops, it seems, were glad to resign to the duke's pleasure, for fear of suffering deeper some other way. The place being thus cleared, the workmen informed him the churches and houses above-

Stow's  
Survey of  
London.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*Somerset-  
house built.*

Heywood's  
Life of King  
Edward 6.

mentioned would not afford sufficient materials to build up to the model. Upon this the protector resolved to furnish himself farther, by pulling down St. Margaret's Church in Westminster. And that the parish might not be unprovided with a place for divine service, he designed the body of the Abbey Church should be given them for that purpose. But this pulling down churches for palaces was a way of reforming the parishioners of St. Margaret's did not understand. And therefore, when the scaffolds came to be raised for so barbarous a purpose, they thought they might fairly defend their church against such illegal and sacrilegious attempts. And thus, by appearing in a posture of resistance, they frightened the workmen, and discouraged the enterprise.

But though the protector was balked at Westminster, he succeeded at St. Paul's. Here he took down a stately cloister, surrounding a piece of ground called Pardon Church-yard; within this inclosure there were two chapels with a charnel-house; one of these chapels was famous for a curious piece of sculpture called "the Dance of Death." But the stone, timber, lead, and iron, it seems, fell short of the plan for Somerset House. And therefore, for a farther supply, most part of the Church of St. John's of Jerusalem, near Smithfield, was blown up with gunpowder, and all the stone carried off to the Strand.

Soon after passing the Act of Uniformity, a new visitation was set on foot. The articles given in charge were to this effect:

Id. p. 73.  
Stow's  
Annal.

"First. That all parsons, vicars, and curates, in reading the king's Injunctions omit such passages as make mention of the popish mass, of chantries, and candles upon the altar.

"Secondly. That the Communion should not be celebrated with the gestures and ceremonies of the Latin service, such as the priest kissing the Lord's table, washing his fingers at every time in the Communion; blessing his eyes with the paten or sudary, crossing his head with the paten; holding up his finger, hands, or thumbs, joined towards his temples; breathing upon the bread or chalice; shewing the sacrament only before the distribution of the chalice; setting any tapers or lights upon the Lord's board, &c.

"Thirdly. That none buy or sell the Holy Communion as in trentals, &c.

“ Fourthly. That none be suffered to pray upon beads.

EDWARD  
VI.

“ Fifthly. That after the Homily every Sunday, the priest should exhort the people, especially the communicants, to remember the poor man’s box.

“ Sixthly. That the Common Prayer be read in the churches on Wednesdays and Fridays, and the people exhorted to come thither.

“ Seventhly. That the curates, every six weeks at least, teach and expound the Catechism.

“ Eighthly. That no man maintain purgatory, invocation of saints, the Six Articles, bead-rolls, images, relics, lights, holy bells, holy water, palms, sepulchres, paschal ashes, candles, creeping to the cross, hallowing the font after the popish manner.

“ Ninthly. That in no church or chapel there should be more than one communion, excepting upon Christmas and Easter-days.

“ Tenthly. That the churchwardens suffer no buying and selling, sports, and improper behaviours, in churches or churchyards, especially during the time of divine service or sermon. That the priest going to the sick with the holy eucharist shall not bring either light, or bell with him.”

The three other articles are not material.

Archbishop Cranmer had a visitation about the same time, and proceeded all along upon the king’s Injunctions.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2.  
Records,  
book 1.  
num. 33.  
*The new  
Liturgy  
mostly com-  
piled with.*

At Easter, this year, they began to officiate by the New Liturgy in some places. This was a free-will offering, and discovered inclination to the English service. For the Act did not inure till Whitsuntide ; at which time, by the order of dean May, it was solemnly made use of in St. Paul’s Cathedral. This Common Prayer-book passed the kingdom without much opposition. It was drawn up with such judgment and temper, that it was hard to find a sensible objection against it. And thus being formed upon common principles of Christianity, many of the Roman Catholics complied with it : for as to the main, it differed not much from the Latin service. However, several bishops and priests continued bigoted to their old form. It is true they officiated publicly with the English book to fence against the penalty of the law, but then they had masses in private, where their practices were not easily discovered : but in St. Paul’s Cathedral the usual masses were

kept on with more assurance. Thus Our Lady's Mass, the Apostles' Mass, &c., were celebrated in Latin by the bishop's connivance, and under the English disguise of the Apostles' Communion, and Our Lady's Communion.

The lords of the council being informed of this prevarication, directed an order to Bonner, not to suffer the mass any longer in Latin; and that the holy communion should be administered at the high altar, and in no other place of the church: and only at such times as they used to officiate at high mass: unless some number of people desire a communion in the morning. In short, they put him in mind he had been complained of not without reason, and required him to govern himself by the Rubric of the Common Prayer.

Bonner put this letter of the privy council into the hands of the dean and chapter, and referred the execution of it to them. He had no inclination for these compliances, and therefore, moved no farther than was necessary to preserve himself. Besides, it is likely he might have some prospect of relief from the present juncture: for now the commons began to grow mutinous, and fly in the face of the government. The occasion was this. Several of the nobility and gentry, being willing to make the most of their abbey-lands, had enclosed a great deal of waste ground: this, though a real improvement of the country, yet being an improvement only to the proprietors, was loudly complained of. For thus, the poor lost the benefit of pasturage, and other conveniences. When the court were informed the peasantry were ready to break out into rebellion, they dispatched commissioners into the country, to examine the grievances of the commons; they had instructions to command the proprietors to throw open their enclosures, and put things in their former condition.

These orders being not every where executed with that expedition the peasantry expected, they resolved to do themselves justice. Thus the ditches were levelled, and the fences plucked up every where in a tumultuous manner. Their numbers increasing, put them upon bolder motions; so that now they began to plunder, remonstrate against the government, and carry their disorders to the last degree of outrage. This insurrection was quickly suppressed in Kent, Oxfordshire, and Sussex; but in Norfolk and Devonshire, the success was otherwise. Here the number of the rebels was formidable, and

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

June 24.

Heylin,  
p. 74.

*An insur-  
rection of  
the commons  
in several  
parts of the  
kingdom.*

moved in the figure of a regular army. And notwithstanding the distance of the counties, they seemed to act by concert: the Devonshire and Cornish rebels were headed by Humphrey Arundel and some other gentlemen. EDWARD  
VI.

The countenance of these persons of condition emboldened the rebels to undertake the siege of Exeter, and make demands upon the government. The articles they sent to the king are these :

“ First, They insist upon having their children baptized, as well on week days as holydays. *The demands of  
the Devon-  
shire rebels.*

“ Secondly, That their children may be confirmed by the bishop.

“ Thirdly, They declare strongly for the doctrine of transubstantiation, and that after the words of consecration, spoken by the priest, ‘ there is very really the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, God and man, and that no substance of bread and wine remains after, but the very self-same body that was born of the Virgin Mary, and was given upon the cross for our redemption ;’—

“ They will therefore, as their language is, have mass celebrated as it has been formerly, without any persons communicating with the priest, because as the office is now managed, the mysteries are treated without due regard, there is no distinction made between the Lord’s body and other meat ; some affirming it is bread after consecration, and that it is beneficial to none but those who receive, with other terms of error and abuse.

“ Fourthly, They insist upon having the host reserved.

“ Fifthly, They demand the use of holy bread, and holy water, in remembrance of Christ’s precious body and blood.

“ Sixthly, That the priest may sing or say divine service, and that God’s service in the usual manner may not be set forth like a Christmas play.

“ Seventhly, That priests may live in celibaey like St. Paul, who commanded them to be followers of him.

“ Eighthly, That the Six Articles enacted in the late reign may be revived.”

These demands were couched in terms of resolution and insolence. They will, they say, have all these things. However, they conclude with a sentence of respect and submission,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

pray God save king Edward, and declare themselves his, both body and goods.

Godwin,  
Annals.  
Stow's  
Annals.  
Holinshed.  
Heylin.

To prevent the ravage of the country, and the effusion of blood, the council thought fit to treat with the rebels, and try to undeceive them. To this purpose a message was sent them in the king's name, by way of answer to their articles.

*The king's  
answer.*

As to the first article, concerning baptism, the king tells them they are "imposed on by some of the incendiaries, and that in case of necessity, the Common Prayer-book gives them the liberty of christening their children at any time of the week."

And as to what they suggest touching the holy eucharist, his highness tells them, "the court and kingdom is misrepresented in their complaint: that by the laws of Church and State, that sacrament is religiously guarded from contempt, and widely distinguished from common bread. As to their exceptions against the new Common Prayer-book, it was drawn up by bishops and other learned men, and that properly speaking, it is no new service, for abating a few particulars, which would not stand the test, the substance continues the same; and since the alteration consists mostly in language, what ground can there be for any reasonable objection? If the divine service was unexceptionable in Latin, what should hinder it from being so in English? Is ignorance a circumstance of advantage? Or, are the prayers the worse because the people understand them?"

271.

As to the mass, the king assures them "the learned clergy have taken a great deal of pains to settle that point, to strike off innovations, and bring it back to our Saviour's institution."

To the article of confirmation, the king bids them "ask their prompters one question. Whether they think an infant baptized is damned if he happens to die before he is confirmed by the bishop? Consider," says the king, "the absurdity of such an affirmation. Our doctrine therefore (continues his majesty) is founded upon sound divinity, and theirs upon scandalous mistake."

Holinshed.

The king puts them farther in mind of "the rudeness of their manner, the treason of their hostile appearance, and that the rising upon their prince makes them liable to everlasting damnation."

These articles were afterwards enlarged by the rebels to fif-

teen, and delivered to the lord Russell, who was sent down with forces against them. And here I shall only mention those which are supplemental to the former. EDWARD  
VL

“First, they demanded that all the general councils and the decrees of the Church in former ages should be observed; that the holy eucharist should only be given to the people at Easter in one kind; that all preachers in their sermons, and priests in the mass, should pray for the souls in purgatory; that the English Bible should be called in: for that, unless this was done, the clergy would have a difficult task to overbear the heretics; that Dr. Moorman and Dr. Crispin might be safely conducted to them, preferred by the king, and settled amongst them to preach the Catholic faith; that cardinal Pole, a near relation of the king’s, should not only be pardoned, but sent for home, and sworn of the privy council; that no gentleman should have more than one servant for every hundred marks per annum of his estate; that half of the abbey and chantry lands, held by what title soever, should be restored to two of the chief abbeys in every county; and that half the alms of the church box, for the next seven years, should be given to those houses, and that a society of religious should be settled there, to pray for the king and the commonwealth; and lastly, that the particular grievances of the country might be redressed, as Humphrey Arundel, and Henry Bray, mayor of Bodmin, should petition his majesty, for whom they desired a safe conduct under the broad seal.”

MSS.  
C.C.C. Miscellan. D.

These articles were by the lord Russell transmitted to the council, and archbishop Cranmer was ordered to draw an answer to them. Where Cranmer’s answer is the same in substance with the king’s, I shall pass it over. And for the rest I shall touch them very briefly.

As to general councils, the archbishop told them “they knew nothing of the matter; and that the practice and belief of the Church of England was agreeable to such decisions. As to the decrees they talked of, they were stretches of the court of Rome, to enslave the rest of Christendom;”—and of this he gave several instances. *The archbishop’s answer.*

For the Six Articles, he told them “the bill had not passed, if the late king had not overawed the members by going in person to the parliament.”

As to their demand of solitary masses, he replied, “the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

ancient canons required the people to communicate, and that the prayers in the missal supposed the holy eucharist received by some of the congregation; that the reserving the host in a pyx was but a modern usage; that the laity in the ancient Church frequently received the holy eucharist in both kinds."

And whereas the rebels had moved for the setting up images in churches, the archbishop returns, "that images were inlets to superstition, and forbidden in Scripture; that they were first used for memory, but afterwards made objects of worship.

"That purgatory has no foundation in Scripture, and implies a diminution of our Saviour's satisfaction upon the cross.

"As for confounding that which is really heresy, their having the Scriptures in the mother-tongue, was the best expedient for that purpose."

Farther, he tells them "their preachers, Moorman and Crispin, were men of design without much knowledge, and very unqualified guides in matters of conscience.

"That cardinal Pole was likely to prove a very dangerous person to this kingdom; that the archbishop had perused a book written by his eminence, in which he behaves himself grossly towards the late king, and lays out all his rhetoric to persuade the princes of Christendom to draw a crusade upon his sovereign, and invade these kingdoms: that their confining the gentry in the number of their servants was an absurd proposal; that it would be impracticable upon the trial; and that by this means many poor people would suffer for want of business.

"That their demand of the restitution of abbey-lands was, in effect, no better than downright quarrelling with the constitution, seizing the patrimony of the crown, perplexing property, and ousting the subjects of those estates conveyed to them by gift, sale, exchange, and other legal methods. And besides all this, they would make a merit of their insurrection, keep up the memory of their rebellion as a glorious undertaking, and settle a body of religious to pray for them as their benefactors."

But neither the archbishop's, nor the king's answer, gave the rebels satisfaction; though the king endeavoured to disentangle them from one great prejudice, which seems to have had a weight in their revolt. They were made to believe, that during the king's minority the state had no authority to make laws, but that the constitution was to continue on the old foot-



ing. To this the king answers, that it was his birth, not his age, which made him their prince; that the powers of government must always be of the same force and extent: that without this advantage the protection of the people, and provision for the public interest, would be impracticable. In short, the king speaks in a style of majesty, offers pardon upon submission, but threatens the utmost severity in case they continued obstinate.

EDWARD  
VI.

However, the rebels believing themselves superior to the king's forces, went on with the siege of Exeter: the townsmen, however, proved very loyal, and made a brave defence. After having held out six weeks, they were pressed very close, and had they not been seasonably relieved by the lord Russell, would have been starved to a surrender. But this nobleman, being reinforced by the lord Grey with a body of cavalry, advanced towards the rebels, attacked their camp, and obliged them to raise the siege and disperse. In this action there were four thousand of the rebels killed and taken; and thus the city of Exeter was preserved, and the commotion quieted in the county of Devon.

272.

*The siege of  
Exeter  
raised.  
August 5.*

The Norfolk peasants went on with their insurrection, doubled the number of those in the west, and made a body of twenty thousand men. They were commanded by Robert Ket, a rich tanner of Windham. At first they insisted upon nothing more than throwing open the late inclosures of common: but when they found the mutiny strongly abetted, and their numbers rise to a considerable army, they enlarged their remonstrance, and opened a new matter of complaint. They set forth "that the free-born commonalty were every where oppressed, and trampled on, by a small number of the nobility and gentry: they were harassed with perpetual drudging to support the pomp and luxury of these men: that they dragged a wretched life, and were treated little better than beasts of burthen.

Stow's  
Annals.

*The remon-  
strance of  
the Norfolk  
rebels.*

"However, the miseries of this world would not last always, and therefore ought to be borne with patience, if that was the worst of the case. But when the loss of their souls was the question, the ruin from that quarter ought to be prevented at the utmost hazard. Now here they had the unhappiness to be concerned: for the holy ceremonies of antiquity were abolished, and a new face and form of religion forced upon them. That by compliance with these innovations, they should fall under

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Godwin,  
Annals.

the terrors of the other world: and the hardships of this life would be succeeded by the insupportable punishment of the damned. As things stood, therefore, they had no remedy left them, but marching up to the court, and rescuing the king from evil counsellors—from men, who make their advantage of his minority; who, under the covert of the royal authority, plunder the Church, and ruin the kingdom: who have no other aim but wealth and dominion, and making their fortunes out of the public calamity.”

*The mar-  
quess of  
Northamp-  
ton goes  
against them  
without suc-  
cess.*

To suppress this rebellion, Parr, marquess of Northampton, was ordered to march against them, with fifteen hundred men. This nobleman entered Norwich, but was not in a condition to preserve the place; for the peasants under Ket attacked the marquess, and, after a dispute for some time, broke his forces, and made themselves masters of the town: in this action the lord Sheffield was lost. Thus the marquess was obliged to retire, and return ingloriously to London.

This rebuke given the marquess of Northampton gave a new alarm to the council, who immediately dispatched Dudley, earl of Warwick, with a more considerable body. In the mean time the rebels grew very insolent and formidable. Ket encamped his army upon Mousehold Hill, near the city of Norwich. And here, under a large oak, called the Oak of Reformation, Ket kept his courts of Chancery, King's Bench, &c. forced the neighbouring gentry to submit to his orders, and, under pretence of redressing grievances, insulted the country at a barbarous rate.

*Dr. Parker  
preaches  
loyalty to  
them.*

Dr. Parker, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, went to the rebels' camp, and endeavoured to bring them somewhat towards sobriety and recollection; and finding one Conyers officiating in the camp, he made use of the opportunity, mounted the “Reformation Oak,” and preached to the rebels.

First, he exhorted them to be frugal in the use of their provisions, and not harass the country in foraging beyond necessity.

Secondly, he dissuaded them from executing revenge, gratifying their private animosities, and treating those gentlemen with rigour who were now in their hands.

And, lastly, he wished them to consider their own interest farther, to drop their enterprise, and close with the king's pardon.

While he was enlarging upon these heads, one of the peasants cried out, the doctor was retained by the gentry; that he came to break their measures, and betray them to slavery. Upon this the rabble took fire, and began to menace the doctor with their weapons; but Conyers going on with the service, and singing "Te Deum," the rebels were diverted for the present, and forgot the unacceptable sermon. Parker seized the juncture, and got into the town.

EDWARD  
VI.

The rebels, to screen their revolt and give a better face to their distraction, issued out their orders in the king's name. To make the disguise pass more undiscovered, they seized several of the commissions directed to gentlemen of the country, pulled off the seals, and clapped them to instruments of their own. For this forgery they were lashed severely by sir John Check. This gentleman was the king's preceptor, and published a seasonable and well-written discourse while the Norfolk and Devonshire insurrections were on foot. This author tells them, "it was a flaming instance of treason, to give out precepts in the king's name without his authority; that no person has any right to execute laws, to redress grievances, to issue out orders, but only the king, and those commissioned by him. You having, therefore," says he, "no authority from the king, what plea can you have to justify yourselves? Since you have no warrant from the constitution, no legal share in the administration, you cannot pretend to be ministers, either of state or justice. To deal plainly, you represent no better sovereign, with your sham commissions, than the prince of darkness; and are officers to none but the devil, for he is the author of sedition."

Holinshed,  
p. 1031.

Check's  
Hurt of  
Sedition, &c.  
Sir John  
Check's  
discourse to  
the rebels.

Holinshed,  
p. 1045.

To proceed: the earl of Warwick, who was a person of great conduct and courage, skirmished with the rebels in the town, and forced them to retreat to their camp. His next step was to straiten their quarters, and cut off their communication with the country. Thus the rebels, being distressed for want of forage, were obliged to decamp, and venture a battle. They drew up in a place called Dussing-dale, where, for a good while, they maintained the fight with obstinacy; but, being charged with great bravery by the earl's forces, they quitted the field, after the loss of two thousand men. However, their whole army was not routed: a considerable body remained still unbroken, and barricadoed with their wagons; but, upon the

They are  
routed by  
the earl of  
Warwick.  
August 27.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
273.

earl of Warwick's riding to them and ordering the king's pardon to be read, they threw down their arms, and submitted. Thus this insurrection was happily suppressed; and only Ket, his brother, and some few of the chief incendiaries, executed.

Stow.  
Holinshed.  
Godwin,  
Annal.

About this time there was another rising in Yorkshire, to the number of about three thousand: but these dispersed upon proclaiming the king's pardon. Ombler, Dale, and some few others, who refused these terms of mercy, were taken, and executed.

August 8.

*The French  
attack the  
English.*

The French perceiving the government thus embroiled, took advantage of the juncture, attacked the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, but were beaten off with the loss of a thousand men, besides what they suffered in their ships.

But the enemy succeeded better upon the continent, and took Blacknesse and Newhaven by Boulogne: the garrisons were put to the sword, and a great train of artillery lost. Upon this captain Bark, governor of Boulogne, conveyed all the ammunition, provisions, and effects, from the basse-ville to the upper town, and blew up the fort of the former.

Stow's  
Annal.

To return to the history of the Church: Peter Martyr being made divinity professor at Oxford, as has been observed, his lectures were not well received by some persons of character in that university. He began to read upon the first epistle to the Corinthians, levelled his discourses against errors and innovations, and went on without disturbance, until he came to the eleventh chapter.

But here, expounding upon the holy eucharist, one Dr. Smith, and some of his party, were highly disgusted: cried out against him as one that deserted antiquity, threw off the customs of the Church, and profaned the holy sacrament of the altar.

*Peter  
Martyr  
disputes  
publicly at  
Oxford.*

Soon after this, they posted up papers at several church-doors, and Smith sent Martyr a challenge for a formal dispute: Martyr went on with his lectures with great resolution, and rebuked the irregular forwardness of his adversary in a speech. He told Smith, that notwithstanding he was willing to engage him upon that subject, yet a debate of this nature could not be undertaken without leave from the king. To this Smith answered, that provided the questions were given out according to custom, moderators fixed, and notaries appointed, to set down the arguments and answers on both sides, the dispute would be regular enough. Peter Martyr did not dislike the

conditions, but objected they had not time to adjust these circumstances, and therefore, refused to enter upon the controversy at present.

EDWARD  
VI.

Having debated some little time, about settling the method of the dispute, and the terms they were to make use of: at last they agreed to refer the whole matter to the privy council, who gave them leave to proceed, and promised to send down commissioners; but Smith, whether he was apprehensive the moderators and magistracy were prepossessed in favour of the reformed, or whether his courage flagged for some other reason, is more than can be known. This is certain, he refused to enter the lists, and retired first to St. Andrew's in Scotland, and afterwards to Louvain.

Thus the matter rested, until the latter end of May, this year: when at the instance of Dr. Cox, dean of Christ Church, and some other visitors of the university, Peter Martyr gave a public challenge to the Roman Catholics, to dispute upon the subject proposed by Smith. Dr. William Tresham, canon of Christ Church, undertook to oppose him. The dispute was held in the divinity schools, Cox, chancellor of Oxford, Holbech, bishop of Lincoln, Haynes, dean of Exeter, Nevenson, doctor of law, and Richard Morryson, esq., all visitors of the university, presiding at the solemnity.

Wood. Hist.  
Univers.  
Oxon. lib. 1.  
p. 267.

May 24,  
A.D. 1549.

The questions maintained by Peter Martyr, were these three:

“First. In the sacrament of the eucharist, the bread and wine are not transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ.”

*His questions.*

“Secondly. The body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally in the bread and wine, or as some express themselves, under the species of bread and wine.

“Thirdly. The body and blood of Christ are sacramentally united to the bread and wine.”

The dispute lasted three days, and was managed against Martyr by Tresham, Cheadcey, and Morgan, responding and opposing in their turns.

But on which side the victory lay is hard to determine, unless the conference be extant. The Oxford historian observes, that Tresham, Smith, Cheadcey, and Morgan, were all extraordinary men. And here he laments the mismanagement of some of the reformed divines of this university: that

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

they went the last lengths of indiscretion and scandal: that both in their sermons and at disputations, they treated the "Holy Mysteries" in a very unbecoming manner: and thus the common people were encouraged to make a jest of the most solemn part of religion. When the privy-council were informed of these disorders, they sent a reprimanding letter to the university, commanded a stricter discipline, and threatened the penalties of the law.

Id. p. 268.

*Martyr's  
letter to  
Bucer con-  
cerning his  
disputation  
at Oxford.*

About a fortnight after the disputation was over, Peter Martyr sent a friend to Bucer with a letter and copy of the conference. In the letter, Martyr takes notice of his being "apprehensive of differing somewhat from Bucer, though he hopes not much, upon this argument; since he grants the body of Christ is present with us through faith, in the holy eucharist, that we are incorporated with him by the act of receiving, and in 'Illud transmutatos,' and transmuted by it, (as he speaks) into his body.

*Fator nos  
vere perci-  
pere.*

"He confesses that we truly or really receive the body and blood of Christ in this holy sacrament, but then this is done by mental perception, or the force of faith: however, he grants, the Holy Spirit operates effectually in the sacraments, by virtue of our Saviour's institution. He mentions the condition of faith, to oppose the superstitious belief of trans- or consubstantiation. He does not doubt but that this sacrament is instrumental to a real union with Christ; neither has he any intention to throw the consecrated elements out of honour and regard. One thing," says he, "it is possible may shock you, and that is, my affirming its being inconsistent with the properties of Christ's body, though glorified, to be in many places: but if you please to consider, you will find the Scripture will not allow me to believe otherwise. The nature of human bodies is another strong reason: and the Fathers are decisive, that the quality of ubiquity or omnipresence is not to be attributed to any being, excepting God Almighty<sup>1</sup>: neither does the contrary opinion, if it were true, signify any thing as to matter of benefit. Upon the perusal of my papers, you will see I assign as much force and veneration to the sacraments as the Scriptures will give me leave."

June 15.  
A.D. 1549.

274.

<sup>1</sup> Many of those who believe in the divinity of the Spirit of Christ will not see much force in Martyr's reasoning, nor limit the ubiquity or multiformity of the body of Christ by any scholastic dogmas.—Vide Osiander, Stegmann, Maius, and Voisin.

Bucer, after some introductive expressions of friendship and respect, acquaints Peter Martyr, “that he was not altogether satisfied with the terms in which the questions were proposed: that he wished the first proposition had been couched in these words, or to the same effect, viz., ‘That the body of Christ is not locally contained in the bread and wine:’ ‘*Nec iis rebus affixum aut adjunctum est ulla hujus mundi ratione:*’ that is, the body of Christ is not joined to the sacramental elements, by any physical or corporeal union.” To Peter Martyr’s third proposition, where he affirms, “‘the body and blood of Christ sacramentally united to the bread and wine,’ Bucer wishes he had subjoined this supplemental clause, ‘united in such an intimacy, that Christ is really here exhibited to those that believe.’ But then this blessing ‘is conveyed by faith: it is not the object of sense, or transmitted by corporeal intervention.’”

EDWARD  
VI.  
*Bucer's  
answer.*

In maintaining his amendment of Peter Martyr’s second proposition, “though he denies a corporal or local presence in the holy eucharist, yet he thinks we ought to keep close to the terms of Scripture, and the manner of expression used by the ancient Church. Now in the language of the New Testament and the Fathers, the exhibiting of Christ is fully expressed. By which we are to understand the presence of our Lord, and not any mark of remembrance which supposes him absent. It is true, the bread and wine are properly called signs, with relation to something farther, and so is the whole solemnity. But then these signs or references to something past, are not the principal things in this holy sacrament: the exhibiting and spiritual manducation of Christ, is the most beneficial and glorious part of the communion: and therefore the Fathers chose rather to express the mystery, by the term of ‘representing,’ than that of ‘signifying.’”

*Fide tamen  
nullo vel  
sensu, vel  
ratione  
hujus sæculi  
intendus,  
recipiendus,  
fructus.*

He observes farther, “that all the orthodox reformed in Germany, are agreed that Christ is truly present to us by faith in this sacrament: and that this presence is not nominal and imaginary, but substantial and real; and therefore I cannot,” says he, “comprehend how it can be maintained as a Catholic tenet, ‘that Christ is not really, and substantially, given and received in the holy eucharist.’”

*Repräsen-  
tanti (quod  
idem est cum  
verbo exhibendi) quam  
significandi  
verbo.*

“For these reasons,” continues Bucer, “I would not have it affirmed that Christ is not really in the holy eucharist:

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

neither would I have the proof of the proposition maintained against our adversaries in this manner: that is, I would not have us assert, that since Christ is in heaven circumscribed, within a determinate place, therefore he is not really, or 're ipsa' in the holy eucharist: we ought rather to conclude thus from the premises, therefore he is not locally in this holy sacrament. And for this reason, that is, to avoid misconstruction and perplexing the argument, I had rather the terms really, substantially, carnally, and corporally, had been omitted."

The reason why Bucer would have had Peter Martyr more full in expressing the exhibiting or presentiating of Christ in the holy eucharist, is, "because, if the conference should be made public, he is afraid the reader might take him in an unorthodox sense, and conclude Martyr's assertion implied our Saviour wholly absent from the holy eucharist: that the benefit of communicating reached no farther than the refreshing our faith, and bringing our Saviour more strongly upon the memory; and that it serves only to give a livelier and more affecting idea of the blessing of our redemption; and that these pious thoughts are cherished and improved by the Holy Spirit. The reader, I am afraid," continues Bucer, "will interpret you to no higher meaning than this: he will not imagine you assert that, as Christ first communicated himself to his members in baptism, so he exhibits himself more and more present in the holy eucharist, and communicates himself to such a degree of intimacy and union, that they really subsist and remain in him, and receive him reciprocally into themselves. In short, I am afraid," says he, "people will think you do not hold the presence of Christ, but only the presence of the Spirit of Christ, and the efficacy consequent upon it; whereas, I am satisfied, you grant Christ exhibits himself present to the faith of the receiver."

*Amplius et  
amplius ex-  
hibeat præ-  
sentem.*

*Et ipsum  
habeant ex-  
istentem et  
manentem in  
se.*

And whereas Peter Martyr had asked Bucer's opinion about publishing the conference, he tells him, "that in case he resolved upon printing, he would advise him to show the copy to his antagonist in the first place; that if there happened to be any mistake or omissions, they might add, alter, or expunge. He advised him likewise to explain himself fuller upon the points above-mentioned, and guard against misinterpretation."

Towards the close of the letter, he acquaints Peter Martyr



“ that these disputes about the sacraments had proved very  
unfortunate in Germany: that the mismanagement of the con-  
tests of this nature had weakened the veneration for the holy  
mysteries, made people break out into animosities and parties,  
and exposed religion to contempt.”

EDWARD  
VI.

Bucer,  
Scrip. Angli-  
can. p. 545.  
et deinc.  
Bucer's  
definition of  
the holy  
eucharist.

In Bucer's definition of the holy eucharist, he speaks to  
the same sense delivered in his letter. He defines the eucharist  
“ a holy ceremony, instituted by our Saviour: that he honours  
the receivers with his presence at the celebration: that he  
excites their devotion and charity, and puts them in a disposi-  
tion to offer their thanks more acceptably to God the Father.  
And upon the pronouncing the words of the institution by his  
minister, he gives his body and blood, to nourish those to  
eternal life who sincerely desire it, and that this blessing is  
conveyed through the symbols of bread and wine.” The rest of  
his definition is not material to the present purpose. ld. p. 551.

Thus we see Bucer is somewhat intricate and involved upon  
this subject: whether he had not the faculty of writing clearly  
or avoided perspicuity on purpose, I shall not determine.

Calvin's, Farrel's, and Viretus's confession of faith upon this  
article, to which Bucer, Wolfgangus Capito, and some others  
of their persuasion subscribed, is more intelligible: and since  
it is couched in terms of magnificence and highest regard, I  
shall translate it for the reader. It begins thus:—

275.

“ We confess that the spiritual life vouchsafed us by Christ  
in this sacrament, does not only consist in his quickening us  
by his Spirit; but over and above this blessing, by virtue of his  
Spirit, he makes us partakers of that principle of life, his flesh:  
by which participation we are nourished to immortal life.  
Therefore, when we mention the communion of the faithful  
with Christ, we understand their communicating with his body  
and blood, no less than with his Spirit; that thus they may be  
in possession of their whole Saviour. For the Scripture  
plainly declares, that ‘ his flesh is meat to us indeed, and his  
blood is drink indeed:’ and if we expect a life by Christ, we  
ought to grow and support ourselves by such nourishment.  
Thus the apostle had no common meaning, when he tells us,  
‘ We are flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of his bone:’ no; by  
this language he insinuates our communion or communication  
with his body: a mystery so sublime, that no words are able  
to reach the dignity of the thing. Neither does our Saviour's

Calvin's  
confession of  
faith with  
reference to  
the holy  
eucharist,  
subscribed  
by Bucer  
and others.  
Carnis sue  
vivificæ.

Ut ita totum  
Christum  
possideant.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

ascension, nor the absence of the local presence of his body, infer any inconsistency with this privilege. For notwithstanding in this state of mortality we live at a distance, and are not in the same place with him, yet the force of his Spirit is not confined by any corporeal interpositions, nor hindered from uniting things, though at the remotest intervals of space: we acknowledge, therefore, his Spirit is the principle of union, and the band as it were of communication with himself: but then we desire to be understood in this sense, that this Holy Spirit does really feed us with the substance of our Lord's flesh and blood, and quickens us with the participation of them for the glorious purposes of immortality. And that Christ offers and exhibits this communion of his flesh and blood, under the symbols of bread and wine, to those who celebrate the holy eucharist pursuant to his institution."

Calvin,  
Epist. p. 396.

I have been the longer upon this argument to show the reader in what terms of mystery and reverence Bucer and Calvin discourse upon the holy eucharist. Thus the Fathers of the primitive Church expressed themselves with the utmost veneration and solemnity upon this subject. For instance, Justin Martyr tells the emperor Antoninus Pius, "that the Christians did not receive the consecrated elements as common bread and wine, but as Jesus Christ was made flesh by the *Logos* of God, and real flesh and blood for our salvation, so we are taught that this food which the same *Logos* blessed by prayer and thanksgiving, is turned into the nourishment and substance of our flesh and blood, and is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus." But notwithstanding the strength of expression in this last clause, it is plain this Father had no meaning of transubstantiation: for in the beginning of this passage he affirms, "our bodies are nourished by this food, and that the bread and wine are turned into the substance of our bodies." Now this cannot, with any consistency of truth or regard, be affirmed of our Saviour's glorified body.

Justin  
Martyr,  
Apoll. 2.

Irenæus was of opinion, that by receiving the holy eucharist our bodies had a principle of immortality conveyed to them, and that by virtue of this sacrament, they would be raised to glory at the last day. St. Chrysostom, to mention no more, speaks of the holy eucharist in language of the highest reverence and admiration; calls it a tremendous sacrifice, and carries the idea to the last degree of solemnity: and though I

De Sacerdot.  
lib. 6.

think I have made it sufficiently appear that neither this Father EDWARD VI. nor any of the rest believed transubstantiation, yet, on the other side, it is evident the ancients thought this sacrament the most august mystery in the Christian worship, that a peculiar divine virtue was annexed to the consecrated elements, and that they were to be received with a distinguishing veneration.

Peter Martyr, notwithstanding Bucer's caution, gave out several copies of his disputation at Oxford: upon this, his adversary, Tresham, sends a transcript to court with a dedication to the privy council. In this address he acquaints the council that Peter Martyr had published the conference, but whether he means it was printed is uncertain, for now it is only to be seen in Fox's manuscripts.

In this dedication, Tresham complains of Peter Martyr for misreporting the case; charges him with wresting the Scripture, with haling the fathers into his cause against their sentiment, with precarious principles, and lying exposed to have his own arguments turned upon him. He pretends he has put a fair copy into their hands; that it was taken verbatim from the clerks who were ordered to write, and that there was nothing in it but what was contained in Peter Martyr's copy.

By the way, if Peter Martyr's copy agreed with Tresham's, I cannot imagine why Tresham should charge the other with misreporting the matter.

Tresham confesses he hath added some supplemental passages, which slipped his memory in the disputation, and hopes it is defensible enough to make use of recollection, and fortify the argument.

In the close, he lays the papers before the lords of the council with all imaginable respect, and desires it may be printed with the king's privilege.

In June, this year, a disputation was held at Cambridge upon the same subject. It was managed before the king's commissioners, Ridley, bishop of Rochester; Gooderick, bishop of Ely; Dr. May, dean of St. Paul's; Dr. Wendy, the king's physician; and Mr. Cheek, his preceptor.

The first question was, that transubstantiation cannot be proved by Scripture, neither is this doctrine supported by the authority of the Fathers for the first thousand years.

Strype's  
Append. to  
Memorials  
of Cranmer,  
p. 122.

Foxii MSS.  
Biblioth.  
R. Harley  
Armig.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Secondly. That in the Lord's Supper there is no oblation or sacrifice, excepting by way of remembrance of Christ's death.

276.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 107.  
Fox, vol. 2.

The questions were publicly argued three days. The first day they were defended by Dr. Madew; Glyn, Langdale, Segwick, and Young being opponents. The second day Dr. Glyn defended the other side of the questions, and was opposed by Perne, Grindal, Guest, and Pilkington. The third day Dr. Perne was respondent; Parker, Pollard, Vavasor, and Young arguing against him: and, to conclude, the determination was made by the bishop of Rochester. The disputation may be seen at length in Fox.

K. Edward's  
Journal, p.6.

It is no wonder to find the doctrine of the holy eucharist thus solemnly argued in both universities, since, as the king observes, this question had been warmly debated in the parliament-house at the beginning of the last session.

To proceed: Bonner, notwithstanding the flexibility of his humour, was not compliant with the Liturgy to a full satisfaction. It seems he had either not dispersed copies of the new Common Prayer, or not pressed the use of them in his diocese, as might be reasonably expected: the council, therefore, thought it advisable the king should write to quicken him in his duty.

*The king's  
letter to  
Bonner.  
July 23,  
A. D. 1549.*

The letter sets forth that this Common Prayer-book was not only agreed to by the unanimous consent of both houses of parliament, but that it was settled by the like assent of the bishops in the same parliament, and of all other learned men of this realm, in their synods and convocations provincial. After some sentences of high commendation on this book, the bishop is commanded to advertise his chancellor and archdeacons of their neglect, and to press frequent communion and conformity to the service.

Bonner.  
Regist.  
fol. 219.

Bonner, finding the king's command precise and peremptory, and perceiving himself taxed with remissness, made no scruple to execute the order.

In short, we do not find any complaints of non-compliance with the service established, excepting in the lady Mary's family. This princess still continued the use of the mass, and to justify her conduct, sent her reasons in a letter to the privy council. By her letter, it appears the council had written to her, and complained of her non-conformity to the constitution.

In defence of her practice, she tells them, “ she was guilty of the breach of no law, excepting one of their own making, meaning the Act of Uniformity : and this she believes in her conscience does not deserve the name of a law. She puts them in mind that as the late king’s executors, they were all sworn to fulfil his will and maintain his laws. That the constitution, as her father left it, should be the rule of her obedience till the king, her brother, was of age : and, besides all this, she could by no means satisfy her conscience in the late alterations in religion.”

EDWARD  
VI.  
*The lady  
Mary writes  
to the council  
for liberty  
of conscience.*  
June 22,  
A. D. 1549.

In answer to this, the council ordered her chaplain, Dr. Hopkins, to acquaint her with the insufficiency of her objections. For instance, he was to represent to her “ that the act concerning religion was previously debated and agreed to by the whole clergy. That it is a great fault in any subject to remonstrate against the king’s laws, and renounce the authority of the legislature. That this fault is heightened in her grace, upon the score of her birth and near relation to the king : that disobedience to the king her brother’s government, implies particular unkindness, disregard to the crown, and overlooking her own interest ; for her grace stands next in the legal settlement. And that her example of incomppliance would be remarkably dangerous at this juncture.

*Their  
answer.*

“ As to her grace’s reminding them, they were sworn to observe the late king’s laws, they grant the suggestion, but reply withal, that when a law is repealed by the same authority it was enacted, it loses its force and denomination. And for her grace to affirm that no law can be discharged during the king her brother’s minority, throws a blemish upon his majesty’s authority, supposes the government maimed and disabled, and opens the way to great disorder and inconvenience :

“ And therefore, her grace’s insisting upon suspending her obedience till the king comes of age, is by no means to be allowed. For the king, as to the functions of government, is always a major. He is king by the ordinance of God : his title is founded upon royal descent, upon proximity of blood, and computation of years comes not within the question. They reinforce their reasoning from Scripture precedents, and observe to her grace, that young children have been recognised kings by God’s appointment : that he has blessed their reigns

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

June 1549.

with extraordinary success, and that they have been remarkable for reforming religion during their minority."

Her resolution of not hearing the points of religion argued any farther, was disliked by the council: they told her "there is more will than reason in pitching upon such measures. That it is not safe for her grace to trust her own opinion in matters of such consequence. That the grounds of religion ought to be brought to the test, and thoroughly examined: that if her opinion is sound and orthodox, it will be no harm to find it proof against argument and opposition. If there are any flaws in it, the discovery will be of service. The bare debating of the subject, therefore, can make no change in her faith, unless she finds herself convinced by an overbalance of argument." And to make the proposal more acceptable, they "desire her grace would nominate the persons for managing the dispute, promising her withal, that they should never desire her grace to move a step farther, than good authority and dint of reason shall carry her."

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 700.

This princess, being apprehensive of compulsion in matters of conscience, sent a gentleman to the emperor to interpose for her.

*The emperor  
appears in  
her behalf.*

There was a complaint at this time at the emperor's court against the English ambassador sir Philip Hobby for using the new Common Prayer-book. The ambassador answered, he was obliged to govern himself by the laws of his own country: that the emperor's ambassador had mass at his chapel in London: that notwithstanding this service was contrary to the laws of England, there was no disturbance given foreign ambassadors upon this score: and that he had reason to expect the same liberty allowed by his master to those of a public character.

277.

As to the lady Mary, the emperor undertook her interest. To prevent a rupture therefore, Hobby, and Paget, another English ambassador, promised in the king's name that she should be dispensed with for some time. This qualification they afterwards declared upon their honour was thrown in. But the emperor and his ministers averred the promise was absolute, without any abatement with respect to time. The emperor sent the protector and council the proposal of a marriage between the lady Mary and Alphonso, brother to the king of Portugal. The council entertained the motion, and though

the late king had left his daughters but ten thousand pounds a-piece, they offered to raise her fortune to a hundred thousand crowns in money, besides five thousand pounds in jewels. This Portuguese prince was about her own age, and offered twenty thousand crowns per annum jointure; but this overture came to nothing.

EDWARD  
VI.

This summer a proclamation was published against acting of plays. It sets forth, that the arguments of these entertainments of the stage went upon seditious subjects, arraigned the government, and exposed the constitution to contempt; that a great many tumults and disorders had been occasioned by this liberty; that therefore, from the ninth day of the present August till the feast of All Saints next coming, no person was to act any stage performance in English in any part of the realm. The penalty was imprisonment, and farther punishment at the king's pleasure.

Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Galba. B.12.  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 103.  
August 6.  
*A proclamation  
against  
plays.*

It seems some indiscreet people, of both religions, had applied to the assistance of the stage, and played their farces against each other. This was a foolish and profane expedient, and tended only to disserve Christianity in general, and make it the sport of libertines and atheists.

Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 7.

About this time, Bonner, bishop of London, received farther orders from the king. The letter sets forth the bishop's negligence and misbehaviour in his pastoral office; that many people of London, and other places of that diocese, absented themselves from the public prayers and communion; that the censures of the Church were not exerted upon fornication and adultery. After this prefatory reprimand, the bishop was obliged to observe the following injunctions:—

First, to preach a sermon at Paul's-cross upon the next Sunday after three weeks from the date of this letter, and once every quarter, and to be present at every sermon at Paul's-cross, unless prevented by sickness, or other reasonable excuse.

*Injunctions  
sent by the  
king to  
Bonner.*

Secondly, upon every day, which was heretofore accounted a principal feast, or "majus duplex," and at all such times as the bishops of London used to celebrate and sing high mass, he was to administer the holy communion at St. Paul's, for the better example of others, unless disabled by sickness.

August 7.

Thirdly, he was bound to cite all such persons before him as do not frequent the common prayer, or receive the sacrament, at least once a-year. He was likewise to cite such persons as

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

frequent places where other rites or services are used different from the established Liturgy. Such offences and noncompliance were to be punished by ecclesiastical censures. He was likewise to be particularly careful in punishing adultery and fornication, pursuant to the laws of the Church.

And, lastly, he was to take care that those who refuse to pay their tithes to the London clergy might be compelled to justice.

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 220.

Farther, for his first sermon at St. Paul's the matter was prescribed him by the king, in the words following, viz.—

*The matter  
of the sermon  
prescribed  
this bishop.*

“ That all such as rebel against their prince get unto them damnation: and those that resist the high power resist the ordinance of God; and he that dies, therefore, in rebellion, by the words of God is utterly damned, and so loses both body and soul. And, therefore, those rebels in Devonshire and Cornwall, in Norfolk, or elsewhere, who take upon them to assemble a power and force against their prince, against the laws and statutes of the realm, and go about to subvert the state and order of the commonwealth, not only do deserve death as traitors and rebels, but do accumulate to themselves eternal damnation, ever to be in the burning fire of hell, with Lucifer, the father and first author of pride, disobedience, and rebellion. What masses or holy water soever they pretend to, or what pretence soever they have, they are in the same guilt with Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, who, for rebelling against Moses, were swallowed down alive into hell, although they pretended to sacrifice unto God. And thus Saul was rejected for saving the fat sheep, and Agag, for sacrifice: for, as the Scripture saith, ‘obedience is better than sacrifice.’ In disobedience, pride, disorder, and rebellion, nothing can please God.

*The Devon-  
shire and  
Norfolk  
rebellions  
not sup-  
pressed  
when this  
order was  
sent.*

“ Likewise, in the order of the Church and external rites and ceremonies of divine service, for so much as God requires humility of heart, innocency of living, knowing of him, charity and love to our neighbour, and obedience to his Word, and to his ministers and superior powers,—these we must bring to all our prayers, to all our service; and this is the sacrifice that God requires, and these be those that make all things pleasant to God. The external rites and ceremonies be but exercises of our religion, and appointable by superior powers; in choosing whereof we must obey the magistrates: the which things we do also see ever have been and shall be—in diverse times and

Id. fol. 221.



places—and yet all hath pleased God, so long as these before-spoken inward things be there. If any man shall use the old rites, and thereby disobey the superior power, the devotion of his ceremony is made nought by his disobedience; so that which else, so long as the same did so stand, might be good, by pride and disobedience is now made nought: as in the case of Saul, Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, and Aaron's two children. But who that joineth to devotion obedience, he wins the garland: for else it is a zeal, 'sed non secundum scientiam,'—a will, desire, zeal, and devotion, but not after wisdom: that is, a foolish devotion, &c.

EDWARD  
VI.

“Further, ye shall for example, on Sunday come seven-night, celebrate the communion at Paul's-church. Ye shall also set forth, in the sermon, that our authority of our royal power is (as of truth it is) of no less authority and force in this our young age, than is or was of any of our predecessors, though the same were much elder, as may appear by example of Josias, and other younger kings, in Scripture; and, therefore, all our subjects be no less bound to the obedience of our precepts, laws, and statutes, than if we were of thirty or forty years of age.”

278.

Before I proceed farther to Bonner's business, I shall add something concerning the king's commissioners at Cambridge. Ridley was appointed one of the visitors, as hath been observed, and ordered to open the visitation with a sermon. Upon this, he wrote to May, dean of St. Paul's, to inform him of what was to be done. He received answer, the visitors were only to discharge some superstitious practices and rites, and to make such statutes as should be found needful. But when he came to Cambridge, he perceived the instructions went farther. The commissioners were ordered to procure a resignation of some colleges, and to convert some divinity fellowships to the study of the civil law; particularly, Clare-hall was to be suppressed. But the master and fellows, though strongly solicited, would not be prevailed with to resign. Upon this, Ridley declared he could not proceed farther with a good conscience. “The Church,” to use the words of our learned historian, “was already so robbed and stripped, that it seemed there was a design laid down by some to drive all civility, learning, and religion out of the nation; therefore, the bishop declared he would not concur in such things, and desired leave to be gone.”

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 120.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*Ridley  
blamed by  
the protector  
for his in-  
compliance  
at Cam-  
bridge.  
June 1,  
A. D. 1549.  
He justifies  
his conduct.*

The other visitors sent a complaint against him to the protector, charged him with throwing in unnecessary scruples, and barking, as they call it, against their proceeding. He wrote a letter of excuse to the protector; acquainting him "he was extremely desirous to stand fair in his grace's opinion, but that his conscience forbade him farther lengths of compliance; and that notwithstanding no person was more inclined to satisfy the commands of his prince, yet in some cases he was bound to make a stand, and deliver unacceptable truths. That a Christian ought not decline his duty for the fear or favour of any mortal man; for our Saviour has forewarned us 'not to fear those who can kill the body.' And elsewhere the apostle tells us 'it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.'"

The protector returned the bishop an answer, blaming him for going too far in his scruples, and disagreeing with the rest of the visitors; tells him the king's business would be checked by his incompliance. However, at last he is contented to leave him to the direction of his conscience.

Id. Records,  
book 1.  
num. 59, 60.

To return to Bonner, who, pursuant to the king's orders, preached upon the first of September at St. Paul's-cross. He insisted upon the heads prescribed him, but did not dilate upon some things, it seems, to the satisfaction of the audience. He is said to have spent most part of his sermon about the manner of our Saviour's being present in the holy eucharist, and plainly asserted the doctrine of the Church of Rome. When William Latimer, bachelor of divinity, and John Hooper, afterwards bishop of Gloucester, preferred an information against him, they deposed themselves present at the sermon, and that the bishop had failed in his performance, and not answered his majesty's injunctions; that he wholly omitted the article of the king's minority, and managed the rest of his discourse in such a manner as was most likely to create jealousies, and make people disaffected to the government.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 673.  
et deinceps.  
*Bonner  
cited before  
the com-  
missioners.*

Upon this a commission was issued out to archbishop Cranmer, Ridley, bishop of Rochester, sir William Petre, and sir Thomas Smith, secretaries of State, and to Dr. May, dean of St. Paul's, to examine the matter. The commissioners were empowered to suspend, excommunicate, or deprive bishop Bonner, or use any other censure ecclesiastical. Any three of them were likewise authorized to pronounce sentence; from

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 222.

whence it follows, that in case of diversity of opinions, Petre, EDWARD VI. Smith, and May, doctor of civil law, might have overruled } archbishop Cranmer and Ridley.

On the tenth of September, Bonner was summoned to appear before the commissioners at Lambeth. When he came into the room where they sat, he behaved himself as if he had not seen them; and being put in mind to pay his respects, he smiled on the archbishop, and protested he did not see him. Fox, p. 675. Cranmer let him know they sat by the king's authority, to call him to an account for his sermon. Bonner being willing, it may be, to have it thought he was questioned about matters of faith, waived a direct answer, began to discourse about the mass, and wished it more revered. He told the archbishop he had written very well upon this sacrament, and was surprised to find his practice not answerable.

When the witnesses were called, he is said to have treated them with contempt and odd language. "One of them," he said, "talked like a goose, and the other like a woodcock, and that there was no truth in their evidence." Thus Fox reports the matter, and charges him with swearing frequently in the course of the trial. If this is true, he misbehaved himself extremely, forfeited his gravity, and talked out of character. But upon inspecting the register, I find no mention of this intemperate carriage, excepting his swearing once in answer to sir Thomas Smith.

The archbishop proceeded to open the charge, and had the bill of complaint read in court. Bonner came prepared with a protestation, in which he sets forth, that since he had not received a copy of the commission, he reserved himself the liberty of excepting, either to his judges, or to any other branch of the commission, as occasion should require. He called the instrument a pretended commission, which being objected as a failure of regard, he excused this freedom, by alleging these were terms of law, and customary methods of defence, which he was obliged to make use of.

After this, he desired to see the bill of complaint: which being put into his hands and perused, he told the commissioners the charge was couched in such general terms, that it was impracticable to disengage himself by a particular answer. The archbishop replied, the main article was his omission in setting forth the king's authority during his nonage. And for the Id.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

proof of this, Hooper and Latimer were produced as witnesses.

279.

Bonner, to disable their testimony, objected heresy, and disaffection to his person against them. He said the motive to their information, was not any failure of his, with respect to the government: their quarrel against him was difference in belief: his asserting the true presence of our Saviour's body and blood in the sacrament of the altar, was that which provoked them to spleen and calumny: and that Hooper had denied this doctrine the day that Bonner preached, and misreported his discourse.

The archbishop perceiving Bonner insist so much upon the true presence in the holy eucharist, asked him what presence he meant: and whether he thought Christ was in the sacrament with face, nose, mouth, eyes, and other lineaments of his body? Upon which Bonner, shaking his head, replied, he was extremely sorry to hear his grace deliver himself in that manner, and urged him to declare his belief precisely. The archbishop let him know this was not a time to dispute that point: that their business now was to execute the king's commission.

Upon Friday, the thirteenth of September, secretary Smith sat with the rest, which he had not done before, although his name was in the commission. Upon this Bonner protested, that, according to law (meaning, I suppose, the canon law), secretary Smith, by not acting at first, had disabled himself from the function of a commissioner. The archbishop owned himself no lawyer, but thought the objection an unreasonable bar. Secretary Petres and Smith told him, the constant practice of the kingdom had been otherwise: that all those, whose names were in any commission, might sit and make part of the court, though they had not been present at the first opening.

His protestation being thus set aside, he read his answer to the articles. First, as to those who informed against him, he charged them with heresy, in reference to the holy eucharist: that lying under this character of infamy, they stood excommunicated by the Church, and, by consequence, ought not to be admitted as informers against their bishop.

Id. p. 673.

*He defends himself against the main article of the charge.*

From hence he proceeded to the injunctions sent him, and denied their being signed, either with the king's hand, or signet, or any of the council; and then coming to the main article, he alleged he had fully set forth the king's authority

in his sermon, and preached against the rebels in Devonshire and Norfolk, to the full meaning and extent of the king's letter: particularly, that he was so far from abetting the insurrection, or giving countenance to any malcontents, that he declared in the pulpit, that all those who rebel against their prince resisted the ordinance of God, and brought damnation upon themselves. That the rebels in Devonshire and Norfolk, being bound to obey their prince, lay under this imputation; and that no pretence whatsoever could justify their taking arms against their sovereign. From hence he inferred, that since he spoke so fully against the insurrections above mentioned, and pressed obedience to the king, it must follow, of course, that he plainly maintained the king's authority during his nonage, for all the nation knew the king was a minor when he preached the sermon: and therefore he hoped no little slips of memory, or failing in punctuality of expression, would be construed to his disadvantage.

EDWARD  
VI.

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 221.

Fox, p. 681.

The court replied, his exceptions against the informers were insufficient, unless their evidence could be disproved. He was told, the injunctions were read to him in council, by one of the secretaries, and given him by the protector himself: that afterwards they were called for, and the article concerning the king's power of governing in his minority being added, they were put into his hands again by secretary Smith, and that he promised to preach pursuant to these instructions. They let him know his maintaining the king's authority by inference and implication, did not come up to explicit assertion and the orders he received; and that it was a slender defence to pretend his want of memory.

After three days' adjourning the court met again, and then Latimer and Hooper desired to purge themselves of the imputation of heresy. They affirmed they had never advanced any thing concerning the blessed sacrament, but what was agreeable to the Scriptures and the true catholic faith: that they offered to be tried upon this article by the archbishop of Canterbury, or by any other learned men the king or the commissioners should appoint. And whereas they had been charged by Bonner with meeting on the first day of September, and concerting false evidence against him, Latimer declared, that he had never spoken with Hooper, either before the first of September, that day, nor till some time after.

*The witnesses purge themselves from the charge of confederacy.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Bonner being called on to justify himself more fully, with reference to the king's power during his minority, answered, that for the satisfaction of the council, and the better discharging his duty, he had prepared notes upon this head; that he had collected several instances from Scripture, and other histories, to prove that the minority of kings was no diminution of the royal character; and that they were to be no less honoured and obeyed, than at any other time of their age. To this purpose he had observed, from our English chronicles, that Henry III., Edward III., Richard II., Henry VI., and Edward V., were none of them of age, and most of them deep in their minority at their accession to the throne: and yet they were all obeyed as complete sovereigns, and the allegiance due to them never so much as questioned. He mentioned likewise several instances in the Old Testament: that Uzziah and Ahaz were but sixteen, Manasses but twelve, Joash and Josiah but eight years old, when they began to reign; to which he added, that the late king was no more than eighteen when he succeeded to his father: that he intended to preach out all these notes, but that his memory failed him; that this accident happened partly by his disuse of the pulpit, and partly by a long bill sent him by the council to give notice of the defeat of the rebels; that, by the length of this paper, his memory was broken; and, besides, his book where his notes were laid fell out of his hand in his sermon: upon these accounts he was disabled from delivering himself so fully, and with that advantage, as he intended. However, he did not omit the citing several texts of Scripture, to put the people in mind of their obedience to governors, with particular application to his majesty's case.

*Bonner's  
further  
defence  
with respect  
to the king's  
authority in  
his non-age.*

As to the other injunctions, he answered he had done his part, and given orders to his archdeacon to see them executed; that he knew of no masses, or Latin service, within his diocese, excepting in the lady Mary's family, or the chapels of ambassadors. The commissioners required him to answer more directly to the point of the king's authority: that, hitherto, they thought his defence short; that, without farther satisfaction, they must pronounce him guilty; but, in case he denied the fact, they would go on farther to examine the witnesses. The bishop giving no farther answer, the witnesses were called; and here, sir John Check and four more had their

oaths given them. Bonner desired time to prepare his interrogatories; which was granted him. He drew a paper of twenty questions, consisting of several parts, and couched artificially enough. To give a proof in one of them: the third interrogatory, then, was this: "Whether they, or any of them, were present at his sermon? Where they stood, and near whom? When they came to it, and at what part of his sermon? How long they tarried, and at what part they were offended? What were the form and words or substance of it? Who heard it in their company? Where the other witnesses stood? How long they tarried, or when they went away?"

Id. p. 686.

Upon Wednesday, September the 18th, Bonner appeared the fourth time before the delegates: and here, because some objections were made against the extent of their authority, the king sent them a declaration in writing, to try the cause, and give final judgment; and proceed, either by way of denunciation, *ex officio*, or according to their discretion, as the matter should require. And, by virtue of this instrument, they are empowered to waive all superfluous delays, and dispensed with in case there should be any omission in the formalities of the law.

Id. p. 688.

Bishop Bonner produced an instrument, to prove himself not obliged to make any farther answer to the charge brought against him: and here, according to his customary language, he called the process and commissioners "unjust and pretensed." He insisted, principally, that the article concerning the king's authority in his nonage was not in the paper given him by the protector; but that secretary Smith inserted it after the protector and the rest of the council were gone.

*His farther  
exceptions.*

He objected, likewise, that the delegates' proceedings were altogether irregular, and contrary to the methods of law; that sometimes they proceeded "ad denunciandum," sometimes "ex officio mero," and sometimes "ex officio mixto;" that this confusion and uncertainty were altogether unprecedented, and contrary to the king's ecclesiastical laws, and more than their commission would justify.

The commissioners, to entangle him farther, and drive him from his defence, gave him new articles, though much of the tenor with the former, and made him swear to give a true answer. The bishop, promising his customary protestation, desired a copy of the new charge, with reasonable time to put

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

in his answer. This being granted, he exhibited an information against William Latimer, priest of St. Lawrence Poultney.

*He exhibits  
an informa-  
tion against  
his informer,  
Latimer.*

This information sets forth, that Latimer, who informed against Bonner, had heard people speak irreverently and seditiously of the king's majesty, in words to this effect: "That the present king of England was but a babe, and fitter for a toast and butter and a mess of milk, than to make laws; and that they were not bound to obey his authority till he was a major; that the said William Latimer declared, at the last session of the commissioners, the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rochester, sir Thomas Smith, and Dr. May, being present, that he had heard such words derogatory to the king's authority spoken, and that the said commissioners did not command the said William Latimer to prosecute the said persons that had spoken the said words; and that the said Latimer has concealed the words aforesaid, and not discovered them to any person, as in bounden duty he ought."

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 224.

This information not only affected Latimer's evidence against Bonner, but came up to an innuendo of connivance and partiality in the commissioners.

Fox, p. 689.

*A farther  
declaration  
of his  
loyalty.*

Fox calls it a "vain cavillation:" neither does he report any answer given it. But, by this expression, he discovers himself either defective in judgment, or a party historian.

On the twentieth, Bonner appeared again, and spoke home to the main article, declaring, as he had formerly done, that the king's authority during his nonage was perfect and complete; that his subjects were bound to obey his laws no less than if they were made after his coming of age. And here he expressly condemns the contrary opinion as a rebellious position.

*He receives  
harsh lan-  
guage from  
sir Thomas  
Smith.*

Secretary Smith was particularly lively against the bishop, charged him with dilatory and evasive answers, fencing with the formalities of law, and treating the court with indefensible freedoms. For this reprimanding and unusual manner, and some coarse language given the bishop, he entered a recusation of Smith's judgment, and challenged him off the bench. In this instrument, amongst other allegations, he sets forth, "that Smith said the bishop acted like thieves, murderers, and traitors; and that, unless he would answer by word of mouth, he should smart, and do worse; and that this secretary would send him to the Tower, to keep company with the rebels



Arundel and Ket, with other rough and menacing expressions, quite foreign to the character of a commissioner.”

EDWARD  
VI.

After this protestation was read, secretary Smith told the bishop he should proceed in his commission, notwithstanding his exceptions. And here he owns his saying, that Bonner acted like “thieves, murderers, and traitors;” and justifies the language.

At this the bishop kindled; and, it may be, temper was no ordinary virtue upon this occasion. However, he exceeded in his resentment; told Smith, as he was the king’s commissioner, and secretary of State, he honoured him; but, as he was only sir Thomas Smith, and outraged him with so much calumny and gross language, he told him “he lied,” defied him, and bid him do what he could. “Quod facias, fac citius.”

And makes  
a warm  
return.  
Id. p. 691.

For this freedom he was reprimanded by the archbishop and the rest of the court. They told him, that, for these intemperate sallies, he deserved to be sent to prison.

Upon this the bishop, thinking himself not well used, replied, that, *de facto*, they might send him whither they pleased, and he would obey them, unless they meant to send him to the devil, for thither he would not go at their command. “I have a right in three things,” says he: “a few effects; a poor carcase; and my soul. The two first you may make prize of, though unjustly; but I will keep the last out of your power.”

Upon this he was ordered to withdraw; and, being called again into the court, he put in an appeal from the commissioners to the king. When they required him to make a farther answer to some of the articles, he replied he was not bound in law to give any farther satisfaction, unless the charge had been drawn in terms more particular and certain. This answer, together with the liberties of his behaviour, were construed a contempt of the court, for which he was committed to the Marshalsea. At his going off, he told Cranmer he was sorry his grace should use him in this manner; but that which troubled him most, was Cranmer’s suffering the heretics to take their range, and poison the king’s subjects in London and elsewhere. And thus he went off with an air of warmth and discomposure.

281.

On the three-and-twentieth instant being brought again before the commissioners, he sticks to his former appeal, declines the jurisdiction of the court, and declares that he not

He appeals  
to the king.  
Sept. 16.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

only appeals from them, but that he intends to bring in a charge against them, as by the king's ecclesiastical laws, and the present matter of fact, he lawfully may. At this session, a letter from Bonner to the lord mayor and aldermen was read in court: the purport of it was to complain, "that some preachers were suffered in the city to rail (as he words it) against the sacrament of the altar, and to deny the real presence of Christ's body and blood. That these preachers told their audience, that faith must not be forced, and that they might believe what they pleased. The bishop requests and requires the mayor and aldermen not to connive at these heterodoxies, nor suffer the people to be any longer misled."

Id. p. 695.

Secretary Smith asked the bishop whether this was his letter. Bonner replied, he was resolved to abide by his appeal. Upon this he was remanded to prison, and ordered to appear on Friday next to receive the judgment of the court, for they acquainted him they should proceed to final sentence, notwithstanding his appeal, unless he could procure a supersedeas. And here, the bishop of Rochester quoted a text out of St. John against Bonner, "he that does evil, hates the light."

Regist.  
Bonner,  
fol. 241.

As it happened the commissioners did not sit till Tuesday the first of October. In the morning before the court sat, the delegates sent their articles privately to the bishop in prison: they required him to confess the charge contained in this draft. The articles are in substance the same with what had been objected to him before, with some additional clauses of his misbehaviour at his trial. Had the bishop signed this paper he had prevented his being deprived.

Id. fol. 253.

At his appearing before them, they continued to press him to an acknowledgment of misbehaviour: and, provided he owned his fault, and made his submission, gave large promises of favour. But Bonner, instead of compliance, insisted strongly on his justification, and reading a new protestation; disowns their authority, calls them pretended judges, and declares that his appearing before them at this time was altogether forced and involuntary: and here, by appealing to the king in his minority, he declares he owns his majesty's authority more fully than the commissioners, who refused to take notice of such an application.

*He is de-  
prived.*

The commissioners finding the bishop wholly unmanageable proceeded to judgment, and pronounced him deprived of his

bishopric. The sentence runs in the name of all the five commissioners, though secretary Petre never sat after the first day.

EDWARD VI.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 127.

*The grounds of his sentence.*

The instrument of deprivation sets forth, that the bishop had been negligent in making inquiry after polygamists, "and those who either officiated or were present at any forms of divine service not allowed by the government. That instead of going to the sermons at Paul's Cross, and countenancing them with his presence, pursuant to his majesty's order; he, the said bishop, not only went away at the beginning of the discourse, but wrote to the mayor and aldermen to persuade them to the same practice."

From hence, the instrument proceeds to the bishop's omission in his sermon with reference to the king's power in his minority: and then makes mention of his contumacy and misbehaviour before the commissioners. And these are the grounds upon which the deprivation is founded.

Fox, p. 697.

Bonner excepts against this sentence as null in the authority, and unjust in the matter, and appeals once more from the delegates to the king's person.

And being thus deprived, he moved for a discharge from the Marshalsea, and for liberty to prosecute his appeal. To this Cranmer replied, that upon farther inquiry they found his cause worse, and himself more dipped in rebellion, than at first they were aware of: and the rest of the commissioners concurring with the archbishop, he was recommitted.

This usage of Bonner was by some thought oversevere. It was likewise censured, as our learned Church historian observes, "as not canonical, since it was by a commission from the king, and since secular men were mixed with clergymen in the censure of a bishop. To this it was answered, (as this gentleman goes on,) that the sentence being only of deprivation from the see of London, it was not so entirely an ecclesiastical censure, but was of a mixed nature, so that laymen might join in it. And since he had taken a commission from the king for his bishopric, by which he held it only during the king's pleasure, he could not complain of this deprivation, which was done by the king's authority."

*Remarks upon his deprivation.*

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 127.

But this answer seems short of satisfaction. For which way is a deprivation from the see of London "not entirely an ecclesiastical censure?" Is not the episcopal office an eccle-

GRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

siastical charge? Is not the bishop's jurisdiction over his diocese a spiritual authority? By being deprived therefore of his see, he is deprived of his spiritual jurisdiction, and by consequence, the censure must be properly ecclesiastical. "But he took out a commission from the king, for the exercise of his function." That is true: but what can be inferred from this extraordinary conduct? Nothing, but that the king may take away those powers which were granted with a clause of revocation, provided it was within the king's prerogative to make a grant of such powers. But not to inquire farther into this matter, there is a clause in the commission taken out by Bonner and the rest of the bishops, which supposes some branches of authority settled by divine right, conveyed by consecration, and independent of the regal supremacy. Now what can this be but a power to exercise discipline, to govern their flocks, and preside in their see in matters purely spiritual?

282.

Our learned Church historian continues, and observes, that "others, who looked farther back, remembered that Constantine, the emperor, had appointed secular men to inquire into some things objected to bishops: and that such had examined the business of Cecilian, bishop of Carthage, even upon an appeal, after it had been tried in several synods; and given judgment against Donatus and his party. The same Constantine had also, by his authority, put Eustathius out of Antioch, and Athanasius out of Alexandria. Afterwards, the emperors used to have some bishops attending on them in their comitatus or court, to whose judgment they left most causes, who acted only by commission from the emperor. So Epiphanius was brought to condemn Chrysostom at Constantinople, who had no authority to judge him by the canons."

*The bishops not deprived by the emperors in the cases proposed.*

Socrat. Hist. Lib. cap. 24.  
Id. lib. 1. cap. 35.

To this it may be answered, that this account of the emperor's proceedings against bishops, misreports matter of fact; for instance, Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was not deposed by Constantine the Great, but by the council of Antioch. As to the case of Athanasius, he was banished by Constantine upon a false suggestion of disloyal practice: and that he threatened to stop the importing corn from Alexandria to Constantinople. But for this the emperor did not pretend to depose him: to which I may add, that during his banishment, he was all along owned as bishop by the Catholic Church. And as to the instance of Paulus, bishop of Constantinople, he was

Id. lib. 2. cap. 7.

removed by a synod; and that not convened by Constantine, but his son, Constantius. EDWARD  
VI.

Farther, as to Constantine's interposing in the case between Cæcilian and Majorinus, upon an appeal of the latter and his party; this answer may be given; Cecilian, after a fair election, was ordained bishop of Carthage by Felix Aptungetanus; Secundus, Donatus, Purpureus, and some other bishops of the opposite party, not being pleased with Cecilian's promotion, consecrated Majorinus to the same see. This Donatist faction pretended Felix, who ordained Cecilian, was a traditor; that is, had delivered the Holy Scriptures up to the heathen persecutors, and for this crime had lost his episcopal character by the discipline of the Church.

This controversy was, at the emperor's instance, first examined in a synod at Rome, and afterwards at the council of Arles, and judgment given for Cecilian at both places. But the Donatists refusing to acquiesce, appealed to the emperor Constantine, who, in a letter to the council convened at Arles, blames the Donatists extremely for not submitting to the decision of the bishops. "Meum judicium postulant, qui ipse judicium Christi expecto." For, to speak truth, continues the emperor, "the sentence of the prelates ought to be no less regarded than if it was pronounced by our Saviour himself." St. Austin commends Constantine for not interposing, and says plainly, "the emperor was not so hardy as to try the cause of a bishop."

*Optat. contra Parmenian. gesta Purgationis Cæcilian et Felicis, &c. Quia Constantinus non est ausus de causâ episcopi judicare.*

However, being at last either tired with the importunities of the Donatists, or prevailed on by the flattery of his courtiers, he consented the cause should have a rehearing before himself at Milan. And here, after the matter was fully examined, the sentence of the councils of Rome and Arles was confirmed, the charge against Felix his being a traditor declared false, and judgment given for Cecilian. Thus it appears the emperor did no more than settle matter of fact, and see the records inspected.

If it is said he received the appeal, reviewed the cause determined by two synods, and took upon him the office of a judge, to this it may be answered, that princes are not infallible in their conduct: it is possible for them to be surprised into foreign business, and carry their regale too far.

That the ancient Church did not allow of appeals to the civil magistrate, in clauses ecclesiastical, appears from the council of Antioch held in the reign of Constantius. This synod Can. 12.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*The sense of  
the councils  
of Antioch  
and Cal-  
cedon.*

decrees, "that if any deacon or priest degraded by their diocesan, or any bishop deposed by a synod, should be so hardy as to give the emperor trouble by any application, when in these cases recourse ought to be had to a synod, and the matter determined there: if, therefore, any person shall overlook the jurisdiction of the prelates, and solicit the emperor for redress, he is not allowed so much as to plead his cause in a council, nor ever expect being restored to his promotion."

Thus the bishops in the council of Calcedon determine in the case of Photius, metropolitan of Tyre: they declare the imperial rescript is of no force against the canons. And yet this case related only to a contest of jurisdiction between a metropolitan and one of his suffragans. Thus at the same general council of Calcedon, the emperor Martian makes no difficulty to acknowledge, that he did not come thither to exercise any power in deciding the controversy, but only to fortify the decrees of the Fathers with the civil sanction. Not that the canons and resolutions of the bishops were not binding before, with respect to conscience; but some people are so unhappy as to be governed farther by temporal penalties than the terrors of the other world.

Farther, the court bishops mentioned by our learned historian did not act by the emperor's commission, though they were sometimes too flexible and complaisant. Neither does the instance of Epiphanius's condemning of Chrysostom support this assertion. For St. Chrysostom was deposed by the synod ad Quereum<sup>1</sup>, neither had Epiphanius any share in that sentence. This bishop had quitted Constantinople, and set sail for Cyprus, before Theophilus of Alexandria, and the rest of the bishops met for the censuring of St. Chrysostom.

To return to Bonner: it must be said he made a hardy and plausible defence. The grounds of his deprivation seem somewhat slender, excepting in one article relating to the king's authority. And here, the bishop proved he had touched the point in his sermon, though not in the form prescribed: and that this omission was only a misfortune of his memory: that this was no feigned excuse appears pretty plainly by his owning the authority of a minor prince, so fully and so often before the delegates. As to his intemperate behaviour, if Fox reports him fairly, he was much to blame. For my part, the process

<sup>1</sup> This council, in the suburbs of Calcedon, at the Oak, met in the year 403.

Council.  
Labbe, and  
Cossart.

Socrat. Hist.  
lib. 6.  
cap. 14.  
et 15.  
Theod. Hist.  
lib. 5.  
cap. 35.  
*Bonner's  
case further  
considered.*

being very tedious, and printed by Fox, I only examined the register for the substance, and therefore, as to the manner, excepting his swearing once to Smith, I shall neither affirm nor deny the charge. EDWARD VI.

And though Bonner defended himself with great dexterity and resolution, yet I somewhat question his making the most of his case. Had he, instead of appealing to the king, appealed to the upper house in convocation, he might, in all likelihood, have got the judgment reversed, and recovered his see. Now, that he had this remedy seems pretty plain, by two acts of parliament. By the first statute it is expressly provided, that "in any ecclesiastical causes which may touch the king, his heirs, or successors, the party grieved may appeal to the spiritual prelates in the upper house of convocation." And this method of appealing is confirmed by an act in the next year of the same reign. It is true this provision refers to trials prosecuted in the courts of bishops or archbishops, but the reason of the case seems to hold against any other court which undertakes the cognizance of ecclesiastical matters; but I shall determine nothing in this point. 283.

That Bonner had no gentle usage, appears from the course of this whole affair. For first, the king's or council's prescribing him the matter, and, in some measure, the words of his sermon, was more than ordinary. The putting such singular terms upon him, must by consequence lessen his character, and make him contemptible: such unusual commands as these must suppose the council believed him remarkably defective, either in integrity or discretion. But "Bonner was looked on generally as a man of no principles. All the obedience he gave, either to the laws or the king's injunctions, was thought a compliance against his conscience, extorted by fear." This censure supposes him flexible to the orders of the court, and compliant to whatever was enjoined him. But to assert it was fear, and not conscience, which brought him to all these lengths; this is but diving into thoughts, and amounts to no more than conjecture. Hypocrisy keeps under covert, and men's hearts lie open to no view but God Almighty's; besides, human laws require nothing more than outward compliance. Courts of justice do not pretend to examine principles any farther than practice discovers them. I have insisted the longer upon this, because I would gladly set the matter in a true light. I be-

24 Hen. 8.  
cap. 12.  
25 Hen. 8.  
cap. 19.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 123.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

lieve Bonner complied beyond his opinion in several instances : I am far from defending the heat of his temper, or his sanguinary proceedings in the next reign : but justice ought to be done to every body's memory ; and the more exceptionable any man's practice is, the less he is in a condition to dispense with any commendation which belongs to him.

*The duke of  
Somerset  
sent to the  
Tower and  
impeached.*

To proceed to some remarkable occurrences in the state. Dudley, earl of Warwick, by suppressing the Norfolk rebellion, had raised his reputation, and fortified his interest to a considerable degree ; and his ambition growing with his success, he resolved to push his fortune, and set himself at the helm. To make way for this project, the protector was to be removed. This was looked on as no impracticable enterprise, considering the present situation of affairs ; for the Protector, by abetting the complaints of the lower commons, and lately ordering inclosures to be thrown open, had disoblged the nobility and gentry. The earl of Warwick, therefore, finding himself supported by a strong party in the council, resolved to oppose the protector. This duke, being informed of their proceedings, wrote to the Londoners to raise a thousand men, and march them well-armed to Hampton Court, for the king's security. He likewise levied some men in the neighbourhood, and conveyed the king to Windsor, with as many of the council and court as he could prevail with to go with him.

October 6.  
A. D. 1549.

The lords in the earl of Warwick's interest had now formed themselves into a council at London. Their names are these : the lord chancellor, the lord St. John president, the marquess of Northampton, the earls of Arundel, Southampton, and Shrewsbury, the lords Russell and Wentworth ; to which we may add the chief justice Mountague, sir Edward North, sir Richard Southwell, sir Edmund Peckham, secretary Petres, sir John Gage, sir Ralph Sadler, sir Thomas Cheyney, sir Anthony Brown, sir Anthony Wingfield, sir John Baker, speaker of the house of commons, and Dr. Wotton. These noblemen, privy-counsellors, and persons of distinction, wrote to the city of London to furnish them with forces, to rescue his majesty out of the duke of Somerset's hands, whom they styled an enemy to the king and kingdom ; and, that this complaint might not appear undeserved, they drew up a charge in form against him. The principal articles are these following :—

*The articles*

“ That by creating discords and misunderstandings amongst



the king's subjects, he had embroiled the commonwealth, which was left in a peaceable and good condition by the late king. That he had countenanced sedition and treason, and occasioned the loss of several thousand men in the late commotions: that, either by his neglect or perfidiousness, he had been the cause of losing several forts and places of importance beyond sea. That being made protector on condition he should do nothing without the consent of the board, he had not observed that condition, but had treated with ambassadors, made bishops and lord-licutenants by his own authority: that he had done many things contrary to law; held a court of request in his own house; embased the coin, and published proclamations against inclosures, contrary to the sense of the whole council: that he had neglected the rules and maxims laid down by the late king for the government of Ireland: that he had armed his own friends and servants, and left the king's servants unarmed. And, lastly, that he had only made it his business to aggrandize himself; to create misunderstandings amongst the nobility; to draw malecontents into his interest; to lavish out a vast deal of treasure in building of palaces, at a time of distress and public calamity."

EDWARD  
VI.  
*of the im-  
peachment.*

The protector, finding himself deserted, that the city of London had refused to assist him, and engaged with the lords of the other party, resigned to his misfortune, and put the king and himself in their hands. Upon this he was sent to the Tower; and here I shall break off his story till the consideration of time call for it.

About the latter end of this month, Calvin, who, it is likely, had not heard of the protector's declension, wrote to him upon the subject of religion. The letter, as it stands in his epistles, is dated in the year 1548, but in the Paper-office the 22d of October is only put down, without the mention of the year. That it was not written the last year I think is pretty plain: first, from Calvin's letter to Bucer, in which he acquaints him he had written to the protector to carry on the reformation: now Bucer did not arrive in England till the beginning of the year 1549; but this letter of Calvin supposes Bucer in England. Secondly, Calvin, in his letter to the protector, makes several objections against the Common Prayer Book, which was not printed till this year, nor so much as drawn up till winter, 1548.

Godwin's  
Annal.  
Stow's  
Annal.

*Calvin's  
letter to the  
protector.*

284.

Calvin's  
Epist. p. 108.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

To come to the matter in the letter. In the beginning of this address, Calvin commends the protector for the zeal and resolution he had shown in retrieving religion, and owns the pure worship of God was now restored in England. He reduces the main of his discourse to three heads. Under the first, he would have the people rightly instructed, and points to the method. And here he requires subscription to the articles of religion: that all bishops and parish priests should be obliged to this condition; and that no person should be admitted to any ecclesiastical function, without giving solemn consent to the doctrines received. He likewise highly approves a "Form of Common Prayer," and looks upon a stated Catechism as a necessary expedient.

He acquaints the protector with his being informed of two sorts of troublesome people in England. One of these divisions were those they called Gospellers. "These," says Calvin, "are men of whimsey and enthusiasm, and if they might have their will, would quickly confound all order and public settlement. The other party are so far smitten with the old superstition, that they will not endure the parting with it. Now both the one and the other ought to feel the weight of a severe correction, and have the sword drawn upon them. For these men are revolters against God as well as the king."

*Gladio  
ultore coer-  
ceri quem  
tibi tradidit  
dominus.*  
Page 83.

Thus we see Calvin had no great tenderness for dissenters. He very heartily recommends methods of rigour, and is far from indulging liberty of conscience.

*His cavils  
against the  
English  
Liturgy.*

His second head touches upon the throwing out abuses. And here he declares against all accommodating schemes, and methods of moderation. He allows of no latitude for discretion, nor gives any deference to antiquity; and seems to confine the rule of worship to express declarations in Scripture. From these narrow principles he falls upon the censure of the English Common Prayer-book. And as an instance of some remaining corruption, he objects against praying for the dead in the communion office. "And here he freely grants this mention of the dead does not imply any approbation of the popish purgatory. He likewise owns himself sensible, that the commemoration of the dead was an ancient custom in the Church; and that this was done to testify the Communion of Saints, to show the correspondence between the Church militant and triumphant, and to declare their belief, that the faithful of this and the

*Against  
praying for  
the dead.*

other world were all of the same society." But this refreshing the ideas of the future state, keeping up a communication between the living and the dead, and giving the last proofs of disinterested charity, will by no means pass Calvin's test. This man, who thought himself wiser than all the fathers of the primitive, or bishops of the present Church, throws in his magisterial exception. He argues that the Lord's Supper is so solemn a part of religion, "that all human additions do but pollute the service. That in our addresses to God Almighty, we are not allowed to indulge our fancy, and give way to sympathy and compassion: on the contrary, we are rather to be governed by the apostle's rule, and make the word of God the ground for our application: but this mention of the dead, which implies either commendation or religious regard, does not come up to warrantable measures, nor answer the true directions for prayer. And being therefore no better than supplemental invention, is not to be endured in the holy eucharist.

EDWARD  
VI.

"There are some other things, as he goes on, which, though they do not fall under such degrees of censure, are not to be excused: and that is, the ceremonies of chrisms and anointing. As for chrisms, what is it but the result of weakness and ignorance? The institution of our Lord will not satisfy some people; they must have a new symbol to represent the operations of the Holy Ghost in baptism, as if the water was not sufficient for this purpose. As for extreme unction, it is the effect of an inconsiderate zeal, not supported with proportionable pretensions. People would practise the custom of the apostles, without apostolic gifts, to justify their imitation; for when the apostles made use of oil in the recovery of the sick, the meaning of this ceremony was to show the supernatural performance; and therefore, when miracles went off, the circumstance of anointing ought likewise to be discontinued. It is therefore most advisable to strike off all these, and admit of no usages but such as are conformable to the inspired writings, and tend to edification. For the toleration of people's weakness ought to be indulged only in order to their better instruction; neither are we to exceed so far in lenity and condescension as to continue any foolish custom merely for the gratifying men's humours, who can give no good reason for the satisfying their demands."

*Non respondet veræ ac legitimæ recte orandi institutioni.*

*Against chrisms and extreme unction.*

*Neque interea stultis immorandum est.*

Thus Calvin has taken great care to avoid the imputation he

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Calvin's  
Epistle,  
p. 108.

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 80.

Epist. ad  
Protect.  
*Honest zeal  
against  
licentious-  
ness.*

285.

1 Cor. vi.

precautions Bucer against: to keep close to the extremes, to guard against an agreement, and stand off from reconciling expedients.

This the learned Heylin calls reforming the Church without fear or wit, without regard to peace at home, or correspondence abroad. "Such lax management," says Calvin, "may pass in civil government, but the conduct of the Church allows no such prudential considerations. Here we are tied down to the express will of God, and barred all supplemental provisions."

Under his third head for suppressing immorality, he shows a commendable zeal, and delivers himself with advantage enough. He lets the protector know how much his grace is obliged to "discountenance libertinism, and punish those crimes which are oftentimes overlooked by the State. That governors take care to do justice upon theft, rapine, and murder, with severity enough. And why? Because they find their own interest sensibly touched. Whereas, intemperance, whoredom, and blasphemy, are frequently connived at; as if these were lawful sallies, or faults almost below consideration. But God pronounces quite otherwise upon these matters. He lets us know how dangerous a thing it is to insult his omnipotence, and not to have his honour in the highest regard. And that Senacherib's profane insolence was pursued with remarkable vengeance.

"And, as to adulteries, it is a shame that those who call themselves Christians should be more remiss than heathens in punishing this crime: that a wickedness of this size should pass for a jest. Is this all the regard we have for the engagements of marriage?—for the most solemn alliance and incommunicable friendship?—for a relation which represents the union between Christ and his Church? As for libertines, if we believe the Apostles, we shall find them charged with no less than sacrilege: they profane the temple of the Holy Ghost, forfeit the Divine protection, the privileges of Christianity, and make themselves obnoxious to eternal punishment. The Apostle does not allow us to maintain any commerce with such licentious people: they ought not, therefore, to be suffered in the Church of God. It is the winking at such instances of scandal which embroils the world, and draws down the judgments of heaven." He therefore very honestly solicits the protector "to interpose his authority in behalf of sobriety."

He “insists upon discipline ; and that the bishops and parish-priests should be particularly careful not to admit any of these libertines to the holy communion.” This is admirable advice, and very well becoming the character of a divine.

EDWARD  
VI.

As for his dictating in matters of religion, intermeddling so freely in the settling foreign Churches, and making himself an arbiter of controversy, this is not altogether so intelligible ; especially since he delivered himself in so decisive a manner. Besides, he addressed the protector as if the government of the Church was almost wholly at his disposal. Now, this supposes a vast compass of spiritual authority within the regale. But that the civil magistrate was absolute in these matters, or that the discipline of the Church ought to be overruled by the State, was far from Calvin’s opinion. This may be proved by his contest with the senate at Geneva. His commentary on Amos is likewise a remarkable instance to this purpose : where, expounding upon these words, “But prophesy not again any more at Bethel,” he delivers himself thus: “‘Prophesy again no more at Bethel.’ Why?—because it is the king’s chapel: that is one reason. Here Amaziah the priest endeavours to prove the Bethel-worship warrantable, because it was settled by the royal authority. The king will have it so : he has a right to execute his pleasure, and nobody ought to contradict it. And, at this day, there are a great many within the pope’s communion who give princes an extraordinary latitude with respect to this matter.—Those who at first gave such large commendations to Henry, king of England, were no long-headed people : their complimenting him with such a sovereign authority, in all matters, shocked me extremely. Those who called him the supreme head of the Church, under Christ, were plainly guilty of blasphemy. This was extravagantly too much. However, its being the effect of an inconsiderate zeal is some excuse ; and, therefore, let us forget it. But that impostor, who was afterwards chancellor to that Proserpine, who now outdoes all the devils in mischief,—this scandalous impostor, the bishop of Winchester, when he was at Ratisbon, did not offer to support this regal supremacy by arguments, nor took any notice of the counter-evidence in Scripture. He thought it sufficient to affirm the king’s authority unlimited, and that it was in his power to set aside ancient usages and introduce new ones at his pleasure. If the question relates to fasting and abstinence, it lies at the king’s

Calvin’s  
Epist. p.132.  
163. 311. et  
alib.  
Prælect. in  
Amos, c. 7.  
p. 292.  
*His judgment concerning the regale.*

*Hujus Proserpine quæ hodie illic superat omnes diabolos.*  
*This Proserpine, as Calvin is so bold as to call her, was our queen Mary.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

appointment. His majesty may command the people to eat flesh upon what days he thinks fit; the king may bar priests the liberty of marriage; the king may deny the people the use of the cup in the Lord's supper. Why so?—because the king's prerogative is absolute. Now, this is exactly Amaziah his doctrine: 'It is the king's sanctuary, and it is the king's court.' Let us examine the grounds upon which it stands. This Amaziah assigns the king a double function; he maintains it is in his power to transform religion into what shape he pleases. Thus he charges Amos with disturbing the public repose, and encroaching upon the prerogative-royal. As to the first part, it is certain, kings, provided they discharge their office, may be styled protectors of religion, and 'nursing fathers' to the Church, as Isaias calls them. It may, therefore, be reasonably expected from princes, that they should make use of their sword in defence of God Almighty's worship. But then on the other side, those are an unthinking sort of people who carry the royal character too far into spiritual matters. This extreme is too common in Germany. Neither do the countries about us stand clear from this infection. And now we are sensible of the consequence of that unhappy principle, which gives the civil magistrate a sovereignty in religion, and dissolves the Church into the State. This sacrilegious invasion rages amongst us at present, by not distinguishing the bounds of civil authority. As things are managed, princes do not think they can reign unless they strip the Church of her authority, and make themselves supreme, both in matters of faith and spiritual government. The devil prompted Amaziah with this notion. Since it was the king's chapel, there must be no prophesying against the court belief. No: the king's religion must stand, and not be questioned. This is agreeable doctrine! These soft notes make music in the ears of princes. They fall in with the imposture, and desire nothing more than to hear themselves made masters of every thing without reserve. Thus they enter vigorously upon the practice of their ecclesiastic supremacy, and pretend a zeal for religion. But the spring of this motion is nothing but ambition; it is only because they would gladly extend their authority, and knock down every thing with their sceptre. There must be a guard upon this quarter; for princes have been always remarkable for this miscarriage, and made it their business to draw religion within their jurisdiction, to bend it to their humour, and sometimes to

Isaias xlix.  
23.  
*Qui faciunt  
reges nimis  
spirituales.*

their interest too. For it is dominion, and not conscience, which frequently governs them in this affair.”

EDWARD  
VI.

Thus we see Calvin was no slave to the regale.

286.

The duke of Somerset being now forced from the administration, and confined, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, had hopes of recovering his liberty; but finding himself overlooked, he wrote to the lords of the council for his enlargement. He complains of being denied the privilege of his peerage, and hindered from appearing in parliament; that his being arbitrarily excluded the house of Lords, might affect the rest of the members, and prove a dangerous precedent. However, he declines contesting his right any farther, and is willing to submit to the judgment of the learned in the law. But after all this resignation, he suggests that if a general council were called, and any one who had a right of voting excluded, this singularity would break the authority, and invalidate the decrees of the whole synod. He goes on to complain of the late protector's proceedings, and hopes better usage from their lordships. He insists boldly upon his innocence; presses to be brought to his answer in the house of Lords; and, instead of imprisonment, makes no question of being commended for what he has done.

*Bishop Gardiner's letter to the Lords for his enlargement.*

Stow's  
Annal.  
p. 600.

About this time pope Paul III. departed this life. The cardinals immediately appeared in the conclave for a new election. Cardinal Pole was not forgotten upon this occasion. His royal extraction, the advantage of his behaviour, and his acquirements in learning, were strong recommendations. However, the cardinals were divided: part of them were in the French, and part in the emperor's interest. These were the two biggest divisions; but some there were who stood clear of parties, and altogether unengaged. The imperial cardinals voted unanimously for Pole. This prelate, instead of acknowledging their favour, blamed their precipitancy; earnestly entreating them not to be swayed in the least by fancy or regards of friendship, but to make the honour of God and the good of the Church the chief motive to their resolves. The speed of Pole's friends being thus checked, gave the French an opportunity of moving the postponing the election till all the members of the college had time to appear. And here cardinal Caraffa, afterwards Paul IV., expecting to gain the chair if Pole could be set aside, applied to calumny, and disparaged his competitor. Thus he endeavoured to draw a suspicion of

*Cardinal Pole hinders his own promotion to the papedom.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

heresy and insobriety upon Cardinal Pole; charged him with keeping too great a correspondence with the Lutherans, and entertaining one Flaminius in his family, who lay under that imputation. That being commissioned to inquire into heresy at Viterbo, he discharged most of the criminals; gave a gentle correction only to some few, but punished none capitally. He told them likewise that Pole had sent a young woman to a nunnery, which many believed was his own daughter. He was therefore at a loss to understand their zeal for choosing this cardinal. Was Italy so barren in learning, probity, and other qualifications, that they must go to the farther end of Europe to furnish them with a pope? To what purpose is all this pains? Every body knows this cardinal is wholly in the interest of the court of Vienna. Have we a mind the emperor should make himself master of the patrimony of the Church, and plunder Rome again by way of diversion, and to make his army an entertainment? Pole defended himself so handsomely against this invective, that the conclave clearly perceived there was nothing but envy and ambition in the charge; and thus their inclination to choose him was stronger than before. Soon after, a majority of the cardinals came to his apartment late in the night, ordered the servants to wake his friend Priuli, a Venetian gentleman; their business was to acquaint him with Pole's election, and that they came to "adore" him, as they call it, according to custom; which ceremony was to pass before the affair could be finished. Priuli having told Pole the news with an air of pleasure, the other gave him a friendly check, and refused to receive the respect of the conclave. He told them a preferment of that nature was more to be dreaded than desired; that it ought to be regularly managed, and not carried on in a tumultuary manner; that night was an improper time to conclude so great a concern; that God was the God of light and not of darkness. He desired them therefore to defer their resolution till next day, and that the matter might then, if God so pleased, be brought to a better issue<sup>1</sup>. The Italian cardinals, interpreting this backwardness to a sleepy phlegmatic temper, began to drop their opinion of Pole's capacity; and thus recalling their votes, they chose the cardinal De Monté, who took the name of Julius III.

Godwin,  
Annal. F.  
Paul, Coun-  
cil of Trent.

To return to England. On the fourth of November the par-

<sup>1</sup> Pole seems to have understood the spirit, as well as the letter, of the "nolo episcopari."



liament sat, after a prorogation. I shall mention those statutes which concern the Church. The first of this kind enacts the recalling the old liturgic books, and taking away images out of churches. The preamble sets forth: "That whereas the king's most excellent majesty has of late set forth, and established by authority of parliament, an uniform, godly, and quiet order of common and open prayer, in a book entitled 'The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies after the Church of England, to be used and observed in the said Church of England, agreeable to the order of the Primitive Church,' much more comfortable unto his loving subjects than other diversity of service, which heretofore of long time has been used; being in the same book ordained, that nothing be read but the very pure Word of God, or which is evidently grounded upon the same; and in the other, things corrupt, untrue, vain, and superstitious, and, as it were, a preparation to superstition." That the not calling in and defacing these books gave occasion to the depraving and hindering the reception of the said Common Prayer-book, encouraged people in their old superstitious service, and kept up a diversity of opinions and ceremonies. It is therefore enacted, "That all books called Antiphoners, Missales, Grailes<sup>1</sup>, Processionales, Manueles, Legends, Pies, Portuasses, Primers in Latin or English, Couchers, Journalles, Ordinalles, or other books or writings whatsoever, heretofore used for service of the Church, written or printed in the English or Latin tongue, other than such as are or shall be set forth by the king's majesty, shall be by authority of this present act clearly and utterly abolished, extinguished, and forbidden for ever to be used or kept in this realm, or elsewhere within any of the king's dominions."

EDWARD  
VI.

*An act for  
calling in the  
old service  
books, and  
destroying  
images.*

*Nothing in  
the first  
reformed  
Common  
Prayer-  
book, but  
what is evi-  
dently  
grounded  
upon the  
Word of  
God.*

287.

"It is farther enacted, that all images, of whatsoever materials, taken out of churches or chapels, or yet standing in any such places, should be destroyed and defaced.

"As for the books, they were to be delivered to the mayor, bailiffs, constables, or churchwardens, in their respective towns, who within three months after they came to their hands, were to deliver them over to the archbishop, bishop, chancellor, or commissary of the diocese, in order to be by them, either openly burned, or otherwise defaced and destroyed. And that in case any of the persons above-mentioned, kept any of the

<sup>1</sup> Grailes, graduals.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

books, and did not bring them in to the archbishop, bishops, &c. they were for the first offence to forfeit ten shillings, four pounds for the second, and for the third, to suffer imprisonment at the king's pleasure.

“ And if the archbishop, bishops, &c. failed to execute the act, and did not burn, deface, and destroy, all the said books, within forty days after they received them, they were to forfeit forty pounds, half of which sum was for the king, and the other moiety for the informer.

“ By this statute it is provided, first, that any figure, or picture, upon any tomb, in churches, or chapels, might stand, in case the person represented had not the character of a saint.”

Secondly. It is provided, “ that any person may keep, or use, any primers in the English or Latin tongue, set forth by the late king Henry VIII., so that the sentences of invocation, or prayers to saints in the same primer, be blotted, or clearly put out of the same.”

3&4 Edw. 6.  
cap. 10.

It is almost a pity there was not a clause in this act, to allow the bishops the liberty of reserving a copy of all these censured books, and lodging them in their cathedral libraries. Thus, the form and distinction of the old offices might have been better known, and some valuable curiosities preserved.

*The bishops complain their jurisdiction was all taken from them.*

On the fourteenth of November, the bishops complained in the house, to the temporal lords, of the great increase of immorality: that their jurisdiction was so checked and straitened, that they could summon no offenders to appear before them, punish no vice, nor exert the discipline of the Church; to prevent these disorders, a bill was brought in, but miscarried at the first reading, because it seemed to entrust the bishops with too much power. However, the matter was not laid aside, but a second bill was drawn by a committee, passed and sent down to the commons, where it sunk after the second reading. But then, there was an attempt made in another form, for reviving the spiritual jurisdiction. To this purpose, an act passed, empowering the king to nominate, by the advice of his council, sixteen of the clergy, four of whom were to be bishops, and sixteen of the temporality, of whom four were to be common lawyers, to peruse and examine the ecclesiastical laws used in England, and to make such an extract, as they should think proper, for the use of the realm. This committee had three years' time to finish their business. And what was either agreed

Journal  
Procer.  
Cotton.  
Libr. Tib-  
erius. D. 1.  
Nov. 18.

by an universality or majority of this number, was to be published by proclamation under the broad seal, and put in practice as the king's ecclesiastical laws. EDWARD VI.

It was likewise provided, that no person should incur any forfeiture, or suit of præmunire, for executing, or making use of any laws, drawn up by the said committee.

On the other side, it is provided, that every ecclesiastical judge and minister, shall be bound to obey the king's writs of prohibition, and of attachment upon prohibition and indicavit. And lastly, it is provided, that the said two-and-thirty persons, or the greater number of them, shall not have any authority to compile, or publish any thing contrary to the common law, and statutes of this realm.

*Thirty-two persons nominated to review the ecclesiastical laws.*

At the passing this bill, the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Durham, Ely, Carlisle, Worcester, Westminster, Chichester, Lincoln, Rochester, and St. David's, protested.

3&4 Edw. 6. cap. 11. Statutes at Large.

One reason of their dissent, I suppose, was, because only four bishops were appointed to assist in the committee of two-and-thirty.

Journal Proccr.

Pursuant to this act, the king directed a commission to archbishop Crammer, and the rest whom he thought proper for that employment. The reader may find their names among the records. The list is not drawn exactly upon the direction of the statute, for there wants one of the number, and besides, there are eight bishops, and as many common lawyers, which is double the number allowed by the act, and yet we have no reason to question the commissions being drawn by the advice of the council.

See Records, num. 61.

There was a subcommittee of eight persons appointed, to digest the matter, to throw it into form, and prepare it for the perusal of the rest. This was done for quicker dispatch. The persons employed were archbishop Crammer, Thomas Goodrick, bishop of Ely, Dr. Cox, the king's almoner, Peter Martyr, doctor in divinity, William May, and Rowland Taylor, doctors of law, John Lucas, and Richard Goodrick, esquires. But this order for constituting a subcommittee, being not given out till the eleventh of November, 1551; I shall postpone it to that time, and at present only take notice, that when the bill for constituting the two-and-thirty commissioners was passed in the house of lords, the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of Durhan, Ely, Carlisle, Worcester, Westminster, Chichester, Lincoln, Rochester, and St. David's protested against it.

The duke of Somerset's business came before the lords this session. This nobleman was solicited to make his submission, and confess the charge. This he was told was the best method to disentangle himself, and get gentle usage. The duke was so flexible as to comply with this advice: thus he subscribed the articles of impeachment, and cast himself upon the king's mercy; and thus the lords being furnished with sufficient matter to ground their judgment upon, sentenced him to the loss of his offices of earl marshal, lord treasurer, and lord protector. He was likewise adjudged to forfeit all his goods, and an estate in lands, of near two thousand pounds per annum. Being informed of this judgment passed by the peers, he sent a letter to the house, in which he owns their lordship's goodness, in carrying their sentence no higher than a fine: "which although his circumstances were almost crushed by it, yet he resolved never to dispute the point with their lordships, nor justify himself in any particular. He confessed, that a man as he was, of no great penetration, might easily mistake his way: and that it was almost impracticable to manage in so high a station, without falling sometimes under the censure of the law. He desired them to interpret his conduct to the most favourable sense, and believe his failings proceeded more from want of judgment, than design. That he was ready to act, or suffer, as their lordships should think fit to appoint. And lastly, he humbly entreats their pardon, and promises such an absolute obedience to their orders, as he hopes might make amends for his former folly."

By this remarkable submission he gained his liberty, was discharged of his fine, and not long after sworn of the privy council: but his waiving his defence, and resigning with so much passiveness, weakened his character, and made him little considered.

The fall of the duke of Somerset, and the earl of Warwick having the ascendant in the ministry, gave Bonner some hopes of retrieving his affairs. He petitioned the king therefore, for a supersedeas against the commissioners, and desired his process might be reviewed, and that he might be heard before the privy council, where he did not question acquitting himself to

Journal  
Procer.  
*The submission of  
the duke of  
Somerset.*  
Decem. 23.

288.

Heylin,  
Hist. Re-  
form.  
Godwin,  
Annal.

*Bonner peti-  
tions his  
appeal may  
be admitted,  
but without  
success.*

the satisfaction of the board. The king upon this application ordered the lord chancellor, the marquess of Dorset, the bishop of Ely, the lord Wentworth, two of the judges, and several other members of the privy council, with some common lawyers and civilians to examine his petition and appeal. This committee, after inspecting the process, and debating upon the course of the trial, came to a resolution, that the appeal having no weight in it, the judgment ought to stand in force.

EDWARD  
VI.

Fox, 698.

Those who were averse to the reformation made their court to the earl of Warwick, expecting his inclination lay for their purpose : but this nobleman, being more concerned for his own greatness than any systems of religion, disappointed their hopes. He found the abetting the reformation was the most effectual way to recommend him to the king. Thus he put on a new disguise, and appeared strongly in his master's sentiment. The earl of Southampton, who was heartily of the popish party, was in no condition to exert himself, for he was neither restored to his office of chancellor, nor made lord treasurer, nor so much as admitted into the number of those who had the care of the king's person : it is said he attempted to supplant the earl of Warwick, but his design being discovered before he could make it bear, he retired suddenly from the court, fell into a deep melancholy, and died in July following.

*The earl of Warwick declares for the Reformation.*

To return to the parliament, in which an act passed for drawing up an ordinal. The act being short, and not printed except in the statutes at large, I shall transcribe it for the reader.

“ Forasmuch as concord and unity to be had within the the king's majesty's dominions, it is requisite to have one uniform fashion and manner, for making and consecrating of bishops, priests, deacons, or ministers of the Church. Be it therefore enacted by the king's highness, with the assent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that such form and manner of making and consecrating of archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, and other ministers of the Church, as by six prelates, and six other men of this realm, learned in God's law, by the king's majesty to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the great seal of England, before the first day of April next coming, shall by virtue of this

*An act to empower a committee of bishops, &c. to draw up an ordinal.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
3 & 4 Edw. 6.  
cap. 12.

present act be lawfully exercised and used, and none other, any statute or law or usage to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.”

When this act passed the house of Lords, the bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Worcester, Westminster, and Chichester, protested against it.

Heath, bishop of Worcester, was one of the six prelates appointed by the king; but refusing to consent to the alterations proposed, he was called before the council, on the 8th of February, and, on the 8th of March, committed to the Fleet for persisting in his incomppliance. This usage looked like a strain of justice; but Heath, having been observed to dissent from all the bills which promoted the Reformation, he was probably upon this score more rigorously treated.

The committee appointed for compiling the Ordination-book struck off the additions of later ages, and governed themselves by the forms of the ancient Church. Thus, in the consecration of bishops, the gloves and sandals, the mitre, ring, and crosier, were omitted: neither in the ordaining of priests was there any anointing, or delivering the consecrated plate.

That the office was not maimed by leaving out these ceremonies, I shall prove from the forms of ordination in the primitive Church, and the concessions of the famous Morinus.

To begin with the author of the “Apostolical Constitutions,” who is supposed to have written before the council of Nice. By these Constitutions, when a priest is to be ordained, the bishop was to lay his hand upon his head, the priests and deacons standing by, whilst the bishop was to say the prayer following:—

“Almighty God, who hast created all things by Jesus Christ, and by him dost govern the universe suitably to the respective nature of things,—for the same power which is able to produce different beings can likewise govern them by different laws and measures,—thus, those beings which are immortal are supported by the conservation of the individual, and those which are mortal by succession; thou providest for the mind by precepts and rules of life, and for the body by repairing the decays of nature;—we beseech thee, therefore, to look down upon thy holy Church, and bless her with farther improvement; increase the number of those who preside in her, and furnish them with strength that they may labour both by instruction

Jan. 31.  
Journal  
Procer.

Mason de  
Minst.  
Anglic.  
p. 214, 215.  
*The forms  
of ordina-  
tion in the  
antient  
Church.  
The apo-  
stolical  
constitutions.*

and example for the edification of thy people. And now we beseech thee to behold thy servant, elected by the suffrage and consent of the whole clergy to the order of priesthood, replenish him with grace and prudence to assist and govern thy people with purity of intention, vouchsafe him the same favourable regard which thou wert pleased to afford thy peculiar people when thou commandedst Moses to make choice of the elders, to whom thou gavest a supernatural assistance. And now, O Lord, let the same blessing descend upon us, and continue the operation of thy Holy Spirit; that so this person, being furnished with the gifts of healing, and an instructive talent, may teach thy people with gentleness of temper, and serve thee faithfully with a willing and pure mind, and officiate in behalf of thy people in an unblamable manner, for Jesus Christ's sake, to whom," &c.

EDWARD  
VI.

289.

Constitut.  
Apostol.  
lib.8. cap.16.

And in the same book a little farther, it is said, that a priest has no privilege to ordain.

In the fourth council of Carthage, the rules for ordination are thus settled: when a bishop is to be consecrated, two bishops are to hold the New Testament over his head, and, while one of the bishops pronounces the prayer of consecration, the rest of that order who are present lay their hands upon his head.

Id. cap. 23.  
*The fourth  
council of  
Carthage.*  
A. D. 401.

At the ordination of a priest, the bishop pronounces the blessing, or makes the prayer for conveying the character. All the priests likewise then at Church lay their hands next the bishop on the head of the person to be ordained.

At the ordination of a deacon, only the bishop who gives him the blessing lays his hand upon his head, because the office of a deacon is not sacerdotal, but ministerial.

The forms of the lower orders are likewise prescribed, which the reader may see in the records.

Records,  
num. 62.

Before a bishop was consecrated, the council orders he should be examined with respect to his belief, learning, and manners.

To proceed, the pretended Dionysius, the Arcopagite, whose works were published in the beginning of the sixth century, gives this account of the ceremonies at ordination. "The bishop elect," says he, "who comes for consecration, is to kneel before the altar, the Gospels are held over his head, he receives imposition of hands from the consecrating bishop. There is likewise a solemn form of prayer used upon this occa-

Morinus de  
Sacris Ordinationibus,  
pt. 2. p. 51.  
*The pretended Dionysius.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

sion. A priest, at his ordination, kneels likewise before the altar, the bishop laying his right hand upon his head, and completing the ordination with solemn prayer. When a deacon is ordained, he kneels only before the altar on one knee, and then the bishop, laying his hand on his head, pronounces a prayer proper for those of that order. All these respective orders are signed with the sign of the cross, the names and degrees of the persons published, and at last they are saluted by the bishop and the rest of the clergy."

Id. p. 57.

*The Greek Church.*

The learned Morinus, from an authentic manuscript of more than eight hundred years' antiquity, gives us a farther account of the forms of ordination practised in the Greek Church. When a bishop was to be consecrated, the archbishop, standing before the holy table, prays for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elect, and, holding his hands upon his head, reads the instrument of his election, then, after some prayers, the archbishop, opening the Gospels, lays them on the head of the person consecrated: the archbishop likewise makes three crosses on his head, and then pronounces the prayers of consecration. After this, one of the bishops reads part of the Litany, then the archbishop, with his hand upon the head of the elect, makes another prayer with respect to the ordination, then he takes the Gospels from the consecrated bishop's head, and puts the omophorion, or pallium, upon him. After this the consecrated bishop is saluted by the archbishop, and the rest of the bishops, and conducted to the bishop's seat, and then the remaining service is performed.

See Records,  
num. 63.

Morin. p. 64.

At the ordination of a priest, the beginning of the office is much the same as that at a bishop's consecration, the bishop or archbishop makes three crosses over him, laying his hand upon his head; in the prayer the order to which he is ordained is mentioned, after this one of the priests of the Church reads part of the Litany. Then the archbishop puts him on a habit proper to his character, and salutes him, which is likewise done by the priests then present. Then the consecrated elements being uncovered, the bishop puts a piece of bread into the hands of the person ordained, and, laying his hand upon his head, bows his body over the holy table. Then the person ordained returns the bread to the bishop, and receives the eucharist before the rest of the bishops.

Id. p. 66.  
Missale  
Francorum.

Moreover, there is the Franks' Missal, a copy of which may



be seen in Morinus and Mabillon, and which the first of EDWARD VI. these learned men believes to have been written before the year five hundred and sixty, though the latter thinks it somewhat later than the popedom of Gregory the Great. However, by the prayers in it for the kings of France, it is plain that country was not governed by a single person, and, by consequence, the Missal must reach considerably higher than the reign of Charles the Great.

The form of ordination in this Missale Francorum, is exactly the same with that of the council of Carthage, with respect to the three orders, of bishops, priests, and deacons.

Thus we see the antient rituals for ordination agree with that drawn up in the reign of king Edward the sixth. There is no anointing the hands and head of the priest and bishop. No chalice or paten delivered to the second order, nor any ring or crosier to the first.

It is true, about the ninth century, we find the use of these ceremonies; but then, as the learned Morinus observes, these supplemental rites, in the forms of ordination, were added only upon the score of solemnity.

This learned person grants the Latin Church has all along owned the orders of the Greek, after the schism, as the west-erns call it: and yet, as he takes notice, it neither is, nor was the custom of the Greek Church, to deliver the chalice and paten to the priest at their ordination. He observes farther, that prayer and imposition of hands are the only essentials in ordination. He acquaints us that the ancient pontificals are charged with fewest ceremonies. That Thomas Aquinas, and other schoolmen, perusing only the rituals of latter ages, inferred the usages of antiquity from thence, which is a wrong way of arguing. That from this principle they have been led into mistakes, made the delivery of the holy vessels necessary to the conveyance of the sacerdotal character, and embarrassed themselves with inexplicable difficulties in reconciling the allowance of the orders of the Greek Church with the customs and constitutions of their own.

To proceed, in latter ages the ceremonies at ordination grew more numerous: thus, as Morinus observes, the pontificals of lesser antiquity, though they omit none of the ancient rites, are enlarged to considerable additions. Thus, for instance, the sacramentary tacked to the end of the manuscript of the Ordo

Mabillon.  
de Liturg.  
Gallican. in  
Præfat.  
Id. lib. 3.  
p. 301.

Morin. de  
Sacris Or-  
dinat. pt. 3.  
p. 4.  
Ibid. p. 6.  
Id. in Præf.  
*The essen-  
tials in ordi-  
nations.*

*The rites in  
the ancient  
ordinats.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
290.  
Hittorp.  
p. 103.  
Id. in Pref.

Romanus, published by Hittorpius, makes mention of putting the paten and chalice in the priest's hands with these words : " Receive thou authority to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass both for the living and the dead." But here we may take notice, that Hittorpius believed the *Ordo Romanus* itself later than our Alcuinus, who lived in the ninth century. Besides it is possible, this manuscript of the pontifical may not be of the same age with the other part of the *Ordo Romanus*, neither does Hittorpius vouch it so far. The sacramentary attributed to Gelasius, though it mentions the offering of sacrifices, yet we meet with nothing of the delivering the holy vessels.

Morinus,  
p. 267.

The pontifical belonging to the monastery of Corbey, published by Morinus, and supposed to be at least as old as the beginning of the ninth century, gives an account of the anointing the hands of the priest, and his offering sacrifices for the sins and offences of the people, but neither the paten or cup are put into his hands by this form.

In an English Saxon ordinal, published by Morinus from a manuscript of above eight hundred years' antiquity, the priest's hands are blessed and anointed with oil and chrism ; his head is likewise anointed, and an officiating habit put upon him. The ordination prayers likewise mention his offering sacrifice for the sins of the people, but there is nothing of the delivering of the paten and cup, nor that sentence so much insisted of, " to celebrate mass, and offer sacrifice for the living and dead." This ordinal being about two hundred years prior to the conquest, and belonging to the English nation, I shall transcribe the part of it which relates to the ordaining and consecrating of priests and bishops.

See Records,  
num. 64.

In short, by the variation in these rituals for ordination, both with respect to age and country, we may infer the ancient bishops did not conceive themselves bound up to precedent in these cases, but that, provided the essentials were retained, they were at liberty to alter or add, as they thought fit.

To return home : the act for authorising a committee to draw up an ordinal, calls deacons ministers, agreeably to the language of antiquity. The committee are empowered by this act to ordain the lower orders, that is, sub-deacons, readers, acolyths, and the rest, for all these seem comprehended in the clause of " other ministers of the Church." But the bishops and

divines appointed for this purpose, went no farther than the superior orders of bishop, priest, and deacon. Their motive for stopping here, as we may reasonably conclude, was because none but these three were of apostolical institution, the rest being the provision of after ages.

EDWARD  
VI.

It is affirmed, this form of “ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons, is the same with that we yet use, excepting some few words that have been added since in the ordination of a priest or bishop. For there was then no express mention made in the words of ordaining them, whether it was to the one or other office: in both it was said, ‘Receive thou the Holy Ghost in the name of the Father,’ &c. But that having been since made use of to prove both functions the same, it was of late years altered as it is now.” This remark put me upon comparing the first ordinal with that published in the third edition of Sparrow’s collection: and here I found them exactly the same. But afterwards perusing this office as it stands reviewed at the Savoy, I perceive the author’s observation is right.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 144.  
*Remarks on  
the supposed  
difference in  
the English  
ordinals.*

The same learned historian mentions “another difference between the ordination-book set out at that time, and that we now use: in the former, the bishop was to lay his one hand on the priest’s head, and with his other to give him a Bible, with a chalice and bread in it, saying the words now said at the delivery of the Bible. In the consecration of a bishop, there was nothing more than what is now in use, save that a staff was put into his hand with this blessing, ‘Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd.’” And in another part of this book, speaking of archbishop Parker’s consecration, he acquaints us the office was performed “according to the book of ordinations made in king Edward’s time: only the ceremony of putting the staff in his hands was left out of the office in queen Elizabeth’s reign.”

Id. p. 403.

But here, as it happens, this learned historian has been led into a mistake. For the two first editions of the ordinal made in king Edward’s reign, printed with privilege by Grafton and Whitchurch, have none of the different rites mentioned by this gentleman. Neither are they to be found in any edition since: There is nothing of a chalice and bread delivered to the priest, nor any rubric for putting a staff in the bishop’s hand, with the sentence of “being a shepherd to the flock of Christ.” Farther, the form of ordination used in queen Elizabeth’s time,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Mason de  
Anglic.  
p. 308. 342.  
358.

Edit. Graft.  
in Pref.  
*The mean-  
ing of being  
moved by  
the Holy  
Ghost.*

was altogether the same with that in the reign of king Edward, as Mason informs us.

By the rule of this ordinal, a deacon was not to be ordained under one-and-twenty years of age, nor a priest under four-and-twenty, nor a bishop under thirty.

And here it may not be improper to take notice of a remarkable passage in the reformed ordinal: it is this, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration, to serve God," &c. To this an affirmative answer is required from the person ordained. Now the meaning of this question cannot import so strong a sense as extraordinary afflation, or prophetic impulse. It is not supposed the person should be under the privilege of supernatural light, and be conscious of a distinguishing operation of divine grace. The being moved, therefore, by the Holy Ghost can imply nothing farther than serious preparation, honest intention, and holy resolution of acting suitably to the office. Now since all good motions descend from above, he that is thus virtuously qualified and resolved, may be in some measure said to "be moved by the Holy Ghost." We may observe, farther, that this question in the ordinal is only put to the deacons: that to which the priests and bishops are required to answer, is couched in less mysterious language. It stands thus: "Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this ministration according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this realm?" As for previous recollection, disinterested views, and serious application for the discharge of the holy function, nothing is more necessary. These things recommended at large by our learned historian, are admirable advice.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 145.  
*Orders not  
accounted  
valid by the  
ancient  
Church  
unless re-  
ceived from  
a bishop.*  
291.

Before I part with the ordinal, I must observe that the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, are all conferred by the authority of the bishop. And in this the English reformation is exactly conformable to the practice of the ancient Church, which never allowed any ordinations performed by persons beneath the episcopal character. To give some instances: after the second general council of Constantinople had declared Maximus no bishop, it is immediately added, that those ordained by him should not be reckoned amongst any distinctions of the clergy.

Can. 4.

When it was objected against Athanasius, that Macarius,

one of his deacons, had broken a chalice, the synod, convened at Alexandria, examining the charge, found upon inquiry that there was no priest belonging to the place where the chalice was broken, excepting one Ischyra, who pretended an ordination from Coluthus. But, upon looking into the character of this Coluthus, he was proved to be no more than a priest. Upon this the synod decreed Ischyra his orders to be perfectly null; that he was to be struck out of the list of the clergy, and pass for no more than a mere layman. And the ground of this sentence, as the synod continues, was so clear and uncontested, that nobody could call it in question.

EDWARD  
VI.

The council of Sardica is full for the same point, and declares Ischyra no priest. Thus St. Jerome, though setting the priest's character as high as it would bear, grants the privilege of ordaining peculiar to the bishop. "Quid facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?"

Athanas. in  
Apolog. 2.  
De Fuga  
sua, p. 570.  
Theod. Hist.  
Eccles. lib. 2.  
cap. 6.  
Hieron. ad  
Evagrium.

The ancients, as they had reason, were so constant in keeping close to this rule, that, when the second council of Seville understood that at the ordination of a priest and two deacons, the bishop, having sore eyes, had only laid his hands upon them, and that the priest pronounced the prayer for conveying the character,—the council, I say, understanding this, censured the whole process of the ordination as scandalous and invalid, and gave sentence that neither of the orders should be allowed.

The first bishop consecrated by our reformed ordinal was Poynt, preferred to the see of Winchester the next year. At the alteration of the Common Prayer-book, in the year 1552, this ordinal was annexed, and confirmed by act of parliament. This ordinal is likewise mentioned in the Church articles, passed in the convocation, A. D. 1562: in one of which it is declared, that "whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of this book, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, are decreed to be rightly, lawfully, and orderly consecrated." This declaration of the Church was afterwards confirmed by act of parliament, in the reign of queen Elizabeth.

Concil.  
Hispal. 2.  
can. 5.

Regist.  
Cranmer.

5 & 6 Edw. 6.  
cap. 1.

Article 36,

8 Eliz. c. 1.

The objection, that the words for conveying the bishops' and priests' character are the same in the ordinal set forth in king Edward's reign, goes partly upon a mistake: for, at the ordination of a priest, the words run thus: "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c.; "Take thou authority to preach the Word of

The objection  
against the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*reformed  
ordinal not  
considerable.*

God, and to minister the holy sacraments in the congregation, where thou shalt be so appointed." But, at the consecration of a bishop, the form stands as follows: "Remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposition of hands: for God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness."

I grant there is some resemblance in these forms; but then there is a plain distinction in other parts of the office. For instance, there is an express declaration of two bishops, that the person presented is to be consecrated to their own order. There are more questions put to him by the archbishop than are mentioned in the office for ordaining priests: some of which suppose a superior authority in his character; and that the exercise of discipline, and the government of a diocese, are branches of his function. The archbishop and two other bishops lay their hands upon the head of the elect; whereas, at the ordaining of a priest, this ceremony is performed only by the diocesan, with some priests assisting. These short remarks may be sufficient to discover the weakness of the exception against this ordinal<sup>1</sup>.

Jan. 19. A.D.  
1549-50.

*A peace with  
France and  
Scotland.*

Towards the end of this year there was another creation of noblemen: the lord privy-seal Russell was made earl of Bedford; the lord William St. John, earl of Wiltshire; and sir William Paget, lord Paget. Soon after the receiving these titles, the lords Bedford and Paget, with sir William Petre and sir John Mason, were despatched into France to treat a peace. Paget had been lately sent to the emperor to acquaint him what disturbance the English received from the Scotch and French, and how much the kingdom was embroiled by intestine commotions; that things being in this posture of disadvantage, there would, unless the emperor lent his assistance, be a necessity of coming to a peace with the French. This application meeting with no success from his imperial majesty, a peace was concluded, upon the following articles, with France and Scotland. As to the French part, Boulogne, with the dependencies, together with the train of artillery, were to be delivered to the French. For this the king of England was to receive four hundred thousand crowns (the crown being worth six shillings and eight pence), at two payments. The Scotch being comprehended in this treaty, Roxburgh and Aymouth, Lauder

<sup>1</sup> Collier's reasoning on the British Ordinal is confirmed by many of the liturgical works cited by Watts and Lowndes.

and Dunghlass, were to be razed. There was likewise to be an open trade between England, France, and Scotland. This treaty was proclaimed in London on the 3rd of March; and, on the 25th of April, Boulogne was evacuated, and the English hostages returned.

EDWARD  
VI.

In the beginning of the next year, Joan Butcher, commonly called Joan of Kent, was burnt in Smithfield for heresy. She was convicted, the last year, before archbishop Cranmer, and other commissioners, for reviving part of the Valentinian heterodoxy, and denying our Saviour's having taken flesh of the blessed Virgin. The archbishop omitted nothing to recover her to a right belief; but she proved incurably obstinate, and reproached Cranmer with passing sentence upon Anne Askew, for denying the corporal presence in the eucharist. She told him he had condemned Anne Askew for a piece of bread, and was now ready to treat her with the same usage for a piece of flesh. Thus, there being no hopes of reclaiming her, she was convicted, and a certificate of her conviction transmitted to the King's Bench, for the delivering her over to secular justice. Part of the form runs thus:—

Godwin's  
Annals.  
Stow's  
Annals.  
May 2,  
1550.  
*Joan  
Butcher  
burnt for  
heresy.*

“Cum igitur sancta mater Ecclesia non habet quod ulterius facere et exequi contra tam putridum membrum debeat; vestrae regiae sublimitati, et potentiae brachii vestri secularis, dietam Joannam haereticam pertinacem relinquimus, et tradimus animadversione vestra regia puniendam et plectendam.”

292.

Regist.  
Cranmer,  
fol. 79.

Thus far the process was carried on the last year: however, her execution was respited till now. In the mean time, nothing was untried to brink her off from her heresy; but all application proving unsuccessful, the king was solicited to sign the dead-warrant. The lords of the council suggested that her perverseness, in case she was spared, might encourage delusion, and occasion the spreading of such dangerous opinions. The king not being satisfied with what was urged by the council, the archbishop was desired to try his interest; but all Cranmer's arguments could not remove the king from his opinion. To execute her under so desperate a misbelief, was to consign her, he said, to inevitable damnation; that, therefore, it was better to correct her with some corporal punishment, and leave her her life for recollection. At last, the king being prevailed with by Cranmer's remonstrance and importunity, he signed the warrant with regret, and told the archbishop he should

*The king  
very un-  
willing to  
sign the  
warrant for  
her execu-  
tion.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

charge him with answering what was done to God Almighty. The unhappy woman was kept a week after this at the lord chancellor's house, where Crammer and Ridley visited her every day, and did their utmost to undeceive her; but she proved impenetrable to all arguments. When she was brought to the stake, Dr. Scory, afterwards bishop of Rochester, preaching to the people in confutation of her heresy, she interrupted him, and told him he lied, with some other intemperate language.

*John Alasco settles in England, and has a church allowed him with extraordinary priviledges.*

About this time, John Alasco, a Polish gentleman, settled in England. He was forced out of his country by the rigour of the Roman Catholics. His first stage was Embden, in East Friesland, where he was preacher to a congregation of the reformed; but here being no likelihood of any long shelter or repose, he embarked for England. He was hospitably entertained by the archbishop, made an acquaintance with sir John Cheke and sir William Cecil, and was by them recommended to the duke of Somerset. By this means gaining an interest at court, he moved his congregation might have leave to transport themselves to London, with the privilege of an independent church. The council, looking upon them as people in distress upon the score of conscience, moved the king in their behalf. In short, their request was granted, and Augustine-friars' church assigned them for the exercise of their religion; and, to give them a farther settlement, the king, by his letters-patent, made them a corporation, consisting of a superintendent and four assisting ministers. By this charter they were empowered to fill the vacancies by death or otherwise: with this condition, however, that the persons elected should be approved by the king and council; and, to leave them more fully to their conduct, the lord mayor, the aldermen, and sheriffs of London, are commanded not to interpose or molest them in their ecclesiastical government. The archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops are likewise forbidden to cite them into their courts, or call them to an account for their disagreement with the English Church. This instrument, by virtue of which John Alasco is made superintendent, bears date the 24th of July.

A. D. 1550.  
See Records,  
num. 65.

This indulgence, though going upon motives of generosity and compassion, proved unserviceable to the English Reformation: for this German congregation was very remote, both in government and worship, from our ecclesiastical constitution.



The allowing, therefore, a religious society so widely different from that of the country, and the exempting these foreigners from the jurisdiction of the bishops, was thought, in effect, an encouragement of schism, and setting up one altar against another. It must be said, this friendship and correspondence with the reformed of other nations disturbed our harmony at home, and proved an occasion of divisions. And of this we have a remarkable instance in John Hooper, nominated about this time to the bishopric of Gloucester. This clergyman, perceiving himself in danger from the "Six Articles" in the late reign, withdrew to Zurich, in Switzerland. When king Henry died he returned to England. His acquaintance with Bullinger, and frequenting the Zuinglian Churches, made him strongly prepossessed in favour of their customs. Being a popular preacher, and a zealous anti-papist, he was taken notice of by the earl of Warwick. By this nobleman's interest the king preferred him to the see of Gloucester, lately void by the death of Wakeman, abbot of Tewkesbury, and first bishop of that diocese. When Hooper came to the archbishop for consecration, he scrupled the episcopal habit: for which reason Cranmer refused him. The earl of Warwick wrote to the archbishop, requesting him to waive the insisting upon these ceremonies, and that this was the king's desire no less than his own. It was likewise moved, that the archbishop would not charge the elect of Gloucester with any oath against his conscience: for, it seems, Hooper had scrupled an oath which, by the law, he was obliged to take.

EDWARD  
VI.

July.  
Hooper  
nominated  
to the see of  
Gloucester.

The archbishop, it is likely, having neither liberty nor inclination to gratify such singularities, refused to comply. Upon this the earl of Warwick prevailed with the king to write for a dispensation with Hooper, discharging Cranmer from all penalties and forfeitures to which he might otherwise be liable. The archbishop, not willing to run the risk of a Præmunire, by obeying the king's private will against his public one in the laws, craved leave to be excused. And since there was no coming at the episcopal character without going through the customary forms, endeavours were used to satisfy Hooper's conscience. To this purpose, Ridley, bishop of London, had a conference with him, and argued the point at length, but without success. The council being apprehensive these disputes might start more questions, and grow to farther inconvenience,

*He scruples  
wearing the  
episcopal  
habit.*

Heylin,  
p. 91.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

sent for Hooper, and advised him to acquiesce. He intreated the board he might have the liberty of putting the reasons of his opinion in writing, which was granted. This paper was given Ridley to answer it.

Hooper, to inform himself farther, wrote to Bucer and Peter Martyr, for their judgment upon the controversy. He received an answer from both. Peter Martyr's letter was to this effect:—

Inter P.  
Mart. Epist.  
*Peter Mar-  
tyr's answer  
to his ob-  
jections.*

293.

“He expresses his satisfaction at Hooper's endeavour to retrieve the ancient purity, and unaffected plainness in religion: that he found it no small difficulty to disengage himself from the customs at Strasbourg, where the distinctions of habit, with respect to holy ministrations, was laid aside: that in religious rites he was for keeping as close as possible to the precedents of holy Scripture, and the most uncorrupted ages of the Church. However, he could not go so far in the other extreme, as to believe the substance of religion affected by clothes: he thought things of this nature altogether indifferent, and left at liberty by the Word of God. Had he been of Hooper's mind, that the customary habits for priests and bishops had been clearly unlawful, he would never have joined himself to the English communion. He thought conformity in these matters at present might be a serviceable expedient. That the contesting circumstantials ought to be declined till the reformation was better settled: that exerting our zeal upon indefensible points, and things of small moment, might lose the good opinion of the people, make them question the judgment of the reformed preachers, and give no credit to what they delivered in matters of the last importance. He proceeds to commend Hooper for his great pains in preaching: that by his talent and application this way, he had gained a considerable reputation, and put himself in a condition of doing a great deal of service. And here he precautions him not to overshoot in his zeal, and launch out into invectives, for that this would be the way to disappoint his pious intention. Besides, by charging these indifferent things as altogether unlawful, we shall,” says he, “draw an imputation upon unexceptionable communions, and condemn the practice of the most celebrated antiquity.

“And whereas Hooper had objected, that the sacerdotal habits were marks of Judaism, and would, in effect, return us to the Aaronical priesthood. To this Peter Martyr replies,

‘ That abstaining from blood and things strangled, were part of the Judaic institution ; however, the council of Jerusalem commanded the Gentiles upon the same observance ; that this was done out of a reconciling principle, and to avoid giving offence. That tithes, for the maintenance of the clergy, were likewise a branch of the Mosaic law. That it would be difficult to produce a command in the New Testament for singing Psalms in public assemblies. That the Christian Church, from the very beginning, had gone upon the imitation of the Jewish economy in several particulars. That the festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide are not without something of ground from the solemnities of the old law. Are these holydays therefore to be set aside because of their resemblance to the Jewish practice ? ’

EDWARD  
VI.

To proceed : Hooper objected farther, “ that these distinctions of habit were inventions of Antichrist, and that we ought not only to renounce the pope’s jurisdiction, but stand off from all the novelties and customs of that see.”

To this Martyr answers : “ That to maintain the unlawfulness of all rites and customs practised in the Church of Rome, looks like an indefensible assertion : that to govern by such narrow maxims would draw a very inconvenient restraint upon the Church of God. Our ancestors moved much more freely than this comes to. They made no difficulty of turning heathen temples into Christian Churches : they translated the revenues dedicated to the support of idolatry to pious uses, and the maintenance of the clergy. Besides, he thought Hooper mistaken in his supposition : he could not grant, that these vestments for officiating, were brought into the Church by the pope ; for,” says he, “ do not we read, in the ecclesiastical history, that St. John the apostle wore a gold plate, or mitre ? And does not Pontius, in the life of St. Cyprian, acquaint us, that this saint, at his martyrdom, gave part of his episcopal robes to his deacons, and was executed in a linen habit ? Thus St. Chrysostom makes mention of the white vestments in which the clergy performed their ministration : and here he puts Hooper in mind, that persons at their baptism put on a white habit.

“ On the other side, granting these distinctions were the inventions of the see of Rome, he did not think the contagion of popery so malignant as to carry infection to every thing it touched, and make it prove mortal to a good man that made

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

use of it. Hooper himself owned, that every thing in religion was not to be condemned upon the score of its being a human constitution. For instance, to communicate in the forenoon fasting, stands upon no higher ground than ecclesiastical, that is, human authority ; and yet he conceived Hooper would not censure this custom. His opinion was, therefore, the ancient usage ought to be continued for a time : that the pressing unseasonable alterations might obstruct advantages of a more significant kind. That, to prevent any weak brother's being misled by the continuance of the customary habits, the people ought to be reminded of the indifferency of these things, that they do not reach into the substance of religion, nor make part of the essentials in divine worship.

“ Hooper had objected, in the third place, that the particularity and richness of this religious equipage, would be apt to draw the eyes of the congregation, to break their attention, and turn to an amusement ; whereas, if the habit was plain and unornamented, nothing of this would happen.”

To this Martyr replied, “ that things commonly seen are seldom gazed at to any disorder : and if the people should be affected to any degree more than ordinary, it is to be hoped the solemnity of the habit, the holy pomp, might prove serviceable to them ; that it might awaken their respect, and recollect their thoughts for the business they were about ; and this seems to be one end of the institution of the sacraments, that by sensible signs the mind might be wrought up to proper meditations.”

Hooper argued, that “ whatsoever is not of faith is sin ;” to disentangle him from the misinterpretation of this text, Martyr refers him to the Epistles of Timothy and Titus, where it is said, that “ to the clean, all things are clean, and that every creature of God is good.”

Hooper urged, in the last place, that we ought to have an express warrant from Scripture for every thing belonging to religion. Martyr was of a different sentiment, and believed, that provided the substance was secured, and the general rules observed, the governors of the Church had a discretionary latitude in lesser matters.

This is Peter Martyr's resolution upon the question ; and Bucer, in his answer to Hooper, is of the same opinion. To give the reader part of his letter : He begins with lamenting

the rise of the controversy, and wishes it may be speedily taken up. He discovers his inclination for the removal of the customary habits, and tells them that at Strasbourgh, Ulm, Augsburg, and other places in Germany where he had any interest, he prevailed that the sacraments might not be administered with any such peculiarity. He complains of the abuse of these things in England, and that the marks and support of antichristianism were scandalously common and apparent. To make good this charge, he offers at several instances. And here he begins with the sacrilegious invasions of the laity; that they seized and plundered the best preferments; gave two or three benefices to their stewards and huntsmen, but with reservation of part of the profits to themselves. Thus they put such vicars upon the people; not those who were best qualified, but such as would engage upon the lowest terms, and afford the best bargain. The universities, as he goes on, which were to furnish the Church with proper guides, had no small number of students either erroneous in their belief, or licentious in their practice. And as to the service of the Church, it was performed in such a cold, lame, and unintelligible manner, that the people were little better edified, than if the office were said in the Phenician or Indian language. Neither baptism nor marriage were celebrated with that gravity and solemnity the business required. That the people can hardly distinguish between the Lord's Supper and the mass, excepting that the liturgy is in English. That pastoral duties are lamentably neglected; that there are no catechetical instructions, no private admonitions, no public censures of disorder. The discipline of the Church is so little put in use, that the spiritual authority is in a manner disregarded, and few persons will so much as own that Christ gave his ministers the power of binding and loosing. That people are promiscuously admitted to the privileges of communion, without any proof of being qualified either in faith or manners. That they appear empty before the Lord, and take little care of the poor at their religious assemblies. That the churches are made places for commerce and diversion; and that the audience are so far from observing that plainness and sobriety in clothes, recommended by the apostles, that the highest solemnities of religion cannot make them balk their vanity, nor come to the Lord's table without gold and jewels, without expense and gaudiness in

EDWARD  
VI.

*Bucer's  
letter to  
Hooper  
upon the  
same subject.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

dressings. Alas! as he goes on, the meaning of the Church, the communion of saints, and the kingdom of Christ, is little understood. The want of discipline is the occasion of this unhappy ignorance. Thus the fear of God and the notion of religion makes a very faint impression; and hence it is that lying, cheating, theft, perjury, and whoredom, are so much the complaint of the times.

These disorders, he tells Hooper, are the main properties, the strength and sinews of antichrist. These therefore are the things which ought to be combated in the first place, and against which our zeal ought to be principally employed.

As to the distinction of clothes, he does not think their being formerly abused a sufficient reason not to use them, or that there is any iniquity in the shape or colour of what we put on. He would gladly know what text of scripture there is to prove, that the Devil, or ill men, have such a power over God's creatures as to make them good for nothing, or unlawful?

"It is certain," continues Bucer, "that our Saviour has only prescribed the substance in matters of order, and the administration of the sacraments, and that the circumstances are left to the regulation of those who preside."

Thus, for instance: We neither receive the communion in the evening, nor in a private house, nor in a posture of discumbency, nor yet in a congregation of men only. And who could justly condemn the Church, if all those who came to receive the Lord's Supper should appear in a white habit, as they formerly did at baptism? To deny a liberty of practice within this compass, will bring us upon one of these conclusions: either that the Church has no power to appoint any thing with respect to the Lord's Supper, without express command from our Saviour. Now, this cannot be affirmed without charging all places of Christendom with scandalous prevarication. For what Churches are there that do not vary from the institution of the Lord's Supper in several circumstances? They are so far from having their time, and place, and posture, commanded by our Saviour, that on the other side his example is quite different from the general practice; for our Lord instituted his Supper in the evening, in a private house, after the eating the paschal lamb, in a posture different from that now received, neither were there any women at the solemnity. Another absurdity is, that the standing clear of the abuse of God's crea-

tures, though received with never so much purity of intention, is impracticable upon these principles. And lastly, at this rate wicked men may in a great measure destroy the benefit of the creation, and make those things they have misemployed a sort of forbidden fruit to others.

EDWARD  
VI.

These fancies therefore ought to be discharged by good men ; neither is there any fear the granting the Church a liberty in these matters should give our holy ministrations a tincture of superstition or paganism, or revive the ceremonial law.

As to religious rites and externals, the design of them is to recommend the service of God Almighty. Now, we know distinction and richness of habit in civil offices are a service to the character. An extraordinary appearance in these cases operates upon the generality, strikes their mind through their senses, and awakens a regard for the magistracy. Now, what should hinder its having the same good effect upon religion ? As for the texts of Scripture against human tradition, urged by Hooper, Bucer replies they do not reach the case in hand. The censure of these traditions affects only those who make them part of the vitals of religion, and prefer them to the Divine commands.

Bucer,  
Script. Ang-  
lic. p. 705.  
et deinc.

In this letter, we see Bucer makes a tragical complaint of the licentiousness and disorder of the times. If it is inquired why the bishops did not exert their character, and apply the usual remedy ? it may be answered, they lay under the dis- countenance of the state. The censure of excommunications had been disused, since the beginning of this reign : whether there was any command laid upon the bishops to forbear the exercise of their jurisdiction, or that there was a project on foot for drawing the cognizance of ecclesiastical causes to the secular courts, or that the publishing the process, under the king's authority, weakened the terror of the sentence, is not easy to determine. However, it is certain this solemn part of discipline was, as it were, suspended, or of little significancy.

295.  
*Hooper con-  
fined to his  
house, and  
afterwards  
sent to the  
Fleet.*  
Heylin.

Thus almost everything grew out of order, and profaneness and immorality had an unlimited range. This made bishop Latimer press for the restitution of the ancient discipline in his sermon before the king. "The English," says he, "are infamous for whoredom, beyond any other part of the world. Besides, they glory in their shame, and make a diversion of being wicked. To check this outrageous disorder, he entreats

*Latimer's  
sermon.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the king to restore the discipline of Christ, and return the Church the power of excommunication. That excluding offenders from the benefit of communion is our Saviour's appointment: now nobody is able to make a better provision than infinite wisdom: and that the exercise of discipline was the likeliest way to stop the progress of vice, and avert the judgments of heaven."

But if the case was thus, and the regale lay too hard upon the Church, the question is, whether it had not been more advisable for the bishops to have resumed their spiritual authority, acted upon our Saviour's commission, and ventured the displeasure of the state.

As for Bucer, and Martyr's letters, they had not that effect upon Hooper, which might reasonably have been expected. He still continued under his former prejudices, and no arguments could reach him; and by Martyr's cautioning him against unseasonable and censorious declamations, we may imagine he had played his satire pretty freely against the customs of the Church. And from his conduct in this dispute, we may, in some measure, collect the strength of his prepossession, and the condition of his judgment. For this incomppliance and liberty in the pulpit, he was first silenced and confined to his house by the council.

Council  
Book.

Hooper thought this usage somewhat severe: to miss his promotion, it is likely was no disappointment; but to be punished because he would not be a bishop, to be persecuted about clothes, and lose his liberty for not being in the fashion, was possibly more than he understood. He ventured, therefore, to take no notice of the order of council, and printed a confession of his faith. He was afterwards committed to the custody of archbishop Cranmer, who tried to bring him off from his singularities, but without effect. The archbishop complained, in a letter to the council, that Hooper was not contented with bare disconformity to the customary practice, but offered to prescribe to the public on this head. Upon this Cranmer was ordered to send him to the fleet, which was done accordingly.

Council  
Book.  
Strype's  
Memorial  
of Cranmer.

In the beginning of August, this year, there was a public disputation at Cambridge, where the following questions were defended by Bucer:—

August 8,  
A.D. 1550.

“First. The canonical books of Scripture are abundantly



sufficient to instruct the regenerate in everything necessary to salvation.

“Secondly. There is no part of the Church militant exempt from a possibility in erring, both in faith and manners.

“All good works which men seem to perform, before justification, are really sins, and merit the Divine displeasure, but after we are justified, good actions are necessarily done by us.”

At the entering upon the disputation, Bucer declares his opinion of what books ought to be received as inspired writings: and here he settles the canon agreeably to the articles of the Church of England. And for this he has the suffrage of antiquity. For the canonical books mentioned by Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, the council of Laodicea, and John Damascen, to which we may add St. Jerom and Ruffinus, go no farther than those two-and-twenty received by the Jews. And thus the books of Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, &c. are struck out of the canon: and though they were allowed to be read in the Church, yet their authority was not to be vouched for establishing any point of doctrine.

But notwithstanding his orthodoxy, in settling the canon, he seems somewhat perplexed about other matters: he makes the privilege of sufficient instruction peculiar to the regenerate: by the regenerate he means the predestinate, and affirms they cannot sin finally, so as not to recover. He maintains inward light and supernatural direction necessary to judge between the canon and the Apocrypha. Now this assertion, to speak softly, seems extremely mysterious. For if we must have a new revelation to understand the old one, to what purpose were the Scriptures written, and why is the Church of Rome blamed for locking them up in an unknown language? What signifies the translation of the Bible into the mother tongue, if we cannot come at the meaning without extraordinary illumination? Are those books which were written for general use, which contain matter of the greatest concern, less intelligible than human compositions? Or cannot God, who made the understanding, proportion his instructions to it? Farther, if we set aside the authority of the Church, and the concurrent testimony of successive ages, what motives of credibility can we urge to a deist, to prove the Scripture the word

EDWARD  
VI.

*A public  
disputation  
at Cam-  
bridge.*

Bucer,  
Script.  
Anglic.

Hist. Eccles.  
lib. 4. c. 25.  
*Some of  
Bucer's  
principles.*

Athanas.  
in Synops.  
et Epist. de  
Festis.  
Epiphanius.  
de Ponder.  
et Mensur.  
Hieron.  
Pref. in  
Proverb.  
Solom. et  
Prolog.  
Galeat.  
Ruffin.  
Expos. Fid.  
Damasen.  
de Orthod.  
Fid. lib. 4.  
c. 8.

Bucer,  
Script.  
Anglic.  
p. 718, 719.  
732. 737

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Id. p. 715.

of God? What possibility of converting infidels is there left upon these grounds? To say we are inspired with a certainty of what we deliver, will look like enthusiasm, unless we can make good our pretensions by miracles, as the apostles did.

296.

Rom. xiv.

Upon the second question, he infers the Church not infallible, because she is not impeccable, as if sin proceeded more from want of light in the understanding than predominancy of appetite and wrong bias upon the will; or that it was impossible to see an important truth, without being under a necessity of living up to it. He endeavours to prove his third question; that whatever is done before justification, though with all the advantage of intention, and the fairest appearance imaginable, is plainly sinful. His medium is this; before justification, no man can lament his failings and misperformance out of a principle of faith: but the apostle tells us, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." And thus, by plainly mistaking the apostle's sense, he builds upon the sand, and falls into no ordinary error. Of the misconstruction of this text I have had occasion to take notice already: to add something farther to what has been already observed. Those of Bucer's opinion, without question, must grant a man cannot be justified, before he believes the doctrine of Christianity: but that every action done under such a state of ignorance and defective persuasion, is not sinful, seems plain, from the tenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Cornelius, before St. Peter was sent to him, was but at the most a Jewish proselyte. Notwithstanding this disadvantage, his charity and devotion recommended him to God Almighty. Thus an angel is sent to him to applaud his practice, and acquaint him, that his "prayers and alms were come up for a memorial before God." Thus we see Cornelius is evidently commended for his piety and benevolent temper, before he could have anything of faith, in Bucer's notion. He is honoured with a message from heaven, and an apostle ordered to make him a visit, as a reward of his present attainments. Now if Cornelius had been in a state of enmity with God Almighty, and never done anything but what was provoking, which, according to Bucer, is the condition of a man unjustified; we have no reason to believe he would have been thus commended in the inspired writings. Besides, if this point wanted farther confirmation, St. Peter, in the beginning of his discourse to this centurion, puts it beyond all question.

The words are these: " St. Peter opened his mouth and said, EDWARD VI. Acts x. 34, 35. ' of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons ; but in every nation, he that fears him and works righteousness, is accepted with him.' " Thus we see the apostle makes no difficulty to declare Cornelius's alms and prayers " works of righteousness." And that he was acceptable to God Almighty upon this score: that the observance of these branches of natural religion qualified him for farther blessings, procured his instruction from St. Peter, and brought him within the pale of the Church.

Bucer was opposed by Segwick, Pern, and Young. And here, by going upon these principles, he is very much embarrassed in the dispute, lies unguarded, and miscarries not seldom in his defence. To translate the disputation at length, would be foreign to this work: but what I have already related, may show the reader his manner in arguing.

Towards the latter end of this year, Bucer wrote animadversions upon the English Common Prayer Book, which I shall mention now, that the history of this learned man may lie more together. Archbishop Cranmer, it seems, had sent to Bucer, to desire his opinion upon this book, and whether some things did not require a farther explanation. Bucer, to qualify himself for a resolution of this case, had gotten the Common Prayer Book translated into Latin, by one Aless, a Scotchman; and, writing his censure by way of letter to the archbishop, he makes this remarkable confession in the beginning: Bucer's animadversions upon the English Common Prayer. His concessions. that upon his perusal of the service book, he thanked God Almighty for giving the English grace to reform their ceremonies to that degree of purity; and that he found nothing in them but what was either taken out of the word of God, or, at least, not contrary to it, provided it was fairly interpreted. Now, if things were in this commendable condition, to what purpose did Bucer take such pains, as we shall see he has done, to bring on an alteration? Was not this divine sensible that the refining upon what is settled, and putting an establishment to a new test, is not to be undertaken without apparent necessity? Inconstancy of measures, new draughts, and retouching things, supposed to be finished, are by no means serviceable to the governors either of Church or state. The people are apt to take exceptions at such new appearances: they are apt to arraign the public wisdom, and question the conduct of

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

their directors upon this score. It has been, therefore, accounted prudential, rather to let little defects pass, than to bring them to a rectified condition, for fear there should be more lost in the authority of the government, than gained in the amendment.

To proceed to Bucer's animadversions, which are divided into eight and twenty chapters<sup>1</sup>.

*His objections.*

IN his first chapter he allows of the disposition of the Psalms and lessons, and the doctrine of the collects, and pronounces the management of this matter agreeable to the word of God, and the usage of the ancient Church: but then he is dissatisfied at the choirs being so remote from the rest of the church, and affirms the performing the service only in that place, an antichristian practice. Why so? Because it supposes the clergy to stand in a nearer relation to God than the laity. And what harm is there in this supposition? Do not those who represent a prince attend his service, publish his laws, and act by his authority, stand closer related than other subjects? And, to come to the case in hand, does not Moses upbraid Corah, and the rest of the tribe of Levi, for misbehaving themselves under their privilege; does he not tell them God "had separated them from the congregation," and brought them "near to himself?" And are not particular powers given by our Saviour to the evangelical priesthood? Does not Clemens Romanus say, that the bishops, priests, and deacons, answer to the distinctions of the high-priest, the second order, and the Levites under the Jewish law? His observation upon the figure of the churches, in the primitive times, and that they were almost round, is a mistake; for they were generally built upon a resemblance of the Jewish tabernacle and temple, which answered to the modern form.

Epist. ad  
Corinth.

In his second chapter he discourses upon the officiating habits. And here he continues so far in his former opinion, as to declare them not absolutely sinful: however, he would willingly have them reformed to the apostolic plainness: but here he might have considered the disparity, between the first age of Christianity and later centuries. In the apostles' times the

<sup>1</sup> Bossuet says, that Bucer was a man pretty well learned, of a flexible spirit, and more fertile in distinctions than the most refined scholastics: how far this estimate is correct, will appear from Collier's elaborate abstract of his writings.

Church was poor, and could not go to the expense of ornament and rich distinctions. EDWARD VI.

297.

Besides, the apostles could work miracles, and, therefore, needed no advantage from figure to support their character. To cure diseases, and raise the dead, was a higher recommendation, than if they had officiated in gold and purple, and appeared in the splendour of the Jewish high-priest: but since the gifts of miracles are recalled, some marks of distinction are no less necessary in the ecclesiastical, than in the civil government. Another argument why he would have the habit for holy ministrations altered is, because it is much the same used with that in the Church of Rome, which he generally salutes by the name of antichrist; standing off from all conformity with the Roman Catholics, is a thing he commonly insists on, but whether this is a good reason or not, I shall examine afterwards.

See Bucer's  
Letter to  
Hooper.

In his third chapter, speaking of the holy eucharist, he has nothing to except against the figure of the consecrated bread, and concludes it indifferent, whether it is round or otherwise: but then, where it is said, that nobody ought to suppose, "that there is less to be received in part, than the whole, but in each of them, the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ:" this he thinks may be misinterpreted by ignorant people, as if the body of Christ was locally circumscribed within the dimensions of the bread. This seems an unnecessary exception: the design of the rubric, is rather to prevent such a construction.

He objects farther against the rubric, for giving those whose course it is to offer, towards the charge of a communion, and to receive, the liberty of sometimes substituting another. This latitude he conceives may make the wealthy neglect the receiving the holy eucharist themselves, and put them upon hiring some poor people to appear in their place: this he thinks, differs little from purchasing of masses, excepting in the cheapness of the bargain. But since this indulgence was granted, to keep up frequent communions, and that the priest might have always some persons to communicate with him; for this reason, I say, Bucer might have given his animadversions a more charitable turn.

He insists upon having this sentence, "that every one should communicate once in the year at the least," expunged in the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

rubric, because it seems to imply a liberty of coming no oftener.

He declaims in his fourth chapter very piously, against the profaning of churches. The neglect of religion upon holydays, and the intemperate abuse of those solemn anniversaries. He conceives reason assigned by the rubric for the priest putting the consecrated bread into the communicant's mouth, and not into their hands, insufficient. He fancies this custom took its rise from a superstitious opinion, that the laity, not having their hands blessed, and anointed like the priest, were not holy enough to touch the consecrated elements. Besides, he rightly observes, it is but comparatively a modern usage, and that our blessed Saviour gave the holy symbols into the apostles' hands. But then, another discourse of Bucer's already related, seems to overthrow his reasoning upon this head. For there he makes no scruple to affirm, that our Saviour prescribed no farther than the substance in these things, and left the circumstances to the Church's regulation. And that the Church has all along practised upon this latitude, he gives several instances, with respect to the Lord's Supper.

Bucer's  
Letter to  
Hooper.

In his fourth chapter, he finds fault with the rubric, for ordering "the minister," that is the deacon, "to take so much bread and wine, as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy communion." This appointment he conceives gives occasion to superstitious fancies, and makes some people imagine it a piacular offence, to put the consecrated elements to common use: as if, says he, after the communion was over, there was something of divinity, or at least some peculiar holiness in the bread and wine. Now though Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and the rest of the Fathers, speak of the consecrated elements in the highest language of veneration, and seem to have a particular regard for them, even after the solemnity of receiving, yet Bucer is of a different sentiment, and finds fault with the remainders being eaten and drunk by none but the communicants: nay, he says plainly, that after the act of communicating, the consecrated elements have no more relative holiness in them, than common bread and wine.

In the fifth chapter, he objects against the customary gestures used at the public devotions, such as "kneeling, crossing,

holding up their hands, knocking upon their breasts ;” though, EDWARD  
VI. by the way, these gestures are left at discretion by the rubric, and might be either used or let alone, as every body thought fit. But what defensible exceptions can be made against these postures? To go through the particulars, Daniel, and St. Paul kneeled at their devotions ; making the cross upon every occasion, more remarkable than ordinary, was the general practice of the Church in Tertullian’s time. And the publican mentioned by our Saviour, “who smote upon his breast,” went home justified, rather than the pharisee, who found fault with him. But these gestures, says Bucer, are made use of in the mass, and that it is to be feared the continuance of them, confirms some people in the good opinion of that worship.

De Coron.  
Mil.

How can this be reasonably inferred, when the known doctrines and usages of the Church, are so very different ?

In his sixth chapter, he is not satisfied with two communions upon Christmas-day. If it is said servants have a better opportunity of receiving the holy eucharist by this order, Bucer thinks this reason has not weight enough in it : that upon this ground, the same direction should reach to every holyday, and Sunday, for it seems, he is not willing to allow our Saviour’s nativity any preference, to other days of lesser solemnity.

Towards the end of his remarks, finding a double communion ordered at Easter, he recollects himself, and recalls his censure.

He allows the reading of the homilies, where there are none Cap. 7. qualified to make sermons.

In other cases he prefers preaching : he complains the homilies do not take in subjects enough, and would have new ones composed upon the following heads. First, concerning the true communion with Christ. Secondly, touching the dedicating places and times, to the honour of God Almighty. Thirdly, for frequent coming to Church, and communicating in the prayers, hymns, and sacraments. Fourthly, touching liberal distributions of charity to the poor. Fifthly, of the worthy receiving the sacraments. Sixthly, concerning the admonition and correction of private and open offenders. Seventhly, concerning barring those the privilege of communion, who are guilty of notorious and scandalous behaviour. Eighthly, of the reconciling those who have submitted to the full length of their penance. Ninthly, of reckoning those no better than

298.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

heathens and publicans, who contemn the discipline of the Church. Tenthly, touching making proper provision for the indigent, pursuant to the direction of holy Scripture. Eleventhly, of the encouraging schools and subsisting poor children for a learned education, who discover a promising genius. Twelfthly, of marriage, and that this relation ought to be engaged in with none, but persons of probity and religion. Thirteenthly, of education proper for the children of Christians. Fourteenthly, of honest employment and avoiding idleness. Fifteenthly, of usury. Sixteenthly, touching fraud, and circumventing our neighbour. Seventeenthly, of all sorts of rapine, and unjust seizure of property. Eighteenthly, concerning epicurism in eating and expensive vanity in clothes.

Cap. 9.

His exceptions against recommending the dead to the mercy of God, have been considered already. His other objection against these words in the prayer of consecration, "and with thy Holy Spirit and word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ:" this objection has been obviated elsewhere.

*Supplices  
te rogamus,  
Omnipotens  
Deus, jube  
hæc perferri  
per manus  
Sancti An-  
geli in sub-  
lime altare  
tuum.*

In the third preface of the Communion-office, he would have this sentence altered, "and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy angels, to be brought up into thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of thy divine majesty." His first reason is, because this form of prayer is not delivered in holy Scripture. But then he must condemn a great part of the Communion-office, which notwithstanding its being unmentioned in Scripture, he is willing to allow.

In the next place, he supposes, that this form of prayer, extant in the ancient Greek and Latin liturgies, was used with reference to the oblations, made by the faithful, and placed upon the Lord's-table: but now, says he, there are no such gifts and oblations. To this it may be replied, that the bread and wine, are offered to God the Father, as the giver of such blessings, and as a commemorative sacrifice, of the passion of our Saviour, and that the preceding words, "accept this our bounden duty and service," may refer to this oblation.

Tobit xii.

Bucer urges in the last place, that the beseeching God Almighty to command his holy angels, to present our prayers to his divine majesty, seems borrowed from the apocryphal book of Tobit. That our Saviour commands us to address God the



Father in his name ; and elsewhere, in Scripture, he is said to be our priest and mediator. Thus the angel that appeared to Cornelius, did not tell him, that either himself, or any other angel, offered his prayers and alms to God Almighty.

EDWARD  
VI.  
Acts x.

Notwithstanding this reasoning, it is certain that angels have part of the administration of our Saviour's kingdom assigned them ; and that they are concerned in the presidency, and guardianship of the faithful. Thus we are taught by the author to the Hebrews, that " they are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." And may it not be part of their employment, to inspect the behaviour, to report the devotions, and intercede in behalf of their charge ? If it is said that God Almighty is omnipresent, and needs no information ; to this it may be answered, he is omnipotent too, and therefore, has no need of the ministry of angels to assist him in his government, and protect his Church, and yet the Scripture acquaints us he is pleased to make use of them for this last purpose. It is hard for us to pronounce upon the extent of an angel's commission, or to what charitable offices their own benevolence may carry them. It is true, St. Paul mentions " one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." But then, by the next verse it is plain, he means a mediator of redemption, and not a mediator of intercession, so far as to exclude all others. For every one who solicits his neighbour's happiness, and recommends him to God in his devotions, may be said to be a mediator in a lower sense. Now such instances of charity are not only lawful ; but the duty of one Christian towards another. And that an angel is barred the liberty of such friendly applications, is more than Bucer has proved<sup>1</sup>.

Acts xii. 15.  
Heb. i. 14.

1 Tim. ii.  
5.

In the sacrament of baptism, he would have but few ceremonies made use of, and takes the freedom to tax the customary rites, with indulging the humour of the vulgar too far ; and that these things nourish superstition, and approach too near the levity of a theatre. From this general censure, which seems to bear hard upon what was the ancient practice in Tertullian's time, he goes on to particulars. Here, in the first place he would have the white habit and chrism laid aside. He grants both these rites have great antiquity to plead, but since the

Cap. 9.

Tertull. de  
Coron.  
Milit. c. 10.

<sup>1</sup> See Jacobi Ode Commentarius de Angelis, 4to. 1739—the best work I have found on the subject.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

religious ardour of the first ages is gone off, these ceremonies, which were signs of it, ought not to be continued. But here, one would have thought he might have concluded the other way: that since these ceremonies were used to honour and explain the sacrament, they should still have been continued, to retrieve the same regard, and make the deeper impression.

Cap. 11.

In the first prayer at public baptism, he would have this sentence expunged: "Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, did sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin." He affirms the Scripture does not teach us thus far, and that this form is productive of superstition, and seems to imply the baptism of Christ had impressed a sanctifying virtue on the element of water. And both here, and in other places, he seems so extravagantly afraid of bordering upon magic, that sometimes one would almost think him under the power of it.

Cap. 12.

299.

He grants the sign of the cross a very ancient usage, and thinks the continuance of it may be serviceable, provided it is rightly understood, and recovered from modern abuse. But then, when the child is signed with the cross, he does not approve the words then used should be spoken to him, because he cannot understand them. But may not the same reason be alleged against the promise made by the godfathers in the child's name, because he is in no capacity of knowing the meaning, or giving his consent to the stipulation? Besides, I do not find Bucer dislikes these words at infant baptism, "I baptize thee," &c., though here is a direct application to the child himself. Afterwards he is so full of scruples, that, instead of "he coming to thy holy baptism," he would have it put being "brought to thy holy baptism."

Cap. 13.

He confesses the exorcising of persons baptized is a custom of the highest antiquity; but then he is of opinion that no person ought to conjure evil spirits but those who have a miraculous power to dispossess them: and even here he conceives their commission did not extend to exorcise any other persons but those who were demoniacs. Now he does not think all persons unbaptized in this unhappy condition. If all people before their admission into the Church were thus in the power of the Devil, he concludes the miracles of our Saviour and his apostles, in casting out evil spirits, will fall under a construction of disadvantage. But the necessity of this inference is more than I can discover; for without question there are degrees of diabolic

jurisdiction and mischief in these cases. Evil spirits may be suffered to make a malignant impression, without having the liberty of an absolute conquest, and commanding the motions of mind and body. EDWARD VI.

From hence he proceeds to rally the old objection, and disapproves of the godfathers and godmothers undertaking for the child, and answering the questions put to him. Instead of this, he would have them interrogated, whether they would do their endeavour to make the child learn his catechism, to renounce the devil, and profess his belief in the creed.

As to confirmation, he seems to think the rubric somewhat short in the direction, and that the "saying the articles of the faith in the vulgar tongue, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and the rest of the Catechism, are not sufficient qualifications." Not sufficient, unless the children are grown up to some degree of understanding in these principles. Cap. 17. And before they are confirmed, he would likewise have them discover a religious inclination, say their prayers without menaces or prompting, shew themselves dutiful to their parents, respectful to their betters, and compassionate to the unfortunate; and that those children who were backward in these improvements, should be refused confirmation, and shamed to an emulation of such as are better disposed.

He conceives the intermitting catechising for six weeks together too long an interval, and would have it repeated every holyday. Cap. 21.

Anointing the sick, though it is left at the patient's liberty, will not pass Bucer's test. But this point has been spoken to already.

At the churching of women, he excepts against offering the chrisme, for his reason above-mentioned. 1 Tim. v.

In the commination, he suggests the changing the order of the curses, and would have them stand as they are placed in the decalogue. He would likewise have the clergy rebuke those publicly who have been publicly scandalous, "that others also may fear." That those who are under penance should be obliged to abstinence and self-denial; to be more frequent in the exercises of religion, and exceed the usual proportion in charitable distributions. That no persons should be readmitted to communion without good proof of their repentance, and strong applications for that privilege. And here he very piously exhorts

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Cap. 25.

the clergy to manage the keys with resolution, and not to be governed by any regards of interest or fear; and in the close of the chapter laments the calamities of Germany, occasioned by the neglect of discipline.

Cap. 26.

In the next chapter, which is the last I have occasion to mention, he moves for the retrenching the holydays, and disapproves of ringing the bells, unless upon public or religious accounts.

Bucer,  
Script.  
Anglic.  
p. 456. ad  
p. 496.  
Archbishop  
Parker,  
MSS.  
C. C. C. C.  
inter Epist.  
Vir. illust.  
German.  
*Bucer's  
censures  
overstrained.*

Peter Martyr concurred with Bucer in his animadversions upon the Common Prayer-book, as appears by his letter to him upon that subject.

However, from what has been observed, the reader may perceive Bucer was somewhat overcharged with scruples, and carried his censure too far. Neither are his remarks at all reconcilable with his concessions in the beginning of his dis-  
course.

And amongst other things, his setting aside antiquity with so much ease is particularly remarkable. There is a great deference, without doubt, due to the authority of the first centuries. It was then the apostolical traditions were fresh, miracles were frequent, and the Church under the conduct of a distinguishing illumination. Then secular views and projects of ambition were foreign to inclination. Under such opportunities and qualifications, what room is there for suspicion of ignorance or foul dealing?

Acts ii. 42.

To reject the usages of the ancient Church, because we do not meet with them in Scripture, is no good logic. It is plainly not the design of the New Testament to furnish liturgies and rituals. The converts to St. Peter's sermon continued steadfastly in breaking of bread; that is, administering the holy eucharist; and in prayers. But what the prayers were at this solemnity, is nowhere delivered in Scripture. Where the extraordinary effusions of the Holy Ghost were not supplied, things of this nature were left to the discretion of the spiritual directors, who were to govern themselves by St. Paul's general rule, "Let all things be done decently and in order."

1 Cor. xiv.

It is true, if the religious customs of antiquity were plainly inconsistent with the doctrine of the inspired writings, we ought to stand off from them; but in other cases our Saviour's saying is applicable to the present purpose: "he that is not against us, is for us." And where the governors of the Church

are under no restraint as to ceremonies and compositions, what should hinder them from following their judgments, and directing as they think fit? "For where there is no law, there can be no transgression." What should hinder them in this case from enlarging the circumstances of worship? From assisting the memory, raising the affections, and explaining the mysteries, with additional ceremonies and devotions?

EDWARD  
VI.

His objection against primitive usages, because they have been overvalued and misapplied by the Church of Rome, goes upon a mistaken ground; for, granting the allegations hold good, there is no consequence in the reasoning. To argue from the abuse against the use of things, is the way to take our bibles from us; for what book has been more abused than the inspired text? By this topic almost every thing in religion and nature must be contraband, and prohibited. Bucer was formerly sensible of this fallacy; he saw the danger of disputing at this rate, and determines against it. To quit antiquity in any custom, because it is continued in the Church of Rome, has neither reason nor charity in it. It is a peevish principle, and helps to keep up a spirit of division. We ought rather to lament the breaches in the Church, than make them wider. All reproachful language, humoursome distance, and unnecessary squabbles, serve only to exasperate one part of Christendom against another, and make our common religion the jest of infidels and atheists. But notwithstanding these abatements, I may seem to have made him, where the subject furnished matter, and the argument would drive, Bucer could work the point, and do justice to the cause, with advantage enough.

See his  
Letter to  
Hooper.  
300.

About this time he wrote a book, entitled "Concerning the Kingdom of Christ," and dedicated it to the king. To bring things to the condition desired, he proposes the sending a considerable number of preachers to all parts of the kingdom, and that people should be recovered from superstition by persuasion rather than rigour. That the universities ought to be seminaries for this purpose, and that those fellows of colleges who either oppose the right belief, or spend their time insignificantly, should be turned out. He is afterwards more particular in his scheme for the retrieving of religion, and proposes several laws to the king's consideration.

Bucer's  
book con-  
cerning the  
kingdom of  
Christ.

First. He would have parents obliged to instruct their children in the principles of religion, and lie under a civil

Bucer, de  
Regno  
Christi,  
cap. 64. et

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

penalty in case they misguide their conscience, set them an example of licentiousness, or suffer them to be corrupted by other people.

His second law, as he calls it, relates to the strict observance of holydays. He is of opinion that these festivals should be wholly spent in religious exercises, without any allowance for recreation.

Thirdly. He solicits the king for a law, that churches may not be profaned with secular business, nor made places for walking and diversion.

His fourth law points to methods for the due exercise of the pastoral function: and here he advises the bishops to apply themselves wholly to the business of their character, and not live embarrassed with secular employment: he would have a proper form of doctrine and discipline offered to them, and that they should take an oath to govern accordingly: he would not have them manage altogether at discretion, but take in the advice of their priests. In the progress of his discourse, he recollects, and relaxes a little, and believes that bishops acting in the civil administration may not only be lawful, but serviceable to religion. But then when they are employed in princes' courts, and business of the state, he advises the constituting a coadjutor, to manage their authority and supply their absence.

He would have the bishops visit their diocese every year, and oftener upon any particular emergency. And that the bishop may be the better apprised of any disorder, he advises the setting suffragans over every twenty parishes, or thereabouts: and if anything happens too hard for them within their division, they should apply to their diocesan for a remedy. He advises the meeting of provincial synods twice a-year, and would have the king send some secular persons to represent his majesty, to preside with the metropolitan, and secure good order in their proceedings.

His fifth law suggests the preserving the revenues of the Church, disposing of it to persons duly qualified, and preventing simony.

And here he charges the pope with plain sacrilege, for exacting first fruits and tenths of the bishops and clergy: and puts the king in mind that nothing can be more remote from piety, than to imitate the court of Rome in this particular.

*He pre-  
cautions the  
king strongly  
against  
sacrilege.*

He grants church lands ought to pay taxes, no less than the estates of the laity, and for this he quotes the Justinian and Theodosian codes : and adds, that the clergy were only excused from the burthen of mean offices, from quartering soldiers, or entertaining persons belonging to the court. From hence he proceeds to take notice what large pensions were paid out of the exchequer for the support of the clergy and the poor.

EDWARD  
VI.

He states that those religious emperors always accounted the revenues of the Church sacred and unalienable. That they would never so much as exchange them with the crown lands, unless the Church had something better, or at least equal, in value. And for this he cites a law of Justinian ; and another of Valentinian and Marcian, to the same purpose.

Bucer, *ibid.*  
p. 75.

From these authorities, he proceeds to take the freedom to advise the king to drop the demanding of first fruits and tenths ; and that unless his majesty waives this exaction, he cannot avoid the imputation of sacrilege. He desires him, therefore, not to use the Church more hardly than the rest of his subjects : nor charge those estates which are settled for the service of God, the encouragement of learning, and the maintenance of the poor, with heavier taxes than are required from other people : he should be sorry to find his majesty show less regard to the interest of religion than his royal progenitors. These princes, says he, though under the conduct of a less orthodox persuasion, founded schools and hospitals. And notwithstanding the remarkableness of their bounty, wanted no fund to keep up the grandeur of their court, and furnish them for success in the field. And unless his majesty governs by these measures, he can neither justify his conduct to God nor man. And here he cries out against the sacrilege of charging bishoprics or benefices with pensions to secular men, who neither officiate in the Church, nor are really indigent.

He tells the king plainly, that exchanging of Church lands ought by no means to be allowed, unless any person has a mind to give the Church the best of the bargain, or at least an undisputed equivalent. He complains that colleges and churches have been extremely injured this way : that well conditioned estates have been wrested from them, and nothing but impropriations, that is, the plunder of the parsonages, given in

*Church  
lands not to  
be exchanged  
without an  
equal value  
returned.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

301.

return. And here he repeats the singularity of laying particular hardships upon the Church. To treat, says he, the ministers of Christ, and those who are particularly instrumental to make us eternally happy; to treat those worse than the rest of mankind, who have no such recommendation to our regard, is no better than downright wickedness.

“I am informed,” continues Bucer, “your majesty’s treasury is exhausted by the expense of a long war. If the case stands thus, this difficulty may be got over by customary supplies, without having recourse to the sacrilegious expedient of the court of Rome.” He puts his majesty in mind to take care not to be imposed on by any misrepresentations; that some people pretend a great zeal to improve the royal revenues, when nothing but their own covetousness and ambition lies at the bottom; that some courtiers, it is likely, may tell his majesty how liberal his father was to his ministers, to what degree of wealth they were raised in that reign by having abbey and Church lands bestowed upon them. “And why may not the son be governed by the precedent of his father’s bounty? Tully,” as Bucer goes on, “shall answer these men. No man ought to be liberal beyond his power, nor exhaust himself for the character of a kind master. And, to come to the case in hand, where has your majesty any abbey-lands now to bestow upon your courtiers? But if the bishops’ revenues, and other wealthy promotions, must be seized, and put under contribution for this purpose, which way can the clergy of impropriated parishes be provided with a competency? How can learning be encouraged, or the poor taken care of?” But these men will object, farther, that the bishops and rich clergy mismanage their fortunes, and do not answer these expectations of charity: they entertain an idle unnecessary retinue, squander away and spend their income in making a figure; and now, since they are allowed to marry, the patrimony of the Church will be spent upon their wives and children.

To this Bucer returns an answer in the Person of our Saviour: “Because pretended and disorderly bishops have formerly misspent my patrimony, does it become you, who account it an honour to profess my Gospel, to seize the remainder? Is it tolerable in you, who complain of those drones, to practise what you condemn, to rob the hives and devour the honey? Are you willing to receive me for your

*A reproof  
of the hypo-  
crisy, &c. of  
some gos-  
pellers.*



Sovereign, and come under the administration of my kingdom? EDWARD  
VI.  
 If you are thus resolved, I would have you consider whether there must not be select officers to execute my orders, and represent me in my government? And whether it is not necessary such persons should have a maintenance suitable to their character and business? And that those I have blessed with genius and talent should be supplied with opportunities of improvement? And since the laws of my kingdom require general kindness, and offices of humanity and compassion, I would have you examine yourselves, and see whether my government does not require a standing and well-furnished treasury? Without such a provision, which way can the poor be made easy, and prove serviceable to me or the commonwealth? Ought I not to be furnished for that exercise of beneficence, which even heathens expected from every wealthy person?—that is, to be provided with a fund for the redemption of captives, to engage for an indigent friend, and to encourage the honest and industrious?—What commonwealth was ever so barbarous and wicked as not to make a distinction between private or public property, and those things which are dedicated to the maintenance of religion? These last even heathens look upon as the demesnes of the Supreme Being. For this reason they were accounted sacred, and above the claim of any mortal; and if the State was sometimes so far pressed as to make use of them, they looked upon the money no otherwise than borrowed, and always took care to restore it when the difficulty was over: for they believed it part of the law of nature, that no government could make seizure of what belonged to the gods, or prescribe against them, upon any pretence whatever. Thus, whoever made bold with anything consecrated to religious uses was charged with sacrilege, and punished with more severity than if he had robbed the commonwealth.

“It is objected by some,” continues Bucer, “that the Church estates were in a great measure gained by imposture: that the weakness of the benefactors was surprised with expectations of being discharged from purgatory and conveyed to heaven; that the colleges and abbeys were founded upon the prospect of this imaginary return. Since, therefore, both the crown and several considerable families have suffered in their revenues by this fraud, it is but reasonable to make them

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

restitution: for God allows neither to rob nor cheat for the furnishing of his altar."

To this objection Bucer answers, first, "that those estates can never be more serviceable to the public than when they are vested in God Almighty: it is impossible they can be better spent than in promoting the interest of religion. Besides, as to those families which have been made victims, and imposed on to lessen their fortune, I desire," says he, "to know how many are remaining? Their posterity, I believe, are not commonly met with. However, those persons who have this peculiarity of descent, and are slenderly provided, ought to be assisted by the Church, and have a preference in her favour. But then, we are to observe, that, by the civil law, all settlements upon the commonwealth, though the uses happen to be exceptionable, were reckoned irrevocable. Thus, for instance, in case any person bequeath a legacy to a corporation for diverting the people with any scandalous spectacle or entertainment; and this town renounces paganism, and turns Christian; and thus the lewd or idolatrous entertainment becomes impracticable. Notwithstanding this, the legacy shall not return to the heirs, but remain in the corporation,—in the corporation, I say, who are obliged to turn the legacy to some justifiable use, and do right to the memory of the benefactor some other way. And thus it follows, by greater force of consequence, that those estates which were given to the Church of God are to remain in the Church's possession. They should, indeed, be spent to better purposes; but then the property ought not to be transferred, though they were given at first upon mistaken motives, and for the support of that which is by no means defensible."

De Usu  
fructu Le-  
gatorum.  
L. Legatum.

302.

After this he puts the king in mind that the honour of our Saviour and the interest of Christianity suffer extremely by the invasions upon the Church, and that his majesty is nearly concerned to put a stop to this disorder; and that, provided he protects the clergy in the enjoyment of their estates, he needs not question being rewarded for his piety and justice, and that God will supply him with means for bounty, and encouraging desert.

He pro-  
poses a pro-  
vision for  
the poor.

His sixth law proposes a scheme for providing for the poor. And here he would have the bishop and his clergy particularly concerned. He suggests the appointing of deacons for this

purpose: that they should inquire into the number and necessity of the indigent, and enter their names in a book; that charitable collections should be registered, and entrusted with the deacons; that they ought to give an account of their management to the bishop and his presbytery; that the bishops in their visitations should inquire what lands were settled for the maintenance of hospitals, and make their report to the king; and that then it would be his majesty's part to recover them to the uses for which they were first intended; that, in case any town is not in a condition to maintain all their poor, some of them should be removed to wealthier parishes; that commissions should be given out to the magistracy for this purpose; and that no person should be allowed to beg,—and for this last he cites a law of the emperor Valentinian.

EDWARD  
VI.

Bucer, de  
Regno  
Christi, 83.

The next law he advises relates to matrimony: upon which head he runs out into a long discourse, and spends several chapters. To touch briefly upon some of the more remarkable particulars: first, he would have matrimonial causes taken out of the hands of the Church, and put under the regulations of the State. He declares strongly for the marriage of cousin-germans; and though St. Austin relates the marriages within this degree prohibited in his time, Bucer observes this law was repealed in the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, and that the matter was thus left at liberty by the emperor Justinian. St. Austin urges, that the marrying with persons unrelated spreads friendship and good correspondence to a greater extent; and that, upon this account, Christians should decline marrying where they are of kin. This Father adds, that modesty and natural reservedness are better consulted this way. Bucer is so far from thinking either of these reasons sufficient, that he prefers the intermarrying with kindred, as far as the degree of cousin-german, to remoter engagements; because people have better opportunities of being informed of the religion and temper of their relations, than they can have commonly elsewhere.

August. de  
Civit. Dei.  
lib. 15. c. 16.

He complains of the canon law for allowing a separation from bed and board, without dissolving the matrimonial engagement. That this is an unreasonable restraint, he endeavours to prove from the Theodosian Code: and, because his citations are somewhat general, I shall point them more particularly to the reader.

By a law of Constantine the Great, if a woman could prove *Marriage*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

allowed  
after di-  
vorce.

III. Cod.

Theodos.  
tit. 16. l. 1.

Ibid. lib. 11.

her husband guilty of murder, poisoning, or breaking up graves, or defacing monuments, she might sue for a divorce, and recover her fortune. Thus if a man could prove his wife false to his bed, a procuress, or poisoner, he might part with her, and marry again. A law much of the same tenor was afterwards published by the emperor Honorius. And here there was some difference of privilege between the case of the man and the woman: for, by the law of Honorius, if the woman's suggestions for a divorce were found justifiable, she was to recover her fortune, and keep what her husband presented her with at the contract, and over and above, she had the liberty of marrying again at the end of five years. If the husband parted with his wife upon defensible grounds, he was to keep her fortune, and have his own presents and settlement returned. And in both these cases the husband and wife have an equal consideration. But in another circumstance the man has the advantage, because he has the liberty of marrying immediately after the divorce: whereas the woman is obliged to stay five years. There is likewise some difference made by the imperial laws in other cases. For instance, if a woman parted with her husband, and declared herself disengaged, without assigning any reasons, the man had the liberty of marrying another immediately: whereas if the woman was thus ill-used, she was barred marriage for one whole year. Secondly, if a woman procured a divorce, and could charge her husband no higher than perverseness of humour, and misbehaviour under the relation: when this happened the woman was condemned to live single all her lifetime: whereas if the woman was discharged upon no stronger imputation, the husband might marry again at two years' end: but in one case the husband and wife had the same treatment: for if either of them had divorced each other without any reason assigned, they were always to live single, and never permitted to marry elsewhere<sup>1</sup>.

Ibid.  
Comment.  
Gothofred.

Id. de Regno  
Christ. p. 93.  
And after  
monastic  
vows.

To return to Bucer, who takes notice that notwithstanding St. Jerome was so great an admirer of celibacy, he was yet overborne by the equity of the case to defend the lady Fabiola in her second marriage, after she had divorced her husband.

He observes, farther, that the Fathers allowed marriage in some cases after monastic vows. For this purpose he pro-

<sup>1</sup> Bucer's arguments on divorce are pretty remarkable—they are quoted at large by Puffendorf, Milton, and Madan.

duces a famous passage of St. Cyprian. Where, speaking of those who had vowed single life, he delivers himself thus: “If,” says he, “they are either disinclined or unable to make good their engagement, they had better marry than burn: ‘si autem perseverare nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam in ignem deliciis suis cadant.’” To confirm this opinion, he cites the authority of St. Austin and pope Gelasius I.

EDWARD VI.  
Lib. Epist. 1.  
epist. 11.

Bucer, *ibid.*  
p. 95.

And to justify marriage after divorce, he appeals to Origen and Leo I. The resolution of this pope is somewhat remarkable. In his letter to the African bishops of Mauritania Cæsariensis, amongst other things, he complains of their connivance at a priest who had divorced his wife, and married another. However, he only advises discharging him the exercise of his function. But he neither declares the marriage void, nor moves for excommunication.

Leo Epist.  
85.

Bucer observes, divorces may be allowed in other cases, besides adultery: such as desertion, &c. And here he offers at answering those texts of Scripture which are thought to forbid this liberty. He declares for the punishing adultery with death, both in man and woman.

Bucer, *ibid.*  
p. 97.

In his chapter concerning the education of youth, he would have those excommunicated who refuse to work when they are able. To secure young people from miscarriage, in their manners or employment, he proposes the choosing some discreet people in every town and village, to inspect their conduct, to examine their genius, and suit them with business accordingly.”

Idem, p. 114.  
122.

303.

*Rules for the education of youth.*

He spends one chapter in laying down some rules for the reforming merchandizing. He grants the merchants have a creditable employment, and that the commonwealth cannot go on without them; but then he would have them restrained from importing unnecessary commodities, and which tend only to the nourishing luxury and pride. He complains their gains are much over-proportioned to their industry or pretensions; that their raising great estates by indirect practice, tempts people of promising parts to engage in that way, who might be more serviceable to the state and Church by a learned education.

Id. p. 134,  
135.

*He advises the reforming the merchants.*

He complains their bringing over curiosities and shining trifles, tempts the extravagant gentry to run out in display, and purchase beyond their pocket. Besides, the merchants living at

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

such a rate of expense and appearance, puts people of condition upon a dangerous emulation; and thus the nobility and gentry, thinking it beneath them to be outdone by men of slender beginnings, strain beyond their strength, in their houses, eating, and equipage: and, by this means, it often happens their fortunes are dipped, their families ruined, and their seats sold to the merchant.

To prevent this mischief, he would have none bound to a merchant till they had passed the test of the parish triers abovementioned, and given fair indications of industry and conscience. Then, as to their business, he would have them barred the liberty of importing any commodities which serve only for fancy and unnecessary figure: and, lastly, he thinks the government should set a moderate price upon every thing they sell; and that retailers should be under the same restraints, to put a stop to covetousness and circumvention. And, to give a more effectual check to vanity and levelling, he recommends the making sumptuary laws: that the distinctions of quality, and a respect for the government, might be kept up: and that people, who are neither in public posts, nor distinguished in their condition, might not have the liberty to exhaust themselves in pomp, to carry on extravagance, and disable themselves for charity.

*He moves  
for explain-  
ing the laws,  
and pub-  
lishing them  
in English.*

He acquaints the king, the laws which settle property are much complained of, for their ambiguity and other defects: that tenures and descents, exchanges, and other contracts, are perplexed, and liable to dispute: that the laws being penned in a foreign language, lie out of common view: that, by this means, those who profess the law are put into a condition to entangle property, and impose upon the subject. That he is informed his majesty's father, being sensible of this great inconvenience, projected a reformation of the laws, and commissioned several persons for that purpose; but since this scheme, as it happened, was never executed, he advises that the laws relating to commerce and estates may be published in English, and explained in such a method, that a common capacity may reach them. For since the laws are every man's birthright, since every one is obliged to keep them, he thinks it but reasonable they should lie open in language and meaning, that every body may understand them.

*And pro-*

From hence he proceeds to lay down some directions for the

regulation of the magistracy. He would have every person nicely examined, before he is put into any office of trust and power. And here he makes sobriety and good life a necessary qualification: he would have no man preferred for favour or money, nor suffered to act by a deputy: he would have the management of the inferior magistracy inspected by those in a higher station; and, that when the term of the office is expired they should give a public account of their administration; and that every body should have notice to inform against them. He remonstrates against tedious imprisonment, and cites a law of Gratian and Valentinian, for speedy trials; and that those committed for malefactors might be quickly either punished or discharged. And whereas long imprisonment is sometimes part of the sentence, he thinks condemning them to some servile ignominious business abroad might prove a more significant correction; because the retirement of a goal keeps people private, and screens them from infamy in some measure; besides, they are commonly useless under such confinements, and left wholly to idleness and ill company.

EDWARD  
VI.  
*poses some  
regulations  
of the ma-  
gistracy.*

He proceeds to discourse concerning the degrees of punishment: and here he proposes the Mosaic law for a rule as to the main; for though we are not bound, either to the ceremonial part, or to all the circumstances even of the judicial, yet, where the cases are parallel, and the application holds, we should be governed by it. For how can we be so certain of equity and exact proportion, as when we proceed by the measures of Infinite Wisdom? Upon this ground he would have those crimes capitally punished in all commonwealths, which were death by the law of Moses. For instance, those who endeavour to make people desert from the true religion, and recommend a false worship, (by which Moses meant Pagan idolatry;) those guilty of blasphemy, breach of the sabbath, contumelious behaviour to parents; those who refuse to submit to the award of the highest court of justice; those guilty of murder, adultery, incest, stealing of men; or false witness, where the life of the person is concerned. Had not these crimes, says he, deserved death, we may be sure God Almighty would have ordered a gentler punishment. And here he complains of the partiality and connivance of human laws: if you ask the reason, says he, why theft is punished with death, and

*A recital of  
some crimes  
which de-  
serve capital  
punishment.*  
Deut. xiii.  
and xvii.  
Levit. xxiv.  
Exod. xxxi.  
and xxxv.  
Deut. xxi.  
Deut. xvii.  
Exod. xxii.  
Levit. xx.  
Deut. xix.  
Levit. xx.  
Deut. xxii.  
Deut. xxiv.  
Deut. xix.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

whoredom and adultery overlooked in several kingdoms? the answer is, because the legislators value their property higher than their religion; it is because they are more concerned for wealth and power, than for the interest of virtue, the honour of God, or their own salvation.

Bucer,  
Script.  
Anglic.  
p. 56 to 170.

This book of "The Kingdom of Christ" was dedicated to the king, and presented for a new year's gift. The young prince, it seems, was pleased with the performance, began to draw a plan from some part of it, and project a reformation of the government.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 157.  
and Records,  
num. 69.  
304.

This tract of Bucer's has a great deal of uncommon thought in it, handsomely supported. The whole discourse appears with a noble air of freedom and integrity. For these reasons, and the scarceness of the book, I have been the longer in giving an account of it, which, I hope, may not be disagreeable to the reader.

Ridley's  
visitation.  
K. Edward's  
Remains.

To go back towards the beginning of this year. Ridley, bishop of London, made a visitation about June. The articles may be seen in bishop Sparrow's Collections. They relate to enquiries concerning the regularity, doctrines, and performances of the clergy; for instance, whether they declared themselves abettors of the pope's usurpation, obstructed the exercise of preaching, or reading the Scriptures in the English tongue? Whether they incited men to sedition, and admitted any persons to communion before they were sufficiently instructed in the principles of religion, and had been confirmed by the bishop? Whether they sold the holy eucharist? preached or argued against the Common Prayer-book? or had private masses? Whether anabaptists, or any other sect, held conventicles? preached heterodoxies, or administered the sacrament in a different manner from the public establishment? Whether any parish priest refused to make use of the Common Prayer pursuant to the directions of the rubric? Whether baptism was administered contrary to the public establishment, with respect either to time or language? Whether infant baptism was impugned? Whether the prohibited degrees of marriage, publishing the banns, and some other circumstances, were duly observed? Whether any person's affirmation of the wickedness of the minister, voids the effects of the sacrament? Whether the curates visit the sick, bury the dead, examine the children, and



expound the Catechism according to appointment in the Book of Common Prayer? Whether the holy-days and ceremonies laid aside, are kept, and made use of? EDWARD VI.

To these articles the bishop added some injunctions. The design of them is mostly to prevent the revival of the old superstitions. For instance, the curates and priests are forbidden to practise several ceremonies prescribed for the mass; such as washing their hands after the Gospel, or receiving the holy communion, shifting the book from one place to another, blessing their eyes with the sudary or paten, and elevation of the consecrated elements before distribution. These, with several other gestures and ceremonies, are prohibited, too long to rehearse.

But the main business of this visitation was the taking down altars, and putting tables in their room. The leading motive to this alteration, as the learned Heylin conceives, was the giving in, in some measure, to the sentiments of Calvin and those of the Zuinglian persuasion. Some of these foreigners, it seems, made it their business to bring the English Church to the model of Geneva and Switzerland.

For this purpose, Hooper, who had no great regard for antiquity, took occasion, in his court sermon this year, to suggest, "that the government would do well to turn the altars into tables, according to the first institution of Christ; that, by this expedient, the people would be cured of a false persuasion of the performing sacrifices; that, as long as the altars continued, both ignorant people and ignorant priests would always dream of sacrifice."

This discourse was well received by some great courtiers, who practised upon the hint; and, as it is to be feared, not altogether upon religious considerations. That interest had the ascendant, seems not improbable, by the inquiry made some time after what jewels, gold and silver plate, hangings, and other rich ornament and furniture, belonged to cathedral or parochial churches, with orders to leave only a very slender remainder.

The alteration above-mentioned being resolved, a letter, in the king's name, was directed to bishop Ridley. It sets forth, "that, notwithstanding altars had been taken down upon good considerations in most parts of the kingdom, yet they were continued in several churches; that this occasioned a great deal of clashing and dispute; and, therefore, to avoid all

Regist.  
Ridley,  
fol. 305.

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 95.  
*The king's  
letter for  
changing  
altars into  
tables.*  
Nov. 24,  
A. D. 1550.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

occasions of contest and misunderstandings, his majesty commands the bishop, that all altars should be taken away in the diocese of London, and tables set up in their room." And, that weak people might not be shocked at this new appearance, there were several reasons digested into form and sent with the letter, to justify what was done. With these arguments the bishop was to furnish such preachers as he thought disposed for the service. This letter was subscribed by the duke of Somerset, the archbishop of Canterbury, the lord-admiral Clinton, the earls of Warwick, Bedford, and Wiltshire, the bishop of Ely, the lords Wentworth and North.

*The reasons  
for this  
alteration.*

The arguments conveyed with the letter, to reconcile the people to the order, were to this effect: first, it was urged, an altar was for sacrifice, and a table for eating; the latter, therefore, was more proper for the solemnity of the Lord's supper. Secondly, that, in the Book of Common Prayer, the words "altar," the Lord's "board," and "table," are promiscuously used, without prescribing anything with respect to figure and form: that it is called a table with reference to the Lord's supper, and an altar upon the score of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving there offered to God Almighty; that, therefore, the changing altars into tables is no contradiction to the Rubric. The third reason aims at the reforming the superstition of the mass, and recovering the people from their misapprehensions concerning the sacrifice offered there. Fourthly, it is argued that altars were erected for the sacrifices of the Mosaic institution; that, since the obligation of this law was now at an end, the form of the altar ought not to continue. Fifthly, our Saviour instituted the sacrament of his body and blood at a table, and not at an altar; neither does it appear the Apostles made use of this latter in their ministrations. Lastly, it is declared, in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, that, if any doubt should happen concerning the use of that book, the resolution of the difficulty should be referred to the bishop of the diocese. How cogent these reasons were, I shall not examine. However, bishop Ridley, as far as it appears, complied with the order without any reluctance; and afterwards, when there happened a contest about the form of the Lord's board,—that is, whether it was to be made upon the resemblance of an altar, or like a table,—he declared for the latter figure, and gave a precedent of it in

his own cathedral of St. Paul's; where he ordered the wall, standing on the backside of the altar, to be broken down. However, it seems this change did not make its way through all the kingdom till the First Liturgy was discharged by act of parliament,—the First Liturgy, I say, where, by the Rubric, the priest is ordered to stand before the middle of the altar, whereas, by the Second Liturgy, the priest is appointed “to stand on the north side of the table,” this put an end to the dispute.

EDWARD  
VI.

305.

It was now thought fit to try the temper of bishop Gardiner, and whether two years' imprisonment in the Tower had made him more flexible. To this purpose, the duke of Somerset, the lord treasurer, the lord privy seal, the lord great chamberlain, and secretary Petre, were ordered to go to him. Being asked whether he would conform to the government, he answered in the affirmative, and appeared ready to recommend and promote the keeping the king's laws. Some few days after, the duke of Somerset, and others of the council, asking his opinion of the Book of Common Prayer? His answer was, that notwithstanding he would not have drawn it up altogether in that manner himself; yet he could fairly reconcile it to his conscience, and therefore should officiate by it, and take care to bring others to the same conformity.

June 9.  
*Bishop  
Gardiner  
further  
examined.*

Council  
Book.  
K. Edward's  
Journal.

This, one would think, looked like reasonable satisfaction. But it is possible some great men were willing to entangle the bishop, and prevent his discharge. But let this be as it will, it is certain he was put to a stricter test. In the first place, there were several articles given him to subscribe. By these he was to make an acknowledgment of his behaviour, and own the justice of his confinement. He was likewise to own the king's supremacy; that the Common Prayer-book was a godly and commendable form: that the king was a complete sovereign in his minority; that the act of the Six Articles was justly repealed; and that the king had full authority to correct and reform what was amiss in the Church. The bishop put his hand to all the articles excepting the first; he stood upon the inoffensiveness of his conduct, and declared he could not subscribe himself guilty of faults he had never committed.

Upon this, the council ordered new articles, and a fuller submission should be drawn for the bishop to subscribe. The articles were two-and-twenty, and comprehended the greatest

*Articles  
injoined him  
to subscribe.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

part of the reformation made in the late and present reign. For instance: that king Henry VIII. had justly dissolved the monasteries, and that the chantry lands were defensibly taken away; that images in churches, and missals, were likewise taken away upon justifiable accounts; that the homilies and ordinal are good books, and ought to be received; that the lower orders of subdeacon, and downward, are unnecessary, and that the omission of them in the late ordinal is altogether justifiable; that all points necessary to salvation are contained in the holy Scripture; that the setting up Erasmus's paraphrase in churches was done upon good grounds. The rest have been mentioned already. These articles, which were put into form by Ridley, Petre, Cecil, and Gooderick, a common lawyer, the bishop was to subscribe, and declare himself willing to recommend and publish them from the pulpit. But Gardiner absolutely refused the article of submission, requested he might be brought to his trial, and desired nothing but justice. As to the other articles, he told the bishop of London and secretary Petre, that when he was at liberty he would discover his opinion; but did not think it reasonable to be pressed to a subscription during his being in prison. This answer being reported to the council, it was agreed to send for him; and in case he gave no farther satisfaction, to put his bishopric under sequestration for three months, and then deprive him, provided his incomppliance continued.

July 19.  
*His bishop-  
ric is se-  
questered.*

When the bishop was brought before the board, and the question put to him, his answer was, that he would gladly obey his majesty's commands in every thing; but at present, his conscience not giving him leave to go the length required, he desired they would be pleased to excuse him. Upon this, the council proceeded to the sentence of sequestration.

In December following, a commission was directed to archbishop Crammer, the bishops of London, Ely, and Lincoln, to secretary Petre, sir James Hales, and some other lawyers, to call the bishop of Winchester before them, and proceed to deprivation, in case he continued obstinate. When Gardiner was brought to Lambeth, before the commissioners, he made a protestation against his judges, and excepted to the legality of their commission, and desired a copy of that and the articles, which was granted.

Dec. 15.  
Council  
Book.

Upon the fourteenth of February following, he was brought

again before the commissioners, and deprived. He appealed from them to the king, and desired a copy of the sentence; to which the commissioners demurred, till the pleasure of the king and council was farther known.

EDWARD  
VI.  
*He is de-  
prived.*

The next day, the council sitting at Westminster, after a debate upon the bishop's case, came to the following resolution: "That, since this prelate had misbehaved himself with respect to the king, and reproached his judges with the names of heretics and sacramentaries, he should be removed to worse lodging, and have but one person of the lieutenant's appointing to attend him; that he should not be allowed any company, nor send letters or messages to any person, or receive any thing from them." His books and papers were likewise ordered to be taken from him.

*And more  
closely im-  
prisoned.  
Council  
Book.*

These proceedings seemed very arbitrary, and by no means consistent with the English claim of liberty and property. It was thought somewhat singular to imprison a man upon a complaint, and after two years' confinement, to put new articles to him, without farther inquiry into the reasons for his commitment. Besides, to deny the bishop the benefit of the king's courts, and stop the channels of justice, was somewhat extraordinary, and came too near the rigours of the Inquisition, as some ventured to say. To allege that the canon law was not rectified, and that the king stood in the pope's place, seems an insufficient defence. For by the canon law, laymen had no authority to make part of the bench for sequestering or depriving a bishop. Besides, to bring liberty and freehold under the cognizance of an ecclesiastical commission, is bearing somewhat hard on Magna Charta.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 152.  
Ibid.

Our learned historian does not stick to confess, that Cranmer was carried beyond his ordinary temper, and stretched a little in the proceedings against Gardiner and Bonner.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 163.

Upon Gardiner's deprivation, Poynt was preferred to the see of Winchester.

306.

This year Day, bishop of Chichester, was called to an account, for not complying with the king's letter, for taking down altars: to prevent prosecution, he came to the duke of Somerset's, and desired he might be excused upon the score of conscience. The next day, appearing before the council, he declared it was his opinion, that the taking down the altars, and the setting up tables, was more than could be justified by the Scriptures, or

Nov. 30.  
A. D. 1550.  
*Day, bishop  
of Chi-  
chester, com-  
mitted to the  
Flect.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.)  
Council  
Book, pences  
R. Harley,  
Armig.  
Isa. xix.  
19.

the Fathers of the Church; and that the six reasons published by the bishop of London, were short of satisfaction. The board requiring him to allege his Scripture authorities, he cited a text from Isaiah, but this was overruled by Cranmer, Ridley, &c. as not pertinent to his point. The two bishops above-mentioned argued the case with him, and laid down some of the grounds of their opinion. To this Chichester replied, he could not perceive their reasoning was strong enough to command his practice: however, he was willing to be farther instructed. The council remitted him to the archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishop of London, and gave him four days to return his answer. The bishop at his next appearing persisted in his former sentiment, and urged a text from the epistle to the Hebrews, where it is said, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle." But the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Ely told him, this citation was foreign to the purpose; that Christ was meant by the word altar in this place, as appears by the context. As to the authorities of the primitive Church, the bishops urged that it was clear, by Origen against Celsus, that the Christians had no altars when this Father lived. This they think may be concluded by negative proof. They added, that in regard the altars had been abused, it was necessary to have them removed. However, they owned the Lord's-table was called an altar by ancient writers. In fine, the bishop of Chichester continued unsatisfied, and was ordered on Sunday following to give in his final answer. He appeared accordingly, and told them, he could by no means prevail with himself to act against his conscience. That if there was no help for it, he thought it a less evil to suffer the body to perish, than to destroy the soul. This answer being construed contempt, he was committed to the Fleet, by the order of the whole board.

Dec. 4.

Heb. xiii.  
10.

Council  
Book.

This bishop's incomppliance had occasioned some disturbance in his diocese, as appears by the council's letter to Dr. Cox, who was ordered to go into Sussex, to quiet the people, and remove their scruples, who, as the letter words it, were now troubled, by the seditious preaching of the bishop of Chichester and others.

October 7,  
1550.

Council  
Book.

To look back a little: in May this year, one Nixon pretended to a spirit of prophecy, took great freedoms upon the strength

of his character, and spoke some things against the king and government, for which he was committed to the Tower.

In November following, the justices, Leister, Bromley, and Portman, appeared before the council, where being demanded why they had proceeded in the præmunire against the bishop of Bath and Wells, contrary to the countermand of that board: they answered they were sworn to suffer the laws to have their due course. At last this question was given them to answer upon the twenty-sixth instant, viz., “Whether if a spiritual office was surrendered to the king, and afterwards the king by parliament newly erects the same office, whether the same be a spiritual office or no?”

To this the judges above-mentioned, by the advice of the rest of their brethren, answered thus in the affirmative: “That a spiritual office so surrendered to the king, notwithstanding the new erection of the same by any act of parliament, remains still a spiritual office as before.”

Voisy, bishop of Exeter, was deprived, or, as some say, resigned this year. He was suspected for secretly abetting the late rebellion in Devonshire. This prelate was no friend to the Reformation, nor yet true to the interest of his see: for he conveyed away fourteen of the best manors, and made long leases, charged with pensions of the rest. And thus he betrayed his Church, either out of covetousness or cowardice.

Kitchen, bishop of Landaff, and Salcot, alias Capon, bishop of Salisbury, and Sampson, bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, though they made shift to comply with the orders for the Reformation, yet it seems they did it with an ill grace, and discovered their disaffection. Thus lying exposed to the displeasure of the court, they were forced to compound at high rates, to keep their station. Thus the cathedral of Coventry and Lichfield was stripped of a great part of its patrimony, to raise a baron's estate for sir William Paget. Salcot of Salisbury bought his peace of some great men, by making long leases of the best of his farms and manors. And Kitchen, bishop of Landaff, was so false and poor-spirited, as to convey away almost all the lands of that rich see, and let the rest for a very long term upon a small rent reserved.

Towards the latter end of this year, there was great complaint made against Dr. Oglethorpe, president of Magdalen college in Oxford. To secure himself from the information which related

EDWARD  
VI.

Council  
Book.  
*The judges' opinion concerning a spiritual office.*  
Council  
Book.

*The see of Exeter voided.*

Godwin, de  
Præsul.  
Angl.  
Heylin.

*Great alienations of bishops' lands.*

Godwin, de  
Præsul.  
Angl.  
Heylin.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*The sub-  
missions of  
Dr. Oyle-  
thorpe and  
Dr. Smith.*

to religion, he signed a paper, by way of letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, to this effect: "That he had never preached against, nor openly contradicted any points of religion, set forth by his majesty, or enacted in parliament: that he thought the king's proceeding in this matter pious and good, if used according to the intendment of his highness's laws: and that the form and order of religion now set forth, was nearer the practice of the apostolical and primitive Church, than that which was formerly used in England: and particularly that communicating the laity under both kinds, that some of the people should always receive the holy eucharist with the priest, the Common Prayer in English, the homilies lately set forth, and many other alterations, were commendable and pious, provided they were rightly used. And lastly, he declares his dislike of the doctrine of transubstantiation, thinks it neither agreeable to the Scripture, nor the belief of the ancient Church: however, he owns a mysterious and incomprehensible presence of Christ's body: that therefore, it ought to be administered with solemnity and reverence, and not received without great preparation."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2.  
Records,  
p. 207.

307.

Dr. Smith is another instance of compliance farther than was expected. He had written a book for the celibacy of the clergy, and appeared pretty much against the changes in religion. Complaints having been sent up against him from Oxford, he was brought to London and imprisoned: but after some little time was admitted to bail. And growing more inoffensive in his behaviour, Cranmer got his sureties discharged; upon which he wrote him a letter of thanks. In this address he tells the archbishop, "he shall always be sensible of his favour; he thanks him for his gentle usage of those in the university who differed from his grace's opinion in matters of religion: he desires to see some part of Cranmer's collection against his book for the single life of the clergy. He professes he wrote this discourse only with a design to discuss the question, and reach the truth, and that it was afterwards printed against his will: he heartily wishes it had never been written, because he found himself mistaken in his main ground: he then believed the English priests were under a vow of celibacy after ordination, but now he was of another opinion. And, lastly, he wishes the archbishop a long life for the countenance and advancement of piety."

Id. ex MSS.  
C. C. C. C.



This year, in February, Martin Bucer departed this life at Cambridge. This learned person, having the countenance of the court and archbishop Crammer, was buried with all imaginable respect. The vice-chancellor and all the graduates, together with the mayor and aldermen, accompanied the corpse to St. Mary's, where, after prayers, Haddon, the university orator, made a speech in commendation of the deceased. After this, his friend Dr. Parker paid him the same regard in an English sermon, and sir John Cheek, in a consolatory letter to Dr. Haddon, laments Bucer's death with a great deal of rhetoric, and gives him an honourable character. He was a person of good learning and regular behaviour: and notwithstanding his singularity in some matters, he seems to have been all along actuated by a principle of conscience, without popular humour, or mercenary designs.

EDWARD  
VI.  
Bucer's  
death.

To the same year we may reckon the privy council's letter to the bishop of London, to forbid the curates of his diocese preaching on any other days than those hereafter mentioned. They acquaint the bishop with their being informed, by the lord chancellor, that several preachers in the county of Essex got too often into the pulpit, and preached on working-days: That this over-frequent preaching drew the people from their business, and gave occasion to idleness. To this end they pray the bishop to restrain these performances only to Sundays and holydays, and that on working-days they should only read the prayers prescribed.

Inter Script.  
Anglic.  
Bucer,  
p. 867 to 914.  
Regist.  
Ridley,  
fol. 261.

About this time the Council-book mentions the king's sending a letter for the purging his library at Westminster. The persons are not named, but the business was to cull out all superstitious books, as missals, legends, and such like, and to deliver the garniture of the books, being either gold or silver, to sir Anthony Archer. These books were many of them plated with gold and silver, and curiously embossed: this, as far as we can collect, was the superstition that destroyed them. Here avarice had a very thin disguise, and the courtiers discovered of what spirit they were to a remarkable degree.

Feb. 25.  
1550.  
*The libraries at Westminster and at Oxford almost destroyed.*

The Oxford libraries had much the same quarter this year from the king's visitors, as that at Westminster. To give some instances, Merton college had almost a cart-load of manuscripts carried off, and thrown away to the most scandalous uses: these books were written upon the subjects of

CRAN-  
MER,

divinity, astronomy, and mathematics, by some of the most eminent of that society. Baliol, Exeter, Queens', and Lincoln colleges were purged of a great part of the Fathers and Schoolmen; and to show the discretion of some people was much of the same size with their justice, and what an antipathy they had to the memory of learned men, great heaps of these books were set on fire in the market-place. This execution of the muses, some young members, bigotted to ignorance, called Scotus's funeral. The public library, made up in a great measure of the books given by Angerville, bishop of Durham; Cobham, bishop of Worcester; and Humphry the good duke of Gloucester, underwent the same fate. The books marked with red were generally condemned at a venture for popery, and where circles and other mathematical figures were found, they were looked upon as compositions of magic, and either torn or burnt. And thus an almost inestimable collection, both for number and value, were either seized by the visitors, turned into bonfires, or given to binders and tailors for the use of their trade. This was a strange inquisition upon sense and learning; and looks as if the earl of Warwick and some others of the visitors had a farther project: and that they intended to seize the superstitious foundations, and reform them to nothing. That this is no uncharitable censure upon the earl of Warwick will appear afterwards. The university languished in their studies the remainder of this reign: and were remarkable for nothing but some trifling performances in poetry and grammar.

Ibid. p. 272.  
et lib. 2.  
p. 48, 49, 50.  
March 8,  
A. D. 1550.  
*Hooper gets  
over his  
scruples, and  
is conse-  
crated.*

Hooper, having now overcome his scruples against the episcopal habit, was consecrated bishop of Gloucester by archbishop Cranmer, the bishops of London and Rochester assisting at the solemnity. He was likewise disentangled from the other difficulty of taking the oath required: this oath, which he stuck at before, was the oath of supremacy, and not that of canonical obedience, as is commonly supposed. This mistake in Fuller's "Church History" stands thus corrected in his "Worthies of England." That this was the case, appears by Cranmer's objecting the danger of his incurring a præmunire; for the bare dispensing with Hooper's oath of canonical obedience had no such penalty annexed; but if Hooper had been consecrated without swearing the supremacy, this omission might have brought the archbishop under a præmunire.

Fuller's  
Worthies,  
Somerset-  
shire.

This compliance of Hooper, as represented by our learned EDWARD VI. historian, looks somewhat remarkable. "He was to be attired," says this author, "in the vestments that were prescribed, when he was consecrated, and when he preached before the king, or in his cathedral, or in any public place; but he was dispensed with upon other occasions." If Hooper Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 166. could conform thus far, one would think there should be little occasion for a dispensation. Besides, if he believed the episcopal habit sinful, which way could he reconcile himself to the wearing it at all? If he did not, what made him scruple appearing in it upon any customary occasion? Why did he 308. affect a singularity against the usages of the Church, and give a precedent of exception? Fox is displeas'd with Hooper for yielding in this point: he rallies him for his conformity, represents him as a player, and passes an awkward jest upon his habit. Fox, vol. 3. p. 147.

Upon the deprivation of Heath, bishop of Worcester, Hooper held the see "in commendam" with his own. This gave his enemies a handle to report him to disadvantage. They wondered a man that had his conscience so lately embarrassed with little matters could reconcile himself to two sees. But it is thought Hooper was not much the richer for his double preferment. The courtiers, it is likely, found him passive in parting with the revenues, and took care to ease him of the imputation of an avaricious prelate. Latimer had preached against sacrilege; and, therefore, little of this compliance could be expected from him. This, it is probable, was one reason of his not being restored to his bishopric upon Heath's removal. But whether Latimer was overlooked upon this motive, or whether he declined the exercise of his episcopal character, is somewhat uncertain.

Great endeavours, as has been already observed, had been used to bring the princess Mary from the Church of Rome; but, as it happened, no arguments or methods of application could make an impression. It is likely Cranmer's pronouncing her mother's marriage void might have given her an aversion to the Reformation. As for her title to the crown, it was not concerned in this dispute. Whether the divorce was lawful or not, she stood next upon the succession. The crown was devised to her by her father's will, who, by act of parliament, was empowered to dispose of it, either by letters-patent, or his Endeavours to bring the princess Mary to the Reformation, but without success.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

last will and testament. However, as her education had given her a prepossession, so it is likely her inclination might stand for the belief and ceremonies formerly received. Thus she kept up the Roman religion in her family, and permitted more than her servants to be present at the mass. This being construed an excess of liberty, Mallet and Barclay, her two chaplains, were committed. She complained of this usage in a letter to the lords of the council, but received no satisfactory return.

This treatment, it seems, making her willing to quit the kingdom, a design was laid to convey her into Flanders. The regent of the Low Countries had hired one Scipper to cruise upon the coast of Essex, to come ashore under pretence of victualling his ship, and take her on board. There was likewise a commotion concerted in that county to amuse the people and cover her escape. But this enterprise, being discovered by the king of France to the English resident, proved abortive: for now the king, being informed of the plot, ordered the putting out some men-of-war, marched down some troops under the command of sir John Gates to secure the coast, and sent for the princess to court. She complied with great unwillingness; and, to give her a farther mortification, her chief servants, Inglefield, Walgrave, and Rochester, were sent to the Tower. When she was brought to the king, he told her "she had been indulged the liberty of having mass a great while, in hopes that time and argument might recover her to a better persuasion; but now, perceiving her resolved to continue in her errors, he should be obliged to take other measures, and recal his indulgence." The princess replied, "her soul was God's, and that she would neither change her faith nor dissemble in her practice." The king answered, "he did not intend to force her belief, but only to restrain her in the outward profession; that she ought to be governed by authority, and live like a subject, and not disturb the kingdom by a dangerous incomppliance." After this discourse she was ordered to continue with the king; but neither Mallet nor any other chaplains were permitted access to her.

This restraint upon the princess was highly resented by the emperor, who sent an ambassador to England, and threatened the king with a war, in case his cousin the princess Mary was denied liberty of conscience. The lords of the council were

Hayward's  
Life of King  
Edward 6.  
p. 120.  
*The king  
cannot be  
prevailed  
with to allow  
her the ex-  
ercise of her  
religion.*

March, 1551.  
K. Edward's  
Journal.

very inclinable to gratify his imperial majesty. They considered a refusal might fall heavy upon the English interest. The merchants had effects to a great value in Flanders. The king had five hundred quintals of powder there, besides other provision for the war. All this they knew would be seized if a rupture happened. The king, therefore, was advised by the whole board to relax a little, to dispense with his sister's compliance, and let the law sleep for some time, to keep fair with the emperor. The king, being strongly averse to the religion formerly received, and having more conscience than politics, refused the expedient. Upon this the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London were appointed to try how far they could work upon his resolution. The point was argued with all the advantage they could give it; and at last, to come close to the question, they told him, though the licensing what was sinful was a sin, yet a temporary connivance might be allowed, where there were hopes of reforming the party. This distinction was too fine for the king's conscience. He expressed himself with a great deal of concern, broke out into tears, and declared he was resolved to run the utmost hazards rather than give way to so strange a permission. The bishops, though sorry to find the king so unalterable in his judgment, were not ill pleased with such indications of piety in so young a person.

EDWARD  
VI.

Hayward.

By the way, this principle upon which the king denied the lady Mary the exercise of her religion makes all toleration of Dissenters unlawful: for, without doubt, it is a sin to disobey our lawful spiritual guides, and continue in a state of separation from the Church: from the Church, I say, where no exceptionable terms of communion are required.

The king being not to be removed from his opinion, the council thought it proper to dismiss the emperor's ambassador in the most obliging manner the case would bear. They acquainted him the king would shortly send a resident to the emperor's court, with full instructions to settle a right understanding between both princes; and, not long after, Dr. Wotton was despatched into Germany upon this affair. He was to "desire the emperor not to concern himself so deep in this matter; to put him in mind, that, as the lady Mary was his imperial majesty's cousin, so she was the king's sister, and his subject too; that, since the king was a sovereign prince, it was

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
309.

somewhat singular the emperor should interpose in his government, overrule his laws, and prescribe to him in the management of his subjects; notwithstanding, the king was willing to practise by the emperor's precedent, in tolerating a different religion, and ready to allow the same liberties of worship to the emperor's subjects which the English received in the dominions of that prince."

*An alliance  
with France.*

The king, perceiving himself upon cold terms with the emperor, thought it advisable to make an alliance with France; and, having received some hints at the treaty of Boulogne, that the overture of a marriage would not be unacceptable, it was resolved to try the disposition of that court. To this purpose, the marquess of Northampton, the bishop of Ely, secretary Smith, and some other gentlemen of distinction belonging to the court, were furnished with a public character; and, to make the embassy more splendid, the earls of Arundel, Rutland, and Ormond, the lords Lisle, Fitzwater, Abergavenny, Bray, with several other persons of condition, went along with them. The marquess, at their first audience, presented the French king with the order of the Garter; after this, the bishop of Ely, in a short speech, declared how desirous his master was to cultivate his friendship with that monarch, and that he had something of moment to propose relating to that matter.

The French king ordered the cardinal of Lorraine, the constable Chastillon, the duke of Guise, and some other persons of quality, to manage the treaty.

The English began with their old demand of the queen of Scots. To this the French answered, they had lost too much blood and treasure to part with her upon any terms; and, besides, her marriage with the dauphin had been long since concluded. The English, finding this point impracticable, proposed a match between king Edward and the lady Elizabeth, eldest daughter of France. This motion was well received by the French commissioners: however, they threw in this condition, that neither party should be bound till the lady was twelve years of age. The adjusting the portion was somewhat more difficult, the English demanding fifteen hundred thousand, and the French offering no more than two hundred thousand crowns. That sum was at last accepted, and an embassy agreed to be sent into England, to settle the jointure, and finish the remaining articles; all which was performed,

Hayward.

and the alliance concluded at London. The Council Book EDWARD VI. gives a farther account of the perfecting this alliance in these words :—

“ This day the lord admiral being returned out of France, delivered to the lords the ratification of the marriage, between the king’s majesty and the lady Elizabeth, the French king’s daughter, under the great seal of France ; and it was accorded that the same treaty should be delivered to the lord treasurer, to be by him reposed in the treasury of the exchequer, to remain there of record in safe keeping.”

This close correspondence with France set the kingdom more at ease, and encouraged to a farther reformation : for now we were reinforced to a balance of strength against any attack from the emperor. Notwithstanding the advances made in the English Churches as to other matters, there was yet no system of doctrine formed for a standard of communion. It is true, something of this kind might be collected from the Homilies and Common Prayer Book ; but this did not discover the Church’s sense in many important points, nor reach to all the controversies then on foot. The scrupling the sacerdotal habit, and the privileges granted to John Alasco’s congregation, awakened a disputing humour, disturbed the public harmony, and disserved the authority of the Church. It is thought, likewise, the turning the altars into tables abated the people’s regard for the holy sacrament, and had no good effect on their devotion. And, to make this solemn mystery grow less in the people’s esteem, John Alasco’s book in defence of sitting at the communion, may be supposed to have contributed. While the altars continued there was no occasion to prescribe the people the posture for receiving : they kneeled of course, and, as they wanted no direction, so neither was there any appointment in the Rubric touching this matter ; but now John Alasco’s congregation sitting, and the figure of a table having a less air of solemnity, made it more necessary to set them a rule. Besides, the clergy were divided in their opinions, and somewhat unresolved at what place of the holy table they were to officiate ; it was thought fit, therefore, a Rubric should be made, to determine this matter.

But much greater alterations than this were now coming forward. The Common Prayer Book was to be reviewed? The Common Prayer-book reviewed. Calvin, Bucer, and Peter Martyr, by making exceptions

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

against the service established, had their share in bringing on this change. Calvin, who thought himself wiser than the ancient Church, and fit to dictate religion to all countries in Christendom, had taken no small pains in this matter. Something of this kind has been observed already in his letter to the protector: he continued still to intermeddle, and solicit for his own fancy, as appears by several other epistles. In his letter to Bullinger, he takes notice of his interposing in Hooper's case, and that he did not approve the rochet and cap in the episcopal habit, though he would not have had Hooper gone quite so far in his opposition. In another of his letters to Cranmer, he speaks disgracefully of the English reformation: "That there was so much popery and intolerable stuff still remaining, that the pure worship of God was not only weakened, but in a manner stifled, and overlaid with it." This letter, though there is no date printed, seems to have been written after the Book of Articles was drawn, and therefore probably after the review of the Common Prayer. That the time may be thus reckoned, seems pretty plain by his congratulating the English for coming to a state of settlement in religion, that by this means the people would not float any longer, nor be at a loss about belief or practice. The learned Heylin cites another of Calvin's letters to the king, in which he acquaints his highness, that a great many things were still out of order in England, and stood in need of a farther reformation.

Calvin.  
Epist. p. 131.

*Quæ non  
obscurat  
modo sed  
prope mo-  
dum obruat  
verum et  
genuinum  
Dei cultum.*  
Id. p. 135.

Heylin's  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 107.

310.

And, as this historian continues, Calvin, being apprehensive he might not pass altogether for an oracle with the council and bishops, tried his interest in other places, and pushed his design by his agents in the court, the country, and the universities. Bucer was a strong second to Calvin, and what efforts he made has been seen already. Peter Martyr agreed to Bucer's amendments, as appears by his letter, in which there are some remarkable passages. For the purpose: "He gives God thanks for making himself and Bucer instrumental in putting the bishops in mind of the exceptionable places in the Common Prayer. That archbishop Cranmer told him they had met about this business, and concluded on a great many alterations: but, what those corrections were, Cranmer did not acquaint him, neither durst he take the freedom to enquire: but, that which pleases me not a little, continues Martyr, sir John Cheek acquaints me, that if the bishops refuse to consent

Jan. 10,  
1550-1.



to the altering what is necessary, the king is resolved to do it himself, and recommend that affair at the next session of parliament." EDWARD VI. Ex Biblioth. C. C. C.

These foreign divines had gained the esteem of some of the English bishops so far, that in the last year's convocation there was a contest in the upper house concerning some controverted passages in the Common Prayer-book. For instance some questions were moved concerning the holydays abrogated and continued by that book. The words used at the giving the bread, and some other circumstances relating to the holy eucharist, came under debate. The lower house had lately received a message from the bishops to consider this matter, and when their answer was required, they acquainted the upper house by the prolocutor, that they had not as yet sufficiently considered the questions, but that in the following session they would report the sense of the house to their lordships. But what account was returned does not appear in the acts of that convocation, there being nothing but the passage already mentioned left upon record.

To proceed: the Common Prayer-book was brought to a review, and altered to the same form in which it stands at present, some little variations for clearing ambiguities excepted. The differences between the first and second Liturgy have been partly observed already, therefore I shall be more brief upon this occasion. However, to mention something in the office of the communion, the ten commandments were added in the beginning. This is supposed to have been done to awaken the consciences of the congregation. There was likewise a confession and absolution added in the beginning of the morning and evening prayer. The rest of the changes consist mostly in discharging several rites and parts of the service retained in the former book.

For instance, the use of oil and the sign of the cross were thrown out of the office of confirmation. There is no liberty left for extreme unction at the visitation of the sick. The prayers for persons deceased, in the communion service, and the office of burial are expunged; and some remarkable passages in the consecration of the eucharist, together with the use of the cross upon that occasion are omitted. The Introites or Psalms in that office are likewise left out.

In this new Common Prayer-book there was a rubric in-

Heylin's  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 107.

*Some differences  
between the  
first and  
second  
liturgies.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

served, for kneeling at the holy eucharist. By this direction it was declared, that the posture of kneeling was retained for a signification of our "humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding such profanation and disorder in the holy communion as might otherwise ensue, yet lest this gesture should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is here declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either to the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine 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 the natural body and blood of our Saviour, Christ, are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body, to be at one time in more places than in one."

This rubric was ordered to be left out of the Common Prayer-book, in the reign of queen Elizabeth, to prevent giving offence to some people, otherwise inclinable to the communion of the Church of England. But since the restoration of king Charles II. some people, either of weak judgments or contentious humours, excepted to the posture of kneeling, as if some dangerous superstition might be covered by it; to satisfy these scruples, the Church thought fit to condescend so far as to restore the rubric of king Edward's reign above-mentioned.

There is another material difference between the two books at the delivery of the consecrated elements: the form in the first book stands thus:—

"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." In the second book thus:—"Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." At the giving the cup, the words in the first book are these:—"The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." The second book stands thus:—"Drink this in remembrance Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." To create a greater reverence for the holy eucharist on

the one hand, and prevent misconstruction on the other, the Church of England has now taken in the first and the second book, and added both the forms in this part of the solemnity. EDWARD  
VI.

The settling the articles was the next material occurrence in the Church that happened this year. Archbishop Cranmer, together with Ridley, had the principal direction in this affair. For this year he received an order from the king and council to draw a book of articles for preserving the peace and unity of the Church. The archbishop is said to have executed the order, and struck out a system. This draught he put into the hands of several bishops, to be farther examined. Thus the matter rested, till the next year, when the council wrote to the archbishop to deliver in the articles: they were sent accordingly, and soon after returned to Cranmer, who digested them to a better method, distinguished them with titles, and threw in some supplemental passages where they seemed too short. Not long after this, he waited on the king with the book, and desired it might be published with the advantage of his highness's authority. The articles being left with the king and council, a letter was directed to Harley, Bill, Horn, Grindal, Perne, and Knox, to consider certain articles, (which, without question, must be these) and make a report of their opinion. *Archbishop  
Cranmer  
draws up a  
book of  
articles of  
religion.*

By the way, the first four of these divines were the king's chaplains in ordinary; and being eminent for their talent in the pulpit, were ordered for itinerant preachers, and to go a circuit, as it were, for the instruction of the people. They were six in all, who were selected for the business of preaching. Two of them were to be always at court; the other four were to execute their charge in the manner following: In the first year, that is, 1551, two of them were to travel into Wales, and the other two into Lancashire. The next year two had the marches of Scotland assigned them, and two went into Yorkshire. The third year two of them preached in Devonshire, and two in Hampshire. And the fourth year, two in Norfolk, and two in Kent and Sussex. Council  
Book. 311.

To return to the articles. The archbishop received the book from the privy council, with orders to examine them farther, and give them the last improvement of his judgment and pen, that being in this condition of advantage, they might pass the convocation, and come abroad by the royal authority. The Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. 171.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

archbishop having made some remarks upon the book, inclosed them in a letter to the lords of the council. In his letter, he requested the lords to solicit the king, that all the bishops might be empowered to oblige their clergy to subscribe the book; and that if this point were gained, such a harmony in religion he hoped would follow as could not otherwise be expected in many years.

Memorials  
of Cramer  
in Append.  
num. 64.

The order to the archbishop for drawing the articles happening in the time before me, I have added the rest for the unity of the relation; though part of the matter of fact did not come up till the next year.

*The sweating  
sickness.*  
July 9,  
A. D. 1551.

This summer the sweating sickness returned in England, and raged to that degree, that in the city of London only, there died eight hundred a week. This pestilential distemper appeared first in this country in the reign of Henry VII. It seemed particularly levelled against the English constitutions, pursued them into other countries, and distinguished them for the calamity; which, besides the breaking out of it here, might be one reason of its being called "sudor Anglicus." The patients when first seized sweated plentifully. The malignity proved frequently mortal within four-and-twenty hours, and sometimes in less than twelve. Women, children, and old men were seldom visited. People in the strength and best period of their life lay most exposed to the infection; and if they happened to sleep a little after the disease had reached them, they died immediately. Scarce one in a hundred escaped at first, till time had farther informed the physicians, and directed to a proper management. The true regimen was this: If a man happened to fall ill in the day time, he was to lie down in his clothes, as the disease found him: if in the night, he was to keep his bed, and lie without motion for four-and-twenty hours. He was not to load himself with clothes so far as to force a sweat, but to keep it in its natural course, and prevent its being checked. Nothing of meat was to be taken during the time of danger, if the patient could possibly forbear. As for drink, that which was customary to the patient was allowed, provided it was warmed, and taken in moderate quantities. He was to be particularly careful to keep his limbs in the bed; for the putting out a hand or a foot was certain death. That which was remarkably strange in this distemper was, its hunting out the English, as it were, through all countries, and lay-

A. D. 1551.

ing no hold of the natives. Several persons of condition were carried off with this sickness, and amongst the rest, Henry, duke of Suffolk and his brother. They were cousin germans to the king, sons to the famous Charles Brandon, and of a very promising genius. Henry, the eldest, died first, and left the title to his brother, who did not enjoy it the length of a whole day. And thus Henry Gray, marquess of Dorset, who married Frances, eldest daughter to Charles Brandon, had some prospect of the honour, and on the strength of this pretension was soon after created duke of Suffolk <sup>1</sup>.

EDWARD  
VI.

About this time, there passing several letters between the privy council and the lady Mary, I shall prosecute the remainder of that affair. She had some months before complained to the council of her chaplains, Dr. Mallet and Barclay, being indicted, and an attachment awarded against them for saying mass in her house. She remonstrates that this usage was a breach of promise made to the emperor's ambassador. To this the council, in their letter to her, reply, that this engagement was made under restrictions: "That her grace was only to have private mass in her closet for a little time; and that this was done in hopes she would shortly be better informed. That during this interval of connivance, she was only to have a few in close attendance at the old service. As for the rest of her family, they were to be present at the reading of the reformed liturgy. They acquaint her grace the emperor's ambassador pressed to have the promise above-mentioned under the broad seal; and being denied this, he moved for the king's letter, but that was likewise refused. Not that there was any intention of failing in the promise; but that they hoped the princess would quickly be brought over to the religion established. As to the ambassador, he was told that the licensing any worship against orthodoxy and known truth, was a sin against God. And therefore, all that the king could do was only to suspend the execution of the law, provided the indulgence was made use of within the compass of the grant. They are informed, as they continue, that her grace is resolved not to admit of any farther debate in the controversy, nor to hear any thing offered against the persuasion of her education. That this management looks as if she was apprehensive her belief would not stand the test of a thorough examination. They add, the Christian faith professed

*The lady  
Mary soli-  
cits the king  
and council  
for the exer-  
cise of her  
religion.*

<sup>1</sup> The sweating sickness appears to have caused more deaths in this country than either the plague or the cholera.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

is the same in substance as before, and that every article of the creed is common to both communions. That the difference lies in the ceremonies and use of the sacraments. That in these particulars the English reformation had recovered the worship to the directions of Scripture, and the usage of the primitive Church.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 705.  
et deinc.

312.

“They commend her for her resolution of standing firm to her faith, provided it is well grounded; but then they tell her faith and opinion are two things. They desire a proof from Scripture of her grace, why the Common Prayer should not be in English? And what grounds she can produce to justify the setting up of images of God in the Church?”

This letter was written in the latter end of the year 1550, when the first Common Prayer-book was used and unreviewed. As to that part of the letter which relates to religion, it was penned, in all likelihood, by Cranmer and Ridley, who were then of the privy council. That it was drawn by one or both of these prelates, may be reasonably concluded from their arguing so much at length from the Scriptures, from the Citation of the Fathers, and the Ecclesiastical History. The reason why I mention this is to show, that the council were then entirely satisfied about the first Common Prayer-book. With what conscience else could they have told the lady Mary, that “we use,” to speak in their own words, “the ceremonies, observations, and sacraments of our religion, as the Apostles and first Fathers in the primitive Church did?” implying that the princess Mary pleaded for later custom against truth, and the English Church for truth against custom.

Aug. May 2,  
1551.

To proceed: the princess Mary wrote again to the council, complaining of Dr. Mallet's being sent to the Tower, and insisting on the promise made to the emperor formerly mentioned. The council, in their answer, deny there was any promise that mass might be said in her house when she was not there; that Mallet and Barclay had broken the conditions of the indulgence, officiated in her absence, and fled from justice over and above.

The princess Mary, not succeeding with the council, addressed the king. In her letter she moves, in very strong and tender expressions, that the permission of the customary worship, and that which was used in the king their father's time, might be allowed her. She repeats the promise made to the emperor by the privy council, and seems to charge them

pretty plainly with denying their engagement, or explaining it to insignificaney. She puts the king gently in mind of his minority; and that, notwithstanding his capacity was much greater than could be expected from his years, yet it was impossible he should already be grown up to that pitch of knowledge and judgment as to pronounce upon matters of religion. She entreats, therefore, she may be permitted to govern her practice by her conscience in things of the last importance; and that this respite may continue till age had qualified his majesty for a judge himself. If this request cannot be granted, she resigns her life, as she had done once before, to the king's pleasure, and declares she had rather die than go on at the expense of a good conscience.

EDWARD  
VI.

August 19.

About a week after the king's receiving this letter he wrote to the princess by the lord-chancellor Rich, who, with sir Anthony Wingfield, comptroller of the household, and sir William Petre, secretary of state, had farther instructions. By the particulars with which they were charged, it appears her three servants above-mentioned—Rochester, Inglefield, and Walgrave—were sent to the Tower for disobeying the king's orders, in not prohibiting the household from saying and hearing mass.

August 24.

But, in April, the next year, they were discharged, and commanded to return to their lady's service.

The business of the lord chancellor, Wingfield, and Petre, was to discharge the mass, and answer the plea in the princess's letter. They were to acquaint her that her request of an indulgence, with respect to religion, could not be granted upon any consideration; and, as for her offering her life rather than alter her persuasion, the king was extremely troubled to find her so far confirmed in a mistaken conscience. However, neither himself nor any of his council had any intention of doing the least harm to her person. These courtiers, after they had spoken to the princess's letter, and acquainted her with the king's resolution, were ordered to call the chaplains and the rest of the household before them, and strictly forbid the first to say, or the other to hear, mass, under the utmost penalties of the law.

*She is re-  
fused.*  
Id. p. 710.

In September, this year, Heath, bishop of Worcester, and Day, bishop of Chichester, were thrown out of their sees for their incomppliance above-mentioned. They were deprived by a

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

commission directed to sir Robert Chohmley, chief baron of the exchequer, sir Richard Reed, Richard Gooderick, John Gosnold, John Oliver, Richard Ryal, all laymen. After judgment given, the council sent a letter to the chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, for the seizing the temporalities of these bishoprics to the king's use. It seems the loss of their sees was not thought punishment enough; therefore, they were kept prisoners in the Fleet till next summer, when, upon their petition for more liberty and air, Day was put into the hands of the bishop of Ely, and Heath was sent to the bishop of London's custody, who were ordered by the king to treat these prelates as charity and discretion should suggest.

Strype's  
Memorials  
of Cranmer,  
p. 230.

To proceed to something remarkable relating to the State. The court had been for some time divided into two factions; the one headed by the duke of Somerset, and the other by the earl of Warwick. There had been lately an alliance made between these two great men: the lord Lisle, the earl of Warwick's eldest son, being married to a daughter of the duke of Somerset. But this relation was too weak to keep them upon good terms. The earl of Warwick, it is said, had projected beyond the ambition of a subject, and entertained a fancy of bringing the crown into his family. It is supposed the illegitimizing the lady Mary and the lady Elizabeth, by act of parliament, might lead him into this thought. But to this it may be answered, that, if an act of parliament could disable the two princesses from inheriting the crown, a subsequent act, which settled them in the succession, must give them an unexceptionable right. However, the earl of Warwick's marrying his fourth son, the lord Guilford, to the lady Jane, eldest daughter to the duke of Suffolk,—this, I say, together with his management afterward, confirmed the suspicion. But that he had formed a conspiracy against the duke of Somerset, and entered into a practice to destroy him, is no more than conjecture: for neither the duke of Somerset nor any of his party offered to prove any such matter. However, it is certain the earl of Warwick, being a man of reach, and of a pushing temper, rose quickly to an overbalance, and gained the ascendant at court. He is said to have procured a creation of honours, in which himself and his friends were principally considered. Grey, marquess of Dorset, was made duke of Suffolk; and himself, duke of Northumberland,—for Henry Percy, the last earl of

Godwin,  
Annal.  
*A misunderstanding  
between the  
duke of  
Somerset  
and the earl  
of Warwick.*

35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 178.

313.



Northumberland, dying without issue, his next heirs were the sons of Thomas Percy, who had been attainted in the last reign for the Yorkshire rebellion, and thus the title slept as to that family;—to go on, Pawlet, lord treasurer, and earl of Wiltshire, was made marquess of Winchester; and sir William Herbert, who married the marquess of Northampton's sister, was made earl of Pembroke. At this solemnity, secretary Cecil, and Cheek, one of the king's preceptors, were knighted.

EDWARD  
VI.  
A creation  
of honours.

October 15.

The duke of Somerset had made some unwarrantable efforts to recover his former greatness, and gone too far in his measures against the other party. And thus his enemies having traced his progress, and furnished themselves with evidence against him, he was sent to the Tower. Sir Ralph Vane, and sir Thomas Palmer, sir Miles Partridge, sir Michael Stanhope, sir Thomas Arundel, Hammond, Newdigate, and two gentlemen of the Seymour family, were committed at the same time. Palmer, Vane, and Arundel, were kept in distinct apartments, to prevent concerting their story, and imposing upon the council. The next day, the duchess of Somerset, and Crane and his wife, her two favorites, were likewise sent to the Tower.

Heylin's  
Hist. Re-  
form.  
Stow's  
Annal.  
October 16.

The duke of  
Somerset  
sent to the  
Tower.

There was six weeks' interval between the duke's imprisonment and his trial. And thus, the king had leisure to sound the design, and relieve his uncle: but whether he had judgment to disentangle this matter, or was altogether governed by the duke of Northumberland's creatures, is somewhat uncertain. An unseasonable amusement happened to lie in his way, which might possibly engage the fancy of a young prince so far as not to leave any room for much other business.

The queen regent of Scotland, having made her daughter a visit in France, was desirous to shorten her voyage, and return home through England. The king's leave being granted at her request, she came a-shore at Portsmouth, where she was honourably received, and conveyed towards London. From Greenwich she came by water to St. Paul's Wharf. From hence she was attended to the bishop's palace, with a cavalcade of quality of both sexes. And here she was presented by the city with wine, and all other sorts of provision. After two days' repose, she came in a chariot to the court at Whitehall, where she was entertained with the usual marks of solemnity and regard. The king showed her every thing that was valu-

Nov. 2.  
The queen  
regent of  
Scotland  
honourably  
received.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

able, either for length of time, curiosity, or expense. And before she took her leave, as Lesley reports, he endeavoured to persuade her to consent to the marriage between her daughter and himself, pursuant to the overture made by the Scotch nobility: that this would be a beneficial alliance to both nations: on the contrary, the disposing the young queen to the French king's son, would prove unserviceable both to the French and Scotch; for he was resolved to be a perpetual enemy to whatever prince should marry her. The queen-regent replied, that the protector Seymour's attacking the Scotch, and ravaging their country in so unexpected a manner was the reason of the engaging her daughter to the house of France. That this English general mistook in the way of courtship: that to make their addresses to a princess with fire and sword, was a rough and unusual way of managing such an affair. That the Scotch being thus harassed by the English, were necessitated to apply to the French king, and to send the young princess thither, as it were for an hostage, to gain his protection: that she was very sorry the juncture had almost brought this matter to an issue, so much different from what his majesty desired. However, she promised to use her interest at the French court, to give his highness satisfaction. If this historian's relation holds good, we must suppose the queen-regent's arrival in England, happened before the treaty with France above-mentioned. For otherwise, the king would not have been at liberty to make this motion. However, by Stow's account, the French treaty seems to have been prior to this interview. To conclude this matter, after a very honourable reception, this queen was attended by persons of quality the whole length of her journey, and entertained by the king's order all along at the county charge.

While this solemnity lasted, the duke of Somerset's business slept, and seemed to be forgotten. But now the prosecution came on in earnest. And to make way for his trial by his peers, he was indicted before commissioners of oyer and terminer, at Guildhall, London. For as sir Edward Coke observes, a peer must either be indicted before commissioners of oyer and terminer, or else in the King's Bench, if the treason, misprision of treason, felony, or misprision of felony, be committed in that county where the King's Bench sits. When he is indicted, the king by his commission under the great seal, constitutes some peer of the realm to be *hac vice*, steward of England. The commission

Lesley, de  
Reb. Gest.  
Scot. l. 10.  
p. 437.

Stow's  
Annals,  
p. 695.

*The duke of  
Somerset  
indicted at  
Guildhall.  
Coke's In-  
stit. pt. 3.  
fol. 12. and  
Entries,  
fol. 432.  
Nov. 21.*

likewise, recites the indictment as it is found: and the lord EDWARD VI. steward is empowered to receive the indictment, &c. and to proceed, “secundum legem et consuetudinem Angliæ:” there are several other circumstances too long to insert. The indictment consists of three branches, first, that he treasonably endeavoured to depose the king, &c. “quod false, malitiose, et proditorie per apertum factum circumivit, compassavit, et imaginavit, cum diversis aliis personis, dominum regem de statu suo regali deponere et deprivare.” This part of the indictment, Coke affirms, was against law, because there is no circumstance specified to prove the overt act.

See Coke's  
Instit. pt. 3.  
fol. 28.

Id. Entries,  
fol. 482.

The second branch of the indictment reaches no farther than felony, “et ulterius juratores prædicti præsentant, quod præfatus Edvardus, dux Somerset, movit et instigavit complures subditos ipsius domini regis ad insurgendum, &c. et ad tunc, et ibidem felonice ad capiendum et imprisonandum prænobilem Johannem comitem Warwick de privato concilio domini regis.” The third branch of the indictment begins thus, “et ulterius juratores prædicti præsentabant, quod prædictus Edvardus,” &c. that is, that the duke of Somerset, &c. feloniously moved, and incited divers of the king's subjects to make an insurrection upon the government, and to seize and imprison the earl of Warwick. And thus this last charge is much the same with the second.

Id. Entries,  
ibid.

The process being thus far advanced, the duke was on the first of December brought to Westminster-hall and arraigned. The marquess of Winchester was lord high steward, he sat under a cloth of state, three degrees higher than the rest of the scaffolds: the lords summoned to try him, were the twenty-seven following; the dukes of Suffolk and Northumberland, the marquess of Northampton, the earls of Derby, Bedford, Huntington, Rutland, Bath, Sussex, Worcester, and Pembroke, the viscount Hereford, the lords Abergavenny, Audley, Wharton, Evers, Latimer, Burrough, Zouch, Stafford, Wentworth, Darcy, Sturton, Windsor, Cromwell, Cobham, and Bray.

314.

*He is tried  
by his peers.*

K. Edward's  
Journal.

It was thought somewhat hard that the duke of Northumberland, the earls of Northampton and Pembroke, who were presumed disaffected to the prisoner, and against the first of whom he is charged to have conspired in the indictment; it was thought somewhat hard, I say, that these lords should be summoned in the precept for the trial. However, here was

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

nothing done against law, for it is in the prince's pleasure to summon what peers he pleases, provided the number exceeds twelve, neither has the prisoner the liberty of challenging any of his judges.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 178.  
*The charge  
against him.*

To proceed: the duke of Somerset was charged with making a party, for getting himself declared protector in the next parliament. This was positively affirmed by the earl of Rutland, and so faintly answered by the duke, that it seemed true. Though this might be a strain of ambition, there was nothing in it that could either touch his life or liberty. But the other articles went much deeper: there was evidence produced that this duke lately contrived an entertainment at the lord Paget's house, near St. Clement's, in the Strand, that the duke of Northumberland, the marquess of Northampton, and the earl of Pembroke, were to be invited thither, and either set upon by the way, or assassinated at dinner: and that the prisoner had planted a hundred men in Somerset House to execute the murder. This plot was first confessed by Crane and his wife, and afterwards owned by sir Thomas Palmer before the lords of the council. He was likewise charged with holding some consults for raising forces in the north, and for attacking the gensd'armes, or guards; that two thousand foot and a hundred horse were ready for this purpose. And when the scheme was thus far executed, the duke was to ride through the city and proclaim liberty, in order to raise the burghers. All this was confirmed by Crane, with an additional discovery, that the earl of Arundel was privy to the attempt, upon which evidence, the earl and the lord Paget were sent to the Tower. And, lastly, Hammond, a servant of the duke's, being examined, confessed his master's chamber had been strongly guarded at Greenwich, to prevent his person being surprised.

Heylyn and  
Bp. Burnet.

Thus, there were five main articles in the charge: first, a design to kill the lords above-mentioned, and having men in a readiness at his house for that intent. Secondly, an attempt concerted for attacking the gensd'armes. Thirdly, a contrivance for levying men in the north. Fourthly, a practice for raising the city of London; and lastly, a resolution of resisting an arrest by the government, and keeping a guard at Greenwich for that purpose.

The king's council enlarged upon the proof, and aggravated the crime according to the customary manner: and if Fox

reports them right, they saluted the duke roughly, and ran out into intemperate language. They argued, that the lodging men at his house, with the intention of killing the duke of Northumberland was treason, by an act against unlawful assemblies, made in the third year of the present reign : that to concert the assassinating the lords was felony : that to resolve upon resisting his attachment was felony ; that to raise the city of London was treason, and to assault the lords felony.

EDWARD  
VI.  
Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 755.

To this the duke answered, that he never had any design of raising the north, but that, upon some reports and apprehensions of danger, he sent to sir William Herbert to stand his friend : that he had no intention of killing the duke of Northumberland, or any other lord, but mentioned it only, and afterwards determined the contrary. That the charging the gens d'arms, a body of nine hundred men, with a hundred of his own, was an enterprise fit for a man out of his wits ; and, besides, if he had prevailed, it would have signified nothing as to the success of the main. This part of the evidence being, therefore, altogether without colour or sense, might reasonably shock the credit of the rest. That he never concerted the raising of London, and thought upon it no otherwise than a place of security. That by the keeping men in his chamber at Greenwich, it was plain he meant no harm, because, when it was in his power, he made no use of them to any such purpose. He urged several things against the witnesses, whose examinations were only read, without their appearing : he desired these men might be brought into court, and that he might have the liberty of confronting them. This, considering his quality, he said, was no more than a reasonable request.

K. Edward's  
Journal.  
Cotton.  
Libr.  
*The duke's  
defence*

Id.

Thus we see the duke went a great way in his confession ; but whether far enough to reach his life, is not so clear. By the statute upon which the indictment is grounded, it is enacted, " That if any person or persons, by the ringing of any bell, &c., or by malicious speaking or uttering of any words, or making any outcry, &c. or by any other deed or act shall raise, or cause to be raised or assembled, any persons to the number of twelve or above, to the intent that the said persons should do, commit, or put in ure any of the acts or things above-mentioned ; (whereof, to take and imprison any of the king's most honourable privy council was one ; ) and the persons to the number of twelve or above, so raised or assembled, after

*Sir Edward  
Coke's re-  
marks upon  
the indict-  
ment.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

request and commandment (in such sort as in the act is prescribed), shall make their abode, or continue together, as is aforesaid (in the act), or unlawfully perpetrate, do, commit, or put in ure any of the acts or things above-said; that then all and singular the persons, by whose speaking, deed, act, or any other the means above-specified, any persons to the number of twelve or above, shall be raised and assembled for the doing, committing, or putting in ure any of the acts or things above-mentioned, shall be adjudged for his so speaking, and so doing a felon, and shall suffer execution of death, as in case of felony; and shall lose his benefit of sanctuary and clergy."

3 & 4 Edw. 6.  
c. 5.  
Statutes at  
Large.  
Coke's In-  
stit. 3.  
fol. 13.

From hence, sir Edward Coke takes notice, that this nobleman's attainder is misreported by some of our historians, and in some points contrary to law. First, whereas it has been said, "he might have had his clergy upon demand, this is plainly a mistake: for the benefit of the clergy is expressly ousted by the act above-mentioned. Secondly, that he was not indicted for going about, &c. the death of the earl of Warwick, then of the king's privy council, but only for his taking or imprisonment, and that, therefore, he could not be indicted upon the statute of 3 Henry VII. as some have imagined." To which I may add, that none but commoners are liable to be tried for anything done against that statute of Henry VII.; sir Edward Coke remarks, in the third place, that the duke's indictment "is altogether insufficient, for it pursues not the words or matter of the said branch of the said act, as by comparing of them it manifestly appeareth." He means, I suppose, that these insurrections or conspiracies were neither treason nor felony, unless the persons so gathered together had refused to disperse upon proclamation made by the sheriff, or some justice of peace in king's name: and that this was the duke's case is neither laid in the indictment, nor pleaded by the council: and the duke's omitting to insist upon this, is reckoned by our learned Church historian an overlooking the best thing in his defence. That such proclamation was not made, this author thinks very plain; for if it had, the duke would either have obeyed it, or tried his fortune by force.

Bp. Burnet,  
Hist. Re-  
form. pt. 2.  
p. 180.

*The branch  
of the statute  
with which*

But neither this learned historian, nor sir Edward Coke, seem to have considered that branch of the statute which lay heaviest upon the duke. It is this: "And furthermore it is

ordained and enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that if any person or persons, after the said twelfth day of February, by open word or deed, shall procure, move, or stir any other person or persons to arise, or make any traitorous or rebellious assembly, to the intent to do, or exercise, or put in ure any of the things above-mentioned; that then every person so procuring, moving, or stirring any other, shall therefore be deemed, and adjudged a felon, and suffer pains of death, and forfeit his goods, chattels, lands and tenements, as in cases of felony, and shall also lose the benefit of his clergy and sanctuary.”

EDWARD  
VI.  
*the duke was  
most pressed.*

3 & 4 Edw. 6.  
cap. 5.  
Statutes  
at Large.

This part of the statute seems to press the duke much harder than the other: for here the bare moving and stirring any person to make a rebellious assembly, in order to kill or imprison any of the lords of the council, is declared felony, without the benefit of the clergy: here is no actual insurrection, nor any proclamation to disperse them required, to make the penalty inure. And, to apply the statute to the case, by Palmer's and Crane's evidence, it appears this duke had concerted the murder of the duke of Northumberland, the marquis of Northampton, and the earl of Pembroke. He confessed himself, in his defence, that he had spoken of this matter. Now to what purpose should he mention so dangerous and criminal an enterprise, unless it was to engage assistance, and make it practicable? That he had no good meaning towards these lords, appears by his asking their pardon, when his trial was over. To set this matter in a fuller light, I shall transcribe the king's letter to his favourite, Barnaby Fitzpatrick.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2, p. 181.  
Heylin.

“ *To our well-beloved servant Barnaby Fitzpatrick, one of the gentlemen of our chamber.* ”

*The king's  
letter to  
Fitzpatrick  
concerning  
the duke's  
trial.*

“ EDWARD.

“ Little hath been done since you went, but the duke of Somerset's arraignment for felonious treason, and the musters of the new erected gendarmery. The duke, the first of this month, was brought to Westminster-hall, where sat as judge, or high steward, my lord treasurer; twenty-six lords of the parliament, went on his trial; indictments were read, which were several; some for treason, some for traitorous felony.

Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 7.  
p. 409.  
transcribed  
from the  
original.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

The lawyers read how sir Thomas Palmer had confessed, that the duke once minded, and made him privy, to raise the north, after to call the duke of Northumberland, the marquess of Northampton, and the earl of Pembroke, to a feast, and to have slain them; and to do this thing, (as it was to be thought) had levied men a hundred at his house at London, which was scanned to be treason; because unlawful assemblies for such purposes was treason, by an act made the last session. Also, how the duke of Somerset minded to stay the horses of the gendarmery, and to raise London. Crane confessed also the murdering of the lords in a banquet. Sir Miles Partridge also confessed the raising of London: Hamman, his man, having a watch at Greenwich, of twenty weaponed men, to resist, if he had been arrested; and this confessed both Partridge and Palmer. He answered, that when he levied men at his house, he meant no such thing, but only to defend himself. The rest very barely answered. After debating the matter from nine of the clock till three, the lords went together, and there weighing that the matter seemed only to touch their lives, although afterwards more inconvenience might have followed, and that men might think they did it of malice, acquitted him of high treason, and condemned him of felony, which he seemed to have confessed. He, hearing the judgment, fell down on his knees, and thanked them for his open trial; after he asked pardon of the duke of Northumberland, the marquess, &c., whom he confessed he meant to destroy, although before he swore vehemently to the contrary. Thus fare you well.

“*From Westminster,*  
“*the 20th of December, An. Dom. 1551.*”

*He is acquitted of treason, but found guilty of felony.*  
Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 180.

When the duke had gone through his defence, the peers withdrew, and, after a long debate, acquitted him of treason: but the greater number found him guilty of felony. Thus our learned church historian. But by the record it appears, that not only the greater number, but all his judges, agreed in their verdict against him. “*Et ulterius quilibet eorum separatim dixerunt, quod prædictus Edvardus nuper dux Somers. de felonis prædictis sibi separatim in formâ prædictâ superius impositis, fuit culpabilis,*” &c.

When the duke received sentence, he thanked the lords for

Coke's  
Entries,  
fol. 482.



the fair usage at his trial, asked the duke of Northumberland, and the other two noblemen above-mentioned, pardon for his ill intentions towards them; then entreated his life might be spared, and his wife and children gently dealt with.

EDWARD  
VI.

It is the custom, at the trial of a peer for treason, to have the axe carried before him at the bar, with the edge towards the prisoner, and, in case of acquittal, the edge is turned the other way at his coming back. The duke of Somerset having this good sign at his coming out of Westminster-hall, the people, concluding him safe, shouted so loud, that the noise was heard as far as Long Acre: but, when they heard of the distinction between felony and treason, and that the duke mis-carried under the latter charge, their satisfaction was over, and they discovered a different passion.

Stow's  
Annals.  
Godwin,  
Annal.

316.

There seems to have been one circumstance of hardship in this nobleman's trial; and that is, that the depositions of the witnesses against him were only *read* in court; that he had not the liberty of confronting them, and putting what questions he thought proper. "It was generally believed," says our learned Church historian, "that all this pretended conspiracy upon which he was condemned was only a forgery." But if this was the case, what made the duke betray his innocence, and make so dangerous a confession? However, it may not be amiss to examine the reasons of this conjecture. The first is: both Palmer and Crane, and the rest of the witnesses who had been made prisoners on the pretence of this plot, were soon after discharged. But how does this prove the plot no more than a practice against the duke of Somerset? Is it not customary to give conspirators a pardon upon making a discovery? and discharge them for the merit of their evidence? The historian's next reason for proving the witnesses perjured, is still more unserviceable. "It was generally thought," continues this gentleman, "that all was an artifice of Palmer's, who had put the duke of Somerset in fears of his life, and so got him to gather men about him for his own preservation; and that he afterwards being taken with him, seemed through fear to acknowledge all that which before he had contrived." But according to this account, if Palmer was so insidious as to lay a snare, it is plain the duke fell into it, for he gathered men about him for his own preservation; that is, at the lowest, he resolved to make use of force, and defend

Remarks  
upon his  
trial.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2, p. 186.

Ibid.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

himself against the government. And if so, how can the depositions to prove the plot be reckoned a forgery?

It is plain by the king's letter and journal that he was fully persuaded of his uncle's guilt, and therefore left him to the law. However, to prevent his being worked to a tenderness, it is said the duke of Somerset's enemies made it their business to divert his highness with balls, tiltings, reviewing his troops, and such other entertaining amusements, which they thought would go farthest in his fancy. And thus, though the duke lived almost two months after judgment given, there was little or nothing done for his preservation. In short, an order being signed at last for his execution, he was brought to the scaffold on Tower-hill, where his speech was to this effect :

*His speech  
upon the  
scaffold.*

“He declares he had never offended the king, either by word or action, and that he had always been as true to the government as any subject whatsoever; but since he was legally condemned, he owns himself subject to the constitution, is willing to suffer in obedience to the laws, and gives God thanks he had time for recollection and repentance allowed him. He puts the company in mind how much he employed his authority in promoting the interest of the Christian religion. That he now received great satisfaction for his having some share in bringing belief and worship to the present condition, and recovering them to a strong resemblance of the primitive Church. This he accounts a great blessing, and exhorts the people to receive it as such, and answer it in their practice; and that unless this was done, greater calamities than what had been felt already would follow.”

Holinshed,  
p. 1068.  
*The people  
in a panic,  
and why?*

When the duke had proceeded thus far, the people were much frightened, and seized with an extraordinary panic. Now because the reason of this consternation has been mistaken, and construed to a prodigy, I shall give the reader an account of it from Stow, the annalist, who was then upon the spot. “The people,” says this historian, “of a certain hamlet, who were ordered to attend the lieutenant of the Tower by seven o'clock, came through the postern, and perceiving the duke on the scaffold sooner than they expected, the foremost of them called out to the rest to mend their pace. These men rushing forward to the scaffold with bills and halberts, made the company which first saw them imagine some forces were advancing to

rescue the duke. Upon this they cried out ‘Away, away!’ This alarm made the rest of the people run off with great confusion, insomuch that many of them fell into the Tower-ditch; and those which stayed upon the hill concluded a pardon had been brought; and having their heads almost turned with the surprise, some fancied it thundered, some said there was an earthquake, and that the ground rumbled under them; but all this noise was nothing more than what they had made themselves, by the trampling of their feet.

EDWARD  
VI.

Stow's  
Annals,  
p. 607.  
*Fox's ob-  
servation  
upon this  
fright.*  
Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 754.

Fox, in relating this story, seems to write under the impression of the terror. “It happened here,” says he, “as the evangelists write it did unto Christ; when, as the officers of the high priest and pharisees coming with weapons to take him, being astonied, ran backwards and fell to the ground.” Thus this martyrologist brings in a miracle to attest the duke’s innocence; and draws an odd, not to say a profane, parallel, between his case and our Saviour’s. And thus we see to what injudicious excesses a bias of inclination may carry a writer.

To return: before the consternation was well over, the people espied sir Anthony Brown, a courtier, riding hastily towards the scaffold, upon which they shouted, “A pardon!” and “God save the king!” But there being no such good news, the duke, having made a sign for silence, went on with his speech.

He told them, “there was no such thing to be expected, as they had the good nature to believe; that Providence had thus ordered the event; and that therefore it was both his duty and theirs to acquiesce and submit. He desired them to behave themselves without tumult and disorder. That for his part he was in a sedate disposition, and desired they would join with him in his prayers for the king, to whom he wished all imaginable prosperity.” To this the people answered “Amen.” The duke went on in his prayers for “the lords of the council, that God would bless their management, and give them grace to act in their station with integrity and justice. And here he exhorted the audience to obey their orders; that such submission was necessary to cover them from the penalties of the law; and that the king’s preservation was likewise better secured by such behaviour. He asked pardon of all he had injured, and declared he heartily forgave all those that had offended him. He desired the people once more to compose themselves, and

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

told them that tumultuous behaviour would neither do him nor themselves any service. And lastly, he desired them to assist him with their prayers, and bear him witness that he died in the faith of Jesus Christ."

Holinshed.

Ibid.  
*The duke's  
character.*

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 185.  
Id. p. 134.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 753. ad  
755.

This duke is described as a person "eminent for piety, humble and affable in his greatness, sincere and candid in all his transactions." But this character runs the historian upon a strong inconsistency with what he had writ before. Fox tells us, "the innocent duke was condemned to die for felony." He never heard the duke robbed or murdered, and therefore wonders how he should be guilty of this crime; and yet, a little before, he had mentioned the statute on which the duke was indicted: and thus this martyrologist, to relieve the memory of one nobleman, lays a black imputation on seven-and-twenty, and brings in a great part of the privy council guilty of murder, and of those lords of the council, too, who appeared strongly for the Reformation. Fox goes on and flourishes extravagantly on the duke's commendation, runs a comparison between him and the good duke of Gloucester, and paints beyond the life; and, when he has done, obliterates some of the best colours with his own pencil: for he is of opinion, that the duke, by suffering or procuring the death of the admiral his brother, stained his honour, weakened his interest, and drew the judgment of God upon him in his execution.

*He was pro-  
tector in  
the reign of  
king Henry  
6.*  
Ibid. p. 756.

After all, the duke was a fortunate general, and had done good service. He was likewise a favourite of the commons, and very well deserved their regard. He risked his interest to screen them from oppression, and did his part to break some very unkind measures concerted against them. For, by raising rents, inclosing grounds, and turning arable to pasture, "the commons of England saw they were like to be reduced to great misery; and," as the historian goes on, "indeed, there seemed to have been a general design amongst the nobility and gentry to bring the inferior sort to that low and servile state to which the peasants in many other kingdoms are reduced."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 114.

Ibid.

Id. p. 181.

Sir Thomas Arundel, sir Ralph Vane, sir Michael Stanhope, and sir Miles Partridge, were tried as the duke's accomplices, found guilty, and executed. The two last were little pitied, being the persons upon whom the ill things that had been done by the duke of Somerset—as our historian reports—were

chiefly cast. However, all four of them declared, at their death, that they had never acted anything against the king or his council.

EDWARD  
VI.

Stow's  
Annals,  
p. 607.

The duke of Somerset, during his imprisonment, had made the lord chancellor his friend. This nobleman was to recover the king to a better opinion of his uncle. The duke's confidence was not misplaced: for the chancellor sent him some intelligence which might have been serviceable; but the letter being written in haste, and superscribed only to the duke, the servant who carried it, having no particular directions, delivered it to the duke of Norfolk, whom he knew well acquainted with his master. The lord chancellor, finding the mistake at night, concluded the duke of Norfolk, to make his court to the duke of Northumberland, would certainly discover him; and therefore, to break the misfortune and make it lighter, he went immediately to the king, and desired leave to resign; and falling sick upon this application, the broad seal was sent for and put into the hands of Gooderick, bishop of Ely, who was sworn lord chancellor on the 22nd of January following.

*The lord  
chancellor  
Rich resigns  
the broad-  
seal.*

*It is given  
to the bishop  
of Ely.*

Stow's  
Annal.  
Dec, 21,  
1531.

Upon this occasion our learned Church historian not only censures Gooderick for accepting this post, but runs out into a general invective against all bishops who concern themselves with affairs of State and civil jurisdiction. He observes, Christ, being requested to divide an inheritance between two brethren, said, "Who made me a judge or a divider?" But this text does not seem serviceable to the author's purpose. The meaning of it appears only to be this: that, since our Saviour's "kingdom was not of this world,"—since he had no commission from the government to determine property,—his interposing in such an affair was not to be expected. But, as our author goes on, St. Paul, speaking of churchmen, says, "No man that wars entangles himself with the affairs of this life:" which was understood by St. Cyprian as a perpetual rule against the secular employment of the clergy. This Father was so strict in this point, that he thought the being tutor to orphans was a distraction unsuitable to their character; that Paulus Samosatenus is represented as one of the first eminent churchmen that involved himself in secular cares; and that there are three apostolical canons against it. He must mean the sixth, the eighty-first, and the eighty-third. But this latter only forbids a bishop a command in the army, and

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2, p. 183.

2 Tim. ii.  
*Secular  
employ-  
ments, whe-  
ther incon-  
sistent with  
a spiritual  
character.*

Bp. Burnet,  
ibid.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

standing upon the military list. The other two canons look nearer his point; but then we are to consider the circumstance of time often alters the case. When the apostolical canons were made, the emperors were unconverted, and paganism the established religion. Under this disadvantage of the constitution the magistracy were obliged to exhibit shows, to countenance the idolatrous sacrifices, and be present at them. It is no wonder, therefore, when offices were thus encumbered, the canons should forbid the clergy having any share in the administration. As for Paulus Samosatenus, besides the charge of heresy for which he was deposed, he is censured for bribery and sacrilege, for affecting a military distinction, for ordering hymns to be sung in his own commendation in the church, and procuring people to clap him as if he had been acting upon a stage. Our historian observes farther, "that the clergy's meddling in secular matters is condemned most copiously and amply by the general council of Chalcedon." I shall cite the canon to which he must refer. It is the third,

*Ducenarius*  
*vocari quam*  
*episcopus*  
*mirant.*  
Euseb. Hist.  
Eccles. l. 7.  
cap. 30.

*Bp. Burnet's*  
*objections*  
*considered.*

318.

and stands thus: "The holy synod is informed, that some of the clergy turn farmers, concern themselves in secular affairs, and neglect their function, out of an avaricious and mercenary temper. It is therefore decreed, that, for the future, no bishop, clerk, nor monk, shall turn farmer, or intrude *ἐπιεσάγειν ἑαυτὸν* into secular employment, unless he is obliged by the civil constitution to take care of some minor related to him, or the bishop of the diocese has appointed him to manage the secular interest and revenues of the Church, or ordered him to undertake the guardianship and protection of orphans and widows, and such unsupported persons, as stand most in need of the assistance of the clergy."

Concil.  
Chalced.  
can. 3.

This canon is much the same with the emperor Justinian's constitution upon this subject; where he will not allow a bishop, or any other clerk, to be a collector of the royal revenues, a farmer of the lands belonging to the crown, or any corporation, a steward, attorney, or surety. But here the reader may take notice that all sort of employments are not barred the clergy, either by the emperor or the council. To speak only to the latter, the council, we see, gives a liberty for the office of guardian, and thus the authority of St. Cyprian is plainly over-ruled.

Justin.  
Novel. 123.  
cap. 5, 6.

Our historian takes notice, "that Charles the Great and his son gave large territories and jurisdictions to many sees, and

that their lands gave them a right to have a share in all the public councils, and to be chiefly employed in all affairs and offices of state, and that the ignorance of these ages made this in a manner necessary." Now, if the ignorance of the times made secular employments in a manner necessary to the clergy: if few or none were qualified for the administration but the bishops, and the government could scarcely go on without them; if the case stood thus, why are they blamed for assisting the State, and doing good in their generation? When they served their prince and country under such exigencies, and were employed to such significant purpose, why are they taxed with ambition, and grasping an authority eccentric to their calling?

EDWARD  
VI.  
Bp. Burnet,  
ibid.

Id. p. 184.

To disengage the clergy farther from this imputation, the reader may please to consider, that under the Jewish economy it was part of the priests' and Levites' business to give resolutions in points of law, to settle property, and try causes both civil and criminal. The high-priest and others of that tribe and function, were members of the Jerusalem Sanhedrim. This Sanhedrim was the last resort of justice, and there was no appeal from it.

Deut. xvii.  
8 to 14.  
2 Chron.  
xix. 8.

Now the Jewish priests had a religious calling, were to instruct the people, and had souls to be saved no less than the Christian. We are to consider farther, that God was the author of this appointment. And therefore, Bucer very justly recommends the imitation of the Judaical law. Indeed, where there is nothing of type or figure, nothing particular as to time, country, or neighbourhood of the Jewish nation: in such cases, we may suppose the ground of the law goes upon the reason of the thing. And to apply this, the priests having a share in the civil administration, was the practice of a state under supernatural direction, and where God was their immediate governor.

Bucer, de  
Regno  
Christi.

Under the Christian emperors, the bishops had judicatures, called courts of audience, and Constantine the Great made a law, that if any parties to a suit had had a mind to appeal from their temporal judges to the diocesan, the bishop's sentence should be unalterable, have the same force as if it had been pronounced by the emperor himself and the governors of the provinces had orders to see it put in execution. Nothing was

Sozom. lib. 1.  
cap. 9.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

Synes.  
Epist. 105.

Possid. Vit.  
August.  
cap. 19.

1 Cor. vi. 4.  
Aug. de  
Opere Mo-  
nac. cap. 29.

Cod. Justin.  
lib. 1. tit. 4.  
leg. 7, 8.

Bp. Burnet,  
ibid.

Bucer de  
Regno  
Christi.

Coke's  
Instit. pt. 4.  
c. 8. fol. 79.

Id. fol. 84.

more common in those early times, than to pitch upon the bishops for referees. And therefore, Synesius calls arbitrating civil differences, part of the episcopal function. St. Austin, though he complains of judging in references, yet was willing to bear it, and often spent the whole morning, and sometimes the whole day, in hearing causes. And further, it was St. Austin's opinion, that the apostle St. Paul instituted ecclesiastical judges, and laid the burden of secular causes upon them. So far was this Father from interpreting the 2nd of Tim. ii. and iv., in our historian's sense. The emperor Justinian grants the bishops the same privilege of receiving references with his predecessor Constantine, and declares their judgment irrevocable. It is plain, therefore, neither these famous emperors or Fathers, thought secular employment altogether inconsistent with a spiritual character: they did not believe it disserved the bishops in the management of their functions, or indisposed them for "that seriousness, that application to religious study and exercises, and that care of souls, which might be justly expected from them."

And to come to the case remarked by our learned historian: the English bishops who were lord chancellors, had suffragans to inspect their diocese, and represent them in the functions of government: and these suffragans, as hath been observed, were no less bishops, as to character, than themselves. Now, even Bucer will allow bishops to reside at court, provided they had coadjutors in the country. And if they may attend on princes, and appear at the council board, why not on the bench in Chancery? If it is objected the bishops are not bred to the profession of the law, and therefore, seem unqualified for such a station: to this it may be answered, that a man of sense and general learning may understand law, if he pleases, without entering himself in the inns of court. Besides, in the Chancery, there are two courts, one ordinary, and the other extraordinary. The first is governed by statute and common law; and here, if the chancellor is at a loss, he hath judges on the bench to direct him. The other is a court of equity, and extends to cases where the law gives no remedy; such as accidents, frauds, breach of trust and confidence. And who can be supposed fitter than a bishop to decide in such cases? St. Germain, in his "Doctor and Student," seems to give the



advantage to a religious character in a resembling instance. EDWARD VI. He tells us, the administration of the goods of the intestate was committed to the bishop, and not to the secular courts, because the law supposed the clergy better fenced against temptation than the laity. He is of opinion the nature of their business, and the force of their calling, would keep the conscience of the clergy more awake, and fortify them farther against covetousness, than other people. Now, when a bishop is supplying the defects of the constitution, and rescuing orphans out of the hands of harpies, a man shall not be over-hasty in pronouncing him misemployed: especially, if we consider a bishop's character is sometimes strengthened by a civil station, and he is put in a condition of doing more service to religion. As for Tindal's and Barnes's remonstrance mentioned by our historian, their testimony signifies not much. To speak clearly, their playing a satire upon the bishops, arraigning their conduct, and weakening their authority, was rather an instance of misbehaviour in these men. Had they remembered the text, "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people," and that St. Paul applied it against himself to the privilege of the high priest, they would probably have been more sparing in their language.

Bp. Burnet.  
pt. 2. p. 132.  
319.

Upon the fall of the duke of Somerset, Farrar, bishop of St. David's, was crushed for want of his assistance: not that he was suspected of any practice charged upon the duke. But this prelate, it seems, being a man of some singularity in his management, adhering to his opinions with remarkable stiffness, and making higher demands of observance than were expected from his character, lost ground with his clergy, and was particularly embroiled with the canons of his own cathedral. Young and Merrick—the first of whom was afterwards preferred to the see of York, and the other to the see of Bangor, by queen Elizabeth—though they did not appear above board, were most active in carrying on an information against him. Amongst other things, he was charged with officiating at a marriage without requiring the married persons to receive the communion, contrary to the rubric in the first Common Prayer-book, which was then in force. His disconformity to the customary habit was another article; he was likewise complained of for ordering the communion table, which had been placed by the official of Carmarthen in the middle of the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

church, to be carried back into the chancel, to the place where the altar stood. His suffering superstitious usages in his diocese, contrary to law, was another branch of the information. But the main charge was his exercising episcopal jurisdiction in his own name, in derogation of the king's supremacy. And thus the duke, and his other friends of that party, being either executed or under disgrace, a commission was issued bearing date the ninth of March, to inquire into the articles; and upon the return made by these commissioners, he was indicted upon the statute of Præmunire at the Carmarthen assizes in July following. And here it may be concluded, the verdict went against him by his being committed to prison, where he continued the remainder of this reign.

A. D. 1551-2.

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 120.  
*Adam Wal-  
lace tried  
for heresy in  
Scotland.*

This year, in Scotland, one Adam Wallace, a man of little knowledge, but very zealous in his religion, was apprehended at Winton in Lothian, and tried for heterodoxy. The earl of Arran, governor; the earl of Argyle, great justice; the earls of Angus, Huntley, Glencairn, and several others of the nobility, were present at the trial. A charge consisting of five articles was brought in against Wallace. First, that he had taken upon him the office of a preacher without any lawful calling. Secondly, that he had baptized one of his own children. Thirdly, that he had denied purgatory. Fourthly, that he had asserted invocation of saints, and prayer for the dead, were downright superstition. And, fifthly, that he had called the mass an idolatrous service; and that in the sacrament of the altar the elements remained bread and wine, after consecration.

To the first article he answered, that he never thought himself worthy of so excellent an employment as the functions of the pulpit; nor did he ever presume to preach. He confessed, notwithstanding, that in some private places he read a portion of Scripture sometimes, and made a short exhortation upon the text to those that would hear him. Upon this it was told him, he ought not to have meddled with the Scriptures. Wallace replied, he looked upon it as the duty of every Christian to acquaint himself with the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the means of his salvation; which was not to be found anywhere but in the inspired writings. And one of the company happening to say, if any man may be a babbler upon the Bible, what business will be left to the bishops and the rest of the clergy? He told him he ought to have mentioned God's

word with more reverence, and that if the judge did right, he would punish him for his blasphemy. "But to your question," says he, "I tell you, that though you and I, and five thousand more, should read the Bible, and discourse upon it, there would be business enough left for the bishops. For we should leave them the preaching the Gospel of Christ, and the feeding their flocks, which would give them sufficient employment. Neither are we at all injurious to them in working out our own salvation, as far as we can."

EDWARD  
VI.

To the second article he answered, that since he could not have a true minister, it was as lawful for him to baptize his own child, as it was for Abraham to circumcise Ishmael and his family.

His defence against the third and fourth articles was, that he never believed or maintained anything but what he found in the book hanging at his girdle, which was the Bible, in French, Dutch, and English. And being called on to keep closer to the point, and be more particular, he replied, that in case he were inclined to declare his mind farther upon these heads, he should require a more upright and indifferent judge. Upon this, the earl of Huntley told him he was a fool for desiring more competent and qualified judges than the governor and the bishops. To this Wallace returned, that the bishops ought not to be his judges, because they were declared enemies to the doctrine he professed: and as for the governor, he questioned whether he had knowledge enough to discover truth from error, and to distinguish the inventions of men from the pure worship of God. The judge that he desired, he told them, was the book of God; and that if he could be convinced out of the inspired writings, to have either asserted or done anything with reference to religion, that was repugnant to the will of God, he was contented to die. But provided they could fix no imputation of this kind upon him, he desired the protection of the governor and nobility against the tyranny of malicious men.

Spotswood,  
Hist. Ch. of  
Scotland,  
p. 90. et  
deinceps.

Being asked what he thought of the mass, he answered, he had read the Bible in three languages, and had never found the mass in any of them: and that what was highest esteemed with men, was no better than abomination in the sight of God. Upon this, all the company cried out, "Heresy! heresy! let him be condemned!" Thus the poor man was pronounced a

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*He is con-  
demned, and  
burnt at  
Edinburgh.*  
320.

heretic, delivered over to the secular power, and put into the hands of sir John Campbell, of Lundie, justice deputy; who having passed sentence of death, remanded him to prison. He spent that night in singing psalms, and was brought to the stake the next day on Castle-hill; where, notwithstanding he was ordered not to make a speech to the people, he took the liberty to desire them "not to be offended with the truth, because of his sufferings: for the disciple is not above his Master." As he was going on, the provost of Edinburgh, who had the charge of the execution, bid him break off; upon which he recommended himself to God Almighty in a short prayer, and suffered with remarkable resolution.

1d.

About this time there happened a great contest amongst the churchmen concerning the object of invocation in the Lord's Prayer. The occasion was this. One Richard Marshall, prior of the Black Friars at Newcastle in England, had lately come into Scotland, and preached at St. Andrews, that "the Pater-noster should be addressed to God, and not to the saints." Some doctors of the university being disgusted at this assertion, prevailed with one Tottes, a Grey Friar, to oppose Marshal, and prove that the Pater-noster might be said to the saints. The friar having ignorance and assurance enough to engage in the cause, took his text out of the fifth of St. Matthew, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." From these words he raised this doctrine: "That the Lord's Prayer might be said to the saints, because all the petitions in this form are applicable to them. For instance: if we meet an old man in the street," says the friar, "we salute him with 'Good morrow, father;' and therefore, with greater propriety of language, we may call the saints our fathers. And since it is granted they are in heaven, we may say to every one of them, 'Our Father which art in heaven.' Then we know," continues the friar, "God has dignified them so far as to make their names holy. Why, then, may we not apply 'hallowed be thy name' to any of the saints? And since they are possessed of the kingdom of heaven, we may upon the strength of this privilege of theirs say to any of them, 'thy kingdom come.' And thus, unless their will had been God's will, they had never been advanced to that kingdom. Since, therefore, there is an uniformity of desire between them and their Maker, we may say to every one of them, 'thy will be done.'" When he came

*Friar  
Tottes's hetero-  
dox and  
whimsical  
paraphrase  
upon the  
Lord's  
Prayer.*

to the fourth petition, he was at a loss for a colour, and confessed "it was not within the saints' power to 'give us our daily bread.' However, they may pray to God for us, that he will please to give it." He stuck no less in the remaining petitions, and carried on his paraphrase with so much shuffling and whimsey, that the audience fell a laughing. And at last, meeting with farther mortification, and being a jest to the boys in the street, who called him "Father Pater-noster," he grew ashamed of his performance, and quitted the town.

EDWARD  
VI.

However, the question did not drop, but was bandied about in the university; in so much, that it was thought fit the point should be publicly argued by the doctors. When they met, they came to no uniform resolution; some of them held that Pater-noster should be said to God *formaliter*, and to the saints *materialiter*. Others, not approving this distinction, affirmed the Pater-noster ought to be said to God *principaliter*, and to the saints *minus principaliter*. The majority seemed willing to settle the controversy upon this footing: that the Pater-noster should be said to God *capiendo stricte*, and to the saints *capiendo large*! However, they came to no final determination, but referred the dispute to the provincial synod, which was to meet at Edinburgh in January following<sup>1</sup>.

*The question determined against him at the synod of Edinburgh.*

The question was accordingly debated at the meeting of the synod; and being put to the vote, there was no small number who agreed "the Pater-noster might be said to the saints." But this opinion was overruled by the bishops, and the most judicious part of the assembly. And thus the sub-prior of St. Andrews was ordered, at his return home, to declare the controversy; and that though the Lord's Prayer was to be addressed to none but God Almighty, yet the saints ought to be applied to for their assistance. At this synod an English catechism was drawn up and published. It contained a brief exposition upon the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. And the curates were obliged to read part of it to the people every Sunday, and holyday, when there was no sermon.

To return to England. On the thirteenth of January this year the parliament met at Westminster upon prorogation, in which several material things were enacted with relation to the Church. The first of this kind which I shall mention, is the

Id. p. 92.

<sup>1</sup> A very striking example of the conflict between religion and superstition.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

*The reviewed  
Common  
Prayer-book  
authorised  
by act of  
parliament.*  
5 & 6 Edw. 6,  
cap. 1.

“Act for the uniformity of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments.” Thus the service-book, as it stood reviewed the last year, was enjoined for public use.

By this statute, the first Common Prayer-book authorized by a parliament, in the second and third year of this reign, is called a “very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God, and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm.”

*An honour-  
able testi-  
mony given  
by the par-  
liament to  
the first  
Common  
Prayer-  
book.*

This is a very honourable testimony. The first book is said to be formed upon the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the practice of the best antiquity. And that it is very serviceable for the promoting of piety, and public advantage. This commendation is given without abatement. There is no stroke of censure, no charge of superstition, no blemish either with respect to doctrine, or ceremonies, thrown upon it. Thus, Bucer’s and Calvin’s animadversions are in effect declared frivolous and of no weight. The men, it is likely, meant well : but then they ventured beyond their talent, and their judgment failed them.

Bucer,  
Scrip. Angli-  
can. Calvin.  
Epist. ad  
Protest. et  
alib.

But if the book was in this good condition, why was it brought under a review? Why are some parts expunged, some added, and some transposed? The statute accounts for this. There were “divers doubts risen for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same.” Then it seems, there was no exception touching any part of the matter. But were these doubts well founded? No; the act says they proceeded “rather by the curiosity of the minister, and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause.” From hence we may infer, that the explanations, as they are called in the second book, were not made without compliance with the weakness of some people: not without condescension to those who had more scruples than understanding, more heat than light in them. When this bill for discharging the first book, and appointing the second, was read in the house of Lords, the earl of Derby, the bishops of Carlisle and Norwich, the lords Stourton and Windsor, protested against it.

321.

Journal  
Procer.  
Biblioth.  
Cotton.  
Tiberius,  
D. 1.

From the full approbation given by the statute to the first book, one may reasonably infer, that the following clause, which mentions the “explaining, perfecting, and making the same prayer and service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people

to the true honouring of Almighty God :” from hence, I say, we may reasonably infer, that this clause was added rather to recommend the second, than to fasten any blemish or abatement on the first book. EDWARD VI.

The ordinal for making archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, was annexed to the bill, and passed with it. The statute was not to inure till the feast of All Saints following, which was almost three quarters of a year. This is another argument of the inoffensiveness of the first Common Prayer-book, and that the parliament believed the people would not receive any harm by the use of it. The curates are enjoined to read this act in the church every quarter of a year for the first year, and once a year afterwards. The former act, by which the first service book was established, was, by this statute, to stand in full force to all intents and constructions for the use of the second book. There is another remarkable clause in this statute, and that is, “that all archbishops, bishops, and all others their officers exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, aswell in places exempt as not exempt, within their dioceses, shall have full power and authority by this act to reform, correct, and punish by the censures of the Church, all persons which shall offend after the feast of All Saints next coming.” If it be asked, does the legislature then make a grant of spiritual jurisdiction? Cannot the bishops discharge the functions essential to their character without leave from the civil magistrate? And can the power of the keys given to the Church by our blessed Saviour not be exercised without a warrant from the State? The answer to this question I shall leave to the reader’s consideration. *The ordinal confirmed by this statute.*

The Common Prayer-book, being thus confirmed by parliament, was by the king’s order translated into French, for the use of the islands of Guernsey and Jersey, and for the town and dependencies of Calais: but the same provision was not made for Wales, till the fifth of queen Elizabeth.

To proceed: on the third of March, a bill was brought into the house of Lords for the relief of the poor, which passed both houses, and received the royal assent. By this statute, two overseers for the poor in every parish were first settled. This bill, by obliging every town to maintain their poor, is by implication a tax upon the subject, and yet, which is somewhat remarkable, it was first read in the house of Lords. Heylin’s Hist. Reform. p. 122. 5 & 6 Edw. 6. cap. 2. *An act for making overseers for the poor.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*Holidays  
and fasts  
settled by  
act of par-  
liament.*

The next act which relates more immediately to the Church, determines the number of festivals and fasts. The preamble sets forth, "that in regard men are apt to be negligent in the worship of God, it has been therefore thought requisite to set a stamp of solemnity on certain days, and assign them for religious observances. That this was done to make people recollect their duty to God Almighty. And to the end they might come better prepared for his service, forbearance of labour and business has been customarily enjoined upon such days. That these days are not called holy upon the score of any inherent quality, nor yet in regard of the saints whose memories are then celebrated; but because they are dedicated to God's honour, and distinguished for the edification of the people. And since neither the time nor number of such privileged days are determined in holy Scripture; from hence it follows, that the appointment of these circumstances is left to the liberty of the Church and State." Thus far the preamble: by the enacting part, the following days are commanded to be kept holy, viz., "all Sundays in the year; the days of the feasts of the Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ; of the Epiphany; of the Purification of the blessed Virgin; of St. Matthias the Apostle; of the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin; of St. Mark the Evangelist; of St. Philip and Jacob, the Apostles; of the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ; of the Nativity of St. John Baptist; of St. Peter the Apostle; of St. James the Apostle; of St. Bartholomew the Apostle; of St. Matthew the Apostle; of St. Michael the Archangel; of St. Luke the Evangelist; of St. Simon and Jude the Apostles; of All Saints; of St. Andrew the Apostle; of St. Thomas the Apostle; of the Nativity of our Lord; of St. Stephen the Martyr; of St. John the Evangelist; of the Holy Innocents; Monday and Tuesday in Easter week; and Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun week; and that none other day shall be kept and commanded to be kept holyday, or to abstain from lawful bodily labour."

It is likewise enacted that the vigils or days before the said feasts, excepting those preceding St. John the Evangelist, and Philip and Jacob, shall be fasted, and that no other day or even shall be commanded to be fasted. And by this statute, the bishops and their officers are permitted to inquire into the breach of the premises, and punish offenders at their discretion by the censures of the Church.



By this statute it is first provided, that nothing therein contained “shall extend to abrogate or take away the abstinence from flesh in Lent, or on Fridays and Saturdays, or any other day which is already appointed so to be kept by virtue of an act made in the third year of the present reign, saving only of those evens and days whereof the holyday next following is abrogated by this statute.”

EDWARD  
VI.

It is likewise provided, “that when any of the said feasts happen to fall upon the Monday, the Saturday preceding, and not the Sunday, shall be accounted the vigil, and fasted.”

It is provided in the third place, “that it shall be lawful to every husbandman, labourer, fisherman, and to all and every other person and persons, of what estate, degree, or condition, he or they be, upon the holydays aforesaid, in harvest, or at any other times in the year, when necessity shall require, to labour, ride, fish, or work, any kind of work, at their free wills and pleasure.”

*A proviso  
for a liberty  
of working  
in several  
cases.*

And lastly, it is provided, “that the feast of St. George may be kept on the twenty-second, twenty-third, twenty-fourth of April yearly, by the knights of the right honourable order of the Garter.” This act was repealed 1 Mar. II., but revived by 1 Jac. I. cap. 25, because 1 Mar. II., is repealed by 1 Jac. I. cap. 25.

5 & 6 Edw. 6.  
cap. 3.

And since the alterations in public service and ceremonies had occasioned contests in several places,—since people were observed to bring their passions to church with them, and quarrel where they ought to have prayed together,—since these disorders were not to be checked the customary way, the jurisdiction of the bishops having either an embargo laid upon it by the State, or else worn out of use and significance,—for these reasons, it was thought fit to guard the honour of religion, and the places consecrated to divine worship, by parliamentary provisions; it is therefore enacted, “that, if any person whatsoever shall at any time after the 1st of May next coming, by words only, quarrel, chide, or brawl in any church or churchyard, that then it shall be lawful to the ordinary of the place, where the same offence shall be done and proved by two lawful witnesses, to suspend every person so offending: that is to say, if he be a layman, ‘ab ingressu ecclesie;’ and, if he be a clerk, from the ministrations of his office.” And here

322.

*An act  
against  
quarrelling  
in churches.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the continuance of the punishment is left to the discretion of the ordinary.

It is farther enacted, "that, if any person shall smite or lay any violent hands upon any other, either in the church or churchyard, that then, *ipso facto*, every person so offending shall be deemed excommunicate, and be excluded from the fellowship and communion of Christ's congregation."

And lastly, it is enacted, "that, if any person shall maliciously strike with any weapon in any church or churchyard, or draw any weapon with intent to strike another, that then every person so offending, and thereof being convicted by verdict of twelve men, or by his own confession, or by two lawful witnesses, before the justices of the assize, justices of oyer and determiner, or justices of peace in their sessions, shall have one of his ears cut off; and, in case the persons so offending have no ears, he was to have the letter 'F' burnt upon his cheek, to mark him for a fraymaker and fighter; and, over and above, he was to stand, *ipso facto*, excommunicated."

5 & 6 Edw. 6.  
cap. 4.

By this act the reader may observe the direction of spiritual jurisdiction is managed by parliament; and, which is more, the penalty of the act "excludes from the fellowship of Christ's congregation," and reaches to the most solemn exercise of the power of the keys.

A case de-  
bated by the  
judges upon  
this statute.

Upon this act an action of false imprisonment was brought by one George Foreman against two Mounsons, justices of peace in the county of Lincoln, and commissioners in causes ecclesiastical, &c. The defendants pleaded the plaintiff stood excommunicated before the purchasing the writ, and, by consequence, was disabled from bringing his action; that he lay under this censure, they proved, because he drew his dagger in a churchyard with an intention to make a pass at a certain person, and that he was indicted for this offence before the mayor of Lincoln and other justices of the peace. Now, whether this was a good plea to disable the plaintiff, was debated at large by the bench. The reason of the judges' making it a question, was, because Foreman was not convicted of the breach of the statute: for a bare indictment, without any answer made to it, or process of outlawry upon it, &c., is no conviction in law,—that is, so far as to make the offender liable to the corporal punishment provided by the statute before

us,—that is, to have his ears cut off, or his cheek branded: and thus far the whole court was agreed. But whether the plaintiff by committing the offence, without proof made of it, or going through the course of a trial, was immediately to be accounted excommunicated, by virtue of the act of parliament above-mentioned, and without any sentence given, or proof of witnesses made before the ordinary,—that is, whether these words in the statute, “*ipso facto*,” without the customary process, would affect a man so far as to make him excommunicate in law, was very much doubted. And this scruple of the judges was founded upon these words in the last clause of the statute: viz. “And, besides, every such person shall stand and be *ipso facto* excommunicated, as is before said,”—that is, “for smiting or laying violent hands upon any person.” And thus the court broke up, and deferred the resolution till the next term; but the plaintiff happening to die in the mean time, the canvassing the point went no farther. Thus we see the judges laid the stress of the whole question upon the statute.

EDWARD  
VI.

This sessions, the marquess of Northampton put in a bill for confirming his marriage, which passed. By the act, the marriage is declared lawful: as, by the law of God, indeed it was; any decretal, canon, ecclesiastical law, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding. There was likewise a bill brought into the house of Lords, and passed there, that no man should put away his wife and marry again, unless he shall be lawfully divorced before some ecclesiastical competent judge. But this bill sunk in the house of Commons.

Dyer's  
Reports,  
fol. 275.  
An. 10.  
Eliz. Reg.

March 19.  
An. 1552.

Journal  
Procer.

Upon this occasion I shall give the reader an argument, together with the resolution of the judges of the King's Bench, upon a resembling case.

Upon the trial of an action of trespass, sued at the King's Bench, it was proved that one John Bunting had contracted himself to one Agnes Adingsel; and that this Agnes was afterwards married to one Twine, and cohabited with him. Some time after this, Bunting sued Agnes in the court of Audience, and proved the contract; and, because Agnes could show no cause to the contrary, the court gave sentence that she should marry Bunting, and cohabit with him, which she did accordingly. By this marriage they had issue one Charles Bunting, and the father died. Now, the question is, whether Charles is legitimate son and heir to John Bunting? If he is, then the

More's  
Reports,  
fol. 169.  
Bunting's  
case.  
*Marriage  
subsequent  
to a contract  
with a third  
person void  
without a  
formal  
divorce.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

323.

verdict was to go against the defendant ; if not, for him. The point, therefore, to be decided in the King's Bench was this : whether the marriage between Bunting and Agnes was lawful, without a preceding divorce between Twine and Agnes, and without summoning Twine to declare if he had anything to allege why Bunting and Agnes should not be married. And here the judges desired the civilians to give their opinion upon the case. Upon this, one Dr. Goldingham argued in court, and endeavoured to prove Charles legitimate, and heir to John Bunting, without making Twine a party to the suit against Agnes, and notwithstanding there was no divorce between Agnes and Twine. First, because Agnes was first contracted to Bunting, which made her his lawful wife by the civil law : for in case they had cohabited after the contract, they should neither have been punished for adultery or fornication, but only for contempt of an order of the Church, which prohibits cohabitation before the marriage is solemnized “*in facie ecclesiæ.*” Thus, if a legacy be given to a woman “*cum uxor fuerit,*” when she is such a man's wife, and afterwards she contracts herself to him, she may lawfully demand the legacy in the spiritual court in case the man dies before the marriage is solemnized. From hence it may be inferred, that, in the construction of the civil law, the woman is reckoned a wife before the wedding ; and, though she is married to a stranger after the contract, yet that marriage is void. This learned civilian argued farther, that the solemnization of marriages was not generally practised in the Church before pope Innocent III., who was the first that made a constitution for this purpose. Before this regulation, marriages were celebrated with this ceremony : the bridegroom came to the place where the bride lived, and conveyed her to his own house, and this was the whole form. And from hence came the phrase of “*ducere uxorem,*” because the man used to lead his wife to his house ; and the woman is said to be “*nupta viro,*” because she is, as it were, “*cooperta nube,*” *i. e.* “*viro,*” —that is, veiled, or under covert-baron, in regard she makes herself subject to him by the covenant of marriage<sup>1</sup>. And for this reason the civil law makes them “*baron*” and “*feme,*” in virtue of the contract before the solemnity of the wedding ; and, in consequence of this, their issue born after the contract, and before the espousals or marriage, is counted legitimate,

<sup>1</sup> “*Nubo, velo, operio ; est enim nubere, sponsæ caput velare flammeo.*”—Ainsworth.

provided the marriage follows: for, in case they are never married, the issue after the contract is a bastard: but when marriage follows, it shall relate to the time of the contract, and void all other marriages which come between, and make them no better than adultery. And, therefore, there was no need of any divorce from Twine, because, by the first contract to Bunting, the woman was disabled from making a contract or marriage with any other man. And thus, the marriage between her and Twine being null, there was no occasion for a divorce: for a divorce supposes the lawfulness of the marriage; it being a maxim in the law, “Ubi nullus habitus, ibi nulla privatio.”

This doctor argued, in the second place, “that Bunting, who claimed after the contract, and in virtue of it, was not obliged to take notice of the marriage between Twine and Agnes, but only to convent Agnes before the ecclesiastical judge, to know the reason why she refused to marry him, pursuant to the contract; all which has been done by him accordingly: and since Bunting has followed the directions, and answered the demands of the law, it is reasonable he should receive the benefit of the law, and have the sentence or authority of the spiritual court to carry on his contract to a lawful marriage.”

Thirdly, this civilian urged, “that forasmuch as Bunting has had a sentence in his favour pronounced by the judge of the court of Audience, it is to be presumed the judge has convented, or summoned, all those it was necessary to summon.

“And therefore, by this sentence, the interest of all other persons shall be barred and defeated: and therefore Twine shall not be allowed to except against the sentence, by alleging he had no notice of it, nor was any party to the process.”—Thus far Dr. Goldingham.

But then it was argued, on the other side, “that, by the common law, marriage in the Church is so strong an engagement, that it cannot be undone or defeated without divorce, and without giving the parties notice to appear in the spiritual court. And in case they die before they are thus convented, their issue shall not be accounted illegitimate; in regard their marriage was only voidable, and not actually void. And, in all cases where the marriage is only voidable, the parties ought to be brought into the spiritual court before separation, for otherwise the marriage will hold good, and the issue be reckoned legitimate. And thus this council agreed the precontract was

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

a ground to make a marriage with a third person voidable, but that it did not make such marriage void *ipso facto*. And therefore some are of opinion, that to make a marriage void, upon the score of a precontract to another person, both the parties married ought to be convented, to show what they have to say against such a precontract, in defence of their marriage; and that unless they are thus convented, their marriage must continue lawful. And, to apply this reasoning to the case in hand, in regard Twine was not convented before the sentence pronounced in favour of the precontract between Bunting and Agnes, the marriage between Twine and Agnes remains undissolved, and, by consequence, the second marriage between Bunting and Agnes is void: from whence it will follow, their issue Charles must be a bastard. But, notwithstanding this plea, the court adjudged Bunting's issue legitimate."

This case being not foreign to the history, learnedly argued, and more than commonly instructive, may, I hope, excuse the reporting it at length. But, before I take leave, the reader may please to observe, that Goldingham, the civilian, was altogether mistaken, in affirming that marriages were not solemnized in the Church till the time of pope Innocent III. For the practice was quite otherwise from the first centuries, and so onward: for, when the parties were agreed, their marriage was publicly celebrated in the Church. They received the bishop's or the priest's blessing, and the holy eucharist, as part of the solemnity.

To proceed. The next thing I shall mention passed this session, with relation to the Church, is an "Act for the declaration of a statute, made for the Marriage of Priests, and the Legitimation of their Children." The act referred to, has been taken notice of in the second and third year of this reign. The purport of it, as hath been already observed, was to void all constitutions and laws whatsoever against the marriage of priests. Notwithstanding this provision, the preamble before us sets forth, "that divers ill-disposed persons had misconstrued the statute made in the second and third year of this reign, thrown a scandalous imputation upon the matrimony of priests, as if the statute abovementioned implied no more than a bare permission; as usury, and other unlawful things, are now suffered, for the avoiding greater inconvenience. From hence many people proceed to draw a blemish upon the birth of priests' children born in matrimony. That this calumny is highly

Tertull. 1. 2.  
ad Uxor. in  
fin. Isid. de  
Eccles.  
Offic. vid.  
Hittorpium,  
p. 218.  
*Married  
priests set  
upon the  
same foot  
of advantage  
with other  
subjects.*

Cap. 12.

324.

dishonourable to Almighty God, to the king's majesty, to the parliament, and the learned clergy of this realm, who have determined the same to be most lawful, by the law of God in their convocation, as well by their common assent, as by the subscription of their hands. And that it is most of all to be lamented, through such uncomely railings against matrimony, and slanderous reproaches against the clergy, the word of God is not heard with reverence, followed with diligence, the godly proceedings of the king's majesty not received with due obedience, and thereby the wealthy men of this realm discouraged to nourish and bring up their children in learning, so as, it is to be feared, lest in place of good learning and knowledge, shall creep in ignorance, and, for learned men, unlearned ambitious men and flatterers, to the great displeasure of Almighty God, and to the peril of the whole state of God's true religion within this realm, if speedy remedy be not provided herein."—The statute, therefore, in the enacting part, sets the clergy, their wives, and issue, upon the same foot of privilege with the rest of the king's subjects. For instance, the children are declared legitimate, and inheritable to lands and tenements. The married priest is enabled to be tenant by courtesy, after the death of his wife, and his widow empowered to claim her dower, &c.

EDWARD  
VI.5 & 6 Edw. 6.  
cap. 12.

Thus the clergy have the liberty of marrying upon the general advantage. When the tithes were taken away in many places, and the parish duties lessened, they had the freedom of engaging in a more expensive way of living. When the revenues were cut short, it was at their choice to increase their charge. They had an opportunity of wanting more things, when the means of procuring them were more slender than ever. Thus they had liberty without much property: they might, if they pleased, be legally undone, and starve by act of parliament. But then this inconvenience is partly to be reckoned to the indiscretions of some of the clergy, in disposing of themselves; and partly to some hardships put upon the Church in this and the last reign. For as to the statute, it is a commendable provision: it takes off an unjustifiable restraint: it returns the clergy to the common liberty of mankind, and leaves them in the condition allowed by the Scriptures and the ancient Church<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph is a remarkable illustration of the peculiarities of Collier's style.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Caut.

*An act con-  
cerning  
usury.*

5 & 6 Edw. 6.  
cap. 20.

Moral Es-  
says, pt. 3.  
under  
Usury.  
Journal  
Procer.  
Regist.  
Thirlby.  
*The bishop-  
ric of West-  
minster dis-  
solved.*

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 121.

*A bill con-  
cerning  
simony mis-  
carries.*

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 193.

To proceed: by an act made against taking interest for money this parliament, it is declared, in the preamble, that “usury, by the word of God, is utterly prohibited, as a vice most odious and detestable, as in divers places of the holy Scriptures is evident to be seen; and that the terrible threatenings of God’s wrath and vengeance justly hang over great and open usury, wherever practised.” I shall make no remarks upon the divinity part of this bill, whether it will hold good or not; because I have elsewhere thoroughly examined the subject, and showed how the constitution stands at present; and to this tract I shall refer the reader.

This parliament dissolved the bishopric of Westminster and united it to the see of London; but the collegiate church, with the exempted jurisdiction, was still continued. The dissolution of this bishopric, by act of parliament, was to corroborate the late proceedings of the crown. For, as the learned Heylin observes, from the Convocation Records, the bishopric of Westminster was dissolved by the king’s letters-patent, upon the twenty-ninth of January last past; and thus the county of Middlesex, which had been laid to it, was restored to the see of London. The lands of Westminster had been so much alienated by Thirlby, that there was scarcely any thing left to maintain the port of a bishop. However, the conveying away those estates, for which they were at the most but tenants for life, was sometimes reckoned a merit in churchmen: and for this reason, as the historian relates, Thirlby was preferred to the see of Norwich. As for the lands belonging to the bishopric of Westminster, the best part of them was snatched by the great courtiers. The remainder was laid out in repairing St. Paul’s cathedral, miserably harassed by some of the Gospellers of those times: and from hence came the common saying, of “robbing Peter to pay Paul’.”

And, to draw towards a conclusion of the ecclesiastical business of this session, a bill passed both houses against simoniacal contracts, reserving pensions out of benefices, and granting advowsons living the incumbent: but, as it happened, this bill missed the royal assent. One of our learned Church historians very justly observes, these abuses have been often complained of, and that new contrivances have been still found

<sup>1</sup> I suspect that this proverb was previously in vogue in the disputes between Romanists and Protestants.



out to fence against the law, and cover simony: that either bargains have been made by friends, without the express knowledge of the parties concerned, or bonds of resignation given, to lay the incumbent at the patron's mercy; and thus the prevarication of some of the clergy is made a precedent for imposing hard terms upon others: and the Church often robbed by such scandalous compliance.

Lastly, the duke of Northumberland, having the ascendant both at court, and in the house of Lords, a bill was brought in for depriving the bishop of Durham. This bishop was charged, by one Ninian Menvil, to have consented to a plot in the north for raising a rebellion; as by the charge of the deponent, the bishop's answer, and Menvil's replication, was largely set forth. But Menvil not producing a letter written to him by Tunstal, as he deposed, upon which the proof of the charge principally depended; this evidence, I say, not being produced, Tunstal was only commanded to keep his house, till he should be called to a farther answer. But the letter being afterwards found in a casket of the duke of Somerset's, the bishop was ordered to appear before the lords of the council: where he was charged with abetting an intended insurrection, and the letter laid before him, which he did not deny to be his hand. Notwithstanding this, he offered to purge himself; but in what manner, or upon what arguments, the record does not mention. It is only said, his answer was judged insufficient by the council, who sent him to the Tower. And the same day sir John Mason was ordered by the board to take an inventory of his goods. Upon this information a bill was brought into the house of Lords, for attainting him of misprision of treason: but his accusers not being brought face to face, the parliament refused to attain him upon the bare evidence of depositions. One of our historians reports the bill came down to the house of Commons, and was thrown out for the reason last mentioned; but let this be as it will, it certainly miscarried. The proceeding by way of attainder against the bishop, is a sign his enemies could not come at him any other way; which makes it probable the letter written by him had no such treasonable contents as was pretended. Besides, the Journal of the House of Lords mentions the bill for depriving the bishop of Durham was twice read and engrossed, but did not pass. This was believed a great disappointment to the duke of Northumberland, who promised himself the lands and jurisdiction of that wealthy

EDWARD VI.

*A bill brought in against the bishop of Durham, but miscarries.*

Council Book, ex Biblioth. Rob. Harley Armig.

325.

Bp. Burnet, pt. 2. p. 195.

April 15, A. D. 1552.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

bishopric. This parliament, therefore, not complying with the duke's expectation, he procured a dissolution, in hopes of a better interest with the next.

The king having lately been sick of the small-pox, and not perfectly recovered, he signed a bill, in which the acts he intended to pass were mentioned: this bill was read in the house of Lords, and amounted to an equivalent of giving the royal assent the customary way. There was likewise a commission issued to the lord chancellor, to two archbishops, two bishops, two dukes, two marquesses, two earls, and two barons, to dissolve the parliament.

K. Edward's  
Journal.  
*The articles  
passed in the  
convocation.*

This year the book of articles lately drawn up by Cranmer and his assistants was laid before the convocation, and agreed there. That they came before this representation of the clergy, appears by the Latin title, which runs thus: "Articuli de quibus in synodo Londinensi, anno 1552, inter episcopos et alios eruditos viros convenerat ad tollendam opinionum disensionem, et consensum veræ religionis firmandum, regia autoritate in lucem editi." From whence it appears they stood upon the bottom of a convocation authority. And, further, by this title it may be inferred, the two houses had transferred their power upon a select number: and that this committee was fully authorised to debate and resolve finally for the rest. For here the title is not worded in such terms of extent and comprehension as we find in the articles published in 1562, where it is said, "they were agreed unto by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London." Instead of this, they are said to be "agreed upon in the synod of London, by the bishops, and certain other learned men, 'inter episcopos et alios eruditos viros.'" From whence it seems pretty plain, that these articles were passed by some members only, delegated by both houses for that purpose. And thus the acts and resolutions of this committee are, in all construction of equity and law, of the same force as if they had passed the votes of the whole body. Besides, it is possible these articles, after having been settled by the committee, might be reported in both houses, and agreed there. This the learned Heylin thinks not altogether improbable, though the acts of the convocation are lost: and to fortify this conjecture, he observes, that these articles were received as the doctrine of the Church of England, for the first five years of queen's Elizabeth's reign. And

Heylin,  
Hist. Re-  
form. p. 121,  
122.

though it is no hard matter to meet with these articles, yet since they make so considerable a part of the English reformation, I shall transcribe them for the reader.

Notwithstanding this progress for retrieving the ancient belief, the people were little mended in their manners. The reader may find the immorality of the times loudly complained of by Beacon, one of Cranmer's chaplains. To mention something of his remonstrance: "What staring contradiction," says he, "is there between the doctrine and practice of Christians. They profess that they know God, but in works they deny him, being abominable and disobedient, and unto every good work—reprobate. How lamentably are we overrun with hypocritical and sensual gospellers! Men who have their tongues tipped with Scripture expressions, can dispute very copiously for justification by faith, talk with great assurance of forgiveness by the blood of Christ, and boast of their being entered upon the list of the predestinated to glory; but then how wretchedly wide do they live of the rule they pretend to! How are they bloated, and almost poisoned with pride! Envy, malice, and revenge are pushed to the utmost excesses in these people: they are licentious to the last degree, and deny their appetites in no instance of scandalous pleasure: their avarice is without measure or shame: they never think they have multiplied their lordships far enough, mounted their revenues to the pitch of their merit, or swelled their fortunes to a sufficient bulk. Indeed, if you will read them by their actions, you would almost think they had an ambition to show themselves heathens, and made it their business to live counter to their duty. As for distributions of charity, prayers, fasting, and other exercises of true religion, those counterfeit gospellers will not trouble themselves with any thing of this kind. All their religion lies in language and dispute; but as for virtue, and good deeds, they are altogether barren and unfurnished."

This summer the religious house of Grey Friars, in London, was preparing for the relief of poor orphans; and about the same time St. Thomas's hospital, in Southwark, began to be repaired, for the service of the poor who were maimed or disabled from getting their living. There was likewise a considerable provision made for the poor in London, by a weekly and general contribution.

On All Saints'-day, pursuant to the act of parliament, the new Common Prayer-book was read in the churches. Ridley,

EDWARD VI.

See Records, num. 66. *A satire upon the dissoluteness of manners.*

Preface to Jewel of Joy.

Tit. i. 16.

Memoirs, Cranmer, p. 290.

*Provisions in London for the poor.* July 26.

Stow's Annal. Id.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
*The New  
Common  
Prayer-  
book exe-  
cuted.*

bishop of London, officiated in the forenoon at St. Paul's cathedral. His habit was distinguished only by a rochet, without cope, or other customary vestment: for by the rubric of this reviewed book, no more than the surplice was required. Thus the bishops thought themselves obliged to forbear appearing with their crosses; and the prebends in all the cathedrals left off their hoods. In the afternoon of this festival, bishop Ridley preached at St. Paul's Cross: the design of the sermon was to reconcile the audience to the new service, and justify the alterations.

Id.

*Sternhold  
and Hop-  
kins's trans-  
lation of the  
Psalms.*

About this time David's Psalms were turned into metre by Sternhold, one of the grooms of the privy chamber. He translated but thirty-seven, the rest of them being soon after done by Hopkins, and others. Clement Marot, groom of the bedchamber to king Francis I. had led the way to an essay of this kind. This Marot, being encouraged by Vatablus to try his genius upon the Psalms, went through the first fifty: and afterwards, upon his retiring to Geneva, he made an acquaintance with Beza, who turned the rest, and had tunes set to them. And thus they began to be sung in private houses, and afterwards were brought into the churches of the French, and other countries, which reformed upon the model of Geneva<sup>1</sup>.

326.

*Hebrew  
professor at  
Paris.*

Hopkins' and Sternhold's performance was afterwards, as Fuller observes, discountenanced by some great clergymen. The reason of their disapprobation was, because they believed this metre was set up in opposition to the reading Psalms sung in cathedrals. The learned Heylin thinks these great churchmen were well founded in their suspicion: they foresaw it is likely the bringing this rhyming performance into the church, might engage the fancy of the ignorant people too far, and make them lessen their regard for the other parts of the service. These presages were afterwards made good to a remarkable misfortune: for when the puritan faction grew up to strength and assurance, this metre made the ancient hymns disrelished, and threw the Te Deum, the Magnificat, &c. out of the church in many places.

Heylin's  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 131.

Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
p. 406.

Heylin's  
Animadver-  
sions upon  
Fuller, and  
Hist. Ref.  
*They are  
rather per-  
mitted than  
allowed.*

Thus sometimes things which are only connived at at first, govern at last. For this translation of Sternhold and Hopkins was rather permission than allowance. For notwithstanding it is said in the title of these singing Psalms, "that they were set forth, and allowed to be sung in all churches before and after

<sup>1</sup> For an excellent account of Marot's version, see D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*.

morning and evening prayer, and also before and after sermon ; ” EDWARD VI. yet this allowance seems rather to import connivance than approbation ; for those who have searched into this matter, with the utmost care and curiosity, could never discover any authority, either from the crown or the convocation. Id.

It has been already observed, the king was empowered by act of parliament to appoint two-and-thirty of the spirituality, and temporalty, to review the ecclesiastical laws, and draw a body out of them. That this performance being afterwards approved by the king, and published under the broad seal, should have the force of a statute within the English dominions. The two-and-thirty commissioners were to be divided into four sub-committees, each of which was to consist of two bishops, and two divines, two canon and civil, and two common lawyers. And what was concluded by each class, was to be transmitted to the rest, and examined by them. The sub-committee, who by the king’s letters-patent had the first digestion of the work, has been already mentioned ; archbishop Cranmer had a principal share in furnishing the matter. It was put into method and form by Dr. Haddon, orator to the university of Cambridge. Sir John Check is likewise said to have contributed to the polishing part. It is written in a correct and beautiful style, and comes up to the force and propriety of the civil law. It is digested into one-and-fifty titles, besides an appendix *de regulis juris*. It is not said whether this draught had passed the approbation of all the four classes or not. The affirmative is most probable, considering it appears in so finished a condition. But the king’s death happening unexpectedly, the book had no royal confirmation, and by consequence miscarried in its authority. However, since it appears to have been drawn up with no small share of judgment and learning, it may not be amiss to give the reader an account of some of the most remarkable contents.

*A brief account of the book drawn up for a body of ecclesiastical laws ; and entitled “ Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.”*

Reformat. Leg. Eccles. in Prafat.

The two first titles settle the Catholic faith, and point out several heresies. But these heads and decisions, being much the same with those of the Church articles in this reign, I shall pass them over.

The third title treats of the process against heresy. Those who lived in places exempt, were to be tried before the bishops or archbishops of the diocese. Here the party accused had the liberty of appealing from the bishop to the archbishop, and from the archbishop to the king’s person. If any one charged

*Heresy.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

with heresy refused to give security to stand to the award of the court, the bishop was authorised to commit him, and detain him in prison till the process was over. And if any such person was lawfully cited, and refused to appear, he was first to be excommunicated, and afterwards committed till he had given sureties to submit to the sentence of the ecclesiastical judge. Those who would not be reclaimed from their misbelief by any admonitions or instructions were to be pronounced heretics, and excommunicated. And provided they renounced their heterodoxy within sixteen days, they were first to give public proof of their repentance, then they were solemnly to swear against a relapse, and thirdly to declare their belief of the contrary doctrine; upon which satisfaction they were to be absolved. But in case excommunication was despised, and the discipline of the Church made no impression, they were then to be delivered into the hands of the secular magistrate, and they were to suffer death by the law. From hence it appears that all capital proceedings for heresy were not laid aside, as our learned historian supposed; neither is this more than might be expected, considering that, by the first article of the book, those who declared against the Christian religion were to forfeit their lives and estates. Farther: if while the process was depending the person prosecuted for heresy removed out of the jurisdiction of the court, the ecclesiastical judge was to apply to the sheriff or mayor of the town whither the criminal was retired, to desire he might be remanded to the court. And provided the sheriff or mayor should refuse to apprehend and return the criminal, they were to be executed for the neglect. Those who were convicted of heresy and neglected their appeal, or refused to give satisfaction in due time, were to be accounted infamous, not suffered to bear any public office, to be of council or witness in any court, or to have the privilege of making their will. If heresy was proved upon any clergyman, his abjuring it afterwards was no sufficient amends to take off his punishment, and recover his preferment; for a churchman's reputation ought to be unblemished: and when he has once tarnished his character, he is disabled for his function. However, there is an exception thrown in for extraordinary cases.

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 198.

*Blasphemy.*

The fourth title is about blasphemy: sets forth the hideousness of the sin, orders the bishop to proceed to speedy justice, and pursue this crime with the same punishment levelled against heresy. And here the article takes notice that the blasphemers

was to be stoned by the law of Moses, and that God had sometimes revenged the connivance at such wickedness by a public calamity. EDWARD VI.

The fifth defines the nature and number of the sacraments, 327. and ranges none, strictly and properly speaking, under that denomination, excepting baptism and the Lord's supper. *The sacraments.* Imposition of hands is made necessary at the consecration and ordaining of bishops, priests, and deacons. Marriages were to be publicly solemnized in the face of the congregation. Children were to be confirmed by the bishop when they could give an account of their baptismal engagement. The parish-priests were to visit the sick, and govern themselves in their applications by the Rubric of the Common Prayer.

The sixth title goes upon idolatry, witchcraft, consulting conjurers, and divining by lots. These crimes, provided the party submitted, were to be punished at the discretion of the ecclesiastical judge; but, in case of obstinacy, excommunication was to follow: and, if any person had done his neighbour any damage by such dark practices, he was bound to make restitution. *Idolatry, witchcraft, &c.*

The seventh provides for the due qualification of preachers: that nobody should be permitted this function without an authority from the bishop; that all novelty of doctrine or expression, all unnecessary questions, all superstitious fancies, should be avoided in the pulpit; that those who have a general license to preach through the whole diocese should be called before the bishop once a-year; that, by this means, the diocesan might be informed what places were most remarkable for disorder; and, being thus acquainted with the nature of the disease, the remedy might be the better proportioned. People of quality and magistrates are particularly enjoined to be constant at the hearing of sermons, both for their own benefit and the advantage of their example; and if any persons disturbed the preacher, they were to be suspended from the sacrament, and barred coming into the church till they had given satisfaction. *Qualifications of preachers.*

The eighth relates to marriage. And here the banns are ordered to be first published by the priest three Sundays or holydays. Afterwards, the bride and bridegroom were to appear in the church, and pass through the ceremonies appointed by the Common Prayer; and that, unless these forms are punctually observed, the marriage is incomplete, and the persons at liberty as before. Those who debauched young *Marriage.*

GRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

women were to be excommunicated, and not to be restored unless they married the persons they had formerly abused; and, if this could not be done, the ecclesiastical judge was to assign the person they had injured a third part of their estate; and, in case such a satisfaction happened to be impracticable, they were then to oblige him to maintain the illegitimate issue, besides farther arbitrary punishment. The marriage of minors, who engaged themselves without the consent of their parents and guardians, was to stand for nothing: but if those who had thus the charge of them proved too dilatory in making or accepting proposals, the young people might apply to the ecclesiastical judge for their relief. The impediments of marriage are reckoned up, and this state left at liberty to men and women of all ages and conditions: with advice, however, not to do anything contrary to decency, nor engage at too great a disparity of years. Polygamy is condemned as a contradiction to the first institution of matrimony in Genesis; and, therefore, whosoever has thus unhappily entangled himself, was to keep close to his first marriage, to disengage from the rest, return the women their fortunes, and, over and above, make the Church satisfaction for the scandal. Marriages made upon force and compulsion, provided the violence was strong and the proofs evident, were not to stand good. At the close of this head the niceness and delicacy of those women who refused to suckle their children is deeply censured, and the preachers are ordered to declaim against this misbehaviour.

*The prohibited degrees of marriage.*

The ninth dilates upon the prohibited degrees of marriage, settles the Levitical law for a rule, and orders people to govern themselves by inference and proportion in the cases unmentioned. As for spiritual relations founded upon godfathers and godmothers, they were to be no bar, there being neither Scripture nor good reason for such a restraint<sup>1</sup>.

*The punishment of adultery.*

The tenth begins with the heinousness of adultery, takes notice that this crime was capitally punished both by the Mosaic and the civil law. To discountenance this license effectually, it is provided, that, if any clergyman was convicted of fornication, incest, or adultery, he was to forfeit all his estate to his wife and children; and, if no such relations were in being, his fortune was to be distributed amongst the poor, or

<sup>1</sup> This put an end to the ecclesiastical prohibition against marriage between gossips, namely, between godparents and godchildren.



to such other pious uses as the ecclesiastical judge should think fit. He was likewise to lose his spiritual preferment, and either to be banished or imprisoned during life. If a layman was proved guilty of this crime, he was to return his wife her fortune, and part with half his own to her, over and above. The remainder of his punishment was either banishment or perpetual imprisonment. Women, when convicted, were to forfeit their dowry, jointure, thirds, and all other profits and advantages, which would otherwise accrue to them by their matrimony; and, besides, they were either to be confined for life or banished. When either husband or wife was convicted of proving false to the engagements of marriage, the innocent and injured person had the liberty of marrying elsewhere: there being no reason to confine one person to single life for the fault of another. And thus we see the case of adultery plainly excepted by our Saviour. However, considering the nearness of the relation, passing over the injury and living together again is recommended, in case there is any hopes of regular behaviour; but, if this favour will not be allowed, the criminal is barred any other marriage; but, not to leave a matter of this moment to private suspicion and disgust, nobody was to part either from wife or husband till the cause was heard, and the divorce pronounced, by the ecclesiastical judge. If either of the parties desert, and cannot be prevailed with to live with the other, the rambling and obstinate person shall suffer perpetual imprisonment, and the party deserted be allowed the liberty of marrying at discretion. But, then, the person complained of, provided he was absent, was to have two or three years allowed him to make his appearance and justify his absence. If a man happens to be a great while in a foreign country, upon the score either of merchandise or serving in the field, and no tidings could be heard of him, his wife, if she pleased, might apply to the ecclesiastical judge, who was to give her two or three years to expect the return of her husband; and if, after she had laid out for the best intelligence, and could hear nothing of him within this term, she had the liberty of marrying another man: but with this condition, that, in case her husband should come home, she must be obliged to live with him again, and break off her second marriage: she was obliged to do this, provided her husband could prove his return was thus long delayed by accident and necessity. When breach

*Desertion  
and absence.*

328.

*Divorce  
allowed in  
several cases.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

of friendship between man and wife came to such a height that they attempted to poison or destroy each other, the judge is ordered to pronounce a divorce: for, where people are so flamingly provoked and envenomed, it is best to part them. Here the ground of the engagement ceases; and there is no reason people should be tied together to murder each other. And, to go somewhat lower, if a man maltreats his wife to a savage degree, and proves incorrigible in cruelty and rough temper, insomuch that he is not to be reclaimed, neither by the judge's admonition, nor by sureties for good behaviour, nor by the discipline of a prison, he ought to be looked on as no better than an implacable enemy, and a perpetual plague. In such a case, therefore, the wife ought to be relieved by a divorce, no less than if her life was plainly in danger. But constant sickness is no just cause for separation: the supporting people under such misfortunes being one of the principal ends and conveniences of marriage. While a suit was depending for the breaking some of the capital articles of marriage, the man was to allow his wife a maintenance suitable to her quality and condition. If a man prosecuted his wife for adultery, or attempting his life, and was cast in the court, he was to forfeit half his estate to her; neither should he have the liberty of alienating that moiety without her consent: and, in case the wife brought in a charge of the same nature against her husband, and failed in the proof, she was neither to have her fortune returned nor receive any advantage which might otherwise accrue to her by her husband; and, lastly, the marriage was to remain undissolved. If a man prompted his wife to turn strumpet, and led her to debauchery, she was to fall under the penalty of adultery, the husband is pronounced a procurer, and the marriage is to continue. If either husband or wife, convict of adultery, can prove the same crime upon the party impeaching, they were both to suffer the same punishment, and neither of them allowed the benefit of a divorce. All confidants and assistants in scandalous amours, who either carry letters or messages, or furnish libertines with their houses for such purposes, are to be punished at the discretion of the ecclesiastical judge. The customary separation from bed and board, the marriage remaining firm in other respects, is declared an unreasonable constitution, repugnant to the Holy Scripture, introductive of great disorders, and therefore not to be endured.

*The penalty  
of prompting  
to licentious-  
ness.*

The eleventh title treats of the admission of the clergy to benefices ; and here a strict examination was to be premised, that the bishop “ might lay his hands suddenly on no man, nor be partaker of other men’s sins.” Patrons are enjoined to set aside all regards of relation and mercenary motives, and to present purely upon the score of proper qualifications ; for the right of patronage was never given for deprecation and abuse, but to protect the interest of the Church. Those patrons, therefore, who dispose of livings upon conditions of avarice and scandal, either to withdraw part of the tithes, reserve some of the buildings, or charge the incumbent with a pension, were to forfeit their presentation for that turn ; and the clerk who complied with such unworthy terms was to lose that living, and be disabled of taking any other. Patrons were not allowed to contract for the granting any presentation before the Church was void. If a living happen to lapse from the patron as far as the crown, and the king did not present in six months, the right was to revert to the patron, and run the same circle, in case of neglect, as before. The clergy, before their admission to benefices, were to be examined by the archdeacon, who was to call in the assistance of such triers as the bishop had assigned for that purpose : the bishop himself is likewise exhorted to take cognizance of so weighty a matter. An oath is likewise required of the clerk to answer clearly to the questions proposed with respect to the subject in hand. After this preliminary caution, he was to be examined upon his belief in the holy Trinity, the canon and authority of the Scriptures, and the controversies then on foot ; and, in short, he was to be tried upon each part of the catechism ; this system being an abstract of the principal parts of religion. And to prevent any heterodox clergy passing the test, the triers were to sound their belief by putting questions upon all the articles of heresy mentioned in the second title ; and here those who gave unsatisfactory answers, or discovered their ignorance in the Holy Scriptures, were to be set aside. Pluralities were altogether disallowed for the future, but those who were already possessed of more than one living were not to be disturbed. Non-residence was not to be suffered in any person, unless age, sickness, or some other sufficient excuse could be alleged ; and here the bishop was to be judge of the weight of the allegation : and to make the regulation more precise and particular, the beneficed person was to go to his

EDWARD VI.

1 Tim. v.  
An admonition to patrons.

The penalty of presenting upon a simoniacal contract.

The examination of those admitted to benefices.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

living two months after institution. Prebendaries who had no cures annexed, were to preach in the neighbouring churches: however, they had five years allowed to improve themselves in the university; upon condition they gave the bishop and chapter a yearly account of their proficiency. Bastards are barred the ecclesiastical function, unless they appear particularly remarkable for parts, learning, and good behaviour. But no recommendation of this kind was a sufficient dispensation for the natural children of patrons, who sometimes had the confidence to make provision for their unhappy issue this way; but since the treating natural children with so much regard is the way to encourage licentiousness, therefore all such institutions are declared void, and the patron was to lose his presentation *pro hac vice*. As for natural infirmities, and disadvantage of person, nobody was to be refused upon that score, unless they disabled the person from executing his office. And, therefore, if a man was blind, stammered to unintelligibleness, or had so rank a breath that no company could well bear him, it was not thought proper to admit him to the priesthood. The clerks, after admission to a benefice, were to swear their resolution of adhering to the received doctrine and discipline of the Church, to renounce the pope, and to own the king supreme head of the Church of England under Christ. They were likewise to swear canonical obedience to their bishop: that they stood clear of simoniacal contracts, would satisfy nothing of that kind made by any other person, and that they would never charge their benefice with any new pensions; and, lastly, those who intruded into any spiritual promotion without authority from their diocesan, were to lose the benefice, and be made for ever incapable of any other; and for farther discouragement of such presumption, they were to be suspended from their function, and excommunicated.

The twelfth and thirteenth relate to cessions, resignations, and exchanges of benefices, which, containing nothing extraordinary, I shall pass over.

The fourteenth states the measures of purgation. Clearing one's reputation this way was requisite either when a man suffered in his character by common fame, or being prosecuted in a court, the proofs fell somewhat short of the law, and yet were supported by strong presumptions; for when there was either sufficient evidence of the crimes, or they wanted so much as a probable colour, in both these cases there was no

Natural children barred spiritual promotions.

329.

What disadvantages of person are incapacities for the priesthood.

The manner of purgation.

room for purgation. Clerks who were convicted of any capital crime in the temporal courts, were not to be admitted to their purgation in the spiritual. If a man had the misfortune to be reported to disadvantage, if the story held on and gained ground, and the person concerned took no care to silence the clamour, the bishop was to endeavour to clear the suspicion, and enjoin people to come in and declare their knowledge; and if nobody appeared, he was to send for the person suspected, and in case he refused to purge himself, he might suspend him *ab officio*, or exclude him the congregation. By the form of purgation the person was to swear himself not guilty of the crime laid to his charge, and to fortify his justification, his compurgators were to take an oath they believed he had sworn nothing but what was true. These compurgators ought to be persons of a clear and unquestioned integrity, and to be thoroughly acquainted with the behaviour of the person they vouched for. Their number was to be determined at the judges' pleasure, with respect to this general rule notwithstanding, that persons of distinction should bring more compurgators than others of private condition. And to be more particular, a bishop was to produce some bishops, a priest some priests, and everybody some of his own rank and quality, to vindicate his innocence. Nobody ought to be forced upon the office of a compurgator. If the bishop happened to insist upon a greater number of these vouchers than the equity of the case required, the person suspected might appeal to the archbishop; he that had rescued his credit from any coarse imputation by a legal purgation, was to be publicly declared innocent by the judge, and have an instrument from the court to show upon occasion. And because wickedness rises by degrees, and takes some time in moving to the last excess, the judge was to break the opportunities, and cut off the occasions of miscarriage. For instance, he that is suspected for an infamous commerce with a woman, ought to be forbidden the house where she lives, and all correspondence with her: and in case the judge's order is contemned, discipline was to follow. He that fails in any circumstance of his purgation ought to be presumed guilty; but this rule was not without limitation, for if a person was accused of heresy, and fell short in his defence, he was not immediately to be thrown up to the civil magistrate, because such a failure is rather a presumption than

EDWARD  
VI.

*Preventions  
of licen-  
tiousness.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

clear evidence. And, to conclude this head, all superstitious purgations, though supported by ancient custom, were to be forborne: such as duels, heated ploughshares, or scalding water.

*Dilapidations.*

The fifteenth settles the business of dilapidations, prescribes the measures for reparation of parsonage houses, appoints the penalties for destroying timber upon the estates of the Church, and mentions the persons who were to repair the houses belonging to cathedrals, colleges, and hospitals.

*Alienations.*

The sixteenth touches upon alienations of church-lands, and that nothing of this kind ought to be done by sale, gift, or exchange, without the bishop's and patron's consent. No leases of farms made by ecclesiastics, were either to exceed the term of ten years, or bind the successor.

*Elections.*

The seventeenth concerns elections in cathedrals and colleges: and here the proceedings are to be governed by the statutes of the respective places, provided there is nothing in them repugnant either to the reformed religion of the realm, or to the constitutions comprised in this book.

*The corrupt practices of lay-patrons.*

The eighteenth fences against mercenary dispositions of livings. And here, the indirect practices of lay-patrons are reckoned up. For instance, some were so rapacious as to reserve the whole profits and perquisites of the benefice to themselves, allowing only some small pension to the incumbent: others were somewhat better natured in their dishonesty, and bargained with the parson to quit nothing but the glebe. Others were contented with keeping the parsonage-houses for themselves. And almost all the rest bring the clergy under articles for the payment of an annual pension or rent, or procure a discharge from paying their tithes, or maim the living in some circumstance or other: insomuch, that there are very few who part with a presentation without some fraudulent and sacrilegious reserve. To counteract this scandalous practice, all such contracts and covenants are declared void: and when the ordinary had ground to suspect such foul dealing, and could not make out the proof, the clerk was not to have institution till he had passed through a canonical purgation, and when a clerk was convicted of any simoniacal contract, he was not only to forfeit his benefice, but remain incapable of any spiritual promotion for the future.

330.

*Regulations of divine service.*

The nineteenth regulates divine service. In cathedrals and colleges the Common Prayer was to be said every morning.

with the Litany on Wednesdays and Fridays, and the Communion-office on holydays. All the prebendaries and clerks who were maintained upon the revenues of the Church, were to be present at morning and evening prayer, unless they could fairly excuse their absence. There was to be a communion on Sundays and holydays, where the bishop, the dean, the archdeacon, the prebends, with the rest of the clerks, were to receive. There was to be no preaching at cathedrals in the morning, for fear of drawing the people from their own parishes : but in the afternoon there was to be a sermon before evening prayer. In singing of psalms, the clergy were to manage in such a manner as was most likely to recommend the service, and raise the devotion of the audience. To this end they were to confine themselves to plain song, and keep within the compass of a few notes ; and therefore, all blending them with too much art, all strains and delicacies of music, were to be avoided : and especially, they were not to shake so far as to make the words unintelligible. And in this psalmody the people were to bear a part with the choir. In parish-churches there was to be a sermon or homily in the morning, and an hour spent in explaining the catechism in the afternoon ; where, after every evening prayer, the parson, with some of the most considerable of the parish, was to direct the disposition of the money given to pious uses. And at this time, public penance was to be undergone, and the discipline of the Church exercised. When there appeared a necessity of proceeding to excommunication, the bishop was to be applied to : and after his consent authentically granted, the censure was to be publicly pronounced in the Church. The sacraments were not to be administered, nor Common Prayer read in chapels without great necessity, it being most fit the people should frequent their parish-church, and the flock keep close to their pastor. It was likewise forbidden to give the sacrament in private houses : for by this means there might be an opportunity for the spreading of heterodoxy. Besides, such separate meetings weakened that union and charity which the holy eucharist was designed to promote. However, there was an exception for sick people, and persons of quality who had numerous families : under this condition, that the parish-priest might be no loser by such a privilege. And over and above, all chapels and private administrations were to be governed by the rubric in the Common Prayer.

EDWARD  
VI.

*Rules for  
psalmody.*

*Sacraments  
not to be  
administered  
in private  
chapels.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

The twentieth dilates upon the maintenance and office of parish-clerks, and from thence, proceeds to the business and management of church-wardens, deacons, and priests: these latter, provided they lived single, were not to entertain any woman in their houses, under threescore years of age, excepting their mothers, sisters, or aunts. Rural deans were to be chosen by the bishop for every deanery; they were to continue only a year. Their business was to make a report to the bishop of the behaviour of the priests, deacons, church-wardens, &c. within their precincts. They were likewise to delate the names of heretics, procurers, strumpets, libertines, and polygamists; and, in short, to inform the ordinary of all people who were remarkably scandalous: these rural deans were empowered to call suspected persons before them, to examine their misbehaviour, and transmit their proceedings in writing to the bishops within ten days. They were likewise to certify the ordinary every six months how many sermons had been preached within their deanery. The archdeacon's post was to be next the bishop in the government of the diocese, with a reservation for the privilege of the dean, with respect to the cathedral. The archdeacon was always to be a priest, his business was to reside upon his jurisdiction, to preach, to visit, to superintend the rural deans: to visit his archdeaconry twice in the year at least, and transmit an account to the bishop of the state of the diocese, within three weeks after every visitation. The dean's office was to take care that every thing was regularly managed within the jurisdiction of the cathedral. And therefore, he was not to be non-resident without leave from the bishop. In cathedrals, the prebendaries were to read upon some part of Scripture thrice a-week, or at least to procure some divine for that purpose. The whole diocese, both clergy and laity, were to be under the bishop, and to be governed by his discipline and direction. He was to preach in his cathedral, not to ordain either at random or for reward, to receive complaints against disorderly curates, and deprive them: to reconcile quarrels amongst the clergy: to prescribe orders for reformation of manners: to visit his diocese every third year: to exert the censures of the Church in places exempt as well as the rest: and in case he visited oftener, he was to receive no procurations, but support the charge himself. He was to be very careful in the choice and management of his family:

*The business  
of rural  
deans and  
archdeacons.*

*The bishop's  
office.*



he was not to entertain any fantastical extravagant people: no body that was scandalous for wine, women, or play. His house was, as it were, to be a seminary for the instruction of the diocese, like that of St. Austin and other primitive prelates. The bishops' wives were not to be airy, idle, or over-dressed. The same rule for sobriety and discretion was to be set for their children: and all this expectation was to reach the rest of the clergy, however dignified or distinguished: in short, the whole compass of the order were to avoid every thing that might bring an imputation of levity, luxury, or pride. Those bishops who were visitors of colleges were to see the statutes observed, the divinity lectures kept up, worthy men encouraged, and others removed. Farther, bishops were to reside upon their diocese, unless urgent business of Church or State called them elsewhere: and when they grew disabled for their function either by age or sickness, they were to be represented by coadjutors. The archbishop was once to visit his whole province, if practicable: he was to inspect the management of his suffragans, to collate to benefices, and perform the other functions of the diocesan, during a vacancy: to deprive incorrigible bishops, and put others in their places: to receive and judge appeals: to settle disputes and differences between the provincial bishops. And if the archbishop and his suffragans happened to disagree, the king was to decide the controversy. It was likewise part of the archbishop's business to convene provincial synods at the king's order. When such assemblies were intimated, every bishop was bound either to appear, or send his excuse by a proxy.

Diocesan synods are prescribed as the best expedient to preserve orthodoxy and discipline, and to maintain a good correspondence between the bishop and his clergy. These synods were to be held once a year, in the beginning of Lent, that the clergy might have time to return to their parishes before Palm Sunday. And if it happened so, that the bishop could not be present, the archdeacon was to supply his place. The synod was to open with singing the litany. The archdeacon or the bishop was to make a sermon in English, unless some extraordinary occasion required another language. When sermon was done, they were to receive the communion; after this the bishop and all the clergy were to withdraw to some private apartment, and here they were to debate those matters which

EDWARD  
VI.  
*Regulations  
for the  
bishop's  
family, and  
the rest of  
the clergy.*

*The method  
and business  
of synods.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

were judged most necessary. For instance: all late heterodoxies were to be censured, and mistakes in the exposition of the Scriptures rectified, differences amongst the clergy examined and decided, and inquiries made concerning conformity. And here every priest was to be asked his opinion upon the points in question. The bishop was to report the sense of the most learned, and decide the controversy himself. And because it was not convenient to keep the clergy many days together, the hearing of those causes which required more time were either referred to the bishop's court, or to the archdeacon at his visitation in September following; the decrees and judgments pronounced either by the bishop or the archdeacon, were to bind the inferior clergy. However, in case they thought themselves under a grievance, they had the liberty of appealing to the archbishop, who was impowered either to confirm or rectify the decree. But then that part of the sentence which was left unreversed by the metropolitan was to remain in full force.

The twenty-first, twenty-second, twenty-third, and twenty-fourth titles relate to churchwardens, universities, tithes, and visitations, which having been either touched already, or affording nothing but what may be commonly met with, I shall waive the abstract.

Certain persons disabled from making wills

The twenty-fifth is spent in laying down rules concerning wills, and other dependencies of that head. Several persons are barred the privilege of making a will. For instance, married women, slaves, and children under fourteen years of age. Those who are not *compos mentis*, unless in their lucid intervals: people that are deaf and dumb, unless it is proved by sufficient witness that they can express their minds intelligibly by signs. Heretics are barred the liberty of making their will, and so were those who had either sentence of death, perpetual banishment, or perpetual imprisonment passed upon them. Those, likewise, were denied this privilege who refused to disengage from their wench till they had a near prospect of death. Those who wrote libels to destroy their neighbours' credit, who were strumpets or panders, unless they had done public penance, were not allowed to dispose of anything by will. And, lastly, usurers were ranged under the same disability. However, several of these persons, though they could not make a will to the customary compass and extent, had, notwithstanding, the liberty of leaving legacies for pious uses:

that is, to discharge prisoners for debt, to relieve orphans and widows, and all people under indigence and distress: to furnish poor maids with a portion to marry them, to maintain scholars in the university, and to repair highways. No man's son ought to be disinherited, or overlooked in his father's will, without the following provocations: that is, unless he has assaulted his father, done him any remarkable injury on purpose, prosecuted him in any court of justice, out of disaffection or malice. and not to do service to the government: if he has been concerned in any dangerous practice against his father or mother: if he has debauched his mother-in-law; if he has raised a calumny against his father, or ruined his fortune in a great measure: if he has refused to be his bail, or hindered him from making his will: in any of these cases, his father has the liberty of leaving him nothing.

EDWARD  
VI.

*Disobedience  
to parents  
how  
punished.*

The next title treats concerning ecclesiastical censures. And here it is laid down for a general rule, that where the punishment is not stated in this collection, the judge was to correct at discretion. Commutation of penance was not allowed, unless in extraordinary cases: and when the emergency happened, the money was to be put into the poor's chest in the parish where the offender lived, or where the crime was committed: but in case of a relapse, the penance was to be done in kind, and no money taken to cover the disgrace.

*Commuta-  
tion seldom  
allowed.*

The twenty-seventh, twenty-eighth, and twenty-ninth touch upon suspension, sequestration, and deprivation. When a bishop was to be deprived, the archbishop and two other bishops of the king's nomination were to try the cause, and pronounce the sentence.

The thirtieth title, which is the last I shall mention, relates to excommunication. This power of the keys, as the book affirms, was granted by our Saviour to the Church: it is lodged with the ecclesiastical governors: the end of it is to maintain the authority of the society, to throw terror into the criminals, and drive them to recollection. This censure was not to be exerted but in cases of extremity: none but great crimes, such as strike at the root of religion, or make a breach in morality, were to fall under this discipline; of this kind are those mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. In short, this rigorous expedient ought never to be made use of, excepting when people are hardened in their wickedness, and that is, when they either

*The power  
of binding  
and loosing  
granted by  
our Saviour  
to the  
Church.*

1 Cor. vi. 9,  
10. v. 9.  
Gal. v. 19.  
Ephes. v.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

332.

make a jest of reproof, take no notice of a citation, or refuse to stand to the judgment of the court. A whole society or corporation was not to be excommunicated: because in such collective bodies there was great variety of manners: and there is no reason innocent persons should suffer for the faults which did not belong to them<sup>1</sup>. This censure was not to be exerted without mature deliberation. It was wished that the consent of the whole Church, or precinct, might intervene for the solemnity of the discipline: but since that circumstance was impracticable, the archbishop, the bishop, or some subaltern ordinary, was to send for the curate where the criminal lived; and two or three priests of character, together with a justice of peace of the neighbourhood; and after the point had been thoroughly debated by this company, the sentence was to be pronounced, entered in writing, and a copy of it given upon demand to the excommunicated person. The sentence was to be certified to the parish and neighbourhood, that they might avoid the company of the offender. The curate of the parish was to read the excommunication the next Sunday before the congregation. And to make the greater impression, he was to dilate upon the circumstances: for instance, that the person being struck with the discipline of the Church, was to be thrown out of the society like a dead member, excluded the participation of the Lord's Supper, the benefit of divine service and Christian conversation, cut off from the expectation of happiness, and the protection of Providence; and consigned over to eternal punishment and the tyranny of the devil: that this was to be the wretched condition of the person excommunicated, unless he came to recollection, reformed his manners, and gave the Church satisfaction; but as long as he continued unrelenting, nobody was to pray, to eat, or drink with him, to salute him, or invite him to their houses. However, the intercourse of commerce, as to buying and selling, was not barred. And if any person made him a charitable visit in order to his recovery, it was not within the prohibition. Those who, after admonition, did not decline conversing with excommunicated persons, were to be excommunicated themselves. If a man continued forty days obstinate under the censure, the excommunication was to be certified into the Chancery, and a writ directed to the sheriff or bailiffs to take

<sup>1</sup> A most important rule, the reason of which should be borne in mind by all sects and parties.

him into custody: and in case they should be biassed either by favour or money, and not commit him within a fortnight, they were to pay treble damages besides all the charge expended in the process. This amerciamment was to be put in the poor's chest, where the ordinary should direct. And if the sheriff or bailiff trifled another fortnight, the fine was to be doubled: and if the person imprisoned was enlarged, or suffered to make an escape before he had made satisfaction to the ordinary, the sheriff or keeper were to be fined to the sum above-mentioned, with the additional penalty of ten pounds more to the poor's chest. And in case they refused, or were dilatory in paying the money, the justices of peace were ordered to distrain their goods, or enter upon their lands, and sequester their profits until they had made satisfaction. When the excommunicated person made his submission, he was to be restored to communion, and the censure taken off. When any criminal was condemned in a temporal court for a capital offence, and afterwards pardoned by the crown, his pardon was to be no protection from the discipline of the Church. Unless, therefore, he submitted to penance, and made reparations for the scandal given, he was to be excommunicated.

EDWARD  
VI.

The book having thus maintained the power of the keys lodged in the Church by our Saviour's commission, it is somewhat surprising to find the king's supremacy asserted to a seeming inconsistency with this doctrine. For, under the title of the Office and Jurisdiction of Ecclesiastical Judges, it is affirmed, "that the king hath the same extended and full jurisdiction, both civil and ecclesiastical, upon the archbishops, bishops, and the rest of the clergy, within his dominions, as he has over his lay subjects." The reason of this assertion is, because all jurisdiction, both ecclesiastical and secular, is derived from the crown, as from one and the same fountain<sup>1</sup>.

To return: the form of absolving excommunicated persons was this. The penitent was to come to the church-door in a habit assigned him by the ordinary, the parson was to meet him, and demand of him, before the congregation, whether he was desirous of confessing his faults before God and the audience, and of being restored to the communion of the Church: When he answered "Yes," the priest was to bring him into the church, to set forth his submission, how ready he was to ac-

*The manner  
of re-admit-  
ting penitents  
to commu-  
nion.*

<sup>1</sup> Collier here states the principle of our monarchy as clearly as Hooker himself.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.  
Luke xv.

knowledge his miscarriage ; and that upon such signs of repentance and humiliation he was not to be rejected. That, in such cases, they ought to consider their own infirmities, and compassionate the frailties of human nature : “ That there was more joy in heaven over one sinner that repents, than for ninety-nine just persons, which need no repentance.” After this the priest was to address the excommunicated person, to exhort him to examine his conscience, to be well assured of his sincerity, and not to trifle with God and the Church. Upon this the penitent was either to kneel or lie prostrate, make his confession to God, lament his condition, abhor his miscarriage, and beg the Divine assistance to preserve him from relapse. After this he was to rise, and being carried to an eminence, where he might be better seen and heard, he was to apply himself to the congregation, to declare his unworthiness in the strongest terms of remorse and compunction, to make particular mention of the crime for which he was excommunicated ; to pray God his example might prove hurtful to nobody, but rather the deplorableness of his condition, and the shame he had undergone, might restrain them from the like miscarriage. And, lastly, he was to beg the congregation’s pardon, and entreat them to admit him to communion. Then the priest was to ask the people, whether they were willing to grant his request, who answering they were, the parson was to lay his hand upon his head, and absolve him in this form :—

*The form of  
absolution.*

“ Ego te coram hâc ecclesiâ, cujus mihi administratio commissa est, te tuorum pœnâ delictorum, et excommunicationis exolvero vinculis, per autoritatem Dei, potestatem Jesu Christi et Spiritus Sancti, consentientibus hujus ecclesiæ præsentibus membris, et etiam ordinario suffragante, tibi que rursus pristinum in ecclesiâ tuum locum, et plenum jus, restituo.”

After this the pastor was to embrace the penitent, to salute him on the cheek, to raise him from his knees, and lead him to the communion table, where a hymn was to be sung, and a thanksgiving prayer made for his recovery.

The rest of the titles are spent in regulations for the ecclesiastical courts, in general definitions, directing the process, and reciting the grounds and maxims of the civil and canon law. Under the title of Appeals, there is one thing very remarkable which I shall mention. The order was fixed thus :  
333. the person who thought himself aggrieved, had the liberty of appealing from the archdeacon, or dean, or any other subaltern

jurisdiction, to the bishop of the diocese: from the bishop to the archbishop, and from the archbishop to the king. And, when the case came as high as the crown, it was either to be determined by a provincial council, or by three or four bishops of the king's nomination. And thus the delegates in the last resort were all churchmen.

EDWARD  
VI.

The law runs all in the king's name, and he speaks in person through the whole book. The supremacy lately acknowledged in his father might probably occasion this manner. Besides, the parliament of this reign had transferred the whole legislature, as to this affair, upon a committee nominated by the king and council; but the king falling into a consumption, which proved mortal the next year, the book miscarried by not passing through the forms required by the act.

June 26,  
A. D. 1552.

Holbeck, bishop of Lincoln, died in August, the last year; but, by the interest of some courtiers, the bishopric was kept in the king's hands till this summer, when John Taylour was promoted thither. During this vacancy the see was horribly rifled; and all the manors, excepting that of Bugden, wrested from it.

Heylin,  
Hist. Re-  
form. p. 129.  
*Depredations upon  
vacant  
bishoprics.*

It was the custom of this reign, as one of our learned historians observes, to seize these opportunities. To give the reader his own words: "In all the vacancies of sees," says he, "there were a great many of the best lands taken from them, and their revenues brought to so low a condition that it was scarce possible for the bishops to subsist. And yet, if what was so taken from them had been converted to good uses,—to the bettering the condition of the poor clergy,—it had been some mitigation of so heinous a robbery; but these lands were snatched up by every hungry courtier, who found this the easiest way to be satisfied in their pretensions."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 203.

These depredations occasioned the publishing a tract this year, for retrieving the credit of the clergy, and supporting them with a decent provision. It was dedicated to Gooderick, lord chancellor, and bishop of Ely. The author complains, the patrimony of the Church was seized to such a scandalous degree, that many of the clergy were forced to subsist themselves upon mean and mechanic employments, and apply to business dishonourable to their function: that such deep poverty had brought on ignorance, as a consequence, and made a great part of the curates remarkably unqualified: that this

Id. p. 202.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

was a reproach to the kingdom, and gave an ill complexion to the Reformation.

*The king threatens to seize the charter of the city of London.*  
K. Edward's Journal.

About this time, the lords of the council sat at Guildhall, and reprimanded the lord mayor and court of aldermen for their negligent government, and particularly for suffering provisions to be sold at unreasonable rates. The rest of the burghers are likewise censured for irregularities in trade. In short, they were told, that, unless this mismanagement was speedily reformed, the king would seize their charter, and govern the city by officers of his own nomination.

*Bishop Ridley's discourse with the princess Mary.*

The princess Mary, as hath been observed, was not to be removed from her persuasion. However, bishop Ridley, being in the neighbourhood of her house at Hunsden in Herefordshire, resolved to wait on her. She saluted him at first in a very friendly manner, entertained him in discourse, and gave order for his dining with her officers; but, afterwards, offering to preach before her, she was shocked at the motion, and desired him to answer that question himself. But when the bishop pressed on, and told the princess he thought it his duty to offer her grace a sermon, she replied, with an air of disturbance, "that, since he went so far in the request, and refused to consult her inclination, the parish-church should be open for him; but neither herself nor any of her family would make part of the audience." The bishop said, "he hoped she would not refuse God's word." She answered, "that what was called God's word now was not God's word in her father's reign; and that the bishop would not have had the resolution to have talked then at such a rate of liberty." After this, she fell into an invective against the administration, declared she was not bound by the laws made in the king's minority; but if, when he came of age, he approved what was done, she was ready to acquiesce. She dismissed Ridley with thanks for his visit, but by no means for his offering a sermon. The bishop, having taken leave of the princess, drank with sir Thomas Wharton in the dining-room; but, immediately upon it, blamed himself for complying with the invitation. "He ought not," he said, "to have drunk in the place where God's word was refused: it was his duty to have retired, and shaken off the dust of his feet for a testimony against the house." These words were spoken with unusual emotion and vehemence, for which Fox seems to commend him. But since the princess was under no

Sept. 1552.

Fox, vol. 2.  
p. 788.



excommunication, whether the bishop discovered his resentment too far or not may be somewhat of a question. EDWARD VI.

To look over the affairs of Scotland, in a word or two. This year the queen-mother made an interest with the nobility, and wrested the government out of the hands of the earl of Arran. The earls of Angus, Huntley, Argyle, Athol, and Cassilis, were the leading quality in this change. This princess made a halt in the execution of her project for some months, because the young queen her daughter was too far in her minority: for she was assured the governor would not quit his post till the queen was twelve years of age. By the laws of Scotland, the king is so far a major at fourteen, and the queen at twelve, as not to be tied to the government of any person formerly put upon them: for, at this age, they are at liberty to choose their governors or protectors for the managing the administration till they come to a full majority. Upon the strength of this privilege, the young queen, at her mother's suggestion, made choice of the French king, the cardinal of Lorraine, and the duke of Guise his brother, for her protectors, who transferred that trust upon the queen-mother. The queen-mother convened the nobility, acquainted them with her right, and demanded the administration; and when the governor alleged the young queen was no more than eleven years of age, the queen-mother, to disappoint all objections, insisted that, by the custom of the kingdom, the young king or queen might, if they pleased, reckon the time from their conception to their birth for one year. The governor allowed this custom as to a king, but denied there was any precedent for a queen. The point was referred to the nobility at Stirling, where the queen, having a great majority, entered upon the government. 334.

This year, some little time before the earl of Arran was removed, there was a provincial synod held at Linlithgow, where all decrees which had passed in the council of Trent under Paul III. were received. There were likewise several canons made for regulating the behaviour of the clergy, and stopping the progress of heresy.

To return to England. The Reformation was somewhat intemperately carried on at Oxford. The visitors were so fond of novelty that they ridiculed the university degrees, and discouraged the exercises. They called the universities a seat for blockheads, and the stews of the whore of Babylon; and the

Lesley, de  
Reb. Gest.  
Scot. p. 477.  
et deinceps.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

schools had commonly no better name than the devil's chapels : and, after having marked this society in such an opprobrious manner, it is no wonder they left them nothing to abuse. We need not be surprised at the visitors breaking open the public treasury, and making seizure of the money, plate, and jewels. In short, many records relating to the privileges of the university were destroyed ; and little, with respect to discipline or improvement, to ornament or treasure, left remaining.

Wood. Hist.  
et Antiq.  
Univers.  
Oxon. lib. 1.  
p. 273.  
*The bishop  
of Durham  
deprived.*  
K. Edward's  
Journal.  
*The death of  
the antiquary  
Leland.*

In the beginning of winter, the bishop of Durham, who had got over the bill of attainder, in the last parliament, was now deprived by a commission.

About this time, the famous antiquary, John Leland, departed this life. He was bred in Christ-college, in Cambridge. He had a great capacity for learning, and improved his genius with extraordinary industry ; and thus, being a person of character, he was employed by the late king to examine the libraries, the Leiger books, and records of religious houses, and make an extract of the remarkable antiquities. This was done, as is supposed, when the project of dissolution was upon the anvil. This commission being a work of time and fatigue, king Henry allowed him a handsome pension ; but, upon this prince's death, the encouragement expired with him ; and thus Leland, being thrown up to hardship, languished away the rest of his life. The public discountenance, it is probable, went deep into his mind ; for, at last, he was so unhappy as to die distracted. His collections, presented to the late king, came into the hands of sir John Cheek. Burton, who wrote the antiquities of Leicestershire, had afterwards four volumes of them, which are now in the Bodleian library.

This year, Bale, the centurist, was sent into Ireland. He was an author not without learning, but pushed his satire to such a degree of indecency that it was not thought proper to prefer him in England ; but, the secs of Armagh and Ossory in Ireland falling void, the king nominated Dr. Goodacre to the first, and Bale to the other.

About this time there was a change made in the order of the Garter. It seems, the credibility of the history of St. George was questioned, and the ceremonies of the solemnity charged with superstition. It was therefore resolved to strike out the name of the patron, and call it only the " Order of the Garter." The festival was not to be held on St. George's day, but at

Whitsuntide. There were likewise some other reformations not necessary to be mentioned. But the dissolution of the free chapel of St. George in Windsor castle is thought to have been the main design of this new scheme : and thus some of the courtiers would have had an opportunity of sharing the lands, under a pretence of resigning them to the crown : but the king's death happening not long after, the project miscarried, the new regulation was set aside, and the solemnity restored to its first institution. That the story of St. George, as to the main, is no legendary fiction,—at least, that it is not without a fair appearance of truth,—the reader may see by consulting the authorities on the margin.

EDWARD VI.

Heylin. Bp. Burnet, pt. 2.

In January this winter, the king fell ill of a consumptive cough : the physicians found it difficult to deal with, and the symptoms grew worse and worse, insomuch, that when the parliament met on the first of March following, the king was in no condition to go to Westminster, but ordered both houses to attend him at Whitehall, where a sermon was preached by Ridley, bishop of London. At this sessions a bill passed in the house of Lords, that none should be capable of any spiritual preferment, unless they were priests, or deacons. The reason of this bill was because many young persons of quality, and gentlemen's sons, had prebends given them upon their promise, that they designed to study divinity, and qualify themselves for the function of an ecclesiastic : but it seems they commonly kept their promotions, without minding to make good the engagement. To prevent this practice, the bishops prevailed with the temporal lords, to concur in a remedy ; but after all, the bill miscarried in the house of Commons.

Heylin's Hist. of the Garter. Supplement to Morey's Dictionary, vol. 3. Article Order of the Garter.

This parliament, which was dissolved on the last of March, passed an act for suppressing the bishopric of Durham. The preamble sets forth, “ that that see being then void, the disposal of it was in the king, that the extent of it was too large, and reached to so many distant shires, that it could not be well governed by one bishop ; and since the king out of his godly disposition was desirous to have God's holy word preached in these parts, which for lack of good preaching and learning, were grown wild and barbarous, his majesty therefore intended to have two bishoprics for that diocese : one at Durham, which should be endowed with two thousand marks annual rent, and another at Newcastle, which should have a thousand marks

*The bishopric of Durham dissolved.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

revenue: and also to found a cathedral church at Newcastle with a deanery and chapter out of the lands of the bishopric: the bishopric therefore of Durham is utterly extinguished and dissolved, and authority is given for letters-patent to erect the new bishoprics, together with a deanery and chapter at Newcastle; with a proviso that the deanery, chapter, and cathedral of Durham, should suffer nothing by this act."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 215.

These new erections were mentioned in all likelihood for a colour, to smooth the way for the dissolution bill, and cover the duke of Northumberland's designs. Had there not been a different design at the bottom, the new erections would have been pursued, and the act taken its effect. This had been no more than a just deference to the legislature; but this provision was in a great measure overlooked, and the mask pulled off in a short time: for, in May following, says our historian, the temporalities of the bishopric were secularized, turned wholly to a county palatine, and granted to the duke of Northumberland.

335.

Id.

That this duke had a prospect, and a promise, too, of the temporalities of this see, is very likely: but that the grant was executed in form of law, is more than appears.

As for Ridley, he was not only named with effect, as our historian reports, but actually translated from London to Durham. For in the instrument by which Bonner was restored to the see of London, in the next reign, it is set forth, that the bishopric of London was then void by the translation of Ridley to Durham, upon the deprivation of Tunstal, by king Edward VI.: and thus Bonner was reinvested, without pronouncing Ridley deprived of the see of London. But on the contrary, it appears by the register that Ridley was deprived of the bishopric of London for heresy and sedition.

Ibid.

Harmer,  
p. 120.

The crown in this reign had great accessions of wealth: the chantry lands, colleges, free chapels, &c. amounted to a great revenue; to which we may add, the seizing a great many manors belonging to cathedrals and bishoprics. Besides this, the lands of several of the halls and companies in London were charged with reserved rents, for furnishing lights and obits, and maintaining chantry priests. To take off this incumbrance, the city paid the king 20,000*l.* And not long after, he received four hundred thousand crowns of the French king for the surrender of Boulogne. But notwithstanding all these extraordinary provisions for the exchequer, the royal revenues

*Crown lands  
diminished,*

were considerably lessened, and the government was in debt, to the value of 250,000*l*. From hence it is plain, how untowardly the treasury was managed, and how far the courtiers served themselves of the king's minority.

EDWARD VI.  
and the king  
in debt.  
Stow's  
Annals.

The king's fortune thriving thus ill, under such opportunities of improvement, it was thought fit to retrench the expenses of the court, and put down some of the tables. Some of the officers, likewise, of less interest, had their management inspected, and were called to account. For instance, the lord Paget was fined 6,000*l*. : Beaumont, master of the rolls, surrendered his land and goods to the king, for his misbehaviour in his office. This man, it seems, had purchased land with the king's money, and fraudulently exceeded his commission in other respects. Whaley, one of the king's receivers for the county of York, had misconduct of a resembling nature proved upon him ; his sentence was to lose his employment, and be fined at the pleasure of the king and council. But all this, though it carried a popular face, gave little relief, and fell much short of the present exigencies.

There was, therefore, a more serviceable expedient suggested. The council had been informed, that a great deal of the plate and furniture in churches had been lately carried off without warrant : that secular men's houses were furnished with altar-pieces and copes, that they drank in chalices at their entertainments, turned the consecrated plate to common use, and made a figure out of the plunder of churches. Now to stop this invasion, and throw the remainder into the public channel, commissions were issued out to persons of condition in every county, with the following instructions ;—and here I shall only transcribe the most material part of the instrument.

Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 7.  
p. 417.

“ The said commissioners shall, upon their view and survey taken, cause due inventories to be made, by bills or books indented, of all manner of goods, plate, jewels, bells, and ornaments, as yet remaining, or anywise forthcoming, and belonging to any churches, chapels, fraternities, or gilds ; and the one part of the same inventories to send and return to our privy council, and the other to deliver to them in whose hands the said goods, plate, jewels, bells, and ornaments, shall remain to be kept preserved : and they shall give good charge and order that the same goods, and every part thereof, be at all times forthcoming to be answered ; leaving, nevertheless,

*A commission to seize church plate and ornaments throughout the kingdom.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

in every church, or chapel, of common resort, one, two, or more chalices or cups, according to the multitude of the people in every such church or chapel, and also such other ornaments as by their discretion shall seem requisite for the Divine service, in every such place for the time.

“ And, because we be informed, that in many places great quantities of the said plate, jewels, bells, and ornaments, be embezzled by certain private men, contrary to our express commandments in that behalf; the said commissioners shall substantially and justly inquire, and attain the knowledge thereof, by whose default the same is, and hath been, and in whose hands any part of the same is come. And in that point the said commissioners shall have good regard, that they attain to certain names and dwelling-places of every person and persons, that hath sold, alienated, embezzled, taken, or carried away, and of such also as have counselled, advised, and commanded, any part of the said goods, plate, jewels, bells, vestments, and ornaments, to be taken or carried away, or otherwise embezzled. And these things they shall, as certainly and duly as they can, cause to be searched and understand.

“ Upon a full search and inquiry whereof, the said commissioners, four or three of them, shall cause to be called before them, all such persons by whom any of the said goods, plate, jewels, bells, ornaments, or any other the premises, have been alienated, embezzled, or taken away, or by whose means or procurement the same, or any part thereof, hath been attempted, or to whose hands or use any of the same, or any profit for the same, hath grown; and by such means, as to their discretion shall seem best, shall cause them to bring into the said commissioners' hands, to our use, the said plate, jewels, bells, and other the premises so alienated, or the true and just value thereof, certifying unto our privy council, the names of all such as refuse to stand to, or obey their order, touching the re-delivery and restitution of the same, or the just value thereof; to the intent, that as cause and reason shall require, every man may answer to his doings in this behalf.

“ Finally, our pleasure is, that the said commissioners, in all their doings, shall use such sober and discreet manner of proceeding, as the effect of this commission may go forward, with as much quiet, and as little occasion of trouble or disquiet of the multitude as may be; using to that end such wise persua-

sions, in all places of their sessions, as in respect of the place, and disposition of the people, may seem to their wisdom most expedient; giving also good and substantial order for the stay of the inordinate and greedy covetousness of such disordered people as have, or shall go about, the alienating of any the premises, so as, according to reason and order, such as have, or shall contemptuously offend in this behalf, may receive reformation, as for the quality of their doings shall be requisite."

EDWARD  
VI.

Fuller, *ibid.*  
from an original.

336.

That these commissions were executed to the length of their instructions there is no reason to question. The learned Heylin observes, that on the ninth of May, this year, sir Roger Cholmely, lord chief justice, and sir Robert Bowes, master of the rolls, the king's commissioners for gathering ecclesiastical goods, held their session at Westminster, called the dean and chapter before them, and ordered "them to bring in a true inventory of all the plate, cups, vestments, and other ecclesiastical goods, which belonged to their church." The piety of former ages, the solemnities of coronations, the funerals of princes and noblemen, had ornamented this church with plate, and religious decorations, and furnished it with officiating habits, to an immense value: but there was nobody so hardy as to lock the church-doors, to conceal the treasure, and address the council. No, the order was obeyed, the holy furniture delivered, and a very slender share of it returned back for Divine service. This Westminster precedent was followed at St. Paul's, and throughout the kingdom. The commissioners' business was to make seizure of all goods in cathedral or parish churches; and thus all jewels and gold, all silver crosses, candlesticks, chalices, and ready money, were within their instructions. They were likewise empowered to carry off all copes of gold or silver tissue, and all other officiating habits and ornamental furniture of value. They were bound to leave no more than one chalice for the communion service; and, as for other conveniences and embellishments, they were entirely left at the commissioners' discretion.

Heylin's  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 133. from  
an old  
chapter-  
book.  
*The plate,  
&c. brought  
in from St.  
Peter's,  
Westminster,  
and  
St. Paul's.*

Dugdale,  
Monast.  
vol. 3. p. 357.

This order for undressing the churches was, it seems, represented to the king "as an inoffensive expedient, and only calling for the superfluous plate, and other goods that lay in churches, more for pomp than use."

Bp. Burnet,  
pt. 2. p. 217.

But those who called these things superfluous, and showed so slender a regard for the honour of religion, were none of the

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

best reformers. Had these people governed in the minority of Josiah, as they did in this of Edward VI., they would in all likelihood have retrenched the expense of the Mosaic institution, and served God at a more frugal rate. They would have dis-furnished the temple of most of the gold plate, carried off the unnecessary magnificence, and left but little plunder for Nebuchadnezzar.

Our learned Church historian seems to be somewhat of this opinion; for, notwithstanding he taxes Heylin for laying too much load upon the young prince's memory, yet he excuses signing the commission upon the score of sickness, and that it is likely the king being so far spent in a consumption, "did not much mind affairs of that kind, but set his hand easily to such papers as his council prepared for him." As for the historian, he makes no scruple to affirm, that the applying consecrated things to common uses cannot be justified, without the plea of extreme necessity.

Ibid.

May 20,  
A.D. 1553.  
*A catechism  
published.*

About this time, a catechism was published by the king's authority: "It was entitled, 'Catechismus brevis Christianæ Disciplinæ Summiam continens.' The king's letters-patent set forth, that it was made by a certain pious and learned man, and presented to him, and that he committed the examination of it to certain bishops, and other learned men, whose judgment he much regarded. This catechism was ordered to be taught in schools; the author of it is not certainly known; some think it was Poinet, bishop of Winchester, and others, Alexander Noel, then schoolmaster of Westminster, and afterwards dean of St. Paul's. Whether the convocation gave any direction or authority for the drawing this catechism, is not certain: for in the next reign, the prolocutor Weston excepted against the catechism published in this king's time, and urged that it was not set forth by the agreement of that house. To this Philpot, archdeacon of Winchester, answered, "that the said house had granted the authority to make ecclesiastical laws to certain persons, to be appointed by the king's majesty, and therefore, whatsoever ecclesiastical laws they or the most part of them set forth, might well be said to be done in the synod of London."

Fox.

This year, Harley was made bishop of Hereford, upon the death of Skip.

And here, to mention a word or two relating to the State.



Sebastian Cabot had formerly offered his service to king Henry VII., for settling a plantation in America; this Venetian was lately made grand pilot of England. He had met with some disappointments from the Spaniard, which made him renew his application to the English court. Here he suggested the attempt of the north-east passage to China: the enterprise being thought practicable, sir Hugh Willoughby undertook the voyage; but himself and his crew were all lost by the excessive frost of the arctic climates. However, this year the adventure was resumed, and three large ships fitted out for that purpose; which though they fell short of their voyage to China, yet by putting in to the bay of St. Nicholas, they opened a considerable trade between Russia and England.

EDWARD  
VI.

*Trade settled  
with the czar  
of Muscovy.  
Stow's  
Annals.*

The king not being likely to last long, the duke of Northumberland quickened his motions, and executed his scheme with all the diligence the juncture required. In the first place, he brought on a match between his fourth son, the lord Guilford, and the lady Jane Grey, eldest daughter to the duke of Suffolk. The solemnity of the wedding was kept at Durham-house in the Strand, which Northumberland had already taken possession of, in the hopes of being quickly owner of the rest of the bishopric.

The king being now far gone into a consumption, and brought to a languishing condition, was more easily worked to Northumberland's purpose. In short, this duke applied so dexterously to his passions, that at last he prevailed with him to make a settlement of the crown upon lady Jane Grey. To bring about this contrivance, he suggested how happy the nation had been under his government, and what a glorious reformation had been carried on by him: that, when such a blessing was so far advanced, the next point was to secure its continuance: that religion, being conveyed to posterity in this condition of purity, the public happiness would be perpetuated, and the best provision made for the honour of his memory. That if the crown should descend to the lady Mary, both the civil and religious interest of the kingdom would be in great danger: for it was well known how strongly this princess was inclined to the doctrine and pretensions of the court of Rome: and, in case she should marry with some powerful prince of that communion, the English constitution might probably be overborne, and the country made a province to a foreign nation:

*The crown  
settled upon  
the lady  
Jane Grey.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

that both his sisters were the issue of marriages censured and disallowed in parliament. And besides, the late king having them by several venters, they were only of the half-blood, and, by consequence, could neither be heirs to his highness, nor to each other. As for the young queen of Scots, she had rejected an alliance with his majesty, engaged with the French, and therefore was no farther to be thought on. That the lady Jane, who stood next upon the royal line, was a person of extraordinary qualities; that her zeal for the reformation was unquestioned; that nothing could be more acceptable to the nation, than the prospect of such a princess; that, in this case, he was bound to set aside all partialities of blood, and nearness of relation; these were inferior considerations, and ought to be over-ruled for the public good.

June 11,  
A.D. 1553.

Over and above this discourse, the duke of Northumberland took care to plant those about the king who would make it their business to touch frequently upon this subject; to enlarge upon the accomplishments of the lady Jane, and describe her with all imaginable advantage. The king's affections standing for this disposition of the crown, he was gained at last to overlook his sisters, and break through his father's will. The next thing was to draw an instrument, and put the settlement in form of law. To this purpose sir Edward Montague, chief justice of the Common Pleas, received an order from the privy council at Greenwich to come thither the next day, and bring sir John Baker, chancellor of the first fruits and tenths, justice Bromley, the attorney and solicitor general, along with him. This order was signed by the lord treasurer, the duke of Northumberland, the earls of Bedford, Shrewsbury, and Pembroke, the lords Clinton and Darcy, sir John Gate, sir William Petres, sir William Cecil, and sir John Cheek.

When sir Edward Montague and the rest came to the court, the king told them that his sickness had given him occasion to consider the state of the realm, the course of the succession, and the consequences likely to ensue. And here he represented the danger to religion and the laws in case the lady Mary should succeed him. And, therefore, to prevent a misfortune of this bulk, his pleasure was, the crown should pass to such persons, and under such circumstances as were specified in certain articles then laid before them: these articles they were to digest into method, and draw up an instru-

ment to the best of their skill. The chief justice and the rest excepted against the order, and desired to be excused: and when farther pressed, moved for time to consult the statutes and constitution; and being afterwards required by a message from the lords to go on with expedition, they made their report at the council board, that having compared the articles with the statutes of succession, they found his majesty's command impracticable: that in case they should draw up an instrument pursuant to their instructions, not only themselves, but all their lordships would be in danger of treason: that they thought it their duty to inform their lordships how the laws stood: that they had not done any thing already, neither had they resolution enough to run such a risk, and cross so directly upon the constitution.

The duke of Northumberland was not in the council-chamber when this answer was returned, but being informed of their in-compliance, came immediately in; he was highly enraged at the disappointment, called sir Edward Montague traitor, said "he would fight in his shirt with any man in that quarrel," and blustered and menaced to that degree that Montague and Bromley were afraid he would have struck them.

When they appeared next at the beard, the king reprimanded them for not dispatching the instrument. The chief justice told him it would signify nothing in law after the king's decease, because the succession being settled by act of parliament, it could not be altered but by the same authority. However, the chief justice Montague and the rest were at last overawed, and drew a settlement of the crown upon the lady Jane. They took the best precautions the case would admit to indemnify themselves; for they engaged upon the conditions of being authorised under the broad seal, and having a general pardon when the instrument was finished. And to give the conveyance a stronger colour of law, all the judges were sent for, and being required to subscribe the instrument, they all put their hands to it, excepting sir James Hales, one of the justices of the Common Pleas. None of the lords of the council, as far as it appears, scrupled the signing this instrument, excepting the archbishop of Canterbury. This prelate, though he liked the person, was not satisfied with the right, and therefore endeavoured to break the project at its first proposal. He took the freedom to argue against it with

EDWARD  
VI.

35 Hen. 8.  
cap. 1.  
1 Edw. 6.  
cap. 12.  
Fuller's  
Ch. Hist.  
book 8. p. 2.  
from an  
original.

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the king ; the marquess of Northampton and the lord Chamberlain Darcy being present. He desired to speak with the king alone, but that would not be granted. The duke of Northumberland told him, that he had misbehaved himself already in remonstrating against the king's will. The archbishop was not discouraged at this rebuke, but bore up against Northumberland at the council-board ; he insisted on his being sworn to perform the late king's will, and urged the entail of the crown upon the two princesses, Mary and Elizabeth. To this the council opposed the resolution of the judges and the opinions of others learned in the law, who affirmed that, notwithstanding this entail, the king being in possession might dispose of the crown as he thought fit. This was more than the archbishop could understand, but being little skilled in the common law, he was staggered with the authority, and resigned too far to the long robe ; he refused to sign notwithstanding, until he was overcome by the importunities of the young prince. The king told him he hoped he would not be the only instance of incomppliance, nor go farther in his singularities than any of the board. Thus the archbishop being pressed on the weak side, yielded at last, and his reason it is possible might give way to his tenderness in some measure ; however, the main ground of his compliance was the opinion of the judges and the attorney-general ; for these he consulted before he subscribed the instrument.

MSS. Foxii.  
July 14.  
*The arch-  
bishop, over-  
ruled by the  
judges,  
signs the  
instrument.*

*Another  
instrument  
signed by  
council to  
adhere to the  
settlement.*

338.

Besides this settlement, signed by three-and-thirty of the privy council, there was another instrument subscribed by twenty-four of them by the king's order. In this writing they engage, upon their oaths and honour, to adhere to and perform every article and branch contained in the settlement of the succession ; and that, if any of them should depart from this engagement, they shall look upon it as a scandalous infraction, and endeavour to punish the offender as a disturber of the public repose. The persons subscribing are these :—

MSS. Petyt.

T. Cant., T. Ely, Winchester, Northumberland, J. Bedford, J. Suffolk, W. Northampt., F. Shrewsbury, F. Huntingdon, Pembroke, E. Clynton, T. Darcy, G. Cobham, T. Cheyne, R. Riche.

John Gate, William Petres, Johan. Check, W. Cecyll, Edward Mountague, John Bakere, Edward Gryffin, John Lucas, John Gosnald.

In the beginning of the next month the king died. Some thought his consumption was the effect of foul practice; that a slow poison was conveyed into his veins, and his death secured by the duke of Northumberland. But this was conjecture without proof: Northumberland was unbeloved; and, therefore, a story to his disadvantage was more easily believed.

EDWARD  
VI.  
*The king's  
death.*

This young prince had a very promising genius, and spent his time to the best purposes of improvement. He had made an unusual progress in knowledge, considering his age. The famous Italian, Cardan, who came into England the last year, was surprised to a wonder at his conversation. This philosopher reports him "master of a great many languages; that, besides his mother-tongue, he talked Latin, French, Greek, Italian, and Spanish; that he spoke the three first to an exactness. He had a comprehensive mind, and seemed formed for all sorts of accomplishments. He had made some proficiency in logic, natural philosophy, and music. He appeared with a majestic air, tempered with condescension and good humour. In short, he looked like an original of his kind, both for parts and management; performed much, and promised a great deal more.

*His cha-  
racter.*

Cardan, de  
Genituris  
Lib.

"He was but in the fifteenth year of his age," continues Cardan, "when I waited on him. He spoke Latin, both as to readiness and phraseology, as well as myself. He asked me, what was the subject of my book 'De Rerum Varietate,' which I had dedicated to his majesty. I told him, that, in the first chapter, I had explained the nature of comets, which had so long puzzled the learned world. He asked me what the cause of them might be. I told him, that when the light of the planets happened to meet and concentre, they produced this appearance. The king objected, that these stars had different motions; and, therefore, thought it would follow, that the comets must vary in their figure and motion, according to the revolution of the planets and their different situation from each other. To this I replied, that the comets are governed by the planetary motions in some measure, but move much quicker, by reason of the different aspect: as we see in a crystal, and the sunbeam, when the ray is reflected on a wall; for here a little change or shifting makes a great difference as to place. The king inquired, farther, how that could be, since there was no solid body in the air to stop the light and make a reflection;

*Moretur  
quidem sed  
longe cele-  
rius illis ob  
diversitatem  
aspectus  
velut crys-  
tallo et sole  
cum iris in  
pariete re-  
luet.*

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

whereas, in the instance I brought, the wall was a subject, or impenetrable body, to return the light of the ray<sup>1</sup>. To this I rejoined, that this phenomenon might be explained by a resemblance of that streak of light which we see in the milky way; and that it might be farther illustrated by observing, that, when a great many candles are lighted up in a room, the intermediate space is bright and lucid. And thus, according to the proverbial saying, 'ex ungue leonem,' from this little specimen we may collect the force of nature and improvement in this young prince. His unusual ingenuity, and the sweetness of his temper, gave a mighty expectation, and endeared him extremely to all persons of sense and virtue. He countenanced the creditable sciences before he was acquainted with them, and had the book part of them before he was of age to reduce them to practice. He gave such early discoveries of carrying human nature to the height, that not only England, but the rest of the world, have reason to lament he lived no longer. Where the solemnity and strength of a royal character was required, he managed like a person advanced in years; but, when it was proper to relax and condescend, represented his stature and his age. He played upon the lute, and applied himself to state affairs. He had a large mind to oblige, and affected magnificence no less than his father. What I have said of this prince are no strains of panegyric, no rhetorical flourishes: my description rather falls short of matter of fact than exceeds it."

Thus far Cardan. How well this king's talent was suited to his birth, and how much he was formed for empire, may partly be collected from his journal, written in his own hand. It begins with his birth, proceeds to his accession to the throne, and is carried on to November, 1552. And here most of the remarkable transactions which happened through the course of his government are set down. The creations of noblemen, the disposal of bishoprics and offices of state, the repairing old forts and erecting new ones, the bringing in of bullion and remittances of money into foreign countries, dispatching or entertaining ambassadors, alliances with neighbouring princes, sieges and battles in Germany and elsewhere, trials of great men, and debates in parliament,—in short, all material occurrences, relating either to peace or war, to business or solemnity,—are entered according as they happened; and that with the

<sup>1</sup> The King was decidedly the best philosopher of the two.

nicest distinctions and subdivisions of time : for not only the years, but the months and the days, are marked. EDWARD VI.

The poor in London had a very considerable provision settled in this reign. To give a brief account of the matter : the late king Henry, before his death, granted Grey-friars, near Newgate, together with Little St. Bartholomew's priory, to the city of London. This last house, at the dissolution, was endowed with 305*l.* annual revenue. The design of this benefaction was to furnish relief for the poor, and to settle a maintenance for a parish-church. The church of Grey-friars was to be turned to this use, called Christ-church, and king Henry was to pass for the founder. The city, being thus far encouraged, began to work upon the provision, fitted up Grey-friars, now called Christ's hospital, and brought in about four hundred children ; but, it seems, what was already done fell short of the necessities of the poor, under all denominations. 339.

*Christ Church, St. Bartholomew's, St. Thomas's Hospital, and Bride-well, settled for the relief of the poor, &c. Nov. A. D. 1552.*

In the beginning of this year, during the king's sickness, bishop Ridley preached before him at Westminster. He insisted upon the duties of charity, and recommended the projecting a maintenance for the poor. And in discoursing upon this argument, he observed that the wealthy and those who were in high stations, were particularly obliged to furnish a subsistence, and make something of this kind practicable. This sermon making an impression upon the young king, he ordered the bishop to attend him in the great gallery at Westminster. When the bishop came, he told him how sensible he was of the seasonableness of the discourse, that he conceived himself principally concerned in the exhortation, and that he resolved to practise accordingly : and since Ridley had probably spent some thoughts upon a scheme, and advised with persons of capacity, he desired he would suggest his opinion, and lay the best expedient before him. A. D. 1553.

The bishop was unexpectedly pleased to find the king's inclination so forward : he told his highness he thought the poor in London, being so very numerous, called most for his assistance. And that it was proper to consult the mayor and aldermen about the manner of the relief. The king, at the bishop's request sent a letter to the lord mayor with orders to call some of the magistracy of the city together, to debate this matter with them, and send him their thoughts what would be the best establishment for this purpose. The bishop carried the letter

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

to sir Richard Dobbs, then lord mayor, who perused the contents; and in short, after several consultations with some of the aldermen and common council, they came to a resolution, formed a scheme, and ranged the poor under three divisions: those who were poor by impotency, by casualty, or extravagance. The poor by impotency were subdivided into three distinctions. First, orphans who were left unsupported by their parents. Secondly, those who were worn out with age, had lost their sight, or were disabled in their limbs. Thirdly, those who were afflicted with noisome or contagious distempers, such as leprosy, &c.

Secondly. The poor by casualty were likewise distinguished into three sorts, viz., wounded soldiers, decayed housekeepers, and thirdly, those visited with any severe or disabling distemper. And lastly, the unmanageable and extravagant poor are likewise put under three classes. I. The prodigal that has squandered away all his fortune upon his vices. II. The stroller who settles no where. III. The lazy and licentious, such as strumpets and others who choose to live upon debauchery or begging. As to these three ranks of poor, the orphans were lodged in Christ's hospital, where they were furnished with necessaries, and bred to sobriety and business. The second general subdivision were provided for in the hospitals of St. Thomas, Southwark, and St. Bartholomew's in West Smithfield. And in these two houses, when Stow wrote, above two hundred diseased persons were well entertained with diet and physic. Bridewell, a house belonging to the crown, was given for the entertainment and correction of rambles, strumpets, and sturdy beggars.

Grafton.  
Stow's  
Survey of  
London.

To make the design bear, and furnish these houses with a competent maintenance, the king dissolved the hospital in the Savoy, founded by king Henry VII. The young king was informed that this hospital, endowed for a comfortable support to pilgrims and travellers, was diverted to scandalous uses, and served mostly for a shelter and encouragement to lewd and lazy people. The master, therefore, and brethren of the house, were ordered to attend the king, and either persuaded or menaced to a resignation. Their lands, amounting to six hundred pounds per annum, were granted to the city of London, for the maintenance of Bridewell and the hospital of St. Thomas. And, for a farther enlargement of their revenue, they had a



royal license for purchasing lands in mortmain, to the value of four thousand marks yearly revenue. The king lived but two days after the perfecting these foundations. EDWARD VI.

But, not to omit any thing of this kind, about two months before he founded Christ's hospital at Abingdon, near Oxford. One sir John Gollafrie had founded a guild, or brotherhood, in that town, for building bridges, repairing highways, and maintaining thirteen poor people, and two priests for officiating in this society. This was settled in the reign of king Henry VI. ; but, by the late act of parliament, for vesting chantries, colleges, &c., in the crown, the lands of this brotherhood were seized for the king's use, the repairing of the ways and bridges turned upon the town, and the poor left to shift for themselves. And thus the founder's design miscarried for some time ; but, in the last year of this reign, sir John Mason, born in the town, and one of the masters of Requests, moved the king to found an hospital there, to settle the lands belonging to the former foundations, and charge the settlement with such services and pious uses as were required from the old fraternity. The king granted sir John Mason his suit, built convenient lodgings for the poor, endowed the hospital with the former revenues, and committed the government of the house to twelve persons, incorporated by the name of the Master and Governors of the Hospital of Christ in Abingdon.

Notwithstanding these good qualities in the king, his reign was far from being unblemished. Camden complains, " that avarice and sacrilege had strangely the ascendant. That estates, formerly settled for the support of religion and the poor, were ridiculed as superstitious endowments, first miscalled, and then plundered. That ambition and faction amongst the nobility, insolence and insurrection amongst the commons, were never more flagrant and disturbing. In short, considering the animosities and tumults amongst great men, the debasing the coin, the disorders in the administration, and the revolt of the peasantry, the kingdom made a miserable appearance, and looked, as it were, languishing in one part, and distracted in another."

Heylin,  
Hist. Ref.  
p. 141.  
*A complaint  
of the rapacities and  
disorders of  
this reign.*

Camden,  
Apparat. ad  
Elizabeth.

As to the charge of sacrilege, and the mismanagement of the revenues of religious houses granted to the laity, one Roderick Morse, alias Henry Brinklow, makes a tragical complaint.

" I doubt not," says he, " but that every good man wishes

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

340.

*Roderick  
Morse, or  
Brinklow,  
his satire  
upon avarice  
and sacri-  
lege.*

that, at our dissolution of monasteries, both the lands and impropriated tythes and churches possessed by them (that is, things sacred to the service of God, although abused by such as had them) had been bestowed rather for the advancement of the Church, to a better maintenance of the labouring and deserving ministry, to the fostering of good arts, relief of the poor, and other such good uses as might remain in them for the benefit of the Church, or commonwealth, a character of the wishes of those who first with devotion dedicated them (as in some other countries was religiously done upon the reformation), than conferred with such a prodigal dispensation as it happened on those who stood ready to devour what was sanctified: and we have in no small number since found such inheritances thence derived to them, but as Sejanus's horse, or the gold of Tholouse. But I abstain from censure, and add here by the way a complaint made to the parliament not long after the dissolution, touching the abuse that followed in the Church, through laymen possessing of appropriated churches and tythes: it deserves to be seriously thought on by every layman that now enjoys any of them, especially where the divine service is not carefully provided for.

“Ye that be lords and burgesses of parliament,” so are the words of it, “I require of you, in the name of my poor brethren that are Englishmen and members of Christ's body, that ye consider well (as ye will answer before the face of Almighty God in the day of judgment) this abuse, and see it amended.”

“When anti-Christ,” as he calls the pope, “of Rome durst openly, without any viser, walk up and down throughout England, he had so great favour there, and his children had such crafty wits (‘for the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light’), that they had not only almost gotten all the best lands of England into their hands, but also the most part of all the best benefices, both of parsonages and vicarages, which were, for the most part, all impropred to them.

“And when they had the gift of any not impropred, they gave them unto their friends, of the which always some were learned: for the monks patronized their friends' children at school, and though they were not learned, yet they kept hospitality, and helped their poor friends. And if the parsonages were impropred, the monks were bound to deal almes to the

*He means  
the monks.*

poor, and to keep hospitality, as the writings of the gifts of such parsonages and lands do plainly declare in these words, *in puram eleemosynam*. And as touching the almes that they delt, and the hospitality that they kept, every man knoweth that many thousands were well received of them, and might have been better if they had not so many great men's horses to feed, and had not been overcharged with such idle gentlemen as were never out of the abbayes. And if they had any vicarage in their hands, they appointed sometimes some sufficient vicar (though it were but seldom) to preach and to teach. But now that all the abbayes, with their lands, goods, and impropred parsonages, be in temporal men's hands, I do not here tell that one halfpenny worth of almes, or any other profit, cometh to the people of those parishes. Your pretence of putting down abbayes was to amend that which was amiss in them: it was far amiss that a great part of the lands of the abbayes, which were given to bring up learned men that might be preachers to keep hospitality and to give almes to the poor, should be spent upon a few superstitious monkes, which gave not forty pounds in almes, when they should have given two hundred. It was amisse that monkes should have parsonages in their hands, and deal but the twentieth part thereof to the poor, and preach but once in the year to them that payed the tythes of the parsonages. It was amisse that they scarcely, once in twenty times, set a sufficient vicar to preach for the tythes that they received.

“But see now how that was amisse is amended, for all the godly pretense. It is amended even as the devil amended his dame's legge, (as it is in the proverb,) when he should have set it right, he brake it quite in pieces. The monkes gave too little almes, and set unable persons many times in their benefices: but now, where twenty pounds were given yearly to the poor, in more than an hundred places in England, is not one meal's meat given. This is a fair amendment! where they had always one or other vicar, that either preached or hired some to preach, now there is no vicar at all, but the farmer is vicar and parson altogether; and only an old cast-away monk or frier, which can scarcely say his matins, is hired for twenty or thirty shillings, meat and drink, yea, in some places for meat and drink alone, without wages. I know, and not I alone, but twenty thousand more, know more than five hundred vicarages and

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

parsonages thus well and gospelly served after the new gospel of England.

“ And so (says sir William Dugdale) the author goes on with sharp admonitions to the laymen, that feed themselves fat with the tythes of the Churches, whiles the souls of the parishioners suffered great famine for want of a fit pastor, that is, for want of fit maintenance for him, for without that, he is scarce to be hoped for.”

Dugdale's  
Monast.  
vol. I.  
fol. 1049.

This Brinklow, who made these remarks, was a London merchant, and is put in the list of learned writers by Holinshed.

*The king  
seems to have  
been bred  
under some  
prejudices.*

As to king Edward, notwithstanding his advantages by nature and education, it is pretty plain his conscience was not always under a serviceable direction. He was tinctured with Erastian principles, and under wrong prepossessions as to Church government: he gives a hard character of the bishops, and makes age and ignorance a ground to seize their jurisdiction. He would have no authority given in general to bishops: but that the best of them should have commissions to execute their function in their diocese; and the rest be as it were laid by, and disabled. And thus he was educated to an opinion of his being the fountain of all spiritual, as well as temporal power. Some politicians above him formed his mind to their interest, flattered his childhood, and misled his understanding: that he was not always under a happy management may be farther collected from some arbitrary commissions, and strains of law in the deprivation of bishops. He seems to have had no notion of sacrilege. Had he been bred to the same aversion to this crime which he expressed against image-worship and the mass, he would never have taken such freedoms with the consecrated revenues, nor impoverished the Church to so lamentable a degree: and, which is somewhat remarkable, most of these hardships were put upon ecclesiastics in the latter end of his reign, when his judgment was in the best condition. And upon this occasion I shall refer the reader to the records, where he may see a farther account of some of the alienations of Church-lands in this, and the late reign. To conclude the story of this prince, he died at Greenwich, July 6, 1553.

K. Edward's  
Remains.  
Cotton. Lib.  
Nero. C. 10.

Records,  
num. 67.

---

NOTE.—The following able remarks, by Hallam, on the progress of the Reformation, and on the essential differences of the two religions, can be no where more appropriately

introduced than at the present juncture, although he, in a few instances, refers to facts not yet related :—

EDWARD  
VI.

“It is said that Henry had meditated some further changes in religion. Of his executors, the greater part, as their subsequent conduct evinces, were nearly indifferent to the two systems, except so far as more might be gained by innovation. But Somerset, the new protector, appears to have inclined sincerely towards the reformation, though not wholly uninfluenced by similar motives. His authority readily overcame all opposition in the council : and it was soon perceived that Edward, whose singular precocity gave his opinions in childhood an importance not wholly ridiculous, had imbibed a steady and ardent attachment to the new religion, which probably, had he lived longer, would have led him both to diverge further from what he thought an idolatrous superstition, and to have treated its adherents with severity. Under his reign accordingly a series of alterations in the tenets and homilies of the English Church were made, the principal of which I shall point out, without following a chronological order, or adverting to such matters of controversy as did not produce a sensible effect on the people.

“1. It was obviously among the first steps required in order to introduce a mode of religion at once more reasonable and more earnest than the former, that the public services of the Church should be expressed in the mother-tongue of the congregation. The Latin ritual had been unchanged ever since the age when it was familiar; partly through a sluggish dislike of innovation, but partly also because the mysteriousness of an unknown dialect served to impose on the vulgar, and to throw an air of wisdom around the priesthood. Yet what was thus concealed would have borne the light. Our own liturgy, so justly celebrated for its piety, elevation, and simplicity, is in great measure a translation from the Catholic services; those portions of course being omitted which had relation to different principles of worship. In the second year of Edward’s reign, the reformation of the public service was accomplished, and an English liturgy compiled not essentially different from that in present use.

“2. No part of exterior religion was more prominent, or more offensive to those who had imbibed a Protestant spirit, than the worship, or at least veneration, of images, which in remote and barbarous ages had given excessive scandal both in the Greek and Latin Churches, though long fully established in the practice of each. The populace, in towns where the reformed tenets prevailed, began to pull them down in the very first days of Edward’s reign; and after a little pretence at distinguishing those which had not been abused, orders were given that all images should be taken away from churches. It was perhaps necessary thus to hinder the zealous Protestants from abating them as nuisances, which had already caused several disturbances. But this order was executed with a rigour which lovers of art and antiquity have long deplored. Our churches bear witness to the devastation committed in the wantonness of triumphant reform, by defacing statues and crosses on the exterior of buildings intended for worship, or windows and monuments within. Missals and other books dedicated to superstition perished in the same manner. Altars were taken down, and a great variety of ceremonies abrogated; such as the use of incense, tapers, and holy water; and though more of these were retained than eager innovators could approve, the whole surface of religious ordinances, all that is palpable to common minds, underwent a surprising transformation.

“3. But this change in ceremonial observances and outward show was trifling, when compared to that in the objects of worship, and in the purposes for which they were addressed. Those who have visited some Catholic temples, and attended to the current language of devotion, must have perceived, what the writings of apologists or decrees of councils will never enable them to discover, that the saints, but more especially the Virgin, are almost exclusively the “popular” deities of that religion. All this polytheism was swept away by the reformers; and in this may be deemed to consist the most specific difference of the two systems. Nor did they spare the belief in purgatory, that unknown land which the hierarchy swayed with so absolute a rule, and to which the earth had been rendered a tributary province. Yet in the first liturgy put forth under Edward, the prayers for departed souls were retained; either out of respect to the prejudices of the people, or to the immemorial antiquity of the practice. But such prayers, if not necessarily implying the doctrine of purgatory (which yet in the main they

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

appear to do), are at least so closely connected with it, that the belief could never be eradicated while they remained. Hence, in the revision of the liturgy, four years afterwards, they were laid aside; and several other changes made, to eradicate the vestiges of the ancient superstition.

"4. Auricular confession, as commonly called, or the private and special confession of sins to a priest for the purpose of obtaining his absolution, an imperative duty in the Church of Rome, and preserved as such in the statute of the Six Articles, and in the religious codes published by Henry VIII., was left to each man's discretion in the new order; a judicious temperament, which the reformers would have done well to adopt in some other points. And thus, while it has never been condemned in our Church, it went without dispute into complete neglect. Those who desire to augment the influence of the clergy regret, of course, its discontinuance; and some may conceive that it would serve either for wholesome restraint, or useful admonition. It is very difficult, or perhaps beyond the reach of any human being, to determine absolutely how far these benefits, which cannot be reasonably denied to result in some instances from the rite of confession, outweigh the mischiefs connected with it. There seems to be something in the Roman Catholic discipline (and I know nothing else so likely) which keeps the balance, as it were, of moral influence pretty even between the two religions, and compensates for the ignorance and superstition which the elder preserves; for I am not sure that the Protestant system in the present age has any very sensible advantage in this respect; or that in countries where the comparison can fairly be made, as in Germany or Switzerland, there is more honesty in one sex, or more chastity in the other, when they belong to the reformed Churches. Yet, on the other hand, the practice of confession is at the best of very doubtful utility, when considered in its full extent and general bearings. The ordinary confessor, listening mechanically to hundreds of penitents, can hardly preserve much authority over most of them. But in proportion as his attention is directed to the secrets of conscience, his influence may become dangerous; men grow accustomed to the control of one perhaps more feeble and guilty than themselves, but over whose frailties they exercise no reciprocal command; and, if the confessors of kings have been sometimes terrible to nations, their ascendancy is probably not less mischievous, in proportion to its extent, within the sphere of domestic life. In a political light, and with the object of lessening the weight of the ecclesiastical order in temporal affairs, there cannot be the least hesitation as to the expediency of discontinuing the usage.

"5. It has very rarely been the custom of theologians to measure the importance of orthodox opinions by their effect on the lives and hearts of those who adopt them; nor was this predilection for speculative above practical doctrines ever more evident than in the leading controversy of the sixteenth century: that respecting the Lord's Supper. No errors on this point could have had any influence on men's moral conduct, nor indeed much on the general nature of their faith; yet it was selected as the test of heresy; and most, if not all, of those who suffered death upon that charge, whether in England or on the continent, were convicted of denying the corporal presence in the sense of the Roman Church. It had been well if the reformers had learned, by abhorring her persecution, not to practise it in a somewhat less degree upon each other, or by exposing the absurdities of transubstantiation, not to contend for equal nonsense of their own. Four principal theories, to say nothing of subordinate varieties, divided Europe at the accession of Edward VI. about the sacrament of the eucharist. The Church of Rome would not depart a single letter from transubstantiation, or the change, at the moment of consecration, of the substances of bread and wine into those of Christ's body and blood; the accidents, in school language, or sensible qualities of the former remaining, or becoming inherent in the new substance. This doctrine does not, as vulgarly supposed, contradict the evidence of our senses; since our senses can report nothing as to the unknown being, which the schoolmen denominated "substance," and which alone was the subject of this conversion. But metaphysicians of later ages might inquire whether material substances, abstractedly considered, exist at all, or, if they exist, whether they can have any specific distinction except their sensible qualities. This, perhaps, did not suggest itself in the sixteenth century; but it was strongly objected that the simultaneous exist-

ence of a body in many places, which the Romish doctrine implied, was inconceivable, and even contradictory. Luther, partly, as it seems, out of his determination to multiply differences with the Church, invented a theory somewhat different, usually called consubstantiation, which was adopted in the confession of Augsburg, and to which, at least down to the end of the seventeenth century, the divines of that communion were much attached. They imagined the two substances to be united in the sacramental elements, so that they might be termed bread and wine, or the body and blood, with equal propriety. But it must be obvious that there is merely a scholastic distinction between this doctrine and that of Rome; though, when it suited the Lutherans to magnify, rather than dissemble, their deviations from the mother Church, it was raised into an important difference. A simpler and more rational explication occurred to Zuingle and *Æcolapadius*, from whom the Helvetic Protestants imbibed their faith. Rejecting every notion of a real presence, and divesting the institution of all its mystery, they saw only figurative symbols in the elements which Christ had appointed as a commemoration of his death. But this novel opinion excited as much indignation in Luther as in the Romanists. It was indeed a rock on which the Reformation was nearly shipwrecked; since the violent contests which it occasioned, and the narrow intolerance which one side at least displayed throughout the controversy, not only weakened on several occasions the temporal power of the Protestant churches, but disgusted many of those who might have inclined towards espousing their sentiments. Besides these three hypotheses, a fourth was promulgated by Martin Bucer, of Strasburgh, a man of much acuteness, but prone to metaphysical subtlety, and not, it is said, of a very ingenious character. His theory upon the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, after having been adopted with little variation by Calvin, was finally received into some of the offices of the English Church. If the Roman and Lutheran doctrines teemed with unmasked absurdity, this middle system (if indeed it is to be considered as a genuine opinion, and not rather a political device,) had no advantage but in the disguise of unmeaning terms; while it had the peculiar infelicity of departing as much from the literal sense of the words of the institution, wherein the former triumphed, as the Zuinglian interpretation itself. I know not whether I can state in language tolerably perspicuous this jargon of bad metaphysical theology. But Bucer, as I apprehend, though his expressions are unusually confused, did not acknowledge a local presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements after consecration,—so far concurring with the Helvetians; while he contended that they were really, and without figure, received by the worthy communicant through faith, so as to preserve the belief of a mysterious union, and of what was sometimes called a real presence. It can hardly fail to strike every unprejudiced reader, that a material substance can only in a very figurative sense be said to be received through faith; that there can be no real presence of such a body, consistently with the proper use of language, but by its local occupation of space; and that, as the Romish tenet of transubstantiation is the best, so this of the Calvinists is the worst imagined of the three that have been opposed to the simplicity of the Helvetic explanation. Bucer himself came to England early in the reign of Edward, and had a considerable share in advising the measures of Reformation. But Peter Martyr, a disciple of the Swiss school, had also no small influence. In the forty-two articles set forth by authority, the real or corporeal presence, using these words as synonymous, is explicitly denied. This clause was omitted on the revision of the articles under Elizabeth.

“6. These various innovations were exceedingly inimical to the influence and interests of the priesthood. But that order obtained a sort of compensation in being released from its obligation to celibacy. This obligation, though unwarranted by Scripture, rested on a most ancient and universal rule of discipline; for though the Greek and Eastern Churches have always permitted the ordination of married persons, yet they do not allow those already ordained to take wives. No very good reason, however, could be given for this distinction; and the constrained celibacy of the Latin clergy had given rise to mischiefs, of which their general practice of retaining concubines might be reckoned among the smallest. The German Protestants soon rejected this burthen, and encouraged regular as well as secular priests to marry. Crammer had himself taken a wife in Germany, whom Henry's law of the Six Articles,—one of which made the mar-

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

riage of priests felony,—compelled him to send away. In the reign of Edward this was justly reckoned an indispensable part of the new Reformation. But the bill for that purpose passed the lords with some little difficulty, nine bishops and four peers dissenting; and its preamble cast such an imputation on the practice it allowed, treating the marriage of priests as ignominious and a tolerated evil, that another act was thought necessary a few years afterwards, when the Reformation was better established, to vindicate this right of the Protestant Church. A great number of the clergy availed themselves of their liberty; which may probably have had as extensive an effect in conciliating the ecclesiastical profession, as the suppression of monasteries had in rendering the gentry favourable to the new order of religion.

“But great as was the number of those whom conviction or self-interest enlisted under the Protestant banner, it appears plain that the reformation moved on with too precipitate a step for the majority. The new doctrines prevailed in London, in many large towns, and in the eastern counties. But in the north and west of England, the body of the people were strictly Catholics. The clergy, though not very scrupulous about conforming to the innovations, were generally averse to most of them. And, in spite of the church-lands, I imagine that most of the nobility, if not the gentry, inclined to the same persuasion; not a few peers having sometimes dissented from the bills passed on the subject of religion in this reign, while no sort of disagreement appears in the upper house during that of Mary. In the western insurrection of 1549, which partly originated in the alleged grievance of enclosures, many of the demands made by the rebels go to the entire re-establishment of popery. Those of the Norfolk insurgents in the same year, whose political complaints were the same, do not, as far as I perceive, show any such tendency. But an historian (Burnet) whose bias was certainly not unfavourable to Protestantism, confesses that all endeavours were too weak to overcome the aversion of the people towards Reformation, and even intimates that German troops were sent for from Calais on account of the bigotry with which the bulk of the nation adhered to the old superstition. This is somewhat an humiliating admission, that the Protestant faith was imposed upon our ancestors by a foreign army. And as the reformers, though still the fewer, were undeniably a great and increasing party, it may be natural to inquire whether a regard to policy as well as equitable considerations should not have repressed still more, as it did in some measure, the zeal of Cranmer and Somerset. It might be asked whether, in the acknowledged co-existence of two religions, some preference were not fairly claimed for the creed, which all had once held, and which the greater part yet retained; whether it were becoming that the counsellors of an infant king should use such violence in breaking up the ecclesiastical constitution; whether it were to be expected that a free-spirited people should see their consciences thus transferred by proclamation, and all that they had learned to venerate not only torn away from them, but exposed to what they must reckon blasphemous contumely and profanation. The demolition of shrines and images, far unlike the speculative disputes of theologians, was an overt insult on every Catholic heart. Still more were they exasperated at the ribaldry which vulgar Protestants uttered against their most sacred mystery. It was found necessary, in the very first act of the first Protestant parliament, to denounce penalties against such as spoke irreverently of the sacrament, an indecency not unusual with those who held the Zuinglian opinion in that age of coarse pleasantry and unmixed invective. Nor could the people repose much confidence in the judgment and sincerity of their governors, whom they had seen submitting without outward repugnance to Henry's various schemes of religion, and whom they saw every day enriching themselves with the plunder of the Church they affected to reform. There was a sort of endowed colleges or fraternities, called chantries, consisting of secular priests, whose duty was to say daily masses for the founders. These were abolished and given to the king by acts of parliament in the last year of Henry, and the first of Edward. It was intimated in the preamble of the latter statute that their revenues should be converted to the erection of schools, the augmentation of the universities, and the sustenance of the indigent. But this was entirely neglected, and the estates fell into the hands of the courtiers. Nor did they content themselves with this escheated wealth of the Church. Almost every bishopric was spoiled by the ravenous



power in this reign, either through mere alienations, or long leases, or unequal exchanges. Exeter and Landaff, from being among the richest sees, fell into the class of the poorest. Lichfield lost the chief part of its lands to raise the estate for Lord Paget. London, Winchester, and even Canterbury, suffered considerably. The duke of Somerset was much beloved; yet he had given no unjust offence by pulling down some churches in order to erect Somerset-house with the materials. He had even projected the demolition of Westminster-abbey; but the chapter averted this outrageous piece of rapacity, sufficient of itself to characterize that age, by the usual method, a grant of some of their estates.

“Tolerance in religion, it is well known, so unanimously admitted (at least verbally) even by theologians in the present century, was scarcely considered as practicable, much less as a matter of right, during the period of the Reformation. The difference in this respect between the Catholics and Protestants is only in degree, and in degree there was much less difference than we are apt to believe. Persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed Churches; that which cools every honest man’s zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive. The Lutheran princes and cities in Germany constantly refused to tolerate the use of the mass as an idolatrous service; and this name of idolatry, though adopted in retaliation for that of heresy, answered the same end as the other of exciting animosity and uncharitableness. The Roman worship was equally proscribed in England. Many persons were sent to prison for hearing mass and similar offences. The princess Mary supplicated in vain to have the exercise of her own religion at home; and Charles V. several times interceded in her behalf; but though Cranmer and Ridley, as well as the council, would have consented to this indulgence, the young king, whose education had unhappily infused a good deal of bigotry in his mind, could not be prevailed upon to connive at such idolatry. Yet in one memorable instance he had shown a milder spirit, struggling against Cranmer to save a fanatical woman from the punishment of heresy. This is a stain upon Cranmer’s memory, which nothing but his own death could have lightened. In men hardly escaped from a similar peril, in men who had nothing to plead but the right of private judgment, in men who had defied the prescriptive authority of past ages and of established power, the crime of persecution assumes a far deeper hue, and is capable of far less extenuation than in a Roman inquisitor. Thus the death of Servetus has weighed down the name and memory of Calvin. And though Cranmer was incapable of the rancorous malignity of the Genevan lawgiver; yet I regret to say that there is a peculiar circumstance of aggravation in his pursuing to death this woman, Joan Boucher, and a Dutchman that had been convicted of Arianism. It is said that he had been accessory in the preceding reign to the condemnation of Lambert, and perhaps some others, for opinions concerning the Lord’s Supper which he had himself afterwards embraced. Such an evidence of the fallibility of human judgment, such an example that persecutions for heresy, how conscientiously soever managed, are liable to end in shedding the blood of those who maintain truth, should have taught him, above all men, a scrupulous repugnance to carry into effect those sanguinary laws. Compared with these executions for heresy, the imprisonment and deprivation of Gardiner and Bonner appear but measures of ordinary severity towards political adversaries under the pretext of religion; yet are they wholly unjustifiable, particularly in the former instance; and if the subsequent retaliation of those bad men was beyond all proportion excessive, we should remember that such is the natural consequence of tyrannical aggressions.

“The person most conspicuous, though Ridley was perhaps the most learned divine, in moulding the faith and discipline of the English Church, which has not been very materially altered since his time, was Archbishop Cranmer. Few men, about whose conduct there is so little room for controversy upon facts, have been represented in more opposite lights. We know the favouring colours of Protestant writers; but turn to the bitter invective of Bossuet; and the patriarch of our reformed Church stands forth as the most abandoned of time-serving hypocrites. No political factions affect the impartiality of men’s judgment so grossly, or so permanently, as religious heats. Doubtless, if we should reverse the picture, and imagine the end and scope of Cranmer’s labour to have been the establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in a Protestant country,

CRAN-  
MER,  
Abp. Cant.

the estimate formed of his behaviour would be somewhat less favourable than it is at present. If, casting away all prejudice on either side, we weigh the character of this prelate in an equal balance, he will appear far indeed removed from the turpitude imputed to him by his enemies, yet not entitled to any extraordinary veneration. Though it is most eminently true of Cranmer that his faults were always the effect of circumstances, and not of intention; yet this palliating consideration is rather weakened when we recollect that he voluntarily placed himself in a station where those circumstances occurred. At the time of Cranmer's elevation to the see of Canterbury, Henry, though on the point of separating for ever from Rome, had not absolutely determined upon so strong a measure; and his policy required that the new archbishop should solicit the usual bulls from the pope, and take the oath of canonical obedience to him. Cranmer, already a rebel from that dominion in his heart, had recourse to the disingenuous shift of a protest, before his consecration, that 'he did not intend to restrain himself thereby from any thing to which he was bound by his duty to God or the king, or from taking part in any reformation of the English Church which he might judge to be required.' This first deviation from integrity, as is almost always the case, drew after it many others; and began that discreditable course of temporizing, and undue compliance, to which he was reduced for the rest of Henry's reign. Cranmer's abilities were not perhaps of a high order, or at least they were unsuited to public affairs; but his principal defect was in that firmness by which men of more ordinary talents may ensure respect. Nothing could be weaker than his conduct in the usurpation of Lady Jane, which he might better have boldly sustained, like Ridley, as a step necessary for the conservation of Protestantism, than given into against his conscience, overpowered by the importunities of a misguided boy. Had the malignity of his enemies been directed rather against his reputation than his life, had the reluctant apostate been permitted to survive his shame, as a prisoner in the Tower, it must have seemed a more arduous task to defend the memory of Cranmer; but his fame has brightened in the fire that consumed him.

"Those who, with the habits of thinking that prevail in our times, cast back their eyes on the reign of Edward VI., will generally be disposed to censure the precipitancy, and still more the exclusive spirit of our principal reformers. But relatively to the course that things had taken in Germany, and to the feverish zeal of that age, the moderation of Cranmer and Ridley, the only ecclesiastics who took a prominent share in these measures, was very conspicuous; and tended above every thing to place the Anglican Church in that middle position which it has always preserved, between the Roman hierarchy and that of other Protestant denominations. It is manifest, from the history of the Reformation in Germany, that its predisposing cause was the covetous and arrogant character of the superior ecclesiastics, founded upon vast temporal authority; a yoke long borne with impatience, and which the unanimous adherence of the prelates to Rome, in the period of separation, gave the Lutheran princes a good excuse for entirely throwing off. Some of the more temperate reformers, as Melancthon, would have admitted a limited jurisdiction of the episcopacy: but in general the destruction of that order, such as it then existed, may be deemed as fundamental a principle of the new discipline, as any theological point could be of the new doctrine. But, besides that the subjection of ecclesiastical to civil tribunals, and possibly other causes, had rendered the superior clergy in England less obnoxious than in Germany, there was this important difference between the two countries, that several bishops from zealous conviction, many more from pliability to self-interest, had gone along with the new-modelling of the English Church by Henry and Edward; so that it was perfectly easy to keep up that form of government, in the regular succession which had usually been deemed essential; though the foreign reformers had neither the wish, nor possibly the means, to preserve it. Cranmer himself, indeed, during the reign of Henry, had bent, as usual, to the king's despotic humour; and favoured a novel theory of ecclesiastical authority, which resolved all its spiritual as well as temporal powers into the royal supremacy. Accordingly, at the accession of Edward, he himself, and several other bishops, took out commissions to hold their sees during pleasure. But when the necessity of compliance had passed by, they showed a disposition not only to oppose the continual spoliations of

church property, but to maintain the jurisdiction which the canon law had conferred upon them. And though, as this papal code did not appear very well adapted to a Protestant Church, a new scheme of ecclesiastical laws was drawn up, which the king's death rendered abortive, this was rather calculated to strengthen the hands of the spiritual courts than to withdraw any matter from their cognizance.

“The policy, or it may be the prejudices, of Cranmer induced him also to retain in the Church a few ceremonial usages, which the Helvetic, though not the Lutheran, reformers had swept away; such as the copes and rochets of bishops, and the surplice of officiating priests. It should seem inconceivable that any one could object to these vestments, considered in themselves; far more, if they could answer in the slightest degree the end of conciliating a reluctant people. But this motive unfortunately was often disregarded in that age; and indeed in all ages an abhorrence of concession and compromise is a never-failing characteristic of religious factions. The foreign reformers then in England, two of whom, Bucer and Peter Martyr, enjoyed a deserved reputation, expressed their dissatisfaction at seeing these habits retained, and complained, in general, of the backwardness of the English Reformation. Calvin and Bullinger wrote from Switzerland in the same strain. Nor was this sentiment by any means confined to strangers. Hooper, an eminent divine, having been elected bishop of Gloucester, refused to be consecrated in the usual dress. It marks, almost ludicrously, the spirit of those times, that instead of permitting him to decline the station, the council sent him to prison for some time, until by some mutual concessions the business was adjusted.

EDWARD  
VI.

THE END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

LONDON:  
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

# BINGHAM'S WORKS,

WITH THE QUOTATIONS IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES, INSTEAD OF MERELY  
THE REFERENCES, AS ORIGINALLY GIVEN.

---

*Just published*, in NINE VOLUMES, 8vo., price 5*l.* 8*s.* neatly bound in cloth,

THE WHOLE

## WORKS

OF

## THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM:

INCLUDING

ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ,

OR THE

ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

CAREFULLY CORRECTED ;

WITH

THE QUOTATIONS IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES AT LENGTH,

INSTEAD OF MERELY THE REFERENCES, AS FORMERLY GIVEN ;

A NEW SET OF MAPS OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY ; AND

LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

---

The *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* of the learned and industrious BINGHAM has been long deemed indispensable to every student anxious to ascertain the construction and platform of the primitive Christian Church. At the present time, especially, a correct knowledge of the subject he so ably discusses is interesting, not only to the ministers, but to every member of the Protestant Church.

The following testimonies, selected from numerous others which could be adduced, will serve to show the estimation in which he is generally held by all parties :—

AUGUSTE, in his Introduction to *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie*, p. 11, (*Leipzig*, 1836,) says—“The English clergyman, JOSEPH BINGHAM, remarkable for his profound learning, and his spirit of unprejudiced inquiry, was the first that published a complete Archæology, and one worthy of the name.”

“Opus ipsum BINGHAMI tam egregium est, ut merito inter libros, quibus Antiquitates Ecclesiasticæ universæ enarratæ sunt, principatum teneat, sive ad rerum copiam atque apparatus, sive ad earum explanationem animum advertere velimus. Commendat illud se accuratiori ordine, argumentis solidis ; sive testimoniis, quæ ex ipsis fontibus hausta ac diligenter adducta sunt, perspicuitate atque aliis virtutibus. Ac quamvis auctor, iis addictus, qui in Anglia pro episcoporum auctoritate pugnant, ad horum sententias veteris ecclesiæ instituta trahat ; animi tamen moderationem, quum in his rebus versatur, ostendit ac si quæ corrigenda sunt facile fieri potest emendatio.”—WALCHII *Bibliotheca Theologica*, vol. iii. p. 671.

The *Quarterly Review*, in an article on Christian Burial, says, “This is traced by Bingham with his usual erudition ;” and in speaking of Psalmody in the early

Christian Church, "of this Bingham produces abundant evidence." And, again, in an article on the architecture of early Christian Churches, "much information on this subject is collected in the *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* of Bingham, a writer who does equal honour to the English clergy and to the English nation, and whose learning is to be equalled only by his moderation and impartiality.—Vols. xxi. xxvii. xxxviii.

"Let Bingham be consulted where he treats of such matters as you meet with, that have any difficulty in them."—DR. WATERLAND'S *Advice to a Young Student*.

"This is an invaluable treasure of Christian antiquities, and deserves the first place in works of this kind: the plan and the execution do equal honour to the learning and industry of the author."—ORME, *Bibliotheca Biblica*.

"A vast body of information respecting the first Christian Churches, and full of valuable learning on the early state of the Church."—BICKERSTETH.

"The reverend and learned Mr. Bingham, in that elaborate work of his, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*," &c.—WALL on *Infant Baptism*.

It is also recommended to be studied by Bishops Blomfield, Van Mildert, Tomline, Randolph, and Coleridge; by Dr. Burton, and in the Tracts for the Times, publishing at Oxford.

To those unacquainted with the value of the work, it may be useful to give an analysis of the twenty-three books of which the *Antiquities* is composed:—

- I. Of Christianity in general; the Names and Orders of both Clergy and Laity.
- II. The Laws of the First Councils.
- III. Of the Inferior Clerical Laws.
- IV. Of the Election and Ordination of the Clergy; Qualifications, &c.
- V. Clerical Privileges, Immunities, and Revenues.
- VI. The Laws and Rules of their Lives, Services, Behaviour, &c.
- VII. Of the Ascetics.
- VIII. Of their Councils, Churches, &c.
- IX. Of the Divisions into Provinces, Dioceses, and Parishes; with the Origin of these Divisions.
- X. Of the Catechisms, and first use of Creeds.
- XI. On the Administration of Baptism.
- XII. On Confirmation.
- XIII. Of Divine Worship in the Ancient Congregations.
- XIV. Of the Service of the Catechumens.
- XV. Of the Communion Service.
- XVI. Of the Unity and Discipline of the Church.
- XVII. Of the Exercise and Discipline among the Clergy.
- XVIII. Of the Penitential Laws and Rules for doing Public Penance.
- XIX. Of Absolution.
- XX. On the Festivals.
- XXI. On the Fasts.
- XXII. On the Marriage Rites.
- XXIII. On the Funeral Rites.

With Four Dissertations. In the first three, those things only briefly described in his *Antiquities* are more fully explained. In the fourth, he defends the English Homilies, Liturgy, and Canons, from domestic adversaries, and particularly the French Reformers.

To this Edition is subjoined, at the foot of each page, in full, the *Greek and Latin Authorities to which Bingham appeals*, in lieu of merely the References as given in former Editions. This valuable addition will save much time to those Scholars who possess the very numerous Works referred to, and much expense and trouble to those who have not access to extensive libraries.



21  
7-0  
7  
V. 5

**THE LIBRARY**  
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
Santa Barbara

---

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE  
STAMPED BELOW.**

---

Series 9482



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**AA** 000 249 049 8

