Word, tho' so many Years since. Well, what say they? It seems Dr. Duck, then my Chancellor, had cited the Church-warards into my Court; therefore either there was, or at least to his Judgment there seemed to be somewhat done in that Business against the Jurisdiction of the Church. They say then, that the Court ended, Dr. Duck brought them to me. And what then? Here is a Caufe, by their own confession, depending in the Ecclesioculum Court; Dr. Duck in the King's Quar- ters, where I cannot fetch him to testify; no Means left me to know what the Proceedings were; and I have good cause to think, that were all the Merits of the Caufe open before your Lordships, you would say, Sir Thos. Duckes did not accord to Law. But what is the Heart of this Charge? It is, say they, That I commanded Dr. Duck to prosecute them. And what fault was in this? For if it were just, why should not Dr. Duck go on with his Prosecution? If Dr. Duck and I were both misfaken in the Particular, 'twas easy getting a Prohibition. Yea, but they say I did, If this swt be so, Sir Thomas Duckes shall be Bishop of London, and I'll be Sir Tho. Duckes. For ought I see in the Weight of it, this whole Charge was but to bring in this Speech. And truly, my Lords, my old dec'dai Memory is not such, as I can recall a Speech three or fourteen Years since. But if I did say it, I profuse 'tis not High-Town, I remember as much, as Sir Thos. Duckes. Mr. Browne, in the summation up the Charge against me, laid the Weight of the Charge in this, That these Church-warards were prosecuted for executing the Warrant of a Justice of Peace upon an Aile-houfe Keoper, for tip- pinging on the Sabbath-Day, contrary to the Statutes Sec. 7. & Carr. 3. To which I answered, That those Statutes did concern the Aile-houfe Keepers only; nor were the Church-warards called in question for that; but because being Church-officers, and a Church-man tipping there, they did not comply of that to the Chan- cellor of the Diocess. Mr. Browne replied, There I am of a mind I was, and they were misfaken. But that excuseth not the Church- warards, who being Church-officers, should have been as ready to inform the Bishop, as to obey the Justice of Peace.

IV. The fourth Inference was about Marriages in the Tower, which I oppofe about Law. The Witnesses Sir William Balfour, then Lieutenant of the Tower. He says, that I did oppofe tho'fe Marriages; And fo fay I. But I did it for the Sub- ject of England's fade: for many of their Sons and Daughters were there undone. Nor Banes, nor Licences, nor any Means of Forfe-Knowledge to prevent it. Was this ill? He fays, That when he fpake with me about it, I defired him to fpake with his Majefly about it, because it was the King's Houfe. What could I do with more moderation? He confefles he did fo, and that he moved the King that the Caufe might be heard at the Council-Table, nor at the High-Commission. To this his Majefly inclined, and I oppofed nothing, fo the general Abufe might be rectified. Then he fays, Mr. Attorney Mgfe did at the Council-Table, it was the King's free Chapel, and that no Pope in those Times offered to hinder there. First, if Mr. Attorney did fo, he muft have leave to fpake freely in the King's Caufe. Secondly, (as I humbly conceive) the Chapel for ordinary Use of Prisoners and Inhabitants of the Tower, where these disorderly Marriages are made, is not that which is called the King's free Chapel; but another, in the fide of the White Tower by the King's Lodgings. Thirdly, if it be, yet I have here none offended, for it was the King's Leave, not by any Allufion of Pope or Power. Then he calls the Lords, That in a Dis- cours of mine with him at Greenwich, about this Business, I let fall an Oath. I am forry for it, if I did, but that's no Trefon. And I know when the Deponent thinks to pleafe by this Intervi- sion: for to the Matter it belongs not. In conclu- sion, he fays truly, That the King committed the Business to Lords and Judges, that in an end might be put to it; and in the mean time ordered, that till it were ended, there should be no more Marriages in the Tower. How this Business ended, I know not. It began, I am free, by Authority of his Majefly's Grant of the High Commission, to question and punish all fuch Ab- ues, Iam in locis exemplis, quos non exempt; And his Majefly having graciously taken this Care for the Indemnity of the Subject, I troubled myfelf no more with it; my Aim being not to cut off any Privileges of that Place, but only to prevent the Abuses of that lawlefs Custom. And if it be knew to be a confiderable Circumstance, as it does to be in all fuch Business, then may it be thought on too, that the Gentleman the Lord the Sea- fcon came to the Table in the Caufe of the Abufe of the Fee of every Marriage. Which I believe was as dear to him as the Privilege.

V. The next Inference is broke out of the Tower, and got as far as Oxford. The Witnesses, Alderman Nixon. He fays, The Mayor, and the Watchman by him, were disturbed by the Professors of the University, and a Confable imprompt. The Night-Walk, and the keeping of the Watch, is the antient, known, and confant Privilege of the University for fome Hundred of Years; and in the Watch fet by the Town (purpoftly to pick a Quarrel) was not according to Law. He adds, That when the Right Honourable the Earl of Berkifhe would have refus'd the Bifhop to the King's Counfel learned, I refuf'd, and faid, I would maintain it by my own Power, as Chancellor. If I did fay this (which I neither remember nor believe) I might be better refus'd Lawyers, (not the Law, but Lawyers) than they a fworm Judge of their own Nomination, which they did.

The Cafe was briefly this. There were fome five or fix Particulars which had, for divers Years, bred much Trouble and Difagreement between the University and the City; of which (to my best remembrance) this was about the Night-Watch, and the keeping of the Watch, which the Mayor's fent as chief. The University complained to me. I was fo far from going any By-way, that I was refus'd upon a Trial at Wiftfraver Hall, thinking (as I after faw) that nothing but a legal Trial would fet two Bodies at quiet. The Townfime liked not this; came fome of the chief of them to London, prevailed with their Honourable Servant our Lord the Earl of Berkifhe, to come to me to Lambeth, and, by his Lordship, offered to have all ended without to great a Charge at Law, by reference to any of the Judges. I said I had no mind to wrong the Town, or put them to charge; but thought they would fly off forward; and therefore offered a legal Trial. After this, fome of the chief Aldermen came to me with my Lord, and offer'd me, That if the University
University would do the like, they would go down and bring it up under the Mayor and Aldermen's Hands, that they would stand to such end as Judge Jones, who rode that Circuit, should, upon Hearing, make. They wrote to, and sent the Paper to undersigne; (and therefore I think Aldermen New's Hand is it as well as the rest:) Upon this I gave way; the University accepted; the Judge heard and settled. And now when they saw my Troubles threatening me, they brake all, whipped up their Recorder to come and complain at the Council-Table, his Majely present. And I remember well, I told his Lordship, (then making the aforesaid Motion to refer to the King's learned) that Lordship knew what he had passed; and that being so used as I had been by the Townsmen, I would trouble myself with no more References to Lawyers, or to that effect. And I appeal to the Honour of my Lord, whether this be not a true Relation.

VI. The sixth Inflation concerns the putting of one Mr. Grant out of his Right. He says, (but he is single, and in his own Counse') That Mr. Bridges was presented to an Imperialion; and that saying for himself, he got a Prohibition, and Mr. Bridge's a Reference to the then Lord Keeper Coventry and myself: That we referred them to the Law, and that there Grant was nonsuited, and so out of his Right. First, In all this there's nothing fait to be done by me alone. Secondly, The Lord Keeper, who well understood the Law, thought it fittest to refer them to the Law; and so we did. If he were there nonsuited first, and out after, it was the Law that put him out. Yet your Lordships see here was a Prohibition given at a Cafe, which the Law itself after rejected.

VII. Then follows the Inflation, That I had a purpose to abolish all Imperialions. The first Proof alluded was a Paffage out of Bishop Montague's Book, p. 210. That Tythes were due by Divine Right, and then no Imperialions might stand. And Mr. Pryse winnelled very carefully, that this Book was found in my own Study, and given me by Bishop Montague. And what of this? Does any Bishop (said Grant) in a Prohibition, or Archbishop one of them? Or must I order for every Proposition that is in every Book that is in my Study, or that any Author gives me? And if Bishop Montague be of Opinion that Tythes are due by Divine Right, what is that to me? Your Lordships know many Men are of different Opinions in that Difficulty; and I am confident you will not determine the Controversy by an Act of Parliament. They were absolving at this time in my Diary, that they meant to bring one of my Projects to fetch in Imperialions; but it was not fit for their purpose: For 'tis expresst, That if I lived to see the Repair of St. Paul's near an end, I would move his Majesty for the like Grant for the buying in of Imperialions. And to buy them from the Owners, is neither against Law, nor against any thing else that is good; nor is it any usurpation of Papal Power.

2. The second Proof was my procuring from the King such Imperialions as in Ireland, as were in the King's Power, to the Church of Ireland. "Which Mr. Nicolas (in his gentle Language) "calls Robbing of the Crown." My Lords, the Cafe was this. The Lord Primate of Armagh writ unto me, how ill conditioned the State of that Church was for want of Means; and befought me that I would move his Majesty to give the Imperialions there, which yet remained in the Crown, for the Maintenance and Encouragement of able Ministry, to live among the People, and instruct them; afflicting me, they were daily one by one beggared away by private Lists, to the great Prejudice both of Crown and Church. And the Truth of this, the Lord Primate is now in this Kingdom, and will witness. I acquainted the King's great Officers, the Lord Treasurer, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer with it. And after long Deliberation, the King was pleased, at my humble Suit, to grant them in the Way which I proposed in my Propositions. That when they came into the Clergy's Hands, they should pay all the Rest respectively to the King, and some Consideration for the several Renewings. And the Truth of this appears in the Decs: So here was no Robbery of the Crown. For the King had all the Rest referred to a Penny, and Consideration for his Casualties beside. And, my Lords, the Increas of Popery is complained of in Ireland: Is there a better way to hinder this Growth, than to place an able Clergy among the Inhabitants? Can an able Clergy be had without Means? Is any Means better than Imperialions reformed? My Lords, I did this, as holding it the best Means to keep down Popery and to advance the Protestant Religion. And I with all my Heart I had been able to do it sooner, before so many Imperialions were gorged from the Crown into private Hands.

VIII. Next I was charged with another Project in my Diary, which was to settle some Orders upon all the smaller Bishops. For this, the Bishops Diney, bun, &c., in their own Means were too small to live and keep any Hospitality, little exceeding Four or five hundred Pounds a Year. I considered that the Commandments taken at large and far distant, caufed a great Dislike and Murmur among many Men; that they were in some Cafes Materia eligibilis, and justly complained of. And hereupon I thought it a good Church-Work to settle some Temporal Leave, or some Benefits, Free Carls, upon the Just Bishops, but nothing but such as was in their Own Right, and Patronage, that so no other Man's Patronage might receive Prejudice by the Bishop's Commandments: Which was not the least Rock of Offence, against which Commandments endanger'd themselves. And that this was my Intent and Endeavour, is exprest in my Diary; and I cannot be forry for it.

IX. Then I was accused for setting old Popish Canons above the Laws. Mr. Burton is the Iole Witness. He says, it was in a Cafe about a Pew, in which those Canons did weigh down an Act of Parliament; * I did never think till now Mr. Bur- ton would have made any Canons Pew-Fellows * with an Act of Parliament. But seriously, should not Mr. Burton's Testimony for this have been produced at the second Inflation of this Day? For in the end of that is just such another Charge; and the Answer there will be fully toConfirm this, and that by Act of Par- liament too.

X. After this came a Charge with a great Outcry: That since my coming to be Archbishop, I had renewed the High-Communion, and put in many illegal and exorbitant Clauses, which were not in the former. Both the Committions were produced. Upon this, I humbly declared that the
the Docket might be read, by which their Lordships might see all those Particulars which were added in the new Commission, and to be able to judge how fit or unfit they were to be added. The Docket was read and there was no particular found, but such as highly deserved Punishment, and were of Ecclesiastical Cognizance: as Blasphemy, Schism, and two or three more of like nature.

1. In this Charge, the first orbitant Clause they inflicted on, as added to the new Commission, was the Power given in Laici Equestri, & non Equestri, as if it were thereby intended to destroy all Privileges. No, not to destroy any Privileges, but to suffer enormous Sins to have any Privileges. Besides, this Clause hath ever been in all Commissions that ever were granted. And I then showed it to the Lords in the old Commission there present, p. 28, 32, 35, 42. Nay more, this Pro-cceeding too in Laici Equestri quae non Equestri, is allowed to the Governors of the Church, in the Exercise of their Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, by Act of Parliament in 3 Eliz. c. 2.

2. The second Clause was Power to censure, by Fine and Imprisonment. This also I showed in the old Commission, Fol. 37, and is (I conceive) in plain purview of the Act of Parliament upon which the High-Commission is grounded. For the King says there, Fol. 13, and (as 'tis in the new) that he grants this Power by virtue of his Supreme Authority, and Prerogative Royal, and (as is added in this latter Commission) By any Authority Ecclesiastical, which is not expresssed in the former. And sure I would never have had that Authority Ecclesiastical to be added, had I any Plot (as 'tis urged) either to exalt the Clergy above the Laity, or to upur Papal Power; which all Men know is far enough from ascribing Ecclesiastical Authority to the King. And as for Fine and Imprisonment, if that Power be not according to Law, why was it first admitted, and after continued in all former Commissions?

3. The third Clause was the Non Obstant, which, he said was against all Law, and of such a boundless extent, as was never found in any Commission or other Grant in England. And he here defined the Lords that he might read it, which he did, with great Affluence of a Triumph. But after all this Noise which Mr. Nicolas had made, I shewed the fame Non Obstant in the Old Commission, Fol. 62. word for word, which I humbly defined might be read and compared: It was so. The Lords looked strangely upon it; Mr. Nicolas was so flattered, that he had not patience to fly till his Reply, (which he faw impossible to be made) but interrupted me, and had the face to fly in that Honourable Assembly, That I need not stand upon that: for he did but name that, without much regarding it. And yet at the giving of the Charge, he inflicted principally upon that Clause, and in his Answer and Laws Terms that are before expresssed. Had such an Advantage been found against me, I should have been accounted extremely nugent, if I compared not the Commissions together; or extremely impudent, if I did.
cannot be imputed to me, who took all the care I could to have it beyond Exception. And I marvel what Security any Man shall have, that adventures upon any great and publick Work in this Kingdom, if such Counsel cannot be trusted for drawing up of his Warrant. And whereas it was said, This Patent for the ten Years space took away both Justice and Mercy from the King, that's nothing more: For whatever the Words be, to enable me the better for that Work, yet these being imperspicuous from him, may be used by him, notwithstanding finding this or any other Patent. And if these be imperspicuous, (as'tis granted they are) no inexeplicable thing can be taken away if it be taken, is void in Law, and the King is where he was in the Exercise of his Right, but for Justice and Mercy. And so I answered Mr. Brooke's summary Charge against me. And as for that which the further urged concerning Str. Gregory's Church, Mr. Edge Jones and others were trusted with what whole Buinefs, and were confir'd for it in this present Parliament. In all which Examination no part of the Charge fall on me. And because here are so many things urged about Free-Chapels, Lay-Fee, Patronates, Appeals, and the like, I humbly d'fire a Sales may be enter'd for me; and that my Counsel may be heard for Matter of Law, if any Doubt exists with your Lordships.

This Day ended, I did, according to my Resolution formerly taken, move the Lords for Means, confedering my Charge in coming, and how oft I had attended, and was not heard. Their Lordships considered of my Motion, and sent me out of the House I should petition them. I did humbly petition their Lordships, May 6. My Petition was presently sent down to the House of Commons, that fo by both Houses it might be recommended to the Commons for Scotlandians. But upon a Speech in the House of Commons, that it was fit to be what would become of me, before they troubled themselves with thinking of Means for me, my Petition was cast aside.

At my parting from the House, I was ordered to appear again on Thursday, May 9, but then fairly put off by an Order (sent to the Lieutenant of the Tower, to Monday, May 13). So the Scorn and Charge of the Day was Kepler. But then I appeared according to this Order, and had Scorn and Charge, for what I escaped the Day before: And, as was my Attendance, was dismissed again unheard; and bad Thursday, May 16, applied unto me. That Day held, and proceeded thus.

The Ninth Day of my Hearing.

May 16, 1664. The first Charge of this Day was about a Reversion of the Town Clerk's Office of Sherborne to one Mr. Ann, which he denied might be infected into the new Charter. First, Mr. Lee is a Jingle here, and in his own Cafe. Secondly, it appears by his own Confession, out of the Mouth of Mr. Bernard, that there was a Reference of this Business to those Lords to whom Sherborne Charter was referred; For he says, That Mr. Bernard told him his Business was fayled, and he thought by me; but did not know whether the Lord Keeper's Hand were not in it. So it seems by himself; this was done by the Lords' Referrees, and not by me. Thirdly, I did not then think, nor do now, that the Reversion of a Place, to be sold for three hundred Pound, (as he confesseth that was) was fit to be put into a Town-Charter. But yet neither, I, nor the Lord Keeper, did any thing in that Stop, but what we acquiesced his Majesty with, and had his Approbation of. And whereas he says, That he acquiesced the Right thereof in the Earl of Shaftesbury with the Stay that was made, and that thereupon his Lordship should say, Have we two Kings? I cannot believe that Honourable Lord would so say, unless he were much abashed by Mr. Le.'s Information, both in regard of his Love to me, and in regard it could not proceed from a Man of so great a Judgment as that Lord is. For I befeech your Lordships consider, may not Lords, to whom a Buinefs is referred, give his Majesty good Reason to alter his Mind in some Particulars, in which they have debated, and not be? And may not this be done without any one of them taking on him to be a second King? If. The second Charge was laid on me by Sir Arthur Hoptaifol, (which should have come in the Day before, as Mr. Nicolaes said, but that Sir Ar- thur was absent in the necessary Service of the State.) Sir Arthur, beingingle and in his own Cafe, says, That Sir John Lombe presented a blind Parson to a living of his. If Sir John did that, or anything to the like, I myself am the Man, and answer for himself. He says further, That this Living is an Impropriation, and so a Lay-Fee by Law; and that when he told me so much, I made him this Answer, That if I did, no Man should cause or permit any Lay-Fee. I conceive, my Lords, here's a great Miftake in the main: For I have been credibly informed, and do believe, that Benefice is preterentative, and so no Lay-Fee. And then there's no Fault to protest unto it, so the Clerk be fit. Secondly, there's a main Miftake, I believe, which I remember well, and where it was that I spoke them. My Words, under this Gentleman's Favour, and your Lordships, were theft, and no other; That I had good Information that the Benefice was preterentative, and that if I lived, I hoped to order it so, that no Man should make a preterentative Benefice a Lay-Fee; there were too many of them already. Thirdly, If I did speak the Words as they are charged, if they come within that Statute of Six Months, which I mention before my self, when I showed the Bird at this time of the Year, as Mr. Nicolaes was pleased to put it upon me. And truly, My Lords, I could easily return all his Bitterness upon himself, could it but my Perfon, my present Condition, or my Calling. III. The third Charge was about the Refuling of a Pardon, which Mrs. Bajfowick said the produced in the High-Communion Court some nine or ten Years since: And the adds, That I should then say, it should not serve his turn. But this was no rejecting of the Pardon; for the Lord would move his Majesty about it. So that if it did not serve his turn, it was from the King himself, upon Motion made, and Reafon given, not from any Power alluminated by the High-Communion or myself. And the Act, whatever it were, was the Act of the whole Court not mine. As for the Words, if mine) I give the same Answer as before, notwithstanding Mr. Nicolaes his Bird. IV. The fourth Charge was, That whereas there was a Proclamation printed about the Pacification with the Scots, it was suddenly stopp'd; and an Order after for burning the Pacification. First, Mr. Huxer is Jingle in this Charge. Secondly,
Secondly, Whatsoever was done in this, was by Order of Council: And himself names an Order, which could not come from me. Thirdly, He charges me with nothing but that I sent word the Proclamation was to be stayed; which, if I did, I did it by Command. Howsoever, this concerns the Sect of Buinsefs, and therefore to the Act of Obligation I refer myself. With this, that I see by this Tefimony, Mr. Houghtor for (I took his Name uncertainly) hath not yet forgotten, Thos. Hall commis Adultery; so fideles he is to catch me at the Pref. V. The first Charge was about a Benefice in Northampton, in the Cafe of Mr. Fryatry and Mr. Johnfon, and Dr. Beal's succecing them. In which broken Buinweather (for such it was) Tirt, That Buinsefs was all along acted by the High-Commion, not by me. Secondly, That though in the Cafe of Simony the Benefice be jott, Ippofe, yet that must be prov'd before the Incumbrand can be thruf up, and another inluyed, els Churchmen were in amiable Condion for their Livelihood. Excommunciation is in many Cafes void in Law, Ippofe; and yet, ante Ianu Sen- timentum, till Sentence be orderly pronounced against it, no Man shall be subjuid to those fearful Consequences which follow upon it. And upon this ground of natural Equity, that in the Statute concerning the Uniformity of Common-Prayer proceeds: Where 'tis said, That Eho. c. 2. A Party once convicted for defying the Common Prayer-Book, and eluating into the fame Crime, shall be deprived of all his Spiritual Promotions, Ippofe Gofio. But how without any legal Procedur: Does it? No, Gibb forbids: For that, preceded immediately in the Statute, are, That he must be first legally convicted of that criminal Relapse; and then follows Ippofe, and not before. And therefore the Superinftitution, before the Simony tried and judged, was illegal; befide the great danger to the Parihioners, while two Parhons, and their several Friends are scrambling for the Tythes. Seco. Fryatry, was not centred for the original Caufe of Simony, but for an Intruder, and Colluder too rone with James, to abufe the King's Grant of the Benefice. Thirdly, It feems Froyatry had a better Opinion of his own Cause: For he went to his Benefice in Tertius, and yet not till the Time on foot again till after seven Years; and that, I think, was when he heard that Mr. Johnfon was a Pretender to it. And his Bond upon the Sentence was to make a final Peace. For the Prohibition, which he fays was refufed, I have anfwered that before, in the Charge about Prohibitions. Besides, it appears by a Law, that as Prohibitions may be granted in some Cafes, fo in some Cafes they may be refufed. For Dr. Beal, there is not the leaft fwear of Proof offered, that I brought him in, if to do fo be a Crime. Thus far Mr. Fryatry went. As for Mr. Johnfon's Title, he fays, That the Lords order'd it for him, and declared that we in the High-Commion could put no Man out of his Frethold. Where first, if your Lordhips have order'd this Buinweather, I muft crave to know how far I fhall have leave to speak to it: For if there be any Errors charged upon the Sentence given in the High-Commion, if they may not be spoken to, they cannot be fa- tisfied. This I am fur of, the Commion hath Power to deprive: For the Statute gives it Power to use all Ecclefial and Spiritual Cenfures; of which De- privation is known to be one: And that Power is expressly given to deprive some Offenders of all their Spiritual Promotions, by the fol- lowing Statute. Therefore I think it follows necifarily, either that we have Power over Frethold in that Cafe, or else that a Benefice is not a Frethold. But I have no reason, howsoever, to speak any thing (we shall never go free) against your Lordship's Order, which, very honourably left Dr. Beal to the Law; as is confeded by Johnfon.

Besides two in their own Caufe, one Mr. Jenkyns is produced; but to what end I know not, unless it be to bedazzle Dr. Beal. He fays, That seven Years fince Dr. Beal was Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge; that in his Sermon then he inveigh'd bitterly againft the Power of Parliaments, and ac- cused some unfavourable Speeches of his, both concerning their Porions and Proceedings. Surely, if Dr. Beal did as is related, he was much to blame. But what is this to thefe? If be be it I did not pun him: How could I punish that I knew not? And I profess I heard none of it till now at Bar. If it be laid I did prefer him; that I do absolutely deny. And neither Mr. Jenkyns, nor any other, offers the leaft Proof that I knew the one, or did the other.

VI. The fith Charge was concerning the Statues of the Universit of Oxford; in which, and the Cathedrals of the new Erection, Mr. Nicolaafs I fays I took on me to be an univerfal Law-giver. Many fuch Offices he bellows upon me, which God knows, and I believe he too, that I never af- feoted. No, my Lords, the great Necessity of this Method is, that the Cafes are in Statutes lay in a miserable confufed Hift. When any Difficulty crep, they knew not where to look for Remedy or Direction. Then into the Convocation-Houfe, and make a new Statue; and that many times proved contrary to an old one concerning the fame Buinweather: Men in the mean time, sworn to both, which could not poftibly be kept together. By this means Perjury was in a manner unavoidable: And themselves confefs in their Regifter, (which is now in Court) that till this was done, they did in a fort fercar, that they might be fome.
in my hands? nor is it so much as said they were. 

And since I withdrew to make my Answer, I have viewed the Record, and an Alteration or Addi-
tion there is; and 'tis a known Hand. 'Tis Dr. 
Drapo's Hand, now Lord Bishop of Salisbury, and 
then Vice-Chancellor; but it is 
able to give a good account of what he said therein, 
and why.

And for o'ertop appears, 'tis nothing but 
the remedement of some slip, which their ignorant 
Regiffer French had failed in, and the Vice-Chan-
cello thought it safest to mend with his own Hand. 

And for my own part, if ever I did anything worth 
Thanks from the Publick in all my Life, I did it in 
this Work for that University. And I with all 
my Heart the Times were so open, that as I 
might have the University's Testimony both of me and 
its. Since I cannot be a great Lord, prelate in 
the House then this Charge was laid against me, 

supplied in part their Absence; for he was over-
heard to say to another Lord, I think my Lord 
Archbishops both doe good Work in all his Life, 
but these Men will object it as a Crime against him 
before they have done.'

With this Charge about the Statutes it was let 
fall, (and I well know why, it was to be a No-
ble Person then prefer,) That I procured my-
self to be chosen Chancellor of that University.
If I had so done, it might have been a great Am-
bition in me, but surely no Treason. But, my 
Lords, I have Proof great force, might be enabled 
to fetch it from Oxford, that I was so far from en-
deavouring to procure: this Honour to myself, as 
that I laboured by my Letters for another. And 
'tis well known, that when they had chosen me, I 
went instantly to his Majesty, so soon as ever I 
heard it, and humbly besought him that I might 
refuse it, as well foregoing the Envoy that would 
follow me for it, and it did plentifully every way. 
But this for some Reasons his Majesty would not 
 suffer me to do.

Then were objected against me divers Particulars 
contained in those Statutes: As, First, The making 
of new Oaths. The Charters of the University 
are not new, and they gave Power to make Sta-
tutes for themselves, and they have ever been upon 
Oath. Secondly, The next Inlegity is, That Men 
are tied to obey the Proctors in linging the Litany. 
This is antient, and in use long before ever I 
came to the University; and it is according to the 
Li-
tury of the Church of England, established by 
Law. Thirdly, The Statute of Banniation from 
the University. But there is nothing more antient 
in the University-Statutes than this. Fourthly, 
That nothing should be proposed in Convocation, 
but what was confecuted unto among the Heads of 
 Colleges first; which was laid to be against the Li-
 berty of the Students. The young Masters of Arts, 
void of Experience, were grown so tumultuous, that 
no Peace could be kept in the University, till 
my worthy Predecessor, the Right Honourable 
Williams Earl of Pembroke, settled this Order among 
them: As he did also, upon the same grounds, 
fette the present way of the Choice of their Pro-
ctors. In both which I did but follow and confirm 
(for so much as lay in me) the good and peaceable 
Grounds which he had laid in those two Bannfines.

And Mr. Browne, who, in the summing up of my 
Charge, urged this against me, mainly milked 
it in two Things. The one was, That he said this 
Inhibition of Proposals was in Congregations; 
wheras it was only in Convocations, where 
more weighty Bannfines are handled. The other 
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was, That this fly of Proposals was made till I 
me might be first acquainted with them. No; it was 
but till the Heads of Colleges had met, and con-
sidered of them, for avoiding tumultuary Pro-
cceedings. And when my Honourable Predecess-
for made that Order, it was highly recommended 
every where: And is it now degenerating into a 
Crime, because it is made up into a Statute? 5

Fifthly, That some Things are referred to arbi-
trary Penalties. And that some Things are of refer-
red, is usual in that University, and many Colleges 
have a particular Statute for it: Nor is this any 
more Power than ordinary School-Masters have, 
which have not a Statute-Law for every Punish-
ment they use in Schools. And in divers things 
the old known Statute is, That the Vice-Chancel-
lor shall proceed gruffly in it, that is, without the 
regular Forms of Law, for the more speedy ending 
of Differences among the Scholars.

Sixthly, That the Statute made by 
me against Conventicles is very strict; 
But for thefe that Statute is expres de illicitis 
Conventiculis; and I hope such as are unlawful 
may be both forbid and punished. Besides, it is 
according to the Charter of Richard the Second to 
that University. Seventhly, The first was the 
Power of dismissing Men, which before never 
ever been in power and in usage in that University, 

as is commonly known to all Oxford Men: And no

longer since than King James his Time, Bishop 
King, then Vice-Chancellor, dismissed three or 
four Townsmen together. Eighthly, That 
Students were bound to go to Prifon upon the 
Vice-Chancellor's, or Proctor's Command. This 
also was antient, and long before my coming to 
the University. And your Lordships may be sure 
the Delegacy, appointed by themselves, would have not 
then been so tinct and usual. Ninthly, and la-

ly. 'Tis 9. § 2. 

About the fly of granting Gras-
ces, unless there were Teltimnity from the Bishop 
of the Diocese. This was for no Graces, but of 
such as live not resident in the University, and so 
they could not judge of their Manners and Con-
version. And for their Conformity to the 
Church of England, none (as I conceive) can be 
safer Witness's than the Bishop of the Diocese 
in which they reside. As such for all Lords, for these 
thus directed by some of their own Body, I obtained 
of his Majesty his Broad-Seal for Confirmation 
and therefore no one thing in them is by any 
Assumpton of Papal Power, as 'tis urged; but by 
the King's Power only. As for the Statues 
them selves, there was scarce one urged against 
me, but it was either a Statute or a Prefcription 
that University long before I was born into 
the World, and could not therefore be of my 
new making. And ther to Mr. 
Browne, in the House of Commons. And such 
Bannition, Discommuning, and the like, are 
well known to be.'

VII. Then followed the seventh Charge, About 
the Statutes of some Cathedal Churches. First, 
my Lords, for this, I did it by Letters-Patents 
from the King, bearing date Mar. 31. diecio Ca-
rosis, and is extant upon Record. And all that was 
done, was per juris remedia, and to nothing mov-
ead against Law, nor done, that was in no 
way. They had extreme need of Statutes, for all lay loose for want 
of Confirmation, and Men did what they liked; 
And I could not but obverse it; for I was D-an 
of Gloucesterc, where I found it so. In seeking to re-
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medly this, I had nothing but my Labour for my Pains; and now this Accumulation to boot. The Particulars urged are, 1. That I had ordered that nothing should be done in these Statutes, except for the Benefit of the Church. 2. That I was principally trusted in that Work by his Majesty, the King, if any Complaint were made, would expect the Account from me. And how could I give it, if other Men might do all, and I not be so much as consulted before they pilled? 2. That I made a Statute against letting Leaves into three Lives. But first, my Lords, the Statute which makes it lawful to let Leaves for one and twenty Years, or three Punjab, Lives, hath this Limitation in it, that they be not for more than three Years them are limited by the four Colleges or Churches. Now in Winchester-Church, and some other, the old Local Statute is more plain, that they shall let no Leaf into Lives. Let the Dean and Prebendaries answer their own Acts, and their Consciences, as they can. And in those Statutes which I did not find pregnant to that purpose, I did not make the Statute absolute, but left them free to renew all such Leaves as were antiently in Lives before. And this give me Leave to say to your Lordships without offence: If but a few more Leaves be granted into Lives, no Bishop nor Cathedral Church shall be able to subsist. And this is considerable also, that, as the Statute of the Church yet stands, the Bishop, for the benefit of the Local and the Diocesan, which they hold, of more than five parts of all the Bishops, Deans and Chapters, and College Revenues in England. And shall it be yet an Eye-fare to serve themselves with the rest of their own? This Evidence Mr. Brewer, whose part it was to fain up the Evidence against me at the end of the Charge wholly omitted: for what caufe, he best knew.

VIII. The next Charge was about my Injunctions in my Visitation of Winton and Sarum, for the taking down of some Houses. But they were such as were in a concreated Ground, and ought not to have been built there; and yet with Caution sufficient to the very letter, and free from over-much Damage. For it appears upon Ota, that they were not to be pulled down till their several Leaves were expired. And that they were Houses not built long since, but by them; and that all this was to be done, to the end that the Church might suffer no damage by them: and that this Demolition was to be made justa Decreta Regni, according to the Statutes of the Kingdom. Therefore nothing enjoined contrary to Law: or if any thing were, the Injunction not took place, by the very Tenor of that which was charged. Mr. Brewer omitted this Charge also, though he hung heavily upon the like at St. Paul’s, though there was which were not removed for it. 

IX. The ninth Charge was my intended Visitation of both the Universities, Oxford and Cambridge. For my Troubles began then to be foreseen by me, and I visited them not. 1. This was urged as a thing directly against Law. But this I conceive cannot be, so long as it was with the King’s Knowledge, and by his Warrant. 2. Secondly, Because all Power of the King’s Visitation was lived in the Warrant, and that with consent of all Parts. 3. Thirdly, Because nothing in this was irrepealable given from the King, all being done first at the Council-Tabs, and the great Council at Law heard on both Sides. 4. Fourthly, Because it did there appear, that three of my Predecessors did actually visit the Universities, and that justice Exchequer of Metropolitans. 5. Fifthly, No Immutiny pleaded, why the Archbishop should not visit; for the Influence against Cardinal Pole is nothing. For he attempted to visit, not only by the Right of his See, but by his Power Legal from the Pope; whereas the University-Chairs are express, that such Power of Visitation cannot be granted by Papal Power. * Mr. Brewer wholly neglected this Charge also, which making such a Shew, I think he would not have done, had he found it well grounded.

X. The tenth Charge was my Visitation of Merton-Collage in Oxford. The Witness Sir Nathaniel Brent, the Warden of the College, and principally concerned in that Business. He said,FIRST, That no Visitation held so long. But if he confound his own Office, he may find one much longer, held and continued at Al-Souls-Collage by my worthy Predecessor Archbiishop Wren by. Secondly, He urged that I should reply, I would be in a hurry for such Visitation, where there was such need should make it good. Thirdly, That one Mr. Richard Nevil, fellow of that College, lay abroad in an Ale-house; that a Wench was gone with Child in that House, and he accused it of; and that this was complained of to me. And Sir Nath. Brent accused for concerning with the Ale-Wife against Nevil. I am not here to accuse the one, or defend the other. But the Case is this: This Case betwixt them was publick, and came to Hearing the Vice-Chancellor’s Court, Witnesses examined, Mr. Nevil acquitted, and the Ale-Wife punished. In all this I had no hand. Then in my Visitations it was again complained of to me. I liked not the Business; but fellowage to do and carry in it, in such a cause it had been legally centered upon the Place. This part of the Charge Mr. Brewer urged against me in the House of Commons, and I gave it the name Anwer. Lastly, When I sat to hear the main Business of that College, Sir Nathaniel Brent was beholden to me that he continued Warden. For in Archbiishop Warham’s time, a Predecessor of his was expelled for less than was proved against him. And I found that true which one of my Visitors had formerly told me, namely, That Sir Nathaniel Brent had for carried him in that College, as that if he were guilty of the like, he would lay his Key under the Door, and be gone, rather than come at a trial. Yet I don’t think it fit to proceed so rigorously. But while I was going to open some of the Particulars against him, Mr. Nicholas cut me off from the Lords, this was to scandalize their Witnesses. So I forbear.

XI. Then followed the last Charge of this Day, concerning a Book of Dr. Boffwicke’s, for which he was cenured in the High-Cummission. The Witness

* The Archbishop had collected many Papers, Decrees, and Proceedings, to effect his Privilege of visiting the Universities, in Right of his See, about the Year 1533. Which being joined to an Essay, among a number of Papers as Lambeth, were by him, after the Archbiishop’s Death, published in his own Name, with this Title, The Plea of the University of Oxford edited, &c. London 1637. eight Sheets in 4to. H. W.
nefies in this Charge were three. Mr. Burtin, a mortal Enemy of mine, and so he hath showed himself: Mrs. Boitwick a Woman and a Wife, and whereunto: for she had a Paper and all written which she had to say: tho' I saw it not till too late. And Mr. Hugieft, a Man that comes in to serve all turns against me, since the Sentence passed against the Printers for Thou shalt commit Adultery.

In the Particulars of this Charge, 'tis first said, That this Book was written contra Episcopos Latinae. But how cunningly never this was pretended, 'tis more than manifest, it was purposely written and divulged against the Bishops and Church of England. Secondly, That I said that Christian Bishops were before Christian Kings: So Burtin and Mrs. Boitwick. And with the Reverence to all Kings Authority be it spoken, who can doubt but that there were many Christian Bishops, before any King was Christian? Thirdly, Mr. Burtin says, That I applied those Words in the Psalm, Whom thou mayst make Prices in all Lands, to the Bishops.

For this, if I did err in it, many of the Fathers of the Church mislead me, who interpret that place to: And if I be mistaken, 'tis no Traiton. But I shall ever follow their Comments before Mr. Burtin. Fourthly, Mrs. Boitwick says that I then said, No Bishop, and no King. If I truly, I learned it of a noble Author, Mr. Inglion, King James, who spake it out and plainly in the Conference at Hampton-Court. And I hope it cannot be Treason to me in to repeat it. Fiftith, Mrs. Boitwick complained, That I committed her Husband close Prisoner. Not I, but the High-Commission, not close Prisoner in his Chamber, but to the Prision, not to go abroad with his Keeper; which is all the close Imprisonment which I ever knew that Court use. Lastly, The Punche of this Charge, is, That I said I received my Jurisdiction from God, and from Christ contrary to an Act of Parliament, which says, Bishops derive their Jurisdiction from the King. This is witnessed by not three, but four Bishops, and reads the Statute. That Statute speaks plainly of Jurisdiction in Ecclesiastis, and Places of Judicature, and no other. And all this ramified Jurisdiction, I and all Bishops in England derive from the Crown. But my Order, my Calling, my Jurisdiction in Foro Conciit, that is from God, and from Christ, and by Divine and Apostolical Right. And of this Jurisdiction it was that I then spake of I named Jurisdiction at all, and not my Calling in general. For I then sat in the High-Commission, and did exercise the former Jurisdiction under the Broad Seal, and could not be so fimple to deny the Power by which I then sit. Besides, the Canons of the Church of England, to which I have subscribed, are plain for it. Nay farther, the Use and Exercit of my Jurisdiction in Foro Concientia, may not be but by the Leave and Power of the King within his Dominions. And if Bishops and Prebysbeers be all one Order (as those Men contend for) then Bishops must be Foro Divina, for so they maintain that Prebysbeers are. * This part of the Charge * Mr. Browne prefied in his Report to the House of Commons; and when I gave this Answer, he in his Reply said nothing but the same over and over again, save that he said, I fled to he

knew not what inward Calling and Jurisdiction: which Point, as I expressed it, if he understood nor, he should not have undertaked to judge me.*

The 16th of May I had an Order from the Lords, for free Access of four of my Servants to me. On Friday, May 17. I received a Note from the Committee, that they intended to proceed upon part of the sixth Original Article remaining, and upon the seventh; which seventh Article follows in his Verba.

VII. That he hath treacherously endeavored to alter and subvert God's true Religion by Law established in this Realm, and instead thereof to set up Popish Supremacy and Idolatry: and to that end hath declared and maintained in Speeches and printed Books divers Popish Doctrines and Opinions, contrary to the Articles of Religion established. He hath urged and enjoined divers Popish and Superstitious Ceremonies, without any warrant of Law; and hath cruelly persecuted those who have opposed the same, by corporal Punishment and Imprisonment; and most unjustly vexed others, who refused to conform thereto, by Ecclesiastical Councils of Excommunication, Suspension, Excommunication, and Graduation, contrary to the Law of this Kingdom.

The Tenth Day of my Hearing.

MONDAY, May 20, 1644. This Day Mr. Serjeant Will undertook the Business against me. And at his entrance he made a Speech, being now to charge me with Matter of Religion. In this Speech he spake of a Title, which came not in at all at once: And he laid it was in the intended Alteration of Religion. First, A Connuissance, then a Toleration, then a Submission. Nor this, nor that: but a Title it seems he will have of Religion. And I pray God his Truth (the True Protestant Religion here established) be not as an Ebb, that Men may with ease wade over to that file, which this Gentlemen seems most to hate. He fears both Ceremonies and Doctrines: but in both he fears where no Fear is: which I hope shall appear. He was pleased to begin with Ceremonies.

I. This he charged first my Chapel at Lambeth, and Innovation in Ceremonies there.

1. The first Witches for this was Dr. Feathy: he says, (4.) There were Alterations since my Predecessor's time. And I say to too, or else my Chapel must lie more uncleanly than is fit to express. He says, I turned the Table North and South. The Innovation says it shall be. And thereto was theirs in going from, not mine

in returning to that way of placing it. Here Mr. Browne, in his late Reply in the House of Commons, said, That I cut the Injunction short, because in the Words immediately following 'tis ordered, That this Place of standing shall be altered, when the Communion is administered. But this, The Charge against me is only about the Place of it, of which that Injunction so careful, that it commands, That when the Communion is done, it be placed where it stood before. Secondly, it was never charged against me, that I did not remove it at the time of Communion, nor both the
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Reason expressed in the Injunction require it; * which is, When the Number of Communicants is * great, and that the Minister may be the better heard * of them. Neither of which was necessary in my * Chapel, where my Number was not great, and * all might easily hear.

(3.) The second Thing which Dr. Fehrly said, was in the Order of a History. That the Chapel last writely, all the time he found in that House. Was it one of my Faults too, to cleanse it?

In his Reply, He says, the Windows were not made up with coloured Glasses, till my Time. The Truth is, they were all shalme to look on, all diversely patched, like a poor Beggar's Coat. Had they all white Glasses, I had not flannelled them. And for the Crucifix, he confesses its was standing in my Predecessor's time, tho' a little broken; so I did but mend it, I did not let it up (as was urged against me.) And it was utterly mistaken by Mr. Brown's, * that I did repair the Story of those * Windows, by their like in the Mafs-Book. No, * but I and my Secretary made out the Story, as * well as we could, by the Remains that were unbroken. Nor was any Proof at all offered, that * I did it by the Pictures in the Mafs-Book; but * only Mr. Prynn testified, that such Pictures were * there; whereas this Argument is of no Confe- * quence: There are such Pictures in the Miffs, * therefore I repaired my Windows by them. The * Windows contain the whole Story from the * Creation to the Day of Judgment; three Lights * in a Window, the two Side-Lights contain the * Types in the Old Testament, and the Middle- * Light the Antitype and Verity of Christ in the * New: And I believe the Types are not in the * Pictures in the Miffs. In the mean time, I know * no Crime or Superstitition in this * History. And tho' Calvins do not * approve Images in Churches, yet * he doth approve very well of them, * which contain a History; and says plainly, that * there have their use, in descendo & ascenden, in * teaching and admonishing the People: And if * they have that use, why may they not infruct * in the Church, as well as out, I know not. * Nor do the Hominies in this Part * particular differ much from Calvin.'

But here the * Statue of Edw. VI. * was charged against me, which requires the Definition of all Images, as well in Glasses-windows, as elsewhere. * And this was so earnestly pressed by Mr. Browne, * when he repeated the Sum of the Charge against * me in the House of Commons.' To which I an- * swered at both times: First, That the Statue of * Edw. VI. spake of other Images; and that Images in Glasses-Windowes were neither mentioned, nor meant in that Law: The Words of the Statue are, * Any Images of Stone, Timber, Almohet or Earth, * grooves, carved or painted, taken out of any Church, * &c. shall be destroy, &c. and not referred to any * superstitious Use. So heres not a Word of Glasses- * windowes, nor the Images that are in them. Sec- * ondly, that the contemporary Practice (which is * one of the best Exponents of the Meaning of * any Law) did neither destroy all coloured Win- * dowes, tho' Images were in them, in the Queen's * time, nor abstain from setting up of new, both in her own * King James-Age. And as the Body of this Statue is utterly mistaken, so is the Penalty too; which, for the first and second Offence, is but * small Fine, and but Imprisonment at the King's * Will for the third. * A great way short of Punish- * ment for Treson. And I could not but won- * der, that Mr. Browne should be so earnest in this * Point, considering he is of Lincolns-Inn, where * Mr. Prynn's Zeal hath not yet beaten down the * Images of the Apostle in the Windows of that * Church. Some, I fear with Windows also which set up * new long force that Statue of Edw. VI. * its well known, that I was once released to have * returned this upon Mr. Browne in the House of * Commons, but changed my Mind, left thereby I * might have let some fonius Spirit on work to * destroy those harmlesse goodly Windows, to the * just Dislike of that worthy Society.'

But to the Statue Mr. Browne added, That the Destruction of all Images, as well in Windows, as elsewhere, was commanded by the Hominies of the Church of England, and those * Hominies confirmed in the Articles of Religion, and the Articles by Act of Parliament. This was also urged before, and my Answer was, First, That theo' we subscribed generally to the Doctrine of the Hominies, as good; yet we did not express, or mean thereby to justify and maintain every particular Prize or Sentence contained in them. And Secondly, That the very Words of the Article to which we subscri- * be, are, That the Hominies do contain a Godly * and a wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for this * Times. Godly, and wholesome for all Times; but necessary for those, when People were nees be ourne from the Worship of Images: afterwards, neither the Danger nor the Need of any. * And * Browne in his Reply saith, That since the Doc- * trine contained in the Hominies was wholesome * and good, it must needs be necessary also for all * Times. But this worthy Gentlemans is herein * much mistaken. Strong Meat, as well: spiritual * as bodily, is good and wholesome; but tho' it * be fo, yet if it had been necessary at all Times, * and for all Men, the Apostle would never have * fed the Corinthians with Milk, and not with * Meat, 1 Cor. iii. 1-2. The Meat always good * in itself, but not necessary for which we more * need to bear it.

(4.) The Fourth Thing which Dr. Fehrly refuti- * es, is, That there were Boxings at the coming into the Chapel, and going up to the Communion- * Table, 'This was usual in Queen Elizabeth's * time, and of old, both among Jews, as appears * in the Story of Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxix. 28. and * among Christians, as is evident in * Renan monument's Notes upon Tertullian.'

And one of them, which have written against the late Canons, confutes it was usual in the Queen's Time; but then adds, That, that part of * Ignorance, What, a Time of such * Reformations, and yet still a Time of ignorance! I pray God the opposite be not a Time of Pro- * fess-ence, and all is well; * Mr. Browne, in the * Sum of his Charge given me in the House of * Commons, influenced in this: I answered * as before, with this Addition, Shall I owe to God * in such House of Parliament, and yet be not * to God in his House, whether I do, or ought to want * worship him? Surely I would worship God, and * how to him, the reader after our Common- * Table shall have a Count.

(5.) For Organs, Candlesticks, a Picture of a * History at the back of the Altar, and Copes at * Comb
Commotions and Confraternizations; all which Dr. Praty named: First, These Things had been in use even since the Reformation. And Secondly, Dr. Praty himself did then acknowledge that it was in my Chapel, as it was at Whitehall; no difference. And it is not to be thought, that Queen Elizabeth and King James would have endured them all their Time in their own Chapel, had they been introduced for Popery. And for Copes, they are allowed at Times of Communion, by the Canons of the Church. So that these, all or any, are very poor Motives from whence to argue an Alteration of Religion.

2. The second Witness against my Chapel was Sir Nathaniel Browne: But he says not so much as Dr. Praty; and in what he doth say, he agrees with him, saying that he cannot say, whether the Picture at the back of the Communion-Table, were not there before my time.

3. The third Witness for this Charge was one Mr. Brown, who came into my Chapel at Prayer-time, when I had some new Plate to conferate for use of the Communion; and I think it was brought to me for that end by Dr. Praty. This Man says at first, He then lay me low, and wear a Cape. That was no Plate. Secondly, That he saw me conferate some Plate; that in that Confection I used some part of Solomon’s Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple; and that in my Prayer I did defer God to accept thefe Veilss. No Fault in any of the three. For in all Ages of the Church, especially since the Establishment, this Devotion had had publick allowance, there have been Confections of sacred Veilss, as well as of Churches themselves. And these immense Veilss are holy, in that they are deputed and dedicated to the Service of God. And we are said to minifter about holy Things, I Cor. ix. 13. And the altar is said to justify the Gift, St. Matt. xxiii. 19. which it could not do, if itself were not holy. So then, if there be no Dedication of these Things to God, no Separation of them from common use, there’s neither Thing nor Place holy: and then no Sacrifice, no Difference between Churches and common Houses, between Holy Tables (to the Injunction calls them) and ordinary Tables. But I would have no Man deceive himself; Sacrilege is a grievous Sin, and was feerely punished, even among the Heathens. And St. Paul’s Question puts it home, would we consider of it, Thou which abhorrest Idols, committest thou Sacrilege? Rom. i. 22. Thou which abhorrest Idols, to the very defacing of Church-windows, doft thou, thou of all other, commit Sacrilege, which the very Worshippers of Idols punished? And this being so, I hope my use of a part of Solomon’s Prayer, in the Words of my own Prayer, (That God would be pleased to accept them) shall not be reputed Faults.

But here stepped Mr. Pryce, and said, This was according to the Form in Mijfijl parso. But ‘tis well known I borrowed nothing thence. All that I used was according to the Copy of the late Reverend Bishop of Winchester, Bishop Andrews, which I have by me to be seen, and which himself used all his time.

Then from my Chapel he went to my Study; and there the second Charge was, that I had a Bible with the five Wounds of Christ fair upon the Cover of it. This was curiously wrought in Needle-

work. The Bible was sent me by a Lady, and the a Protestant. It was both to delude the Western, but the Bible I kept in my Study from any Man’s Hand or Eye, that might take offence at it. Mr. Browne touched upon this, and my Answer was the fame, having that I mentioned not the Lady. 2. That I had in my Study a Miffl, and divers other Books belonging to the Roman Liturgy. My Lords, ‘tis true, I had many; but I had more of the Greek Liturgies than the Roman. And I had as many of both, as I could get. And I would know, how shall we answer their Errors, if we may not have their Books? I had Liturgies, all I could get, both printed, and also the Alvara in divers Copies. If this be an Argument, why do they not accuse me to be a Turk? 3. To this Charge was added my private Prayer-book, which Mr. Pryce had taken from me in his Search. Where first I observed, That the Secrecy between God and my Soul were brought to be divulged in open Court. ‘Nobilis gravis dictum: But fee whether it can be paralleled in Heathenism.’ But what Popery was found in these Prayers? First, that there were in Canonical Hours, Hora fucce, & Hora nonn. Sec. I injoyed myself several Hours of Prayer; that, I hope, is no Sin: And if some of them were Church-Hours, that’s no Sin neither: Seven times a Day will I praise thee, (Psal. cxix.) was the Prophet David’s, long before any Canonical Hours. And among Christians they were in use before Popery got any head. God grant this may be my greatest Sin. Secondly, The Prayer which I made at the Consecration of the Chapel at Hamwerfield, I did not think might be and any other. No Offence found. Thirdly, The Word Prostratus in my private Devotions, before I came to the Exchang. If I did go to God, what’s that to any Man? But I pray, in all this curious Search, (and Mr. Pryce here, and all along, spared no Pain) why were no Prayers to the Virgin and the Saints found, if I was so swallowed up in Popery? 111. From my Study he went on to my Galleries. The Serjeant would find out Popery everywhere, and I did before, hence I will set out three Pictures: The first of them was a fair Picture of the four Fathers of the Western Church, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory. It was as lawful to have this Picture as the Picture of any other Man. Yet, but there was a Dove pictured over them, and that for the holy Ghost. That’s more than any Wrennels did or durst depose. The second, was the Ecce Homo, as Pilate brought Christ forth, and bade him to the Jews. This Picture is common, and I yet know no hurt of it, to be nothing worthier and that I declare as much as any Man, and have written as much against it as any Protestant hath: And it was then read in part. And for both these Pictures I answered out of Calvin: That it is lawful to make, and have the Picture of any Things, quorum faut cognoscas Ostiis, which may be seen. Now the Dove was visible and seen, St. John i. 42. 33. That was the first Picture. And for the second, the Ecce Homo, why did Pilate say Ecce, but that the Jews might and did see him? John xix. So both Pictures lawful by the Rule laid down by Calvin. Mr. Browne charged against both these Pictures very warmly. And when I answered as before, in his Reply he fell upon my Answer; and...
said this was the Devil's Practice: I would have brought in the Mean between them, and preserved it too, by God's Blessings, had I been let alone.

2. Sir Henry says next, That he knew of no Bowings in that Chapel before my time, but by the Right Honourable the Knights of the Garter at their Solemnity. No time else? Did he never see the King's Mass in my time? Or did he never see any such Officer, or the Lord Chamberlain attend him there, without Bowing and Another too? And for the Knights of the Garter, if they might do it without Superintendence, I hope I and other Men might do it too ; but chiefly since they were ordered by the late King to do it with great Reverence and solemn Sacrament: Which proves the Antiquity of this Ceremony in England.

3. He farther says, That there was a Lady Crucifix in a piece of Hangings hung up the Altar, which he thought had been before my time. But that he had not seen it. He says, This Lady Crucifix hung up in the last Reign. For, as they call it. As they call it. What say I? To defer from the Lady which was about forty Years since: So it was not brought thither by me to counteract Popery. And I hope your Lordships do not think me such a Fool; if I had an Intention to alter Religion, I should hang the Protection of it openly in my Gallery, thereby to bring present Danger upon myself, and destroy the Work which, themselves fav', I intended cunningly. And if there be any Error in having and keeping such Pictures, yet this is no efficient Proof that I had any Intention to alter the Religion established, which indeed may be taken notice of once for all.

IV. From my Gallery, the Serspay crossed the Water to Blenheim Hall, and here I have it, for at that time he took no Leave of Captain Gifford, or his Wife, before (I am looser) At the Court he met Sir Henry. And this Knight being produced by him against me, Gys, Thiz in my time Bowing, were constantly used in the Chapel there. But, first, Dr. Fox, told your Lordship, there was nothing in my Chapel, but as it was in use at White-Hall. So all the Popery I could bring, was there before. And, Secondly, it being to God in his own House, so as not, how it should or could be known to the public with Safety, and perhaps somewhere above, long before. (as I could not prove by the Veltery-Men) and so all the time of Sir Henry's being in Court, had a Crucifix wrought in it, and yet his Conscience never troubled it at all. Fourthly, That he could not possibly think that I intended any Popery in it, considering how hateful he knew me to be at Rome, beyond any my Predecessors since the Reformation: For so he professed at his return from thence to myself. And I humbly desire a Salar, that I may have his called to witness it: which was granted.

* All the Pictures were placed in the Gallery by Cardinal Pole, when he built it, and certainly there still, leaving out her defaced in the time of the Rebellion, as were the Windows of the Chapel, and the Chapel itself converted into a Dancing-Room. Archbishop Parker's Tomb in the middle of it being first laid down, and his Bones cast upon the Danhill.
after much pruffling for some Maintenance, considering how oft I was made attend, and with no final Expense, on May 25. I had an Order from the Committee of Sequestrations, to have Two hundred Pounds allowed me out of my own now Sequestr'd Estate: It was a Month before I could receive this. And this was all that ever was yet allowed me since the Sequestration of my Easte, being then of above two Years continuance.

The Eleventh Day of my Hearing.

MONDAY, May 17, 1644. This day Mr. Sergeant White followed the Charge upon me; and went back again to my Chapel-windows at Lambeth: Three Witnesses against them. The first was one Peter Wadkins. He says, there was in one of the Glass-windows on the North-side, the Picture of an old Man with a Glory, which he thinks was of God the Father. But his thinking so is no Proof; nor doth he express in which of the North-windows he saw it. And for the Glory, that is usual about the Head of every Saint. And Mr. Brown, who was the second Witness, and was trusted by me for all the Work of the Windows, both at Lambeth and Croyden, says expressly upon his Oath, that the King was no Picture of God the Father in the Windows at Lambeth. But he says, he found a Picture of God the Father in a Window at Croyden, and Archibishop Cranmer's Arms under it; and that he pulled it down. So it appears this Picture was there before my time, and continued there in to zazas an Archibishop's time, as Cranmer was well known to be; and it was pulled down in my time. Neither did I know till now, that ever such a Picture was there; and the Witnesses deploys he never made me acquainted with it. The third Witness was Mr. Pryes. He says, He had taken a Survey of the Windows at Lambeth. And I doubt not his Diligence. He repeated the Story in each Window. I have told this before, and shall not repeat it. He says, the Pictures of these Stories are in the Mats-Book. If it be so, yet were they not taken thence by me. Archibishop Morton did that Work, as appears by his Device in the Windows. He says, the Story of the Day of Judgment was in a Window in atrio, that must not come into the Chapel. Good Lord! whither will Mauce carry a Man? The Story opposit is of the Creation; and what, must not that come into the Chapel neither? The Chapel is divided into an inner and outer Chapel: in this outward the two Windows mentioned are; and the Parition or Screen was in that Chapel, which made that two, which I think in the same Place. If the Picture is expressed, from the very building of the Chapel, for ought can be proved to the contrary. So neither I, nor any Man else, did flout out the Day of Judgment. He says, I had read the Mats-book diligently. How else should I be able really to confute what is affirmed in it? He says, I had also a Book of Pictures concerning the Life of Chrift in my Study. And it was for me to have it; for some Things are to be seen in their Pictures for the People, which their Writings do not, perhaps dare not avow.

If the second Charge of this Day, was about the Administration of the Sacrament in my Chapel. The Witnesses.
The first was Dr. Haywood, who had been my Chaplain in the House. They had got from others the Ceremonies there used, and then brought him upon Oath. He confessed he admi-
nixed in a Cope, and the Canon warranted it. He confesses (as it was urged) that he fetched the Elements from the Credential (a little Side-Table as they called it) and set them reverently upon the Communion-Table. Where's the Offence? For first, the Communion-Table was little, and there was hardly room for the Elements to stand convenient-ly there, while the Service was in Administration: And, Secondly, I did not this without Example; for both Bishop Andrews, and some other Bishops, used it all their time, and no Exceptions taken.

The second Witness was Rob. Cornewall, one of my former Servants. He was very forward Witness: He shewed himself, but did no more than is said and answered before; both of them confessing that I was sometimes present.

III. The third Charge was about the Ceremonies at the Coronation of his Majesty. And, first, out of my Diary, Feb. 2, 1645, 'tis a strange, that I carried back the Regalia, offered them on the Altar, and then laid them up in their Place of Safety. I bare the Place at the Coronation of the Dean of Welfington, and I was to look to all those Things, and their safe return into Culiody, by the Place I then executed; and the offering them could be no less to the King, in Holy Days; and the Right Honourable the Knights of the Garter offer at their Solomonry: And the Offertory is established by Law in the Common Prayer Book of this Church: And the Prebendaries affurred me it was the Custom for the Dean to do. Secondly, they charged a Marginal Note in the Book upon me, that the Union was in feudal Cruces. That Note doth not lay that it ought to be done; but it only relates the Practice, what was done. And if any Fault were in anointing the King in that Form, it was my Predecessor's Fault, not mine; for he so anointed him.

Thirdly, they say, there was a Cruce among the Regalia, and that it stood upon the Altar at the Coronation, and that I did not except against it. My Predecessor executed at that time, and I believed would have excepted against the Cruce had it flood there: But I remember not any there; yet if there were, if my Predecessor had approved the flanding of it, or were content to connive at it, it would have been made but a Scorn had I quarrel'd it. Fourthly, they say, One of the Prayers was taken out of the Pontifical. And if it were, as they say, if it were, Herlin affirms, that the old Crucifix being found in the Regalia, was then placed upon the Altar at the Life of Law, p. 444.

Then leaving the Ceremonies, he charged me with two Alterations in the Body of the King's Oath. One added, namely these Words (agreeable to the King's Prerogatives) the other omitted, namely these Words, (one Pulpit elegere, which the People have chosen, or full clause.) For this latter, the Clause omitted, that suddenly vanished; for it was omitted in the Oath of King James, as is approved by themselves in the printed Votes of this present Par-

liament. But the other highly insist-

ed on, as taking off the total Affurance which the Subjects have by the Oath of their Prince, for the Performance

p. 706.
Performance of his Laws. First, I humbly con-

ceive this Clause takes off none of the Peoples

Assurance; none at all. For the King’s just and

legal Prerogative, and the Subjects’ Assurance

for Liberty and Property, may stand without further,

and be found for Hundreds of Years. Sec-

ondly, That Alteration, whatever it be, was not

made by me; nor is there any Interlending or Al-

teration so much as of a Letter found in that Book.

Thirdly, If any thing be amis therein, my Pre-

decessor gave that Oath to the King, and not I.

I was merely ministerial both in the Preparation,

and at the Coronation itself, supplying the place

of the Dean of Wemungler.

After this Day’s Work was ended, it infinitely

spread all over the City, that I had altered the

King’s Oath at his Coronation, and from thence

into all parts of the Kingdom; so as all must be

true which was said at the Bar against me, what

Answer ever I made. The People, and some of

the Synod, now crying out. That this one thing

was enough to take away my Life. And tho’ this

was all that was charged this Day concerning this

Oath, yet seeing how this Fire took, I thought fit,

the next Day that I came to the Bar, to declare

that the Books of the Coronation of former Kings,

especially those of Queen Elizabeth and King James,

might be seen and compared, and the Copies

brought into the Court, both from the Exequiers,

and such as were in my Study at Lambeth, and a

fuller Inquisition made into the Binnels; in regard

I was as innocent from this Crime, as when my

Mother bare me into the World. A 15. was en-

ter’d for me upon this. And every Day that I al-

came to the Bar, I called upon this Binnels:

But I saw what or other was still pretended by them

which managed the Evidence, that I could not get

the Books to be brought forth, nor any thing to be

done, till almost the last Day of my Hearing. Then

no Books could be found in the Exequiers, nor in

my Study, but only that of King James; whereas,

when the Keys were taken from me, there were

Deeds Books there, as is confided in

the printed Votes of this Parliament,

and one of them with a Watchet-Satin

cover, now missing: And whether this of King

James (had not my Secretary, who knew the Book,

seen it drop out of Mr Pryson’s Bag) would not have

been conceited too, I cannot tell. At last, the

Book of King James’s Coronation, and the oth-

er urged against me concerning King Charles,

were seen and compared openly in the Lords

House, and found to be the Fame Oath in both,

and no Interlending or Alteration in the Book

charged against me.

This Binnels was left by the Serjeant to Mr.

Maynard, who made the molt that could be out

of my Diary against me: And to did Mr. Browne,

when he come to give the Sum of the Charge

against me, both before the Lords, and after in

the House of Commons. And therefore for the

avoiding of all tedious Repetition, and for that

the Arguments which both refer to the Same,

and because I had no time to break a Charge

of this moment into divers Pieces, or put them

in different Places, I will here set down the

whole Binnels together, and the Answor which

I then gave.

Mr. Browne, in the Sum of the Charge against

me in the Commons House, when he came to this

Article, said, He was now come to the Binnels

so much expected. And I humbly besought that

Honorable House, if it were a Matter of so

great Expectation, it might be of as great Ac-

tention too, while I should folow that worthy

Gentleman step after step, and answer a i

went.

And, First, he went to prove out of

my Diary, that this Addition (of the King’s Pre-

rogative) to the Oath, was made by me. That

he says, That December 31. 1625. I went to

Hampton-Court. That’s true. He says, That

there, Jan. 1. I understood I was named with

other Bishops to meet and consider of the Cer-

mories about the Coronation; and that, Jan. 6.

we did meet at White-Hall accordingly; and that,

Jan. 6. we gave his Majesty an Answer, Not, I

(as ‘twas charged) but We gave his Majesty an

Answer. So if the Oath had been changed by

me, it must have been known to the Committee,

and broken forth to my Ruin long since. Then

he says, That Jan. 16. I was appointed to come

at the Coronation, in the room of the Dean of

Wimungler. That’s no Crime: And ‘tis added in

the Diary, that this Charge was deliver’d unto

me by my Predecessor. So he knew that this

Service to attend at the Coronation was impos’d

upon me. He says next, That Jan. 18. the

Duke of Buckingham had made me to the King, to

shew his Majesty the Notes we had agreed on

if nothing offended him. These were only Nuns

of the Ceremonies. And the other Bishops for

me, being pensive, to give the Account. Then he

says, Jan. 23. It is in my Diary. Let me

peruse, I had a Book ready. And it was then

after such Meetings, and the Coronation being

to follow Feb. 2. and I desired to sit and at-

tend that Service, that I should have a Book re-

dy: The Ceremonies were too long and various

to carry them in Memory. And whereas ‘tis

urgeth, That I prepared and altered this Book,

the Words in my Diary are paratus babi, had I

the Book ready for my own use in that Service.

Nor can paratus babi signify preparing or altering

the Book. And, Thirdly, ‘tis added there,

That the Book which I had ready in my hands,

did agree per omnia esse libero Regali. And if it
did agree in all Things with the King’s record-

ed Book then brought out of the Exequiers, where

there is the Alteration to laboriously sought to be

fard on me? I humbly beseech you to mark

this.

Yet out of these Premises put together, Mr.

Browne’s Inference was, That I made this Altera-

tion of the Oath. But surely these Premises, nei-

ther single nor together, can produce any such

Conclusion; but rather the contrary. Because

Inference upon Evidence, is not Evidence, unless

it be aboldly necessary; which all Men fe

that here it is not. But I pray observe: Why was

such a sudden trial made at Jan. 23. whereas it

appears in my Diary at Jan. 31. that the Bishops

were not alone actued with this Coronation-Bin-

nels, but ali Processe, but other Great and Noble

Men all? And they did meet that Jan. 31. and

fist in Council about it. So the Bishops Meet-

ings were but preparatory to eate the Lords;

most of the Ceremonies being in the Church-

way. And then can any Man think that such

great Lords, when they came to review all that

done, would let the Oath be altered by me;

or any other, so materially, and not check it

at it? ’Tis impollible.
Marginal Note in my Hand, that Saco Fure Cose is underfoot in the Oaths of a King. A Book. But there's a great deal of Difference between Tju Regis & Prerogativa, between the Right and Inheritance of a King and his Prerogative, tho' never so legal. A Book of Submission, and until I shall be convinced herein, I must believe that no King can swear himself out of his native Right. Secondly, If this were, and still be an Error in my Judgment, that's no Argument at all to prove Malice in my Will: That because that is my Judgment for Tju Regis, therefore I must stuff Prerogativa Juvum, which is not my Judgment, into a publick Oath which I had no Power to alter. These were all the Proofs which Mr. Maynard at first, and Mr. Browne at last, brought against me in this Particular. And they are all but confusional, and the Commons therefore said that I did not alter this Oath by adding the Prerogativa, the Proofs I shall bring are pregnant, and some of them necessary. They are these.

1. My Predecessor was one of the Grand Committee for those Ceremonies. That was proved by his Servants to the Lords. Now his known Love to the Publick was such, as that he would never have suffered me, or any other, to make such an Alteration. Nor have he concealed such a Crime in me, loving me so well as he did.

2. 'Tis notoriously known that he crowned the King, and administered the Oath, (which was avoided also before the Lords by his ancient Servants;) And it cannot be rationally conceived he would ever have administered such an Alteration to his Majesty.

3. 'Tis exprest in my Diary, at Jan. 21, 1625. (and that must be good Evidence for me, having been so often produced against me) that divers great Lords were in this Committee for the Ceremonies, and did that Day sit in Council upon them. And can it be thought they would not so much as compare the Books? Or that comparing of them, they would endure an Oath with such an Alteration to be tender'd to the King? Especially since 'tis before confest that one Copy of King James's Coronation had this Alteration in it, and no other final Copy, he would ever have administered such an Alteration to the King at the State.

4. 'Tis exprest in my Diary, and made use of against me, at Jan. 23, 1625, that this Book urged against me did agree per amus cana Libro reguli, in all things with the King's Book, brought out of the Exequier. And if the Book that I then had, and is now infested upon, did agree with that Book which came out of the Exequier, and that in all things, how is it possible I should make this Alteration?

5. With much Labour I got the Books to be compared in the Lords House; that of King James's Coronation, and this of King Charles's, and they were found to agree in all things to a Syllable. Therefore 'tis impossible this Book should be added by me. And this, I conceive, casts off all confusional Proofs to the contrary.

Lastly, In the printed Book of the Votes of this present Parliament, p. 756, it is acknowledged, that the Oath given to King James and King Charles was the same. The same therefore unaltered. And this Pageage of that Book I then shewed the Lords in my Defence. To this Mr. Maynard then replied, that the Votes there mentioned were upon the Word eighth, and the Doubt whether

VOL I
41. The Trial of Dr. William Laud, 19 Car. I.

1. There the first Witness is Sir Nathaniel Brent. And he says, The standing of the Communion Table at St. Mary's was altered. I have answered to this Situation of the Communion Table already. And if it be lawful in one place, 'tis in another. For the Chapel of Magdalen-College, and Christ-Church Quire, he confesses he knows of no Direction given by me to either: nor doth he know whether I approved the things there done or no. So all this is no Evidence. For the Picture of the Blessed Virgin at St Mary's. Don't I knew nothing of it till it was done, so never did I hear any Abufe or Disfigure of it after it was done. And here Sir Nathaniel confesses too, that he knows not of any Abolition of it, as Men pulled the Streets or otherwise. When this Witness came not home, they urged the Statute of Merton-College, or the University, (§ 11.) where (if I took my Notes right, they say, I enjoined ablation Recreation. And as I know no fault in that Injunction or Statute, so neither do I know what due bodily Reverence can be given to God in his Church, without some Bowing or Gommutations.

2. The second Warden was Mr. Cockett. He says, That by the due Decency of reverence was required by my Visitors in none of my Articles, he gave Reasons against it, but Sir John Laske urged it till first. First, My Lords, if Mr. Cockett's Reasons were sufficient, Sir John Laske was to blame in that but Sir John Laske must answer it, and not I. Secondly, it may be observed, that this Man by his own Confection, gave Reasons (such as 't was were) against due Reverence to God in his own House. He says, That Dr. Freezou told him from me, That I wished he should do as others did at St. Mary's, or 'twas another exercise his Place as Preacher. This is but a Heresy from Dr. Freezou, who being at Oxford, I cannot produce him. And if I had such a Message, I know no Crime in it. He says, That after this he defied he might enjoy in this particular the Liberty which the King and the Church of England gave him. He did not; and from that Day he heard no more of it, but enjoyed the Liberty which he asked. I say, Sir, Channel defined the same Liberty as well as he. And Mr. Channel had it granted as well as he. He confesses ingenuously, that the Bowing required, was only towards, not to the Altar. And to the Picture at St. Mary's Door, he says he never heard of any Reverence done to it; and doth believe, that all that was done at Christ-Church was since my time. But it must be his Knowledge, not his Belief, that must make an Evidence.

3. The third Witness was one Mr. Brudev. He says, There was a Crucifix in Lincolne-College Chapel since my time. If there be, 'tis more than I know. My Lord of York that now is, when he was Bishop of Lincoln, worthy befalshw much Coft upon that Chapel; and if he did set up a Crucifix, I think it was before I had ought to do there. He says, There was Bowing at the Name of Jesus. And God forbid but there should; and the Canon of the Church requires it. He says, There were Latin Prayers in Lent, but he knows not who joined. And then he might have held his peace. But there were Latin Sermons and Prayers on Ash Wednesday, when few came to Church, but the Lent Procecdors, who understood them. And in divers Colleges they have their Morning-Prayers in Latin.
Latin, and had so, long before I knew the University. The last thing he said, was, that there were Copies used in some Colleges, and that a Traveller should pay, upon the flight of them, 'thet he saw but such a thing upon the Pope's back. This was the first he said, and to which he was allowed to add in his Latin.

"This is a new Pope in the Church in Rome." He was then urged the Conclusion of a Letter of mine sent to that University: the Words were to this effect, "I desire you to remember me a Dinner, gratis, and that you will pray for me."

The Charge lay upon the Ward-presidents, which is no more, than that when they fall on their knees, or prostrate to Prayer they would remember me. In which sense of mine, or of Expression of it, I cannot yet see no Objection. No, nor in care all Affairs, their religious time of Prayer being at the Communion.

Here Mr. Brooke aggravates the things done in that University, and fell upon the Titles given in some Letters from thence: but because I have answered those Titles already, I refer the Reader thither, and shall not make here any tedious Repetition. Only this I shall add, That in the Civil Law 'tis frequent to be seen, that not Bishops only one to another, but the great Emperors of the World have commonly given that Title of Sunhast, to Bishops of meaner place than myself; to say no more. But here Mr. Brooke, in his last Reply, was pleased to say, That Title was not given to any Bishop of England.

First, If I had my Books about me, perhaps this might be refused. Secondly, Why should I do a Man as he so much disparage his own Nation? Is it impossible (be my Unworthiness what it will) for an Erastian Bishop to defend as good a Title as another? Thirdly, Be that as it may, if it were (as certainly it was) lawfully given to other Bishops, though they not Erastian, it then is neither Blasphemy, nor Affirmation of Papal Power, as was charged upon me.

V. From Oxford Mr. Serjeant went to Cambridge. And I must be guilty, if ought were amiss there too.

For this fifth Charge were produced three Witnesses, Mr. Wallis, Mr. Greece, and Mr. Somn. Their Testimonies agreed very near: so I will answer them together. First, They say, That at Peter-Howe there were Copies and Candlestickles, and Pictures in the Glass-Windows; and the like. But these things I have often answered already, and shall not repeat. They say, The chief Authors of these things were Dr. Wren and Dr. Cuff. They are both living, why are they not called to answer? Here there was no flaw of Proof to bring any thing home to me. For no use of them says, that I gave direction for any of these. No, (says Mr. Serjeant,) but why did I tolerate them? First, No Man complained to me.

Secondly, I was not Chancellor, and endured no small Envy for any little thing that I had occasion to look upon in that place. And Thirdly, This was not the least Cause, why I followed my Right for Power to visit there. And though that Power was confirmed to me, yet the Times have been such, as that I did not then think fit to use it. It would have been more Envy on my part who have too much already. * As for Mr. Greece, who hath laboured much against me in Vol. I.

... all this Bufores, God forgive him; and while he inherits his Father's ill Affections to me, God forgive him from his Father's End.*

VI. From Cambridge he went to the Cathedrals, and first to Cambridge. Here the Charge is bowing versus Almer: the two Witnesses, two Prelates of that Church, Dr. Jacsas, and Dr. Blecken- den. And first, Mr. Jacsas says, the bowing was versus Almer: so not is, but toward the Altar: and Dr. Blecken den says, it was the Ablution of the high Majestie of God, to whom, if no Altar were there, I should bow. Dr. Jacsas says, This Bowing was to his grief. Strange! I avow to your Lordships and the World, no Man did so much approve all my Proceedings in that Church, as he; and for this Particular, he never found the least fault with it to me: and if he conceal his Grief, I cannot sake it. He says, This Bowing was not in use till within this six or seven Years. Sure the old Man's Memory fails him. For Dr. Blecken den says, The Communion-Table was railed about, and Bennawed before it, when he came first to be a Member of that Church; and 61 upon his Oath, that's above ten Years ago; and that it was pratified before their new Statutes were made; and that in those Statutes no Punishment is fixed for the Brach or not Performance of this Reverence. I could tell your Lordships how often Dr. Jacsas hath fixt his Opinions in Religion, but that they tell me their Wittases must not be taunted. As for the Statutes, my Secretary Mr. Doll, who copied them out, testified here to the Lords, that I left out divers Superfluitates which were in the old Book, and ordained many Sermons in their rooms.

The next Cathedral he instance in, was Win- chtower. But there's nothing but the old Objections, Copes. And the wearing of them is warranted by the Canon, Conv. 21, and Reverence at coming in and going out of the Church. And that, great Kings have not (in better Ages) thought much to do. And they did well to instance in the College of Winchorter, as well as the Church; for his concill, the Injunction sent thither requires, that this Injunction be as strict as is not consonant from the Church of England. So this may be a Comment to the other Injunctions. But for the Copes in Cathedrals, Mr. Bunc in his last Reply was not satisfied. For he said, the Canon mentioned but the wearing of one Cope. But it is; but they must have that before they can wear it. And if the Canon enjoin the wearing of one, my Injunction might require the providing and using of one. Bibles, if there be no Popery, no introduction to Superflution in the having or using of one: there can be none in the having of more for the same use: the Superflution being lodged in the Misuse, not in the Number.

VII. From the Cathedrals, Mr. Serjeant went to see some Parish-Churches. And first 'tis charged, That in a Parish-Church at Winchorter two Tears were removed, to make way for railing in of the Communion-Table. But for ought I know, this might have been concealed. For it was liked so well, that they to whom the Seats belonged, removed them at their own Charges, that the rest might not be dignityed. The next Instance was in St. Gregory's Church, by St. Paul's. The Charge was, the placing of the Communion-Table Altar-wife. To the Charge
itself, Anfwer is given before. The Particulars which are new, are these: the Witnes Mr. Wyin. He says, the Order for such placing of the Table was from the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul’s. And St. Gregory’s is in their peculiar Jurisdiction. So the Holy Table was there placed by the Ordinary, not by me. He says next, that the Patroners appealed to the Arches, but received an Order to command them and the Cauze to the Council-board: That it was a full Board when the Cauze was heard, and his Majestie present; and that there I maintained the Queen’s Injunction about placing the Holy Table: In all this, he says, there is nothing charged upon me, but Maintenance of the Injunction; and I had been much to blame, if I should not have maintained it. He says, Sir Henry Martiu came and saw it, and said it would make a good Court-Cupboard. If Sir Henry did say so, the Scorn ill became either his Age or Proficiency; tho’ a Court-Cupboard be somewhat a better Phrasie than a Drefler. God forgive them who have in Print called it so. He says, that hereupon I did say, That he which spoke that, had a Stigmatical Portion in his Bafian. This Man’s Memory leaves him long for Words: this is many Years since; and if I did speake any thing sounding this way, ’tis more like I should say Subjunctive, than Stigmatical Portion. But let him look to his Oath; and which Word fover I used, if Sir Henry used the same, I might hear the other. For a profane Speech it was, and little becoming a Dean of the Arches. He says, That soon after this Sir Henry was put out of his Place. Not very soon after this; for I was at the time of this Buisnes (as far as I remember) Bishop of Lound, and had nothing to do with the dispofing of his Place. After, when I came to be Archiprishop, I found his Patent was void, neither could Sir Henry himself deny it. And being void, and in my Gift, I gave it to another.

He says further, That it was urged that this way of placing the Communion-Table was against the Word of God, in Bisph Sford’s and Mr. Fox’s Judgment; and that I replied, It never better they should not leave these Books in Churches, than to abuse them. First, For ought I yet know, (and in these Straits of Time the Books I cannot come at) their Judgment, rightily understood, is not so. Secondly, Though these two were very worthy Men in their time, yet every thing which they say is not by and by the Doctrine of the Church of England. And I may upon good Reason depart from their Judgment in some Particulars, and yet not differ from the Church of England. As in this very Particular, the Injunction for placing the Table fo, is the Act of the Queen and the Church of England. And I conceive the Queen, then upon the Act of Reformation, would not have enjoyned it, nor the Church obeyed it, had it been against the Word of God. Thirdly, If I did say, That if they could make no better use of Jewsel and the Book of Martyrs, it were better they had been not in the Churches; they gave too great occasion for the Speech: For they had pick’d divers Things out of those Books which they could not mutter, and with them dispertaer’d both themselves and their Neighbours. And yet in how many more modest Men might make better use of them, I never gave Counsel to have those-Books removed, (nor is that so much as charged) but said only thus: That if no better use would be made of them, then that left Remedy; but never till then.

This last Page. fage Mr. Browne inflicted upon; The taking of good Books from the People. But as I have an
fwer’d, there was no such Thing done, or is
 tended; only a Word spoken to make fully like
see how they abused themselves and the Church,
by misunderstanding and misapplying that which
was written for the good of both. Lastly, It was urged, he said, that the Communion-Table must stand Altar-wife, that Strangers which come and look into thee Churches, might not see such unlike Proportions; the holy Table standing one way in the Northern Churches, and the Altar-wife in the Peculiar Annexed. And truly, to see this, could be no Commentary of the Discipline of the Church of England. But howsoever, Mr. Claris (the other Witnes with Wyau, and agreeing with him in the mean) says plainly, that it was the Lord of Arundel that spake this, not I; and that he was seconded in it by the Lord Wbfa, then Lord Treasurer, not by me.

VIII. The last Charge of this Day was a Pledge of one Mr. Shelsford’s Book, pag. 20, 21.
That they might take the Reserved Pledges for their Examples, &c. And Mr. Pryn wittnessed the like was in the Miill, pag. 256. Mr. Shesford is a more Stranger to me, his Book I never read; if he have said any thing unjust or untrue, let him answer for himself. As for the like to that, which he says, being in the Miill, tho’ that be but a weak Argument, yet the like.

Here this Day ending, I was put off to Saturday, June 1. And then again put off to Thrusday, June 6, which held.

My Twelfth Day of Hearing.

Thursdays, June 6. 1644. This Day Serjeau Wilde, instead of beginning with a new Charge, made another long Reply to my Anfwers of the former Day. Whether he found that his former Reply, made at the time, was weak, and so repected, I cannot tell. But another he made, as full of premeditated Weaknes, as the former was of suffden. Mr. Prynn, I think, perceived it, and was often at his Ear; but Mr. Serjeant was little les then angry, and would not.

I knew I was to make no Anfwer to any Reply, and to took no Notes; indeed holding it all as was, that is, either nothing, or nothing to the purpose. This tedious Reply ended.

I then came on the Third Charge about the Window of coloured Glass set up in the Chapel at Wimington. It was the History of the coming down of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles. This was charged to be done by me, and at my Coft: the Wittneses, Mr. Browne, employ’d in setting up the Window, and Mr. Sutton the Glazer.

These Men say, That Dr. Nezall, Sub. Dean of Wimington, gave order for the Window, and the setting of it up; but they know not at whole Coft, nor was any Order given from me. So here’s nothing charged upon me. And if it were, I know nothing amiss in the Windows. As for the King’s Arms being taken down (as they say) let them answer that did it. Tho’, I believe, that the King’s Arms standing alone in a white Window, was not taken down out of any ill Means, but only of Necefly to make way for the History.

II. The Second Charge was the Picture of the Blessed Virgin set upon a new-built Door at St. Mo- ry’s in Oxford. Here Alderman Nixon says, That
some Pagrellas put-off their Hats, and, as he suppos'd, to that Picture, But, my Lords, his Soggold is no Proof. He says, that the next Day he saw it. But what did he see? Nothing, but the putting on the Hat; for he could not see why, or to what, unless they which put off, told it. They might put off to some Acquaintance that pulled by. He farther says, he saw a Man in that Porch upon his Knees, and, he thinks, praying; but he cannot say certainly. But then, if the Man, i.e. he hath being borne me, would have suffered him, he might have had tell till he knew to whom he was praying, for till then 'tis no Evidence of his, he says, he thinks that I contemnanced the setting up, because it was done by Bishop Owen. But Mr. Brownefield, who did that Work, gave Testimony to the Lords, that I had nothing to do in it. He says, there was an Image set up at Carfax Church, but pulled down again by Mr. Whidbey, Vikar there: But this hath no relation at all to me. This Picture of the Blessed Virgin was twice mentioned before: and Sir Nath. Brent could say nothing to but this. Here, Mr. Cockett did not mean to have any of his Abufe. And now a Mr. Albermarle Nixon says, he saw Hats pull'd off: but the Man who knows not what, Nor is there any Shew of Proof offer'd, that I had any Hand or Approbation in the setting up of it; or that ever any Complaint was made to me of any Abuse to it, or Dislike of it. And yet Mr. Browne, when he gave the Sum of the Charge against me, insinu'd upon this also, as some great Fault of mine, which I cannot yet see.

III. In the next Charge, Mr. Serjeant is gone back again to Wisbech, as in the former to Oxford. The Witnifl'es are Mrs. Chorley, and her Daughter. They say, they were being at Court, and going into the Chapel, and it seems a Woman with them, that was a Papist; and that while they were there, Dr. Brown, one of the King's Chaplains, came in, bowed toward the Communion-Table, and then at the Altar knee'd down to his Prayers. I do not know of any Fault Dr. Brown committed, either in doing Reverence to God, or praying there. And yet if he had committed any Fault, I hope I shall not answer for him. I was not then Dean of the Chapel, nor did any ever complain to me. They say, that two Strangers came into the Chapel at the same time, and saw what Dr. Browne did, and said thereupon, what fate we did not suffer such, and should be of the Religion flourishing: And that the Woman which was with these Witnifl'es, told them they were Priests. First, this can no way relate to me; for neither did thofe Women complain to me of it, nor any from them. Secondly, If these two Men were Priests, and did say as is testified, are we ever a whit the nearer them in Religion? Indeed, if all the Difference between Rome and us conflit'd in outward Reverence, and no Points of Doctrine, some Argument might hence be drawn; but the Points of Doctrines being fo many and great, put fopoff to that. Thirdly, If Recullants, Priests especially, did fo pretty, might it not be from their being willing to dif- contemnace the holy and Worthy Worship in the Service of God, that they may have opportunity to make more Profelyes? And 'tis no small Advantage, to my knowledge, which they have this way made. And this was the Anwser which I gave, when he charged this upon me in the House of Commons. Here, before they went any farther, Mr. Serjeant Wilde told the Lords, That when Sir Natha-

 Bret was employed in my Vifitation, he had Infruptions for particular Churches, of which none were tact Intimations; and some expres't. I know not to what end this was spoken, for no coherent Charge followed upon it. But fure he thinks Sir Nathaniel Brent very skilful in me, that he can understand my tact Intimations, and know to what particular Church to apply them. And as 'tis said no more at the Bar, I neither did I think to fay any more after; yet now I cannot but a little blame myself. For ever since Mr. Mayward left off, who pleased the Strafrongly, yet fairly, against me; I have been in very ill Con- dition between the other two. For, first Mr. Nicholas I had some Sense, but extreme virulent and foul Language; And from Serjeant Wilde Language good enough sometimes, but little or no Sense. For let me anwser what I would, when he came to reply, he repeated the Charge again, as if I had made no Anwser at all; or 'as if all that I express'd never so plainly, had been but tacit Intimations; which I think he under- stands as much as Sir Nathaniel Brent.

IV. In the Fourth Charge he told the Lords I would not trouble them with repeating the Evidence, but only put them in mind of some things in the Cafe of Ferdinando Adams of Ipswich; of the Men of Lexes suffering in the High-Commiffion, of the Parliifl'ers of Buckingham, and fome others heard, but would leave the Lords to their Memory and their Notes; Yet read over their Sen- tences given in the High-Commiffion, and made a Repetition of whatsoever might but make a Shew to render me odious to the People. And this hath been their Art all along, to run over these two things twice and again, (as they did here) in the Second Charge above the Picture of the Blessed Virgin) to the end, that the Ad- ditors changed, the more of them might he it; and that which wrought not upon some, might upon others. In all which I patiently referred myself to my former Anwers, having no other way to help myself; in regard they pretended that they renew'd the fame Infruptions, but not the same way; but in one Place, as against Law; and in another, as against Religion. But why then did they in both Places run over all Circumstances applicable to both? And on they went too with the Men of Lexes; where, 1. One Mr. Peny (they fay) was condemned cruelly in the High-Commiffion, for not removing the Communion-Table. The Bulfines was but this: Sir Nathaniel Brent, and his own Ordinary Dr. Nevill, ordered the Remove of the Table; he would not. For this Contumacy he was condemned, but enjoined only to make his Submission to Dr. Nevill. Which, I think, was a Sentence far from any barbarous Cruelty, as 'tis called. 2. Another Infruption, and the next, was Mr. Bar- ket. He fays, he was condemned also about removing the Communion-Table, and for that only. But firft, this was not for removing the Holy Table, but it was for altering the Church- wardens to remove it back again from the Place, where lawful Authority had set it. And secondly, whereas he fays, he was condemned for this only, the very Charge itself confufes him. For there 'tis said, that this, about removing the Commu- nion-Table, appears in the fixth Article that was against him. Therefore there were five other Articles at least more against him: and therefore not this only.

3. The
3. The third Instance was Mr. Chance: And he likewise is said to have suffered very much only about railing in of the Communion-Table. But this is not so neither: For he confesses that he spake reproofful Words against Authority, and in contempt of his Ordinary; that he said the Rails were fit to be set up in his Garden; that he came Fifty Miles from his own Church, on purpose to contemnse this Boxtine: And all this he acknowledges upon his Oath in his Submittion. And yet nothing laid upon him but Suspension; and that no longer than till he submitted. And all this the Act of the High-Communion, not mine.

And so I answered Mr. Browne, who urged this against me also. And the Truth of all this appears apt to be: tho' they were taken away, and kept ever since from my use, yet many Things done in that Court have been charged against me. And here stepped in a Tellermy of Mr. Goulbourn's, that I threatned 'em openly in the High-Communion to fulfond Dr. Merivat. And why might I not do it, if he will be over-bold with the Proceeding of the whole Court? I have known ere now a very good Lawyer committed from the Chancery- Bar to the Fleet, tho' I hall spare Names.

4. The fourth Instance was in Mr. Workman's Cafe; charged as if he were sentenced only for preaching a Sermon to the Judges against Images in Churches. (1) The first Witness was in the Cause was Mr. Longly. He says, Mr. Praxtik was con-

sidered for this Sermon and other Things. Therefore not for this Sermon only: The High-Commim-

tioners were no such Patron of Images. He says, That when I was Dean of Gloucester, I told them in the Chapel, that King James had heard of many Things amiss in that Church, and required me to take care of them. 'Tis true, he did so. He says farther, that hereupon I placed the Communion-Table Altar-wife, and commanded due Revereence at the coming into the Church. This I did, and I have given my Reason often already for it out of the Institutes of Queen Elizabeth. He says, that Bishop Smith took offence at this, and would come no more to the Cathedral. First, my Lords, this Gentleman was then School-mater there, and had free Access unto me: He never dif-
covered this. Secondly, the Bishop himself never told me he was in any manner displeased: And if he had, I would either have fastified his Lordship in that, or any thing else that I did: or if he had fastified me, I would have forborn it. He says, That Mr. Workman, after he was put from his Lecture, was not suffered to teach Children. If he had been suffered, this Man had been like to make the first Complaint for decay of his own School. But, Secondly, the Communion thought it no way fit to truit him with the Education of Children, who had been fautions among Men; especially not in that Place, where he had so flourished himself.

And this Answer I gave to Mr. Browne: who, in

summing the Evidence, stood much, and in-

volved as earnestly against this cruel Preceding with Mr. Workman, as upon any one Thing in the Cause. And I shall add, that the Judges after this

would not he forced to prattle Physick, to get his Living. Bar, First, no Witness evidences

this, that he was denied to prattle Physick.

And, Secondly, he might have taught a School,
or prattled Physick, any where else. But he had

done so much Harm, and made such a Fussion in

Gloucester, as that the High-Communion thought it not fit to continue him there: And he was not

willing to go from thence, where he had made

his Party. He says farther, That some few of the

Citizens of Gloucester were called into the High-

Communion, for an Annunity of Twenty Pound; a Yearallowed Mr. Workman out of the Town-Stock. For the Thing itself, it was a gods Abuse and Scorn put upon that Court: that when they had conferred a Seminastic Lecturer, (for such he was there proved) the Townsmen should make him an Allowance of Twenty Pound a Year: A Thing in

I humbly conceive not fit to be endur'd by any God-

lized Government. And whereas Glamour is made, that some few of the Citizens were called to an Ac-

count for it, that's as strange on the other Side:

For where there are so many Gentlemen, the Noise

would be too great to call all. And yet here's Noise enough made for calling a few. Here it was

replied by Mr. Meynart, That this was done by that Corporation, and yet a few fuddled out an

answer; and that therefore I might be fuddled out to answer for Things done in the High-Communion.

But, under favour, this learned and worthy Ge-

tlemans is mistaken: For here the Mayor and

Magistrates of Gloucester did that which was no

way warrantable by their Charter, in which Case

they may be accountable, all or some. But in

the High-Communion we meddled with no Cause

not cognisiable there; or if by Misfortune

we did, we were false of a Prohibition to that

us. And meddling with nothing but Things

proper to them, I conceive still no one Man can

be fuddled out to fatter for that which was done

by all. And this may serve to answer Mr. Brow-

 KNOWS also, who in his full Reply upon me, when I

might not answer, made use of it.

(2) The Second Witness was Mr. Pory of Glou-

cester. He says, That Mr. Brecky, and Mr. Goul-

the Town-Clerk, were called to the Council-Table

about this Annunity; and that I defiled it might be

further examined at the High-Communion. If this

were true, I know not of it, to that effect:

that such an Act of Government might be more

than thoroughly examined, than the Lords and he-

to. But the Witnesses do not give this in Evi-

dence: For he says no more, than that he heard

from Mr. Brecky, and the Mayor, that there was no

Concern or Business. And the Mayor, that the High-Communi-

tion called upon this Boxtine of the Annunity, as

informed that the Twenty Pound given to Mr.

Workman, was taken out of the Monies for the

Poor. And this I must still think was a good and

sufficient Ground justly to call them in Question.

He says also, that the Men were fined, because

that which they did was against Authority. So by

their own Witness it appears, that they were not

fined simply for allowing Means to Mr. Workman,

but for doing it in opposition to Authority. Lab-

bly, he says, they were fined Ten Pound a-piece:

and that justly taken off again. So here was no

such great Persecution, as is made in the Case.

And for the cancelling of this Deced of Annunity, it

was done by themselves, Mr. Longly witnessed.

And lastly the Mayor, that the Proceedings of the

High-Communion was read, which I could not have

come at, had not they produced it.

And by that it appeared evidently, that Mr. Work-

man was confounded as well for other Things, as

for his Sermon about Images in Churches. As first

he said, So many Places in Dancing, were so many to

Hell. This was hard, if he meant the Massacre

in the Inns of Court at Charlestown: and he excepted

none. Then he said, and was no way able to prove
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2. Yet the second Wimpe, Mr. Tompkins, says alfo, That I did judify this Picture. * God for

give him the Malice or Ignorance of this Oath, be it which it will. He might have been as wary as Mr. Corvill, and added (as he remembers) For so many Years since, as this Hearing was, he may eafeily mistake. But if I did lay any such thing, why are not my own Papers here produced against me? I had that written when I was in prison, and the Paper was in my Study with the rest, and came (for ought I know) into their Hands which follow the Charge against me. I ask again, why is not this Paper produced? Out of all doubt it would, there appeared any such fuch thing in it. He says alfo, That I laid then, that if the Idol of Jupiter was set up, yet it were not lawful to pull it down in a popular Tumult, but by Orde and Au

thority. I did lay fo, or to that effect, indeed; and must lay it all. For I find in St. Augustine, almost the very Words. And Bishop Divacan, a Man very learned, cites this Place of St. Augustin, and approves it. And they both prove this Doctrine from Dent. vii. 5. & xii. 2. Where the Command given for defroying of the Idols, when they came into the Land of Canaan, was not left at large to the People, but fetted in Moses the Chief Magif

trate, and his Power. And according to this Rule, the Temple of Ephesus, tho' then grown very fancholous, was not pulled down but by Gentilizes Command. Which Place I then flew the Lords. But this Wimpe added, That Mr. Show

field had Authority to do this from the Veity. If he had, that's as good as none; for by the Laws of England there is yet no Power given them for that, or any thing effe. And that all Vellries do, is by Uliparion, or Content of the Parish, but reaches not this. The Bishop of the Dioces had been fitter to be conflifted herein than the Veity. Here, as if these Wimpefs had not Lin enough, Mr. Nicolus offered himfelf to be a Wimpe; and told the Lords he was prefent at the Hearing of this Caufc; and that four Wimpefs came in clear, that the Picture broken down, was the Picture of God the Father; and that yet the Sentence of the Court paffed againft Mr. Showfield. First, if this be fo, it concludes againft the Sentence given in the Star-Chamber, nor againft me: And he calls it here the Sentence of the Court. Secondly, be it that it were undoubtedly the Picture of God the Father; yet he ought to have taken Authority along with him, and not to go about it with Violence; which he did, and fell, and brake his Leg in the Bafinets. Thirdly, By his own Description of the Picture, it seems to me to be none old Fabulous Picture out of a Legend, and not one of God the Father: For he then told the Lords, it was the Picture of an old Man with a Budget by his Side, out of which he was plucking Adam and Eve. And I believe no Man ever faw God the Father fo pictured any where. Laftly, Let me obferve to Mr. Nicolus, that he acts all parts upon him wherein he may hope to do me mischief.

VI. The third Charge was concerning a Bible that was printed with Pictures, and fold. The Wimpe was Mr. Walfad a Statcnon, who says, That this Bible was licentia by Dr. Weeks, my Lord of London's Chaplin, not mine: Thus far it concerns not me. * Yes, says Mr. Browne in his left Reply, for it appears in a Lift of my Chaplains, under my own Hand, that Dr. Weeks was
one. 'Tis true, when I was Bishop of Bath and
Wells, he was mine; but my Lord of London
had him from me, so soon as ever he was Bi-
shop; and was his, not mine, when he licent-
ated that Book. And Mr. Bracow knew that I an-
fwered it thus to the Lords.' He says, That
I gave him Direction that they should not be fold
openly upon the Stalls; but only to discreet Men
that knew how to use them. The Caepe was this:
As I was at Prayers in the King's Chapel, I there
faw one of them in Mrs. Kirk's Hands. She was
far enough from any Affection to Rome. And this
being the first Knowledge I had of it, many were
viewed and fold before I could prevent it. And I
accepted, I have lent one, (which was lent to the Wintifs
or another) and acquainted the Lords of the Council with it, and cravec his Direction
what should be done. It was there ordered, that
I should forbid the open Sale of them upon their
Stalls, but not otherwise to learn and discreet Men.
And when I would have had this Order riffer, no Man fluck to me but Mr. Secretary Cook.
So according to this Order I gave Direction
to Mr. Waljas, as he witnessed.
Here Mr. Mayord replied, That I ought to have
withdrown this Order, in regard it was every
fainly. For, said he, either these Pictures were
good or bad. And if they were good, why should
they not be fold openly upon the Stalls to all that
would buy? And if they were bad, why should
they be fold privetly to any? To this Reply
I was not suffered to answer. But when I heard
Mr. Bracow charge this Bible with Pictures a-
uggest me, then I anfwered the thing as before,
and took occasion thereby to answer this Ditto
namely: That, That this kind of Argument
concludes not; but in things necessary, and where
no Medinun can be given. For where a Medinun
can be given, the Horns of this Argument are
too weak to hurt; and for'tis here. For Pictures
in themselves are things indiffenent; not finely
good, nor finely bad, but as they are used.
And therefore they were not to be fold to all
Comers, because they may be abused, and be-
come Evil; and yet might be fold to learned and
discern Men, who might turn them to good.
And that Images are things indiffenent of them-
elves, is granted in the Homilies, 
which are against the very Peril
of Idolatry. He said, There were
some inconvenience Pictures among
them, as the Assumption and the Dove. Be it
fo, the Book was not licent by me nor mine
And yet, as it then shewed the Lords, they were
not fo ftrick at Amsterdam against these Pictures;
for the Book which Mr. Waljas shewed me, was
printed and fent thence, before it was printed
here. Besides, our old Engifh Bibles in the
Beginning of the Queen were full of Pictures, and
no fault found. As for that which was added at
the Bar, That one of these Bibles was found in
Secretary Winderbank's Trunk, and another in Sir
John Lambe's; that's nothing to me.

VII. The last Charge of this Day was, That
something about Images was expeuged out of Dr.
Featy's Sermons by my Chaplain, Dr. Bray, before
they could be suffered to be printed. But, First,
himself confesses, That I did not hit him might
print them, so nothing were in them contrary to the
Difcrine and Discipline of the Church of En-
gland. Secondly, He confesses, That when Dr.
Bray made fay of them, he never complained to
me; and I cannot remedy that which I do not
know. Thirdly, He confesses, That all the time he
was in Lambeth-House, my Predecessor ever left
Care of the Pref upon his Chaplains; and why I
might not do it as well as my Predecessor, I do not
yet know. But he faid, That he complained to
Sir Edmund Scott, and defird to be advised by
him what he should do; and that he anfwered, He
thought I would not meddle with that troublesome
Busines, more than my Predecessors had done.

Be this fo, yet Sir Edmund Scott never told me
this; nor is there any leat Proof off that
he did. But, John, and this is like Paffiges a-
book, containing fome Things of Books, mak-
such a great Noise, as if nothing concerning Im-
pery might be printed; and because Mr. Bracow
in rumming up of the Charge in the Houfe of
Commons, warmly iffufion this Particular,
I thought it necessary to anfwcr as follows: That
what moved my Chaplain to expunge that large
Paffige against Images, I know not; nor could I
now know, my Chaplain being dead. But that
this I was sure of, that elsewhere
in those very Sermons there was as
plain a Paffige, and full against 1-1-
images left in. And in another Place
a whole leaf together spent to prove
them, &c. But, and this is as the Bafflcs, and he fo tells them.
yea, and that the Pope is
Anonfcript; and not only called
fo, but proved by divers Argumenta-
only, but in plain Terms, that he
is the Whore of Babylon. And there
Paffiges I then read out of the
Book itself in the House of Commons:
and many other like to there are. So my Chap-
 lain might fee good Caufe to leave out some Pif-
fages, where fo many upon as good Caufe were
left in.'

But to the Busines of leaving the Care of the
Books, and the Over-view of them
to my Chaplain, it was then urged,
That the Commiifary of John Lord
Archibishop of York, had excom-
municated the Lord Bishop of Dur-
burn, being then in the King's Ser-
vices; and that the Archibishop
himself was deeply fain for this
Act of his Commiifary; and that
therefore I ought much more to be
anfwerable for my Chaplain's Act,
whom I might put away when I would, than he
for his Commiifary, who had a Patent, and could
not be put out at Pleasure.' Mr. Bracow also
foled this Precedent clofe upon me. But, firl,
there is a great deal of Difference in the thing it-
self: My Chaplain's Caepe being but the leaving out
of a Paffige in a Book to be printed; but his
Commiifary's Caepe being the Excommunicating
of a great Bishop, and he in the King's Service;
and therefore Honour the Laws of this Realm are very
tender. And, Secondly, the Bishop and his Offi-
cial, (call him Chancellor or Commiifary, or what
you will) make but one Perfon in Law; and there-
fore the Act of the Commiifary, to the full Ex-
tent of his Patent, is the Act of the Bishop in Law,
and therefore, is not to be anfwerable for it. But the Bishop and his Chaplain are not one Perfon in any Confequenc of Law. 'And
fay he may put away his Chaplain when he will,
yet that cannot help what is past, if ought has
been the
been done amiss by him. And this was the An- 
swer I insinuated on to Mr. Browne.

Upon my entrance on this Day's Defence, I 
found myself aggrieved at the Diurnal, and 
other Pamphlets of the Week, wherein they print 
whatsoever is charged against me, as if it were fully 
proved; never so much as mentioning what or 
how I answer'd. And that it troubled me the more, 
because (as I conceived) the Papalists, as there ex- 
pected, treached deep upon the Justice and Pro- 
cedings of that Honourable House; and could 
have no aim but to incense the Multitude against 
me. With some force; but, not without a fault. 
receipt; but there they died, and the weekly A- 
bulence of me continued to keep my Patience in 

The Thirteenth Day of my Hearing.

WHIT-MONDAY, June 11. 1644. The first 
Charge of this Day, was the Opinion 
which was held of me by the Senators. The first 
Witness was Sir Henry Mildmay, who (as is before 
told) told me without asking. That I was the 
most hateful Man at Rome, that ever was in my 
See; the Roman Jesuits were not to be trusted, 
but to be used only by good Preparation, a flexi- 
ble Contenance, and a fair leading Interrogatory. 
by Mr. Nicholls, (Mr. Sergeant Wilde was sick, 
and came no more till the last Day, when I made 
my Recapitulation) he minced it. And now he 
says, That there were two Factions at Rome, and 
that one of them did indeed speak very ill of me, 
because they thought I aimed at too great a Power 
here in England; but the other Faction spake as 
well of me, because they thought I endeavoured 
to bring us in England nearer to the Church of 
Rome. But, First, my Lords, this Gentleman's 
Words to me was very round and general; That I was 
hated at Rome, not of a Party or Faction there; 
and my Servants heard him at the same time, and 
are here ready to witness it, That he then said 
the Pope was a good Gentleman, and did use 
to ride two or three great Horses in a Morning; and 
but that he was something taller, he was as like 
Archbishop Philips (who was then at Dinner with 
me) as could be. But I pray mark what wise Men 
he makes them at Rome. One Faction hates me, be- 
cause I aim at too much Power; and the other 
loves me, because I would draw England nearer 
Rome. Why, if I went about to draw England 
nearer Rome, can any among them be so foolish as 
to think my opinion must have such a powerful 
Power for them, why should any there condem- 
me? And if I used it against them, why should any 
here accuse me? * Now fast bee these drafts tempo- 
rious; theses things fall not with the Times, or 
the Dispositions of Rome: But the plain Truth is, 
I do not think that ever he was at Rome; I never 
heard a Whisper, that he only stepped into France 
for another Cure, not to Rome for Curiosity, 
which was the only Caufe he gave the Lords of 
his going thither.

2. The second Witness was Mr. Challoner. He 
fays not much of his own Knowledge, but of 
that, that tattling Gossip, yet he tells us, his 
Lords, I was a very obscure Man in Rome within these 
fifteen Years. Be it so, if he pleases; yet I have been 
a Bishop above Thirty and Twenty Years; and his 
Eighteen Years since I was first Dean of his Mu- 
jelly's Chapel-Royal. He says, That after this 
time there was a strong Opinion of Reconcilia-
tion to Rome. A Strong Opinion, but a weak Proof. 
For it was an Opinion of Enemies, and few men 
could easily believe, that they over much defied. He 
farther said, That some of them were of Opin- 
ion, that I was good Roman Catholic, and that 
I wrought cunningly to introduce that Religion 
by Incense; and that they prayed for me. First, 
My Lords, the Opinion of Enemies is no Proof at 
all, that I am such as they think me. And se- 
condly, this is a notable, and no unpleasent piece 
of Canning, for an Enemy to defray by commend- 
ing the way, and I doubt not but it hath been practis'd, to raise a Jealousy a- 
gainst me at home, thereby either to work the Ruin 
of my Peron, or utterly to weaken and disable me 
from doing harm to them, or good for the Church of 
England. Besides, if the Condemnation of E- 
nemies may in this kind go for Proof, it shall be 
in the power of two or three prattling Jewels, 
to destroy any Bishop or other Church-man of 
England when they please. At last he told a 
Story of one Father J ohn, a Benedictine; that 
he affected him how Church-Livings were dispo-
fed in England, and whether I had not the dif-
ference of those who were in the King's Gift? 
And concluded, That he was not out of Rome, he 
see England reduced to Rome. Why, my Lords, 
this is not Father J ohn's Hope alone; for there is 
no Roman Catholic but hath some Hope alive 
in him to see this Day. And were we not for that 
Hope, there would not have been so many, so 
offensive, so dangerous Practices upon this King-
dom to effect it, both in Queen Elizabeth's time, 
and since. But if this I know not what Father 
John hope for, what is that to me?

3. The third Witness was Mr. Anthony Mildmay; 
a Man not thought on for a Witness, till I called 
for his Brother Sir Henry, but now it comes la-
den with his Brother's Language. He says it 
as Sir Henry did before. That there were two 
Factions at Rome, the Jesuits, and they abhorred 
me; but the other, the Peculiar Priests, they wished 
me well, as he was informed. First, This is so 
one and the same Tellimony, that any Man that 
will, may see, that either he informed his Brother, 
or his Brother him. Secondly, Here's nothing af-
firmed, for it is but as he was informed: And he 
doth not tell you by whom. It may be, my Lords, 
it was by his Brother. Then he says, This was 
to make myself great, and tells a Tale of Father 
Fletcher, as much to the honor, but as that which 
Mr. Mildmay told of Father J ohn. But whatsoever 
either of these Fathers said, it was but their 
own Opinion of me, or Heuray; neither of which 
can prove me guilty of any thing. * Thus much 
Mr. Anthony made a shift to say by Five of the 
Clock at Afternoon, when I came to make my 
Answer. And this (as I have sufficient Caufe to 
think) only to help to flour up his Brother's 
Tellimony. But in the Morning, when he 
should have come, as his Brother did, he was 
by nine in the Morning to drunk, that he 
was not able to come to the Bar, nor to speak 
common Sense, he had been brought thither: 
B. Mr. Anthony in Testimonie.

II. The second Charge was the Consecration 
of two Churches in London, St. Catherine Croy-Church, 
and St. Giles in the Fields. The Witanesse two. 
1. The first Witenas was one Mr. Willingtom. 
And he says, That I came to those Churches in a 

* The Archbishop calls the English Pelfogi Roman Catholicks; not as allowing them to be such, but referring to that Name, which from them were before laid to have affected to him. W. W.
pompous manner: but all the Pomp that he mentions, is, that Sir Henry Martin, Dr. Dak, and some other of the Archbishops, attended me, as they usually do their Diocesans in such solemnities. He says, he did curiously observe what was done, thinking it would one day be called to an account, as now it is. So this Man (himself being Judge) looked upon that Work with a malevolent Eye, and God preserve him from being a malicious Witness. He says, that at my Approach to the Church-door, was read, Life up your Heads, O ye Gates, and he ye lift up, ye everlasting Doors, and the King of Glory shall come in, Psal. xxxii. 7. And this was urg'd over and over, as a Jeer upon my Person. But this Place of Scripture hath been antiquely used in Conformations: And it relates not to the Bishop, but to God Almighty, the true King of Glory, who, when the Dedication enters by his Gate to take possession of the Head, then to be made his. He says, that he knelt down at my coming in, and after used many Bowings and Cringings. For my kneeling down at my entrance, to begin with Prayer, and after to proceed with Reverence, I did but my Duty in that; let him scoffingly call it Cringing, or Docking, or what he please.

He says farther, That at the beginning I took up Duff, and threw it in the Air, and after used divers Curfs. And here Mr. Prynn put Mr. Nicol's mind to add, that fregers & Creverm is the Form of Conformity used in the Protestant; And Mr. Browne, in his summary Account of my Charge, laid the very Conformity of these Churches as a Crime upon me, and insisted on this Particular. But here my Answer to all was the same: That this Witness had need look well to his Oath, for there was no throwing up of Duff, no Curfs used throughout the whole Action: Nor did I follow the Protestant, but a Copy of Learned and Reverend Bishop Andreys, by which he conformed divers Churches in his Time; and that this is so, I have the Copy by me to witness, and offered them to throw it. Nor can this howsoever favour any way of Trafal. No, said Mr. Browne, but the Trafal is, to fetch, by these Ceremonies, to overthrow the Religion established. Nor was that ever bought by me: And God of his Mercy preserve the true Protestant Religion amongst us, till the Conformity of Churches, and Reverence in the Church, can overthrow it; and then I doubt not, but, by God's Blessing, it shall continue fast to the Foundation.

He says also, that I did pronounce the Place Holy. I did so: And that it was in the folowing Act itself of the Conformation, according to the usual Form in that behalf. And no Man will deny, but that there is a Derivative and a Relative Holines in Places, as well as in Veffels, and other Things dedicated to the Honour and Service of God. Nor is any thing more common in the Old Testament; and this express in the New, both for Place and Things: 1 Cor. ix. 13.

Then it was urged at the Bar, that a Prayer which I used, was like one that is in the Protestant. So in the Maffal are many Prayers like to the Collects used in our English Liturgy, so like, that some are the very same, translated only into English; and yet these confirmed by Law. And for that of

Psal. xxvi. 6. Venite, procedamus, &c. then also excepted against, that hath been of very ancient use in the Liturgies of the Church. From which Rejections Pealehus, unquam & Graeco? We have equated the Chaff, shall we cast away the Corn too? If it come to that, let us take heed we fall out upon the Devil's winnowing, who labours to beat down the Corn; 'tis not the Chaff that troubles him, St. Luke xxii. 31. Then they urged my Predecessor Archbishop Parker, that he found fault with the Conformation of new Churches. I answered then upon Memory, that he did not find fault simply with Conformations of Churches, but only with the superfetitious Ceremonies used therein. And this line, upon perilous of the Place, I find it to be true. For after he had in some commended the Popes for taking away some gross and superfetitious Purifications, he added that yet, for want of Liberty or Prudence, their last Penitent and Mifil-backs did out the matter in multitudine Ceremoniarum, & progeandi Digita, tete, & Texta, & Exorcisatio Animae. So that were the Things he found fault with, not the Conformations itself; which he could not well do, him self being then a conformer Bishop.

2. The second Witness was Mr. Hype. He says, that he agrees with the former Witnesses, and for all, and the throwing up of the Duff, &c. Since he agrees with the former Witnesses, I give him the same Answer. Yet with this Observation upon him and his Oath: The former Witnesses say, that at the beginning of this Action, I took Duff and threw it up; this Man agrees with him, and adds it all; and almost in the very next Words, confesses he was not there at the Beginning. Nor there; yet he saw it. My Lords, if you mark it, this is a wholsome Oath. He says, that then the Churchyard was confirmed by it. It was so; the one Act must follow the other, the both done the same Day: For the Places being different, the Act could not pass upon them at the same time. Then he said, there were Fees required, and a good Eye had to the Money. This is a poor Objection against me: if the Officers did expect any Money without Rule, or beyond Precedent, let them answer for it. But for that which was paid to belong to me, I privately gave it to the Poor of the Parish: and this Mr. Delly my Secretary, then presented, attested to the Lords. Lastly he fell, they had not new Churches; let him look to his Oath again; for 'tis not commonly known, they were both new built from the Ground, and St. Giles not wholly upon the old Foundation.

III. The third Charge was laid on me only by Mr. Nicol's, and without any Witnesses. It was, That I went out Popery itself; for the Popish conformed Churches only, but I had been so con- corneous, that I had conformed * Chapels too. My Lords, the use of Chapels and of Churches in regard of God's Service, is the fame. Therefore if Conformation be fit for the one, it must needs be for the other. And the Conformations of Chapels was long before Popery came into the World. For even Oratories newly built were conformed in or before Euloginius's Time; and he flourished the Year of Christ 310. So ancient they are in the Court of Cardinality, and for any

* Here in England, both before and since the Reformation, Chapels newly erected were always formally conformed, as well as Churches. I would produce innumerable Instances of the Time preceding, many of the Time succeeding the Reformation. H. W.
Prohibition of them, there is neither Law nor Canon in the State or Church of England that doth it.

The Chapels they infall in are three. First, they say I consecrated a Chapel of the Right Honourable the Lord Treasurer Wivou's. I did so, and did no harm therein. As for the Touch given by the way upon that Honourable Person, he is gone to God, I have nothing to do with it. Secondly, they infall in a Chapel of Sir John Wycett's building. 'Tis true, I consecrated that too, but just before I consecrated it, a stage coach, built in the year of my reign, where he was born, and it was built in my name, and to the Work proper for me. The third Infall was in my own Chapel, in my House at Westminster, when I was Bishop of St. Davids, the Room lay walled and out of repair, and I fitted it at my own cost, and consecrated it into a Chapel, that House having no Oratory before. Here they further aggravated many Circumstances; as First, That I named it at the Dedication, The Chapel of St. John the Baptist. I did so name that Chapel, in memory of the College where I was bred, which bears the same Name; but I dedicated it to God and his Service. And to give the Names of Angels and Saints to Churches, for distinction-like, and for the honour of their memory, is very antient and usual in the Church, as appears in St. Agatha, and divers others of the Fathers; but dedicated only to God: Which in the midst of Superstitious Times, the School itself confesseth. 'S'though not ordain'd. Secondly, That I did it upon the 29th of August. And why might I not do it that Day, as well as upon any other? But referring to name the Chapel as I did, I rather made choice of that Day, both because it was the Day of the Decollation of St. John the Baptist, and because as upon that Day God had wonderfully blessed me, in the Hearing of my Caule concerning the Predishtship of St. John's College in Oxford, by King James of everlasting Blessings: So yet no Offence. Thirdly, There was a Paper read, and avowed to be mine; To which I assented. Description of Chapel-Furniture and rich Plate, of which the King was in use in that Chapel, and Wafers for the Communion. At the reading of this Paper I was a little troubled. I knew I was not so rich, as to have such Plate or Furniture; and therefore I humbly desired the Paper of the. So soon as I saw it, I found there was nothing in it in my hand but the Indorsement, which told the Reader plainly, that it was the Model of the Reverend Bishop Andrews's Chapel, with the Furniture, Plate, Ceremonies therein and all, and of such a Nature. And this Copy was sent me by the Houlapp Chaplain to that famous Bishop. 'This I laid open to the Lords, and it would have made any Man ashamed, but Mr. Prym, who had delivered upon Oath, that it was a Paper of my Chapel-Furniture an Untrue, contrary to my Conscience, and my own Eye. Right of the Paper. And for Wafers, I never either gave or received the Communion, but in ordinary Bread. At Westminster I knew it was sometimes used, but as a thing indifferent. As for the Star here given to that Reverend dead Bishop of Winchperter, it might well have been fairest; he delivered far better Ulage for his Service to the Church of England, and the Protestant Caue.

IV. The Fourth Charge was the publishing the Book of Creations: and it was uttered in with this Scorn upon me, That I laboured to put a Badge of Holiness, by my Breath, upon Places; and to take it away from Days. But I did neither; the King commanded the printing of it, as is therein attested, and the Warrant which the King gave me, they have. And tho' at Conferences I read the Prayers, yet it was God's Blessing, not my Breath, that gave the Holiness. And for the Day, I ever laboured it might be kept holy, but yet free from a superstitious Holiness. And this was said, That this was done of purpose to take away Preaching. But first, there is no Proof offered for it. And Secondly, it is impossible: for till the Afternoon-Service and Sermon were done, no Recreations is allowed by that Book, nor then to any, but such as have been at both: therefore it could not be done to take it away. Thirdly, the Book names none but lawful Recreations; therefore if any unlawful be done the Book gives them no warrant. And that some are lawful (after the publick Service of God is ended) appears by the Practice of Geneva, where after Evening-Prayer, the elder Menn bowl, and the younger train. And Calvin saies in express Terms, That one Caue of the Institution of the Sabbath was, That Sermonis might have a Day of Rest and Recreation from that Labour. And what time of the Day fit, if not after Evening-Prayer? And what Rest is there for able-bodied Men, if they may use no Recreation? They it was urged, That there was a great Riot and Disorder at Wakes kept on the Lord's-Day. That is a very sufficient Caue to regulate and order those Feasts, but not quite to take them away. I make no doubt for my part, but that the Feasts of the Dedication was abused by some among the Jews: and yet Christ was so far from taking it away for that, as that he honoured it with his own Presence: St. John's. 22. As for the Paper which was read, containing three Caues why that Book was published, that was a Note taken for my own private Use and Memory. Then came in Mr. Prym, who said, That the Lord Chief Justice Richardson had made an Order in his Chirch against the Wakes, and was forced to revolve it. This was done by Authority, as it is before answer'd; to which I refer myself. Here 'tis added, to help fill up the Nolte. But Mr. Prym says, That all the Gentlemen in the Country petitioned on the Judge's behalf. No; there was a great Fussion in Sowerthfield at that time, and Sir Robert Phillips and all his Party writ up against the Judge and the Order he made, as was apparent by the Certificates which he returned. And Sir Robert was well known in his time to be neither Pope nor Profane. He says farther, That Williaii then Earl of Pembroke was out of Town, and the Book printed in the interim by my Procurement. But for this stuff, here's not one word of Proof offered, and so I leave it.

V. The Fifth Charge was, That some Ministers were punished for not reading this Book. Witness for these were produced.

1. The first was Sir Nathaniel Brent; who says, He had charge from me to call for an account of not reading this Book, both in my Province at my Visitation, and in my Diocess. His Majestie having commanded this, I could do little, if I had not so much as inquired what was done. And
he confesses, That for my Province he gave time to them which had not read it, and then never asked more after it. So here was no eager Prosecution. But then he says, that three in my Diocces stood out, and asked time; and confesses that I granted it; but adds, that when he asked more time for them, I denied it; and that they were then suffered to go off alone. I thought I had reason to deny, when I saw they did but daily by asking time. And it was then evident, that in the Diocces of other Bishops far more than three were punished, and their Punishment greater. However, this my Proceeding was far from Rigour.

And this was the Answer that I gave Mr. Bacon, who in the Sum of his Charge interfered in this Particular against me.

2. The second Witnesse was Mr. Colman, one of the three Ministers that was suffered. He says, That he was suffered by Sir Nathaniel Brow, and that when he came to me about it, I said, If you know not how to obey, I know not how to grant your Petition. Truly, my Lords, finding him both wilful and ignorant, I cannot tell what I could say less. He says, that his Patron took away his Benefice. Why, my Lords, he had none: he was only a Curate, and God knows, unfit for that. So being suffered from his Office, this must needs be done. He says, he was not abdolved till the Statute came in, and that he was conformable in all things else. For the time of his Abdolation, I leave that to the Record: but for his Conformity in other Things, 'tis more than ever I heard of any.

This I can say for him, he is good at purchasing a Benefice; for he offered a Servant of mine One hundred and fifty Pounds, so he could procure me to name him to the Parliament for Cowthun in Kent. Since, I have heard he is as good at doing Reverence in the Church:

for he pilfed in the Body of the Palace:

Cathedral at Canterbury at Noon-day, as will be jufithed by Oath.

And for this Very particular, the Book of Recreations, he informed at the Council-able against a Gentilman of Quality, for saying, It was not fit to be printed: be fits, for Ministers to read in the Church. And as truly, as he laid by the Heels, for the Fullhold of this Information, it is very true. But there is point of Conscience too, that can refute to read the Book, as being unfit, and complain to have another punished for saying 'tis so.

3. The third Witnesse is Mr. Willson. He says, that I sent to Sir Nath. Brow to suspend him. That is true, but it was when he would neither obey, nor keep in his Tongue. He says, his Living was sequestred for almost four Years. But it was not for not reading this Book. For himself confesses it was done in the High-Comission; and that for Dilapidations, in not repairing his Houfe.

4. The fourth Witnesse was one Mr. Swallow, a Minister in the Dioceses of Rochester. All that was done against this Man, was openly in the High-Comission Court; and there he was convicted of other things, as well as for this. Himself confesses his open railing to bow at the Name of Jesus, tho' the Canon of the Church command it. I kept him off from being sentenced a long time, and when he was sentenced, he confesses I was not present. He says, somewhat was expounded out of his Brief. If it were, it was with the content of his Counsel; which in that Court was ordinary. Howsoever it cannot touch me: for those Things were done at Informations, where I was not present. He says, that when I heard of the Nature of his Defence, I said, If my just Defense were put in, it should be barret. This was upon just Complaint of the Judge then present at Informations, affirming it was against all the Course of that Court. He says, there is no Penalty mentioned in that Declaration. And I say, his Obedience, and other Duties, should have been the more free and clearful. Well, I pray God keep us in the Mean, in this Business of the Sabbath, as well as in other Things: that we not run into a Jesuit Superstition, while we seek to shun Prophanesse. This Calvin hath in the mean time amused me, That those Men who wandr'd so freely upon the Sacrament of the Sabbath, de, by a gross and carnal Satrachathism, three times out-go the Superstition of the Jews.

Here it was inferred, That there was a Combination for the doing of this in other Dioceses. But no Proof at all was offered. Then Bishop Montagius's Articles, and Bishop Wren's, were read, to shew that Inquiry was made about the reading of this Book; and the Bishop of London's Articles named, but not read. But if I were in this Combination, why were not my Articles read? Because no such thing appears in them; and because my Articles gave so good Content, that while the Convocation was sitting, Dr. Ewes and Dr. Holles's came to me, and defined me to have my Book confirmed in Convocation, to be general for all Bishops in future, it was so moderate, and according to Law. But why then (say they) were other Articles thought on, and a Clause that none should pass without the Approbation of the Arch-bishop? Why; other were thought on, because I could not in modesty press the Confirmation of my own, tho' solicited so. And that Clause was added, till a standing Book for all Dioceses might be perfected, that no Figure in the interim might be put to any, but such as were according to Law.

VI. The sixth Charge was about reverting of a Decree in Connexy (as 'tis said) about Houses in Dr. Walton's Parish, given (as was said) to superstitious Uses.

1. The first Witnesse was Serjeant Turner. He says, He had a Rule in the King's Bench for a Prohibition in this Cause. But by reason of some Defect (what, is not mentioned) he confesses he could not get his Prohibition. Here's nothing that reflects upon me. And if a Prohibition were moved for, that could not be pernicious to me, but to my Judge in some Spiritual Court, where it seems this Cause depended, to which the Decree in Connexy was directed. And indeed this Act, which they call a Revocation, was the Act and Seal of Sir Nath. Bacon, as Vice-General. And if he violated the Lord Keeper's Decree, he must answer for it. But the Instrument being then produced, it appeared concurrent in all Things with the Decree. The Words are, 'mutua ius propriumet in partes in Curia Cancellatione jussim, &c.'

2. The
2. The second Witness was Mr. Edwards. And wherein he concurs with Serjeant Turner, I gave him the same Answcr. For that which he adds, ThaT Dr. Wollen did Leafes of these Houles at an undcr Value, and called none of the Parishioners to it: If he did in this any thing contrary to Ju- rica, or the Will of the Donor, or the Decree, he is living to anwer for himself; he it concerns not. For his Exception taken to my Grant (of Confirmation, I think he means) and to the Words therein, Quinis & Cunctatis, &c. 'tis the ancient Style of such Grants for I know not how many Hundred Years; no Syllable innovated or altered by me.

VII. Then followed the Charge of Mr. Burton and Mr. Pryns, about their Answcr, and their not being suffered to put it into the Star-Chamber. Which, tho' Mr. Pryns preffed at large before, yet here it must come again, to help to fill the World with Glamour. Yet to that which shall but seem new, I shall answcr. Two Things are said: (i.) The one, that they were not suffered to put in their Defence verbis & formis, as it was laid. There was an Order made openly in Court to the Judges to expunge scandalous Matter. And the two Chief Justices did order the expunging of all that which was expunged, be it more or less; as appears in the Acts of that Court. (ii.) The other is, that I procured this Expunging. The Proof that procured it, were these: First, Because Mr. Calk- foot gave me account of the Bofines from Mr. At- torney. I had reason to look after the Bofines, the whole Church of England being scandalized in that Bill, as well as myself. But this is no Proof that I either gave Direction, or used any Solicitation to the Reverend Judges, to whom it was referred. Secondly, Because I gave the Lords Thanks for it. It was openly in Court: It was after the Expunging was agreed unto. And what could I do in such a Cause of the Church, tho' I had not been personally concerned in it? Thirdly, Because I had a Copy of their Answcr found in my Study. I conceive it was not only fit but necessary for me to have one, the Nature of the Cause considered. But who interlined any Paragges in it with Black-lead, I know not: For I ever used Ink, and no Black-lead all my Life. Thence be strange Proofs that I procured any thing.

Then Mr. Pryns added, That the Justice and Favour which was afforded Dr. Lighton was de- nied unto him. As far as I remember, it was for the putting in of his Answcr under his own Hand. This, if so, was done by Order of the Court; it was not my Act.

VIII. The last Charge followed: And that was taken out of the Preface to my Speech in the Star- Chamber. The Words are, That one Way of Government is not always either fit or best, when the Humours of the Peo- ple are in a continual Change, &c. From whence they inferred, I laboured to reduce all to an arbitrary Government: But I do humbly conceive no construction can force those Words against me for an arbitrary Government: For the Meaning is, and can be no other, for sometimes a Stricker and sometimes a remitter holding and ordering the Reins of Government; yet both according to the same Laws, by a different use and application of Mercy and Justice to Offenders. And so I answer'd to Mr. Browne, who charged this against me as one of my ill Counsellors to his

Majesty. But my Answcr given is Truth: For it is not said, That there should not be one Law for Government, but not one Way in the ordering and execution of that Law.

And the 6 Observer upon my Speech, (an English Author, and well enough known, tho' he pre- tends 'tis a Translation out of Dutch) tho' he spares nothing that may be but carpt at; yet to this Paffage he says, 'tis a good Maxim, and wishes the King would follow it. And truly, for my part, I learned of a very wise and an able Governor, and he a King of England too, it was of Henry VII. of whom the Story says, That in the Difficulties of his Time and Caufe he used both Ways of Government, Severity and Cle-

mency; yet both these were full within the Compuls of the Law. He far too wise, and I never yet such a Fool, as to imbrace arbitrary Government.'

June 14. 1644. This Day I received a Note from the Committee, that they intended to proceed next upon the Remnant of the Seventh, and upon the Eighth and Ninth Original Arti- cles which follow to be verbsa. 8th. That for the better advancing of his Traitorous Purposes and Designs, he did abuse the great Power and Trust his Majesty repose in him; and did intrude upon the Places of divers great Officers, and upon the Right of other of his Majesty's Subjects: whereby he did procure to himself the Nomination of fundry Persons to Ecclesiastical Dignities, Promotions and Bene- 

fits, belonging to his Majesty, and diverts of the Nobility, Clergy, and others; and hath taken upon him the Commendation of Chaplains to the King; by which Means he hath preferred to his Majesty's Service, and to other great Promotions in the Church, such as have been popishly affect- 

ed, or otherwise unfound and corrupt both in Doctorine and Manners.

IX. He hath for the same traitorous and wicked Intent, chosen and employed such Men to be his Chaplains, whom he know to be notoriously dissociated to the Reformed Religion, grossly addicted to Popish Superstition, and erroneous and unfound both in Judgment and Practice. And to them, or some of them, he hath committed the Licensing of Books to be printed; by which Means divers illicit and superstitious Books have been published, to the great Scandal of Religion, and to the seducing of many of his Majesty's Sub- jects.

The Fourteenth Day of my Hearing.

Monday, June 17. 1644. At the end- ing of the former Day's Charge, I was put off to this Day, which held.

1. The first Charge was concerning Mr. Dab- ilet's having his Benefit in London, and going into Holland.

2. The first Witness for this was Mr. Turner, a bitter Enemy of mine; God forgive him. He speaks as if he had fled from his Ministry here for fear of me. But the second Witness, Mr. Dabell, says, that he went away under a Warrant that came to sumon him into the High-Commission. The Truth is, my Lords, and 'tis well known,
known, and to some of his best Friends, that I
preferred him once before, and my Lord Port came
and gave me thanks for it. If after this he fell
into danger again, say Sir Pecrum kahet; I cannot
preferre Men that will continue in dangerous Cour-
ses. He says farther, (and in this the other Wit-
nesses agree with him) That when I heard he was
gone into New-England, I should say my Arm
should reach him there. The Words I remember
not. But for the Thing, I cannot think it fit that
any Plantation should secure any Offender against
the Church of England. And therefore if I did
say my Arm should reach him, or them so offend-
ings, I know no Crime in it, so long as my Arm
reached no Man but by the Law.

2. The second Witness, Mr. Drakeford, adds noth-
ing to this, but that he says, Sir Maurice Abbot
kept him in bed. For which I thank you. For by this it appears, that Mr. Douaart was
a dangerous and foolish Man, and accounted
in my Predecessor's time, and it seems procured then too, that his Brother Sir Maurice Abbot was
fain (being then a Parionier of his) to labour
hard to keep him in.

II. The second Charge was concerning Natha-
aniel Wicken, a Servant of Mr. Prym.

1. The first Witness in this Case was William
Wicken, Father to Nathaniel. He says, His Son
was nine Weeks in divers Prisons, and for no cause
but for that he was Mr. Prym's Servant. And it ap-
pears upon Sin, that there were many Articles of
great Misdemeanour against him. And afterwards
himself adds, That he knew no cause, but his ref-
using to take the Oath ex Officio. Why, but if he
knew that; then he had nothing of his being Mr. Prym's Servants: unless he will say all
Mr. Prym's Servants refuse that Oath, and all that
refuse that Oath are Mr. Prym's Servants. As
for the Sentence which was laid upon him, and the
Imprisonment, that was the Act of the High-
Commination, not mine. Then he says, That my Hand
was first in the Warrant for his Commitment. And
so it was to be of course.

2. The second Witness was Sarah Wayman; she
says, That he refused to take the Oath. There-
fore he was not committed for being Mr. Prym's Servant. She says, That for refusing the Oath, he
was threatened he should be taken pro Concesso;
And that when one of the Doctors reply'd, That
could not be done by the Order of the Court, I should
say, I would have it Order'd in the next Court Day;
That he was in the Court of that Court, that
any Man may be taken pro Concesso, that will not
take the Oath, and answer. Yet feyeling how that
Party of Men prevailed, and that one Doctor's
doubting might breed more difference, to the great
scandal and weakening of that Court; I publicly
acquainted his Majesty and the Lords with it;
who were all of opinion, that if such Refusers
might not be taken pro Concesso, the whole Power
of the Court was shakend. And hereupon his Ma-
jesty sent his Letter under his Signet, to command
us to uphold the Power of the Court, and to pro-
ceed. She says farther, That he defined the light
of his Articles, which was denied him. It was
the constant and known Courte of that Court, that
he might not see the Articles till he had taken
the Oath which he refused to take.

3. The third Witness was one Flower. He agrees
about the business of taking him pro Concesso; But
that's anwered. He adds, That there was noth-
ing laid to his charge; and yet confesseth, that
Wicken defers to see the Articles that were against
him. This is a pretty Oath: There were Arti-
cles against him, which he defers to see, and yet
there was nothing laid to his charge.

4. Then was produced his Majesty's Letter sent
unto us. And herein the King requires us by his
Supreme Power Ecclesiastical to proceed, &c.
We had been in a fine cafe, had we disobeyed this
Command. Besides, my Lords, I pray mark it, we
are enjoined to proceed by the King's Supreme
Power Ecclesiastical; and yet it is here urged a-
gainst me, that this was done to bring in Popery.
An excellent new way of bringing in Popery by
the King's Supremacy. Yes, but they say, I should
not have procured this Letter. Why? If I hope
I may by all lawful ways to preserve the Honour
and just Power of the Court in which I sat. And is
expressed in the Letter, that no more was done,
than was agreeable to the Laws and Customs of the
Realm. And 'tis known that both an Oath, and a
taking pro Concesso in point of refutall, are used
both in the Star-Chamber and in the Common

5. The last Witness was Mr. Prym, who says, that
his Man was not suffer'd to come, during his Soreness, when his Ears were croup. This
Favour should have been asked of the Court of
Star-Chamber, not of me. And yet here is no
Proof that I denied him this, but the bare Repor-
t of him, whom he says he employ'd. Nor do I
remember any Man's coming to me about it.

III. The third Charge followed; it was con-
cerning Flogging of Poole's from the Pkest, both old
and new, and expunging of some part of them.

1. The first Instance was about the English Bibles
with the Geneva Notes. The Bibles with those Notes were tolerated indeed both in Queen
Elizabeth's and King James's time; but allowed
by Authority in neither. And King
James laid plainly, That he thought the Geneva Translation was the soundest, and
many of the Notes very partial, unwise,
faululent, and favouring too much of dangerous and
subversive Conjectures: and gave Instrance. This Pa-
fage I then read to the Lords; and withall told
them. They now of late these Notes were more
commonly used to ill Purposes than formerly, and
that was the Cause why the High-Commination was
more careful and strict against them than before.

Here Michael Sparks the elder came in as Wit-
ness and said, He was called into the High-Commination about thes Books: but he confest it,
was not only for them. He says, The Refrain't
of them Bibles was for the Notes: but he adds, as he
fayth. And his Supposal is no Proof. Besides,
he might have added here alfo, that the Refrain't
was not for the Notes only: for by the numerous
coming over of Bibles, both with and without
Notes, from Amsterdam, there was a great and a
just Fear conceived, that by little and little Print-
ing would quite be carried out of the Kingdome.
For the Books which came thence, were better
Print, better bound, better Paper, and, for all the
Charges of buying, folding, cold cheaper.

And would any one buy a worse Bibe dearer,
why might he have a better cheaper? And to preverse
Printing here at home, as well as the Notes, was
the cause of BifTer looking to those Bibles: And
this appears by a Letter of Sir William Biffield's,
his Majesty's Agent in the Low-Countries; the Let-
tter written to me, and now produced against me:
but makes for me, as I conceive. For therein he
fends
are named in Mr. Fox, and yet not all of them neither; for he had left out the solemn Days, which are in Fox, Feb. 2. Feb. 25. Mar. 25. And Grammer translated it to Mar. 29.

In this particular Mr. Genevred, Brother to this Almanack-Maker, writeth, but that the Queen sent to me about this new Almanack. If her Majesty did send to me about it (as 'tis probable he would dilate the Book) is that any Crime in me? Could I prevent her Majesty's sending, who could not know so much as that she would send? He says, His Brother was acquainted in the High-Commis- sion, but charged me, that he made a Fæscion in the Court. If I did say so, fully, my Lords, I saw some prudifying by this in new-found Way. He says, The Papists bought up a great Number of these Almanacks, and burnt them. It seems he could not hinder that, nor I neither; unleas it shall not be lawful for a Papist to buy an Almanack: for when he hath bought him, he may burn him if he please.

But since the Book of Martyrs was named, I shall tell you Lordships how careful I was of it. It is well known how easily Abridgements, by their Bre- vity and their Cheapness, in short time out work the Authors themselves. Mr. Young the Printer laboured me earnestly and often for an Abridgment of the Book of Martyrs, but I still withheld it (as my Secretary here presen can testify) upon these two Grounds: The one, it should bring the large Book itself into disfave; and the other, it should be out of any manner of Thing should be left out, that should have been charged as done of purpose by me, as now I see its in other Books. And I only pray your Lordships to open your Eyes upon the Front- piece of the Book of Martyrs, printed anno 1642: since this Parliament began, and when I was safe enough from having any hand in the Buffens, and there you shall fee as dangerous Pictures as have been charged upon me, or any my Chapel-Win- dows.

Upon occasion of Mr. Genevred's Calendar, Mr. Prym took occasion to tell the Lords, That I had made Notes upon the Calendar in the Miffell. I de- ered they might be read: it was thought too te- dious. They were nothing but some Additions of my own reading to the Occurrences on some Days. And because the Calendar in the Miffell is now open and large, I thought fit to write them there.

5. The fifth Inscription is in Dr. Peak- linson's Cenfure of \* \* \* \* and of \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*; and that this Book was licened by my Chaplain Dr. \* \* \* \* \* ; and he was confir'd in this Honourable House for that and like Slips of his. Then it was inferred at the Bar, That it must be taken as my Act, if it were done by my Chaplain: But Inferences are no strong Proof. And, I conceive, no Man can by Law be punish'd criminally for his Servant's Fact, unlees there be Proof that he had it hand in it. Then it was urged, but without any Proof too, that the Book was approved by me. To which I shall answer when Proof of Writ is made; and if I had, 'tis far enough from Treacon.

6. The next Inscription was about the calling in of Thomas Bowes's Disputation of the Mafs. The Witnes Mr. Prym. He says, The Book was licen- ced, and that a Papist thereupon said, Doth my Lord of Canterbury licent such Books? That I was informed of these Words, and the Book called in the next Day. Firdt Mr. Prym is single in this
part of the Testimony for the Words. Secondly, if any Papist did say so, it was not in my Power to stop his Mouth; and they which license Books, must endure many and various Centuries, as the Readers of them stand affected. Thirdly, if any Papist did so speak, I have Reason to think it was to do me no much harm; and in the Lay, Fourthly, This is a very bold Oath, for it was evident, that I was informed of these Words. He was not present to hear it, and then he can have it but by Hearsay; and no Religion teaches him to swear that for Truth, which he doth but hear. Lastly, The Book was called in, because it was filled out contrary to the late Decree for Printing. Yea, but Mr. Prym swears, and so doth Michael Sparks the other Witnesse, That the Book was sent to the Printer before the Decree. But First, Sparks's Oath is uncertain; for he says, Mr. Prym lent him the Book before the Decree; and then by and by after says, it was about that time. Now the Book is somewhat large, so that it might be lent him before; and if it were lent, it might be printed and that a good Space too. And, Secondly, Mr. Prym himself confesses, the Book was sent after the Decree was in Agitation.

7. The seventh Impeachment is about Arminianism, as maintained by me against the Declarations of both Houses of Parliament, and of King James's, concerning Purtians and Britains. First, I have nothing to do to defend Arminianism, no Man having yet charged me with the abetting any Point of it. Secondly, King James's Declaration is very learned: But under Favour, he puts a great Deal of Difference between Purtians and Britains; and his Majesty's Opinion is clear with the Article of the Church of England, and so expressed by himself; and to which I ever contended. And the Pulpit in the Conference at Heston,

Coffin, at Hanover Court,

f. 29, 30.

dividual was then read to the Lords; and yet for the Peace of Christendom, and the strengthening of the Reformed Religion, I do heartily with these Differences were not purg'd with such Heat and Animosity, in regard that all the Lutheran Protestants are of the same Opinions, or with very little Difference from those which are now called Arminianism.

And here comes in Michael Sparks, who says, He was called into the High-Communion about a Book of Bishop Cosin's I cannot punctually remember all Particulars so long since; but he confesses the Bishops was in the High-Communion, and so not firmly chargeable against me. Besides, he is fidget in this Bishops. He says, He was Eleven Years in the High-Communion, and never sentenced. This is more than I know: But if it be so, he had better look to some honefer Men; for a bitter Enemy, to his Power, the Church-Government never had. He was Mr. Pryms Printer. He says, I was a Dean then, and he thinks of Hestford. I was never Dean of Hestford: But howsoever, this is a dangerous Oath; let him think of it. He feears that I was a Dean then, and a High-Communioner, or else what had I to do in the Bishops? Now it is well known I was never a High-Communioner, till I had been a Bishop some Years. For the Book itself, Sparks says nothing what was the Argument of it, but (so far as I remember) it was expressly against the King's Decree, and so I never read it. But because, when he summed up the Evidence against me in the House of Commons. And ther' in his Reply he seemed to deny this, yet I remember no Proof he brought for it.

8. The last Impeachment was pregnant, and brought forth many Particulars. As First, Dr. Peels's Parallels against Bishop Manning: but this was full-born; at least it says nothing of me. Secondly, Mr. Prym's Parallels, and against Dr. Cosin, both were set out. But he doth not say absolutely burr, but as he is informed; and he may be informed untruly. And howsoever he says, it was done by the High-Communion, not by me. Thirdly, Some Sheets of Dr. Stedliph's Book prohibited the Preach at Oxford. I hope Oxford is able to give an Account for itself. And whereas it was here said at the Bar, They hoped I would have some reprof of non-conformity to the Part; I would satisfy their Hopes abundantly, could I bring Witnesse from Oxford; for even and Reddy a Hand I carried to both Parties. Fourthly, Mr. Burton questioned about his Book called, The Seven Fruits. But himself confesses, That upon Sir Henry Martyn's Information, that, as that Cause was laid, the High-Communion had no Power in it, he was dismission.

Fifthly, That about his Book, intituled, Bohol, no Babel, he was questioned at a Court out of Term. This was very usual, whenever the Court was full of Bishops, to hold one Court-day out of Term. This is warranted by the Communion, and Warning of it was always publicly given the Court-day before, that all, whom it concerned, might take notice of it, and provide themselves.

Sixthly, He says he was there called at Bishop Hermiston. 'Tis more than I know that Bishop Hermiston called at him; but if he did, I hope I am not brought hither to answer all Men's Faults. Seventhly, He says, He declared the Petition of Right, yet was committed. This is more than I know: I know nothing of such a Petition, and was from the Church Court, not from the High-Communion Court, not by it. He says next, That he could never be quiet. But I am sure, my Lords, the Church for these Years could never be in quiet for him and his Associates. Lastly, They say, Some Passages against Arminianism, were left out of two Letters; one of Bishop Darcans, and the other of Bishop Nolds, sent to be printed. First, Here's no Proof at all offer'd, that I differed in any thing from the Doctrine express'd in those Letters. And Secondly, for the leaving out of those Passages, it was (it seems) done to avoid kindling of new Flames in the Church of England. And it appeared on the other Side of the Paper, which was produced against me, and so read to the Lords, that these Passages were left out by the express Order from those Bishops themselves, under Bishop Holford's own Hand; and with Thanks to Dr. Turner, then my Chaplain, for his Letter to them. And here this Day Bishops ended; and I received Command to attend again the Twentieth of the same Month.

The Fifteenth Day of my Hearing.

Hurlsby, June 20, 1644. This Day came a motion to the House. A Day or two before, as now also, the Landing-Place at Wimington was not so full of People; and they which were there, much more civil towards me than formerly. My Friends were willing to persuade me, that my Anser had much abated the Edge of the People, favorably partaking of it. Except Leisler, who was Multitude, whom it seems nothing would satisfy but my Life, (for so I was after told in plain Terms by a Man deeply interested in them;) when I pretendly saw Spintermann coming toward...
me; who, so soon as he came, fell to his wonted rolling, and afield aloud, What the Lords meant, to be troubled so long and so often, with such a base Fel-

minion as I was? they should do what they thought meet of the way. I heard the words with Grief enough, and so left the room and him in the Hands of God, Many Members were earnest to have me complain to the Lords. I remembered my late Complaint about the Pamphlets had no Redress, and so forbear it. They notwithstanding, out of their Zeal, com-

plain to Mr. Lieutenant of the Tower, who pre-

vently went forth, and said he would school him; but I heartened no more after it.

When I came to the Bar, Mr. Nicolaes began with great Violence, and told the Lords, the Bu-

finess grew higher and higher against me. What the Bishops did, will after appear; but I am sure he grew higher and higher: and from this time forward, besides the Violence of Exploitation, gave me such Language, as no Christian would give a Jew. But God, I humbly thank him, blest me with Patience; and so I made my Earnest Answer. That which made him say the Bishops grew higher and higher, was this: Upon my often calling to have the Oaths at the Coronation of King Jesus and King Charles compared, some of them repaired again to my Study at Lambeth, to search for all these Copies of Coronation-Books as could there be found. In this diligent and curious Search (for Mr. Prynn's Malice made it) they found some Papers concerning Parliaments, no other (I praise God for it) than such as with indifferent Construc-

tion might (I hope) well pass; especially, con-

sidering what Occasion led me, and what Com-

mand was upon me. And, as I have been told by able and experienced Men, they would have been nothing, had they been found in any, but this troublesome and distracted time about the Rights of Parliaments (this said). However, I was most unfortunate they should be now found; and I had not left them a Being, but that I verily thought I had destroyed them long since: But they were unhappily found among the Heaps of my Papers. And so,

I. An Answer to the Remonstrance made June 17, 1628. (which is sixteen Years since) was made the first Charge against me.

II. And the second Charge was, a Paper con-

cerning a Declaration, Jan. 28, 1628. To both which I then answered; but because these are urged more than once, to help fill the People with new Clamour, and because they are more closely pressed against me at the last Day of my Hearing, and be-

cause Mr. Browne, in his suminary Charge, had and charged all these three Papers together, to avoid tedious Repetition, I will also make my whole and entire Answer together, as I shall comply. The third Charge of this Day was, a Letter of a Jesuit to his Superior, found in my Study, dated March 1628. Let the Letter be dated when it will, I hope the Archbishop may get and keep the Letters of any Jesuits or others. How shall I be able to know or prevent their Plots upon the Religion by Law established, if this may not be done? Yet this I define all Men to take Notice of, that this Letter was not directed to me. I was then Bishop of London: The Letter was found in a Search. But when by all possible Care taken by the High-Commination, the Author could not be found, I had (as I humbly conceive) great Reaon to keep it. And I then humbly desired the whole Letter might be read. There was in it, That Ar-

minionum (as 'twas urged) was their Drug, and their Plot against us, &c. The Jesuit feeling a Fire kindling about these Opinions, might write what he pleased to help on his Cause: Yet this Drug, which they then received Opinion of all the Lutherans, and they too Learned Protestants to use their Drugs. And if it be their Dress, why do the Dominicans so condemn it? Nay, why doth the Master of the Sentences, and the School after him, for the most, determine rigingly against it? And whereas 'tis said, That these Men had In-

struments at the Duke's Chamber-Door; that be-

longs not to me, I was not Porter there. As for that Power which I had (called by Mr. Nicolaes the Command of his Ear) I used it as much as I could to shut such Instruments thence. Behide, 'tis barely said, No Proof at all offer'd, that such Instruments were about the Duke's Chamber-Door. Other Papers were found in my Study, above fifty at least, exprieving my continued Labours for some Years together, to reconcile the divided Opinion of the Masons, so that they might go with united Forces against the Remonstrants. Why are 't not these produced too? Would not Christianity and Justice have my Innocence cleared, as well as my Faults accused?

IV. The fourth Charge was Bishop Montague's Preferment. The Parliament (they say) called him in question, and the King called in his Book; yet, in Affront to the Parliament, that he was preferred by me. No, it was then publicly known in Court (whether now remembered or not, I cannot tell) that he was preferred by my Lord Duke; but being a Church-Business, the King command-

ed me to signify his Pleasure to the Signer-Office: And the Docket (which is all the Parliament do mention) mentions him only as one of the King's Pleasures, not him that procures the Preferment: So the Docket in this Case is no Proof at all.

V. The fifth Charge was a Paper, intitled, Con-

federations for the Church. Three Exceptions against them. The Observations of the King's Declaration, Art. 3. The Letters, Art. 5. And the High-Commin-

iation and Prohibitions, Art. 10, 11. The Paper I de-

fired might be all read: nothing in them against either Law or Religion. And for Letters a Let-

ter Care taken, and with more Ease to the People, and more Peace to the Church, by a Combination of conformable neighbouring Ministers, in their Turns, and not by some one humorous Man, who too often mildeats the People. So-

condly, My Copy of Confederations came from Archbishop Hurst, in which was some frequent Exploitation con-

cerning the Roman and Sidney Colleges at Cambridge, which the King in his Wilton thought fit to leave out. The King's Instructions upon these Confederations, are under Mr. Baker's Hand, who was Secretary to my Predecessor: and they were sent to me to make Exceptions to them; if I knew any, in regard of the Ministers of London, where I was then Bishop. And by this, that they were thus sent unto me by my Predecessor, 'tis manifest, that this Account from the several Diocesies to the Archbishop, and from him to his Majesty once a Year, was begun before my time. However, if it had not, I should have been glad of the Honour of it, had it begun in mine. For, I humbly conceive, there cannot be a better or a fater Way to preserve Truth and Peace in the Church, than that once a Year every Bishop shoule
give an Account of all greater Occurrences in the Church to his Metropolitan, and he to the King: Without which, the King, who is the Supreme, is like to be a great Stranger to all Church Proceedings.

VI. The sixth Charge was about Dr. Sibborge's Sermon, That my Predecessor opposed the printing of it, and that I opposed him, to affront the Parliament. Nothing to, my Lords: Nothing done by me to oppose, or affront the one or the other. This Sermon came forth when the Lords were not seated in Parliament. The Lords, and the Judges, and the Bishops, were some for, some against it. And if my Judgment were erroneous in that Point, it was muted by Lords of great Honour and Experience, and by Judges of great Knowledge in the Law. But I did nothing to affront any. 'Tis said, that I entered into the Sermon, That the People may not refuse any Tax that is not unjustly laid. I conceive nothing is justly laid in that kind but according to Law, God's and Man's: And I dare not say, the People may refuse any thing so laid. For 'tis Regis, the Right of a King, (which is urged again against me too) I never went farther than the Scriptures lead me; nor did I ever think that 'tis Regis, mentioned 1 Sam. viii. was meant of the ordinary and just Right of Kings. For the Right of the Church of St. Paul would be, would affume unto themselves, and make it Right by Power, 1 Sam. viii. 12.

Then they say I expounded some things out of it; As, First, the Sabbath, and put instead of it the Lord's-Day. What's my Offence? Sabbath is the Jews Word, and the Lord's-Day the Christians. Secondly, About evil Counsellors, to be used as Haman. The Paffage (as there expressed) was very scandalous, and without just Cafe, upon the Lords of the Council. And they might justly have thought I had wanted Dilference, should I have left it in. Thirdly, That I expounded this, That Popery is against the first and the second Commandment. If I did it, it was because it is much doubted by Learned Men, whether it be fit for the First, or the second Commandment, or denies the Unity of the God-head. And Mr. Perkins (who charges very home against Popery) says not the Breach of the first Commandment up on them. And when I gave Mr. Brewer this niver; in his left Re- ply he asked why I left it both? Why, I did it because it is being again the second is common and obvious, and I did not think it worth the flandering in such a Sermon, when it could not be made good against the first.

But they demanded, Why I should make any Animadversions at all upon the Sermon? It was thus: The Sermon being prefented to his Majesty, and the Attorney-General, he committed the Care of printing it to Bishop Montague, the Bishop of London, and four other; of which I was one. And this was the Reason of the Animadversions now considered; as also of the Answer to my Predecessor's Exceptions (now charged also) and called mine. But it was the Joint Answer of the Committee. And so is that other Particular also, in which the whole Bishops is left to the Learned in the Laws: For tho' the Animadversions be in my Hand, yet were they done at and by the Committee, only I being pusey Bishop, was put to write in my Hand.

VII. The seventh Charge was Dr. Mornurine's Business and Preferment. It was handled before, only reduced here to make a notice, and so put it over.

VIII. The eighth Charge was concerning some Alterations in the Prayers made for the Fifth of November, and in the Book for the Fast, which was published June 1636, and the Prayers on the Coronation-Day.

1. First, For the Fast-Book: The Prayer mentioned was altered, as is expressed; but it was by him that had the ordering of that Book to the Prayer, not by me. Yet I cannot but approve the Reason given for it, and that without any the least Application of Merit: For the Bane of Fasting, by thinking it meritorious. In the Book left out; whereas in this Age and Kingdom, where and where Fasting of the Church are cried down, there can be little fear of that erroneous Opinion of placing any Fasting in Fasting.

2. Secondly, For the Prayers published for the Fifth of November and Coronation-Day; the Alterations were made either by the King himself, or some about him when I was not in Court: And the Book first me, with a Command for the printing, as there altered. I made say till I wait upon his Majesty, I found him resolved on the Alterations; nor in my Judgment could I justly except against them. His Majesty then gave Warrant to the Bishops themselves, with the Alterations in them; and by his Warrant I commanded the Printing. And I then showed both the Books to the Lords, who view'd them, and acknowledged his Majesty's Hand, with which, not his Name only, but the whole Warrant was written.

And here I humbly defend three Things might be observed, and I still define it. First, With what Confidence this Paffage out of my Speech in the Fast-Chamber was urg'd against me, (for fo it was, and fiercely by Mr. Nicolius) to prove that I had alter'd the Oath at the King's Coronation, because the Prayers appointed for the Anniversary of the Coronation were alter'd. Which is absolute Non-sence. Secondly, He charged me that the Word Antichristiana was left out. But that is visibly untrue: for it is left in. Thirdly, That tho' it be in, yet that the Alteration takes it off from the Papists, as also their Rebellion. Neither: For the Change is this: That Antichristian Sel, alter'd into The Antichristian Sel of them which, &c. and, whose Religion is Rebellion, alter'd into whoa reiurn Reli- gion into Rebellion. By which it is manifest, that the Alteration takes off neither Imputation from the Papists, but moderates both. And for ought I yet know, 'tis necessary it should: For if their Religion be Rebellion, see what it will produce. Is not this the Sylogism: The Religion of the Papists is Rebellion; but Christianity is the Religion of the Papists; therefore Christianity is Rebellion. It may not enlarge; but you may see more, if you please, in my Speech in the Fast-Chamber. And when Mr. Brewer in his 256, the Sum of his Charge prefled the Elle Alterations hard against me, he did not so much as mention that I had the King's both Warrant and Command to all that I did in that Particular. And besides urg'd this as a great Innovation; because the Prayers mentioned had continued unaltered for the space of above thirty Years; not remembering therewith, that the Liturgy of the Church, established by Act of Parliament, must be taken away, or alter'd, tho' it hath continued above fourscore. Nay and Episcopacy must be quite abolished, 'tis no more continued.
The Sixthteen Day of My Hearing.

THURSDAY, June 27, 1644. I appeared this Day against the First Charge laid against me, by the Chaplain Dr. Bray, for Epumgions out of Dr. Feaste's Sermons. The fame Charge ad verbum which was before, and I gave it the fame Answer. These Repetitions of the fame Things being only to increase Calumny, and to fill more Mens Ears with it.

II. The second Charge was certain Expunctions of some Things against the Papists in Dr. Clark's Sermons. The Witnesses which swore to the Passages left out was one Mr. White, a Minifter, and it seems some near Acquaintance of Dr. Clark's. But, first, this Witness is finge. Secondly, he brought only a Paper, in which he had written down what was expunged; but Dr. Clark's Sermons he brought not with it: So 'tis not impoffible he might be mif taken. Howevew, I not having the Book, could not possibly make an abfolute Confrontation: Thirdly, this Witness confesses that Dr. Weeks, then Chaplain to my Lord of London, had the View of Dr. Clark's Sermons, and took Exceptions against some Passages, as well as my Chaplain Dr. Haywood did. So it seems there was Care for it. Fourthly, I anwser, That for this, and for all other of like nature, my Chaplain must anwser for his own Act, and not I. He is living, and an able Man: I humbly defire he may be called to his Account. For 'tis not possible for me to tell your Lordships upon what Grounds he did expunge these many and different Passages, which are intimated against me. Lafiely, in all the Passages of Dr. Clark's Sermons it is not any where dilinguished which were expunged by my Chaplain, and which by Dr. Weeks. So that the Charge in that behalf is left very uncertain.

For the Passages themselves, as they are many, so they are such as may easily be mif taken, the most of them. And whether Dr. Clark handled them in fuch manner as was not justifiable, either against Annoitants, or the Papists, cannot possibly be known, till each Place in the Book be examined for the Thing, and my Chaplain, Dr. Haywood, for the Meaning. This made a great Noise in Mr. Browne's Summary Charge against me: He alleging, that two and twenty Passages about
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Points of Popery were dished out of Dr. Clark's Sermons. To which I answered, That I conceived my Chaplain would be able to make it good, there were two hundred left in for Two and twenty left out; and that which they were left out, were not some way or other justifiable against the Papists, as set down and expressed by him. And if so, they are better out than in: For we gain nothing by urging that against the Papists, which, when it comes to the Touch, cannot be made good against them.

One Passage is here added out of Dr. Fenton's Sermons, p. 225, where he inveighs against too much immodesty and beautifying the Church, and not the Servant. First, If there be not a care to beautify the Soul, let Men profess what Religion they will, 'tis a just Exception; and I believe no Fault found with that. But, Secondly, for the over-much beautifying of the Church, 'tis a Point that might be well left out. Little Necessity, God knows, to preach or print against too much adorning of Churches among us, where yet so many Churches lie very nattily in many Places of the Kingdom, and no one too much adored to be found. Nay, the very Confecration of Churches cried down, (as is before expressed.) And this Opinion, that no Place is holy but during the Service in it, made Mr. Calamy, the Minifter, to put it in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury, and divers others to do so, and more against the Pillars of St. Paul's, nearer hand, as may daily be both seen and smelt, to the flame of that which is called Religion. Here Mr. Nicols would fain have shoved it to the Out-side of the Church, (which had been bad enough;) but it was the Inside I spake of; and the thing is known.

Then an Inflance was made in a Book of Dr. Jones. The Witness that any thing was ex Bronx out of this, was only Mr. Otrcnen. And he confesses, that this Book was licened by Dr. Baker, and he my Lord of London's Chaplain. Mine, Here my Friends at the Bar infer, that Dr. Baker was unkind to me. First, That's not so, he was preferred by his own Lordship. Secondly, If he had been preferred by me, it could have made no Charge, unlefs Proof had been made that I preferred him for abusing Dr. Jones's Book. And for the Docket, which is the only Proof offered that I preferred him I have already shewed, that that is no Proof. Yea but they say, Dr. Baker was employed by me as one of my Vistors. And what then? Must I be answerable for every Fault that is committed by every Man that I employ in my Visitation, tho' be a Fault committed at another Time and Place? tho' I humbly defire Dr. Baker may answer for himself, before I acknowledg any Fault committed by him. And tho' I conceive this Anfwcr abundantly satisfactory for any Thing that may concern me, yet Mr. Browne omitted not this Inflance against me.

III. The third Charge was personally against myself, and taken out of my Speech in the Star-Chamber. The Words there: The Altar is the greatest Place of God's Resplendence upon Earth, greater than the Pulpit; for there 'tis (sic) the Holy of Holy of Holy; while in the other it is as much but Hoc est Verbum meum, This is my Body; but in the other it is as much but Hoc est Verbum meum, This is my Word: And a greater Reverence is due to the Body, than the Word of the Lord. Out of this Place, Mr. Nicolas would needs inform, that I maintained Transubstantiation; because I say, there 'tis Hoc est Corpus meum. First, I perceive by him, he confounds (as too many else do) Transubstantiation with the Real Presence, whereas these have a wide Difference. And Calvin grants, Real and True Presence, yea, and he grants realiter too, and yet no Man a greater Enemy to Transubstantiation than he: as I have proved at large in my Book against Fijlers, and had leave to read the Passage therein to the Lords. And Mr. Perkins avows as much. And secondly, the Word there makes nothing against this. For after the Words of Confession there, pull, be the Minifter not to unworthy, yet 'tis infallibly Hoc est Corpus meum to every worthy Receiver. So it is not Hoc est Verbum meum, from the Pulpit to the Belft of Heaven, nor by the belt of Preachers since the Apostles time. And as Preaching goes now, scarce is any thing heard from many in two long Hours, that favours of the Word of God. And St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. xi. 29. of a great Sin committed in his time of not differing the Lord's Body, when unworthy Communicants received it. Where was this? Why it was there, at the Holy Table or Altar where they received, yet did not discern. I hope, for all this, St. Paul did not maintain something against this. Mr. Sprague in his Commentary. 'tis Charge prefixed this also upon me. I answered First, before, and added, That in all Ages of the Church the Touch-stone of Religion was nor to hear the Word preached, but to communicate. And, at this Day, many will come and hear Sermons, who yet will not receive the Communication together. And as I call the Holy Table the greatest Place of God's Resplendence upon Earth, so do a late learned Divine of this Church call the Celebration of the Eucharist, the Crown of Publick Service, and the most solemn and chief Work of Christian Assemblies; and he a Man known to be far from affecting Popery in the least. Was not that Divine.wise in this, which our Saviour himself teaches, St. Matt. vii. 26. That there is some Falsif of the Pulpion of Chrift, and of this Blasph my Sacrament worthy received.

Another Passage taken out of my Speech, was, That due Reverence be given to God, and to his Altar. Hence Mr. Nicolas infers again, this Reverence is one joint Act, therefore 'tis Divine to the Altar, as well as to God, and so Idolatry. First, The very next Words in my Speech are, that this Reverence to the Altar comes for ftrit of Divine Worship. What can prevent an Objection, if such plain Words cannot? Secondly, Having thus plainly expressed it, he may infer too far, that I do not then worship God. For this Reverence is one joint Act; but 'tis confessed, that 'tis not Divine Worship to the Altar, and therefore not to God. But Thirdly, This Gentleman, by his favour, understands not the Mysteries which lie hid in many Parts of Divinity. In this for one. For when this Reverence is performed, 'tis to God as to the Creator, and to Divine; but 'tis only toward, and not to the Altar, and so far short. And tho' in outward Performance it be one joint Act, yet that which is not separated, is, and must be distinguished one from the other. To make

a good Work acceptable to God,
• there must be both Faith and
• Charity; they cannot be separated
• one from the other: what shall
• they not therefore be distinguishing-
• ed? He that speaks (faith St. Au-
gustine) by one joint Act lends
• out his Voice and his Word; re-
• flected they cannot be, shall not
• they be distinguished therefore?
• But I have lived long enough, and
• taken pains to small purpose, if
• • Mr. Nicolas. or any Layman else, at his by
• • and if there Hours from a busy Profession, shall
• • be able to teach me in that which I have la-
• • ttered all I can to Lord God bless the poor.
• • Bilbops and Clergy of England, if falling into a
• • Storm (as I now am) they must have flux Judges
• • • Mr. Nicolas.

IV. The fourth Charge is the licencing of Sales, and other Books which had Popery in them, by my Chaplain Dr. Haywood.

1. To this Mr. Pryse (who is the Figure Wit-
• • • neys) says, That he tender'd a Bill to the then
• • • Lord Keeper against my Chaplain for licening this Book, and that his Lordship refuted it. If the Lord Keeper Geography refuted his Bill, I believe, were he living, he would affianc' justly why he did it. But whatever Caufe he had, it concerns not me, that he rejected the Bill. Mr. Pryse says farther, that this Book of Sales was printed heretofore, but purged first by Dr. James; but licened now by Dr. Haywood, not according to that Purgation, but with all the Points of Po-
• • • pery in. For this he produces Mr. Oakes, whose Son printed it. And says farther, that his Cor-
• • • rector at the Press found fault with some Passages, and thereupon he was sent to Dr. Haywood, who returned answer (as they say) That if he licensed it, he would justify it; and that his Son told him this.
• • • First, my Lords, this Under–testimony of Mr. Oakes, produced by Mr. Pryse, is nothing but a Hearsey from his Son, who is now dead, and cannot be examin'd; and while he was living, ran away to France, where he was hang'd. This was a most noble Piece of Villany per-
• • • fected against my Chaplain, and, thro' his Sides, a-
• • • gainst me. It was thus, my Lords: Whether the Bill were rejected or no, I cannot tell; but the Complaint of printing this Book came publickly into the Star–Chamber. And then was the first time that ever I heard of it. I then humbly defired their Lordships, that Dr. Haywood might answer whatever he had done amiss, either there, or where they pleased. The Court prefently com-
• • • manded Mr. Attorney Banks to call all Parties be-
• • • fore him, examine them thorowly, and then give his Account what he found; that the Court might proceed farther according to Justice. Dr. Haywood appeared, and animadver'd Mr. Attorney how he had correct'd Sales in all Popish Points before he licenc'd it. But young Oakes, and he which brought Sales to be licenc'd, (who was then thought to be some Jenkins Recusant, and, as I remember, lodg'd for that time of printing in Oakes's Houfe) ran both away, or hid their Heads, and would not be found. And this was a mere Plot of this Recusant, if not Priet, to have Sales printed with all his Points of Popery in him, to work Milchfeif to my Chaplain and myself: And young Oakes was in all likelihood well paid for his pains. This Ac-
• • • count Mr. Attorney brought into that Court, and

this Relation Dr. Haywood (who I obtained might be after fen) attest'd at this Bar.

One Circumstance our discussed Memory
milftook. For I thought, and for a Time told the Lords, that for this Clamour raiferd upon him in this way, I did soon after dismiss him my Houfe. But after, I found that he was gone out of my Houfe before. However, I left him without any Mediation to the Justice of the Court. And here I may not forget that which I then observed to the Lords, that whereas 'tis urged, that many Points of Popery have paffed the Prebfs; 'tis no wonder, if such Act be used as was here to get out Sales. And this farther is observable, that all these Quotations of Popish Opinions, mentioned here, up the Nobe, are out of four or five Books at the most, of which more out of this Sales than all the rest. And called in he was, as
• • • soon as known. Which Mr. Browne in the Sun
• • • of his Charge acknowledges.'

2. After Sales, the next Infantine was in a Book intituled, Chief's Epistle to the devout Reader. Four particular Points were urg'd out of this: but nei-
• • • ther I nor my Chaplains had ought to do with it. For it was licenc'd at London-Houfe by Dr. Weeks. Nor was there ever any Complaint brought to me to have it calld in: nor was any such Proof so much as offer'd.

3. The fourth Infantine was of a Book call'd The Female Glory. Dr. Pryse (who first a-
• • • gain) say'd, that Dr. Haywood licenc'd Mr. Oakes, and justifi'd all the Passages in this Book: And added, that this was by my Direction. But upon my Motion at the Bar concerning the Boldness of this Oath, Mr. Pryse recdscd himself, and said, that I appointed him to answe Mr. Barten. But it is one Thing to appoint him to answe Mr. Bur-
• • • tton, and another to direct him to justifi all Pas-
• • • sages in The Female Glory.

4. The fourth Infantine was in a Letter sent to me from one Crotam, a young Divine in Ireland. He was bred in St. John's–College in Oxford. At the Lord Mountnorris's Intreaty, I sent Crotam into Ireland to be his Chaplain. If he miscarried there, I wrote him a very kind Letter to me, nor prescribe what he should write in it. But to my remembrance, I never heard of any Miscoiarage of his in Matter of Religion: And whether he be living or dead, I know not. That Letter indeed hath a Cross at the Top of it. But then was another Letter of his shewed without a Cross, in which he calls Rome, Monfrum Atmo-
• • • minandum. Howsoever, I conceive all this is no-
• • • thing to me.

5. The fifth Infantine was a Book, which they said was licenc'd by Dr. Weeks. And if so, then not by my Chaplain. But upon perusal, I find no License printed to it, nor to any of the other, but only to Sales, which is answered.

6. The sixth Infantine was in Bishop Montague's Books, the Gag and the Appeal. Here they say, that Dr. White told Dr. Fealy, That five or six Bi-
• • • shops did allow these Books. But he did not name me to be one of them. Then Mr. Pryse urged upon his Oath, that these Books were found in my Study. And I cannot but blest myself at this Ar-
• • • gument. For I have Bellarmine in my Study, there-
• • • fore I am a Papist; or I have the Ailcen in my Study, therefore I am a Turk, is as good an Ar-
• • • gument as this: I have Bishop Montague's Books in my Study, therefore I am an Arminian. May Mr. Pryse have Books in all kinds in his Study, and may
may not the Archbishop of Canterbury have them in his? Yes, but he says, there is a Letter of the Bishop to me, submitting his Books to my Cen- ture. This Letter hath no date, and so belike Mr. Prym thought he might be bold both with it and his Oath, and apply it to what Books he pleased. But as God would have it, there are Circumstances in it as good as a Date. For 'tis therein exprest, that he was now ready to re- move from Chichester to Norwich. Therefore he must needs speak of submitting those his Books to me, which were then ready to be set out, which were his Originals Eccelestiis, not the Goggs, nor the Appeal, which are the Books charged, and which were printed divers Years before he was made a Bishop; and my Receipt indorsed upon it, is Mar. 29. 1638. And I hope Mr. Nicolas will not call this the Colour of an Answer, as he hath called many of the rest given by me.

7. The seventh Instance was in a Book licensed by Dr. Martin, then my Chaplain in London-Houfe. This Book, Mr. Prym says, was purposely set out to countenance Arminianism, as if it had been some Work of moment, whereas it was answered twice in the Queen's time. If Dr. Martin did this, 'tis more than I remember; nor can I go long after give any account of it. But Dr. Martin is living, and in Town, and I humbly declared he might be called to answer. He was called the next day, and gave this Account.

[The Account is wanting; a Space left for it, but not filled up.]

Mr. Prym says farther, That after this he preached Arminianism at St. Paul's Croft. Why did not Mr. Prym come to me, and acquaint me with it? Which neither he nor any Man else did. And I was in Attendance at Court, whither I could not hear him. And the Charge which came against him upon the next Day's Hearing, was this and no more. That one that preached at the Croft Universal Re-emption; but that he gave testimony, knew him not: only he says, one told him 'twas Dr. Martin.

1. The last Instance was of a Bible commonly fold, with a Popish Table at the end of it. This is more than I know, or ever heard till now; nor was any Complaint ever brought to me of it. And I cannot know all things that are done abroad for Gain; for that will teach them to conceal, as well as move them to act. Yet one of the Popish Heads mentioned in that Table, was Confirmation, which is commanded in our Church-Liturgy, and ratified by Law.

Here this Day ended, and I was ordered to ap- pear again July 4. That Day I received a Note, under Mr. Nicolas's hand, that they meant to pro- ceed upon the Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Fourteenth Original Articles, and the Sixth and Seventh Additional. The last Warrant for other Articles, came under Serjeant Wilde's Hand, and Mr. Nicolas signing this, it seems, mistook: for the Eighth and Ninth Original Arti- cles are in part proceeded on before. Now they go forward with thee, and then on to the rest; which will write down severally, as they come to them.

The same Day, being Thursday, all my Books at Lambeth were by Order of the House of Com-mons taken away by Mr. Secretary to the Right Honourable the Earl of Warwick, and carried I know not whither, but are (as 'tis commonly said) for the use of Mr. Peter. Before this time, some good number of my Books were deliv- ered to the use of the Synod, the Ministers which had them giving no Catalogue under their hands, which or how many they had. And all this was done contrary to an Order of the Lords, bearing date Novemb. 5. 1634, for the safe keeping of my Books there; and before I was convicted of any Crime. This Day also I received an Order, which put off my Hearing to the next Day.

The Seventeenth Day of my Hearing.

1. FRIDAY, July 5. 1644. This Day I ap- peared again: And the First Charge against me was, That I had preferred none to Bi- shoprics, Deaneries, Prebends, and Benefices, but Men positively afflicted, or otherwise unwor- thy. And some they named:

1: As Firth, Dr. Meandering, disfigured by the Parliament.

2. Secondly, Mr. Mountegrue, excepted against by Parliament. But for those, no Proof was now brought: They referred themselves to what was said before, and do I. And where they go to prove only by Dockets, I desire it may still be remembered that the Docket is a full Proof. Who gave Order for drawing the Bill at the Signet-Office, but no Proof at all who procured the Pref- erment.

3. Thirdly, Bishop Corbet. But the Earl of Dorset got my Lord Duke of Buckingham to pre- fer him, to make way for Dr. Duppa, his deliv- ering Chaplain, into Christ-Church. Nor was any thing said against Dr. Corbet, but that he was preferred by me.

4. Fourthly, Bishop Pierce; against whom there was no Proof offered neither. And he is like to answer it, if any be.

5. Nor was there now any Proof offered against Bishop Wren, who was named also; at the least not till he was made a Bishop. So if I did prefer him, it seems I did it when nothing was laid a- gainst him. And if after he had his Preferment, he did any thing unworthily, that could not I foresee; and he is living to answer it.

6. The Sixth was Bishop Linley, a Man known to be of great and universal Learning, but preferred by the then Lord Treasurer Parliament, not by me. Him they charged with Arminianism. The Witneces two: The first, Mr. Smart; he is posi- tive, he was his Fellow Prebendary at Durham. There was Animosity between them. And he, Smart, is able to judge of Arminianism. Sec- ondly, Mr. Walker, who could do nothing; but that he heard so much from some Ministers, and Dr. Bishopwic. So here is as learned a Man as Christadom had any of his time, debased in this great and honourable Court, by Ignorance, and a Hearsay; and that, when the Man is gone to that which should be his Quiet, the Grave.

7. The Seventh was Archbishops Nelle, a Man well known to be as true to, and as stout for, the Church of England established by Law, as any Man that came to Preferment in it. Nor could his great Enemy Mr. Smart try any thing now a- gainst him, but a Hearsay from one Dr. Moor of Wincogher. And I cannot but profess, it grieves me much, to hear so many honest and worthy Men
fo ufed, when the Graye hath ust up their Months from awnerring for themselves.

8. The next was Dr. Cofes, to be dean of Petterborough. I named four of his Majesty's Chaplains to him, as he had commandd me: and the King stretched upon Dr. Cofes, in regard all the Means he then had, lay in and about Dewjas, and was then in the Scots hands: so that he had nothing but Forty Pound a Year by his Headship in Peter-Houfe, to maintain himself, his Wife and Children.

9. The Ninth was Dr. Peter, a known Armri- niun, to the Deanery of Wreror. What Proof of this? Nothing but the Docket. And what of the Crime? Nothing but Dr. Poully's Testimony: who says no more but this, That Dr. Peter was at first against Armuniunis; (that's abstinence:) but afterwards he defended it, as he hath heard; (there's a Hearfry.)

10. The Tenth was Dr. Baker.

11. The Eleventh Dr. Weeks. Both very honed and able Men; but preferred by their own Lord, the Lord Bishop of London.

12. The Twelfth was Dr. Bay. He had been my Chaplain above ten Years in my Houfe; I found him a very able and an honed Man, and had reason to prefer him to be able to live well, and I did fo. Here is nothing objected against him, but his Expugnating, and not Expugnatings of some Books, which if he were living, I well hope he would be able to give a good account for.

13. The Thirteen Dr. Hyflin. He is known to be a learned and an able Man; but for his Professor, both to be but Majesty's Chaplain, and for the wicked which he got in that Service, he owes it under God to the Memory of the Earl of Danby, who took care of him in the University.

14. After these, they named some, whom they said I preferred to be the King's Chaplains. The Wimels here Mr. OldNorlike, the Lord Chamberlain's Secretary. He says, The Power and Practice of naming Chaplains was in the Lord Chamber- man for these 25 Years. And I say, this is still, for ought I know. He says, That in all things concerning which the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant went in this Form, They are to sell and require you, &c. that there his Lordship did it without consulting the King; and that the Warrant for Chaplains run all in this Form. First, This is more than I know, or ever heard of till now. Secondly, Be it so; yet this is hard to deny the King to hear preaches, before they be sworn his Chaplains, if his Majesty desire it, since it argues a great Care in the King, especially in such a fac- tious time, as began to overlay this Church. Thirdly, He confesses, that he knows not who put the King upon this way, but believes that I did it. He is slyke, and his Belief only is no Evidence. And whatsoever gave the King that Ad- vice, defered very well both of his Majesty and the Church of England; That none might be put about him in that Service, but such as himself should approve of. But that which troubled this Wimels, was another thing. He had not Mo- ney to pay for every man that was made Chaplain; nor Money to get them a Month to wait in; nor Money to change their Mouth, if it were in- convenient for their other Occasions; nor Money for sparing their Attendance when they pleased. In which, and other things, I would he had been as careful of his Lord's Honour, as I have been in all things. For 'tis well known in Court, I observed his Lordship as much as any Man.

The Men which are influenced in, are Dr. Hyflin. But he was preferred to that Service by my Lord the Earl of Danby. Then Dr. Peter. But the Lord-Keeper Coventry was his means. Dr. Cofes was preferred by Bishop Wells, whose Chaplain he had been many Years, and he moved the Lord Chamberlain for it. Dr. Lawrance was my Lord Chamberlain's own Chaplain, and preferred by himself; and in all likelihood, by Mr. OldNorlike's means: for he was Fellow of Magdalne-College in Oxford, as Mr. OldNorlike himself was, and he once (to my knowledge) had a great opinion of him. Dr. Haywood indeed was my Chaplain; but I preferred him not to his Majesty, till he had preached divers times in Court with great Approbation; nor then, but with my Lord Chamberlain's Love and Liking. As for Dr. Packington, I know not who recommended him; nor is there any Proof offered that I did it.

15. Then they proceeded to my own Chaplains. They name four of them: First, Dr. Weeks. But he was never in my Houfe, never meddled with the licensing of any Books, till he was gone from me to the Bishop of London: So he is charged with no Paul, so long as he was mine. The Sec- ond, Dr. Haywood. But he is charged with nothing but Saleis, which was a most desperate Plot against him, as is before the Queen. The Third is Dr. Martin. Against him came Mr. Prym, for his Arminian Sermon at St. Paul's-Crake. But that's answered before. And Mr. Walker, who said, He propounded Arminian Questions to divers Ministers. Belike, such as were to be examined by him. But he adds, As these Miniflers told him. So 'tis but a Hearfry. And say he did propofe such Questions, may it not be fit enough to try how able they were to answer them? The Fourth was Dr. Bay. Against him Dr. Fealy was again produced, for that which he had expunged out of his Sermons. But when I saw this so often inculcated to make a noile, I humbly defired of the Lords, that I might ask Dr. Fealy one Question. Upo'n the grant, I asked him what Nothing were of late expunged out of a Book of his written against it; and Dr. Fealy defired him to speak upon the Oath he had taken. He answered rooundly, That divers Passages against the Anabaptists, and none in de- fence of the Liturgy of the Church of England, were expunged. I asked, by whom? He said, by Mr. Reufe and the Committee, or by, or Reufe or the Committee. Be it which it will, I obser'ed! to the Lords, that Mr. Reufe and the Committee might expunge Passages against the Anabaptists, nay, for the Liturgy established by Law; but my Chaplains may not expunge any thing against the Papists tho' perhaps mitaken.

From thence they fell to Men whom they said I had preferred to Benefices. They named but two. Dr. Hyflin was one again, whom I preferred not. The other was Dr. Jackson, the late President of Corpus Christi-College in Oxford. Dr. Fealy, being produced, said, Dr. Jackson was a known Arminian. If fo to him, 'tis well; the Man is dead, and cannot answor for himself. Thus far I can for him, without meddling with any of his Opinions: He was very honest and very learned, and at those Years he was of, might deserve more than a poor Benefice.

16. Here Mr. Prym came in again, and testified very boldly, That I gave many Benefices, which were
were in the Gift of the Master of the Wards: and all Prefferments only to such Men as were for Ceremonies, Popery, and Arminianism. For the fift of these two, the Bishops was thus: There arose a Difference betwixt the Lord Laud, and Doctor Government, and the Lord Cattington; then Master of the Wards, about the disposing of those Benefices. It grew somewhat high, and came to Hearing by the King himself: His Majesty, upon Hearing, gave the Right of Sealing to the Lord Keeper; but for the time, till more might appear, referred the Giving to himself, that he might have some of these foeller Prefferments to beflow upon such Ministers as attended upon his Navy then at Sea. I never gave any one of these Benefices in my Life. And that this Story is of Truth, the Lord Cattington is yet living, and can witness it. And this very Anwer I gave to Mr. Browne, who in sumning up the Charge laid this alfo upon me, and with-out mentioning what Anwer I gave to it. For the second, That I preferred none but such Men; this known I preferred Bishop Holl to Exeter, Dr. Parker to Carliffe, Dr. Cook to Bridfell first, and then to Herford; that I gave Dr. Wellsfield the Arch-deaconry of St. Anna's, that I was Dr. Fell's means for Christ-Church, and Dr. Higge's for the Deanery of Litchfield; that I settled Dr. Dawning at Hackney, and Mr. Horrick, at Macclesfield, when the Broad-Seal formerly given him was questioned: That I gave two of my own Benefices to Mr. Pelham and Mr. Taylor, two of the new Synod; an Hospital to Dr. Jackson of Canterbury, and a Benefice to his Son-in-Law, at his Suit. I could not name all these upon the sudden, yet fome I did; and no one of them guilty of this Charge in the least. Mr. Browne in his Summary said, I could not name but one or two. And when in my Answer made in the House of Commons, I specified more, a-fong which Mr. Pelham was one; Mr. Browne said in his Reply, That Mr. Pelham had indeed his Benefice of my giving, to himself told him, but it was at the Intrety of a great Nobleman. Say it were; Mr. Pelham was then a Stranger to me: somebody must speak, and affure me of his Wants and Worth, or I cannot give. But if upon this I gave it freely, is it worth no thanks from him, because a Nobleman spake to me? Let Mr. Pelham rank this Gratitude among his other Virtues.

17. From hence they stepped over into Ireland, and objected my preferring of Dr. Chappel to be Master of the College at Dublin. Here the first Witnes is Mr. Walker. He says, That all his Scholars were Arminians. This is a great Sign, but not full Proof. He says, That Dr. Chappel was at first ftreng against them, but afterwards changed his Mind. Dr. Fostly said the like of Dr. Peter. Some say Arminius himself was at first zealous against those Opinions, but studying hard to confute them, changed his own Mind. 'Tis hard, Mr. Walker, do not flulty these Points too hard.' For my own Part, Dr. Chappel was a Cambridge Man, altogether unknown to me, five that I received from thence great Testimony of his Abilities and Finesse for Government, which that College then extremely wanted; and no Man ever complained to me, that he favoured Arminius.

The other Witnes was Dr. Hayle, a Fellow of the College in Dublin. He says, That the Doctor did maintain, in that College, justification by Works, and in Christ-Church, Arminianism. In this he is single: But if it be true, why did not the Lord Primate of Armagh punish him? for he says, he knew it. That he opposed some things in the Synod: And it may be there was just Caufe for it. Layly, he says, the late Lord Deputy liked not the Irish Articles, but gave them an honourable Burial, as he says the Lord Primate himself confessed. I am a Stranger to all this; nor doth Dr. Hayle charge any thing against me; but says, That they which did this, were supposed to have some Friend in England. And surely their Carriage was very ill, if they had done.

18. Then were Letters read of my Lord Pri-mate to me, in which is testified my Care of the Patrimony of that Church. And then a Paper of Instructions given by me to the Lord Deputy at his first going into that Kingdom. For the first, tho' it be in here, among Matters of Religion, yet I pray your Lordships to consider, 'tis about the Patrimony of that Church only; and I thank them heartily for producing it. For in this Letter is a full Confession of my Lord Primate's, That the Motion of getting the Improprations from his Majesty, (formerly objected against me) proceeded from him, as I then pleased: And the Letter was read. For the second; my Lord Deputy, a little before his first going into Ireland, asked me what Service I would command him for the Church there? I humbly thanked him, as I had Relton, and told him I would bethink myself, and give him my Thoughts in writing: These are they which are called Instructions. They are only for the good of that poor Church, as your Lordships have heard them. This was all; and herein my Lord shewed his Honour, and I did but my Duty, 'Tis I very well understood why this Paper is produced against me.'

After this, they proceeded to the Eleventh Original Article, which follows in due course.

XI. He in his own Person, and his Subtages, Visitors, Surrages, Chancellors, or other Officers, by his command, have caufed divers Learned, Pious, and Orthodox Preachers of God's Word to be silenced, suppressed, deprived, degraded, excommunicated, or otherwise griev'd and vex'd, without any Just and lawful Caufe; whereby, and by divers other Means, he hath hinder'd the preaching of God's Word, caufed divers of his Majesty's Loyal Subjects to forsake the Kingdom, and increas'd and cherish'd Ignorance and Profanerien amongst the People; so that he might the better facilitate the Way to the effecting of his own wicked and traitorous Design of altering and corrupting the true Religion here established.

1. The first Influence to make good this Article, was a Repetition of some Lectures before-mentioned. But when they thought they had made Noise enough, they referred the Lords to their Notes; and I did it to my former Anwers.

2. The second Influence was out of some Articles of Bishop Montague and Bishop Winn, and their Account given to me. Bishop Winn, Art. 16. speaks of the Afternoon-Sermons being turned into Catechismes; And Art. 5. (of his Account, I take it) That no Lecture in his Diocess after 8c. It was made plain to the Lords, that this was spoken of some fingle and factitious Lecturers; and that they had their Lectures read by a Company of Learned and Orthodox Ministers by turns; as appeared by the Monday Sermon at Bury, during that Learned
This Article is only about the Forfeitures. That which I did, was this. I was (as then advised, upon such Information as was given me) clearly of Opinion, that this was a cunning Way, under a glorious Pretence, to overthrow the Church-Government, by getting into their Power more Dependency of the Clergy, than the King, and all the Peers, and all the Bishops in all the Kingdom had. And I did conceive the Plot the more dangerous for the Faithfuls of the Pretence, and that to the State as well as the Church. Hereupon, not malliciously (as 'tis charged in the Article) but conscientiously I resolved to frustrate it if I could. And I thought it might be done. Upon this, I acquainted this Majesty with the thing, and the DANGER which I conceived would, in few Years, spring out of it. The King referred me to his Attorney and the Law. Mr. Attorney Noz, after some Pfane upon it, proceeded in the Exchequer, and there it was by judicial Proceeding and Sentence overthrown. If this Sentence were according to Law and Justice, then there's no Fault at all committed: if it were against Law, the fault, whate'er it be, was charged on the Judges, not mine; for I follow'd the Sentence of the Law; and here I humbly defied, that the Lords would at their Leisure read over the Sentence given in the Exchequer, which I then delivered in; but by Reason of the Length, it was not then read: whether after it were, I cannot tell. I defied likewise that my Council might be heard in this, and all other Points in Law.

1. The first Witness was Mr. Kendall. He says, That speaking with me about Presten, I thanked God that I had overthrown this Forfeiture.

2. The second Witness Mr. Miller says, he heard me say, They would have undone the Church, but I have overthrown their Forfeiture. These two Witnesses prove no more than I confess'd: For in the Manner aforesaid, I deny not but I did my best in a legal Way to overthrow it. And if I did thank God for it, it was my Duty to do so, the thing being in my Judgment so pernicious as it was.

3. The third Witness was Mr. White, one of the Forfeeters. He says, That coming as Counsel in a Cause before me, when that Business was done, I fell bitterly on him as an Underminer of the Church. I remember well his coming to me as Counsel about a Benefice; and 'tis very likely I spoke my Conscience to him, as freely as he did to me, but the Particulars I remember not; nor do I remember how it was agreed to me to Feliou, nor his Offer to change the Men or the Course, so the thing might stand. For to this I should have been as willing as he was; and if I remember right, there was order taken for this in the Decree of the Exchequer; and his Majesty's Pleasure declared, That no Penny to given should be turned to other Use. And I have been, and shall ever be as ready to get in Improprations, by any good and legal Way, as any Man, (as may appear by my Labours about the Improprations in Ireland.) But this way did not stand either with my Judgment or Conscience.

1. First, Because little or nothing was given by them to the Forfeitters, to whom the Tythes were due, to any; that the Privatemen which paid them, might have the more cheerful Instruction, the better Hospitality, and more full Relief for their Poor.
The Trial of Dr. William Laud, 16 Car. I.

41. The Eighteenth Day of my Hearing.

WEDNESDAY, June 17, 1644. This Day they charged upon me the Twelfth Original Article, which follows in these Words:

XII. He hath traitorously endeavoured to cause Divisio and Difcord between the Church of Eng- land and other Reformed Churches, and to that end hath suppreffed and abrogated the Privileges and Immunities which have been by his Majesty and his Royal Ancestors granted to the French and Dutch Churches in this Kingdom: And driven other whether, ye may call them Menaces and Diifection to those Churches, so by such Divisio the Papists might have more Advantage for the Overthrow and Extirpation of both.

I. The first Charge is, That I deny them to be a Church: For they say that I lay plain- ly in my Book against Fisher, that

Cont. Fisher. No Bishop, no Church. Now 'tis well § 25: § 170. known they have no Bishops, and therefore no Church. The Page in my Book is an Inference of St. Jerome's Opinion, no Declaration of my own. And if they, or any other, be aggriev- ed at St. Jerome for writing it, they may answer him. Mr. Nicholas explained. That this was seconded by Bishop Montague's Book, which Mr. Pryse (carefully) witnesseth was found in my Study, and licenced by Dr. Bray. Is this Argument come again, that Bishop Montague's Book was in my Study? Leave it for shame. But they have now left me never a Book in my Study; so I can- not make them any fuller Anwer, without view- ing the Place, than themselves help me to by their own Confession; which is, that he adds this Ex- ception, That none but a Bishop can ordain, but in case necessitas, which is the Opinion of many learned and moderate Divines. Yet this is very confiderable in the Bishops, whether an inevita- ble necessity be called upon them, or they push on such a kind of Necessity upon themselves.

II. The second Charge is out of a Letter of mine to Bishop Hall, upon a Letter which he had for- merly sent me. In which, it seems, is something about the Case of Necessity in point of Ordination, which (they say) I disliked. And it seems I dis- liked upon good Ground: For he had given me Power, under his Hand, to alter what I would in that which he sent unto me. I would not take that Power; but writ back to him what Page I thought might be better expressed, if it could agree with his Judgment also. Herupon he sent me another Letter of Jan. 18, 1639, in which he al- ter'd those Things which I put to his farther Con- sideration. Could any thing be more fairly car- ried? And this Letter was read to the Lords. Yes, but they say, I disliked the giving of this Title Antiscript to the Pope. No, I did not finely dis- like it; but I advised Bishop Hall, if he thought it good, not to affirm it so positively. And the Reason I gave was this: That King James being preffed upon a great Occasion that he had main- tained that the Pope was Antiscript, which might much trouble, if not quite cross some Proceed- ings much desired by that prudent King, his Ma- jesty made answer, I maintain it not as a Point of Faith.

Here this Day ended, and I was commanded to attend again July 15. But was then put off to July 17, which Day held.
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**Faith, but as a probable Opinion:** And for which I have more Grounds than the Pope hath for his Challenge of Temporal Power over Princes. Let him recall this Opinion, and I'll recall that. This I write to the Bishop, but left him free to do what he pleased.

Here Mr. Nicholas fell extremely upon me, insomuch that I could not but wonder at their Patience which heard him. Among other Titles bestowed upon me, and words, he called me, over and over again, Pander to the Whore of Babylon. For I was much moved; and humbly desired the Lords, that if my Crimes were such as that I might be used like an Arch-bishop, yet I might be used like a Christian; and that were it not for the Duty which I owe to God and my own Innocency, I would defend my Defence before I would endure such Language in such an Honourable Personage. Heretofore some Lords threatened their Dullness, and wished him to leave, and purifie the Evidence.

* Mr. Browne in summing up the Charge made this a great Matter, the Denial of the Pope to be Antichrist. But I did not deny it, nor declare any Opinion of my own: as many Prelates, and those very learned, are of Opinion that he is not. 'Tis true, I did not, I cannot improve foul Language in Controversies. Nor do I think that the calling of the Pope Antichrist, did ever yet convert an underhanding Papist. And fare I am, Gabriel Power's Persecutors make (to say no worse) in this Point, did the Church of England no good, no honour in foreign Parts; For there he affirm's, 'That he is as certain that the Pope is Antichrist, as that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and Redeemer of the World.' As for the thing itself, I left it free to all Men to think as they judge and their Judgment guided them; as appears by the licensing of Dr. Fortescue's Sermons, which approves the Pope, in his Opinion, to be

1. Dr. Ferlly's Sermons, p. 88.
2. *Antichrist;* where he calls him afo the Where of Babylon. Which
3. *farelly I should never have suffred to be printed, had I been her Pan-
4. *der.* And for Bishop Hall, I only

*told him what King James had said, and left him to make what use he pleased of it.'

III. The third Charge was out of a Paper, which Bishop Hall, about the time when he wrote his Book in Defence of Episcopacy, sent unto me, containing divers Propositions concerning Episcopal Government. In which either he or I, or both, say, (for that Circumstance I remember not) That Church-Government by Bishops is inalterably human Law. To this I answer'd, That Bishops might be regulated and limited by human Laws, in those Things which are but Incidents to their Calling; But their Calling, so far as it is *purely Divine,* by Divine Right, cannot be taken away. They charge farther, That I say this is the Doctrine of the Church of England. And so I think it is: For Bishop Bilson fet out a Book in the Queen's time, intitled, *The Perpetual Government.* And if the Government by Bishops be perpetual, as he there very learneved proves thro' the whole Book, it will be hard for any Christian Nation to out it. Nor is this his Judgment alone, but of the whole Church of England. For in the Preface to the Book of Ordination are these Words; From the Apostles
time there have been three Orders of Ministers in the Church of Christ, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Where *it's evident, that in the Judgment of the Church of England, Episcopacy is a different, not Degreeonly, but Order from Priesthood, and fo hath been reputed from the Apostles times. And this was then read to the Lords. And the Law of England is as full for it, as the Church: For the Statute of Elizabeth, and the Act of Uniformity confirms all and every Part of this Book of Ordination. Where also the Law calls it, *The high Estate of Prelacy. And Calvin,* (if my old Memory do not fail me) upon those Words of St. John, ver. 20, 21. *As my Father sent me, so I send you, &c.* says thus upon that Place, *Eadem illius impunit Perfanias ac idem Varis affigit.* And if our Saviour Christ put the fame Person upon the Apostles, and assigned to them the same Right which his Father gave him, it will prove a four Work to throw their Successors the Bishops out of the Church, after sixteen hundred Years continuance; and in the mean time cry out against Innocens! For either Christ gave this Power to the Apostles, and that will make the Gospel a Thing temporary, and confined to the Apostles' times; or else he gave the same Power, tho' not with such eminent Gifts, to their Successors also, to propagate the same Gospel to the end of the World, as St. Paul tells us he did, *Ephes* iv. 11. Now all the Primitive Church all along gives Bishops to be the Apostles Successors; and then it would be well thought on, what Right any Christian State hath (be their absolute Power what it will) to turn Bishops out of that Right in the Church which Christ hath given them.

IV. The fourth Charge was an Alteration made in a Brief for a third Election for the disdiffered Ministers and others in the Palemaniate. The Queen of Bohemia was pleased to do me the Honour to write to me about this: And because two Colledions had been before, her Majesty deireth that this third might be only in London, and some few Shires about it. I out of my Difire to relieve those disdiffered Protestant, and to express my Duty to the Queen, became an humble Suitor to her Majesty that this Collection all might go thro' England, as the refl had done. And it's acknowledged by all, that this I did. Now the Witneffes which accuse me for some Circumstances in this Bifines, are two.

1. The first is Mr. Wakerby. He says, That Mr. Ruby (who was employed by the Queen of Bohemia about this Collection) was roughly used by me upon Occasion of this Clause put into the Brief, and which, he says, I cautioned to be altered. This, Firt, is a bold Oath; for Mr. Wakerby was not present, but sweares upon Hearfey. Secondly, What Kindnes I threw him and the Bifiefs, is mentioned before; and if for this Kindnes he had been praftifing with Mr. Wakerby about the Brief, (as I had probable Reason to supfpect) I cannot much be blamed, if I altered my Countenance towards him, and my Speech too, which yet these Witneffes (for all the Evidence in this) have no Reason for. Then taketh Carriage, only upon Mr. Ruby's unthankful Report. He says, That these Words, the Antichristian Yoke, were left out. First, this is more than I remem-
ber; and the Briefs I had not to compare: Nor is there any Necessity that two Briefs, coming for the same Thing, with some Y ears distance be-
tween, should agree in every Phrase or Circum-
stance. Secondly, if I did except against this Paf-
fage, it was partly because of the fore-recited Judg-
ment of King James, of which I thought his Sou-
King Charles ought to be tender; and partly be-
cause it could move nothing but Scorn in the com-
mon Adversary, that we should offer to determine such a Controversy by a Broad-Seal. I remember well, since I had the Honour to fit in this House, the naming of Tythes to be due true Devo nation call out the Bell; a prudent Lord alking the Peers, whether they meant to determine that Quel lion by an Act of Parliament. The other part of the Clause, which they say was altered, was, The Re-
ligion which we sweth them proffes. Whence they infer, because {with them} was left out, that I would not acknowledge them of the same Religion; which follows not: For we may be and are of the same Religion, and yet (agree) not with them in those Opinions, in which we differ from them. And this brings me to that which is al-
tered are, that they are perfected for their Reli-
gion; and their Religion is the Protestant Reli-
gion, and so is ours. And therefore I could have no Intention to make the Religions different, but the Opinions under the same Religion.

9 For Mr. Wobserly, he is a Dutchman born; and
how far the Testimony of an Alien may be of
force by the Law, I know not: And a bitter E-
nemy to me he hath ever fiewed himself, since
I complained to the King and the Lords that a
 Stranger born and bred should be fo near a Se-
cretary of State, and all his Papers and Cyphers,
and all the Force that Mr. S anything. A Thing which few States would endure. And
how far the Testimony of such a man's Ene-
my should be admitted, let the World judge.

Admitted he was.'

2. The second Witness was Mr. Hartlip. He acknowledges my Improvement of the Collection, and my great Relicines therein; which doubles I should not have fiewed, had I accounted them of another Religion. He says, There was no Alter-
ation but in that Clause, and that implies a man-
ified Difference. But that is but in his Judgment; in which I have already shewn, that partly is mit-
taken, and so to be. Before, he comes here as Mr. Witness to the Fact, not as a Judge of my Intentions or Thoughts. He adds, that, if he remember well, the Alteration was drawn by me. But if he do not remember well, what then? Surely here's no Evidence to be grounded upon I'. Here, upon,

XIII. He hath traitorously and wickedly ende-

The Seventeenth Additional Article.

That the said Archibishop at several times with-
in those ten Years last past, as Poyning and elsewhere within this Realm, contrary to the known Laws of this Land, hath endeavoured to advance Popery and Superstition within this Realm: And for that end and purpose hath wittingly and wil-

ingely received, harboured, and relieved divers Popish Priests and Jesuits; namely, one called Saunderson, alias Danport, a dangerous Peron and Francize Friar: who having written a Po-

pist and Sedulous Book, entitled, Deus, Natura, Gratia, wherein the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, eatablished by Act of Parlia-

ment, were much traduced and scandalized; the said Archibishop had divers Conferences with him, while
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while he was in writing the said Book : and did also provide Maintenance and Entertainment for one Monstre St. Giles, a PapistPriest, at Oxford, knowing him to be a Popish Priest.

1. The first Charge (they say) was to be laid as a Foundation ; and it was, That I was generally repented a Papist in Heart, both in Oxford, and since I came there.

2. The first Witnesse for this was Dr. Fossy. He says, There was such an Opinion of me Thirty Years since there. But he says, he never heard any Popish Opinion maintained by me. So here's nothing of Knowledge. And if I should say that above Thirty Years ago there was an Opinion that Dr. Fossy, then in Oxford, was a Puritan, this could make no Proof against him: Nor can his saying that I was reputed a Papist, make any Proof against me. He says farther, That one Mr. Ruffell, who had been bred in St. John's-College, told him in Paris, that I maintained some Catholick Opinions. First, Mr. Nicolaus would have it that this Mr. Ruffell was my Scholar: But the whole College was not so near to him to be ever any relation to me in the least degree. After his Father's Death he left the College, and went beyond-Sea; where the weak Man (for such he was) lost his Religion. Secondly, Dr. Fossy says expressly, that Mr. Ruffell said I was no Papist; which, for the Contenance of his own Charge, he would never have said, had he thought me one. Thirdly, if he did say that I maintained some Catholick Opinions; yet he named none, by which there might be Trial and Judgment whether they were such or no, in the Sense he meant them. Lastly, Mr. Perkins, in his Reformed Catholic, says of us, That I was a Papist, and we agree: Shall he be a Papist for this? Or shall not that which is lawful for him, be as lawful for me?

3. The second Witnesse was one Harris. He says, That Mr. Ireland (who was some time Student of Corpus-Church in Oxford, and after School-mate at Wofington) told him that he would leave the Church of England. This is a bare Report from Mr. Ireland, with whom I never had any Acquaintance, nor was scarce in his Company twice in all my Life. Nor is it in my power to hinder what Mr. Ireland will say, or Mr. Harris from him. He says, That one that called himself Leader, came over on purpose to make this Reconciliation. If he did, which is more than I know or believe, I think he would hardly make such a one, as Harris is report- ed to be, acquainted with it. But however, if he did come with that purpose, was it in my power to hinder his coming? And here is no proof offered that I did help on his Purpose, or so much as know of it. He says he often petitioned me for Relief, but had none. It may be; I well knew he deferred none: And your Lordships know that by Law I might not afford him any. Had I given him any, I should now have heard it with both Ears. For I am informed he is a Priest, and condemned in a Premunire, and was let out of Prison on purpose to be a Witnesse against me. And having seen that which is abroad, after his Hand, has now slipped away, and gone. Who got him out of Prison for this good Purpose, I know not; but fare somewhat there is in it, for your Lordships see his Testimony is now read, but he appears not.

3. The third Witnesse was Sir Nathaniel Brent, (now absent, but came in the next Day.) He says, I was esteemed Popishly-afflicted in Oxford; and he gave three Infrances very carefully, to prove it. The first was, that in the Divinity-School there, I maintained the Necessity of Baptism. I did so; and my Predecessor Archbishops Abbot was then Vice-Chancellor, and present, and approved my Opinion: and my Grace palled for my Degree to be Bachelor of Divinity, without any one Man's Opposition. He says, that Mr. Larkin and Morton-College then believed him all my Supposition taken in Bellarmine. This is a bold and a dangerous Objection. He might swear that Mr. Dale shewed him in Bellarmine, in which he said was my Supposition; but that he shewed him all my Supposition there, is a strange Oath for a Man of Learning and Law to make, in such a Preface. Besides, I have my Supposition, which I then made, yet by me; and if my Tenet of that Question be the same with Bellarmine's, or that there be any Line taken out of him, but what I cite for my own Advantage against him, I will utterly forfeit my Reputation of any Learning to your Lordships. His second Infrance was, that I was acquainted with one Mr. Ducea, Fellow of Corpus-Church, a man, who was suspected to be a Papist, and after his Death, it was to be one, by a Book that was found in his Study, proving that a Man might be a Roman Catholic, and yet go to Church, and conform in England. I was acquainted with this Man; he was a very good Scholar, and an honest Man, and a good Protestant, for ought I know. For the Traction found after his Death among his Papers, that's no Proof: for Scholars get all the Papers they can, especially such as belong to their own Profession. And the more strange the Opinions are, the more they make it harder to get them. Nor is it any Proof that the Traction was of his making, because written in his own Hand, as 'tis urged. For the Argument being so foul and dangerous, it could not be false for him, nor any way fit, to commit it to any other to write for him. Nor is there any Proof that I knew he had such a Traction by him; neither indeed did I. The Opinion is very base and unworthy, and was first broached by the Jesuit Asius, and it seems one of the Fellows had enlarged him, and made this Traction out of his Principles. His third Infrance was, that I petitioned King James in this Business. I was complained of to King James by a great Perfon, that I had inward Acquaintance with this Man, that I was in his Malignancy, my washing Month being June, and not long after the Complain made. I took occasion in my first Sermon to confume this Opinion, and then petitioned his Majesty that it might be examined, that such an Imputation might not lie upon me. His Majesty referred it to the Lord Archibishop of Canterbury, Bishops of London, Winchester, and Dorely; where, after full Examination, I was acquitted.

2. The second Charge was, that the fame Opinion was holden of me beyond the Seas, that I was a cunning Promoter of the Romish Cause. And here the Witnesse are the fame which were produced before; Mr. Chancellor, who took over the old Tale again of I know not what Plot he heard from a Jesuit: nothing but Hearlay at the best. And it favours like an Alamacean de pax fausta, or rather of some what else, which I will spare to name, because he is upon his Oath. The other Witnesse is Mr. Anthony Mildmay, who also tells over
over his old Tils of his Father Pitton. But he was out of the way again, and appeared not till the next Day, with Sir Nathaniel Brent. So here's a Repetition again of the same Witness, and for doing things to multiply the noise. Only noble
Sir Henry Mildmay appeared not the second time;

... tell.'

III. The Third Charge was, That I had a damnable Plot, to reconcile the Church of England with the Church of Rome. If to reconcile them with the Maintenance of Idolatry, it were a damnable Plot indeed. But if Christian Truth and Peace might meet and unite together, all Christians over, were that a Sin too? Were I able to plot and effect such a Reconciliation, I would think myself most happy, whatever I suffered for it. But how is this damnable Plot proved? Pope Gregory write a Letter to his Nuncio in Spain, and a Letter also to King Charles; which Letter is printed: Copies of the same Letters were found in my Study. Could I hinder the Pope from writing to whom he pleased? Shalt not I get Copies of any Letters I can, to see what preaching is abroad for private Interest? Shall it be lawful for all my Predecessors to get and keep Copies of such Letters by them? Shalt it be unlawful for me only? And here I produced Mr. Dods, an ancient Servant to my Predecessors, who witnessed that Archbishop Bancroft had store of them, and kept them all his time. Nor do I know, how this Charge can fall upon me: for there is no one word in any of the Letters produced, that reflects upon me, or any Plot of mine. Nor indeed had I ever any such as this Reflect upon.

IV. The Fourth Charge is, That I had a hand in the Plot for sending the King, when he was Prince, into Spain, to be perverted in his Religion. They follow their Proof of this out of my Diary: And they begin with my Friendship with the Lord Duke of Buckingham, who waited on the Prince in this Journey. And first they urged my Diary at June 19, 1622, where I mention, that there were then Particulars, which are not for Paper. But the Words, which lead these in, were his Entrance upon a near Respect to me, the particular Expressions whereof were not for Paper: Nor Word, nor Thought, of either Plot or Popery. Then they urged June 15, 1622, where 'tis said, that I became C. that is, Confessor to the Lord Duke. First, If my Lord Duke would honour me so much as to make me his Confessor, as I know not so much as, if I were so professed, if I were a Papist, wherefore was it not for Paper. Should I venture them for, there's never a Perfon of Honour present, but would think me most unworthy of that Trust. Next, they prefixed June 19, 1623, where I confess, that I received Letters from my Lord Duke out of Spain. I did so; and I then held it great honour to me, and do so still. But then, and long before, it was known to all Men whither he was gone, and with whom; nay, it was commonly known to all Men of Quality hereabout within six or four Days: And till it was so commonly known, I knew it not. Yes, but then they inferred out of Feb. 17, 1623, That the Prince and the Marquis of Buckingham fet forward very secretly for Spain. And Feb. 21. That I wrote to his Lordship into Spain. 'Tis true, they went away that Day, and very secretly; but I neither did, nor could set it down, till afterwards that I came to know it. And then I soon as I came to know it, which was about the 21st, I did write. To the King was committed (how honestly let all the World judge) a Paßage out of a Letter of mine to Bishop Hall. But that Letter was read, at my humble Motion to the Lords, and the Date of it was in 1624. So many Years after this Bufnes of Spain. And the Paßage mentioned, was only about King James's manner of defending the Pope to be Antichrift, and how he falved it while the Prince was in Spain. But King James related it after. Nor could any Words of that Letter be drawn to the King's going thither, much less to any knowledge I had of it.

V. The Fifth Charge was concerning his Majest's March with France. And here again they urge my Diary at Mer. 11, 1625. That the Duke of Buckingham was then and there employed. And at May 19, & 29, That I then wrote Letters to him. First, My Lords, I hold it my great honour, that my Lord Duke would write to me, and give me leave to write to him. Secondly, I have committed some Error in these Letters, or none. If none, why are they charged? If any, why are they not produced, that I may see what it is, and anwer it?

VI. The Sixth Charge was, That I was an Informer of the Queen's. They this they endeavoured to prove by my Diary in three places. First, at Aug. 30, 1634. Upon occasion of some Service done, she was graciously pleased to give me leave to have immediate Access unto her, when I had occasion. This is true, and I most humbly thank'd her Majesty for it: for I very well knew what belonged to Addressets at second-hand in Court. But what Crime is in this, that the Queen was pleased to give me Access unto her, when I had occasion? Here's no word of Religion. Secondly, at May 18, 1655. Where 'tis said, That I gave her Majesty an account of something committed to me. If her Majesty lent or spake to me to do any thing, as it seems she did, shall I want so much Duty, as not give her an account of it? So belike I must be unmannerly with her Majesty, or lie open to no less a Charge of High Treason. Thirdly, at April 5, 1639. 'tis made a great Matter, That I should then dispatch a great Business of the Queen, which I understood she would not move for herself: and that for this her Majesty gave me great Thanks. Mr. Nicholls's Inference upon this was, That they conceive wherefore. But his Conceit makes no Evidence: he must not only conceive, but prove wherefore, before he can work anything against me. As for Religion, as there is no word of it in my Diary, so neither was it at this time thought on. Her Majesty would therin have moved for herself: But it seems it must be an Crime if I be but civil and dutiful towards the Queen, though it be but thrice mentioned in so many Years.

VII. The Seventh Charge was, That I forbade Miniflers praying for the Queen's Conversion, and punished others. The first Witness, Mr. Rauff, says, That Sir Nath. Brent gave it in charge at Bux-Church in my Visitation. The more to blame he, if so he did. Yes, but he says, it was by my Command delivered unto him by Sir John Lambe. Was it so? How doth Mr. Rauff know that? he doth not express. He was not present, when I spake with Sir John Lambe. And if Sir Nath. Brent told him of it, 'tis but Hearsay. And Sir Nath.
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Nath having been so ready a Witnesse against me, why is he not examined to this Particular? And as for the Paper which was shewed, it appears plainly there, that it was no Paper of Infraductions sent to my Visitors by me, but of particular Informations to me of which one was, That the Queen was prayed for in a very fantastic and scandalous way. And this appeared, when that Paper was read. And this I referred to my Visitors, as I not only might, but ought: not forbidding the Prayers, but the fanciful Composition of them. The second Witnesse was Mr. Pryme, who says, That Mr. Jowes was punnished for praying for the Queen. He was punished in the High-Commission for scandalous abusing the Queen, under a Form of praying for her, and for divers other Articles that were against him. And this An
twer I gave to Mr. Browne, who forgot not this in summing up my Charge.

VIII. The Eighth Charge was, That I punished me for praying to preferve the Prince. No, God forbid. The High-Commission Book was shewed, and that there in the Year 1634, one Mr. Hovee was cenfrued for it. I got this Act of the High-Commission to be read to the Lords: His Prayer went thus, That God would preserve the Prince in the true Religion, of which there was Cause to fear. Could this Prayer have any other Operation upon the People, than to make them think his Majesty was careless in the Education of the Prince, especially in point of Religion? And this was so grievous and grasculous a Scandal upon a Religious King, as nothing could be greater. Upon the matter, it was the shew of a Prayer for the Prince, but was indeed to defrry the King in the Hearts of his People. And had I not there contended to his Punishment, I had deferred to be punished myself. Mr. Browne, when he repeated the Sum of the Evidence, laid this Charge upon me, "but spoke not one word (to my remembrance) of this Answere given to it."

IX. The Ninth Charge, That I did extol Queen Mary's Days. The Proof for it was taken out of the Preface to the Statutes of the University of Oxford. I took a great deal of pains about those Statutes; and might justly have expected Thanks for it, not such an Accusation. But as for the Preface, it was made and printed at Oxford: I meddled not with it. I could truth the University with little, if not with the making of a Preface. If they have done any thing amis in it, let them answer it. The Pageage was about certain Offers made to amend those confusid Old Statutes, both in Edward VI's and Queen Mary's Days; but no effect came of the pains then taken, Recrutish Lohze, says the Preface. So that this can I answer for them: There's not a word spoken of Religion, but of Manners only, and that as much in relation to the Times of Princes following, as hers. For the Words, to my remembrance, are Interim op
tando Temporum Felicitate, &c. And that Interim cannot be refrained to Queen Mary's Days only, but must include the whole Interim, or middle distancce of time, to that preface in which Isettled the Body of their Statutes; that is, all Queen Elizabethe's and King James's years, which I think no Man can deny was Opitando Temporum Felicitat.
The Trial of Dr. William Laud, Car. I.

1. First, then they charge that he had often conference with him, while he was writing his Book intituled, Deis, Naturis, Gratia. No, he never came to me, till he was ready to print that Book. Then some Friends of his brought him to me. His Suit then was, That he might print that Book here. Upon Speech with him, I found the Scope of his Book to be such, as that the Church of England would have little Cause to thank him for it: and so absolute denying it. Nor did he ever come more at me after this, but twice or thrice at morn, when he made great Friends to me, that he might print another Book, to prove that Bishops are by Divine Right. My Answr then was, That I did not like the way which the Church of Rome went, in the Case of Episcopacy. And howsoever, that I would never give way, that any such Book should be printed here from the Pen of a Romanist; and that the Bishops of England were able to defend their own Cause and Calling, without calling in Aid from Rome, and would do in due time. Maintenance he never had any from me, nor did I then know him to be a Priest. Nor was there any Proof so much as offered in contrary to any of this.

2. Secondly, They did specially except against a Paffage in the Licenier, and another at the end of the Book. The Book was printed at Lyon, where I could not hinder the printing, either of the whole, or any part. This might have been something, had I licentia here; but that I constantly denied.

3. Thirdly, They produced a Letter written to me from Venice, by one Mr. Middledon, Chaplain there to the Right Honourable the now Earl of Denbigh, his Majesties Ambassador. Therein he writes, That S. Clara was Hono acquestimus, and that one Monseigneur S. Giles was the Author of that Book. That Clara and S. Giles were the Same Person, is but Mr. Middleton's Opinion. Such News as he there heard, some true, some fall, he thought fit to write unto me: and he being absent, here's no Proof upon Oath, that they are one and the same Person. And I hope a young Man's Letter from Venice, or any other Place, signifying only such things as he hears, shall not stand for good Evidence in a Cause of Life. And he was mainly deceived in this Particular, as appears, First, Because what Clara is, I know not: but Monseigneur S. Giles is a great Scholar, and a sober Man; and one that gave the late Lord Brookes to good Content, that he allowed him One Hundred Pound a Year during his Life. Secondly, Because 'tis commonly known that Clara is an Englishman, and S. Giles a Frenchman born and bred.

The 7th and following. Thirdly, Because their own Articulate, upon which they bring this Charge, acknowledges them too distinct Person. Fourthly, Because both Mr. Prym and Mr. Nicolls had Monseigneur S. Giles before them in Examination, and could not but know him to be a Frenchman: as appears by a Warrant given to him by Mr. Prym, to secure him after his Examination; which Warrant follows in these Words:

T H E S E are to certify those whom it may concern, That the Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to prosecute the Archbishop of Canterbury, have examined and received Satisfaction from Monsieur S. Giles, a Dutchman Servant to the Right Honble. of Venice; and therefore he is no farther to be examined or troubled concerning the same,

This Licenier came to my Hands since my an. 
Swering was past, so I could not then shew it. 
Monsieur S. Giles was never the Man that gave 
me notice of any of this, not so much as that he 
had been examined; but my Secretary Mr. Dill 
came to hear of it by chance, and went to him, 
and had this Copy (with some Labour) from him, 
and will make Oath it is a true Copy. This is 
not the thankfulllest Part that ever S. Giles played, 
considering my Carriage towards him.

4. Then they charged upon Monseigneur S. Giles directly, That I knew him to be a Priest, and yet maintained him at Oxford. The Case was this: Mr. S. Giles was in good Place about the Queen's Majestie at her first coming: Here he did so good Services to this State, that he left himself in France, and durst not go thither when the French were sent away. All this while the Man was unknown to me, till his Majestie one Day at St. James's told me this, and that he was a Priest, and that it lay upon him in Honour to allow him some Maintenance, and prescribed me a Way how to order it, that he might receive One Hundred Marks a Year as from him; and gave me charge, if the Pension were at any time behind, I should acquaint him with it. After this Mr. S. Giles, by his Friends, petition'd his Majestie, that being a Stranger, he might live in Oxford, to have the Use of the Library there, being resolved to meddle no more with the Controversies of the Time, but to apply himself to Metaphysical Learning. His Majestie was defirous to have him plac'd in some College, to gave Charges: But this I most humbly deprecated, because it might be dangerous to the Youth there, and scandalous to his Majestie, the Church, and the University; and dangerous to myself, being Chancellor: to the reft I submitted. So he was left to place himself in some Town-House, as he could: And for this his Majestie gave me his Warrant, which Mr. Prym, in his Search, took from me. But here follows the true Copy of it.

Charles Rex.

Antwerbury, Mr. S. Giles by serving Us and this State, both left all his Hopes in France, and desir'd to spend his time here at his private Studies, I would have you think upon some way for his Maintenance, and to place him in Oxford, that he may have the use of that Library, which he much desir'd. And you may fo order it, that his Profession in Religion may do no harm.

And according to this Direction of his Majestie I did take order, but with an Assurance from himself, and with Spies upon him there, before the special Care of the Vice-Chancellor, that he should not converse with young Students, nor exercise his Priestly Office, nor do any thing against the Laws. Nor did I ever hear that he failed in any of these Assumptions.

5. Then

* The Archbishop related this Case more at large, and therewith the Scripture, on which he defended himself in a sermon Paper which being by Prym in the Tower, was never published and read before the Lords. It may be found in Prym's Complete Hist. p. 428.
5. Then they produced one Mr. Broad, who testified, that while S. Giles lived at Oxford, some Doctors came to him. Doctors were able to deal well enough with him; but all Reforjtof young Scholars was forbidden. He says farther, that Mr. S. Giles should say, That the Bishops of England were cordially of his Religion, but that he feared their Rigindens was spoilt all. First, This is but a Report of his Speech. Secondly, Why was not S. Giles at his Examination asked, whether he had it or not? And if he did, what God had he for it? At last, no more, but it was his Opinion of the Bishops who were never the more cordial to Popery for his thinking so. And Thirdly, I doubt it appears by this time, that all is overthrown, or near it, not by the Rigidens, but by Over-Remissness of some Bishops, who never would believe any Danger could come from the Cold, as they were called.

6. Lastly, What's the Reaçon of this great En- deavours, upon nothing but News in a Letter, to make Clara and Mr. S. Giles to be one and the same Man? Doubtless, nothing but a Hypo- tropical of my Blood. For Reforjtof Priests to Laybishops, was usual in both my last Peculiarities times, Burchatts and Abbotts, and some lay in the House and had Relish. This was proved to the Lords by two eminent Servants of that House: Neither of which have been done in my time. Archibis. did make a Warrant (this Warrant was shewn) to secure Mr. Prym an English Priest, upon a Command of King James, why may not I a French one, by the Warrant of King Charles? King James justified Bishops Canonry for doing this, when he was Bishop of London, and no Privy-Counselor: And may not I do it, being Archibishop and Privy-Counselor, with as much Privity of the King and the State, as he did? But to let these pass, why should I say here was a Thrift for Blood? I'll tell you why. The Statute of 27 Eliz. makes it Felony without Benefit of Clergy, to maintain or relieve any Reufil Priests born in England, or any other of her Majesty's Dominions, knowing him to be such. Now they had laid their Articles. That I had given Maintenance to one Monseigneur S. Giles, a Popish Priest at Oxford, knowing him to be such. But when, upon Examination of S. Giles, they found him to be a Frenchman, and so not within the Statute; (as the Words of that Statute are) then there was a Charge of High Treason; yet against their own Knowledge and Confidence, they gave that in Evidence to reach my Life any way.

Here Mr. Nicholls, so soon as he had discoverd whether I tend, would have broken me off flying. They did not urge it for that now, they were not yet come to it. I replied, if they came to it after, I would be at the Pains to answer again: But since it concerned my Life, I would not flipp it now, for I have it unanswered in any Circumstance. So I went on, but they never mentioned it after; and by this way meant certainly to have involved me within the Law, Clara being an English born. God of his Mercy grant, that this Thrift after my Blood lie not too heavy upon their Souls. Mr. Browne, in sumning up the Charge, fell upon this also. I made a brief Answer out of that which is afore said: Yet after in his Reply, he fell upon this also. Mr. Mrdithv's, and cites his News for Evidence, that S. Giles were the same Man: Which I much wonder of. I was able and grave a Man as he is, should swallow from Mr. Prym, who doubted (being prudent) was angry to see himself so laid open in the House of Commons.

XII. At last came in the last Charge of this Day, That a Cardinal's Hat was offered unto me. My Diary quoted for this, at Aug. 4, & 21, 1633. I could hinder no Offer, unlefs I could profe what each Man came about, and so thin them. But why is not my Answer, there set down, express- ted too? My Answer was, That somewhat dast was in me, which could not sufFer me to accept that such Rome were other than those of Islam. Besides, I went out of my Majesty, and acquainted him with it; which is all that the Law L.3. Inc.3. requires at my Hands. And his Maj- esty very prudently and religiously (yet in a calm Way, the Perions offering it having Relation to some Ambassador) tried me freely of that, both Trouble and Danger. They urged further out of the Papers of Andreas ab Heberfeld (which Mr. Prym took from me in his Search) That Signior Care had Power to offer me a Cardinal's Hat. The Words which they cite, are (for I could never get these of the Papers finc the Mandatum habebis offerem, sed non obto. What Power he had to make me such an Offer, I know not; but themseHs confess he did not offer it. Nor had I ever any Speech with him during all the time he stayed here. I was sollicit'ed as much by ho- norable Friends to give him Admittance to me at Lambeth, with Affurance he should speake nothing about Religion, as ever I had about any thing in my Life. I still refused, and could not persuade myself to do other; and yet could not but inwardly (in Verbo Sacratissimo, this is true) condemn myself of gross Insufciency for refusing; for which yet now I see I am much bound to God for that Unmerited Life. Had I held a Conversation with him, Power he had to make me such an Offer, I know not; but themselves confess he did not offer it. Nor had I ever any Speech with him during all the time he stayed here. I was sollicit'ed as much by ho-
in the Letters Patents for the Palatinate, and the Letters between Bishop Hall and me. These Proofs are answer'd before, and repeated here only to make a Noise. Nor did I in any of these deny the Pope to be Antichrist: For, to forfear that Word, for some both Temporal and Ecclesiasti-
cal Refects, is one thing; and to deny the Thing itself, is another.

II. The second consists of a great many Parti-
culars, and most of them urged before, repeated only to help to make the Ignorant clamourous and wild against me. God forgive them this Prac-
tice.

1. The first Particular was Shelvord's Book : The whole Book. And Mr. Pyron very gravely said, That this Book, and the other two following, were found in my Study. Is he not yet allahmed of this Argument? May I have no Book in my Study, but I must be of the same Judgment with the Au-
thor in all Things? The Author is altogether un-
known to me; the Book was licentiated at Cam-
bridge: so nothing faulty in me, but the having of the Book in my Study.

2. The second was Dr. Heytin's Book against Mr. Burton. This Book was printed by my Com-
mand (they say) and in it is a Passag for Absolute Obedience to Kings, Burton, p. 229. This was before all. And I did command the printing of the Book, but gave no Warrant to put any thing un-
justifiable into it. This Passag I caused to be read to the Lords; and the Doctor there says no more than what he learned of King James in the Con-
ference at Hampton Court. But if any thing be amiss, he is ready to answer it: But I find not one word in him, that this Absolute Obedience ought to be in any thing that is against Law. * That's * one of Mr. Nicol's Stretchers.

3. The third Particular is Bishop Montague's Appeal, p. 141. But nothing hence charged up-
on me, but only, that the Book was found in my Study. I would Mr. Pyron could find any Book* there now.

4. The fourth was, That divers Books of like nature where licentiated by my Chaplains. But none was of all they then named, but Dr. Heytin's and Sales, of which your Lordships have heard the Plot how it came to be licentiated. And for Dr. Hey-
tin, he is ready to make all good, which he hath therein done.

5. The fifth Particular is, That the Homilies which are authorized in the Church of England, make the Pope Antichrist, p. 216. And the Baby-
lonish Beast of Rome, p. 516. But, First, this is no-
ting against me, till it be proved, (which yet is not done) that I have purposely denied the Pope to be Antichrist. And, Secondly, I do not conceive, that the Article of the Church of England, which con-
firm the Homilies, doth also confer every Phrase that is in them. Nor, Thirdly, do I con-
ceive, that the Homilies in those Places which are cited, do make the Pope the great Antichrist. In the first place, the Words are, to the beat-
ing down of Sin, Death, the Pope, the Devil and all the Kingdom of Antichrist: Which Words cannot possibly imply, that the Pope is that Antichrist. In the second place, he is only called the Babylon-
ian Beast of Rome, which Phrase doth sufficiently signify the great Antichrist. For the Beast to often
mentioned in the Revelation (Chap. xi., 7.) is no where called the Babylonian Beast of Rome, And if that Beast do stand for the great Antichrist, I say if; because those Scriptures are very doubtful. * Annot. in Apoc. x. 10. And it is pri-
marily the Roman Empire in the Judgment of the Genesee Notae. ^ And that there should be two great Antichrists, is more

* Quemadmodum feque dixi, aut indicibus, ut fundamenta & minas manere; ina non possum eff Ecclesiastum fors ab Antichristo vel a fundamenta fracturi, vel folo sanguinis, sed ad ipsa quseque valutinse feminamur asdicium fugere volet. Calv. E. 4. 

* Quaestiones feque dixi, aut indicibus, ut fundamenta & minas manere; ina non possum eff Ecclesiastum fors ab Antichristo vel a fundamenta fracturi, vel folo sanguinis, sed ad ipsa quseque valutinse feminamur asdicium fugere volet. Calv. E. 4.
That in the depth of Antichrist, the Foundations of the Church crumbled into the Past, from which the Church might not recover. And this Papacy was then read to the Lords. Thirdly, these two learned Witnessies (as they would be reputed) are quite mistaken in their very Terms: For they represent me, as if I said, Not in Fundamentals, but in Circumstantial; whereas there are not Membræ oppostræ, but Fundamentals and Superstructures, which may sway quite beside the Foundation. And this, tho' not the only, is a main Pulling in the Roman Fabric; in which many Things are built upon unwarreable Tradition, as is express'd in my Book at large, and their many Superstructures named; and that Papacy read all to the Lords.

And this I answered first to the Lords, and after to Mr. Browne's Summary Charge; who in his last Reply said two Things: First, That when I said Rome was a True Church, I spoke it generally, without this Distinction. But this is quite beyond the Proof; for no Witness says so. Besides, it is manifest by Distinction of Fundamentals from other Doctrines (acknowledged by both the Witnessies) that I did not speak it absolutely, but plain enough to any ordinary Reader. Understand, truly, (which I was very sorry to hear from so grave a Person) be added, That there was no Truth of a Church, but in the Verity of Doctrine and Manners; and that in Veritate Erites, a Company of Turks were a True Church. Now God be merciful to us, whether we are (as is known) that Greek Word Βαρβαρια, which signifies Church, signifies also in Heathen Authors any kind of Company or Congregation of Men, Turks if you will. But in Ecclesiastical Writers, and among all Christians, the Word Church is used only (and Βαρβαρια too) for a Company of Men who professe the Faith of Christ, and are baptized into his Name. And with many Christians the Company of Turks are such a Church in Veritate Erites, in the Verity of this Being, as all the World knows. But the Pope is to be feared, he may say what he pleases. But I was very much troubled to hear this, and from him. I had almost forgot that Mr. Nicolas here prefixed the Authority of the Honorable on me again; however, it is not in the Bishop's p. 213. Rome and their Ablutions are not the true Church. But the Answ is easy: For I say as the H instability, and as it means too in that Place; namely, that the Church of Rome is not the True Church, is the Catholic Church, nor the Head thereof. But there is a great deal of Difference between the Church and a Church: The one is the General, the other a Particular. The Church it cannot be: A Church it is; and a true one too, in the Sense before specified. Upon occasion of this, Mr. Nicol's Wound was open again, and said, That at the beginning I reckoned up some I had converted; but if this were my Opinion, and that if this might stand for good, I might convert the Devil and all. My Ears had been so beaten with his Language, that I was patient, and left him to infall. And to help on this Bifflax, while he was in these loud Exposition of Penumbræ came to Mr. Burton to the Bar, and in my hearing deffered him to repeat the Testimony he had given which Mr. Burton did, and his Lordship seemed to
be much pleased with it. Not long before, when the News was come hot to the House that York was taken, when I came at Five in the Afternoon to make my Answer, I was no sooner come to the Bar, but the same Lord came and sat just before me, and there with much Joy told Mr. Lieutenant the News. I presume he did it in favour to me, because he thought it would put me in very good Heart, being then instantly to begin to make my Answer. God forgive this Lord; for I have deferred in my time far better of him, if he understood himself, or any Man else.

V. The next Charge was out of Dr. Pocklington's Allen's Curinghimself, p. 49, 50, where he speaks (they say, for I now have not his Book) of a Happiness that the Bishops of England can derive their Succession from St. Peter; which, in great Scorn, Mr. Nicolas called the Archbishop's Pedigree. First, If there be any Crime in this, Dr. Pocklington is to answer it, not I. Secondly, he may form what he will; but wise Men know 'tis a great Honour to the Church of England, and a great Stipple in the Mouths of the Romishists, that her Bishops can derive their Calling successively from St. Peter; especially considering how much they stand upon personal Succession. Thirdly, Dr. Pocklington in this says no more for me and the Bishops, than 'tis the Bishops of all Christian Churches from the Apostles. As to the Donatists in the same Words, save that St. Augustine begins at St. Peter, and defends to his own Time; and the Doctor begins at his own Time, and ascends to St. Peter. ' But it seems, an upright Clergy, without a Calling, will serve Mr. Nicolas well enough.

VI. The sixth Charge was, That Books were written of purpose to maintain thefe Opinions; and such Men as writ them only preferred. He named Mr. Shelford, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Cusworth, and Dr. Pocklington. This had been chamomared upon already: If any have set out unworthy Books, they may be called to account for it; I hope I shall not answer for all the Divine in the Kingdom. They whom I preferred were worthy and able Men, and it will not be in the power of Mr. White's Centuries to blast a Man of them a mong any that know them. For these that are named, Mr. Shelford I know not, Mr. Butterfield I faw punished in the High-Communion; neither of them preferred, that I know. The two last, by whomsoever they were preferred, deferred all the Preferment they had, and more.

VII. The seventh Charge is out of my Diary at June 15, 1622, where 'tis said, That I preferred Asper's Guardian Wills; an Old Friend. And here Mr. Nicolas laid all the Correpondency open, which he said) that Gentleman had with the Pope's Agents, with Priests and Jesuits: And when he had made him this way as foul as he could, then I must he guilty of all, for preferring such a Man to the King. This Gentleman was indeed my antient Friend: In my many Years Acquaintance with him, I faw nothing in him but Honesty and Worth. If when he was preferred, he deceived my Opinion, he is living to answer for himself. Many in all Ages have been preferred to Princes, which do not answer the Hopes and Defeats of them which prefer them; and yet they are not made answerable for them neither. But whether he did fail in any pub- lick Truth; or no, I am not his Judge. Yes, but some Letters were found from his Son Thomas, what Entertainment he had in foreign Parts for his Father's sake. But these Letters were read to the Lords, and there is not one Word in them that relates to me: And 'tis both likely and fit the Son of a Secretary of State should be worthily used in his Travels. Yes, but his son Christopher was at Rome, and sent thither to infirmate himself with the Pope; So Andreas ab Hagenfeld writes in the Papers which Sir William Balfour sent over to me. If he did send his Son to that end, then I discovered his Plot: For I caused three of his Books to be examined by the King and the Lords, as is before related. Besides, in my poor Judgments, the Pope must be a very ample Man, ('tis may be Mr. Nicolas thinks him fo, compar'd with himself) that a Youth of Seventeen at the most, should infirmate himself to think any thing out of him for his Father's Service. Lastly, he professed, that my Interest continued with Mr. Secretary in all thene Courses of his. 'Tis well known in Court the old Intered did not continue between us: But for Oldfriendship's sake I will not be drawn to say more. As for his relating of any Priests, he must give an Account of that himself. But for myself, I was so careful in this Particular, that I never put my Hand, the publick Seal of Council-Chamber, to any Relic in all my Time. I might be named as present when such a Relic was made, (which I could not avoid:) but act in any I did not. Nay, I was so careful, that I refused to set my Hand to any Licence to travel, lest, if any young Man should be perverted abroad in his Travels, any thing might be impuned to me. And this all the Clerks of the Council can witness. ' But I see no Wariness, no Care, can prevent the Envy and the Malice of the Many and the Mighty.

VIII. The eighth Charge was my Correspondence with Popish Priests. And for proof of this, they produced divers Witnesss.

1. The first Witness was Mr. Radforth, one of the common Meffengers used to fetch such Persons. He says, That Simioinus Flidig, bragged to him that he had Acquaintance with me. Here's nothing but a bragging Report of Simioinus; who, what he is, I know not. So here's no Proof. He says, That four Pound was sent to himself, to free him out of Prison; and that Davis told him he came from me. This is but a Hearsay from Davis, as the former was from Simioinus. But say, my Lords, if I did lend him four Pound to free him out of Prison, doth he not now very thankfully repay me the same? If this be my Lords, I did lend him four Pound; And the Money that made me lend it, was because I heard he was a Convert from Popery to be a Protestant, and that his Imprisonment was as much for that as for any thing else. And this was attested to the Lords by my Servant Mr. Smith, who was one of them that moved me for him.

2. The second Witness was Francis Newton, another Meffenger. He says, that when he had taken Henry Pars, a Priest, he should have been carried to a private Committee; that he disliked it, and complained to Mr. Secretary Cook, who (he says) found him to my mind, and that when he came to Lambeth, Mr. Dell told him his Master, my Guardian, with Sir Toby Matthew. My Servant Mr. Dell being...
ing appointed my Solicitor, was now present in Court, and denied all this. And well he might; for Sir Toby was never in my Garden with me in all his Life. And if Mr. Dell told him that I would not meddle in the Bufenfes, (as he says he did) Mr. Dell must give the Account for it, not I. Yet if there were a Reference of this Mors to a private Committee, thehindring of that was more proper to Mr. Secretary than to me. Howsoever, here was no hurt done: For he confesses that Mors was sent back to Neuwage, and if (as he farther says) he was charg’d by Mr. Secretary Wadbeuk, that is nothing to me. He says, he was informed by Stedely, that Smith, alias Flood, was acquainted with me. But if he were but informed to himself, that’s no Proof to inform your Lordships. He says, that Brown a Priest was dismissed out of the High-Communion. Thus it was: He was called in theather for very foul Uncleanness. In proces of this Bufenfes, he there openly confis’d himself a Priest. Hereupon that Court sent him to Newgate. ‘What became of him after, I know not, fave that I know he was chiefly examined by Mr. Fyn and others concerning me.’ This Newton, upon what Grudge I know not, calls me Rogue, and all to nought in all Companies; and with so much I acquainted the Lords. 3. The third Witness was Sbe, May, a Meffen- ger also. He says, that Sir Toby Matthew was accounted a Priest when he was in Parts beyond the Seas; and that he saw him in a Coach with me, and that he went over with me in my Barf. First, I gave in two Exceptions against this Witness: One, that he was a Man of no Conscience; for he had shifted his Religion from Protestant to Papist, and back again three or four times: Which was a Thing known. The other was, that he kept a Brothel-House at this present, and that his Fellow Wadbeuk knew this, and called him pinning Knave, saying he kept a Baste of Wenchses at this time in his House. And therefore he has space of him but the fifth of this present fyf, in the Ball Tavern in the Falser-Tard. So I thought him a most abominable Man. But he was at all this. 4. And afterward Wadbeuk meeting my Servant Mr. Snath, he told him that he did say jo to Maya, and wonder’d how he should come to hear it. ‘Being admitt’d, and saying as he did, I told the Lords that he began with a very bold Oath, and like a Shifter of his Religion: For I had four Servants there, three of which usually attended me when I went and retourn’d from Court, Mr. Dell, Mr. Snath, Mr. Godswin, and Mr. Dohbn, and they all attrested the contrary; and I never went, but one of these, at least, was with me. Besides, he is finge in this Testimony. He says, that he saw Sir Toby several times in my House. But he confesses withall, that he never felt him near me or my own parts. I cannot say that ever he was within my Doors. But if he, or others of his Quality, do come to pry out any thing in my House, how is it possible for me to hinder it? My Porter could not see it written in their Foreheads, who they were. He says, that one Price was often seen at my House. But he doth not say he was seen with me, or there with my Knowledge. He says, that one Leander was reported to have been my Chamber-Fellow in Oxford. First, This is but a Report, and fo no Evidence. Secondly, If he were my Chamber-Fellow in Oxford when we were Boys together, I am sure he was then no Priest; and he was but a Boy when he left the College. He confesses that I gave Order to observe who and how many referred to Ambassadors Houfes, and Signior Cone’s, and says he thought I could prove it. But I believe he would never have confess’d it, but that he knew I could prove it. And thereupon I showed the Lords many Papers certifying me what Numbers were found referring to each Place respective; and Thomas May’s Hand to many of those Papers. He says, he took one Peter Wiflard, and brought him to me to Wadbeuk, while Sir John Lane was with me. But he confessteth, that Wiflard then shewed Mr. Secretary Wadbeuk the Paper, he want to did charge him: And then what could I do to this Paper? Nay, I have some caufe to think he would never have apprehended him, had he not known he had that Warrant. Lastly, he says, that once at the Star-Chamber I told him he was too quick and nimble for me. And I hope it is no Trefon, if I did say fo. Nor could I mean he was too quick in apprehending Prifets, for I found both him and his Fellows, after Crafye’s death, enough at that: But if I said fo, it was because I could not tell how to truant his Shifting and his Wiflins. 4. The fourth Witness was Elizabeth Graye, Wife to Thomas Graysinger. And this is a very fine Witness. For first, her Testimony was committed by me, my Wiflins was committed, by my means. And then with a Breath the fays, She doth not know by whom he was committed, but the thinks by Secretary Wadbeuk and me. But since the doth not know, but think only, I hope her thinking can be no Evidence. She fays, that she delivered me a Petition, and that I flung it away, faying, I could not meddle with any Priest-catching Knave. The Witness fingle, and I doubt doating, and the Words far from Trefon. 5. The fifth Witness was John Cooke, a Meffen- ger too, and one that for his Mildeoman had stood in the Pillory. This I urged against him, as unfit to witness against me: ‘My Witness that I saw him in the Pillory, was fo threatened, that he fent me word he durst not come. I may not fay from whom this Threatening came.’ But the thing was so true, that Cooke himself confess’d it, but excused the Caufe; and his Testimony received. He told how his Fifer the Jefuit was taken by Graye; that when he was brought to the Council-Table, Secretary Cook and I went to the King to know his Pleaoure about him; that we brought back word from his Majesty to the Lords, that he should be bannish’d. All this while here’s no hurt done. Then he fays, that notwithstanding this Order of his Majesty, Graye and he was by a Warrant from the Secretary Wadbeuk: That Wadbeuk upon Grays order to secret Cook, and to me, and that Dell told him I would not meddle with it. My Secretary must anfwer this, I remember it not. But if Mr. Dell received any fuch Anfwer from me, that I would not meddle with it; there were two apparent Reafons for it: One, that I would not meddle with it alone, his Majesty’s Order being to all the other, that Fisher was the Man I had written again, and Men would have been apt to say, that when I could not anfwer, I fought means to delibry. So I way fit (alone at leaf) to meddle with him all Men. He fays, that Graye was committed the Fifer, for railing on me to my own Houfe. Yet he can’t imagine that he was not committed by me. And I presume your Lordships will think there was Caufe of his Committent.