

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The life, times and writings of Jeremy Taylor*

C. J. Strankes

### How to cite:

---

Strankes, C. J. (1952) The life, times and writings of Jeremy Taylor. Masters thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/10335/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

This thesis was published in  
1952 with new material resulting  
from the incorporation of the  
Murray mss., by S.P.C.K. for  
the Church Historical Society  
under the title " The life and  
writings of Jeremy Taylor ".  
A copy is available at the  
Archdeacon Sharp Library  
at 274.206.

THE LIFE, TIMES AND WRITINGS OF JEREMY TAYLOR

by

REV. C. J. STRANKS. M.A.

A thesis presented for the degree of M. Litt. in the  
University of Durham.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.	I
CHAP:	
1. Birth and Education.	1
2. Patronized by Laud.	31
3. Episcopacy Asserted.	67
4. First Years at Golden Grove.	92
5. Quietness and Success.	146
6. Controversy.	191
7. Ministry in London and Ireland.	223
8. The Reorganization of Trinity College, Dublin.	275
9. Taylor in his Diocese.	301
10. The Last Scenes.	329
11. Taylor's Character and Achievement.	346
Appendices.	V
Bibliography.	XXVI
Index.	

PREFACE.

In the following pages the life of Jeremy Taylor has been studied in relation to his writings and his times. To a peculiar extent Taylor was the product of the first half of the seventeenth century.. It is doubtful if his peculiar genius could have ripened so completely at any other period of history than one in which an elaborately enriched style was admired and religion was the chief mental interest. Yet the seventeenth century provides so vast and deeply absorbing a background, that the difficulty has been not to lose sight of the central figure of this study in a wealth of accessory detail. Accordingly, an effort has been made to confine the history either to those facts which elucidate the life and education of a seventeenth<sup>CENTURY</sup>/divine or those incidents in which Taylor was engaged, or which influenced his thought.

Taylor's writings have been studied in the order in which they were produced and treated as part of his life. Only in the last few years did active work transcend in importance his labours as an author and theologian. For the most part the history of his opinions is the history of the man. That in his thought there is very little that can be truly called original is a long standing charge against him; but no one has hitherto attempted, by putting his work into its proper historical sequence, to show just what was borrowed and what was new in idea and method.

A considerable amount of material has been included in this thesis which does not occur in any other biography of Taylor. Such as the fact that he was consulted by the King in 1647 on the possible limits of toleration, from which some interesting deductions may be drawn. The important proposal made by him on behalf of the London clergy that the Prayer Book should be taken off and some other forms provided, a suggestion which sent Hammond into vigorous opposition. Some details of Taylor's early intercourse with the Conway family have been added, which not only throw light on the circumstances of his life in London but show that it was not merely on Evelyn's

recommendation that he was invited over to Ireland. It seems to have puzzled both Taylor and his biographers to assign a cause why he was not given a bishopric at home; or, at least, when his position in Ireland proved so difficult why his request for translation to England was ignored. A letter of Sheldon's which is quoted in the following pages supplies an explanation, if not a reason.

The Irish portion of Taylor's life has never been treated very fully or very satisfactorily. Heber used the Carte M.S.S. and the Rawdon Papers, but Adair's "True Narrative" had not been published and he does not seem to have had access to the State Papers. Sir Edmund Gosse made some slight use of Adair, but not nearly to the extent warranted. He also left the State Papers unsearched. These two sources have proved themselves to be of the highest value. From Adair I have taken details of the Presbyterian agitation against bishops, both before and after Taylor's arrival, in Down and Connor. From the State Papers an account of this agitation as it was reported to the bishop by his agent in the diocese. This is particularly important as it was the basis of the complaints which Taylor made to Ormonde and the reason for his desire to resign. Three other letters in the State Papers clarify entirely the hitherto obscure details of Taylor's death. They were written by Rawdon within a day or two of the events he describes and provide a vivid, as well as a reliable, account of his illness, his monetary affairs, the condition in which he left his family and his burial, the date of which must be corrected from August the twenty-third, as was previously believed, to September the third.

From Dean Carmody's "Lisburn Cathedral and its Past Rectors" as well as from information supplied by Dean Carmody himself I have been able to fill in to some extent the background of the immediate locality in which Taylor lived and worked, and to present a little more fully the character of Rust, Taylor's eulogist and the first Dean of his Cathedral. It has generally been supposed that a former friendship with Rust was the cause of Taylor inviting him over to Ireland, but it would now seem that this was not the case.

An older friendship, which has only recently been brought

to light, was that between Taylor and Henry More. The Conway Letters show how close this intimacy was, a fact which must not be forgotten when Taylor's theology is assessed.

Some other points to which attention has been given are first of all the origins of Taylor's Eucharistic Prayers. Beyond stating that they were from the ancient Liturgies, especially the Greek, the compiler did not indicate the sources of his material. Then the truth of the charges which Taylor, in common with other Protestant controversialists of his day made against the Church of Rome; and also, the statement of Bishop Wordsworth that Doctor Dubitantium is largely drawn from Sanderson's "Conscience and Human Law," a charge which as I have tried to show has not very much support. A number of small points in which either Heber or Gosse were mistaken have been corrected.

No bibliography of Taylor's first editions which pretended to be complete has hitherto been published with his life. The commonly accepted list in Lowndes is uncritical and incorrect in many details.

In cases where the spelling of proper names varies the usage of the Dictionary of National Biography has been followed.

All reference to Taylor's Works in this thesis are to "The Whole Works of The Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D. Edited by Heber and Revised by Eden". London. 10 Vols. 1847-52.

From beginning to end I have received great assistance from many whose kindness in answering the letters of a quite unknown correspondent fills me with amazement. Dean Carmody, of Down, and Mr. H. A. Boyd, of Ballycastle, both replied to the questions I put to them on Taylor's Irish career and added facts of which, but for their generosity, I should have remained ignorant. The Venerable the Archdeacon of Connor, the Reverend Dr. White, Canon H. B. Swanzy and others in Ireland supplied me with information. The Reverend H. B. Walton of Hardwicke, Buckinghamshire, kindly obtained for me photographs of documents in the Bodleian, at Oxford, and many other friends lent me books. In this respect I owe a great debt

to the authorities of Kobe University, who, in making me free of their library allowed me the use of one of the finest collections of books in the Far East.

## CHAPTER ONE.

In sixteen thirteen, the year of Jeremy Taylor's birth, the seeds of the struggle which began in sixteen forty-two were already planted. James the first had been King of England for ten years. During that time he had contrived to disappoint every important section of his subjects except the High Church Party and that solitary exception was able to stand him in no very good stead. It was obvious that unless the court and the people could be brought to a better understanding of each other the future was full of alarm.

Those who belong to our own generation do not need to be told how deeply an atmosphere of strife may influence the minds of the young and so though the continual bickering between the King and his subjects may have had very little direct effect upon the Cambridge barber's household, it provided the political environment in which his precocious son Jeremiah grew up, some account of it is therefore essential to the study we are to make.

James came to England to meet a Parliament which was inclined to become more and more self-assertive. Under Elizabeth, respect for the Queen and the memories of the great dangers and glories which they had shared with her, as well as some fear of her formidable personality had checked any far reaching opposition to her authority even though her popularity in the country was on the wane. Under James the Parliament felt that it was time they began to be jealous for their privileges. As if he was eager to provoke still more this already unquiet spirit the new King met his peoples representatives with talk of his prerogative which had the highest and most alarming sound. At their very first meeting in the new reign the Commons rose to defend what they believed to be two several attacks on their privileges and at the end of the session met the complaints of the King with a vindication of themselves which emphasized that the liberties they fought for were theirs of right and not merely allowed them of

the royal grace.

James was in no condition to win a battle with his Parliament for as time went on he grew more and more in want of money and theirs was the only hand that could give it adequately.<sup>1</sup> Although throughout his reign, the increasing commercial prosperity of the country gave him a revenue far greater than that on which Elizabeth had managed with some niggardliness to make ends meet, he overspent his income by 50,000 to 150,000 pounds a year. Without Elizabeth's gift for making a little money go a long way he was also without the resources which had enabled her father and grandfather to raise funds without danger. Henry the seventh had taxed the nobles, Henry the eighth had robbed the Church and the nation as a whole had not cared for either of these bodies enough to become troublesome on their account. James the first could do nothing but increase the burdens on the wealthy middle class, a much more formidable task. In an effort to add to his revenue the King exercised what he believed to be his right to place an imposition on imports. Currants were already legally taxed by the statute of tonnage and poundage, James put upon them an additional duty which a merchant named Bate refused to pay. The case came before the court of exchequer which upheld the King, though when the opinion of his two chief justices Pop<sup>h</sup>am and Coke was taken they refused to admit that the King might levy impositions merely for the sake of revenue, though they seem to have thought he might do so to protect the rights of his subjects against foreigners. The affair was afterwards debated in Parliament, which put forward a statute of Edward I, clearly forbidding any levy of duties without consent of Parliament, to which the Crown lawyers replied with Tudor precedents supporting King James' claim.<sup>2</sup> Salisbury's expedient of the Great Contract between the King and Parliament in which the King would surrender his claim to impositions in return for enough money to satisfy

1. Gardiner, "Hist: of Eng:" Vol.1. pp.294-5,  
Vol.2. pp.113-4.

2. Maitland. "Constitutional Hist: of England"  
pp.258-259.

the needs of the state came to an end in increased dislike on both sides, which was aggravated by the reoccurring complaint of Parliament against misgovernment, the pride of the episcopate and the persecution of the Puritans. The old issue of Monopolies, which had been contested under Elizabeth, was more and more bitterly fought over as James' reign proceeded.

In 1611, the momentous year which saw also the issue of the authorised version of the Bible and Shakspeare's retirement, James sent his first parliament home determined to carry on affairs without its aid. He was forced to call his parliament together again three times before his death, but in each case there proved to be no possibility of Crown and Parliament working together in willing partnership.

To support a quarrel with the people's representatives James should at least have had popularity among the people, but this he lost as fast as he could. His ungainly figure, his reputed cowardice, his arbitrary and incessant pretensions, all tended, not only to obscure the ability he possessed but also to make the prevailing impression of him in his own age and since that of a foolish pedant ludicrously misplaced at the head of a great people. To those who remembered the orderly government of Elizabeth, the ruinous mismanagement of the King's regime did not add to their liking for him. Ambassadors and troops went unpaid; the fortifications of the country were falling into decay and the navy, which had been the instrument of the greatest triumphs of former years, mismanaged and robbed by Sir Robert Mansell, was the disgrace of a maritime country.<sup>1</sup> The King's leaning toward Spain irritated the Protestant feeling which was specially strong among the merchants and sea-going population, who were still further alarmed when in 1615 the details of the negotiations with respect to the Spanish match came to light and there was a prospect of Roman Catholicism being a tolerated religion, with a Roman Catholic Queen, whose children, at least until they were twelve years old, would be brought

1. "Cambridge Modern History." Vol.3. pp.564.

up in their mother's faith. Whatever respect the people may have had for their ruler was not increased when it became known that at least one of the reasons why the King sought a Spanish Princess for his son, rather than a French one, was that the Spaniards would give £600,000 with the Infanta, while the French would only offer £200,000 with their Princess.<sup>1</sup>

The churlishness of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, and the overbearing pride of Buckingham, which made it impossible for any but sycophants to come into contact with him, alienated many from the court; with which these two were associated as successive favourites. The unsavoury details connected with Somerset's marriage to the Countess of Essex, taken as representative of the morality allowed to those in the circle of the King's most intimate friends, disgusted people of all religious parties. Buckingham might have done his master's cause some good if he had possessed either patience or experience. He did what he could to repair the defects of the navy, and the financial reforms, carried out by his protegee Sir Lionel Cranfield, might have made the King almost independent of monetary aid from the Commons if only he could have kept himself free from financial commitments abroad.<sup>2</sup> But Buckingham and Prince Charles, coming home in a pique from their futile trip to see the Infanta, demanded war with Spain and active interference in the fighting in the Palatinate where already not a few English volunteers were learning the military arts which they would practise in civil war at home in a few more years.

King James' fourth, and last, Parliament, called together in 1624, was not averse to war with Spain but wanted one of the old-fashioned sort, chiefly naval and commerce destroying. Instead, they were afforded the disastrous failure of Mansfield's ill-prepared expedition, in which twelve thousand men were landed on the coast of Holland with no prospect of doing anything but starve there.<sup>3</sup>

1. 'Cambridge Modern History.' Vol.3. pp.561.

2. See H.G.R.Reade; "Side Lights on the Thirty Years War". London. 1924. Vol.3. pp.132 ff.

3. "Cambridge Modern History." Vol.3. pp.577-8.

This was the crowning failure of James never very successful policy in the Palatinate, where the Protestant cause had always many sympathizers in England.

James had alienated both his parliament and a large section of the politically minded of his people, and he early began to quarrel with the most outstanding personality among his Judges. Coke was a man whom it would have been exceedingly difficult not to make into an enemy. With vast learning he united a cantankerous assertion of his own importance and the importance of any offices which he might hold. In 1605 Archbishop Bancroft presented from Convocation a series of articles against the proceedings of the Common Law judges in claiming the exclusive right to interpret Acts of Parliament touching the church. The judges, however declared that they were the proper interpreters of the Acts of Parliament, "and", said Bishop Stubbs, "as the whole liturgy, and indeed the Bible also might be brought under those terms, there was practically no limit to their assumption of infallibility".<sup>1</sup> The King sent for the judges and told them that it was for him, as their head, to decide which courts should have jurisdiction. Coke replied by affirming that the King himself was under the law, quoting Bracton at his majesty to uphold the contention. The matter went undecided, but from that time until 1616 Coke quarrelled with the King over the powers of the Court of High Commission, the imposition of customs, the way in which the judges were asked their opinion in Peacham's case, the Court of Chancery and, finally, over Bishop Neile of Lincoln who had received the grant of two livings from the Kings to be held in commendam, an action which Coke accounted illegal. Efforts were made to induce Coke, now the Chief Justice, to change his mind, but he refused and was dismissed - "Ruined", as a contemporary put it, "by pride, prohibitions, praemunire, and prerogative."<sup>2</sup> From that time an able and venomous man was added to the number of the King's persistent enemies. But Coke's

1. Stubbs; "Seventeen Lectures." p.378.

2. Gardiner; "History of England." Vol.3. pp.25-6.  
Also, Maitland; "Constitutional History of England." p.271.

dismissal meant more than that, "The defeat of the Judges left King and Parliament face to face and ensured the grave questions at issue being dealt with on political rather than strictly legal grounds."<sup>1</sup>

religious hatreds, disappointments and fears embittered all these other disputes. The Puritan element in England had looked forward to the coming of James the first, for he had been brought up in the most Protestant of countries;<sup>2</sup> the Roman Catholic hoped that when the son of Mary Stuart arrived in England he would find some way of lightening the heavy persecution they had borne until then. The Church of England, by all human reckoning, had little to expect; it was therefore with considerable misgiving that Whitgift sent Neville, the Dean of Canterbury, to offer his felicitations to the new King. It was soon clear that the church which apparently had the least claim on him in reality had the least to fear. There were some in it whom the King could not look on very favourably. He disliked those who wished for a Presbyterian discipline as well as those who held an Arminian theology but in the main it offered him precisely what he wanted - an ordered system in which due place was given to authority and yet which did not look to any earthly power higher than his own.

James had a certain feeling toward toleration. As he himself said, he was unwilling that the blood of any man should be shed for diversities in religion. So his first attitude toward the Roman Catholics was to extend to them a halting favour which, while it left the penal laws as they were, was content that they should not be put into execution unless the King saw fit. But his policy pleased none, since it was intended to benefit none but the King himself. He intended, ultimately, to put an end to Popery in England but in the meantime he would use the lives and liberties of his Roman Catholic subjects as assets in his foreign politics. A little more liberty to Popish recusants could always be a makeweight in a Spanish treaty. To the Puritans this was trafficking with Baal. Even to the King it soon appeared less wise than he had originally

1. "Cambridge Modern History." vol.3. p.566.

2. Heylyn; "History of Presbyterianism." p. 316.

thought it to be, as the numbers of openly acknowledged Roman Catholics increased. Gossip started a rumour that he was about to make his submission to the Pope. This the King disproved by reimposing the recusancy fines which in his initial attempt at toleration he had remitted.<sup>1</sup> Exasperated at his conduct, some of the Romanists found vent for their anger in the Gunpowder Plot and turned James' suspicious dislike of them into a panic-stricken fury which found its outlet in repressive legislation. Communion was to be received at an Anglican altar at least once a year as a test of orthodoxy and those who refused to put in an appearance were to be subject to the fiercest penalties. It was a law which weighed almost as hardly on the English as on the Roman Church, since it made her offer her most sacred rite to those who did not believe in its sanctity but accepted it merely as the lesser of two evils. James' policy with the Romanists had failed but his ill-success brought neither himself nor his throne into danger. By this time the Counter Reformation had lost its force; there was nothing to make the suppressed remnants of Roman Catholicism in England a serious danger to the English Church, or to the State.<sup>2</sup>

James, however, failed with another body which was day by day becoming more formidable. Throughout Elizabeth's reign there had been those among the reformers who were not satisfied that the Reformation was proceeding far enough. Though they were of many, and often contradictory, doctrinal opinions, they were united in the desire to purify the Church of England from every taint of likeness to the Church of Rome. They had no wish to found a separate body and let Anglicanism work out its own salvation without them. Their religious opinions were to be the opinions of everybody in the land. Their loyalty to the throne had never been seriously called into question, though their attacks on the national Church, as it existed, had been bitter and long continued. Under Elizabeth their position had been none too good; the Queen's religion was not so

1. The King specially charged the Anglican bishops to assist him in his anti-roman policy. See "State Papers of James the First." Vol.13. p.25.
2. Wakeman. "The Church and the Puritans." p.63.

much a matter of conviction as of like and dislike, and she did did not like Puritanism. Hence the coming of a King trained under John Knox, that most thorough of reformers, could only seem a change for the better to all those who wished to push their ideas of reform as far as they could go.

On his royal progress from Scotland in 1603 the King received from Puritan sympathisers the famous Millenary Petition,<sup>1</sup> which claimed to have the support of a thousand of the clergy.<sup>2</sup> It asked for a revision of the Prayer Book which would leave out the words priest and absolution, abolish confirmation, discontinue the use of the ring in marriage and the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, that women should not be allowed to baptise and that the Lord's Day should not be profaned. The Petition also asked that only those who could preach should be ordained and that abuses in the ecclesiastical courts, pluralities and the diversion of tithes from the church should be abolished. James refused to commit himself but showed his sympathy with, at least, the aim of the Petition, by announcing, in July 1603, that he would set aside some of the tithes impropriated by the crown for the encouragement of preaching, and, in the Autumn of the same year, summoned the Hampton Court Conference.

Nineteen representatives of the orthodox clergy sat, including the Archbishop. The Puritans were represented by four only of their leading divines, who were present by the King's invitation, but they were all four able men. They presented their objections under four heads. Of doctrine, of pastors, of church government, of ritual and the Prayer Book. The doctrinal changes

1. No original copy of this petition exists; it was, however, printed by Fuller in his Church History. Bk.10. p.21, and is easily accessible in Gee and Hardy. "Documents illustrative of English Church History." Doc: No.88.
2. "Now we, to the number of more than a thousand of your Majesty's subjects and ministers, all groaning under a common burden of human rites and ceremonies". Gee and Hardy. Doc: Illust. of the History of the English Church. p.509 This would appear to be an exaggeration. Hallam. (Constitutional History Vol:1. p.276, note) put the number of signatories at 825 obtained from 25 counties. The whole matter is fully discussed in Gardiner, "Hist: of Eng:" Vol:1. p.148, note.

they wished for would have brought the Church of England more clearly into line with the reformed bodies on the continent and were generally, refused, though the King agreed to the request for a new translation of the Bible. We therefore have reason to be thankful to the Conference for procuring us the authorised Version. The Puritan desire for a more learned clergy was a laudable one, but it was pointed out that it was not so easy to move the old men who were already in possession and that a good deal of the fault lay with the patrons who preferred unworthy persons. It was in the discussion of the third head that the most serious difficulties arose. Dr. Reynolds one of the Puritan leaders, suggested that if the prophesyings were renewed any dispute which arose from them should be settled by the presbyters and the bishop in conjunction.. At this James lost his temper and burst out with his famous declaration that "a Scotch presbytery agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil". If the King had been an impartial judge before he certainly was not from that time onward. The objections to the Prayer Book contained under the fourth head were all of minor importance. Throughout the Conference the King spoke often and at length, with a humour which was frequently misplaced. It was hardly to be wondered at that the Puritans should think themselves unfairly treated when so few of their divines had been invited and those few treated with such little courtesy.<sup>1</sup> James ended the Conference with another of his famous but unhappy remarks that he would make the Puritans conform or herry them out of the land.

There was a good deal of herrying to be done in the subsequent years and not all of it by the same side. The Hampton Court Conference had made a bad situation worse and though no one could say that either the Bishops or the King had handled the situation with kindness or tact nevertheless a great deal was to be said for them. James' experience in Scotland as well as his own reason had taught him the danger of democracy overstepping the

1. "The Puritan ministers were insulted, ridiculed, and laughed to scorn, without either wit or good manners." Neal."History of the Puritans." Vol: 2. p.27.

bounds of religion into politics and threatening the throne. The Bishops knew that their own existence was at stake, for, although the Puritans were no longer as high in their tone as they had been, in Elizabeth's time when they asked for Episcopacy to be abolished, yet their aim was the same - they did not wish to be tolerated but dominant in the Church of England. The Lambeth Articles which they asked should be accepted as the official standard of the Church's belief would have left no room in the Church for Andrewes or Donne and the increasing number of those who were finding the milder theology of Arminianism attractive.<sup>1</sup> In December 1604 the Archbishop demanded ex animo subscription from all the clergy to the three articles of the Royal Supremacy, the Prayer Book, and the Thirtynine Articles. About 300 Puritan clergy refused to comply and resigned their cures.<sup>2</sup>

Since the Elizabethan Settlement the Church of England had become increasingly conscious of her position as a branch of the Universal Church and, in spite of James' sending emissaries to the Calvinistic Synod at Dort, had shown herself less and less inclined to compromise herself with foreign Protestantism, though her scholars still derived help and stimulus in their studies from the works of foreign Protestants.<sup>3</sup> Even before the time of Laud the movement for restoring decency and some measure of beauty to the worship of the Church had begun. The labours of scholars of the type of Jewel, Hooker, Bancroft, Buckeridge and Andrewes were clarifying her true place in the history of the Universal Church and giving her both a philosophical and a theological position which could be held against Puritanism on the one side and Romanism on the other. There was, perhaps, between Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, no bishop whose character has their sweetness and holiness of life, yet, the Church

1. For the Lambeth Articles see Strype. "Life of Whitgift." Bk: 4. p.117.

2. This is the number estimated by the Puritans, Bancroft placed the number at forty-nine. See Heylyn. "History of the Presbyterians" p.376. The only authority for demanding the test to be subscribed ex animo was Article thirtysix of the New Canons, Statute Law supported the subscription itself.

3 "Cambridge History of English Literature." Vol:7. p.306.

of England as a whole was gaining in dignity, sanctity and learning throughout that period.

It was tragic that the whole theory of the King's prerogative should be under discussion at the time and that the leading high church men should have committed themselves to a theory of the people's relationship to the crown which a large part of the people themselves were beginning to deny. The two political parties which were fighting for dominance in England had attracted to themselves allies from those who were in religious opposition to one another. Something stronger than self-interest drew each to the other no doubt, but certainly they went where their interest for the time being seemed to lie. The King was the legal head as well as the powerful support of the Church. That the ecclesiastical party clearly recognised and, though among the King's friends there were many who disliked the Bishops personally, it was as natural that the court party should support the Church as it was that the Church party should support the crown. Many of the parliamentary leaders were Puritan in their own sympathies but if they had not been it would scarcely have been in reason for political agitators to refuse the tremendous help which persecuted religious convictions could bring. Religious and political parties fell into what might be reckoned their natural alignment.

Every institution in the land, during the last years of James the First, was gravitating toward one side or the other. Even the Universities could not stand aloof while the matters in dispute depended to a great extent upon learning. Oxford attached itself to the King and the court; Cambridge, which from its position near the great trade routes to Germany had felt early the influence of the reformation stayed mainly Puritan in its sympathies.<sup>1</sup> In 1613, when Jeremy Taylor was carried to the font in Holy Trinity Church, Cromwell was at Sidney Sussex College. St. John, one of Hampden's counsel in the famous ship-money trial, had his education at Queens College to be followed there by Milton; Fairfax matriculated at

1. Bass Mullinger. "History of the University of Cambridge" p.80.

St. John's College in 1626; some of the strongest who thought and acted for the Parliament in the Civil War had their training at Cambridge.

It was a pleasant city, then as now. Harrison, describing it in 1577, wrote, "It standeth very well, saving that it is somewhat near unto the fens, whereby the wholesomeness of the air is not a little corrupted."<sup>1</sup> Provisions were cheap and plentiful. If the fens tainted the air they compensated a little by supplying the townsmen with wild fowl and fish in abundance. The river provided a convenient waterway by which coal and wood could be brought to make good the local deficiency in fuel. The fens were responsible for the fact that very little hay could be grown in the neighbourhood and that also had to be borne by the Granta from villages on solid land. It was a fresher, if not a happier, England into which the seventeenth century child was born. Local feeling was stronger; local self-sufficiency was greater; everything that a householder needed could be made in his own home or in his neighbours' and made to suit local and individual taste rather than turned out by mass production to suit mass taste as determined by the works psychologist. Cambridge streets were as narrow and as filthy as those of other towns in an age when houses were built as anyone pleased and sanitation was no man's care. But though there was plenty of dirt there was no drabness. The university buildings were full of dignity and the ordinary ways and byways of the town, with their multifarious signs, the timbered houses over-hanging and gabled, were at least more beautiful than our modern streets.

It is a thankless task to guess where a genius receives his first abiding impressions, but it may be more than a coincidence that Jeremy Taylor was, in after life, fascinated by water in all its states and that he was born near the fens. Water oozing out of boggy soil; water dammed up; water in rivers; water winding in slow streams he used over and over again in carefully worked passages, each one designed to point a moral, and there is at least a likelihood that his memory was recalling incidents observed in boyhood within

1. Harrison. "Elizabethan England." (Ed: Furnivall) p.249.

a mile or two of Cambridge.

In the seventeenth century, the country was within the reach of all and was everyman's playground. Though the townsman's door opened where, "houses thick and sewers annoy the air",<sup>1</sup> in a town like Cambridge, and with no other means of locomotion than his own feet, he could be in fresh air and green places within half an hour. The approach to life was more poetic than it is ever likely to be again. There were so many things in everyday life that science had left as yet unexplained and the imagination could decorate with fancy. It was not only the youngest of children who believed in fairies, they were unquestioned realities to most grown-ups. The spiritual world was real, and, only just a little less apparent than the material environment in which men lived. Shakspeare's first audiences would not consider the Weird Sisters and Puck as mere creations of a poet, they were beings who might quite possibly intrude into their own lives. Bunyan, George Fox and many more besides saw visions. God made His displeasure known by thunderbolts, floods and storms; and His favour by visible blessings. That this naiveté had its evil side cannot be doubted. A man might put some harmless, half-idiotic, old woman to death for the crime of having bewitched him or his cattle; but it meant that life was presented under forms which were at the same time simpler and more mysterious and, therefore, more suitable for the poetic fancy to work upon. This fancy was finding its expression not merely in the output of known poets such as Shakspeare, Herrick, Marvel and Milton, but in the prose of divines and in the songs with which the lover serenaded his mistress or the amateur musician recreated himself. Music was one of the greatest amusements of all classes. Every village had its musician; every gentleman of any taste and education wrote songs and set them to tunes of his own composing.<sup>2</sup>

1. Milton. "Paradise Lost". Bk. 9. Ln. 446.

Milton in a rather unexpected place gives interesting testimony to his countrymen's passion for music. "It will ask more than the work of twenty licensers to examine all the lutes, violins, and the guitars in every house--. and who shall silence all the airs and madrigals that whisper softness in chambers? The villages also must have their visitors to enquire what lectures the bagpipe and the rebec reads, even to the ballatry and the gamut of every municipal fidler; for these are the country-man's Arcadias, and his Monte Mayors". "A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing". Prose Works. p.109.

For this grace of life even the Puritans found place. Both Milton, the poet, and his father were organists, and Mrs. Hutchinson records of Colonel Hutchinson's mother that, "She had an admirable voice and skill to manage it", and that at her death, "she went away singing a psalm".<sup>1</sup>

But for all the music and the poetry life in the seventeenth century was harder than it is to-day. If the upper classes were idle the farmer, the tradesman and his apprentices worked hard for long hours. Most people were content with one full meal a day, generally taken in the early afternoon.<sup>2</sup> At other times a draught of beer and a piece of bread, or some simple dish which happened to be in season, was enough to keep hunger at bay. There was more pain in the world, some of it the unavoidable result of neglected sanitation and lack of knowledge, much of it deliberately inflicted, for our seventeenth ancestors could be savagely cruel. But there was with it a genuine and infectious, if at times rather broad, humour which was of great use in mitigating asperities.

The first undisputed date which we have in the life of Jeremy Taylor is that of his baptism, which took place in Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge on August 15th, 1613. It is reasonable to suppose that he was born in the same year and so it was assumed until, in the eighteenth century, the works of the Irish antiquary, Sir James Ware were published and it was seen that in order to overcome a chronological difficulty in Taylor's later life, Ware had suggested that he was born in 1611.<sup>3</sup> Nathaniel Taylor, the father of Jeremy, was a barber in Cambridge. On the thirteenth of October, 1605, he married Mary Dean and their family, six sons and one daughter, were born between the years 1606 and 1619. Edmond was baptized on August the third, 1606; Mary was baptized on the eleventh of June, 1609; Nathaniel on the eighth of December, 1611 and Jeremy on the fifteenth of August, 1613, to be followed by Thomas and John

1. "Memoirs of Col: Hutchinson". p.41.

2. Bryant. "The England of Charles II." p.104.

3. Sir J. Ware: Works. (Ed. Harris) Vol: 1. (Irish Bishops

baptized in July, 1616 and April 1619. If Ware's suggestion is correct then either Nathaniel and Jeremy were born, but not baptized, in the same year, or, the whole Taylor family, after the eldest, were not baptized until they were two years of age, neither of which suppositions seems over likely.

Nathaniel Taylor was, at that time, living in a house opposite Holy Trinity Church which afterwards became an Inn and was named the Black Bull. Like most of the facts in his famous son's early life this has been disputed and the suggestion made that he was born in Petty Cury, in a house which became the Wrestler's Inn. This is improbable for the Wrestler's Inn is beyond the bounds of Holy Trinity parish where the Taylor family were baptized and where the father was churchwarden. Possibly at a later period a move was made to Petty Cury. There is likewise no evidence to support the idea that Nathaniel Taylor belonged to the higher rank of barber surgeon which is only one of the slightest attempts that have been made to elevate the whole stock of the Taylors. Heber did the best he could to help forward this philanthropic work,<sup>1</sup> drawing the material for the ancestry with which he presented Taylor from some alleged manuscripts, generally referred to as the Jones MSS. from their reputed owner William Todd Jones of Homra, County Down.<sup>2</sup>

Jones was a politician and pamphleteer but the story went that at one time he intended to write a life of Jeremy Taylor with whom he was remotely connected. The material which he had got together for his work included a family book which gave, in the Bishop's own handwriting, an account of his life and ancestry. Besides this there were some autographed letters which he had written and received, a letter from Lady Wray, Jeremy Taylor's granddaughter, to William Todd of Castle Martin dated May the thirtyfirst, 1732, and many other interesting documents.<sup>3</sup> Jones died in 1818 as the result of a carriage accident and these particular manuscripts disappeared.

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor" (Taylor's Works.Vol:1. p.10.ff.
2. See Appendix E.
3. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor" (Taylor's Works: Vol.1. p.10.

Jones' other paper had been placed under the care of the Earl of Moira at Montalto and were afterwards said to have been transferred to Donnington but no trace of anything referring to Taylor was ever found there. The best that Heber could do was to make a guess that they might have been in the London Custom House, together with some things of the Marquis of Hastings, and were destroyed there by fire. But Heber was not left without consolation. Mr. Jones had made some extracts with a view to his intended work and they, together with the marriage settlement of his youngest daughter, and some traditions about the Bishop and his descendants, were "liberally communicated" to Heber by Mr. Jones' sisters, Mrs. Wray and Mrs. Mary Jones.<sup>1</sup>

With this as his authority, Heber included in his biography the following statements as matter of fact; that the Taylor family had originally belonged to the smaller gentry in Gloucestershire, where they had long held an estate at Frampton-on-Severn; that Nathaniel, Jeremy's father, was descended from Dr. Rowland Taylor of Hadleigh who had been burned at the stake for his Protestantism in the Marian persecutions. Both these pieces of information were given on the authority of some extracts made by Todd Jones, from Lady Wray's letter. Apparently, the rest of the notes offered little of importance.

apart from the alleged statement of Lady Wray, the only support for the story of gentle forbears is in the fact that Taylor once applied to Dugdale, the antiquary, for information about a coat of arms "borne by the Taylors of Cumberland and Northumberland".<sup>2</sup> What Dugdale's answer was we do not know, but the coat of arms enquired about was granted in 1614 to "Roger Taylor, son of Thomas Taylor, son of Roger Taylor, Esq. of London", between whose family and that of the Bishop there is no traceable connection.

1. Heber. 'Life of Jeremy Taylor'. (Taylor's Works. Vol:1. p.11)  
It will be seen from what has been said above that they<sup>WERE</sup> only "Extracts", which may or may not have been accurate, taken from a letter which had unaccountably disappeared, and which can never be certainly proved to have existed.
2. Hamper, "Life of Dugdale", contains a mutilated portion of this letter dated, April the first, 1651, and numbered letter 65.

For the descent from Doctor Rowland Taylor there is no other support whatever, though Heber refers to a passage in Taylor's works where Dr. Rowland Taylor is spoken of with "deserved commendation" and "something like filial fondness".<sup>1</sup> Rowland Taylor had been Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer and was burned at the stake on Aldham Common, near Hadleigh, in Suffolk, in 1555, fifty eight years before Jeremy Taylor's baptism. Under such circumstances it is extraordinary that the first hint we have of the connection between the two should come from Lady Wray sixty five years after Jeremy Taylor's death. If the supposition is true Edmond Taylor, Nathaniel's predecessor as churchwarden, must have been the son of the martyr and, if that were so, there should have been plenty of people in Cambridge who knew of the fact. The world had not forgotten Rowland Taylor. Fox's Book of Martyrs, the author's final edition of which appeared in 1583, had lifted him up as an ideal minister of a parish, a man of great general ability and a scholar. If he had died a normal death he would have been one with whom most people would have been proud to claim kinship; but, in Protestant Cambridge, a man who had sealed his devotion to reformed principles with his blood would have been an even more desirable ancestor. Yet, Jeremy Taylor never makes any such claim and Rust, who was brought up in Cambridge and was probably only a little junior to his bishop, never mentions it, neither does Anthony à Wood who knew personally many of Taylor's friends. If Edmond Taylor, churchwarden of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, in 1589 was a relative of Nathaniel Taylor, and the link is doubtful, he must be taken as the first of Jeremy Taylor's ancestors to emerge into the light of history. If his claim is disallowed, we must fall back upon the only certainty Nathaniel Taylor, churchwarden and barber.

That is, however, not the last of the problems of Jeremy Taylor's early years. We may suppose his being brought up at home in a godly family, taught to say his prayers and learning his letters,

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol:1) pp.12-3. The passage referred to in Taylor is in the preface to the Apology for Set Forms. Taylor's Works. Vol:5. p.237.

a little later on listening to stories from the Bible and from Fox's Book of Martyrs. But the time comes when he must go to school and the actual date of his going is another problem.

Dr. Stephen Perse, fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, when he died in 1615, left his money to found a free school for the town of Cambridge.<sup>1</sup> He already owned some land on what had been the site of the Augustine Monastery of Grey Friars and here a building was erected with a room for the Master and one for the Usher. By the terms of the will a hundred boys were to be admitted chosen from Cambridge, Barnwell, Chesterton and Trumpington. The first Headmaster was Thomas Lovering, a man of considerable reputation, who taught his pupils so well that they are said to have become "Minerva's darlings". In 1618 the foundation stone of the new school was laid and in 1619 the first boys were admitted. Jeremy Taylor was then six years old.

On the eighteenth of August, 1626, Jeremy Taylor was admitted a sizar of Gonville and Caius College and it is the admission book there that makes the difficulty for it states that he was then in his fifteenth year and that he had been ten years (per decennium) the pupil of Thomas Lovering "in Schola publica". If we accept 1613 as the most probable year of his birth, the first statement is wrong, for he would then be only thirteen years old. The last half of the entry is more puzzling, but not necessarily incorrect. To help in providing an explanation, Sir James Ware suggested that Taylor was born as early as 1611. Heber seems to have been ignorant of the date when the Perse School was founded.<sup>2</sup> He first takes 1613 as the proven year of Taylor's birth and doubts the truth of the admission book entry on the ground that no-one would send a child of three to a public school. Sir Edmund Gosse considers the whole entry incorrect remarking that, "the book proves itself of slight authority in the matter of dates by saying that Jeremy had attended the Perse school for some ten years."<sup>3</sup> which the book does not say. As it stands the entry may only mean

1. Cooper. "Annals of Cambridge." Vol:3. pp.95-101.  
Also Cooper, "Memorials of Cambridge." Vol: 3. pp.154-160.
2. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works. Vol.L. pp.13-4. and Edens note.
3. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor." pp.4-5.

that Taylor had completed more than nine years under Lovering, but that they could not all have been spent at the Perse School is clear when we remember that the school was not open until 1619. Lovering, however, before he went as Headmaster to the new Perse foundation had kept a school in St. Edward's Church, Cambridge, where Perse's own brother-in-law, Thomas Elwin, had been educated and had after been a master at Kings College school, to which it is possible that Jeremy Taylor was sent when he was between three and four, moving when his master moved, to the Perse School.

Children began their education early in those days. It was the continual endeavour of the founders of the new Grammar Schools, which were being opened in so many places at this time, to prevent children being forced into school by their parents before they were really capable of obtaining any advantage by attendance. The statutes of Christ's Hospital demanded that, to be admitted, a boy should be "above four years of age and born in wedlock",<sup>1</sup> and though the rules of most other schools insisted that he should be older there is no reason to suppose that a private teacher like Lovering, would refuse a precocious child of between three and four if his parents could pay the small dues required for him. The phrase, "in Schola publica" would more accurately describe this earlier tuition than the later part of Taylor's education for Dr. Perse's foundation was a free, rather than a public school. Rust<sup>2</sup> says that Jeremy Taylor "was ripe for the university before custom would allow of his admittance; but by that time he was thirteen years old he was entering into Caius College", a testimony which fits in with 1613 as the year of his birth and does not contradict the supposition that he had been at school longer than most children if he was so forward in his studies.<sup>3</sup> What would be more natural under the circumstances than that the parents should put the age of their child at a little more than it really was in order to get him into college, especially

1. "Cambridge History of English Literature". Vol: 7. p.338.

2. Rust. "A Funeral Sermon." (Taylor's Works. Vol. 1. p.cccxxii)

3. Isaac Barrow was entered at Peterhouse when he was only thirteen.

in days when birth certificates were unknown and their word was all there was to go upon. If this is so the only mistake in the admission book is that of his age, and that made in good faith.

Scholarship in the seventeenth century was no easy pursuit even for small boys. Lessons began at six o'clock in the morning at the Perse School and went on until five in the evening, with a break of only two hours. There were no fees to be paid except twelve pence to the Usher who wrote the boy's name down in two books, one kept in the school and the other by the executors of the Doctor's will who chose the scholars. Discipline in all schools was enforced by savage beating. Burton complained that school-masters "make many children endure a martyrdom all the while they are at school; with bad diet, if they board in their houses, too much severity and ill-usage, --- still chiding, railing, frowning, lashing, tasking, keeping, that they are ---- weary of their lives".<sup>1</sup> School founders of that period from Colet onwards generally set down the chief aims which they wished to be pursued in their school and the executors of Dr. Perse, doubtless putting in writing what had been his expressed wish, stated in the ordinances that the scholars were to be "carefully and diligently taught as well in good manners as in all other instruction and learning fit to be learned in a grammar school". What such "instruction and learning" was we know from contemporary sources, and can form an accurate picture of the curriculum through which Jeremy Taylor passed. In what many consider his greatest work, Taylor remarked that, "Education is so great and invincible a prejudice that he who masters the inconvenience of it is more to be commended than he can justly be blamed that complies with it".<sup>2</sup> He was speaking of the bad education of dissenters and evil-disposed persons, but he would probably have agreed that the good effects of his own training were as permanent. Certainly no one could think of an education more likely to turn out the sort of man he became, than that through which he passed.

1. Burton, "Anatomy of Melancholy." Vol:1. p.333.(Everyman Ed.)

2. Taylor, Works. Vol:.5. p. 503.

In his time, religion lay at the base of all learning. Every schoolmaster aimed at making his pupils, first of all, well instructed Christians, than as good latinists and as capable orators as might be. The day began with prayers. The text-book might possibly be a religious one made up of words and phrases taken from their context in Virgil and strung together again to make a life of Christ. If a sermon was being preached that day the whole school would be taken to hear it. The most intelligent boys discussed the claims of Calvinism, Arminianism or Romanism, just as now they discuss Pacifism or the League of Nations. Prayers closed the school day.

On Sunday all the classes went to hear the sermon preached in their parish church and not merely to let it flow over their heads in a string of unheeded words, it was another school exercise and as severe as any. Boys were expected to take notes of what they heard, keeping the headings and divisions which the preacher had made and jotting down in the margin a word or two of brief analysis and any Scripture references the preacher might use. After church the whole was to be revised and the analysis expanded. On Monday the revised copy was to be taken to school and turned into Latin and, on the Monday week, some forward boy was to stand up before the class and recite the whole without book.<sup>1</sup> The sermons of seventeenth century preachers were long and learned. How the boys in their congregation must have felt their hearts fainting within them as they listened to Sunday's hour-long discourse on predestination, knowing that they themselves were predestined to stew over it for eight days and then, perhaps, stand up to repeat it to a master whose theological principles made him critical of it from the preacher's lips and intolerant of it from his pupils.

Latin they were never free from. Boys were expected to speak it even at games. They learned their Latin grammar by question and answer in that language. They translated into it, composed in it and read text-books drawn from a very wide area of its literature. Beginners generally started with "Pueriles Confabulationes", went on

1. Mitchell. "English Pulpit Oratory." p.74.

to Corderius' Dialogues and Aesop's Fables, then to Cicero, Ovid and Virgil, Pliny, Seneca and recognized Latin writers nearer their own time. Behind this intensive training in one subject lay the desire to send students up to the Universities with such a mastery of Latin that they should be competent to pursue all their studies in it without further trouble and, wherever they might be, in any part of Europe, they might be able to communicate their thought in the medium common to all educated persons.

Greek was little taught, though it had found its way into some Grammar Schools by 1600, where the boys were instructed in grammar and read a little of Isocrates, Hesiod and Homer. A strictly practical purpose, similar to that which underlay the study of Latin, also prescribed the tremendous attention paid to Oratory both in the school and the university.

It was an age in which the pulpit and the public assembly exerted a vast influence. A good portion of the boys in any school would, in after life, become divines, lawyers or school-masters and need a knowledge of Oratory, either for use or to teach to others. A good proportion of the rest, either as merchants or tradesmen, would be called upon to make speeches at least in their parish vestry and possibly in the national Parliament. Just as boys were taught Latin because it was indispensable to study and communication with foreigners, so they were taught Oratory as the indispensable necessity for success in after life.

Rhetoric was studied in Latin like everything else and the chief text-books in use were those produced by famous teachers of Oratory in the early Christian period. a favourite one was the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius, a sophist of Antioch and a fellow pupil with Chrysostom of Libani<sup>s</sup>, the greatest orator of his day.<sup>1</sup> "So trial subjects set to Chrysostom and Aphthonius by Libani<sup>s</sup> became the trial subjects prescribed by Brinsley and attempted by Jeremy Taylor."<sup>2</sup> The Progymnasmata was severely technical in its method, being divided into fourteen heads, the rules of each being given

1. Mitchell. "English Pulpit Oratory." p.56.

2. Ibid. John Brinsley was the Puritan schoolmaster of Ashby-de-la-Zouch. His "Ludus Literarius," published in 1612, was an important educational handbook.

and their working illustrated by examples. as soon as this was mastered the boys were set to writing themes of twelve or thirteen <sup>lines</sup> / each in imitation of their models; first, a written copy was handed in to the master and then the whole learned by heart and repeated aloud. In order to enrich their themes, the boys were made to search every author they read for suitable illustrations and comparisons which they were to write down in commonplace books to be ready when needed. It is not mere accident which makes the illustrations of seventeenth century sermons, Taylor's less often than most, seem so remote from life, the preachers were obeying the instruction of their early days and taking experience at second hand. Besides illustrations, portions from standard authors might be woven into the young orators work in order to give strength and an air of learning to the whole. So also the long passages in Latin or Greek, which the modern reader finds such a wearisome feature of the seventeenth century sermon, had a partly schoolboy origin. Mitchell points out that the most profitable advice on how to make such excerpts as these is to be found in the manual of the Jesuit, Drexilius, and that Jeremy Taylor shows more acquaintance with the works of Drexilius than any other English divine, a fact which is not without interest when we remember the masses of quotation which Taylor uses, though, later on, we shall explain how far less mechanical he is in this than the rest of his contemporaries.<sup>1</sup>

Speakers who had spent years as youths in seeking and memorizing rhetorical passages in classical authors would naturally be quick to use what they had gained when they came to make speeches in English. Foster Watson remarks that, "Unless the school and university training in rhetoric are borne in mind, an important factor in accounting for the wealth of imagery and expression in the English Literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is overlooked".<sup>2</sup> Letter writing was almost

1. Mitchell. "English Pulpit Oratory." p.82.

2. Foster Watson. "The English Grammar schools to 1660." p.452.

the only other subject which occurred in the school curriculum and that also was included from practical considerations, since up to the Civil War the only method of conveying news other than by word of mouth was by long letters from one to another.

With nine or ten years of this training at his back, Jeremy Taylor, in 1626, entered Gonville and Caius College. Originally founded in 1348 by Edmund Gonville, the Dominican Vicar-General of Ely, and named by him the Hall of the Annunciation, by the time of the Reformation it had fallen into decay but was re-founded in 1557 by Dr. Caius, one of its own graduates. A successful physician who had done well academically at Cambridge and Padua, Dr. Caius devoted the large fortune which his practice in London had brought him to restoring what he called "that poor house Gonville Hall". He built lavishly and beautifully; its three famous gates were a conspicuous feature of his work. That of Humility, "a simple archway with entablature" and the word "Humilitatis", being that through which the young freshman entered college from Trinity Street. From this a broad walk bordered by trees led to the gate of Virtue, a gateway tower on the east side of Caius Court, adorned by the word "Virtutis". To the South, fronting on Schools Street, stands the gate of Honour, bearing the word "Honoris". Beautiful as it is now, it must have been still more beautiful in its first state, painted white, with the carved roses and coats of arms picked out in crimson and gold.<sup>1</sup>

Possibly because he was a medical man, Dr. Caius had ideas on sanitation which were not shared by many in his time. He left orders that no dirt or filth of any kind was to be thrown into the courtyard, neither were beds or linen to be aired there and a man was to be permanently employed to keep the pavements clean.

Though at the time of his graduation in the reign of Henry the Eighth the College had the reputation of being a hotbed of reformed opinion, Caius himself was credited with a strong leaning toward Rome. It may have been nothing more than a hatred

1. Stubbs. "Cambridge". (Mediaeval Towns Series). Article on Caius College, passim.

of vandalism for he always regularly attended the College Chapel and never spoke of Protestantism without respect. He certainly had a collection of Mass Vestments, books and ornaments in his rooms for, because of a rumour about them, he was forced to submit to a visitation by the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Colleges, who burnt the Doctor's treasures in his own courtyard.<sup>1</sup> Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, graduated from the College in 1597 and Dr. Cosin was a fellow there. Though there was a number of years between them, Caius' love of vestments and symbolism may have had some effect upon Cosin, whose ritualism at Durham afterward caused Dr. Smart so much anxiety.<sup>2</sup>

Taylor was put under the tutelage of Thomas Batchcroft, a conscientious, if not very brilliant, person, who soon after that date, was elected Master of the College from which office he was later ejected by the Puritans.<sup>3</sup> A sizar's life, such as that which Jeremy Taylor was now living, was by no means enviable, though it offered to poor men's sons a means of getting the education which would otherwise have been beyond them. Burton quotes with approval Howson's description of a poor scholar's lot. "When we come to the University if we live of the College allowance we are needy of all things but hunger and fear".<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the best education the University could give was open to a sizar and, at this period at least, there was no rigid class distinction which cut him off from other students. It was an age in which servitude did not necessarily carry with it contempt, since it was not primarily something sold for money but a duty attached to rank. Some of the greatest churchmen of the age received their training in this manner and it was rarely made a cause of reproach to them in

1. Bass Mullinder. "History of Cambridge University." p.127.
2. Smart's polemic against Cosin was printed at Edinburgh in 1628; with the title "The Vanity and Downfall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies". The introduction to this unintentionally amusing work contained the gist of the sermon and is reprinted in More and Cross "Anglicanism" Doc; No.254.
3. The tuition at both Cambridge and Oxford was mainly tutorial; there were lectures, but they were poorly attended and the student decided his own fate by the extent of his private reading.
4. Burton. "Anatomy of Melancholy." (Everyman Edition) Vol.1. p.311.

after life.<sup>1</sup>

A student who could afford to pay his own way had a pleasant enough time. Harrison complained that such, "Study little other than histories, tables, dice and trifles",<sup>2</sup> and Mrs. Hutchinson, a less prejudiced author, mentions that her husband when at Cambridge, "For his exercise practised tennis, and played admirably well at it; for his diversion he chose music, and got a very good hand which he afterwards improved to great mastery on the viol. There were masters who taught to dance and vault whom he practised with".<sup>3</sup> Townsman and gownsmen fought out their quarrels with their fists then and for a couple of centuries after. A long list of contemporary observers wailed over the vicious life which privileged undergraduates lived and yet, in spite of all, the men who served their country in a great crisis of her history with complete devotion on the one side or the other were among those who were called idle and debauched.

Certainly as far as numbers were concerned the Universities were not as prosperous again until nearly two hundred years had passed.<sup>4</sup> The subjects studied at that time were very limited. Arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy were attracting less and less attention.<sup>5</sup> Taylor himself is said to have been taught mathematics and grammar at home by his father, a statement which Gosse<sup>6</sup> accepts as true, rather strangely since the authority for it is a reputed letter of Jeremy Taylor's to Batchcroft in the Jones' MSS which Gosse previously dismisses as a "mystification or hoax".<sup>7</sup> Those students who did not intend to enter the Church read Law or Physic which offered them an entrance to a career in one or

1. John Howe, who was chaplain to both Oliver and Richard Cromwell and one of the most famous as well as most moderate of Nonconformist divines; Isaac Barrow, great both as a mathematician and as a theologian, and in Tillotson's eyes "as near St. James perfect man as was possible to be"; Pepys, the diarist and Sir Robert Sawyer, attorney general and after his dismissal from that post senior counsel for the seven bishops in 1688; were all sizers at Cambridge in the first half of the seventeenth century.
2. Harrison. "Elizabethan England" (Ed: Furnival) p.253.
3. Hutchinson. "Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson." p.51.
4. Bass Mullinger. "History of the University of Cambridge" p.212.
5. Burton "Anatomy of Melancholy." (Everyman Edition) Vol.L. p.309.
6. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor. p.4.
7. Ibid. p. 1.

other of those professions, but by far the greater number of those who went to the university as poor scholars had no future before them but to, "Teach a school, turn lecturer or curate, and for that he shall have falconer's wages, ten pounds per annum and his diet, or some small stipend so long as he can please his patron or his parish!"<sup>1</sup>

A little Greek was taught and some Hebrew. The Latin Classics were read easily enough by men who had been drilled in that language from their infancy.

Gradually learning was widening out but every new direction in which she turned was suggested to her by the prevailing, all-absorbing interest in religion. Oriental languages were beginning to be studied and researches were being made into heathen cults contemporary with the Old Testament to see what contribution they could make to a better understanding of sacred history. The foundations were being laid of those studies which afterwards produced marvels of patient learning like the Polyglot Bible which Brian Walton edited and those minutely particularizing commentaries on the Bible which Puritan scholarship delighted to produce and Puritan zeal to ponder. Controversial divinity was, however, the main learned pursuit and in that men spent incredibly laborious lives.<sup>2</sup>

Cambridge, as a whole, was stoutly Calvinistic in its teaching, though it had listened to a presage of the coming Arminianism from the lips of Peter Barro. the Lady Margaret Professor in 1595, before the Calvinists in their zeal for unqualified predestination had deprived him of his office. The movement which was beginning to bring something like dignity into worship in the parish churches established itself in Cambridge. At Peterhouse, where Dr. Cosin was Master from 1635 to 1644, the ritual caused deep anxiety to those who, like Hutchinson, then an

1. Burton, "Anatomy of Melancholy." (Everyman Edition) Vol:1. p. 306.
2. Controversy was considered so important that in 1609 Matthew Sutcliffe the Dean of Exeter, established a college in Chelsea where Protestant divines were to study and unite in controversy against Rome. In spite of enthusiastic support from James the First the project failed and the funds were returned to Sutcliffes' heirs. (See Dic: Nat: Biog: Art. Matthew Sutcliffe)

undergraduate, belonged to the Puritan side.<sup>1</sup> Though supported by some outstanding men, the High Church Party in Cambridge never became anything more than a vigorous minority.

In this atmosphere Jeremy Taylor spent his youth. We do not know who his friends were or what special predilections he had in his studies. Dr. Samuel Ward, the Master of Sidney Sussex College and at that time Lady Margaret Professor, was then engaged in his magnificent feat of theological endurance, a course of lectures on original sin lasting "nine years or thereabouts". Taylor attended them sometimes and thought them very futile.<sup>2</sup> This is the only opinion of his we have on either his teachers or their teaching. There is no hint in his later life that he came into contact, while at Cambridge, with any of his famous literary contemporaries. Milton, then at Queens, is said to have afterwards had a great respect for Taylor, but it is only a rumour. George Herbert is so near akin to Taylor in character that had they ever met one or the other would have probably left some mention of the meeting. With all his future dependent on academic success which, in turn, depended largely on unremitting labour, Taylor would have had no time to spare for cultivating the literary cliques, so it is not very strange that he seems to have been without acquaintances among the band of half-dozen authors who passed through Cambridge at that time and afterward made a name for themselves. He does not seem to have been intimate with many of the theologians either, though in later days he knew Henry More well, and that particular friendship may have had its beginning in undergraduate days. It is possible that he was also acquainted with George Rust.

Dr. Perse's benefaction remained Taylor's means of subsistence throughout his life at Cambridge, for the Doctor, in addition to founding the School, had established six bursaries and six fellowships at Caius College, preference being given to suitable graduates of the Perse School. Taylor had entered Caius

1. Hutchinson . "Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson" p.51.

2. Taylor's Works. Vol. 7. p.548.

College on the Perse foundation but so many students were hoping for assistance that it was not until 1629 that he received any money. At Michaelmas 1628 he was granted a bursary and held it for five years. In 1630-1 he took his B. A. degree and in 1633 was rewarded with a Junior Fellowship, again on the Perse foundation, at the same time he relinquished his bursary.<sup>1</sup>

He was now of a standing in the University which enabled him to take pupils and naturally, being a poor man, he began to earn a little money by teaching. Two of those who came under him at this time are specially interesting; Martin Perse, because it would seem that Taylor had some slight opportunity to show his indebtedness to Dr. Perse by attention to one who bore his name; and other, Edward Langsdale, because he was almost certainly the brother of Taylor's future wife.

The exact date of Taylor's ordination, like most other dates in his life, is unknown. It most probably took place in 1633, when Taylor was twenty. Dean Comber, in his Discourse on the Offices of Ordination, published in 1699, mentions, "the most famously learned Bishop Ussher ordained before he was twenty-one; and the pious and eloquent Bishop, Jeremy Taylor, who entered into Orders younger than he", and that is the only light we get on an incident the details of which are now past recovery. In the following year Batchcroft appointed Taylor a reader in Rhetoric and he took his degree of Master of Arts.

So far his career had been such as might have been foretold for a brilliant and industrious young scholar. Speaking of the impression he made at this period, Rust remarks, "Had he lived amongst the ancient pagans he had been ushered into the world by a miracle, and swans must have danced and sung at his birth; and he

1. Heber (Life of Jeremy Taylor. p.xvi) disagrees with the statement that Taylor received a fellowship. Rust (Funeral Sermon. Taylor's Works. Vol:1. p.cccxxii) says that as "soon as he was graduate he was chosen fellow" and Rust was in a good position to know. Taylor's name first occurs in the Absence-Book of Caius College as a fellow on eighth of November, 1633. These facts are discussed in the Gentleman's Magazine for April 1855.

must have been a great hero, and no less than the son of Apollo, the god of wisdom and eloquence. He was a man long before he was of age and knew little more of the state of childhood than its innocence and pleasantness."<sup>1</sup> The last sentence sounds a little melancholy. It hints at so many long days spent grinding ceaselessly at books with no time to spare for recreation. However, Rust, no doubt, meant it for praise. But now the opportunity which shaped the whole of his future life came to him by mere chance.

In college, two graduates generally roomed together, having two scholars sharing their apartments and under their care. Taylor's room mate had been a certain Thomas Ridsen, a man his senior by three years and now engaged in London as a Lecturer at St. Paul's Cathedral. Something made it impossible for Ridsen to fulfil his duties and he asked his room-mate to go in his place. Taylor accepted the invitation and in London, preaching at St. Paul's, met the patron without whom his brilliant talents would have found little scope in the future.

1. Rust. "Funeral Sermon". (Taylor's Works. Vol.1. p. cccxii)

## CHAPTER TWO.

Taylor was now about twenty-one years old,<sup>1</sup> and if Rust's evidence is true, he had grown into an exceedingly handsome young man.<sup>2</sup> His personal appearance, combined with an oratorical gift which was already apparent, made such an impression upon the congregation of St. Paul's that the news of the attractive young preacher just come to town was brought to the ears of Archbishop Laud. There was very little that was of any importance to the Church he loved which did not come to his notice sooner or later. For good men, if of the right principles, Laud had a patronage as ready as his interest was keen. Taylor, from the same college as Cosin, was likely to be of the right way of thinking, therefore he received a command to appear at Lambeth to preach before the Archbishop.

Laud was a very shrewd judge, a hard man to sweep away by one brilliant exhibition no matter how powerful the abilities displayed might be, nevertheless, Taylor seems to have come very near to performing this feat. The Archbishop listened with "wonder and satisfaction"<sup>3</sup> to a discourse which was "beyond exception and beyond imitation"<sup>4</sup> and, when it was all over, the only adverse remark he made was that the preacher was too young. This was a fault for which Taylor humbly begged his pardon and promised that if he lived he would mend it.<sup>5</sup> Laud knew very well that if Taylor was to develop as he ought to do he must not stay in London; too much popularity and too much preaching are both bad for a young priest.

1. Rust. (Funeral Sermon. Taylor's Works. Vol: 1. p.cccxxii) says that it was soon after he had taken his M.A. which happened in 1633.
2. Rust."Funeral Sermon". Taylor's works. Vol:1. p.cccxxii)
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Rust. Ibid. Lloyd."Memoirs". p.702. This retort is credited to a number of people in similar circumstances, but there is no reason why it should not have been made by Taylor, it is a piece of wit that is likely to occur to a good many.

Taylor came away from the interview with the promise that Laud would do something for him. Rust and Lloyd are eloquent about the impression which Taylor had created and a number of his biographers quote their words as if they were Laud's own, whereas those two were probably doing nothing more than describe the interview between the preacher and the Archbishop as vividly as possible.

Taylor apparently never resumed the academic life at Cambridge which his visit to London had broken. There was little present inducement for him to remain in Caius' College. His Fellowship, being only on Dr. Perse's foundation, carried with it neither the same standing nor emolument as a Fellowship on the College would have done, and in Cambridge, Taylor seems to have had few friends powerful enough to push him into anything more important. It has been stated that after leaving London Taylor retired into the country to a place called Maidley Hall, near Tamworth in Staffordshire.<sup>1</sup> but this has been contested on the grounds that no such place exists, and either Madely in the northern part of the county should be substituted, or Tamworth in Warwickshire for Tamworth in Staffordshire.<sup>2</sup> The next clear light we get on Taylor's comings and goings is from the Absence Book of Caius College which shows that he returned to the college for one day, in October 1635, arriving on the thirteenth and leaving on the fourteenth, probably to make arrangements for going away from Cambridge for good. He vacated his Cambridge Fellowship on Lady Day 1636.

Laud was making a definite attempt to obtain preferment for the young man whose preaching had so impressed him. On October the twentieth, 1635, Taylor was incorporated M.A. at University College, Oxford, as the indispensable preliminary to his receiving some settlement there. On October the twentythird Laud addressed

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol:1.) p.xviii. Heber based his statement on a letter in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for 1783. p.144.
2. Willmott. Bishop Jeremy Taylor. p.95. "Gentleman's Magazine", for 1792. p.109. This last writer says that he searched for and did not find Maidley-Hill but the correspondent in 1783 wrote Maidley Hall.

the following letter:

"To the Warden and Fellows of All-Soul's Coll. Oxford.

Salutem in Christo.

These are on the behalf of an honest man and a good scholar: Mr. Osborn, being to give over his fellowship, was with me at Lambeth, and, I thank him, freely proffered me the nomination of a scholar to succeed in his place. Now having seriously deliberated with myself touching ~~recommending~~ this business, and being willing to recommend such an one to you as you might thank me for, I am resolved to pitch upon Mr. Jeremiah Taylour, of whose abilitys and sufficiencys every ways I have received very good assurance. And I do hereby heartily pray you to give him all furtherance by yourself and the fellows at the next election, not doubting but that he will approve himself a worthy and learned member of your society. And tho' he has had his breeding for the most part in the other university, yet I hope that shall be no prejudice in him, in regard that he is incorporated into Oxford (ut sit eodem ordine, gradu, etc.) and admitted into University college. Neither can I learn that there is anything in your local statutes against it. I doubt not but you will use him with so fair respects as befits a man of his rank and learning, for which I shall not fail to give you thanks. So I leave him to your kindness and rest

Your loving friend  
WILLIAM CANT." 1

Mr. Osborn had done something he had no right to do. The nomination to the Fellowship was not his to offer but Laud, who appears to have been ignorant of other provisions in the statutes of All Souls, seems to have taken Osborn at his word and expected his own nominee to have been elected without question. The Archbishop was right so far as the majority of the Fellows were concerned for they elected Taylor almost unanimously, but one of them, Gilbert Sheldon,<sup>2</sup> himself to become Primate later, was against the whole proceeding and opposed the election. There the matter rested, for time was on the side of Laud, so long as the majority refused to change their minds. The Archbishop was Visitor of the College, and, if no valid election was made, then the right of appointment accrued to him by virtue of his office.

1. Wood, "Athenae Oxoniensis" (Ed; Bliss) Vol: 3. p.782. An identical copy is in the archives of All Souls College. A copy with three slight verbal differences, i.e. addressed to "Dr. Richard Astley, Warden of All Souls"; in line four, "That place" for "his place" and "Mr. Jeremy Taylor" for "Mr. Jeremiah Taylour", is printed in Laud's Works. Vol:VI. p.437, from Tanner MSS.ccoxi. Fol:116. A note written in Bancroft's hand on the Tanner MS copy of this letter records the initial opposition and Taylor's election on Laud's mandate of November the twentyfirst, 1635.
2. Heber "Life of Jeremy Taylor" (Taylor's Works. Vol:1. p.xviii. speaks of Sheldon as the warden, this is incorrect. Richard Astley, elected 1618, died, Feb. 23rd. 1636. held office at the time but a letter of Laud's dated Dec. 18. 1635. (Works. Vol. vi. p.445) speaks of Astley's weakness still continuing so probably Sheldon who succeeded him did the work. Gosse and Brown repeat

Sheldon does not seem to have been in any way bitter about the matter. Taylor was given a probationary Fellowship in November the third 1635 and waited quietly until January the fourteenth 1636 when Laud, this time in the full exercise of his right, appointed him to a Fellowship at All Souls.<sup>1</sup>

Anthony à Wood's comment on the situation is in the main correct. "He came in merely by the paramount interest of the said Archbishop; yet it was done against the statutes of the College in these two respect. First because he had exceeded the age, within which the said statutes make candidates capable of being elected, and secondly that he had not been of three years standing in the University of Oxon, only a week or two before he was put in (sic). However he being a person of most wonderful parts and like to be an ornament thereunto he was dispensed with".<sup>2</sup> Wood was wrong in one respect. The statutes did not exactly forbid a person of Taylor's age being elected and,<sup>3</sup> as far as his standing in the University was concerned, Laud may have thought that when his protégé was a member of Oxford he carried his standing at Cambridge with him.

Taylor was now definitely started upon a career and by the influence of the greatest man in the Church of England of that day, but it is quite possible to overestimate the influence which the patron had upon his nominee. Taylor would have been a Laudian in many respects if Laud had never lived. To one who loved beauty and kindness as much as he did the aridities of Puritan theology and worship would inevitably have been distasteful. Add to this the facts that he was born in the diocese of Ely, over which the saintly influence of Andrewes had presided, and <sup>that</sup> he had been educated at Caius where the second founders views could not have been quite forgotten in his time and there are circumstances sufficient to

1. Wood. "Ath: Ox:" (Ed: Bliss) Art: Taylor. Note, quoting All Souls College Register. Laud's mandate was dated November, twentyfirst, 1635, but the College did not act upon it until the next year.
2. Ibid.
3. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol.1. p.xviii)

give him some bias towards the High Church position.<sup>1</sup> But the same temperament which predetermined the party of Taylor's main allegiance at the same time forbid him to adopt their entire outlook. There is abundant evidence in Taylor's later work that he loved and revered Laud but none that he was ever dominated by him.

Laud was now at the height of his power, the most influential, the most courted and the most hated man in England. From that day to this it has been only the most detached and impartial of historians who have been able to consider the man and his deeds with any calmness. People are fated to take sides about him. When Laud was growing up there was one great question before the Church of England. Had she got rid of Roman domination only to submit herself to a tyranny as narrow and as bitter from Puritanism? For a time it looked as if the answer might be 'yes'; that it was eventually 'no' was due, above all earthly things, to his life and death. That life is all of a piece. It offers only such modification of character as time and stress are certain to bring about in all mutable things.

Born of middle class parentage, he was educated at Reading School, and at St. John's College, Oxford, where his academic career was successful if not overwhelmingly brilliant. He passed through the usual round of College offices. In 1603 he was made Proctor and the leniency of his rule was in marked contrast to that of his colleague.<sup>2</sup> He interested himself in the recreations of the students, especially in their dramatic performances to the expense of which he contributed. He was an industrious scholar and a great lover of his College and University. So he might have gone on in easier times, but everyone was taking sides and Laud, even if he had wished to, could not have escaped; his public utterances made it clear that he was with the

1. Pembroke had produced more High Churchmen than any other of the Cambridge colleges, but Osin as has already been said, and William Barret, a supporter of Barro's attack upon Calvinism were from Caius College.

2. Clark. "Wood's Life and Times." Vol.2. p.234.

Catholic and against the Calvinist party. In his exercise for the Doctorate of Divinity, which he took in 1608, he maintained the thesis that Episcopacy is Jure Divino.<sup>1</sup>

In 1611 he was proposed for the Master-ship of his College. The Puritans, who detested his principles and disliked his person, offered the bitterest opposition, one of them even going to the length of tearing up the paper on which Laud was nominated as it lay upon the altar.<sup>2</sup> King James, to whom the disputed election was referred, decided in Laud's favour, though he was not over fond of him personally.<sup>3</sup> Laud discharged his new office with ability and, in spite of some abuse from his theological opponents which was fully worthy of their later dealing with him, ended his career in Oxford with a good measure of popularity. The continual foulmouthed hostility which he was compelled to endure from the Puritans must be borne in mind if the undoubted irascibility of his dealings with them in later life is to be rightly appraised.

At Gloucester, whither the King had sent him as Dean in 1616 to reform one of the most neglected Cathedrals in England, he passed through a similar experience, being subject to unscrupulous vilifying which never hindered the steady pursuit of his object and which only died down as his purpose prevailed. It was no doubt provoking to the Puritans that Laud refused to believe gross neglect in the external ordering of religious things to be a sign of a high state of spiritual development. There seems some reasonableness in his refusal. After five years at Gloucester he was made Bishop of St. Davids but his growing influence at court made him absent himself from his diocese more than a Bishop should.

1. Prynne in his "Breviate" p.2. remarks "He then (at the B.D. exercise) maintained there could be no true Church without Diocesan Bishops for which Dr. Holland (then Doctor of the Chair) openly reprehended him in the schools". On this Laud comments in the margin "My tenet was and is still, yt episcopatus is Jure divino; But it was when I proceeded Dr; and it is a notorious untruth yt Dr. Holland said any such thing" Laud's Works Vol:111. p.262. Heylyn "Life of Laud", p.54. also made the mistake of supposing the occasion was the B.D. exercise and, probably following him Gardiner Dic:Nat: Biog: Art: "Laud", fell into the same error, as did Hallam, "Constitutional History." Vol:1. p.366, note, referring, with Heylyn as his authority, to the supposed subject and rebuke of the B.D. exercise. Considering how positive Laud's words are the mistake ought not to be continued.

2. Hutton. "William Laud." p.12.

3. "Calendar of State papers." June 14th. August 5th. 1611.

In 1626 he was translated to Bath and wells and two years later to London. In 1633, on the death of Abbott, Charles greeted the Bishop of London with the words, "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury you are very welcome".<sup>1</sup> Henceforth he was in a position to carry out the reforms he had come increasingly to think necessary.

It would be hard for anyone to deny that some intervention was needed. Whatever form the discipline took, some authority must be brought to bear upon the neglected churches, the many unworthy clergy and the continued encroachments of the laity upon the property and position of the Church. Just what type of discipline was adopted would depend upon the theory of the nature of the Church held by those in authority. Laud's general position was that of the most moderate of the reformers, a little more logically defined and filled out a little, but, in essence, the same. He did not believe it to be his duty to make the Church of England Catholic, she was Catholic already; but he did believe it his duty to make her conscious of her heritage and determined to hold it fast. His fatal mistake lay in a wrong estimate of the rapidity with which the Church could be influenced. He attempted to bring about in a few years, by command, what could only have been done peaceably, by the persuasion, guidance and education of some generations.

It is a commonplace of history that he did not ultimately fail, though, because of the methods which he adopted, the Church he loved was forced through the violent crisis and reaction of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>2</sup> Visitation of his province and the Court of High Commission were his two chief instruments. Both were bitterly attacked; one on the ground that it was a revival of an obsolete privilege and the other that it was harsh and unconstitutional in its method. It is true that no Archbishop since the Reformation had exercised direct authority outside his own diocese but the likelihood of such a thing reoccurring had not entirely passed from men's minds. Harrison

1. Hutton. "William Laud." p.35.

2. Gardiner. "History of the Great Civil War." Vo.2. p.108.

mentions the dues payable on such an occasion as part of the charges an incumbent might expect to fall upon him.<sup>1</sup> But after the lapse of so many years it was inevitable that, unless the Visitation were carried out with such extraordinary tact that no party felt it directed against itself, an outcry would be certain to ensue. In the instructions which he issued to his Vicar General, Laud insisted that the altar be placed at the East end and that enquiry should be made into cases of neglect and abuse.<sup>2</sup> On the whole the changes thus brought about were not very greatly objected to and the Visitation was productive of lasting results. In Dr. Hutton's opinion "It was a definite assertion of the place of the altar and not the pulpit as the centre of worship in the English Church."<sup>3</sup> From that day to this, in spite of some lapses in practice, the Church of England has always held this to be her position.

The Court of High Commission, Laud's other instrument, was hated both by Coke's admirers among the Common Lawyers, who held that it exceeded its powers, and by the Puritans, for it ignored the protests of the one and prosecuted <sup>the</sup> other. This opposition of the lawyers was only one more phase in their long battle with the spiritual power. It was their aim to make the Common Law which they administered the supreme authority in every section of the nation's life and their successors persevered in this design, not always with right on their side, until they had relegated the Canon Law to a subordinate position and made the Church itself hardly more than a department of the state. The Court of High Commission was sometimes overbearing in its methods, it was not always entirely popular with the clergy themselves, but its legal basis could not be denied.

This Court had its origin under Elizabeth when the Queen was

1. Harrison. (Ed: Furnival) "Elizabethan England!" p.73.
2. See Laud's Works. Vol: V. p. 379-476 for Visitation Articles of the Diocese of St. Davids. London, Winchester, Canterbury, The Cathedrals and Public Schools. Laud's Articles for the Visitation of his Province in 1635 seem to have been the same as those issued for his Diocese in 1634.
3. Hutton. "William Laud." p.77.

empowered to appoint any number of persons, to exercise under Her Majesty all manner of jurisdiction in any wise touching ecclesiastical matters.<sup>1</sup>

Laud's use of it added to the growing unpopularity of the institution. Yet on the whole it does not seem to have deserved all the abuse which was then and since showered upon it so liberally.<sup>2</sup> Its sentences were lenient for the times. When we consider the undoubted cases of browbeating and abusing witnesses and extorting evidence from those who ought not to give it, we must remember that these things took place when the laws of evidence were far less developed than they are now and that a culprit would have been likely to receive no better treatment from a judge in the ordinary courts than he did from the Commission.

Laud's activity is amazing and it proceeded from a resolute if narrow sense of duty. His conscience would not allow him to condone, even for a time, opinions which were destructive to the Catholicity of the Church. The consciences of his opponents were, however, as stubborn as his own and tragedy resulted. In every sphere of his activity he was, no less than Milton, "ever in his great taskmaster's eye." He found time to intervene, some said interfere, in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs; he was<sup>a</sup> voluminous correspondent of Stafford and active in all Irish matters. Besides all this he made leisure to study, to be a collector of books and the munificent patron of scholars. He gave over one thousand three hundred MSS. mostly in oriental languages, to the Bodleian besides a collection of coins. St. John's College received continual benefactions from him, from the days of his Fellowship to the end of his life.<sup>3</sup> Pococke, the orientalist, collected for him and so did

1. For the Act (1. Elizabeth. Cp.1.) see Gee and Hardy.

"Documents Illustrative of English Church History." Doc: 79.

2. It was often objected to as a piece of purely clerical tyranny. Compare Selden. "Men cry out upon the High Commission, as if the Clergymen only had to do with it, when I believe there are more Laymen in Commission there than Clergymen; if the Laymen will not come, whose fault is that? So of the Star-Chamber; the people think the Bishops only censur'd Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, when there were but two there, and one spake not in his own cause". Selden. "Table Talk." Para: 22.

3. Hutton. "William Laud." p.107.

Graves in Egypt. By the King's order every ship of the Turkey Company after 1634 brought home from each voyage some Arabic or Persian MS. to be disposed of by the Archbishop of Canterbury as the King thought fit.<sup>1</sup>

Laud not only served the Church as a statesman and patron of learning but he was her apologist as well. In his famous controversy with the Jesuit, Fisher, which he undertook at King James' command, he gave the great weight of his authority to the position, midway between Rome and Geneva, which the earlier apologists, notably Jewel, had taken up. When, at his trial, he was charged with popery he pointed proudly to twentytwo persons whom he had brought back from Rome, among them Sir William webbe, a relative of his own and Chillingworth the greatest of Protestant logicians.<sup>2</sup> He had also kept Buckingham firm in his allegiance to the English Church. He brought to the service of his religion courage, learning and a conscience; the only thing he had not to give was the tact that was vitally necessary. It was certain that, as soon as they were strong enough, his opponents would strike at him and in December 1640 they did so. He was arrested and lodged in the Tower. He was brought to trial, his work for England almost done.

Laud was, as one who wrote an account of his death said, "of a clear and gallant spirit"<sup>3</sup> but he had a hard side. He was also an iron-willed, unimaginative, rigidly conscientious man; one who felt the strength which the Catholic discipline brought to his own faith and worship and, therefore, thought it indispensable in the lives of others. A man whom perpetual struggle made harsh-seeming and austere but who could, none the less, be drawn towards the

1. "Cal. of State Papers." 1633-34. p. 477.

2. Laud's Works. Vol. IV. pp. 63-66.

3. "A perfect Relation of the Suffering and Execution of the Most Reverend Father in God; William, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; With his Last Dying Speech and Deportment on the scaffold. January the tenth, 1644." (Printed in "Famous Sermons," edited by Maclean. London. 1911. p. 73)

volatile Buckingham and the gentle piety of Jeremy Taylor. As he stood at his trial day after day, fighting his last fight, his poise was more gallant, his wit readier, his calm greater than ever before. In his defence he was forbidden the help of a lawyer but he was never without an answer which shattered the truth, if not the effect, of the charge against him. Nothing could break his courage; neither loneliness nor bitter abuse, persecution or death. He bore patiently with the impertinent catechism which Sir John Clotworthy saw fit to inflict on him in his final moments alive and he began his last sermon standing on the scaffold where his severed head would lie in a moment with a joke at the discomfort of his preaching place. When Taylor read the noble tale of his earliest patrons death he did not know that Sir John was to be an offence to him also in his own closing scenes. "Laud was an encourager of learning, a stiff maintainer of the rights of the Church and of the Clergy and one that lived to do honour to his mother, the University, and his country," says Anthony à wood and no-one will deny that he grasped a good deal of the truth about a by no means easily understood character.<sup>1</sup>

When Taylor went to All Souls in 1635 Laud's influence in the whole University was supreme. He could have sent his protégé to no better place in which to ripen in those Church principles which the Catholic party had set themselves to restore in England. Taylor made some lasting friends at Oxford but we know little more of his life there than we do of his life at Cambridge. Wood says that it was there he obtained the knowledge of casuistry for which he was afterwards famous.<sup>2</sup> It was apparently some time before he could forget Sheldon's opposition to his election. Years later, writing to Sheldon, he remarked, "Two debts you are pleased to forgive me one of money the other of unkindness. I thank you for both but this later debt was contracted when I understood not you and less

1. Wood, "Athenae Oxoniensis". Art: "Laud."

2. Ibid. Art: "Taylor".

understood myself.<sup>1</sup> Better knowledge of each other made them lifelong friends.

In Oxford Taylor met another friend of Laud, William Chillingworth. If he had any influence upon Chillingworth it is imperceptible. That Chillingworth had a high opinion of him, though at the same time conscious of his failings, is clear from a letter written by Chillingworth to his "Deare Harry", a correspondent who was in all probability Sir Henry Coventry. He wrote "Mr. Taylor did much confirm my opinion of his sufficiency; but let me tell you in your eare - methinks he wants much of the ethical part of a discourser and slights too much many times the arguments of those he discourses with; but this is a fault he would quickly leave, if he had a friend who would discreetly tell him of it."<sup>2</sup> The Mr. Taylor has not been absolutely identified with Jeremy but circumstantial evidence makes it extremely likely. Each of the two men has his character illuminated to some extent by the letter. Chillingworth's respect for mere dialectics was the greatest weakness in his magnificent mental equipment. Truth is not always with victor in an argument. To Taylor, Chillingworth's logic-chopping must have often seemed a wearisome business when it was employed in defence or attack of things which Taylor's poetic intuition had already convinced him were true. But, however, inattentive he may have seemed, the companionship bore great and lasting fruits.

The other known acquaintance of Taylor's at this time affords a curious reversal of all that has just been said of Chillingworth. Francis à Santa Clara was the name in religion of Christopher Davenport.<sup>3</sup> Born somewhere about 1598, he had been educated at Merton College, Oxford, but afterwards went abroad to Douay, Ypres and Salamanca. While on the continent he became a Franciscan monk and returned as a missionary to England. He was a good deal thought of by both Roman Catholics and Protestants. Queen

1. Letter to Sheldon, undated but probably December, 1655, printed Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor" (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p. xlix. From Birch Coll: Brit: Mus:
2. Des Maiseaux'. "Life of Chillingworth." p. 50.
3. Wood. "Athenae Oxoniensis." Vol: 3. Col: 1221.

Henrietta made him her chaplain.

Writing, proselytizing, raising money for Roman Catholic work overseas and ministering to Romanists in England were the occupations of Santa Clara's long life, and were carried on under many aliases. Oxford was the scene of a great deal of his activity and it was there that he and Jeremy Taylor came into contact. Similarity of taste probably drew them together for Santa Clara "was excellently well versed in School Divinity, the Fathers and Councils, Philosophers and in ecclesiastical and profane historians,"<sup>1</sup> and Taylor himself was reading a good deal of School Divinity at this period. The acquaintance gave rise to the rumour that Taylor was on the verge of going over to Rome and in later times the Romanists themselves declared that he had entertained some such idea. There is only slight indication apart from this that it was ever likely though, as far as the missionaries were concerned the wish to obtain such a convert was no doubt father to the thought that they almost obtained him.<sup>2</sup> In the first of the three, "Letters to a Gentleman tempted to the communion of the Romish Church" Taylor remarks about a subsequent rumour that he was on the point of going over "Sir be confident, they dare not tempt me to do so, and it is not the first time they have endeavoured to serve their ends by saying such things of me. But I bless God for it; it is perfectly a slander".<sup>3</sup>

The intimacy between Taylor and Santa Clara only lasted during the time of Taylor's residence in Oxford. Santa Clara wrote books; one of them, "Deus, Natura, Gratia", so conciliatory in tone towards the Protestants that it was put on the Index Expurgatorius

1. Wood. "Athenae Oxoniensis." Vol.3. Col: 1221.

2. Rust says. "In his younger years he met with some assaults from Popery and the high pretensions of their religious orders were very accommodate to his devotional temper; but he was always so much master of himself that he would never be governed by anything but reason, and the evidences of truth, which engaged him in the study of those controversies."

'Funeral Sermon'. (Taylor's Works. Vol.1.) p. cccxxvi.

3 Works. Vol: 6. p.667.

in Spain and only just escaped being publicly burned in Italy.<sup>1</sup>  
 An intimacy with him was one of the charges against Laud at the time of his trial.

Santa Clara found times hard under the Commonwealth but continued his comings and goings under various disguises until Charles the Second returned, when he was once more made a Queen's chaplain, this time to Catharine of Braganza. He was several times elected Provincial of his Order. He died in May 1680 and was buried in London at the Church of the Savoy Hospital.<sup>2</sup>

Chillingworth's ideas on many things became definitely woven into the texture of Taylor's mind no matter how indifferent to them he may have seemed when he first heard them. The intercourse with Santa Clara, pleasant no doubt while it lasted, left no mark at all.

Taylor's academic life came to an end in 1638. In March of that year Juxon, Bishop of London, presented Taylor to the living of Uppingham in Rutlandshire. Rust states that he was given the living by the Archbishop but it was not Laud's to give though he may, however, have brought Taylor to Juxon's notice.<sup>3</sup> The former incumbent of the living had been Dr. Edward Martin, President of Queen's College, Cambridge. A Loyalist and a definite Laudian, since he was one of the Archbishop's chaplains, he had preached vigorously against Presbyterianism at Paul's Cross.<sup>4</sup> This fact does not seem to have made him a much better parish priest than his neighbours. His other preferments took him away from home a good deal and the care of the Uppingham people devolved to a great extent upon his curate, Peter Hausted, a man whose theological and political views were similar to his rector's. Hausted himself does

1. It is important to note that the Roman Index contains two parts. One, the Index Librorum Prohibitorum, which contains a list of those books which are forbidden entirely to Roman Catholics, and two, the Index Expurgatorius, which contains a list of those books which may not be read until certain parts have been altered or left out.
2. Wood. "Athenae Oxoniensis." Vol: 3. Col.1221.
3. Rust. "Funeral Sermon." (Taylor's Works. Vol.1.) p.cccxxi.
4. Dic: Nat: Biog: Art: "Edward Martin".

not seem to have been outstandingly zealous in the parish. He was a dramatic author of some talent both in Latin and in English and died among the King's supporters at the siege of Banbury Castle.<sup>1</sup>

Taylor can hardly have done much more than go to Uppingham and install himself in his new preferment before he was back at Oxford again, this time to preach the annual Gunpowder Treason sermon on the fifth of November. This is the first of Taylor's productions to survive. The London sermons and the college addresses may have supplied some of the material which was afterwards woven into his later work but they are not extant in recognisable form.

This first public sermon of his has come in for a good deal of adverse criticism. Heber on the whole speaks highly of it though he criticises the scholastic arrangement and condemns some of the vocabulary as, "the mere cant of traveled foppery".<sup>2</sup> Gosse thinks it dull and overloaded with authorities though he points to one passage which he thinks is perhaps a presage of coming greatness.<sup>3</sup> Actually it is the work of a young man who had not yet broken away from the tradition of his age. It would have been remarkable if he had done so being yet only twentyfive and having lived his life in entirely academic surroundings.

The sermon is dedicated to Laud by his "Grace's most observant and obliged chaplain, Jeremy Taylor". This is the first indication we have that he had ever received such preferment. When it was bestowed we do not know, though if he had held it throughout his residence at All Souls it may explain a good many of those absences of his which are recorded in the college books. The text of the sermon is from St. Luke IX. 54 where St. James and St. John ask for fire to consume the inhospitable Samaritans. The method is a little rigid. "1. The persons who asked the question. 2. The cause that moved them. 3. The Person to whom they propounded it.

4. Dic; Nat; Biog; Art; "Peter Hausted."

2. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor" (Taylor's Works. Vol:1) p. cxlviii.

3. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor" p.20. The passage referred to is in Taylor's Works. Vol: 8. p. 495. concluding paragraph. Heber had previously pointed out the same passage.

4. The question itself and 5. The precedent they urged to move a grant, drawn from a very fallible topic, a singular example, in a special and different case."<sup>1</sup> The division is followed by a brief expansion of each of the headings, then they are each one taken over again and fully treated. Under the first heading a little is said about the sinfulness of the apostles in wishing to call down fire from heaven and it was suggested that their fault was due to overhasty characters and a defective education under the law. By a none too clear transition he passes on to Romanists generally and Jesuits in particular whose sinfulness was of the same kind as the apostles since they wished for violent means to destroy the enemies of the Church. Taylor's reading must already have been extraordinarily wide or he must have spent a good deal of time looking up those Romanist books which were thought treasonable for he ranges from "Sanders our countryman", Emmanuel Sa and Mariana to the "damned act of Jacques Clement the monk upon the life of Henry the third of France, of Jean Chastel and Ravallac upon Henry the fourth."<sup>2</sup> He sums up with reference to a series of Roman casuists representing almost every European country to show that the trend of Roman teaching on the duties of a subject was to encourage treason if the ruler was not in obedience to the Pope.

He returns to his text for a time in the second section and then begins a long passage dealing with the Papal Bull in Queen Elizabeth's time. This brings him to the statement that under Elizabeth "none were put to death for being a Roman Catholic, nor any of them persecuted for his religion."<sup>3</sup> The Bull urged people

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.458.

2. Ibid. p.465.

3. Works. Vol: p.469. It is interesting to compare with this the opinion of a modern historian. "In writing of the persecutions under Elizabeth alike of Catholics and of Puritans, it is not uncommon to imply that the political argument of their defence was a mere pretext with a theological motive. --- Whereas the foundation of Elizabeth's persecutions was that opinions as such were of no consequence but that people who would not conform their conduct to her regulations must either be potential traitors politically or anarchists socially". Innes. "England under the Tudors". p.417-8.

to disobedience, therefore laws of increasing severity had to be made to put a stop to the disobedience. It was not a religious matter at all. Their religion allowed the Romanists to associate with the Anglican Church before the publication of the Bull so why not after? Taylor seems to overlook the fact that the authority of the Pope in such matters was part of the Romanists' religion. This is a point which Taylor obviously thought of great importance for it occupies a good deal of his time.

The main portion of the third section is devoted to proving that "He that conceals an intended murder or treason makes himself as much a party for concealing as is the principal for contriving."<sup>1</sup> This of course opens up the whole question of the inviolability of the Confessional, though he insists that the plotters did not confess a "fait accompli" but only put a question as to the righteousness of what they intended to do, a fact which, in Taylor's opinion, released that particular matter from the Seal of Confession. But, even supposing their confession had been "formal and direct", "there is no such consent of the present Church nor any universal tradition of the ancient Church for the inviolable Seal but plainly the contrary."<sup>2</sup> For the present Church, meaning by that the Church of England, he refers to the Canons of 1604 "they forbid not disclosure in case of murder or treason."<sup>3</sup> And in the Roman Church

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.487.

2. Ibid. p.489. Modern casuists hold the Seal utterly inviolable. See Kirk "Conscience and its Problems". p.303. and p.348 note. Gaume. "Manual for Confessors," Ed: Pusey. pp.397-401. Slater. "Manual of Moral Theology." Vol: .2. pp.174-177.

3. Ibid. p.489. The relevant passage in the Canons is as follows: "We do straitly charge and admonish him (the minister) that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy, except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called in question for concealing the same, under pain of irregularity" Canons of 1604. Canon 113. It has been stated by a "Legal Correspondent" (Church Times Dec: fifteenth, 1933) that "There are now no crimes the concealment of which subjects a man to the death penalty and it is doubtful if any existed at the time when the Canon was enacted." The Canons of 1604 may be considered as binding on the clergy for they were accepted by Convocation and sanctioned by the King. But since they were refused by Parliament only those individual Canons which were included in later legislation have statutory authority for the laity.

there had been casuists who held that a confession might be revealed to prevent an incestuous marriage and it was universally held that heresy was outside the Seal. In the ancient Church both Sozomen<sup>1</sup> and Origen<sup>2</sup> indicate that a priest might use his discretion in revealing what he had heard in confession. St. Leo seems to assume that the practice of the Church went to the other extreme, for he says "some sins are inconvenient to be published - and he derives it not from any simple necessity of the thing or a divine right, but lest men out of inordinate love to themselves, "should rather refuse to be washed than buy their purity with so much shame".<sup>3</sup>

Sections four and five are quite short, dealing with the heinousness of the sin which, in Taylor's opinion, was aggravated by the use of gunpowder and the ruin which would have resulted to the surrounding districts if the Houses of Parliament had been blown up. There are a few passages here and there which give promise of the orator who was later to develop. It is odd that there are not more, for the eloquence of later times was of the exuberant kind which generally goes with youth.

It was in that style apparently that Taylor had preached at St. Paul's and Lambeth and ravished those who heard him there. Possibly in the case of the Gunpowder Treason sermon the academic audience checked him a little. In the presence of those who had been his teachers he dare not let himself go. One thing is certain, the sermon, no matter how much it interested, could have ravished no one.

It is certainly not the sort of sermon which anyone who intended to join the Church of Rome could preach without a good deal more duplicity in his character than Taylor seems to have been guilty of. There is a story, given by Anthony à Wood, that the sharpest expressions in the sermon were not Taylor's own work but

1. 'Hist. Eccles.' lib: vii. Cap: 16.
2. 'Homil: ii. in psal: xxxvii.
3. Works. Vol: 8. p.493.

were inserted by the Vice Chancellor but,<sup>1</sup> as most critics who have noticed this story point out, the whole sermon is so much of a piece, the anti-Roman attitude so consistent throughout that it is hard to see how the Vice Chancellor could have influenced the tone to any extent without writing the entire sermon himself. But the story goes that the Romanists were so disgusted at Taylor's weakness or duplicity that they refused to have anything more to do with him.

There is some question as to whether it was at Laud's or the vice Chancellor's request that Taylor undertook the sermon. His own words are "it was obedience to my superior that engaged me"<sup>2</sup> and, as the words appear at the beginning of the dedication of the sermon itself to Laud, they may be taken as fairly strong indication that it was someone else who set him to work. As Heber points out, among all the reasons which the author alleges for dedicating his publication to the Archbishop, the fact that it was undertaken at the Archbishop's command is never mentioned<sup>3</sup> though that would have been the strongest of all had it occurred.

Some time, soon after his induction to his living and possibly as a return favour for the dedication, Laud was instrumental in getting Taylor appointed a chaplain to Charles the first.<sup>4</sup> Taylor now returned to Uppingham and settled down to the ordinary duties of a parish priest. He was only twenty-five, a good scholar and a known preacher but with no practical experience of pastoral work to help him in his task. We are given an interesting glimpse of his new parish by the diarist Evelyn who, under the heading August the seventh 1654, notes, "Went to Uppingham,

1. Wood. "Athenae Oxoniensis." Art: Taylor.

2. Works. Vol: 8. p.454.

3. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works. Vol.1. p.xxii)

4. Rust. "Funeral sermon." (Taylor's Works. Vol.1.) p.cccxxii.

One of the charges against Laud at his trial was that he "hath taken upon him the nomination (Prynne, and Rushworth, read 'commendation') of Chaplains to the King". To which Laud replied that it was an office which by ancient custom belonged in great part to the Lord Chamberlain" and "I never named any to His Majesty, but I did fairly acquaint the Lord Chamberlain with it and desired his favour". Works. Vol:III. pp.408. 410.

the Shire town of Rutland, pretty and well built of stone which is a rarity in that part of England, where most of the rural parishes are but of mud, and the people living so wretchedly as in the most impoverished parts of France, which they much resemble, being idle and sluttish. The country (especially Leicestershire) much in common; the gentry free drinkers." So, on that evidence, it would seem that in Uppingham, Taylor, like his brethren elsewhere, had to wrestle with two of the most deeply rooted vices of the seventeenth century.

George Herbert said of his "Country Parson" that "The great and national sin of this land he esteems to be idleness, great in itself and great in consequence; for when men have nothing to do, then they fall to drink, to steal, to whore, to scoff, to revile, to all sorts of gamings."<sup>1</sup> Baxter also sums up the evils of his time as "pride, fullness of bread and abundance of idleness, and want of compassion to the poor." Though he does not specifically mention gaming in this place, one of the most vivid passages in "The Autobiography of Richard Baxter" describes how he sat down to gamble at Ludlow Castle and when it was over resolved never to play again for fear of the terrible fascination the pursuit might have for him.<sup>2</sup>

The common picture of a cavalier, debonair, beautifully dressed, full of poetry and gentlemanly sentiment needs some revision. In actual life he was as likely to be a drunkard whose accomplishments amounted to little besides the use of arms, skill with the dice box and possibly enough music to serenade his mistress. For years before the Civil War the gentry were losing their hold upon the country. Idleness at home was driving them to court, there to find something gentlemen might deign to do and possibly the chance to increase their patrimony. But by far the greater number of those who carried their fortune to court to improve it did nothing more than spend it there.<sup>3</sup> Masques shows and parties ran

1. Herbert. A. "Priest to the Temple" p.239.

2. Baxter. "Autobiography." (Ed: Lloyd) p.14.

3. See. Sanderson. Works. Vol: 3. pp.81-2. p.109-119.

away with vast sums of money. Harrington's story of the entertainment which the Earl of Salisbury gave to Christian the Fourth of Denmark in the summer of 1606 has found its way into a good many history books. It would be hard to discover an account of a more bestial performance. Whitelocke's description of the pageant given by the Inns of Court at Whitehall in 1633, which cost twenty-one thousand pounds, is equally well known.

Of those who stayed at home lavishly expensive dress and households had helped to ruin many before the Civil War came and completed their destruction. Sexual morality was very bad. The cases which came before the Court of High Commission naturally only present one side of the picture, but they are sufficiently many and varied to indicate what the position was.

A hard task confronted the clergy of England if they were to adequately fulfil their function. As a body they had not done so for many years. During the period from the beginning of the reformation to the inauguration of the Laudian régime there had been too little stability in the Church of England to encourage the growth of a devoted priesthood. The account of himself which Greene put into the mouth of a "plain country Sir John or Vicar" was not an unfair characterization of many of the country clergy under James the first and Elizabeth. "For me friend, I am indeed none of the best scholars; yet I can read an homily every Sunday and holyday, and I keep company with my neighbours, and go to the alehouse with them, and if they be fallen out, spend my money to make them friends, and on Sundays sometimes, if good fellowship call me away, I say both morning and evening prayer at once, and so let them have a whole afternoon to play in. This is my life; I spend my living with my parishioners, I seek to do all good, and I offer no man harm."<sup>1</sup> It was not a high standard perhaps yet there have been times in the church history when the average was lower still. Even the better part of the clergy were less inclined to make themselves conspicuous for

1. Green. "Quip for an upstart Courtier," printed in "Harleian Miscellany." Vol: 5. p.417 ff.

their theological opinions than for useful lives spent in devotion to some pursuit which might serve to augment the poverty of their livings. They were the school-masters and physicians of the countryside. Some of the schools they began survived through many hands until they found their place in an organised educational system. Many were, no doubt, similar to the one John Evelyn attended as a boy of four when "one Frier taught us at the Church porch at Wotton,"<sup>1</sup> sporadic attempts to make a little money or meet a need. Jealousy on the part of professional medical men curbed the activity of the clergy among the sick. Because of a complaint put forward by the College of Physicians a convocation held at Westminster, under Abbott in 1623, forbade the clergy to exercise physic except in their own parishes and for charity only.<sup>2</sup>

A good deal of the blame for the lack of energy in spiritual matters lay with the patrons of livings who too often made simony of one sort or another the only means of preferment.<sup>3</sup> A man who had obtained his living either by discreet services while acting as his Lordship's chaplain, or by the actual transference of money, was not likely to hold opinions which might imperil his purchased property. It cannot be doubted that a servile priesthood, which was content to take its own small share of the pickings and at the same time consent to the general robbery of the Church carried on by those of the laity who had the power, greatly injured the prestige of the Church in the early days of its establishment under Elizabeth. Here and there protests were made. The Puritan, Harrison, complained that "The Church were now become the ass whereon every market man is to ride and cast his wallet."<sup>4</sup> But a resolute attempt to put an end to these scandals was soon to be begun.

Throughout the Reformation there had always been many who held a catholic conception of the Church of England, though they had not always been dominant. Toward the end of the sixteenth century, however, the catholic party began to gain in strength. In

1. Evelyn, "Diary," résumé of the year 1624.

2. Landon, "Manual of the Councils" Vol: 2. p.340.

3. Burton, "Anatomy of Melancholy." (Everyman ed.) Vol:1. p.322.

4. Harrison. "Elizabethan England." (Ed. Furnival) p.73

1596 Bilson became Bishop of Worcester and nine years later Andrewes, the greatest figure in the Catholic party before Laud, was given the see of Chichester. This tendency was continued, when in 1608, Neile was made Bishop of Rochester, and, on his translation to Lichfield, in 1611, was succeeded by Buckeridge, Laud's tutor and his predecessor as President of St. John's College. With Laud's own appointment to the Deanery of Gloucester and his growing influence with the King, the principles for which he stood may be said to have become the most powerful in the Church of England.

This position had not been reached without set-backs. When Bancroft died in 1610 Andrewes, the great friend of James the first and a man whose learning and sanctity so obviously fitted him for the part, was passed over and the Primacy given to the Puritan Abbott. Whatever his office, Andrewes' character was the greatest asset his party could have. Everyone who is familiar with his "Private Devotions" knows something of his learning and piety. His sermons, so much admired in their day, show the nimbleness of his wit, while some of the greatest of his contemporaries did honour to the charm of his character. It is conclusive testimony to the prevailing absenteeism of his time when even so exemplary a prelate as he spent only three months of each year in his diocese when Bishop of Ely.<sup>1</sup> There was very little difference between his theology and ritual and that of Laud. He was an Arminian before the days when Arminianism had become popular as a system;<sup>2</sup> he was a Ritualist before Ritualism was considered necessarily introductory to Romanism. It would be easy to draw parallels between Andrewes and Taylor, who was born in his diocese. In learning, in character, in ability and in the personal charm which all who met them had to acknowledge each very much resembled the other, Taylor also seems to have studied his predecessors works with care. In "The Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament" he speaks of

1. Pattison. "Casaubon" p.389.

2. "Ency: Rel: and Ethics". Art: "Arminianism."

Andrewes as "a wise prelate, a great and good man, whose memory is precious and had in honour."<sup>1</sup>

Andrewes' Arminianism came to be one of the leading theological characteristics of the Catholic Party. Loyalty to the throne was as strong in him as in his successors, though he was less rigid in his statement of his opinion. For Andrewes, the Royal Supremacy over the Church of England was only the regulative authority which must be in the hands of governors if they are really to govern. It is an authority which scripture approves and which Kings and Emperors had always exercised. Laud may have gone further than Andrewes and the bulk of the High Church clergy may have followed Laud but, even then, their Erastianism was not so thorough-going as that of their Presbyterian opponents. For the Laudians the state was the instrument of the Church, not its master.

However much the Presbyterian mind had broken loose from the past in other things, in matter of Church government it rested as wholly on external authority as any medievalist. The Presbyterians and High Church men as they worked side by side in the parishes of England in the years before the Civil War offer interesting points of contrast, in the performance of their ordinary duties, quite apart from whatever theory of the nature of the Church which they might hold.

In the great towns, the home counties and in sea-going districts the chief sabbath day exercise was a long sermon dealing with some controverted point in theology or opening some text of the scriptures. If the incumbent of the living were for any cause negligent of this method then funds would be produced by sympathisers in order to requite the services of some Puritan minister who would deliver his lecture after the authorised service had been read.

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.165. Taylor scarcely ever mentions Andrewes name without adding some words of praise or admiration. In his works. Vol: 4. p.487. Taylor uses, and expands in exactly the same manner as Andrewes, an anecdote from Aeschylus. In Works, Vol: 10. p.463, he borrows and misapplies the same line and a half of Homer which Andrewes had misapplied in his "Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine". pt.ii. par.2.

Although the lectures did supply teaching where frequently no teaching at all would have been given they were too often used as the means of increasing party rancour. On Laud's advice the King directed that they should be given only after the minister who was to lecture had himself read the Prayer Book service and that instead of the customary Genevan cloak the surplice should be worn; he hoped by these means to see that the incumbent was not overborne in his own church by an intruded lecturer.<sup>1</sup>

The Puritan saw England as needing enlightenment in the scriptures and education in the disputed points of theology; his sermons and lectures were designed to supply that need. The Laudian parish priest conceived his duty to be, mainly, the instruction of his people in the received doctrines of the Church. Consequently, "he exacted of all the Doctrine of the Church Catechism of the younger sort the very words, of the elder the substance".<sup>2</sup> This did not prevent George Herbert at any rate, "preaching constantly", but catechism was the main method approved by the party.<sup>3</sup> Confirmations were infrequent and by the Puritans, at least, not over-valued.

Between the High Anglicans and the Puritans there was a large number of beneficed clergy who sided habitually with the stronger party. They were not distinguished for any sort of piety. The highest aim they had was to hold as many livings as they could obtain by methods doubtful or otherwise, while most of the pastoral work belonging to these emoluments was done by a curate for eight or ten pounds a year. Bribery and powerful patronage were the two easiest means of advancement, without one or the other the inferior clergy stood a poor chance of ever becoming anything else.

1. "Instructions sent from the King to Archbishop Abbot in the year 1629". Para. V. (Laud's Works. Vol: v. pp.307-8) The same instructions are substantially repeated in "Instructions sent from the King to Archbishop Laud in the year 1634". para: V. (Laud's Works. Vol:.V. p.312)
2. Herbert. "A Priest to the Temple." p.208.
3. See Taylor's own "Rules and Advices to the Clergy." works. Vol: 1. p.111.

There is an interesting pamphlet in the Harleian Miscellany dealing with the curates lot. Two unbeneficed clergymen, Master Needham and Master Poorest meet and begin to talk. After describing how, in spite of scholastic ability, he failed to get a scholarship at Oxford being prevented "once by half a buck and some good wine" once by "a great lady's letter" and once again because "the warden of the college had a poor kinsman", Master Poorest goes on to tell how he went into the country and became a curate "under a great prebend and a rich double beneficed man, where I found promises beyond performances, for my salary was inferior by much to his cook or his coachman, nay, his barber had double my stipend; for I was allowed but eight pounds per annum, and get my own victuals, clothes, and books as I could; and when I told him the means were too little, he said that 'if I would not he could have his cure supplied by another, rather for less than what I had' and so I was yoked to a small pittance, for the space of twelve years". Master Needham had done very little better. His parson had a proud wife who robbed the curate of half his fees to buy "Lace, pins, fans, black bags, satin petticoats etc., and toward the maintenance of a boy servitor to go before her". This lady's husband had very changeable opinions about "where and how to place the Lord's table; it stood in the church, anon it must be advanced into the quire; then it must be east and west, and presently after north and south; covered, uncovered, railed, without rails, of this fashion, of that, of this wood, of another, nay he himself, who was the first that altered it, hath now within this month or two, altered his opinion, and placed it again in the body of the church. Oh fine weather cock!" Master Poorest described how his rector, Dr. Proud, "weareth cassocks of damask and plush, good beavers, and silk stockings, can play well at tables,<sup>1</sup> or gleek,<sup>2</sup> can hunt well and bowl very skilfully; is deeply experienced in racy canary, and can relish a cup of right claret; and so he passeth the time away". After discussing the idea of turning parish clerks, who were said to be very well paid, the two

1. Tables. i.e. Backgammon.

2. Gleek, i.e. a game of cards.

decide to better themselves Master Poorest by going "as chaplain to a ship" Master Needham by becoming preacher to a "regiment of soldiers."<sup>1</sup>

However, in spite of much neglect and rapacity of this sort, there were places in England where the pastoral work was as thorough as anything the Church of England was to see again for nearly two hundred years. Sanderson at Boothby Pannel "did not think his duty finished when he had read prayers, catechized, preached and administered the Sacrament seasonably - besides this he practised what his conscience told him was his duty reconciling differences, preventing law-suits, visiting the sick and disconsolate and helping the poor with his alms".<sup>2</sup> George Herbert's life at Bemerton followed the same course. The influence of the clergy touched every home. Their sermons and the Bible were the only means of enlightenment which the bulk of the people possessed, for books were few and dear. Bunyan must have been fortunate for on his marriage, "Though we came together as poor as poor might be not having so much household stuff as a dish or spoon between us both"<sup>3</sup> yet his wife brought with her " 'The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven' and 'The Practice of Piety' which her father had left her when he died" and a little later on he "came upon Luther upon Galatians, it was so old that it was ready to fall piece from piece if I did but turn it over". It was a large library for a small country tradesman.

The attitude of the bulk of the people toward Sunday was undergoing a profound change during this period and, until our generation, the change was considered permanent. The Christian Church took over from the Jews the obligation to observe one day in seven as a day of rest and worship, but felt no necessity to keep either the Jewish sabbath day or all the ordinances regarding it. Throughout the first seven or eight hundred years of the Church's

1. "The Curates Conference," 4to; 13 pages. Printed 1641.

"Harleian Miscellany" Vol: 1. p.495 ff.

2. Walton. "Lives." p.314.

3. Bunyan. "Grace Abounding." p.19.

4. Ibid. p.60.

life religious authorities guarded carefully the idea that Sunday was primarily a day of worship, but the majority of people did not observe the day with anything like the strictness enjoined. "From the year 900 till the Reformation there was practically no limits set to the amusements of the people on Sunday".<sup>1</sup> but with the Reformation the difficulties began.

The leaders of the movement could hardly admit that an ecclesiastical rule was unchangeable merely because it was derived from antiquity. To do so would have committed them to a number of things they wished to destroy. They believed, of course, that Genesis two and Exodus twenty were historical but that did not enable them to identify Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath,<sup>2</sup> they were therefore compelled to rest the observance of Sunday on the rational grounds of the universal need of a day of rest and joint worship. Sunday was, in their eyes, not a divine institution, the observance of which must be forced upon all, but a day which, after the obligation of worship had been discharged, could be used with Godly discretion. Calvin accordingly played bowls on Sunday and John Knox was not more inclined to be repressive on that day than on any other.

Under Queen Elizabeth work, if of a pressing kind, was actually encouraged. Merchants went to their business to discharge urgent matters, carriers and pedlars did not remit their journeys and the Royal Council chose Sunday as its day of meeting.<sup>3</sup> But England in the seventeenth century was turning steadily toward Old Testament ideals, among them a conception of Sunday approximating to the Jewish Sabbath. In 1595 Nicholas Bounde, a Suffolk clergyman, published a book entitled "The True Doctrine of the Sabbath" in which he claimed, with much boldness if little reason, that the observance of the Christian Sunday as if it were the Jewish

1. "Ency. Rel; and Ethics". Art: 'Sabbath'.

2. The use of the word Sabbath for the Christian Sunday began under Elizabeth and became popular under James the first and Charles the first. See Hallam, "Constitutional History," Vol: p.368. note.

should be enforced by the state. Trivial as the argument of the book was it had a great influence both at home and abroad. Fuller says "It is incredible how taking this doctrine was" <sup>1</sup> and Heylyn, though perhaps he is not the most impartial of witnesses in this matter, mentions a Puritan preacher who declared "that to do any work on the Lord' day was as great a sin as to kill a man or to commit adultery" and another who said "that to make a feast or dress a wedding dinner on that day was as great a sin as for a father to kill his child."<sup>2</sup>

The Government was forced into the controversy. In 1618 the first "Book of Sports" insisted upon the liberty of the people to keep Sunday in the way they had been accustomed, except for the savage sports of bull and bear baiting. The Sunday Observance Act of 1625 forbade any to leave their own parishes on Sunday in search of amusement. The second issue of the "Book of sports" in 1633, while it was strong in its admonition of the Justices of Peace to prevent any unruliness on a Sunday, nevertheless, allowed men to keep that day in "freedom with manlike and lawful exercises"<sup>3</sup> But the last vestiges of reasonableness in the matter were fast disappearing as Puritanism became more and more Judaic in mind. In 1643 Parliament burnt the "Book of sports" by the hands of the common hangman and imposed a Sunday that differed little from the Jewish Sabbath on all those who accepted their authority. In 1648, with the formal adoption of Presbyterianism, the rigidities of the <sup>Puritan</sup> sabbath were fixed upon England to remain the ideal of the serious part of the nation for more than two hundred years.

Not all the High Church clergy were in favour of the policy recommended by the "Book of Sports". The Parson of Elstowe for instance, though apparently with High Church leanings, preached on the evils of breaking the sabbath either with labour, sports or otherwise, but that did not prevent Bunyan spending Sunday as

1. Fuller. "Church History." Bk.ix. sec: viii. par: 20.
2. Heylyn. "History of The Presbyterians". p.310.
3. Gee and Hardy. "Doc: Illustrative of Eng: Ch: Hist:" Doc.xciii.

he had always done in playing cat, bell ringing and dancing.<sup>1</sup> The country people clung tenaciously to their ancient sports on Sunday. A parliamentary newspaper gives us an interesting glimpse of the way in which the Uppingham people kept Sunday in July 1643, nearly a year after Jeremy Taylor had left them to go to the wars. "Some of Colonel Cromwell's forces coming by accident into Uppingham town, in Rutland, on the Lord's day, found the bears playing there in the usual manner, and, in the height of their sport, caused them to be seized upon, tied to a tree and shot."<sup>2</sup> As their late rector had not taught the Uppingham men the new rigidity in Sabbath keeping Cromwell's men in this particular at least instructed them very forcibly.

Dr. Piers, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who, at the request of the King, reported on the village feasts found them nearly always innocent and often performing a charitable purpose. He divides them into four kinds; the first, Feasts of Dedication in memory of Churches, were held on the Patronal Festival or a Sunday near it. The second kind were called Church Ales. These took place when the people went straight from their afternoon prayers to sports on the village green, or in the Church yard or to merry making in the ale house; the proceeds of these meetings were often devoted to some such worthy cause as beautifying their church, providing new bells or helping the poor. The third kind of village feast was the Clerk Ale. At this the people sent provisions to the Parish Clerk and then gathered at his house for a festivity which they enlivened with the ale they purchased from him. In poor parishes this was almost the only means of recompensing the Clerk. The fourth type of feast was the best of all. This was held to set up some poor man by the liberal contribution of his friends at a Sunday joviality. It is a pity that fanaticism should stamp out gatherings which were the means of lightening the tedium of country

1. Bunyan, "Grace Abounding" p.20.
2. "A Perfect Diurnal of some Passages of Parliament, and from other parts of the Kingdom, from Monday, July twentyfourth, to Monday July thirtyfirst, 1643" These bears are said to have been brought over from Holland by the Queen.

life and forwarding a good purpose.<sup>1</sup>

The question of Sunday observance was but one of the problems whose influence was at work in the land drawing men to one side or the other in the religious dispute. In the country districts the smaller squires, who became the backbone of Puritanism in those places, were increasingly being alienated from the Laudian party as the clergy grew more devoted to the Church and more inclined to claim her rights. Laud's clergy could not be treated with contempt for they were learned, able and zealous and, at any rate while Laud was free, had the power to make themselves felt. It may be objected against them that, as a body, they had no desire to popularize their learning at a time when it would have been of supreme service to their cause had they done so. "Jewel and Bull, Hall and Donne, Hooker and Taylor, lived and wrote for their peers and for future ages but not for the commonality of their own"<sup>2</sup> and it was just to this commonality that the Puritan addressed himself, but it was these men who gave the Church of England a reputation for learning that many years of sloth and negligence were not afterwards to destroy.

Nor were they learned only, but they were filled with a piety of a type which it is the glory of the Church of England to claim as peculiarly her own. Nicolas Farrar at Little Gidding did his best to revive something of the monastic ideal before it had been suppressed for more than two generations. George Herbert's character is well known as is that of his biographer Isaac Walton.

In the ennobling of the material fabric of the Church which they had inherited they were as conspicuous as they were in its spiritual enrichment. When the Laudian movement began to make itself effective in the parishes every church in the land was eloquent of Reformation vandalism and nearly a hundred years of

1. Hutton, "Church of England from Charles the first to Anne" p. 108.

2. Stephen. Sir James. Essay on "Baxter"; (Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography Vol: 2. p. 4. London 1907 2. Vols.) . . .

subsequent neglect. In most places the images, shrines and tabernacles, rood lofts and "monuments of idolatry" had been "removed, taken down and defaced."<sup>1</sup> The painted windows were left merely because it would be an expensive business to replace them with plain glass. Drabness had settled down even where there was no conspicuous neglect; the glory of worship had departed. Instead of the Mass with its splendour of lights, vestments and ritual; the minister, clad in a black gown, read Mattins or Evensong "in the body of the church with his face toward the people in a little tabernacle of wainscot provided for the purpose."<sup>2</sup> Placed in the nave the altar served any purpose to which it might be put by casual irreverence or deliberate profanation. In at least one case, that of the Abbey Dore, there was no place to worship in but the ruins of the ancient church and there, kneeling beneath an arch which still remained intact, to shield his book from the weather, the curate read prayers. In this instance a truly appalling condition was soon to be remedied by the generosity of Viscount Scudamore who rebuilt the Abbey and retrieved the ancient altar "one entire stone twelve foot long four foot broad and three inches thick, from its desecrators who had used it to salt meat and make cheese upon."<sup>3</sup>

Laud and Juxon were both energetic church builders. Archbishop Neile reported in 1636 that £6,562.15.7. had been spent in restoring and beautifying churches in the Archdeaconry of York, the West Riding and Nottingham. The cavalier John Harrison built St. John's, Briggate, the most beautiful church which the City of Leeds possesses today. Herbert rebuilt the church at Layton Ecclesia and repaired that at Bemerton. Many other lesser known people up and down England were doing similar things. Beauty began to come back to the people's worship. One of the tasks of Laud's Vicar General in the Metropolitanical Visitation was to see that all

1. Harrison. "Elizabethan England." Edit: Furnival. p.77.

2. Ibid.

3. Hutton. "Church of England from Charles the first to Anne" p.103.

altar were restored to the east end of the churches again.<sup>1</sup> Lights, and, in many cases, incense were used, while in some Cathedrals and parish churches the priest began to wear a cope once more. Churches were decorated for the great festivals with "holly, ivy, rosemary, bays and green Boughs."<sup>2</sup>

The frequency and type of church service differed in different places. In the parish church Holy Communion was celebrated usually once a month. Nearly always it followed Mattins and both services were over before noon. The direction of the Prayer Book that those intending to receive the Holy Communion on the following Sunday should notify the clerk sometime during the preceding week was widely kept. Evensong was generally said at about three o'clock in the afternoon and this was the recognized time for the priest to catechize his people. Saints days and their Eves were generally observed and the Litany said on Wednesdays and Fridays. In the Cathedrals it was usual for the Holy Communion to be celebrated on Sundays and Saints days; the canons preached frequently and the music was good.<sup>3</sup>

Under Elizabeth the national love of music has been utilized to good effect in church services especially in the Cathedrals and this movement received a great impetus from the Laudians. It was a time when very many organs were built.<sup>4</sup>

In his "Ductor Dubitantium" Jeremy Taylor expressed the opinion that "The use of musical instruments may also add some little advantage to singing, but they are more apt to change religion into air and fancies, and take off some of its simplicity."<sup>5</sup> In 1638 he may have been of a different mind for one of his first acts as Rector of Uppingham was to build an organ. On March twentyfirst 1638 the Bishop of Peterborough granted a faculty to build an organ in the parish Church at Uppingham and added a recommendation that

1. "Articles to be inquired of in the Metropolitall Visitation etc., in and for the Dioces of Winchester, London, 1635. Para: 1. (Laud's Works. Vol:V. p.421)
2. Hutton. "Church of England from Charles the first to Anne" p.99.
3. Ibid. p.103.
4. Grove. "Dictionary of Music". Art: "Organs."
5. works. Vol: 10. p.411.

the organist should be paid a salary of twelve pounds a year.<sup>1</sup>

This was a large sum for a rural community to provide for one church functionary. The grant was made two days before Taylor's induction to the living by Bishop Dee so the movement to obtain an organ may have been set on foot by Taylor's predecessor.

It was the first of a number of additions made to Uppingham church during Taylor's time, most of them indicative of Laudian principles. On May the tenth, 1639, Bishop John Towers of Peterborough dedicated in his Cathedral church a number of ornaments for Uppingham.<sup>2</sup>

Seventeen days later the register records that "Mr. Jeremiah Taylor, Rector, and Mrs. Phoebe Landisdale married May 27th".<sup>3</sup> There is a possibility that this Phoebe Landisdale or Langsdale was a sister of the Edward Langsdale whom Taylor had coached in his Cambridge days, certainly she had a brother of the same name who became a doctor of some reputation. If Taylor's former pupil and the lady who became his wife were brother and sister then she came of a good family, for when Edward Langsdale entered <sup>College</sup> Caius <sub>in</sub> 1633 his father, Gervase Langsdale, of Holborn, London, was described as a gentleman. Brown suggests that they may have met in London when Taylor was preaching at St. Pauls.<sup>4</sup> Heber thinks that as the marriage took place at Uppingham Phoebe Langsdale was a resident of the town and that as Taylor afterwards mentions his

1. Uppingham Vestry Book for the years 1638-1642.

2. Ibid.

1 Chalice with a cover silver and gilt.

2 Patens silver and gilt.

2 Pewter flaggons.

1 Diaper napkin for a Corporall.

1 Bible.

1 Booke of common prayer.

1 Altar cloth of greene Silke Damaske.

2 Altar Cloths of Diaper.

1 long cussion of crimson velvit lin'd with crimson searge, with 4 greate tassells of crimson silke.

1 Short cussion of the same.

1 Tippet of taffety sercenit.

1 Surplice.

2 Blacke hoods of Searge lin'd with taffety sercenit

3. Uppingham Marriage Register, page bearing date from 1632-1638.

4. Brown. "Jeremy Taylor." p.19.

wife's mother and not her father that he was dead.<sup>1</sup>

Of what happened during Jeremy Taylor's years at Uppingham we know very little. He only mentions his family affairs in his works now and then and has indeed given there his opinion that domestic life should be kept in the background. The burial register under the year 1642 gives us one small glimpse of sorrow visiting him for it records that "William the son of Jeremy Taylor and Phoebe was buried May 23rd". In the "Autobiography of Henry Newcome"<sup>2</sup> we see Taylor again, this time in his capacity as a confessor. A certain Mrs. Turner, whose husband was the incumbent of Little Dalby in Leicestershire, had her doubts about the position of the English Church and was strongly inclined to join that of Rome. Naturally this was a grief to her family and someone persuaded her to consult the Rector of Uppingham before she finally made up her mind. She did so and Taylor "enjoined her penance". This may imply that he heard her confession or it may not. She afterwards told her son that on this occasion she saw in Taylor's study a little altar with a crucifix upon it. This story is interesting, not only for the insight it affords into the ecclesiastical atmosphere in which he worked, but for the proof it gives that the fame as a casuist which he had won at Oxford had followed him into the country. It does not seem to have been of much use on this occasion, however, as the lady went over to Rome. Taylor's reputation at this time was that of a very High Churchman. Barlow in 1641 reckoned him with Heylyn, Thorndike and Pocklington among those who were forcing the Church of England into further extremes than the law allowed. If that were so it was certainly not publicly known for Taylor never seems to have received any of that scurilous abuse which the Puritan pamphleteers poured over the recognised High Church leaders who were assailed with the foulest

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works. Vol.1.) p. xxiii.

2. Published by the Cheetham Society. 1852. Vol: 2. p.312.

language of brothel and tavern.<sup>1</sup>

We know nothing more of Taylor's life at Uppingham. We can deduce that it lasted about three years.<sup>2</sup> In August 1641 he signed his name at the bottom of the page in his parish register. By the next August the King had set up his standard at Nottingham and called all loyal subjects to his side to join in the now inevitable struggle. Taylor most probably considered his chaplaincy to the King necessitated his answering the call. The next page in his parish register which ended in December 1642 was not signed. His action in joining the royal forces would at once render him obnoxious to the committee which the Parliament had set up in 1640 to remove all scandalous ministers.<sup>3</sup> If they then declared his living vacant the Committee of Plundered Ministers which had been set up in 1642 to provide for those Puritan ministers who had been ousted by the royalists would find a substitute. When Taylor left home never to return as Rector again he carried with him the MS of his first important book, "Episcopacy Asserted". Where he left his wife and family or whether they went wandering with him we do not know. In November 1642 Taylor was with the King in Oxford having, most probably, accompanied him in his passage through the Midlands.

1. Anyone who wishes for a sample of language which even in these days is unprintable should see two pamphlets in the Harleian Miscellany "A nest of perfidious vipers". Har: Mis: Vol: V. p.590, and "The character of an Oxford incendiary". Ibid. p.497.
2. Taylors pulpit and a patten used by him still remain at Uppingham.
3. On December nineteenth. This was a subcommittee of the Grand Committee for Religion which was set up on November sixth, 1640.

### CHAPTER THREE.

Taylor was young, he was ambitious, he was well read and he had a gift for writing; it was inevitable that sooner or later he would take his part in the theological battle of books that was going on. Of all the subjects that were being debated, Episcopacy might easily seem to him to be the most worthy of study. During that last year or two at Uppingham when the system was being violently attacked his thoughts and reading upon it had shaped themselves into a book. Taylor's originality in his devotional work was very great but in all his controversial writing his debt to those who went before him is obvious. Therefore, to understand, "Episcopacy Asserted" rightly it must be studied in relation to what had been written previously on the same subject.

From the very beginning of the reformation some of the greatest of its leaders in England spent their strength in the effort to prevent it going too far. Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, Field, all accepted the faith and practice of the primitive church as their standard. The claims for Episcopacy were not at first set very high. Divines such as Whitgift,<sup>1</sup> Bridges,<sup>2</sup> and Cooper<sup>3</sup> were more inclined to defend it as the legal than the divine system of church government. But as more people became interested in the controversy and scholarship went deeper the apologists for Episcopacy began to claim that the method of rule they supported was both scriptural and apostolic and that Presbyterianism was neither. The first formal treatise on church government after the Elizabethan settlement, Saravia's, insists on the necessity of Bishops, where they can be had, and sees no need for any complete break with ancient institutions out of zeal for Reformation.<sup>4</sup> It is obvious that, although Saravia was more moderate in his opinion than some of those who followed him, he gave Episcopacy a very high place.

Associated with Saravia upon the same side was Matthew Sutcliffe whose treatise "Of Ecclesiastical Discipline", mainly

1. Strype. "Whitgift". Bk. iv. Chap. 24. passim.
2. Bridges. "Defence of Church Government". passim.
3. Strype. "Annals". Bk. vi. p. 155.
4. "De Diversis Gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii". Frankfurt. 1591. An English translation appeared in 1692.

destructive of the Presbyterian position, appeared in 1592. Beza wrote against them and Saravia replied in defence of both.

The next year 1593 saw the publication of two still more important works against the Presbyterian position. One, written by Bancroft then Chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift,<sup>1</sup> and the other by Bilson, at that time Warden of Winchester College.<sup>2</sup> Bancroft is said to have been the first to maintain the divine institution of Episcopacy. He had done this in a sermon as early as 1589. The position he then outlined, according to Dr. Mason, was nothing different from that of the ordinal.<sup>3</sup> The "Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline" was a critical rather than constructive work. It deals again with the persistent Presbyterian assertion that in the sub-apostolic age bishops and presbyters were equal if not identical. Constructively Bancroft was content to maintain that episcopacy was apostolic and therefore divine in its origin.

Bilson's work the "Perpetual Government of the Christian Church" was "remarkable for its confident and uncompromising assertion of Catholic principle in days so little favourable to the assertion".<sup>4</sup> Its method was similar to that followed by Bancroft. The divine principle of a hierarchy is traced back to the Old Testament and its subsequent history is shown to be both apostolic and catholic. By ordination grace is conveyed and therefore it could only be given by those who were the appointed channels of that grace. The Angels of the seven Churches referred to in the revelation he understands as Bishops.

Hooker, Bilson's contemporary, was by no means so confident in his assertion. The first four books of the "Ecclesiastical Polity" were published in 1594, the fifth in 1597, the sixth did not appear until 1648 and <sup>the eighth till</sup> 1651. The seventh dealing with episcopacy, was not published until it made its appearance in

1. "Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline". London. 1593.
2. "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church", 1593.
3. Mason. "The Church of England and Episcopacy" p.45.
4. Ibid. p.52.

1662 in Gauden's edition of Hooker.<sup>1</sup> These last three books can therefore have had no effect on anything that Taylor wrote. Hooker has a poor opinion of Presbyterianism's historical claims. "Our persuasion is that no age ever had knowledge of it but only ours; that they which defend it devised it".<sup>2</sup> On the other hand he certainly thinks episcopacy in accordance with scripture and he finds that other ministers of the word and sacraments have always been subordinate, to the Apostles in the beginning and to the Bishops since. This is undoubtedly a blow at the theory of the Presbyterians, largely based upon a passage in St. Jerome,<sup>3</sup> that the Presbyters and Bishops were of identical powers, a view which was forcibly upheld by Field.

In the writings of Bishop Andrewes we come very close to the sources of Taylor's thought. Andrewes has no doubt that "a belief in the Divine sanction of episcopacy was not the private opinion of a few Anglicans but the doctrine of the Church itself".<sup>4</sup> The Apostles ordained successors to themselves who had powers as full as their own, some to succeed them after their death, others, such as Timothy and Titus, to act with equal power to the Apostles while they themselves were alive. To the Apostles and their successors alone belongs the power of ordaining. In spite of this "Andrewes was not prepared to make episcopacy absolutely indispensable."<sup>5</sup>

Most of the strongest defenders of Episcopacy in England were inclined to accept the Presbyterian orders of foreign churches on the ground that in those places episcopacy was not to be had.. Overall's "Convocation Book", 1606, asserted the Catholic position even more strenuously than Andrewes. Its account of how the Apostles

1. "Those cases that concern the power and offices of ecclesiastical superiors and supreme, were (though in another manner) long since done by the incomparable Mr. Hooker, and the learned Archbishop of Spalato but their labours were unhappily lost and never saw the light". Taylor. *Dedication to Ductor Dubitantium*. Works. Vol: 9. p.iii.
2. Hooker. "Ecclesiastical Polity". Bk.iii. sec.x. Par: p.334.
3. "Ad Evangelium". Tom: 4. Prt. 2. Col: 803.
4. Mason. "The Church of England and Episcopacy". p.66.
5. Ibid. p.69.

provided a succession for their ministry by ordaining fit persons to follow them in their work was similar to that of most of the unequivocal defenders of episcopacy who had gone before. The persons chosen were first of all intended to serve local churches only and did not receive either the power to ordain or to excommunicate. Besides these were special legates such as Timothy and Titus who received complete powers. As time passed the Apostles took the ablest of their helpers and conferred episcopal powers upon them. Overall's book insists very strongly that none ordained except those who had specifically received power from the Apostles or their successors to do so. Ordination by Presbyters was never allowed.

The number of authors writing on the episcopal side increased steadily as the years went on. Not all of them were Catholic in their theology, not all of them were agreed as to the exact degree of reprehensibility attached to ordination by prebyters but all of them clung to apostolic succession.<sup>1</sup> James' emissaries to the Synod of Dort could not be accused of catholic leanings yet one of them, Carleton, protested vigorously against any attempt of the Synod to declare the parity of ministers of the Church and the others "spoke also in the cause". One of them, John Davenant, then Bishop of Salisbury, but from 1621 Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge, had previously, in one of his professorial lectures, adopted an argument very similar to that which Taylor was later to develop at length. Bishops, he claimed, have always had higher dignity, greater power, and a nobler office than prebyters. If they were the same this could hardly have been.<sup>2</sup>

The third of the emissaries was not only a greater man than the others but published a more thorough-going statement of his reason for adhering to episcopal government. In 1635 Joseph

1. Crakenthorp (Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae. 1625) For instance: and Mason (Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England. 1613) The dedication of this last book was accepted by Abbot.
2. "Nobis sufficit (hac verborum velitatione seposita) si ostendamus eos qui appropriate vocantur episcopi habere dignitatem altiorum, potestatem majorem, et eminentiora officia sibi annexa quam habent alii prebyteri, idque verbo Dei minime repugnante". Determinationes quaestionum quarundum. (1639) p.187.

Hall, then Bishop of Exeter, sent certain proposals on Episcopacy to Charles the first. In 1637 his great work "Episcopacy by Divine Right" appeared, Hall began his book with a strong reproof to Graham, Bishop of Orkney, who had renounced his orders as Bishop; then he lays down the propositions he is about to defend in the remainder of the book. These assert the divine institution of the church, the apostolic and catholic nature of Episcopacy, that anyone who departs from the judgment and practice of the Universal Church does something which is both scandalous and dangerous. Hall was particularly fortunate in being able to use the Epistle of Clement which had only just become known to scholars, through the gift of the Alexandrine MS of it, by Cyril Lucar, to King Charles.<sup>1</sup> Hall was also able to draw upon the Epistles of Ignatius. In addition to his learning Hall brought to his task an orderly mind and a prose style as good as any in England. Laud had seen and approved and possibly suggested a few alterations in Hall's work before it was made public.

Archbishop Ussher had a reputation for colossal learning and could not be suspected of any personal hostility toward the Puritans, Any contribution of his to the debate was certain to have great influence. In 1641, at the solicitation of Hall, he wrote a short tract on "The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans Briefly Laid Down". Like others before him Ussher traces the beginnings of Episcopacy from imitation of the Old Testament models. It was confirmed and approved by Christ in his messages to the

1. Codex Alexandrinus; one of the most important of the great uncial texts and the first to become known to western scholars. It is generally designated by the letter A, since that was the symbol for it used by Walton in his Polyglot Bible. Originally it belonged to the Patriarchs of Alexandria but was taken with him by Cyril Lucar on his translation to Constantinople in 1621 and sent by him as a present to James the first of England, who died before it could be presented; it was therefore accepted by Charles the first in 1627 and is now in the Brit: Mus: Codex A contains the Old Test: and some apocryphal books; the New Test: with the Epistle of Clement of Rome, and the homily sometimes called the second Epistle of Clement; at that time these were the only known copies of these two books. Codex A has had an important effect on the textual criticism of the Bible.

Church of Asia. In Ussher's opinion each of the Seven Churches was a Metropolitan See and an indication that provincial jurisdiction had already been set up. Ussher was not concerned in this, or in the other tract of his which was issued in the same year, "The judgement of Dr. Rainoldes touching Episcopacy", to debate how far the Presbyters were different from the Bishops, but he was apparently sure in his own mind that from Apostolic times the Bishops had been superior.

It is not always clear just how much of what was published under Ussher's name had his full authority behind it. Ussher was apparently given to drawing up papers for his own use and other people were given to publishing them, without his consent. In his "Reduction of the Episcopacy unto the form of synodical Government received in the ancient Church"<sup>1</sup> the power of order and jurisdiction was to be exercised by an ecclesiastical synod with the bishop as president. However shorn of power and glory such an episcopate would be, there was still no hint that the bishop ought not to be specially consecrated to his office or that the presbyters had the right to ordain. On this last point his undoubted opinion was expressed in a letter to Dr. Bernard, "I have ever declared my opinion to be that episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine, and consequently in places where Bishops cannot be had the ordination of Presbyters standeth valid; yet on the other hand holding as I do, that a Bishop has a superiority in degree over a Presbyter you may easily judge that the ordination made by such Presbyters as have severed themselves from those Bishops to whom they have sworn canonical obedience cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical"<sup>2</sup>

1. It was surreptitiously printed in 1641, 4to; and again in 1642. 4to; each time with a title suggesting that the liturgy was considered in the same publication. Ussher obtained an order of the House of Commons (Feb. 9th. 1640-1) suppressing the book. It was examined by a subcommittee of divines appointed by the Lords (March 12th. 1640-1) and was, on the whole, acceptable to the Puritans. It had considerable effect on schemes for accommodation which were mooted at the Restoration both in England and Scotland. The 1641 text is given in Baxter. *Reliquiae* (1696) Vol: 2, p. 238 ff. The original, from Ussher's own MS. was published by Bernard, as "The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church." 1656, 4to.
2. Elrington. "Life of Ussher." p. 258.

This long assertion of the claims of Episcopacy, lasting from the Reformation to the Civil War, had not gone unnoticed by the Puritans. Much of it, especially in Elizabethan times, had been provoked by distinguished statements of the Presbyterian position. It was the publication of the "Book of Discipline" by Cartwright and Travers in 1580 and the setting up, in places, of the Presbyterian system consequent on that book which had been the stimulus to Bancroft.

The line of attack from which Episcopacy was eventually to suffer most had been initiated by Martin Marprelate in 1558.<sup>1</sup> It had never been clearly determined who was mainly responsible for the stream of anti-episcopal propaganda of a satirical and personal kind which a small group of people, under the pseudonym of Martin Marprelate, poured out from a fugitive press. It lasted from November 1588 to September 1589 and Udal, Penry and Throckmorton were all concerned, to some extent, in the authorship.<sup>2</sup> In all the seven tracts which are extant and, as far as we can judge, in those which have not survived the method was the same, to cover with ridicule bishops and everything to do with them. The authorities were, in the end, able to put a stop to Martin's activity but the most damaging accusation the bishops had to face from that time onward was not that they were ecclesiastical usurpers but that they were proud, greedy and useless.

To many who were inclined to think Episcopacy as a system historically justified, the actual bishops as persons were displeasing their subservience to the King, the unworthy methods by which many of them had obtained their preferment, their rapacity, their non-residence had made many of them very odious.<sup>3</sup> Laud's reforms in church affairs and methods of government in state matters had provoked a peculiarly bitter animosity against him. Another

1. 'Cambridge History of English Literature'. Vol: 3. Chap.xvii. Also Arber. 'Introductory Sketch to the Marprelate Controversy'. Passim.
2. Henry Barrow and his friend John Greenwood have both been credited with a share in the authorship of the tracts but they were both separatists while the authors of the Marprelate Tracts were plainly Presbyterians.
3. Heylyn. "Life of Laud". p.199.

prominently placed churchman, the Lord Keeper Williams, had very little in his character to recommend him to anybody. They were too much lords of this world and too little fathers of God's people. As royalty became more and more obnoxious, the bishops, who had chosen to stand or fall by the King, became increasingly unpopular. The unfortunate wording of "The et Caetera Oath" imposed by the convocation of 1640 added to both the dislike and the ridicule which the bishops had to face.<sup>1</sup>

On the eleventh of December 1640 the Presbyterian citizens of London, well dressed and with orderly behaviour, offered a petition to the House of Commons for the abolition of episcopacy "root and branch".<sup>2</sup> They claimed that their petition had the signature of fifteen thousand well wishers. A request so strongly backed could not be ignored by the Commons however much they might dislike this indication of direct interference by the people in the nation's affairs. Discussion was put off until February eighth 1641. On that occasion it was clear that no party in Parliament wished episcopacy to function as it had been doing in the past few years. Falkland, speaking for those who loved the church and King, but who disliked the Laudian reforms, would have been content to bring the bishops more completely under the control of Parliament. Sir Harbottle Grimstone would have gone a little further and withdrawn all temporal jurisdiction from the bishops. Bagshaw represented those who thought that episcopacy in itself was corrupt and dangerous to the right of both crown and people. The house decided to refer the grievances complained of to a committee but to keep in its own hands the decision as to the ultimate fate of the bishops.

On February twentyfourth the impeachment of Laud was agreed to without a dissentient voice. The attack on the bishops was going forward. On March tenth the Commons resolved that the

1. Gee and Hardy. "Documents Illustrative of the History of the English Church." Doc: xcvi. The disputed legality of the convocation, and the words "et caetera" in the oath caused it to be withdrawn by the King's order in August. 1640.
2. Ibid. Doc; xvii.

right of the bishops to sit in the Upper House was harmful to the Commonwealth. On the next day they deprived the clergy of their power to act as commissioners of the peace or of having any judicial power in civil courts. On the twentyseventh a bill for the extirpation of episcopacy was read a second time in the Lower House and was agreed to by a majority of twentyseven, though Falkland spoke in opposition. On June fifteenth a resolution to end deans, chapters, and all cathedral offices, and to utilise the funds which had supported them for the advancement of learning and piety was agreed to by the house and embodied in a bill. The House of Lords was distinctly more favourable to episcopacy and, though equally hostile to some of the bishops, refused in June 1641 to allow them to be excluded from their seats in Parliament. This opposition was not successful for long. In the following February most of the bishops being prevented from appearing to defend their own cause, the bill to take away their votes was easily passed.<sup>1</sup> To it the king gave a reluctant consent, his last concession before the Civil War.

The adherents of Presbyterianism were gaining in power. It soon became obvious to those who were only luke-warm friends of episcopacy that they must make up their minds on which side they intended to fight. As the bishop's authority became weakened, religious anarchy increased. However much the anti-episcopal men in Parliament and out disliked bishops they were not prepared to see all restraints taken away from religious discussion and worship, nor, to avoid this, were they prepared to submit themselves to the rigid government of Presbyterianism.<sup>2</sup> The Root and Branch Bill

1. Twelve Bishops withdrew from the House at the end of December and made a solemn protest that Parliamentary proceedings in their enforced absence were illegal, for this they were committed to prison at the request of the Commons. (Rushworth, Vol: V. pp.466-7) Nearly all the others withdrew toward the end of the session (Fuller. Ch: Hist: Bk.xi. Sect.V. Para:24) Three bishops remained to the last and voted against the bill.
2. Hallam. "Constitutional History". Vol:2. p.105.

died in committee but the exigencies of the time brought it about that the extremists who had carried the bill forward were more and more courted by those who wished to subordinate the King to Parliament. On the other side the Episcopalian were, with the King's friends, becoming a Royalist party which was strong both, in the Lords and in the Commons and popular in the country.

Charles had felt himself able in January 1642 to impeach and attempt to arrest the five members of the House of Commons, Pym, Hampden, Hazzlerigg, Holles and Strode, who had made themselves particularly obnoxious to him. His attempt failed of its purpose but it precipitated the civil war. For the next eight months both sides prepared for the resort to arms they knew to be inevitable. The King moved to York and there made his appeal to the country as the defender of her laws and constitution. Many came to his side with the same feelings in the matter as Sir Edmund Verney who could not forsake the King whose bread he had "eaten for near thirty years" though he had no "reverence for bishops for whom this quarrel subsists".<sup>1</sup>

On the seventh of September the House of Commons suppressed episcopacy and the Lords gave their consent to the measure. The opposing armies met at Edgehill in Warwickshire on October twentythird and proved that neither of them were yet sufficiently well trained to achieve a decisive victory.

The King continued his passage through the midlands, arriving at Oxford on October twentyninth, most probably with Jeremy Taylor in his train. At some time during the two months of the year that remained Taylor published his first important book which is now generally known as "Episcopacy asserted" though its title is actually "Of the Sacred Order and Offices of episcopacy". What influence he thought the book would have in the condition to which the country was now come it is difficult to say. Probably it was never intended to do more than strengthen the known weak adherence to episcopacy of many of the King's friends. In this it may have succeeded to some extent, for Charles was so pleased

1. Clarendon. 'Life' Vol; 2. p.66.

with the book that on November first, 1642, possibly before the work was actually made public, the degree of D.D. was conferred on Taylor by royal command. As the King had only been in Oxford for eight days this fact may be a slight indication that Taylor had been with the King during the Edgehill campaign and that at some time during that march Charles had seen, and approved, the MS of "Episcopacy Asserted".

Those who are acquainted with the development of the episcopal controversy from the Reformation onwards will have already met most of the arguments to be found in Taylor's book. It was prefaced by a dedication to the "Truly Worthy and most accomplished Sir Christopher Hatton". When in 1657 it was republished, bound up in one volume with "The Apology for Liturgy" and "The Liberty of Propheying", Taylor was conscious that unkind critics might consider his use of the fathers in "Episcopacy Asserted" contradicted what he declared to be his opinion of them in "Liberty of Propheying" and so contributed a second dedication to Lord Hatton in which he made an attempt to reconcile this apparent difference. As we have the book now this second dedication comes first, but consideration of it will be better delayed until after we have made a study of the "Liberty of Propheying".

Although the King was pleased with Taylor's book he was not prepared to add to his unpopularity by defending the author <sup>should</sup> that need arise. Taylor makes that quite clear in the beginning of the dedication to Hatton:

Sir;

I am engaged in the defence of a great truth, and I would willingly find a shroud to cover myself from danger and calumny; and although the cause both is and ought to be defended by Kings, yet my person must not go thither to sanctuary unless it be to pay my devotion, and I have now no other left for my defence; I am robbed of that which once did bless me, and indeed still does (but in another manner), and I hope will do more; but those distillations of celestial dews are conveyed in channels not pervious to an eye of sense, and now-a-days we seldom look with other, be the object never so beauteous or alluring. You may then think, sir, I am forced upon you; may that beg my pardon and excuse;"<sup>1</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.9.

The reference to Laud is interesting for the Archbishop was in the Tower and could help his protégé no more. The new patron to whom the author turned seemed as good a choice as could be made. Whether they had met before they were both with the King at Oxford we have no means of knowing. It is possible that they had done so for Hatton was at Jesus College, Cambridge, when Taylor was at Caius, and Hatton's country house, Kirby Hall in Northamptonshire, was only a few miles from Uppingham. In 1643 Hatton became a Privy Councillor and was, in Clarendon's words, "a person in great reputation". It was however a reputation which he was soon to lose.

There was no doubt in Taylor's mind that bishops and Kings stand or fall together and he makes his position clear in the dedication of his book. Bishops, in his opinion, look to the King both for their livelihood and their promotion and, in return, they keep men firm in their duty to the King, assist him with their counsel and pay him taxes greater in proportion than those of the laity. The dedication closes. It is quite short but written with skill. Taylor all his life was a good hand at this sort of composition.

He begins his book with a reference to past persecutions by far the most severe being those which aimed at extirpating the bishops whom the old persecutors had considered fundamental to the church's life. In his opinion, which he admits he borrowed from St. Cyprian, the abolition of episcopacy is the forerunner of the great apostacy. It has been the catholic practice of Christendom for fifteen hundred years and he demands that his adversaries:-

"Bring admirable evidence of Scripture, or a clear revelation proved by miracles, or a contrary undoubted tradition apostolical for themselves, or else hope for no belief against the prescribed possession of so many ages".<sup>1</sup>

Episcopacy is built upon three bases "Divine Institution, apostolic Tradition and Catholic Practice". Taking them in that order Taylor was able to proceed with his discussion upon historical lines and thus give a unity to his book which was

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.16.

not always present in similar works. The position he takes up is that the scripture which legislates so carefully for personal behaviour could not "Make default in assignation of the public government, insomuch as all laws intend the public and general directly, the private and the particular by consequence only and comprehension within the general." <sup>1</sup> This is to put a very weak argument first and one that Hooker had previously demolished. Taylor had certainly read as much of the "Ecclesiastical Polity" as had been published at this time. Nevertheless, Hooker's reasons against seeking an unalterable form of Church government in the Bible had left him unimpressed.

His next argument is a little stronger. If church government does not derive from Christ, then it does from human prudence and can be changed as circumstances change, which would a certain cause of schism. History was proving in Taylor's own days, as it has proved abundantly since, the truth of the last half of that statement. The Independents were causing schism enough. Accordingly the whole object of Taylor's argument was to prove that there must be some exclusively scriptural form of church government. Present day scholars might call such a task impossible.

Did Episcopacy derive from Christ? This is the most necessary part of his thesis. If he establishes that he establishes everything. He finds the apostolic commission first in the power of "binding and loosing" which Our Lord gave to the Apostles and this was reinforced and amplified by St. Luke XII.42 in which Christ asks who is the faithful and wise steward. A steward is a pastor; a pastor and a ruler, he asserts, is the same thing, "this is a known truth to all who understand either laws or languages".<sup>2</sup> Receiving these powers in their own persons the apostles had authority to hand on to their successors, not their miraculous gifts, but, "the ordinary office of Apostolate". "Now in clear evidence of sense these offices and powers are preaching,

1. works. Vol: 5. p.16.

2. Ibid. p.18.

baptizing, consecrating, ordaining and governing".<sup>1</sup> That these successors were bishops is clear from scripture, particularly in the cases of Titus and Epaphroditus, for "their apostolate was a fixed residence and superintendence of their several churches".<sup>2</sup> This is clearer still from the cases of the Angels of the Seven Churches who were commended for trying "those who say they are Apostles and are not". Taylor uses this as proof that the Apostolate was an office Episcopal in its nature. The imposters did not counterfeit a person but an office; this office, of course, being that of pastor and governor of Christ's flock, in fact the Episcopal office. The point that Taylor is concerned to make is that from the time of the apostles to his own day there has been an unbroken transmission of certain powers from bishop to bishop by the laying on of hands; but he is careful to refrain from any illustration or elaboration of the succession which would tend to represent it as mechanical.<sup>3</sup>

Having proved the divine origin of bishops, Taylor goes on to seek the origin of the presbyterate. He finds it, as others did before him, in Christ's commission to the seventy who, although they were only heard of once in the Gospels, according to Taylor, soon began to exercise a function in the early church. He instances Ananias who baptized St. Paul, and Philip the Deacon; He mentions as his authority for this identification "Eusebius and Dorotheus".

This brings him to another of the most hotly debated points in the controversy. Were bishops and prebyters equal? Taylor says they were not for only the apostles ordained and confirmed. An obvious case was that of Philip who had to obtain apostolic confirmation for his converts at samaria. The apostles were also the rulers of the church, for Christ said to them "as the Father hath sent me so send I you," that is with plenitude of power.

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.20.

2. Ibid. p.23.

3. Such for instance as Mason's illustration of orders passing through the bishops as through "conduit pipes". Mason. "Vindication of the Church of England." p.165.

This seems to be putting a greater burden on one small word than it can bear. To these arguments from scripture he adds:-

"The belief of the primitive church is that Bishops are the ordinary successors of the Apostles, and Presbyters of the seventy-two; and therefore did believe that episcopacy is as truly of divine institution as the apostolate, for the ordinary office both of one and the other is the same thing, for this there is abundant testimony."<sup>1</sup>

This is the end of his argument for divine institution of episcopacy, he now goes on to prove the apostolic tradition of it which he had stated to be the second basis of the system.

The Apostles, he contends, ordained bishops to several churches, and he supports this statement with an enormous range of patristic quotation. Ordinations mentioned are those of St. Simeon to be <sup>the</sup> successor of St. James at Jerusalem, Timothy at Ephesus, Titus at Crete, Mark at Alexandria, Linus and Clement at Rome and Polycarp at Smyrna. He argues from the Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus that there was a clear transference of episcopal power in each case. He deals at length with the comment of Jerome with which the Presbyterians made such play, but it must be admitted that his interpretation could be called a little strained.

Taylor insists that Jerome's only claim is for bishops and presbyters to rule the church in common; he was not of the opinion that each of them had in himself the same office, for Jerome clearly states that a presbyter could not ordain:-

"And suppose St. Hierome, in this distinct power of ordination, had intended it only to be a difference in fact, not in right, (for so some of late have muttered,) then St. Hierome had not said true according to his own principles, for Quid facit episcopus excepta ordinatione quod presbyter non faciat? had been quickly answered if the question had only been de facto".<sup>2</sup>

He now passes on to his third basis of episcopacy namely catholic practice. The church early began to appropriate special names to special offices. Before that they had been used indiscriminately. In this process the word "bishop" came to

1. works. Vol: 5. p.40.

St. Thomas Aquinas and most of the great schoolmen except Duns Scotus (Sent: iv.xxv. 1, 2, ad 3.) held that episcopacy is not a distinct order. Throughout his works Taylor's leaning toward the Scotists is apparent.

2. works. Vol: 5. p.71.

be applied exclusively to the supreme officer of the church, but not as his sole name. "Pastor" was also used and this brings a protest from the author against the Genevan practice of calling presbyters "pastors", since, in the early church, that designation was restricted to bishops for whom also there were other special titles such as "doctor", "pontifex", and "sacerdos". The subordination of presbyters to bishops was proved by the fact that when a priest was elevated to the episcopate he had to be specially ordained to his new office and in this ordination the presbyters were not allowed to join in the laying on of hands.

The Presbyterians had ingeniously argued that if the consecration of the sacred elements in the Eucharist is the highest work to which man can aspire, and a presbyter undoubtedly had the power to consecrate, how could he be inferior to a bishop. Taylor retorts that it is presumptuous to compare the sacraments, but, in any case, those who could exercise a double right of consecration that is to say those who could both consecrate the Eucharist and bestow Holy Orders, were undoubtedly greater than those who could exercise only one. Not that the point made serious argument, says Taylor, for:-

"These men that make this objection do not make it because they think it true, but because it will serve a present turn. For all the world sees that to them that deny the real presence this can be no objection, and most certainly the anti-episcopal men do so in all senses; and then what excellency is there in the power of consecration more than in ordination? Nay, is there any such thing as consecration at all?"<sup>1</sup>

Taylor on the position of the reformed churches is particularly interesting. They and their opinions had been bandied about so much in theological controversy that Taylor was obviously getting tired of them:-

"What think we of the reformed churches? For my part I know not what to think; the question hath been so often asked, with so much violence and prejudice, and we are so bound by public interest to approve all that they do, that we disabled ourselves to justify our own. For we were glad at first of abettors against the Roman church; we found these men zealous in it; we thanked God for it, as we had cause; and we were willing to make them recompense by endeavouring to justify their ordinations, not thinking what would follow upon ourselves; but now it is come to that issue that our own episcopacy is thought not necessary, because we did not condemn the ordinations of their presbytery. Why is not the question

1. Works. Vol. 5. p. 109.  
2. Ibid. p. 118.

rather what we think of the primitive church than what we think of the reformed churches?"

It was the duty of these churches if they thought their own bishops corrupt to seek ordination from pure sources. But he will not condemn them. They must stand or fall to their own master. As bishops had the sole right of ordaining, so had they always had the sole right of confirming. Taylor is obviously more sceptical of the necessity which the reformed churches were under than some other writers of his time and history has shown that his feeling was right. In Scotland especially the break with episcopacy was deliberate and unforced by circumstances.

The suggestion that when Taylor produced his book the effect he specially wished to make was upon the rather lukewarm friends of episcopacy among the King's adherents is borne out by the fact that the next section, which comprises nearly half the book, is specially directed to those who "By all means would be thought to be quite thorough in behalf of bishops' order and power, such as it is, but call for a reduction to the primitive state, and would have all bishops like the primitive."<sup>1</sup>

In this part Taylor's arguments are an expansion of those already used by John Davenant. The primitive church "expressing the calling and office of a bishop, did so in terms of presidency and authority." Again multitudes of quotations from the fathers are brought in to show that they used the highest terms possible when they referred to the dignity of a bishop. They had complete spiritual authority over clergy and laity, they were appointed the judges in all spiritual causes by the canons; the bishops' powers were universal but they did not trespass on those of royalty, the church had its sphere and the King his.

Taylor ends this section with a passage in which he already seems to be feeling his way towards the position he afterwards outlined in "The Liberty of Prophesying"; though as will be seen he does not expressly repudiate the right of the ecclesiastical power to hand an offender over to the secular arm.

1. Works. Vol: .5. p.129.

"As no human power can disrobe the church of the power of excommunication, so no human power can invest the church with a lay-compulsory. For if the church be not capable of a jus gladii, as most certainly she is not, the church cannot receive power to put men to death, or to inflict lesser pains in order to it, or anything above a salutary penance, I mean in the formality of a church tribunal, then they give the church what she must not, cannot take"<sup>1</sup>

After going over a little of the old ground about the difference between presbyters and bishops, he suddenly brings the question into his own age. "We have seen what episcopacy is in itself, now from the same principles let us see what it is to us."<sup>2</sup> It was, and is, necessary to the very being of a church and both Ignatius and Cyprian are brought in to support his statement. Without bishops there can be no unity. To those who respect episcopacy but object to the outward honours which had come to be associated with it, he replies that they can love a thing little who grudge it good words, and did not St. Paul say that bishops were worthy of double honour.

Some people objected to bishops having secular employment in the state. Why should they object? The Councils of the church had never forbidden it and the practice was reasonable in itself. Bishops were often the fittest people that could be found for certain offices, and when they were away from their dioceses they could delegate their power to proper persons.<sup>3</sup> Taylor ends with a request for his readers prayers both for the King and for episcopacy.

Without adding much to the arguments already in circulation Taylor had produced a notable book. Heber calls it "a specimen of manly and moderate disputation",<sup>4</sup> though his theological opinions did not coincide with the author's and he was not impressed by the evidence Taylor had offered for the divine

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 147.

2. Ibid. p. 192.

3. Ibid. p. 207 ff. Taylor's handling of this subject met with Laud's particular approval. In his answer to Lord Say's speech against the Bishops" He refers to "A Book entitled, 'Episcopacy Asserted,' made by a Chaplain of mine, Mr. Jer. Taylor, who hath learnedly looked into and answered such canons of Councils as are most quick upon bishops or other clergymen for meddling much in temporal affairs. and therefore thither I refer the reader, being not willing to trouble him with saying over another man's lesson". Works. Vol:6. pp.199-200.

4. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1) p.clix.

institution of episcopacy. Taylor was handicapped in a similar way to most of his contemporaries who wrote on this subject. They went to antiquity to find one precise model of church government and were often a little troubled when they found something which was not quite one thing or another. A more critical method of dealing with their sources would also have been useful to them. If a statement was plain it was generally taken at its face value, if it was obscure it could be argued over; but in the seventeenth century there was little endeavour to estimate the respective values of ancient authors, what opportunity they had for knowing the subject they wrote about, or their freedom from prejudice.

Taylor's reading was immense and he uses the material it offered him liberally. We may feel sometimes that the quotations he brings out so confidently prove very little and, even to do that, are strained more than they ought to be; at the same time, they are not mere pedantry, they are there because Taylor thought them relevant. His language is very temperate for a theological disputant. He was too gentle minded to pad out his book with abuse or to whip up the spirits of his adherents by calling names. There are none of the gorgeous passages which decorate his later work. The prose is plain and, apart from the lavish quotations and a few obsolete words here and there, very readable. Once or twice he even drops into colloquialisms.

Early in 1643 the King appointed Taylor to the living of Overstone in a district between Northampton and Wellingborough where the King's authority was still respected.<sup>1</sup> Gosse conjectures that this was given to Taylor through the influence of the earl of Northampton who was to some extent Taylor's friend.<sup>2</sup> After the Earl's death at the battle of Hopton Heath, on March <sup>the</sup> nineteenth, 1643, his widow still continued to befriend Taylor, so it is possible, though there is no proof of it, that the gift of Overstone was made at their request. It is doubtful if Taylor ever went to his new charge, just as it is doubtful how long he stayed in Oxford.

1. The Overstone registers for the period of Taylor incumbency are no longer in existence.

2. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor". p.27.

Wood says that he was a frequent preacher before the court and that he was attached to the royal army as a chaplain until the decline of the King's cause made him seek refuge in Wales.<sup>1</sup> That is probably like many more of wood's statements, true enough in the main but not to be pressed in detail. Taylor, a royal chaplain, a popular preacher and in favour at court because of his book, would be almost certain to preach before the King.

There is reason also to suppose that, for a time at least, he was a chaplain with a part of the King's forces, but it is almost certain that Taylor was not in unbroken attendance on the King and the army from the time he left his parish until his appearance in Wales.

During the Spring of 1644 he may have paid a visit to Uppingham for in that year the issue of the cavalier news sheet, "Mercurius Aulicus", for the week ending May second contained a piece of information about the parish which had probably been conveyed to Sir John Birkenhead, the writer of the publication, by Taylor himself. Birkenhead would jump at the story for it came very handy to his purpose that week, which was to illustrate the character of the ministers whom Parliament was forcing on the parishes of England in place of the Royalist clergy.

"Monday, May 6. - Now, if you would see what heavenly men these lecturers are, be pleased to take notice, that at Uppingham, in Rutlandshire, the Members have placed one Isaac Massey to teach the People, (for the true pastor, Dr. Jeremy Taylor, for his learning and loyalty is driven thence, his house plundered, his estate seized, and his family driven out of doors.<sup>1</sup>) This Massey, at a communion this last Easter, having consecrated the bread after his manner, laid one hand upon the chalice, and smiting his breast with the other, said to the parishioners - 'As I am a faithful sinner, Neighbours, this is my morning draught;' and turning himself round to them said, 'Neighbour's, here's to ye all!' and so drank off the whole cupfull, which is none of the least. Many of the parish were hereby scandalized, and therefore departed without receiving the Sacrament. Among which, one old man, seeing Massey drink after this manner, said aloud, 'Sir, much good do it you'. Whereupon Massey replied, 'Thou blessest with thy tongue, and cursedest with thy heart; but 'tis no matter, for God will bless whom whou cursedest'. This Massey coming lately into a house of the town, used these words 'This town of Uppingham loves Popery, and we would reform it, but they will not,' (and without any further coherence, said,) 'but I say, whosoever says there is any king in England besides the Parliament at Westminster, I'll

1. This does not necessarily mean that Taylors sequestration had only just taken place as the Dic: Nat: Biog: would imply.

make him for<sup>(sic)</sup> ever speaking more.' The master of the house replied, 'I say there is a king in England besides the Parliament in Westminster,' whereupon Massey, with his cudgel, broke the gentleman's head. Whoever doubts that Mr. Massey is injured by these relations, may satisfy themselves in inquiring of the inhabitants of Uppingham parish."

Written with a purpose though the account is, there is no need to reckon it as untrue. "Mercurius Aulicus" is trustworthy on the whole until the decline of the King's cause.<sup>1</sup>

We have no means of determining what happened to Taylor between the spring of 1644, when he possibly made the visit which has just been referred to, and 1645 when he appeared in Wales, this time bearing out Wood's statement that he served as an army chaplain

At Christmas time, 1644, Rowland Laugharne had captured Cardigan Castle for the Parliament though the Royalists, recognising it as a strategic point of great importance, had garrisoned it very strongly. As soon as the news of its fall came, Colonel Gerard set out from Newcastle Emlyn, one of Lord Garbery's residences in South Wales, to retake Cardigan for the King. He attacked on January twentysecond, 1645, and was repulsed, but he tried again and this time managed to get into the town and cut the bridge, thereby blocking the entry of provisions into the castle; at the same time summoning Colonel Poole, its governor, to surrender.

Poole somehow or other found means to get the news of the castle's danger to Laugharne who returned and attacked the Royalist besiegers. Poole summoned all his resources and made a sally at the same time. Between the two forces Gerard was utterly beaten, loosing "Two hundred slain upon the place, four brass pieces ordnance, six hundred arms, and one hundred and fifty prisoners taken, whereof Major Slaughter, divers inferior officers, and Dr. Taylor."<sup>2</sup> There is no specific statement that this is Jeremy but there is no reason to suppose that it was anybody else.

1. "Cambridge History of English Literature". Vol: vii. p.343. But S.R.Gardiner (History of The Great Civil War. Vol: 1. p. vi) is of the opposite opinion remarking that it is "untrustworthy to the end" being written with the sole end of making Puritans and Parliamentarians ridiculous".
2. Whitelocke. "Memoirs". p.130.

It is difficult to decide what had brought him to Wales. Possibly he had gone with Gerard as Fuller went with Hopton, in order to escape from the noise and unruly life of Oxford. Wood's statement that he was an army chaplain to some extent bears out this supposition. On the other hand he may have been already settled as a schoolmaster in Wales and only left his pupils, as he left his parish at Uppingham, because the King's forces were actually in the neighbourhood. A third possibility, less likely than either of the others, is that he had already become chaplain to Lord Carbery and therefore naturally went with the force which set out from Lord Carbery's residence. There is no means of knowing until more evidence comes to light than we now possess. Neither do we know how he escaped out of the hands of his captors. Laugharne, after his success at Cardigan, advanced to Newcastle Emlyn but there the Royalist forces defeated him and Taylor may have been recaptured or he may have been left behind at Cardigan and afterwards exchanged.

The whole story of Taylor's first appearance in Wales is full of problems. Heber suggested that, Taylor went down to Wales and renewed an acquaintance made previously with a Joanna Bridges who had a property called Mandinam, two miles east of the village of Llangadock, married her and settled down, all before he was drawn into the expedition with Gerard which we have just described.<sup>1</sup> That Taylor married a lady called Joanna Bridges during the time that he was in Wales is undoubted but it is very unlikely that this union took place so early.

Heber partly based his conjecture that Taylor had married Joanna Bridges in 1643 or 1644 on the following passage:-

"In the great storm which dashed the vessel of the church all in pieces," he had been cast on the coast of Wales; and in a little boat thought to have enjoyed that rest and quietness which in England, in a far greater, he could not hope for. "Here", he continues, "I cast anchor; and thinking to ride safely, the storm followed me with such impetuous violence, that it broke a cable, and I lost my anchor. And here again I was exposed to the mercy of the sea, and the gentleness of an

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1. p. xxvi.

element which could neither distinguish things nor persons.<sup>1</sup> And but that he who stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of his waves, and the madness of his people, had provided a plank for me, I had been lost to all the opportunities of content or study. But I know not whether I have been more preserved by the courtesies of my friends, or the gentleness and mercies of a noble enemy."<sup>2</sup>

Taylor's biographers have spent a good deal of ingenuity upon this passage but it must be confessed that the results are meagre, Heber takes the 'little boat' to mean Taylor's settling down with Joanna Bridges, the 'great storm' to be Gerard's attack on Cardigan Castle, and considers the 'noble enemy' to whom Taylor was indebted to be Laugharne himself. In 1644 an edition of the Psalter was published at Oxford under Hatton's name, but which was afterwards classed as a work of Taylor. In 1646, also at Oxford, "A Discourse concerning Prayer extempore" appeared anonymously. This was afterwards expanded by Taylor and published as his own. Heber uses both these incidents to help him in his contention that Taylor was for some time in captivity; in his opinion a prisoner of war would not run the risk of aggravating his position by appearing in print.<sup>2</sup>

Gosse suggests that the 'little boat' represents clerical work of some kind in Wales and that the 'greater' represents Oxford. He objects to the identification of Laugharne as the 'noble enemy' on the ground that 'noble' points to one who was technically a nobleman. He adds that "it would greatly simplify our enquiry if we could persuade ourselves that the noble enemy was Richard Vaughan, the second Earl of Carbery."<sup>3</sup> Gosse admits that Carbery was not at this time actually an enemy, but his standing was so doubtful that diffidence about giving offence either to the king, to whom the

1. This sentence is particularly interesting since it could be pressed to mean that Taylor was not deliberately persecuted but <sup>was</sup> only a sufferer in the general upheaval.
2. Works. Vol: 5. p.341. Gauden at a later date used the same image of escaping from ship-wreck on a plank in his description of the plight in which the Anglican ministers found themselves after Cromwell's edict of November 24th. 1655. "After these poor ministers had gained some little plank or rafter possibly a little refuse living, or a curateship, or a school or a lecture, or some chaplains place in a gentleman's house, by which to save themselves from sinking; they are now alarmed afresh." Gauden. "Petitionary Remonstrance". p.4. Gardiner thinks that the Petitionary Remonstrance" was never presented and was probably not written until about 1660. "History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate". Vol: 3. p.336. note.
3. Heber. 'Life of Jeremy Taylor' (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1. p.xxvii.

"Liberty of Propheying" was to be presented, or to Carbery, his patron, may have been the very cause of Taylor's ambiguity. It is an interesting suggestion but there are arguments against it.

In the first place, 'noble', in the seventeenth century, was undoubtedly applied to many who were not technically of noble birth. It signified moral characteristics as much as rank, and could well be applied by Taylor to Laugharne who, if he released him, had treated him nobly.<sup>1</sup> Also, if Carbery was the enemy, it is hard to say who were the friends who put forth exertion. We have no record of any. In addition, Must, preaching Taylor's funeral sermon in 1667, uses very similar language, either because he knew no more of the facts than we know - in which case he could very well have left out all reference to them since he was not writing a biography, or because the same reason for discretion existed then as existed in 1647, though neither Charles the first, or Carbery's feelings need then have been considered. The whole incident seems inexplicably obscure.<sup>2</sup>

There is, however, one point upon which Taylor's biographers do not seem to have laid sufficient stress. Keeping school was certainly Taylor's main occupation during the first years of his residence in Wales. Throughout that period it was Hatton to whom he looked as a patron rather than to Carbery; both the "Liberty of Propheying" and "The Great Exemplar" were dedicated to him and not until 1651, when "Holy Dying" was published, had Taylor's association with the Vaughan household grown so strong as to displace his former patron.

Associated with Taylor in the school were William Nicholson<sup>3</sup> and William Wyatt.<sup>4</sup> Nicholson had been Master of

1. It may not be irrelevant to note that Laugharne deserted to the King in 1648.
2. Must, "Funeral sermon". (Taylor's Works. Vol.1. p.cccxxii)
3. William Nicholson, born at Stratford, Suffolk, the son of a rich clothier. First a chorister than a bible-clerk at Magdalen college Oxford. At the Restoration he was appointed bishop of Gloucester by Clarendon's interest. He was the patron and friend of George Bull who dedicated to him his work on Justification and wrote his epitaph. Died. Feb. 5th. 1671. Nicholson was the author of a well known exposition of the catechism.
4. William Wyatt born at Todenham in Gloucestershire. Owing to the civil war he did not take his degrees at Oxford until

(Continued)

Croydon Free School until 1629 and later was Archdeacon of Brecon. In 1643 he was named one of the Assembly of Divines but refused to sit and soon after his livings were sequestrated, so that, about the same time that Taylor was without a settled means of living, Nicholson also was in need of an occupation. In default of clerical employment he would naturally think of setting up a school again and where could he do it better than in Wales where his connection lay, and where the Kings power was still supreme Taylor had a family to support; the church could give him nothing and, as circumstances were then, there was little to hope for from a patron. One profession only offered him a living - keeping school. Nicholson was an Oxford man and, though he graduated from Magdalen in 1615, it is quite possible that he would be up at Oxford several times during Taylor's residence there and the two meet. Taylor, needing employment, joins Nicholson, and Wyatt, an Oxford friend of Taylor's is added to their staff. Lord Carbery, as the most influential person in the neighbourhood, would be asked to lend his patronage to the venture. Taylor has entered his 'little boat'.

The school is just set up when Gerard is getting together a force for the attack on Cardigan and Taylor says goodbye to his teaching for the time being to act as chaplain to the expedition. He is taken prisoner, as we have seen, but the help of his friends would be forthcoming - Nicholson would probably appeal to Carbery for help on behalf of his captured partner - and Laugharne, the 'noble enemy', would be prevailed on to release him. All this is based on conjecture but it seems to fit the facts as well as the two guesses previously given.

All we know for certain is that Taylor went to Wales in search of peace and quiet, that the civil war shattered his hopes and disturbed his fortunes for a time but eventually allowed him to settle down to that peaceful life at Golden Grove in which his greatest work was done.

4. (Contd) 1661. After leaving Wales he taught at Lvesham Worcestershire, and then at Twickenham in a school kept by William Fuller who continued his patronage when bishop of Lincoln making Wyatt prebendary (May 13th. 1668) and precentor (Nov; 6th 1668) of that cathedral. died Sept. 9th. 1685.

#### CHAPTER FOUR.

All over England the Loyalist clergy, dispossessed of their livings, were seeking quietness and a means of livelihood. Taylor was more fortunate than many. He was able to spend the best years of his life in peace, away from persecution, straightened for money at times but not depressed by hopeless poverty, in a congenial occupation which left him time enough to develop the literary gift of which he was now fully conscious. In Wales he was to learn how that gift could best be employed. The three friends had considerable success with their school. Several youths were "educated there most loyally and afterward sent to the University".<sup>1</sup> It produced at least one distinguished man, Sir John Powel, who was dismissed from his place on the King's bench for stating, at the trial of the seven bishops, that the Declaration of Indulgence was a nullity. At his death it was recorded on his tombstone that he was educated under Jeremy Taylor

The school was kept at Llanfihangel-Aberbythych, Carmarthenshire, in a house called Newton Hall which suggests that the masters had a fair number of boys under their charge. Wood states that Lord Carbery was the patron of the school<sup>2</sup> and it may have been in this connection that Taylor and he first came into contact. But, however the acquaintance was made, it ripened into the most famous friendship in Taylor's life.

Richard Vaughan, the second Earl of Carbery, was at this time a man nearly fifty years of age. He had lived the normal life of an influential country gentleman before the outbreak of the civil war, travelled, represented a constituency (Carmarthen) in the Parliament of 1624 and succeeded to his earldom in 1634. When the war began energetic action on one side or the other was looked for from him. He disappointed the expectation. As he had raised some troops, he received command of the King's forces in Wales and an English peerage in 1643, but did little to justify

1. Wood. "Ath: Ox:" Art: "Taylor".

2. Ibid.

his appointment for when Rowland Laugharne defeated him in the following year Carbery was glad to pay his fine as a delinquent and in 1647 receive a pardon from Parliament. It did not increase his popularity with the Royalists that he escaped the sequestrations with which their enemies were so liberal in that neighbourhood. It was whispered about that Essex procured him his pardon "for service done by him to Parliament while he was General and proved by a certificate from the General to Parliament"<sup>1</sup> This, however, did not entirely allay Carbery's fears. When, in 1648; Cromwell's campaign in Wales brought him into the neighbourhood of Golden Grove the owner thought it wiser to be out of the way and, accordingly, withdrew to one of his outlying farms and left his wife to do the best she could with the victorious General should he chance to call. He did call, but, whatever his intentions were before his visit, the charm and courtesy of his hostess so disarmed him that when he went on his way he had done no hurt to her or her family. Later on he must have felt some friendliness for Lord Carbery since, when he became Protector, "Cromwell sent from the parks he then possessed near London several stags unto him to furnish his park at Golden Grove in Wales."<sup>2</sup> He was indeed "In a word a fit person for the highest public employment, if integrity and courage were not suspected to be often failing in him."<sup>3</sup>

It was a time when those who were not strong for one side or the other could not hope to be understood. Carbery was a man of refinement; home-loving but without that nobility of mind which on one side was exalting Charles into a martyr to be passionately loved, for whom all must be risked; and which, on the other side, was making personal freedom a thing which none could buy too dearly. Men of Carbery's type do not serve their fellows in heroic ways but they have their uses. If their interest with

1. M.S. circa 1660, printed in the Cambrian Register. Vol: 1. p.164.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. See also, Phillips. "Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and The Marches". (1874) Vol: 2. p.157.

those in power is great enough they may furnish an asylum to those arts which war is apt to destroy. Though Carbery was lukewarm both to King and Parliament, he offered a refuge to Jeremy Taylor. The Parliamentary leaders were not eager to harry a man whose opinions might be different from theirs if he was willing to go quietly about his business. Evelyn, for instance, lived at Deptford as a known Royalist and even kept up a correspondence with his father-in-law, the King's ambassador in Paris, but no one interfered.<sup>1</sup>

Golden Grove is a lovely name for a very lovely place.. The original house where Taylor was entertained was burned down in 1729 and a new dwelling afterwards built on the site. An engraving, published as a frontispiece to Taylor's "Polemical Discourses" in 1657, shows what the house was like when the author lived there. It was a large building surrounded by park land. About a mile away the river Towy flowed past it on the north. There were the ruins of two old castles Dynevor and Dryslwyn well in view. The countryside was thick with trees of differing foliage and sheltered by hills. Grongar Hill, a place which Dyer's poem has made famous, is a little to the west. All this had its influence on Taylor. Although it was a time when natural scenery was not given the place in literature which it has since received, Taylor's writings at Golden Grove show that he was not entirely indifferent to the beauty with which he was surrounded.<sup>2</sup>

But he had not yet escaped from the neighbourhood of wars. On June the fourteenth 1645, The King's army was smashed at Naseby by the Parliamentary forces which outnumbered the Royal troops by nearly two to one. By July the first the King was at Abergaveny not much more than forty miles from Golden Grove seeking help from the gentlemen of Herefordshire and South Wales.<sup>3</sup>

1. Evelyn. "Diary" March 21. 1649. The Diary for this and the following years records a continual series of open visits to his father-in-law in Paris.
2. See Works. Vol: 3. p.330, for a simile drawn from the effect of a high wind on scenery similar to that of Golden Grove.
3. Clarendon. "History of the Rebellion". Vol.9. p.68.

It was near enough for Taylor and his friends to have ridden over and paid their respects to the defeated monarch had they wished. On July the third the King moved on to Raglan still hoping for, and striving to obtain, help from the Welsh, but none was forthcoming. The gentry offered promises which they could not fulfil, volunteers came in very slowly, and pressed men ran away for the people of those parts were not eager to serve the King outside their own borders.<sup>1</sup> All the while bad news came in fast. Pontefract had surrendered, Scarborough Castle had fallen, Hereford was besieged and had little chance of effective resistance, all hope of real succour for the royal cause was dwindling away. Monmouthshire had offered a few men, Glamorganshire a few more men and a little money, but disaffection was growing and every day the King's own safety grew less. Yet out of this darkness a light began to arise. Scotland showed an unexpected disposition to come to terms. Hopeless of doing any good in Wales, on August the fifth the King marched northward. Before another year was over he had surrendered himself to the Scots.

Between the publication of "Episcopacy asserted" in 1642 and the "Liberty of Propheying" in 1647 three minor works associated with Taylor's name appeared. The first, Hatton's Psalter, was afterwards attributed to Taylor on grounds the insufficiency of which will be examined later. The next "A Discourse concerning Prayer Extempore", appeared anonymously in 1646 but, because of the favourable reception it met with from Charles the first, Taylor afterwards expanded the work and it was republished in 1648 with a dedication to the King, then drawing near to his end. The other, "A New Institution of Grammar", was an ordinary piece of schoolmaster's writing. Wood says that Wyatt wrote it and apparently he always claimed it as his.<sup>2</sup> Taylor's part was probably nothing greater than looking over the MS., making a few suggestions and contributing an English dedication, to the

1. Clarendon. "History of the Rebellion". Vol:9. p.68.

2. Wood. "Ath: Ox:" Art: "Taylor". See also wood, "Fasti Oxoniensis," Bat: of Div: 1661. Art: Wyatt.

"Most Hopeful Christopher Hatton, Esquire", one of their pupils, son of Lord Hatton of Kirby whom Taylor obviously still looked upon as his patron. Wyatt supplied a Latin dedication in which he rather pompously refers to the school as "Collegium Newtoniense". Taylor's name had a greater value than Wyatt's who was merely an unknown usher in a Welsh academy so the work was put out as his.

In 1647 he published his "Liberty of Propheying"; a work which is important not only in his own development but in relation to English life and literature as a whole. This was the first of his books to be printed in London. Royston was now his publisher and had bought up the copies which remained of the "Episcopacy Asserted" and reissued them with a new title page in 1647. It was, on the whole, a fortunate relationship, though there were some quarrels during its course. Royston was at the head of his profession in his day. He was bookseller to Charles the first and the two Kings who succeeded him. His royalist publications got him into trouble with the Parliament, but the printing of the Eikon Basilike and the consequent monopoly of printing Charles the first's works which he received at the Restoration must have made sufficient amends.

Taylor's own writings, especially his devotional ones, were extremely popular and likely to be worth any publisher's while. It is to be doubted, though, that the inducement to make money had any effect in setting him to work on the "Liberty of Propheying". The sum he would be likely to gain by it would hardly compensate him for the necessary expenses.<sup>1</sup> Authors then and for some time after looked to the dedication as the most remunerative part of their work, but Hatton, to whom the book was to be offered, was not in the circumstances likely to be very liberal. Taylor wrote because he could not help writing. He

1. For instance Baxter only got £10 for the first impression of his most popular work, "The Saints Everlasting Rest" Milton's £5 for "Paradise Lost" is well known. On the whole subject see "Camb: Hist: of Eng: Lit:" Vol. ix. p.316.

confesses as much in the dedication.

"Since I have come ashore, I have been gathering a few sticks to warm me, a few books to entertain my thoughts, and divert them from the perpetual meditation of my private troubles and the public dyscrasy; but those which I could obtain were so few, and so impertinent and unuseful to any great purposes, that I began to be sad upon a new stock, and full of apprehension that I should live unprofitably, and die obscurely, and be forgotten, and my bones thrown to some common charnel-house, without any name or note to distinguish me from those who only served their generation by filling the number of citizens."<sup>1</sup>

Taylor had the scholar's mentality. In the midst of distresses he turns to books to find an anodyne, and reading leads on naturally to writing without much other thought for the result than that it may bring him fame. He wants a subject which will not need continual reference to a library, for he has few books of his own. Oxford and Cambridge are far away and apparently he is not yet sufficiently intimate with Lord Carbery's household to have the run of the collection which would almost certainly be found at Golden Grove. The tremendous difference in the number of quotations to be found in this work and the number in the sermons, which were published six years later when the friendship with Carbery was settled, show that somehow, in the meantime, Taylor had obtained access to more books than he could afford to buy. He found the subject he wanted. It was suggested to him by the struggle which was going on all around him, from which he had suffered and so many more beside.

There are indications that he had thought for some years on where the bounds of toleration should be set.<sup>2</sup> It was plainly contrary to the Gospel that men should fight over religion. Could not some way be found to settle the differences between Christians without resort to the sword. Once he has made up his mind he writes eagerly, "as if I had thought it possible with my arguments to have persuaded the rough and hard-handed soldiers to have disbanded presently"<sup>3</sup> The arguments are already in his head,

1. Works. Vol. 5 p.341.

2. "I remembered the result of some of those excellent discourses I had heard your Lordship make", shows that he had discussed the subject with Hatton. Works.Vol:5.p.343.

3. Ibid. 5 p. 342.

what he himself has suffered has only made their truth more apparent. we know that he was friendly with Chillingworth in the days when they were both living in Oxford and we know how much Chillingworth's experience as well as his inherent dislike of dogmatism had made him tolerant of religious differences. Now, in his wandering, captivity and poverty, Taylor recalls some of the conversations of the old days to which at the time he had been reckoned indifferent. Absence from books set free Taylor's style but not his mind. He never in all his life belonged to that class of writers which, becoming possessed with some revolutionary idea, thinks it out from the beginning with no conscious debt to others. He is of those who, having had the grounds of an appeal supplied beforehand can present them with a force and beauty of which their authors are incapable.

Toleration had a long and honourable history before Taylor produced his great plea for everyman's right to interpret the Bible according to his own conscience.<sup>1</sup> Advocates of toleration were to be found among the early Christian fathers. They sought it not merely for their own benefit but as a principle. How far they would have been willing to apply it to heathen cults is doubtful for to many of them the very existence of the worship of other deities than their own was the most heinous of offences against truth. Within their own body, however, they were willing to allow differences. Tertullian<sup>2</sup> and Lactantius<sup>3</sup> were both strong in their assertion of the wickedness of persecuting opinions. The rigidity against heretics which increased as the centuries went by, only did so in spite of considerable opposition. Athanasius wished to regain heretics for the church by conciliatory methods. Ambrose condemned the persecution of the Priscillianists and Martin of Tours denounced it as an atrocity because it went so

1. "Prophecy - The interpretation and expounding of Scripture, or divine mysteries. Applied in the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries and sometimes later to exposition of the Scriptures especially in conferences and to Preaching" "Shorter Oxford English Dictionary," Laud defending himself against the charge of disallowing the Geneva Bible, said "I pray God that point of Arminianism Libertas Prophetandi, do not more mischief in short time than is expressible by me". Works. Vol: IV. p.263.
2. "Ad Scapulam." 2.
3. "Div; Inst;" V. 20

far as the shedding of blood. The church as a whole was slow to sanction the infliction of the death penalty upon heretics.

Throughout the middle ages the universal domination of the church did not prevent the existence of a good deal of free speech.<sup>1</sup> The church remained supreme because the bulk of her adherents were satisfied with her sovereignty, not because they feared to offer a challenge. When the reformation came it was itself a triumphant assertion on the part of a vast number of people of the right to alter from beneath an institution which they could no longer support. The reformers by no means repudiated persecution. They burned both Roman Catholics and Servetus, but their movement, whether they recognised it or not, was the assertion of the right to differ for conscience' sake. In making the Bible, interpreted by the best exegesis at each one's command, the supreme guide of conscience the reformers made it impossible for one christian to persecute another and remain logical.

The execution of Servetus called out one plea for toleration which is important. Early in 1554 Calvin published a treatise in defence of the magistrates of Geneva who were responsible for the heretic's death, and, in reply to this, Sebastian Castellio, a Frenchman who had been a friend of Calvin's at Basle, issued a short tract which he signed Martin Bellius. It is a collection of extracts from the fathers and more modern writers in favour of toleration,<sup>2</sup> prefaced by a letter to the Duke of Wurtemberg in which Castellio sketches cautiously but unmistakably the main arguments against persecution. No man can force belief. So many of the matters in dispute are both too obscure and too unimportant to justify persecution. To punish a heretic is to provoke sympathy both with him and his heresy. These

1. Piers Ploughman, and Chaucer, for instance were sufficiently outspoken in their criticisms of the church. See also Trevelyan. "England in the Age of Wycliffe". pp. 104. ff.
2. He quotes from Lactantius, Jerome and Augustine as well as from more modern authors such as Luther, John Brenz and Jacob Schrenck. He was not averse to slightly editing a passage if it sharpened his point.

are the chief but not the only pleas for toleration put forward in the book.<sup>1</sup> It is important to the present study because in 1659 Jeremy Taylor shows himself acquainted with another of Castellio's writings<sup>2</sup> and it is possible that when he wrote the "Liberty of Propheying" Castellio's reply to Calvin was among those few books which he had at hand - those few which a man may carry on horseback.<sup>3</sup> It was portable, it had the quotations from the fathers which he wanted and some of the arguments which he used.

In its own way the Renaissance movement made its own contribution to freedom of thought and one which, though it had little moral force behind it, did useful service. The neoclassicism, which degenerated into scepticism in religion and laxity in morals, was not likely to care about anything sufficiently to persecute, and the better adherents of the movement imbibed enough of the religious tolerance of Greece and Rome to be favourable toward it in their own day. Erasmus was as eager on behalf of toleration as he was for anything and Sir Thomas More, while he allowed persecution a function in real life, granted toleration a place in Utopia.

Throughout the sixteenth century the pleas for toleration increased as the sects which the Reformation had brought into being continued to split into still smaller bodies. The Racovian Catechism, which the Socinians published in 1605, is a good example of a persecuted minority being forced by their circumstances into an assertion of the universal necessity for toleration. Pleas for toleration came naturally with most frequency from those who were most persecuted. The Baptists, who suffered greatly, were quick

1. There is an excellent modern edition. "Concerning Heretics. An anonymous work attributed to Sebastian Castellio. Now first done into English, together with excerpts from other works, of Sebastian Castellio and David Joris, on religious liberty." By Roland Bainton. Columbia University Press. 1936.
2. Works. Vol: 1. p. lxxxiv. The reference occurs in a letter to Evelyn.
3. works. Vol: 5. p. 343.

to see that if there was to be toleration in religion it must come from the state relinquishing all claim to interfere in spiritual affairs.<sup>1</sup> In 1612-3 the English Baptists at Amsterdam declared that as Christ is the King and Lawgiver of his church no magistrate has the right to interfere in matters of religion.<sup>2</sup> The idea was restated over and over again, chiefly by members of their body, until England as a whole had learned the lesson which adversity had taught the dissenters.<sup>3</sup>

Very little progress toward putting toleration into practice will be made until it possesses advocates in the dominant party. Lord Bacon, whose mind was not only great in one or two lines of thought but interested in most of the problems which confronted his age, belonged to the dominant church in England and on two occasions put out pleas for toleration. That they were limited and cautious is not so important as the fact that they were made. They were the beginning of an assertion on the part of those who had the power to persecute that persecution should be stayed and Bacon, being what he was, was not likely to issue them without making sure previously that they would find a sympathetic reception. In his tract "Of Church Controversies" he pleaded for reasonableness all round and for a higher standard of life to be set by the bishops. The ministers whose dissent was of a moderate kind and who were willing to make some show of conformity ought not to be too quickly silenced."Ought they not, I mean the Bishops, to keep one eye open, to look upon the good that those men do, and not to fix them both upon the hurt that they suppose cometh by them".<sup>4</sup> Bacon has no sympathy for such as are "intemperate and incorrigible".<sup>5</sup> but ill-considered words ought not to be pounced upon and made an occasion of silencing a preacher.

1. It is a pity that the Baptists were afterwards among the bitterest persecutors of the Quakers. See. "The Journal of George Fox" (Everyman Edition) pp. 133. 137-8, 141 and numerous other instances in the same book too many to quote.

2. Gardiner. "History of the Civil War" Vol: 1. p.286.

3. See. "Tracts on Liberty of Conscience" 1614-1661. Edited by E.B.Underhill. Published by the Hanserd Knollys Society, London. 1846.

4. Bacon. works. (London. 1824) Vol: 2. p.517.

5. Ibid.

In his other little work "Of the pacification of the church" he pleads for unity in essentials and not too much discussion of inessentials. "In church matters the substance of doctrine is immutable, and so are the general rules of government; but for rites and ceremonies and for the particular hierarchies, policies and discipline of churches, they be left at large. And therefore it is good we return unto the ancient bonds of unity in the church of God, which was, one faith, one baptism and not, one one hierarchy, one discipline"<sup>1</sup> If the suggestions in the last sentence had been accepted many people would have been spared much suffering in the next few years. Not that James the first, for whose consideration the two pamphlets were primarily intended, ever really desired to persecute opinions merely. His attitude was that while God alone can change the minds of men it was the duty of a responsible government to see that as little mischief as possible came from mistaken notions. It is summed up in his directions to the bishops in 1609,-

"Now must I turn me to you my lords and bishops, and even exhort you earnestly, to be more careful than you have been, that your officers may more duly present recusants, than heretofore they have done, without exception of persons; that although it must be the work of God that must make their minds to be altered, yet at least by this course they may be stayed from increasing or insulting upon us."<sup>2</sup>

James the first's intentions were generally good but he was not always master of his fears.

Some thirty three years later than Bacon, another member of the Church of England produced a plea for toleration which far transcended the Lord Chancellor's cautious pamphlets. William Chillingworth, who had spent a large portion his life seeking certainty in religion, going too and fro and finding none, had at last come to rest in the Church of England. In 1637, as his contribution to a controversy begun in 1630 by the Jesuit, Edward Knott, he produced his famous book "The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to salvation". Its cumbrous arrangement makes it

1. Bacon. Works. (London. 1824) Vol: 2. p.529.

2. King James' Works. (Fol: Ed: 1616) p.545. There are many expressions of his desire for toleration scattered up and down the King's works. See. Ibid. pp.100, 140, 248, 268.

difficult reading now though it has been through a vast number of editions and has had an incalculable effect upon the minds of thinking Englishmen since it appeared. It is bound up with Knott's book "Mercy and Truth or Charity maintained by Catholics", in alternate chapters, and there is continual reference to Potter's "Answer to Charity mistaken" to which Knott's book was a reply. Clumsy in arrangement and haunted by the ghost of Dr. Potter as it is, the passages in which Chillingworth shakes himself free of his two encumbrances are an inspiration to all who value clear thinking expressed in simple, forcible English. He had a gift for coining phrases that are not soon forgotten - "The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of protestants."<sup>1</sup> "The difference between a Papist and a Protestant is this; not that the one judges and the other does not judge, but that the one judges his guide to be infallible, the other his way to be manifest".<sup>2</sup> His plea for liberty of conscience is unequivocal. Protestants are inexcusable, in his eyes, if they attempt to force the consciences of any or try to make others accept their own interpretation of doubtful passages of scripture.<sup>3</sup>

Chillingworth had probably thought out a great deal of his book during the discussions with the scholars whom Falkland brought together at his house at Great Tew. One of these, "the ever memorable John Hales", was, in his tract on schism, to go as far as Chillingworth in his protest against persecution of religious opinions, and, like Chillingworth, his main reason for claiming toleration was the difficulty of finding any absolute truth. In his opinion the councils of the church were not composed of those most likely to be disinterested in their search for truth and there was no more trustworthy authority to be found anywhere else. So both Hales and Chillingworth built their argument on the basis that Taylor was to use later on, the difficulty of finding any truth

1. Chillingworth. "Religion of Protestants." (R.T.S. Ed: 1839) Vol. 2. p.427.
2. Ibid. Vol: 1. p. 254.
3. Ibid. Vol: 2. p. 36. p.256.

so overwhelmingly evident that it ought to be forced upon all.

Chillingworth and Hales sought toleration on academic grounds. The Independents demanded it because it was necessary to their lives. Henry Burton whose Protestantism had brought him more than the usual amount of persecution was freed from imprisonment and disabilities by Parliament in 1641, and by 1642 was ministering to an Independent congregation in Friday Street when he issued a pamphlet "The Protestation protested". In it he sketched out a plan of a national church which allowed toleration to other Independent churches, which was found at the Restoration to be the best solution of the problem.<sup>1</sup> Lord Brooke went further. In "A Discourse upon the nature of that episcopacy which is exercised in England" he demanded the widest freedom of speech. None whose doubts were reasonable ought to be forced by violence, no matter how lowly an origin a doubter might have.<sup>2</sup>

But a still more sweeping demand for religious liberty of the widest kind was made by the Welsh-American, Roger Williams, in his famous book "The Bloody Tenent of Persecution", published in 1644. Williams had gone to America in the hope of finding there the liberty he had not found in England and he had been disappointed. The people at Salem offered to make him their assistant minister but the magistrates objected for Williams had already made known his doctrine that every man ought to be left entirely free in matters of religion; he had also added to his unpopularity by a written statement that the Indians had some right to their land. Threatened with banishment, Williams still clung to his teaching that the power of magistrates only extends to the outward affairs of men. He fled to the woods and lived on the kindness of friendly Indians until he at last succeeded in founding the state of Rhode Island as an entirely free democracy. It was while he was in England in 1643-4 to obtain a charter for his new state that he published his famous book in which he set

1. Gardiner. "Hist: of Eng:" Vol. 10. p.35.

2. Ibid. pp.35-7.

out before the world the principle of entire individual religious liberty which his whole life had proclaimed.

In a remarkable pamphlet published in March 1644 the anonymous author desired a toleration which was even more inclusive than that which Williams had demanded for he wished the belligerent armies to be disbanded, both the King and the Parliament to forego their opposing claims and every man to enjoy peaceably his own religious opinions without interfering with his fellow. Only Romanism was to be forbidden and that on the ground that it was idolatrous, though even then its followers were not to suffer for their obstinacy.<sup>1</sup>

By this time discussion on toleration was no longer confined to books. The public were talking about it. Independency was strong in the Parliamentary army therefore the army clamoured for religious toleration, and what the army wanted it was certain to try and get. In January 1644 Charles the first as a move in the political game offered the Independents, through Vane, liberty of conscience; but what was intended to be a secret negotiation came out and died in an atmosphere of increased suspicion.<sup>2</sup> There was very little real feeling for toleration on either side as yet though both the King and the army leaders were willing to stretch a point or two for those who would give them loyal service. A number of people who had a constitutional dislike for dogmatism were leaving London where hard and fast Presbyterianism was every day becoming more demanded and joining the King in the hope of finding a freer atmosphere with him, a hope which was not always fulfilled. Fuller was one of these. By his sermons, first in London and afterwards in Oxford, he had laboured with all the power that was in him to make each side try and understand the other. London was not to be convinced. Fuller's moderation was supposed to be Royalism and he was ordered

1. For a discussion of the possible authorship of this work see Gardiner. "History of the Civil War". Vol: 1. p. 290. Also "English Hist: Review." Vol:1. p.144.
2. Gardiner. "Hist: of Civil War." Vol: 1. p. 274. *ibid.* p. 310.

to take the Covenant. Rather than do so he withdrew to the king at Oxford. His desire to compromise brought him no great popularity there and after a short stay he left to join Hopton as an army chaplain; a course which Chillingworth for similar reasons pursued.

Inclination and political necessity were both making the Presbyterianism of the Parliamentary authorities increasingly rigid. In 1644, in order to add to their favour with the Scots, Parliament issued an ordinance directing that the Covenant should be taken by every Englishman over the age of eighteen, the names of those who refused were to be reported to the Parliament. It was an attempt to rivet Presbyterianism fast upon England.

Individualism found one vigorous champion in Milton. He had been writing, and making public, his unpopular opinions on divorce and the fact that he had offended against a Parliamentary regulation in issuing one of his tracts without permission of the licensers made him begin to consider the whole subject of the freedom of the press. On November twentyfourth, 1644, he published his famous "Areopagitica", a defence of unlicensed printing. Writing primarily to plead for the freedom of the press, Milton widened his argument to demand unstinted liberty for every intellectual activity. Everybody declared themselves eager for truth but if their professions were to be carried into practice they must give up the claim to decide what was evil and ought to be suppressed. Good and bad must grow together and let time make the true nature of each manifest. Milton had made a sweeping and eloquent plea which was worthy of even his great name. He had dignified the literature of toleration and ennobled the whole controversy.

But there was no one yet who was willing to translate Milton's spirit into action. Charles the first was always attempting from expediency to grant a little of the toleration which could only have been helpful to him if given on principle. In February 1645 he consulted the clergy at Oxford on the possible

limits of the religious freedom he might grant to his enemies. The result with a declaration which contained a complete sketch of national toleration, and one which the leaders of the Anglican clergy were willing to accept. Assisted by this the King's Commissioners at Uxbridge offered a plan of church government which if it had been put forward a few years earlier might at least have taken all religious bitterness out of the quarrel between King and Parliament. According to this plan episcopacy was to be retained but <sup>the</sup> bishops were to exercise their jurisdiction with the help of an elected synod of presbyters. Parliament was to remedy all abuses and the Book of Common Prayer was to undergo such alteration as would make it agreeable to its users. Everybody was to have entire freedom in matter of ceremony.<sup>1</sup> The Oxford clergy had given it as their opinion that toleration should be granted to both Presbyterians and Independents by suspending all the laws against them. But the Uxbridge proposals brought no results. The Independents were too full of suspicion and dislike of the King to accept his concessions.

The year 1647 which saw the publication of Taylor's book saw several practical attempts to find a basis for toleration though all were doomed to failure. The Heads of Proposals, laid before the army and approved by them in that year, repeated the old suggestion of taking away coercive power from the bishops and abolished all penal legislation on religious matters as the laws then stood, but, fearful lest the Roman Catholics should gain any encouragement, suggested that some fresh legislation should be brought forward against them in place of the Recusancy Acts. It was very similar to the plan which did actually succeed in 1689 but Charles could not accept it as it was originally proposed. In August 1647, during the course of <sup>a</sup> discussion between the King and the army on the Heads of Proposals, it was agreed that the suggested toleration should include Roman Catholics who would take the oath of allegiance in a modified form. This was tentatively approved of by

1. "The Clergy's Paper tendered concerning religion. Feb. 10th." Printed in "The English Hist: Review." Vol. II. p. 341.

a committee of English Roman Catholic clergy and submitted to Rome for the Pope's consideration. But Charles found it difficult to preserve the simple and direct dealing which would have given the proposals a chance to be put into operation. He shuffled until the negotiations broke down and the hope of peace on these terms was lost.<sup>1</sup> The King was now near London. On August the twentyfourth he had been moved from Holmby House and brought to Hampton Court while the army quartered itself at Putney. On the twentysixth, in order to make some show of satisfying the Scots the Newcastle Propositions, which were equivalent to a total surrender to the Parliament and Presbyterianism were reintroduced to Parliament, but Charles was given to understand that his real hope of compromise lay with the army and the independents. Taylor was now to gain personal knowledge of those complicated manœuvres for a settlement between the king and his subjects of which he had previously known by letter and hearsay. In August 1647 he was himself in London, in close contact with the King and well aware of all that was being done. On the twentyeighth, Charles, who was in doubt as to what degree of toleration he could lawfully allow the Independents, once more consulted the clergy and Taylor was among those whose opinion was asked. There are copies of the question and answer still surviving one of them written out in Dr. Hammond's own beautifully clear hand.

Qu:

Whether upon any necessity or exigence of state it bee lawfull for a Christian Prince, beside the religion established, so to tolerate the exercise of other religions in his Kingdom, as to oblige himself not to punish any subject for the exercise of any of them.

Answer:

That

Although every Christian Prince bee obliged by all just and Christian wayes to maintain and promote to his power the Christian religion in the truth and purity of it, yet in case of such exigence and concernment of Church and state, as that they cannot in human reason probably be preserved otherwise. We cannot say that in conscience it is unlawfull, but that a Christian Prince hath in such exigents a latitude allowed him, the bounding whereof is by God left to him"<sup>2</sup>

1. Gardiner. "History of the Civil War". Vol: 3. p. 329 and p.354.
2. Bodleian. Tanner MS. No.58. There are two copies of this document both in the Tanner MS. and numbered 58. That in Hammond's writing has only nine signatures, the other has twelve, though in both cases the signatures are original. On both papers Taylor is the last to sign.

This opinion was signed by twelve leading clergy among them Jeremy Taylor.

The Liberty of Prophesying had been published in the previous June and Taylor's ostensible purpose in London was no doubt to see his book through the press. Neither the King, who is said to have disapproved of the wide bounds of the toleration proposed by Taylor in his work or Hammond, who objected to the teaching on baptism, which Taylor had included can have been seriously displeased with him since they were willing to take his opinion on so important a matter.

On October thirteenth 1647 another possible scheme of toleration was introduced into the House of Lords and debated there. It provided for Presbyterianism to be accepted for three years in the church. Those who wished to worship in other ways could do so unless they were Papists or refused to accept the Apostle's Creed or had been excommunicated by the recent decree. Everyone was to attend the worship of God somewhere on Sunday, unless they could show a good cause for being absent. When the plan came to be debated in the House of Commons toleration was withheld from those who wished to use the Book of Common Prayer and consequently all hope of Charles' listening to the proposals was taken away.<sup>2</sup> On either side it was only the Independents who cared for toleration as anything more than a political manoeuvre. In December of the same year Charles was treating with the Scots. He agreed with them to confirm the Covenant by an act of Parliament, though no one else was to be forced to take it. Presbyterianism was to be allowed for three years while an assembly of Divines, of which twenty members were to be nominated by himself, discussed the final settlement of the church. Whatever conclusion they came to was to be ratified by Parliament, and Charles, now that he was friendly with the Presbyterians, turned his back on the Independents and promised to suppress them. This coalition broke up as might have been expected.

1. Lords "Journals". Vol: 9. p. 482.

The "Liberty of Propheying" was published in June 1647. Taylor wrote rapidly. It is a mistake to consider him a lonely thinker in a country place cut off from all that might shape his thought or influence his book. He is certain to have been familiar with all that the fathers and the Anglican writers on toleration had produced, and the various political negotiations of which toleration had been a feature would for the most part be known to him. He would be certain to be well acquainted with the opinion of the Oxford clergy which had been used as the basis of the Uxbridge proposals for he had many friends in that city. The books of Chillingworth, Hales and Castellio and, possibly, the Racovian Catechism would be handy.<sup>1</sup> Daille's "Du Vrai Usage des Pères";<sup>2</sup> was a book which the Great Tew group thought very highly of and which Falkland himself had partly translated. This we know that Taylor used for he refers his readers to it.<sup>3</sup>

Here was all the material he needed. To say that Taylor took his thoughts from other sources no more detracts from the greatness of his work than it lowers Shakspeare's plays to say that he borrowed his plots elsewhere. Taylor's dedications are always important and the one to Lord Hatton prefixed to the "Liberty of Propheying" is particularly so. After describing the conditions under which he set to work he quotes fifteen texts as the basis of all that he has to say in the book which is to follow. He makes an effort to clear the air and to get members of one body to look at those of another without letting theological prejudice colour their vision too much.

"If persons be Christians in their lives and Christians in their profession, if they acknowledge the eternal son of God for their Master and their Lord, and live in all relations as becomes persons making such professions, why then should I hate such persons whom God loves and who love God, who are partakers of Christ and Christ in them, because their understandings have not been brought up like mine, have not had the same masters, they have not met with the same books nor the same company, or have the same interest, or are not so wise, or else are wiser; that is, for some reason or other which I neither do understand nor ought to blame, have not the same opinions that I have, and do not determine the school-questions to the sense of my sect or interest."<sup>4</sup>

1. Taylor makes no reference to Socinianism in this book but in his other works he shows himself to be acquainted with its teachings. See Works. Vol: 7. p.551. Ibid.p. 563. and two letters to Evelyn given Works. Vol: 1. p.lxvii. Ibid. p.lxxxii.
2. Geneva, 1632.                      3. Works. Vol.5. p.488.                      4. Ibid. p.346.

But this attitude may make people think that he is indifferent to religion so he defends himself against this accusation by stating the limits of his discourse.

"First I answer, that whatsoever is against the foundation of faith, or contrary to good life and the laws of obedience, or destructive to human society and the public and just interests of bodies politic, is out of the limits of my question, and does not pretend to compliance or toleration; so that I allow no indifferency, nor any countenance to those religions whose principles destroy government, nor to those religions (if there be any such) which teach ill life; nor do I think that anything will now excuse from belief of a fundamental article, except stupidity or sottishness and natural inability. This alone is sufficient answer to this vanity; but I have much more to say."<sup>1</sup>

Under the second heading all he pleads for is "That men would not make more necessities than God made which indeed are not many".<sup>2</sup>

His third defence is that God alone can judge such matters and the fourth that "No part of the discourse teaches or encourages variety of sects and contradiction of opinions, but supposes them already in being."<sup>3</sup> He adds two more reasons. His book aims at encouraging honesty in religious opinions not dissimulation and he is pleading against the use of too severe remedies in cases of theological disease. Taylor goes on to show the origin of intolerance in the church. It came in, he says, "with the retinue and train of Antichrist" by which he means the increasing worldly prosperity of Christianity "When the church's future grew better, and her sons grew worse and some of her fathers worst of all."<sup>4</sup>

The first three hundred years was the golden age of the church. There was no persecution at all then. This appeal to the early ages is thoroughly Anglican. He mentions thirteen of the fathers whose testimony he intends to refer to in his book as condemning persecution. This is interesting because it shows quite clearly that he must have had some compendium of the relevant passages similar to Castellio's to which he could refer. If the works of all the fathers he quotes from had been accessible he could hardly have complained of a shortage of books. Either he

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 346.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. p. 347.

4. Ibid. p. 349.

had somebody else's collection of extracts at hand or toleration had interested him longer than is supposed, and so deeply that at some time when he was near to a library he had made a commonplace book on this one subject.

As the ages grew worse so men grew more cruel, the argument goes on. Arius behaved himself so badly that a temporary decree for his relegation had to be obtained, but it was soon taken off and then God punished the heretic, but Atticus and Nestorius and some others persecuted relentlessly. The wisdom of toleration is proved by the prosperity of merciful princes. In the church of Rome the Popes from Innocent the first onward became increasingly fond of persecution, but they stopped short of inflicting death until Dominic preached his crusade against the Albigenses.

The purpose of the page or two which follow is to make sure that the reader understands what Taylor's attitude toward error really is:-

"Let all errors be as much and as zealously suppressed as may be (the doctrine of the following discourse contradicts not that); but let it be done by such means as are proper instruments of their suppression, by preaching and disputation (so that neither of them breathe disturbance), by charity and sweetness, by holiness of life, assiduity of exhortation, by the word of God and prayer."<sup>1</sup>

A man who believes the apostle's Creed and lives a good life is secure. There is no need for men to argue about the smaller points on which the sects are so severe:-

"In five hundred sects which are in the world (and for ought I know there may be five thousand) it is five hundred to one but that every man is damned; for every sect damns all but itself, and that is damned of four hundred and ninety nine"<sup>2</sup>

The only hope for a Christian distracted by mutually condemnatory sects is to cling to "the creed of the apostles; and in all other things an honest endeavour to find out what truths we can, and a charitable and mutual permission to others that disagree from us and our opinions."<sup>3</sup>

Christian controversialists ought not to falsify their opponent's cases either by suppressing or altering their books or

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 354.

2. Ibid. p. 355.

3. Ibid. p. 357.

fathering upon them arguments which they themselves repudiate; truth and modesty are the best, as well as the strongest, weapons. All his life Taylor's chief concern was with practical religion rather than with speculative theology, and he draws his dedication to a close on that note.

What holiness of life consisted of everybody could be certain:-

"I am certain that a drunkard is as contrary to God, and lives as contrary to the laws of Christianity, as a heretic; and I am also sure that I know what drunkenness is; but I am not sure that such an opinion is heresy."<sup>1</sup>

And again, he says:-

"How many volumes have been writ about angels, about immaculate conception, about original sin, when all that is solid reason or clear revelation in all these three articles may be reasonably enough comprised in forty lines? And in these trifles and impertinencies men are curiously busy, while they neglect those glorious precepts of Christianity and holy life which are the glories of our religion, and would enable us to a happy eternity."<sup>2</sup>

In his last paragraph Taylor states that he owes a good deal of what he is about to say to Hatton himself:-

"Your lordship knows your own; but out of your mines I have digged the mineral, only I have stamped it with my own image, as you may perceive by the deformities which are in it."<sup>3</sup>

He then ends with a well-turned compliment on the estimation in which Hatton is held by both the learned and the pious.

This dedication is particularly interesting because Taylor had foreseen that he would run a good deal of risk of misunderstanding on the part of the zealots who thought that toleration could only proceed from loose morals, so he takes the opportunity a dedication offers him to explain what his attitude toward truth and untruth was and at the same time to sketch the main lines on which he is about to develop his argument.

Jeremy Taylor divided the "Liberty of Propheying" into twentytwo sub-sections, but the book really falls under three main heads. One, that, while the essentials of our duty are clear, there is no infallible guide to truth; two, that the enlightened

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.359.

2. Ibid. p.361.

3. Ibid. p.364.

reason is the best guide we have; three, an enquiry into how far people of a good life who seem to err in speculative matters are to be tolerated. He begins with an enquiry into the nature of faith, meaning by that word what is objectively to be believed rather than a psychological function. There are many things discussed in theology which we can very well be ignorant of, what is indispensable is that we should believe Christ to be the Son of God, for:-

"All that Christ when He preached taught us to believe, and all that the apostles in their sermons propound, all aim at this, that we should acknowledge Christ as our Lawgiver and our Saviour; so that nothing can be necessary by a prime necessity to be believed explicitly, but such things which are therefore parts of the great article".<sup>1</sup>

If it is argued that what is deducible from this ought to be believed also, Taylor is willing to agree if the person who is to believe it really does see it to be deducible, but there will certainly be many who cannot and on them the obligation is not binding.

The Apostle's Creed is the summing up of all that is completely indispensable in Christianity. If it was insufficient why was it accepted in the early days as the badge of Christianity. Everyone is at liberty to add to his own creed such things as he may be honestly persuaded of, but he must not attempt to force those additions upon others. The only foundation necessary for religion is that simple one which Christ and his Apostles laid.

Having discussed what he means by faith, Taylor now explains what he means by heresy. In apostolic days, he declares, heresy was always the denial of the simple, fundamental doctrines of Christianity mentioned in the Apostle's Creed or such teaching as resulted in an evil life. As time went on heresy was given a wider connotation and so the word was more frequently used, but still everybody who was classed as a heretic was not condemned. He tries to show that as time went on the church's treatment of heretics became less wise and less certain and "Even when general assemblies of prelates have been, some controversies that have

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 370.

been very vexatious have been pretermitted, and others of less consequence have been determined."<sup>1</sup>

The Council of Nicea produced its creed in an effort to provide a final settlement of the church's faith but it was unsuccessful from that point of view. Many other creeds were produced, among them the Athanasian, the severest of all. To sum up this section:-

"The nature of faith and its integrity consists in such propositions which make the foundation of hope and charity, that which is sufficient to make us to do honour to Christ, and to obey Him. And to encourage us in both; and this is completed in the apostle's creed. And since contraries are of the same extent, heresy is to be judged by its proportion and analogy to faith, and that is heresy only which is against faith. Now because faith is not only a precept of doctrines, but of manners and holy life, whatsoever is either opposite to an article of creed, or teaches ill life, that's heresy."<sup>2</sup>

Taylor next goes on to see if it is possible to find some sufficient authority to settle all the vexed questions which lie outside the Apostle's Creed. The Bible, he decides, is not capable of providing this authority, since it contains in itself too many causes of uncertainty. In the first place there are many different versions and many different readings. There are also different ways of expounding the scriptures, some may do so in a literal some in a spiritual manner. Often the sense of two different passages taken plainly and literally may seem to contradict each other. For instance, anyone arguing that there are differences in degrees of reward hereafter might well quote the parable of the talents; his adversary, arguing that all are rewarded to the same extent, might equally well quote the parable of the labourers in the vineyard. There are also many places where the mysteries spoken of are so deep that only "very holy and spiritual" people can understand them.

"Of this nature are the spirit of oblation, belief of particular salvation, special influences and comforts coming from a sense of the spirit of adoption, actual fervours and great complacencies in devotion, spiritual joys, which are little drawings aside of the curtains of peace and antepasts of immortality".<sup>3</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.402.
2. Ibid. p. 409.
3. Ibid. p. 419.

Some passages if they were pressed would overthrow the practice of a good part of christendom. The text that "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God".<sup>1</sup> is used as an argument for infant baptism, but we do not argue from the other text that "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you"<sup>2</sup> that infants ought to be communicated. So, from its own nature, scripture is difficult and this is added to because we have no certain means of expounding it. None of the different methods of exegesis in use are infallible. Again we can find no certainty except in that upon which all Christians are said to be agreed, namely the contents of the Apostle's Creed.

Taylor next examines the claims of tradition both to expound scripture satisfactorily and to bring clear light to bear upon difficult questions. But those claims are ill founded for traditions are both contradictory, and, uncertain, and the churches which value traditions most highly, spoil their effect by picking and choosing among them.

But there is another source of truth which has been trusted in its day:-

"Since we are all this while in uncertainty, it is necessary that we should address ourselves somewhere where we may rest the sole of our foot; and nature, scripture, and experience, teach the world in matters of question to submit to some final sentence. For it is not reason that controversies should continue till the erring person shall be willing to condemn himself; and the Spirit of God has directed us by that great precedent at Jerusalem, to address ourselves to the church, that in a plenary council and assembly she may synodically determine controversies. So that if a general council have determined a question or expounded scripture, we may no more disbelieve the decree than the spirit of God himself who speaks in them."<sup>3</sup>

Yet here again there is no absolute certainty to be found, for councils have been so often corrupt and unworthy and there is no promise that God will reveal the truth by them in all circumstances and "There are so many questions concerning the efficient, the form, the matter of general councils, and their manner of proceeding, and their final sanction, that after a question is

1. St. John. iii. 5.
2. St. John. vi. 53.
3. Works. Vol: 5. p.442.

determined by a conciliary assembly, there are perhaps twenty more questions to be disputed before we can with confidence either believe the council upon its mere authority or obtrude it upon others."<sup>1</sup> Another point to be considered is that

"There is no general council that hath determined that a general council is infallible; no scripture hath recorded it, no tradition universal hath transmitted to us any such proposition; so that we must receive the authority at a lower rate and upon a less probability than the things consigned by that authority. And it is strange that the decrees of councils should be esteemed authentic and infallible, and yet it is not infallibly certain that the councils themselves are infallible, because the belief of the council's infallibility is not proved to us by any medium but such as may deceive us."<sup>2</sup>

This section of Taylor's argument is reinforced by such a wide range of historical allusion in illustration of the discrepancies and contradictions of councils that either he had one of the most amazing memories for theological history that England has ever known or else he was writing with most carefully prepared notes before him. His own statement about lack of books would rule out the possibility that he had the sources themselves at hand for his range of authorities is enormous.

In the next section he takes his argument still further. If councils are not infallible then most certainly the Pope is not. Taylor examines a mass of texts from the Bible which in their day have been used and misused in the cause of Papal infallibility. He dismisses the Romanist interpretation of most of them as fanciful and strained. To take one example. It had been argued that because Christ prayed for St. Peter that his faith might not fail it followed that the prayer included the Popes also who were St. Peter's successors. That argument is of little use:-

"For it may be remembered that for all this prayer of Christ for St. Peter, the good man fell foully, and denied his Master shamefully; and shall Christ's prayer be of greater efficacy for his successors for whom it was made but indirectly and by consequence, than for himself for whom it was directly and in the first intention? And if not, then for all this argument the Popes may deny Christ as well as their chief and predecessor Peter"<sup>3</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 5. -.452. Compare, Hales, "On Schism." Works. (Ed: 1765) Vol: 1. p.60.
2. Ibid. p.453.
3. Ibid. p.464.

Even if St. Peter was head of the Apostles it did not follow that the privileges and mission conferred upon St. Peter descended to the Popes. The attitude of the fathers toward Papal infallibility helped its exponents very little for a good many of the fathers opposed Rome and a good many more were very equivocal in their support. In addition the dealings of the Popes with false doctrine has often been so uncertain and wavering that no trust can be put in such a power. The fathers can do very little more than the Pope in determination of disputed questions. In the past many have dissented from their conclusions with good cause and there is no reason why we should not do the same. Those who quote the fathers most, pick and choose, refusing to follow those authorities which are against themselves.

The next possible source of truth to be discussed is the church in her "diffusive capacity."

"In which capacity she cannot be supposed to be a judge of controversies, both because in that capacity she cannot teach us, as also because if by a judge we mean all the church diffused in all its parts and members, so there can be no controversy for if all men be of that opinion, then there is no question contested, if they be not all of a mind, how can the whole diffusive catholic church be pretended in defiance of any one article, where the diffusive church being divided, part goes this way and part another"?<sup>1</sup>

all the authorities fail to provide a sufficient guide whereby men may determine truth. Reason proceeding upon the strongest grounds remains the best guide:-

"He that follows his guide so far as his reason goes along with him, or, which is all one, he that follows his own reason (not guided only by natural arguments but by divine revelation and all other good means) hath great advantages over him that gives himself wholly to follow any human guide whatsoever, because he follows all their reasons and his own too; he follows them till, reason leaves them, or till it seems so to him, which is all one to his particular; for by the confession of all sides an erroneous conscience binds him when a right guide does not bind him. But he that gives himself up wholly to a guide is oftentimes (I mean if he be a discerning person) forced to do violence to his own understanding, and to loose all the benefit of his own discretion, that he may reconcile his reason to his guide."<sup>2</sup>

Reason itself often errs but in ways that are not culpable for understandings are different and, in their differing,

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 492.
2. Ibid. p. 495.

bound to err, therefore everyone should be modest in his opinion and the less he knows the more modest he should be. Often men are misled by prejudice or the apparent success of wrong opinions or a faulty education. Sometimes the impostures of adversaries confirm men in their own wrong opinion or they are overcome by the testimony of false miracles or some small thing like a proverb or the mere reputation of a learned man will fix wrong opinions in men.

"And therefore as there are so many innocent causes of error as there are weaknesses within, and harmless and unavoidable prejudices from without; so if every error be procured by a vice, it hath no excuse, but becomes such a crime, of so much malignity, as to have influence upon the effect and consequent, and by communication makes it become criminal."<sup>1</sup>

It is the wrong teaching which leads to bad acts which ought to be punished:-

"No christian is to be put to death, dismembered or otherwise directly persecuted for his opinion, which does not teach impiety or blasphemy. If it plainly and apparently brings in a crime, and himself does act it or encourage it, then the matter of fact is punishable according to its proportion or malignity."<sup>2</sup>

No one should under any circumstances give a certain punishment for an uncertain fault:-

"If he be killed, he is certainly killed; but if he be called heretic, it is not so certain that he is a heretic."<sup>3</sup>

In the parable of the wheat and the tares the right way to treat error is shown, for both are to grow together until the harvest.

Persecution is not only wrong it is unwise. When times change the persecuted may themselves persecute. No man can be compelled by force to make any real alteration in his opinions. Taylor rapidly reviews church history to show that persecution came into the christian family with the growth of self-interest and temporal designs. But because persecution is not to be allowed it does not follow that the governors of the church are to be neglectful of their charge. Those who are in error:-

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.510. Compare Chillingworth. "Rel: of Prot:" Vol: 2. p.222.
2. Ibid. p.514.
3. Ibid. p.517.

"Must be convinced by sound doctrine, and put to silence by spiritual evidence, and restrained by authority ecclesiastical, that is, by spiritual censures, according as it seems necessary to him who is most concerned in the regiment of the church"<sup>1</sup>

as far as the attitude of princes toward faulty doctrine among their subjects is concerned it is clearly their duty to tolerate all differences of opinion which do not lead to evil deeds. To do otherwise would be to usurp the function of God. But the laws which are made are to be maintained and those who plead weakness of conscience as a ground for exemption from their working are by no means to be encouraged, for:-

"I have known in some churches that this pretence hath been nothing but a design to discredit the law to dismantle the authority that made it, to raise their own credit and a trophy of their zeal, to make it a characteristic note of a sect and the cognisance of holy persons: and yet the men that claimed exemption from the laws upon pretence of having weak consciences, if in hearty expression you had told them so to their heads, they would have spit in your face, and were so far from confessing themselves weak, that they thought themselves able to give laws to christendom, to instruct the greatest clerks, and to catechize the church herself."<sup>2</sup>

The Anabaptists were the class of dissenters to whom the orthodox Presbyterians and Anglicans were least willing to extend toleration. Taylor now takes up their case. The two main tenets which distinguished them, in spite of a number of changing beliefs, were the repudiation of infant baptism and refusal to recognize certain functions of the civil power. Taylor first states the case for infant baptism then that against it to show that there is something to be said for the Anabaptists. It may have been felt, after the issue of the book, that he had put their case too strongly, for in the second edition<sup>3</sup> he added a long refutation of their arguments. The other opinion of the Anabaptists that "It is not lawful for princes to put malefactors to death, nor to take up defensive arms, nor to minister an oath, nor to contend in judgement"<sup>4</sup> is answered very simply. There must be law and order in the world and if those notions were tolerated it would be overthrown.

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.531.
2. Ibid. p.538.
3. That of 1657.
4. Works. Vol: p.589.

Taylor considers the position of Roman Catholics last of all. Here he was on peculiarly difficult ground. The Roman Catholics hold all the articles of the apostle's Creed. They hold more besides, but he had previously stated that so long as a man's opinions were harmless and he made no attempt to force them on others he could believe what he liked. He holds to that opinion now, though to do so would infallibly damn his book in the eyes of the party with whom the decision to tolerate, or not to tolerate, would come to rest more and more. If he had intended to write an eloquent appeal for anglicanism to be let alone Taylor ought to have avoided the subject of Romanism. That he mentions it may perhaps show that his desire for complete toleration was genuine. Taylor is willing to grant to Romanists the liberty he grants to others, freedom to hold any speculative doctrines which do not endanger either good morals or the state. This was a great advance on all the schemes of toleration which had preceeded Taylor's, for the Protestant dissenters while vigorously demanding freedom of worship for themselves were equally vigorous in refusing it to Roman Catholics.

The last question to be touched upon is how far communion, that is fellowship, between different churches is to be allowed. He decides that churches are "Bound to allow communion to all those who profess the same faith upon which the apostles did give communion"<sup>1</sup> and individuals must follow the laws of their churches. There the book ends, but in the edition of 1657 Taylor added the beautiful story of Abraham which he had found, he says, in the "Jew's books". Actually he quoted it from Gentius, who in turn borrowed the story from the Persian poet Saadi and inserted it in the dedication he prefixed to his translation of Rabbi Solomon ben Virga's "Shebet Jehuda," (Rod of Judah)<sup>2</sup> but the fact that he found it in a book of Jewish history probably led Taylor to make the

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 604.

2. Ameterdam. 1615. Taylor was therefore not acquainted with the story when he published the first edition of "Liberty of Propheying."

mistake about its origin.

"When Abraham sat at his tent door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers; he espied an old man stooping and leaning on his staff, weary with age and travel, coming towards him, who was a hundred years of age. He received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, caused him to sit down; but observing that the old man eat and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, he asked him why he did not worship the God of heaven: the old man told him that he worshipped the fire only, and acknowledged no other god; at which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham, and asked him where the stranger was; he replied, "I thrust him away because he did not worship Thee": God answered him, "I have suffered him these hundred years, although he dishonoured Me, and couldst thou not endure him one night when he gave thee no trouble?" Upon this saith the story "Abraham fetched him back again and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction."<sup>1</sup>

The story has had an interesting history since Taylor brought it to light. Benjamin Franklin sent it in a letter to Lord Kaimes and, as he had not mentioned the authors name, it was assumed that it was written by Franklin himself. That misconception, however, has long since been put right and the passage finds its way into a good many anthologies as an example of Taylor's style.

"The Liberty of Propheying" is a remarkable book. Many people may be inclined to class it as Taylor's greatest production though to do so is to under value higher achievements elsewhere in Taylor's works such as the originality, and consummate success, of his decorated style and the enduring influence of his devotional writings. There was not much in the Liberty of Propheying that was completely new, it did not lay down and develop any far reaching philosophical principle though here Taylor seems to have missed his chance for there was a germ of freedom in Arminianism which, had he possessed gifts of mind equal to those with which he was endowed in the heart and the imagination, might well have been made the basis of his thesis. But the most that it claims is that no one should persecute for there is not sufficient certainty in religious matters for its justification. It would be hard to prove that it had any great influence at the time of its publication or afterward. Lovers of intellectual freedom have never saturated

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 604.

their minds with it as they have done with Milton's *Areopagitica*. Certainly it was not that sudden flame of liberty breaking out in the universal darkness of persecution which it is sometimes made out to be. It was nevertheless a noble and generous hearted outburst. Though it has little of the literary glory of *Holy Dying* it is one of the best examples of that very sound plain style in which Taylor was no less at home than in his more elaborate manner.

The *Liberty of Propheying* has been very useful to Taylor's reputation for the subject and his treatment of it have given him a wider appeal than the preacher and the theologian could hope to claim. Through it many have become acquainted with that sweetness of spirit and nobility of mind which though they were never absent from Taylor's work might have otherwise remained unknown to them. Those who respect and admire the *Liberty of Propheying* do so because of the character revealed in it and not because of the intellectual propositions it advances. All that Taylor put into it he learned elsewhere except the skill in presentation and the loving kindness which broods over the whole. It was, as an effort has been made to show, the development of that definite feeling for toleration which the spread of sectarianism and an increasing lack of certainty in religious truth had brought to light, a process which was aided in Taylor by the bitter struggles of the age in which he wrote.

The rationalistic school which had grown up at Leyden had made its presence felt in England before Taylor added to its influence there. The "*Religion of Protestants*" had not been written primarily for the discussion of toleration but Chillingworth as far as his scope allowed, had not been less decisive in demanding it. Hales, in his short tract on Schism, had been content to leave his "*hardy paradoxes*" without proof. Taylor widened the influence of the ideas of both these men tremendously by making them the subject of a whole work, by reinforcing their statements with arguments and proof, by making explicit what they had left implied

and by writing his work in such a way that it would be certainly read. His own kindness made him stress a little further than his predecessors had done toleration by agreement to differ rather than by mutual concession, but the grounds of this toleration had all come from other sources. From the Arminians the sufficiency of the Apostle's Creed; from Chillingworth the unreliability of the scriptures;<sup>1</sup> from Daille the weakness of testimony from the fathers and from Chillingworth and the Leyden school generally the preferability of enlightened reason as a guide.

To some extent he spoiled the arguments he borrowed by carrying them further than their originators intended them to go. There are, unquestionably, many different versions and readings of the Bible but they invalidate the scripture to a far less extent than Taylor would have us believe. and it is not outside the bounds of possibility to decide what was, in the main, the opinion of the more important fathers in spite of some errors and contradictions inevitable in the works of all men. Taylor repudiated Papal infallibility but the position he had taken up led either to that or to agnosticism.<sup>2</sup> If all the guides which Taylor examines one after another are as untrustworthy as he pretends then we have no real authority for that upon which all Christians are agreed. It depends only upon a consensus of opinion which might any day be broken.

Taylor may have intended his arguments to have a far wider implication than he cared to state, and, if he really meant what he said, there was no undoubted source of truth which could be used to support the Apostle's Creed, therefore those who dissent from that, Jews, Mohammedans, Heathen or Atheists, ought not to be persecuted so long as they are willing to conform to that standard

1. "Three fourths of his argument were written under the influence of Chillingworth's great work". Gardiner. "Hist: of Civil War". Vol: 3. p. 311. Chillingworth said that he would "not only willingly but even gladly die for the Bible. "Rel: of Prot": Vol.2. p. 428. He had, however, previously in Chap: 2. passim, of his book mentioned many of the causes of the unreliability of the scriptures which Taylor afterward brought forward.
2. Coleridge. "Table Talk". June fourth, 1830.

of morality which the state expects of all citizens. Taylor certainly never said anything like that and the omission has been charged against him as a fault.<sup>1</sup> He may have thought that if he did so his chance of obtaining some measure of toleration amongst Christians would be ruined.

Taylor's subjects always carried him away. In this case, when he began to write, he may perhaps have intended only to produce such arguments as would have induced the dominant Presbyterians to allow the Anglican church organisation to remain side by side with their own. This is what he himself says in the dedication to Lord Hatton of the collected edition of his controversial writings published in 1657. There he says,

"When a persecution did arise against the Church of England, and that I intended to make a defensative for my brethren and myself by pleading for a liberty to our consciences to persevere in that profession which was warranted by all the laws of God and our superiors, some men were angry and would not be safe that way, because I had made the roof of the sanctuary so wide that more might be sheltered under it than they had a mind should be saved harmless."<sup>2</sup>

Anthony a Wood says much the same thing.<sup>3</sup> But it is obvious that as the book now stands it is far wider in its scope. It is more charitable and possibly wiser to suppose that, instead of Taylor being in 1657 a little ashamed of what he had written in 1647, he recalled then the original intention rather than the mature design and execution of his book. His complete absorption in the argument in hand did more than widen its scope, it led him sometimes into condemning an authority which the course of a previous discussion had encouraged him to rely upon. His critics were quick to see this, especially in the markedly different weight he allows to the fathers, the councils and the apostolic canons in "Episcopacy Asserted" and in the "Liberty of Propheying".<sup>4</sup> In an effort to explain the discrepancy he included a lengthy defence of his apparent inconsistency in the use of the fathers in the

1. Heber. 'Life of Jeremy Taylor'. (Taylor's works. Vol: 1.) p. clxxxiv.
2. Works. Vol: 5. p. 3.
3. Wood. "Ath: Ox:" Art: "Taylor."
4. Taylor does not name those who made this objection.

1657 dedication to Lord Hatton.

People had accused him, he says, of seeming "to pull down with one hand what I build up with another."<sup>1</sup> His defence takes the form of asserting that the fathers and the councils may afford an excellent corroborative to arguments which can be proved true on other grounds but have no absolute authority in themselves. He had appealed to them in "Episcopacy Asserted" because some who read that book might value their testimony. "But Episcopacy relies not upon the authority of the Fathers and councils, but upon scripture, upon the institution of Christ, upon an universal tradition and an universal practice not upon the words and opinions of doctors." This type of argument does very little to mend the situation. Taylor had attacked the final authority of scripture as strongly as he had the fathers and the councils, and if the testimony of the fathers were actually ignored it would be a harder task to prove that universal tradition and practice upon which Taylor professed now to rely. He does not say so but it is quite possible that some of the difference in treatment was due to the fact that he had just been reading Daille.

The immediate reception of the "Liberty of Propheying" was not over good, far as the theories of toleration were advanced among thinkers the times were not yet ripe for so sweeping a measure as that which Taylor had proposed. A rumour got about that the "Liberty of Propheying" had the King's support behind it and Charles was by no means pleased.<sup>2</sup> It was the section in which he presented the case of the anabaptists against infant baptism which seemed to have given the Royalists the most cause for dislike.

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 4.

2. "At Causham (Caversham) I had the honour to come into his (the King's) presence, tho' I stayed not there; but, by all I could perceive either from himself or any other, he was very apprehensive in what hands he was, but was not to let it be discerned. Nor had he given that countenance unto Dr. Taylor's Liberty of Propheying which some believed he had but that really and truly it was refreshment to his spirit to be used with some civility, and to serve God as he was wont, and to see some old faces about him". Warwick. "Memoirs". p. 301. Sir Philip Warwick. 1609-1683. He was secretary to Juxon, 1636, secretary to the King in 1647 and again in 1648. His "Memoirs" published in 1702.

Hammond, at the King's request, set himself to answer the arguments which Taylor had advanced and in his "Letter of Resolution to six Queries of present use with the Church of England" devoted himself especially to the question of infant baptism. It was more an amicable disagreement than a controversy for Hammond wrote with courtesy and respect for his opponent and the result of it was that Taylor himself produced a refutation of the position he had outlined and inserted it in the second edition of his book. His desire for toleration however came in for a particularly virulent attack from Samuel Rutherford, the professor of divinity at St. Andrews, who published in, 1649, "A Free Disputation against pretended Liberty of Conscience", directed against Taylor by name. It is as thorough-going a defence of religious persecution without stint as could be imagined.

Rutherford never hesitated. Persecution in his eyes is not a regrettable necessity but a holy duty. All the most blood-thirsty passages in the Old Testament are marshalled to prove his case. The Mosaic Law, the practice of Old Testament heroes, the denunciations poured out by the prophets upon the Babylonian harlot, even St. John's command that no true believer shall say God speed to a false teacher are all used in arguments for persecution. "

"He seems in one place to have some compunctious doubts as to the propriety of fire as an instrument of conversion and, on the whole, to give the preference to hanging, yet he elsewhere urges that as stoning was the punishment for idolatry under the Mosaic law, and as the despisers of the Gospel are unquestionably worthy of a much sorer punishment, so it may be thought that burning hath something in it marvellously suited to the occasion and to the necessities of Christendom".<sup>1</sup>

Taylor took no notice of Rutherford's crude savageries but this effusion is said to be the reason why Milton inserted Rutherford's name in his sonnet on the new forcers of conscience. There is a rumour that Milton always had a great respect for Taylor which adds a little more likelihood to the story.

We have already seen how Taylor's rhetoric obscured, past understanding, the details of his arrival in Wales. a long

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p. cclxi.

letter to Dr. Bayly, dated on the "Vigils of Christmas, 1648" offers another instance of Taylor's deliberate use of picturesque language in order to veil his meaning, and in this case also he used it so successfully that it is impossible to discover his secret. All that is clear is that Taylor had received a letter from Bayly who was an old friend of his, and that the two had recently met on which occasion there had been some misunderstanding between them. The letter had contained "severities" as well as "just and religious kindness". Then Taylor refers to the conversation they had at their meeting.

"What I delivered in transitu, when I had the happiness last to meet you, I knew I poured into a breast locked up as religiously as the priests of Cybele, and, but that I was certain you permit all your friends and servants to speak to you with a freedom as great as that of the sun or the air, I should not have delivered to you so displeasing a truth less by an unnecessary discourse I should have discomposed the state of that friendship, from which I have received so many effluxes and profitable emanations.

However, sir, I shall most religiously observe your cautions (and had done so by my own proper purposes,) not to dispute in trivis that point which is of so secret consideration and is too apt to be mistaken and misconstrued by avaricious and prejudicate spirits. I know it is easy to encourage a crime by a neighbouring truth, but nothing is sufficient to secure the church's just interests, if any colour may be pretended for an injury."<sup>1</sup>

All that it is possible to make of this is that Bayly has misunderstood Taylor in some way, and that Taylor had explained himself but that the affair was so secret that it had to be done with the greatest caution. Although he had given him his confidence Taylor has remonstrated with his friend a little sharply. So far as we know Taylor had done nothing remarkable since he published the Liberty of Propheying in 1647, it is therefore tempting to suppose that the secret had to do with that book. The last sentence quoted indicates that Taylor had been trying to do some good to the church but that his action had been wilfully misconstrued. It is possible that the rumour which connected Charles the first with the Liberty of Propheying had some justification in spite of the King's denial and it was that which Taylor had entrusted to the bosom of his friend who possibly considered that Taylor had gone too far in the toleration he had

1. Bodleian. Tanner. MSS. 468.

suggested.

After these cryptic paragraphs the letter goes on to fulfil, at some length, its ostensible purpose of answering a question which Bayly had put as to the lawfulness or otherwise of the King alienating church lands. Taylor's opinion is that it is impossible for lands to be given to God in the sense that they become entirely and forever sacred, therefore with reasonable cause the King may alienate them.

On June the twelfth, Parliament, partly to provide a system of church government to replace the Episcopate which they had abolished, partly to curry favour with the Scots, had called together an assembly of "Godly and learned divines" to settle the government and liturgy of the Church of England and to revise her doctrines. Of the one hundred and thirtyone divines who were summoned only sixtynine appeared at Westminster, Taylor's friend Nicholson who had been invited being one of the absentees. The proceedings began with a fast and a long debate on the Thirtynine Articles which was intended to wile away the time until the Scots commissioners arrived. When they came the price of any assistance which their country might give to Parliament was soon made clear. They were to demand that England take the Solemn League and Covenant. Parliament was not eager to do so and some of the divines greatly disliked it but there was nothing else to be done. Both these bodies accepted the oath for themselves and the government ordered that on February the second everybody in England over eighteen years of age should take it also. Though the oath was not imposed as rigidly as it might have been it pressed very hardly on the loyal Anglican clergy, many of whom were forced to vacate the preferment which they had managed to retain until then.

For nearly a year no effort was made to fill up the vacancies thus caused, which were accordingly seized upon by sectaries with influence or friends and these intruders the Presbyterians later found <sup>it</sup> exceedingly difficult to dislodge. At length, on September the twentysecond 1644, the Assembly, in reply

to a petition of the London ministers, did put out a temporary plan for ordinations which set up committees in London and the chief towns to examine candidates and ordain those who were suitable by imposition of hands. One month later they attempted to remedy the equally chaotic state of worship by agreeing to a Directory of Public Worship to take the place of the Prayer Book so much disliked by the Scots and their imitators. In effect the new book followed the old proposals of Cartwright and Travers. It did not, however, receive its final authorization until January the third, 1645. In the meantime it had been submitted<sup>to</sup> and approved by, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. The order enjoining the use of the Directory was followed in August by another imposing a penalty of forty shillings for each offence on all ministers who refused to use it and a fine of five pounds for the first offence, ten pounds for the second, and a year's imprisonment for the third on all ministers who used the Book of Common Prayer. The King retorted by a proclamation from Oxford (November thirteenth, 1645) eulogizing the Prayer Book and condemning the Directory. Nor was this the only opposition offered.

In 1646 Taylor published, probably hurriedly and certainly without his name, a short booklet which was both a defence of the Prayer Book and a criticism of the Directory.<sup>1</sup> This he reissued in 1649, considerably expanded and with the title changed from "A Discourse concerning Prayer Extempore" to "An Apology for authorised and Set Forms of Liturgy". The Prayer Book, he says, has always had a peculiar hold upon the affections of Englishmen. It had been compiled by men whom everyone who professed to love the Reformation was bound to honour. Nothing that Taylor could say on behalf of the Church of England would be listened to more readily than a defence of the Prayer Book. High Church men revered it because of the catholic teaching it conveyed and because

1. This was one of a number of criticisms on the Directory put out by prominent anglicans. Henry Hammond published a "View of the New Directory" and David Jenkins, a Welsh judge and a strong royalist, published a biting attack entitled "A Scourge for the Directory".

of the ancient sources from which it was drawn, Ordinary church-going people, of no special religious party, liked it because it was what they were used to. Only the most rigid of the Presbyterians and Independents objected to it utterly. Consequently Taylor could appeal not only to his own party but to those also who were technically outside its bounds.

When Taylor's criticism of the Directory appeared in its final form the Assembly had melted away. Its constituent elements had never been such as to guarantee it a smooth or a long career. From the beginning the greater part of its Anglican representatives had refused to sit and time only brought out more clearly the differences between the Presbyterian and Independent members. During the long discussion on a scheme of ordination, to replace the temporary one of September 1644, the division grew wider still. At length a form was completed but only London, and a few Presbyterian strongholds elsewhere, made any attempt to put it into practice. Neither could the rigid scheme of Presbyterian government which had been hoped for by some be carried out. The sectaries and an Erastian Parliament were too strong for its supporters. The Assembly was happier in the acceptance it gained for its doctrinal statements, its two catechisms - the Longer and the Shorter - with its Confession of Faith have served ever since as a standard exposition of Calvinism in this country. The fate of the Assembly showed how little chance there was of Presbyterianism displacing Anglicanism in England.

As Taylor's "Apology" now stands it is not so much one book as a collection of tracts written at various times upon cognate subjects. First comes the dedication to the King, written probably toward the end of 1648. This is followed by the Author's Preface, which had first appeared in 1658 when it formed an introduction to the Collection of Offices which Taylor published in that year. These Offices were intended to help Episcopalian congregations who, as the Prayer Book was suppressed, found themselves in need of some regular guide for their worship. At the Restoration all need for

such a collection of devotions disappeared with the renewed use of the Prayer Book.

So, when a third edition of the "Apology for Liturgy" was printed in the 1673 issue of "Sumbolon Theologikon", the preface was transferred from the Offices, where it might have been overlooked, to its present position in the "Apology".

This is followed by a letter to Bishop Leslie, which was prefixed in 1659 to his "Discourse of Praying with the Spirit" on the title page of which he describes himself as "Henry Leslie" (maugre all antichristian opposition) Bishop of Down and Connor, Taylor was then living in Ireland and Leslie was his Diocesan. Then follows the "Apology" itself as it was issued in 1649

In the preface Taylor enumerates fifteen advantages which a liturgy has over extempore prayer or over forms hastily devised to suit the necessity of the moment. They are practically the same as the arguments in favour of liturgy in the "Apology" itself. He passes on to praise of the conservative tendency which the first reformers showed so clearly in the compilation of the Prayer Book. Although the Protestant refugees who afterwards fled to Frankfort began to have scruples of conscience about the Book, Calvin, to whom they went for advice, did not give them much encouragement. Those on the other side, namely the Roman emissaries who came to England about the same time, could never charge the Book with either impiety or heresy.

The Edwardian divines had compiled the Book so carefully that "it was accounted the work of God". When it was suppressed Protestants sealed their devotion to its principles by their death. Archbishop Cranmer, for instance, in his purgation offered, if the Queen would give him leave, to prove the Prayer Book to be both scriptural and catholic. In the next page or two Taylor sets out to perform what Cranmer had offered to do and his demonstration shows how widely he had read in ancient liturgies before he began it. He claims that the Prayer Book sufficiently fulfils every want which a Christian may need to express in his prayers. Here he reverts again to the love which the early

reformers had for it. He probably felt that this was a line of argument which would appeal particularly strongly to those who loved the Reformation without belonging to any extreme religious party. In this passage he mentions again, as he had done earlier, Dr. Rowland Taylor, but says nothing that might show special knowledge of him or any close relationship to him.

Taylor next enumerates thirtyone detailed objections to the Directory and closes his Preface with a burst of affection and praise for the Book of Common Prayer.

The Letter to Bishop Leslie sets out some of the usual arguments against extempore prayer. Then the Apology begins with a criticism of the Directory in general.

"I shall give no other character of the whole," says Taylor, "but that the public disrelish which I find amongst persons of great piety of all qualities, not only of great but even of ordinary understandings, is to me some argument that it lies so open to the objections even of common spirits, that the compilers of it did intend to prevail more by the success of their armies than the strength of reason and the proper grounds of persuasion."<sup>1</sup>

In order to satisfy "The many people who in their behalf desired me to consider it"<sup>2</sup> Taylor proposes to make an examination of the work, but he will do so without any bitterness, knowing that he differs as much from those of the other persuasion as they from him. Two different schools of thought compiled the Directory, those who objected to all set forms of prayer and those who refused all forms but their own. So, in order to begin at the beginning, Taylor starts with a discussion of extempore prayer. The questions he is about to consider are briefly, "Whether it is better to pray to God with consideration or without? Whether is the wiser man of the two, he who thinks and deliberates what to say, or he that utters his mind as fast as it comes?"<sup>3</sup>

That reverence toward God demands set forms of prayer is a thing not only evident in itself but confirmed by excellent examples, for, "The wisest nations have always prepared their verses and prayers with set forms"<sup>4</sup> And so, at the first consideration,

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 259.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. p. 261.
4. Ibid. p. 262.

extempore prayer has the worst of it. But it is contended by some that there is a gift of prayer. Undoubtedly God gives His Spirit to the church but that Spirit always chooses to work through the best human means. As an example, the writers of the Bible may be instanced, for they undoubtedly were moved by the Spirit but that did not release them from the obligation to use whatever of this world's skill they could in the presentation of their message.

The next question is more difficult. Some men do not object to set forms but only to those imposed by authority. But although the church insists on a liturgy for public worship she does not prevent any man developing in private any gifts of prayer he may possess. To the argument that the same set form may not always fit the mood of the worshipper Taylor replies,

"Public forms, it is true, cannot be fitted to every man's fancy and affections, especially in an age wherein all public constitutions are protested against, but yet they may be fitted to all necessities, and to every men's duty; and for the pleasing the affections and fancies of men, that may be sometimes convenient, but it is never necessary; and God that suffers dryness of affections many times in His dearest servants and in their greatest troubles and most excellent devotions, hath by that sufferance of His given demonstration that it is not necessary such affections should be complied withal; for then He would never suffer those sterilities, but Himself by a cup of sensible devotion would water and refresh their dryness; and if God Himself does not, it is not to be expected the church should."<sup>1</sup>

The church has been given a stewardship of prayer and so her ministers must not only pray for the people but teach the people themselves how to pray and for this there is no method so convenient as the use of a set form.

Taylor now turns to both scripture and catholic tradition to show how consistent their witness is to the necessity for a liturgy and here, of course, he was appealing to the two centres of authority upon which the greater number of English theologians had relied for a hundred years. He gives us an interesting glimpse of an English household below the rank which kept a chaplain when he argues that at home also, "a set and described form of prayer is most convenient in a family, that children and servants may be enabled to remember, and tacitly

1. Works. Vol: 5. p. 282.

recite the prayer together with the Major-domo."<sup>1</sup>

But a set form of public prayer has other uses besides those mentioned. It is a bond of union for all who worship by its means, it affords an assured standard of doctrine, it teaches the faith at a time, and in a way that it is most easily received, it preserves the authority of the church and is a great security for the religion of the whole people. In the place of the set form of prayer which Taylor was defending a good many of those on the other side would substitute what they called "conceived" forms, by which they meant forms invented by the minister to suit the occasion, and it was argued that while set forms confined the Spirit, "conceived" forms set it free. To this Taylor replies that, so far as he can see, the Spirit may be free in either, but, supposing the argument to be correct, the minister by the self-invented form which sets free the Spirit in him binds the Spirit in his people. Besides, the Directory had appointed everything to do with prayer except the actual words and, therefore, imprisoned the Spirit.

It is claimed by some, he says, that the minister ought to be given as much liberty to make his own prayers as to make his own sermons, but there is a difference. In the one case the minister preaches to the people and in the other he prays on their behalf and, therefore, they ought to know before hand what it is he intends to pray about. Some latitude may be allowed in words directed to the people but every care is demanded in language which is to be addressed to God. He goes on to say:-

"But yet methinks the argument objected so far as the extempore men make use of it, if it were turned with the edge the other way would have more reason in it; and instead of arguing, 'Why should not the same liberty be allowed to their spirit in praying as in preaching?' it were better to substitute this, 'If they can pray with the Spirit, why do they not also preach with the Spirit.'"<sup>2</sup>

Taylor answers the argument that the encouragement of "conceived" forms will make a learned ministry, by saying that it is a mistake, "To offer that as a means of getting learning which cannot be done at all as it ought but after learning is already gotten".<sup>3</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.299.
2. Ibid. p. 310.
3. Ibid. p. 314.

In his last paragraph he reviews briefly all the reasons he had advanced against the substitutes offered for the Prayer Book and concludes with the remark that in the public prayers of a whole national church, "An unlearned man is not to be trusted and a wise man dare not trust himself."

This is the best piece of controversial writing Taylor ever did. He was writing in defence of something which he loved very dearly and he was sure of the sympathies of many of his readers. He had reasonableness and antiquity both on his side and he loved them both. Though he is prone, even in so short a work as this, to repeat himself, he does not do here, as he does in so many other places, spoil the effect of a good argument by trying to reinforce it with a doubtful one.

Anyone more politic than Taylor might have thought 1649 a bad time to issue a defence of the Prayer Book. It might very probably bring down the wrath of the government on his head, it was extremely unlikely to influence those who were now forcing the Directory on the country, and it could, at most, only comfort and confirm the love of those in whom use and association had begotten liking. Taylor did not use his dedication as a means of deprecating the wrath that might fall upon his head, he boldly addressed the book to the King.

By the time the "apology for Liturgy" was in many people's hands Charles the first was dead. The Scots to whom he surrendered in May 1646 had given him up to the Parliament, from whose charge the army had taken him. After nearly two years more of unsuccessful shifts he had been sentenced to death by a court whose authority he refused to recognise and beheaded in Whitehall in the sight of a multitude who were filled with amazement and pity at the deed. The Prayer Book had been cut to pieces and burned at the hands of the common hangman. Charles had possibly been put to death by the same person, though his executioner had worn a mask.<sup>1</sup> Taylor's book then, came to his readers as a protest on behalf of

1. Gardiner. "History of the Civil War". Vol: 4.  
p. 322. note.

royalty and the Church of England, two institutions which, though many might wish to reform them, few would like to abolish.

There is a story that Jeremy Taylor, in an interview with the King just before his execution, received from him his watch as a parting gift, a ring set with two diamonds and a ruby, also some pearls and rubies which were taken from the ebony case in which the King kept his bible.<sup>1</sup> Apart from the objects themselves the only authority for this is the Jones ms which it must be admitted makes the story suspect. The problem presented to those of Taylor's biographers who have believed it to be true has always been to find a time when the gift could possibly have been made. The ring is said to bear the date August 1647,<sup>2</sup> and accordingly this has been suggested as the time without any other support for the hypothesis. One biographer of Taylor rejects this date as "evidently too early"<sup>3</sup> while still another calls the whole story "mere conjecture".<sup>4</sup> None of these writers seem to have been aware of the opinion on toleration given in response to the King's request on August twentyeighth, 1647, which Taylor signed thereby proving that he was in London at the time and making it highly probable that he had an interview with the King. It may well have been that Charles made some gift, such as might be in his power, to his chaplain who helped him on this occasion.

There is also some indication that Taylor was in London in August 1648. It is found in a publication entitled "Hooker's Miscellany",<sup>5</sup> the authorship of which is ascribed in Nichol's Literary Anecdotes to Dr. William Webster, one of Pope's butts in the Dunciad.<sup>6</sup> According to this account, when Lord Herbert of Cherbury was lying on his death bed in London in August 1648 he sent for Jeremy Taylor and asked that he might receive the Blessed

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p. xxviii.
2. Dic: Nat: Biog: Art: "Taylor".
3. Ibid.
4. Brown. Jeremy Taylor. p.25.
5. No. 41. Vol: 1. p. 342. (London 1736)
6. Nicols. "Literary Anecdotes". Vol: 2. p.36 (London 1812)

Sacrament from him.<sup>1</sup> Taylor refused to communicate him unless Lord Herbert would first recant the heretical opinions he had published in his books, which the dying man would not do. It was this incident which set Taylor to work thinking out the "Moral Demonstration" which he afterward included in "Ductor Dubitantium".<sup>2</sup> But in August 1648 the King was at Carisbroke Castle and it is most unlikely that Taylor would visit the Isle of Wight or be allowed to see the King if he did. On December the first Charles was removed to Hurst Castle and from then, until the King's death, there seems no occasion when an interview with Taylor could be supposed likely, even if he had prolonged his absence from Wales to so late a date, or made another visit to London so soon.

"The Great Exemplar", his next work, published in 1649, must have taken him some time to prepare for it is a large book, indeed it is only second in bulk to the enormous "Ductor Dubitantium". If it had not been so unwieldy it would have received far more attention than it has done, for it stands definitely among the best of Taylor's writings. It is the first clear indication that he had arrived at that stage of his literary development when he could write at will those glowing passages, saturated with beauty both of thought and sound, with which his name is inseparably connected.

"The Great Exemplar" is a book of practical piety, the first Life of Christ to be written in English. There had been works of a similar nature in Latin, but devotion, like everything else, was more and more coming to be recorded in the vernacular. A famous Latin Vita Christi had been written by the German monk Ludolf of Saxony in the fourteenth century, John Bergeant asserted that the "Great Exemplar" was nothing more than a translation of

1. His tombstone states that he died "Vicesimo Die Augusti" 1648. (See Aubrey. "Brief Lives". Ed: Clark. Oxford. 1898.)
2. Works. Vol: 9. p.157. Archbishop Ussher is also said to have refused the Sacrament to Lord Herbert of Cherbury when on his deathbed because of the sick man's remark that "If there was good in anything it was in that; or if it did no good it could do no harm."

the Vita.<sup>1</sup> As soon as the two books are examined Sergeant's accusation is refuted. There are similarities but they are only slight, while the differences are many and obvious. The Vita Christi contains an account of the Life of Christ, profusely annotated with extracts from the fathers, with a series of dogmatic addresses and instructions concerning the spiritual life, meditations and prayers. It was extremely popular both for its own qualities and because of the great reputation of its author. There are a good many MS copies of it in existence and the printed editions are very numerous, the earliest being issued at Strasbourg, and another at Cologne in 1474. So far as is known no English translation was ever made but a very famous French one by Guillaume Lermenand was published in folio at Lyons in 1487 and often reprinted, the latest edition being issued at Paris in 1878. It was in a Spanish translation that Ignatius of Loyola, very near death's door with the wounds that he had received at the defence of Pampeluna, read the book and experienced that first change of heart which led to his conversion and ultimately to the founding of the Jesuit Order. Taylor, whose reading was omnivorous, may have seen the book and it is just possible that it interested him sufficiently to be kept in mind when he began arranging his material for his Life of Christ. If it had this influence on him it is as much as it could have had.

The few years immediately before and after 1642 seem to have been the germinative years in Taylor's life, just as the period at Golden Grove was the time in which these early seeds were brought to harvest. It was then that the line of thought which produced the "Liberty of Propheying" was apparently developed and Taylor definitely says that the "Great Exemplar" had its origin then. In the dedication of the second part of the book to Lady Mary, Countess Dowager of Northampton, Taylor states very clearly that it was her late husband, the Earl of Northampton, killed in the

1. Sergeant. "Literary Life of John Sergeant. Written by himself in Paris at the request of the Duke of Perth. Edited by John Kirk, D.D." London, 1816.

battle of Hopton Heath.<sup>1</sup> who had first conceived the work which became the "Great Exemplar". He says of his book, "Your Honour best knows in what soil the first design of the papers grew", and later on in the same dedication he says, "I hope your Honour will for his sake entertain what that rare person conceived, though I was left to the pains and danger of 'bringing forth'".<sup>2</sup> This may mean one of two things. Either the Earl of Northampton suggested to Taylor that the subject was a fit one for him to undertake or else he intended to write a book of that sort himself and consulted his friend about what he had in mind, but afterward, on account of more pressing business, had to leave the execution of it to him. This is as likely a suggestion as any. It was a time when a good many of the nobility wrote books and some of them at least were not averse to having their productions worked over by a clever chaplain or dependent. Taylor performed some such service for Hatton when he produced his "Psalms" and it is most unlikely that he would have refused to do the same thing for Northampton. As it is we have no reason to regret that the collaboration was never undertaken.

Taylor was not writing a critical Life. He makes no attempt to provide a "harmony" of the Gospel story or discuss chronology. His object was to make Christians love Jesus and one another more and so everything which served that end was utilized. He takes details from the apocryphal gospels without scruple if they add anything of interest to his story. All his gifts are here dedicated to the main purpose of his life - making men and women holy. He was acting in the spirit of his famous saying that, "Theology is a divine life rather than a divine knowledge".<sup>3</sup> So, to carry out his purpose, he directs all the affection and attention of those who will be taught to the contemplation of the divine Life of Jesus Christ upon earth.

1. He was leading a charge when his horse was killed under him and his helmet knocked from his head. He was offered quarter. "I scorn to take quarter from such base rogues as you are" he replied, and was immediately slain with a halbert.
2. works. Vol: 2. p. 283.
3. Works. Vol. 8. p. 368.

"The Great Exemplar" is divided into three parts. The first ends with the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus; the second with the Miracles, which are not taken in any chronological order but considered together; the third with the Resurrection and Ascension. Each of these parts is subdivided into sections containing a portion of narrative, one or more discourses, considerations and prayers.

The first part is dedicated to Lord Hatton who in 1648 had retired to Paris where, for a time, he did what he could to help the royalist exiles until poverty and the loss of his great reputation overtook him. Controversial theology had left Taylor mentally tired and hopeless of any result from disputation. He admits this:-

"I am weary and toiled with rowing up and down in the seas of questions, which the interests of christendom have commenced; and in any propositions of which I am heartily persuaded, I am not certain that I am not deceived; and I find that men are most confident of those articles which they can so little prove that they never made questions of them; but I am most certain, that by living in the religion and fear of God, in obedience to the King, in the charities and duties of communion with my spiritual guides, in justice and love with all the world in their several proportions, I shall not fail of that end which is perfective of human nature, and which will never be obtained by disputing."<sup>1</sup>

The hope which he has set before him is that he might help forward the salvation of all men. Three words at the end of this dedication have caused more trouble than they should. The author holds that his best reward will be to be accounted among his patrons "relatives and servants", so the possibility that Taylor was united, in one way or another, by ties of blood to the Hatton family has been debated. It need not have been, for Taylor in other places uses the word "relative" without any implication of kinship.

The dedication to the second part is the one already mentioned- to the Dowager Lady Northampton. The third part was originally dedicated to the second Lady Carbery and is full of gratitude for the kindness shown to him by her and her household in his distress. When, after her death, the "Great Exemplar" came

1. Works, Vol. 2. p.3.

to a second issue Taylor added another dedication to the third part, this time to Alice, the third Lady Carbery. A compliment was no doubt intended but one would think the dedication over full of the praises of her predecessor for the lady to be very grateful.

Those who go through Taylor's works in the order in which they were written will read the "Great Exemplar" with the feeling that they have come at last to the Taylor they have been led to expect. The preface is an eloquent meditation upon the whole family of man, a part of creation which wants nothing but Christianity for its perfection. In the Consideration upon the Nativity we come to something new to English religious literature. There is warmth and elevation. The whole scene, as Taylor sets it out, is bathed in a soft glow like those old pictures of the Birth of Christ in which the only light that illuminates the stable is that which radiates from the son of God. It is instinct with the tenderest poetic feeling especially the passage in which the Blessed Virgin broods lovingly one by one over the limbs of her newborn Child, when "She kissed him and worshipped him, and thanked him that he would be born of her, and she suckled him and bound him in her arms and swadling bands."<sup>1</sup>

The section is followed by a quaint and perhaps necessary discourse at that time "Of the duty of nursing children". It was meant to encourage mothers to feed their children themselves and not to hand them over to foster mothers.<sup>2</sup> This is only one of the twenty discourses scattered throughout the book. They represent in all probability sermons preached by Taylor in the period immediately before the civil war and it is possible that it was from discussion of some points in them that Northampton went on to consider the idea of writing a Life of Christ himself or of encouraging Taylor to do so. The discourses were obviously intended to be preached. They could be very well taken out of

1. works. Vol: 2. p.66.

2. There is a quaint tract on the same subject in the "Harleian Miscellany" Vol: 2. p.27-33. entitled "The Countesse of Lincolns Nurserie". Oxford. 1622.

their present setting and published separately.

In 1672 two sermons of Taylor's supposedly hitherto unpublished were printed in London from a manuscript "supplied by a person of honour yet living". In all probability the third Earl of Northampton is intended. One of these was entitled "Christ's Yoke an easy Yoke",<sup>1</sup> the other "The Gate to Heaven a straight Gate".<sup>2</sup> The whole of the first appears in the "Great Exemplar" and a good part of the second is to be found there also. This shows how perfectly naturally the discourses can be taken out of their setting.<sup>3</sup> Though dealing with cognate subjects the sermons<sup>are</sup> in no way closely linked with the preceding narrative. Those who like long books will find no fault with them where they are for they add to the beauty of the "Great Exemplar" though they are not essential parts of its structure.

Prayers are interspersed throughout the book at the pauses in the narrative and at the end of the discourses. They are a little wordy and they lack the conciseness and balance of the Prayer Book Collects but they are eclipsed only by them.

Following the account of Christ's Baptism and Temptation a section on the baptism of infants is introduced. It is probably there to make quite clear to those who might still be troubled by the arguments advanced for the Anabaptists in the "Liberty of Propheying" that Taylor held orthodox views on the subject. There are other doctrinal sections inserted later on, one of faith, another on repentance and another on the Blessed Sacrament, but they differ very little from the teaching contained in Taylor's definitely doctrinal works. The consideration of his

1. Works. Vol: 1. p.115. It appears in the Great Exemplar, partly in "Considerations upon the Death of the Innocents" (Works. Vol: 2. p.148) partly in the Discourse of the excellency of the Christian Religion. (Ibid. p.515)
2. Works. Vol: 1. p.115. Many sentences in it are taken from the "Considerations upon the Circumcision." (Works. Vol: 2. p.99)
3. They are either old sermons which Taylor drew upon for the "Great Exemplar" or vamped up by a publisher from the sources mentioned and passed off as unpublished work.

theology on these matters will best be left until, those books are under review.

The theological parts contain by far the greatest portion of the direct Latin and Greek quotations included in the book. All the rest is saturated with learning, a good deal of it drawn from classical poetry but it is introduced, at most, a phrase or two at a time, generally a graceful reference is made or a few instances cited which prove a point. For example, speaking of miracles, he recalls that:-

"One Caius was cured of his blindness by Aesculapius, and so was Valerius Aper; and at Alexandria, Vespasian cured a man of the gout by treading upon his toes, and a blind man with spittle. and when Adrian, the emperor was sick of a fever, and would have killed himself, it is said two blind persons were cured by touching him, whereof one of them told him that he also should recover."<sup>1</sup>

The "Great Exemplar" undoubtedly suffers from its length. It might also have been injured by want of unity and the different portions tended to fall into isolation if the figure of Jesus Christ upon earth had not been made as prominent as it is in all.

"The Holy Jesus" and "The Prince of the Catholic Church" are the two titles of the saviour of which Taylor is very fond; the first is indeed the most generally used name throughout the book. Mystical interpretations which startle the more literal minded reader of to-day occur with frequency. When Christ cleansed the temple we are told that, "The holy Jesus 'made a whip of cords', to represent and to chastise the implications and the enfoldings of sin, and the cords of vanity."<sup>2</sup> There is another upon the Pierced Side which, from the minuteness with which every detail is interpreted, would be more likely to shock than to help the devotional piety of the present day. But the vivid imagination which to a more reticent age seems misused here fills the whole book with life and movement. Taylor's imagination was pictorial and in this book at least he is specially fond of evoking scenes which resemble victorious processions in the increasing triumph of their progress.

One of these describes Jesus entering Hades after His death. The righteous men of old catch the first glimpse of

1. Works. Vol: 2. p.495.

2. Ibid. p.312.

their coming enlightenment and rejoice to see it. The accursed spirits shrink away from it in anger and dismay, amazed that a man durst come among them or a God should die. These elaborately beautiful passages are generally found in the Considerations. In the narrative portion Taylor is content to tell the story simply, in the discourses it is turned to some practical use, in the considerations its appeal to the soul is heightened by every art of language Taylor could compass.

One of the loveliest paragraphs in the book occurs in the meditation upon the Passion and is built up round the figure of the mourning Virgin:

"By the cross of Christ stood the holy Virgin-mother, upon whom old Simeon's prophecy was now verified: for now she felt a sword passing through her very soul: she stood without clamour and womanish noises; and silent, and with a modest grief, deep as the waters of the abyss, but smooth as the face of a pool; full of love, and patience, and sorrow and hope. Now she was put to it to make use of all those excellent discourses her holy Son had used to build up her spirit, and fortify it against this day. Now she felt the blessings and strengths of faith; and she passed from the griefs of the Passion to the expectation of the Resurrection; and she rested in this death, as in a sad remedy; for she knew it reconciled God with all the world. But her hope drew a veil before her sorrow; and though her grief was great enough to swallow her up, yet her love was greater, and did swallow up her grief."<sup>1</sup>

The "Great Exemplar" has been often reprinted apart from Taylor's works but it has never found the popularity of "Holy Living and Dying", or the Sermons.. Its length is one great disadvantage, probably the main one, but the book suffers also from being neither a Life of Christ nor a collection of sermons. For Taylor it was a great discovery. It taught him the magnificence of his strength and where that strength most truly lay.

1. Works. Vol: 2. p. 710.

## CHAPTER FIVE.

Not every author receives his due share of recognition in his lifetime. His work may be so far in advance of his age that only a few forward-looking individuals recognize its value, or he may be so constitutionally opposed to the general tenor of his times that his contemporaries will have nothing to do with him. Taylor was fortunate. He belonged enough to his age to understand its needs and to offer something in satisfaction of them, but he had roots enough in the past and appeal enough for the future to lift him out of the ranks of those who achieve only a contemporary fame.

In 1649 while Taylor was living quietly in Wales developing the gift that was in him Parliament, which had executed Charles the first and sent Charles the second into exile, transformed England from a monarchy into a republic. Everyone hoped that a new election would give the country a form of government which had at least the full support of all those who had opposed the King. But what remained of the Long Parliament still clung resolutely to power. The ideal they set before themselves was to establish in England an aristocratic oligarchy similar to that which ruled Holland and Venice. All legislative power they proposed to retain in their own hands, the executive authority was placed in the hands of a Council of State composed of fortyone persons, between them these two bodies hoped to settle the country and provide liberty of worship for such forms of religion as they considered truly Protestant. But the army was the real master of the situation and the soldiers were among those who were most bitterly disappointed that a new Parliament had not been called. For the present they were too busy to intervene. Levellers within their own ranks threatened the overthrow of all discipline, wars both in Ireland and Scotland needed their presence, the Rump was the government in being and for the time England must submit to its rule.

Taylor must have set to work upon "Holy Living" as soon as the "Great Exemplar" had been launched upon the public, and he was convinced, not only that he wrote devotional books better than any other, but that people were more willing to read them.

In 1650 "Holy Living" was published. The book is so famous that it hardly needs any description.<sup>1</sup> It is now generally bound up with "Holy Dying", and the two are regarded as one work. Actually, there was a year between them in publication, and there is a considerable difference in their tone. But the two are quite properly linked as they were undoubtedly both the outcome of the same design. Taylor could hardly have written a book dealing as fully with the christian life as he intended to do and treat sickness and death so very briefly, unless he had planned subsequently to write a special work for that purpose. The very title itself "The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living" suggests that it needs the parallel "Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying" to bring it to a completion.

The plan of "Holy Living" is worked out on a method similar to that of the "Great Exemplar". There are four chapters, each divided into sections, and these are again subdivided. In the first portion the particular virtue under review is treated generally; in the succeeding portion it is reduced to rule, with prayers and meditations, suitable for it. Positive teaching occupies the author throughout. He does not care to waste more time than is absolutely necessary inveighing against evil. He assumes

1. "Holy Living" was not the first manual of popular devotion to be published after the reformation though it is the most attractive of all the early books. A widely used work the "Practice of Piety" was "Printed about forty times in 8vo. and 12mo, the eleventh edition of which was printed in London, 1619. It was also printed once or more in the Welsh tongue, and once or more in French, A.D. 1633, written by Dr. Lewis Bayley, consecrated December eighth, 1616. Bishop of Bangor. "Kennet's Register. p. 350. It aimed at being a complete manual of christian teaching and practice. Besides the numerous printed sermons there were also books of pious thoughts similar to Henshaw's "Daily Thoughts" 1637. And Hall's "Meditations and Vows." 1606, in existence to provide religious reading.

that, in the main, his readers want to be holy; and require from him such help as may enable them to bring their desires to good effect.

Taylor had trained himself in an orderly school. He believed that the visible divinely-appointed order of the church had its counterpart in the disciplined life of the soul. Neither was left to the sway of its own emotions.

"God will go out of His way to meet His saints, when themselves are forced out of their way of order by a sad necessity; but else God's usual way is to be present in those places where His servants are appointed ordinarily to meet. But His presence there signifies nothing but a readiness to hear their prayers, to bless their persons, to accept their offices, and to like even the circumstance of orderly and public meeting. For thither the prayers of consecration, the public separating it, and God's love of order, and the reasonable customs of religion, have, in ordinary, and in a certain degree, fixed this manner of His presence; and He loves to have it so."<sup>1</sup>

The Christian religion could be divided into three parts, "Sobriety, justice, religion. The first contains all our deportment in our personal and private capacities, the fair treatment of our bodies and our spirits; the second enlarges our duty in all relations to our neighbour; the third contains the offices of direct religion, and intercourse with God."<sup>2</sup>

Asceticism for its own sake does not attract him, neither does he encourage others to the practice. People may choose pleasant food in preference to unpleasant so long as it is not the mere delight of eating which indulged. There is no glorification of celibacy. Marriage and single life are both states to which a man is called by God and neither is more or less holy than another. Taylor's intention was not to show a way whereby the soul of the Christian could enjoy spiritual delight, or cultivate itself in solitary perfection unconcerned with any other business than that which passes in the secret recesses of the spirit between a man and his Maker. He was concerned with outdoor Christians, and how they may best fulfil every duty they have to God, their brethren, and themselves. The book therefore becomes to some extent a manual of casuistry.

1. works. Vol: 5. p.24.

2. Ibid. p.44.

A section, for instance, dealing with a merchant's duties, headed "Rules and measures of justice in bargaining", treats the ethics of buying and selling with considerable detail. His opinion is that: "In prices of bargaining concerning uncertain merchandises, you may buy as cheap ordinarily as you can"<sup>1</sup> providing certain conditions are observed. There must be no violence; the prices must be governed, roughly, by what is customary in such cases; there must be neither monopoly, nor, what in modern language would be called cornering of products, and the good of the public as a whole must be considered. Wages must be paid promptly, and no one is to take in hand anything for a fee which he has not the ability nor some reasonable chance to perform. A doctor, for instance, is forbidden to undertake the treatment of an incurable disease without first explaining to the patient that he considers the case hopeless. The whole section is interesting as it shows that Taylor was fully aware of some of the difficulties which were being created by the increasing complexity of the nation's commercial life.

On the duties of subjects to princes he is as inflexible as ever. The doctrine of non-resistance is set out complete:

"Lift not up thy hand against thy prince or parent, upon what pretence soever: but bear all personal affronts and inconveniences at their hands and seek no remedy but by patience and piety, yielding and praying, or absenting thyself."<sup>2</sup>

Taylor, like every other Royalist, would consider that his allegiance now bound him to the exiled Charles the second.

The final section in the book deals with the Holy Communion. Doctrinally Taylor was never very sure of himself. His teaching in different places is apt to seem contradictory, but one thing never changes. His devotional attitude toward the Blessed sacrament is always the same; awe at the approach to an exceeding great mystery; complete abasement, coming from a sense of his own unworthiness to approach the altar to which he was commanded to come, and from which his soul drew life and

1. Works. Vol: 3. p.131.

2. Ibid. p.118.

health.

"Holy Living" contains one of the first attacks that Taylor made upon the idea that a deathbed repentance is sufficient to save a man who has consistently disobeyed God throughout his life. This was a crusade that he never gave up. It would be interesting to know what personal incident lay behind it, for to one who felt, more than he thought, the stimulus to such a profound conviction would be almost certain to come from something actually experienced. No doubt a good many of those whom he met in his army days would be tempted to silence the exhortations of a too persistent chaplain with the promise to think of the repentance he advocated at a more convenient season, and it may have been, that the body of some such a one, carried in after a quick death in battle first impressed upon Taylor the futility of deferring the contrition which comes at any time later than it ought.

Most of Taylor's books have a few slight autobiographical touches in them. "Holy Living" has more than most. They throw light, both on his mentality and his circumstances. It is hard to believe that he was not referring to himself when he wrote:-

"I am fallen into the hands of publicans and sequestrators, and they have taken all from me; what now? let me look about me. They have left me the sun and moon, fire and water, a loving wife, and many friends to pity me, and some to relieve me, and I can still discourse; and unless I list they have not taken away my merry countenance, and my cheerful spirit, and a good conscience: they still have left me the providence of God, and all the promises of the Gospel, and my religion, and my hopes of heaven, and my charity to them too; and still I sleep and digest, I eat and drink, I read and meditate, I can walk in my neighbour's pleasant fields, and see the varieties of natural beauties, and delight in all that in which God delights, that is, in virtue and wisdom, in the whole creation, and in God himself. And he that hath so many causes of joy and so great, is very much in love with sorrow and peevishness, who loses all these pleasures, and chooses to sit down upon his little handful of thorns."<sup>1</sup>

Accepting this as autobiographical, it would seem that his first

1. Works. Vol: 3. p. 91. In the same section Taylor uses the first personal pronoun in several other instances of men falling into adversity but the passages quoted above correspond so closely with what we know of his circumstances that it is reasonable to suppose that the details are autobiographical.

wife must have been alive at the time, since he could speak of his wife being left to him after the sequestration of his living. If the passage can be accepted as evidence, and there is no reason why it should not be, then it goes a long way toward clearing up the difficulty which surrounds Taylor's marriages since it constitutes proof of the fact that his first wife was alive in 1650.

The same temper of mind which he exhibits in the passage just quoted continues throughout the section which deals with contentedness. It has a far truer ring than the conventional book philosophy offered by those who desire to help others to bear an adversity they themselves have never felt. He takes his reader into his confidence. He shows him his circumstances. "If", he says to him "God should send a cancer upon thy face or spread a crust of leprosy upon thy skin" would you not, to escape it, "gladly be as poor as I am or as the meanest of thy brethren"<sup>1</sup> He refers to someone, in all probability the wife he was soon to lose, in terms which show how strong was the affection which bound them together.

"I have known an affectionate wife, when she hath been in fear of parting with her beloved husband, heartily desire of God his life or society upon any conditions that were not sinful, and choose to beg with him rather than to feast without him; and the same person hath upon that consideration borne poverty nobly, when God hath heard her prayer in the other matter."<sup>2</sup>

Possessed of the cheerful disposition and vigorous common sense as well as the domestic happiness which is mirrored here Taylor must have found his retreat at Golden Grove a very pleasant one in spite of the apparent poverty which accompanied it.<sup>3</sup> Literary fame was coming to him and "Holy Living" did a great deal to add to it. Writing a manual of direction for the conduct of ordinary life Taylor does not give that full rein to his fancy or to his language which he allowed to himself in

1. Works. Vol: 3. p. 93.

2. Ibid.

3. In 1647 Parliament made an order that one fifth of the income from their former livings should be allowed for the support of the dependents of the sequestered clergy. There is no indication that Taylor's family received any advantage from this.

"Holy Dying" and in the Sermons", and so from a purely literary point of view "Holy Living" falls below the other two books. But though there are no great outbursts of exaltation, a very high level of strong, interest-compelling, prose is maintained throughout.

The argument of the book often suffers considerably through being inconsecutive. It is not so much one evolving train of thought that is offered as a bundle of disconnected reasons all to some extent bearing on the same point. Consequently the reader finds his progress hampered a little. He goes forward by a series of leaps rather than steadily, and with increasing impetus, as he would do if each reason was the natural outcome of the one which went before. Taylor's sentences lie like a handful of jewels, each one complete in its own beauty, neither borrowing from nor lending to its neighbour. There is scarcely any more warmth than there is in jewels. Taylor feels no devotional raptures himself nor attempts to inspire any. It is all concerned with action in this world. If you wish to be holy, says Taylor, this is what you must do; the visions which inspire action are outside his scope. It is the cumulative effect of so much sweetness, reasonableness and trust in the goodness of God, the air of pure holiness which hangs over all which is impressive and only stops short of inspiration.

Almost as soon as the book was published the cheerful reliance upon the divine goodness which it advocated was put to still more severe test in Taylor's own life. Death took both his wife and his patroness. In a letter to Dugdale, dated April the first 1651, he mentions his loss. "I have but lately buried my dear wife"<sup>1</sup> he writes, and goes on to refer apparently to an intention to write a tract upon baptism and, later in the letter, mentions that he is transcribing his "Rule of Holy Dying". The dedication of that book is to Lord Carbery and there again Taylor

1. Hamper. "Life of Dugdale". p.250.

2. Works. Vol: 3. p.258.

refers to his bereavement when he says:-

"Both your lordship and myself have lately seen and felt such sorrows of death, and such sad departure of dearest friends, that it is more than high time we should think ourselves nearly concerned in the accidents."<sup>1</sup>

All this dedication shows how keenly Taylor had felt the double blow which had come to him. That consolation which he offers to his patron is the same with which he has fortified himself. Frances, Countess of Carbery, seems to have been something more than a lady bountiful who had shown kindness to a destitute clergyman.<sup>2</sup> Both in the dedication to "Holy Dying" and in the magnificent funeral sermon in which Taylor glorified her memory he speaks of her as one who had shown him the fullest and deepest friendship. She married Lord Carbery in June 1637 when she was very young. Her lot lay in a quiet place but she seems to have been as notable a woman as any of her time and it was an age of great women. She was clever, charming, of so spotless a character that "You might as well have suspected the sun to smell of the poppy that he looks on, as that she could have been a person apt to be sullied by the breath of a foul question."<sup>3</sup> Though her married life only lasted thirteen years she was the mother of ten children and died, worn out by continual child-bearing, soon after she had brought her last child, a daughter whom she called Athamia, into the world.<sup>4</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 3. p.258.

2. Lord Carbery was three times married. First Wife: Bridget, daughter and heiress of Thomas Lloyd of Llanllyr, Cardigan-shire. Second Wife, Frances, daughter of Sir John Altham, of Oxey, Oxfordshire. She was Taylor's patroness and died. Oct: 9th. 1650. Third Wife, Lady Alice Egerton, daughter of John, first Earl of Bridgewater. She was a pupil of Henry Lawes, Milton's friend, and an adventure of hers has been mistakenly supposed to have suggested the plot for Milton's Comus. See Masson. "Life of Milton". Vol: 2. p. 227.

3. Works. Vol: 8. p.443.

4. All Carbery's surviving issue were by her. Francis, the eldest son died before his father in 1667. John Vaughan, third and last Earl of Carbery inherited. Probably educated under Taylor. Appointed Governor of Jamaica, 1674, accused of extortion and superseded by the Earl of Carlisle, 1678. Was a patron of literature. Dryden considered his tastes and dedicated to him one of the filthiest of his poems. Pepys says he was "one of the lewdest fellows of the age, worse than Sir Charles Sedley" "Diary". Nov.16th. 1667. He was a bitter opponent of Clarendon.

the account of her end is without doubt the most moving passage Taylor ever wrote. It is all the more powerful because he attempts no set description but turns, as it were, every now and then from his rapt contemplation of death itself to her who was passing through its shadow. Religion had been one of the great occupations of her life. As much time as she could spare from the management of a great household and the upbringing of her children she had spent in prayer and meditation. Every day she either read a sermon or listened to one and almost the last plan she ever had was for collecting in "a large book" such religious "assistances as she would choose so that she might be readily furnished and instructed to every good work".<sup>1</sup> Her religion was strong and deep as a great river and "In all her actions of relation towards God, she had a strange evenness and untroubled passage, sliding toward her ocean of God and of infinity with a certain and silent motion". And so she came to death, prepared for everything, and dreading nothing but the actual pain of her dissolution.

"But so it was that the thought of death dwelt long with her, and grew from the first steps of fancy and fear, to a consent, from thence to a strange credulity and expectation of it; and without the violence of sickness she died, as if she had done it voluntarily, and by design,-----  
 And in this I cannot but adore the providence and admire the wisdom and infinite mercies of God. For having a tender and soft, a delicate and fine constitution and breeding, she was tender to pain, and apprehensive of it, as a child's shoulder is of a load and burden,-----  
 But God, that knew her fears and her jealousy concerning herself, fitted her with a death so easy, so harmless, so painless, that it did not put her patience to a severe trial. It was not (in all appearance) of so much trouble as two fits of a common ague; so careful was God to remonstrate to all that stood in that sad attendance that this soul was dear to Him; and that since she had done so much of her duty towards it, He that began would also finish her redemption, by an act of a rare providence, and a singular mercy. Blessed be the goodness of God, who does so **3**  
 careful actions of mercy for the ease and security of his servants

It was with the thought of this death, and the loss which he had suffered in his own family, in mind that Taylor wrote "Holy Dying". That it did not spring suddenly out of his sorrow as has been suggested<sup>4</sup> is quite clear from his own words in the dedication to Lord Carbery when, after references to the death of

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.446.
2. Ibid. p.447.
3. Ibid. p.448.
4. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor." p.89.

his lady, Taylor says, "this book was intended first to minister to her piety and she desired all good people should partake of the advantages which are here recorded."<sup>1</sup> This, as well as some words which follow a line or two later, show that "Lady Carbery had prompted him to write "Holy Dying". But when the time of publication came she was dead and Taylor could do no more than "dress her hearse with the bundles of cypress" which were intended "to dress her closet"<sup>2</sup> a curious folding plate adorns the first edition. It represents the hall of a country house where a divine is exhibiting the lifesized portrait of a skeleton to a lady who has her husband and child nearby. This rather gruesome work was executed by Peter Lombart, the French engraver who produced several of those portraits of Taylor which were often used as frontispieces to his works.<sup>3</sup> In this case also the clergyman is said to represent Taylor, and the gentleman and lady Lord Carbery and his third wife.

It may be doubted whether the first paragraph of the dedication is in the best of taste for the author very pointedly reminds Lord Carbery of what was then happening to the body of the wife whom he had buried such a little time before. This is not the only occasion in the book when the ghastliness of corruption is dwelt on a little more than a modern reader thinks necessary. There is the revolting story of the young German gentleman which Taylor thought worthy of polishing into one of his most finished sentences.<sup>4</sup> But, on the whole, there is far less of the horrible side of human dissolution in this book than in other compositions on death that the age produced. He only goes into the charnel-house when it is necessary to read his auditors a lecture upon what he finds there. He himself is neither attracted nor repelled by

1. Works. Vol: 3. P. 257.

2. Ibid.

3. Pierre Lombart. - d. 1681. He came to England from Paris in 1640 (circa) practised successfully as an engraver and portrait painter until a little after 1660 when he returned to Paris, where he died. He was known to Evelyn and so may have been a link between him and Taylor. See "Diary" for June 23rd. 1653.

4. Works. Vol: 3. p. 271.

decay. The human body has none of the horrible fascination for him that it had for Donne. He can see it near its end and feel neither curiosity, wonderment nor regret at its fate. When a man comes to death he has come to "That harbour whither God has designed everyone that he may find rest from the troubles of the world."<sup>1</sup> There is neither fear of this end, nor longing for it, in his mind. It is inevitable, it is God-sent and therefore, it is well. And just as Taylor avoids any extraordinary clinging to this world so does he refuse to go into raptures and dilate upon the glories of the next. There is no mention of harps, singing, or angel choirs in his book, but patience in sickness, self examination and repentance for sin and then a cheerful abiding of the issue.

All this was new in the literature of the age. The refusal to see death as a macabre monster, a black figure hurling poisoned darts or as the majestic subduer of tyrants and kings was a break away from a literary convention that had held too many and lasted too long.<sup>2</sup> Taylor writes about death just as so many have undergone it before his day, then and since, quite simply and naturally. Part of the reason may have been that the death bed of Lady Carbery which the funeral sermon shows had affected him so profoundly was still fresh in his mind. What he had witnessed at his wife's bed side we do not know, it belonged to that private life which he tells us he was never anxious to reveal. He delivered no funeral oration over his wife. He could not make his grief objective to that extent. But though recent experiences no doubt had their share in determining the tone of his writing the main explanation lies in the extraordinary serenity of his religious faith. Whatever vicissitudes his exterior circumstances may have suffered no waves or storms had gone over his soul. He had served

1. Works. Vol: 3. p.336.

2. In the sixteenth century Montaigne and Shakspeare are almost alone in their attitude of quiet acceptance of death. In Donne the preoccupation with all that concerned it has the force of a morbid passion, but from then on the dread of mortality appears less and less in English Literature. See Spencer. "Death and Elizabethan Tragedy". Harvard University Press and Milford. London. 1936.

God in the beauty of holiness and the beauty of holiness was his strength. The theology which he professed avoided extremes. It neither threatened him with the pain of purgatory, nor the wrath of a God who delighted in anger; and so he feels that one who has done all he can to fortify himself by a life of devotion may safely resign his spirit, when the time comes, into the hands of a merciful Saviour.

"Holy Dying" has more personal feeling in it than any other of Taylor's books. There was nothing like it in English before he wrote and he disagreed so profoundly with the Roman Catholic teaching about death that it is doubtful if any Latin manuals influenced him. His continually reiterated objection to deathbed repentance, which finds vigorous expression here too would be a sure indication that he would condemn Extreme Unction. He calls it a "charm"<sup>1</sup> and says "It must needs be nothing", for no rational man can think any ceremony can make a spiritual change without a spiritual act of him that is to be changed."<sup>2</sup> On prayers for the dead he unhesitatingly condemns intercessions for those who have lived evil lives for their state is determined, but he neither expressly, or by the tone of the passage, condemns supplication on behalf of those who have lived faithfully and died trustfully.

The book came straight from his heart and his experience. He writes of the real difficulties which a parish priest finds in actual ministrations among his flock. Of the reluctance of sick people to send for a priest until life is almost extinct he treats fully. Not all of this was remembered from his Uppingham days, for he seems to have exercised his pastoral office whenever he had an opportunity right up to the Restoration.

In the first chapter Taylor reaches the height of his literary glory. He did few things as well and nothing better in after days. The grandeur of his theme is matched by the exaltation of his language and the range and beauty of his imagery. To read it for the first time is like turning into a tropical valley, one is

1. Works. Vol: 3. p. 261.  
2. Ibid.

overwhelmed by hitherto unimagined luxuriance. This fact has been recognised by most of the makers of anthologies, for in nearly every collection in which Taylor figures something is taken from this chapter. His subject is the inevitability of death, and the pathos of its coming suddenly to one who, like the dead captain in the shipwreck, strong in his hopes and confident in his future, meets his end.<sup>1</sup> Every one of us has but the feeblest hold on life. "Death meets us every where and is procured by every instrument and in all chances".<sup>2</sup>

Taylor had the poet's mentality and, though he could not write verse, he proves himself in this chapter a master of prose rhythm. Almost every line will show how skilfully he matches his cadences to his thought. Take, for example, the lament of Ninus

"This man is dead: behold his sepulchre: and now hear where Ninus is. Sometimes I was Ninus, and drew the breath of a living man; but now am nothing but clay. I have nothing, but what I did eat, and what I served to myself in lust, that was and is all my portion. The wealth with which I was esteemed blessed, my enemies meeting together shall bear away, as the mad Thyades carry a raw goat. I am gone to hell; and when I went thither, I carried neither gold, nor horse, nor silver chariot. I that wore a mitre, am now a little heap of dust."<sup>3</sup>

There is nevertheless very little that could be called merely fine writing in the book. He does, it is true, pile up arguments and images but there is sincerity in them all. They are there because the writer felt that they might bring extra, and perhaps necessary, persuasion to bear upon the reader, not because they offered him a chance to show how beautifully he could embroider a common, if noble, theme. Indeed the sincerity, the pathos, the beauty of Taylor's meditations upon death do, for the moment, trick us into believing that he is saying something new, when actually originality is entirely wanting in the basic ideas upon which he erects so lovely a fabric.

In essence the sum of the whole book is this. We must all die, we ought therefore to endeavour to die worthily. A stock reflection of every moralist Pagan or Christian. The author's debt to the classics throughout the whole book is conspicuous,

1. Works. Vol: 3. p.268.
2. Ibid. p.269.
3. Ibid. p.272.

not only in pointed stories, skilfully borrowed, but in allusions, quotations and paraphrases. Our generation will never read "Holy Dying" with the complete understanding of, and joy in, the author with which our forefathers read it, because we are without that background of knowledge of the literature of Greece and Rome which educated men were wont to have. A moderately well-read man nowadays will probably recognize the names of the more famous authors to whom Taylor refers; he may even make some effort to verify for himself how close the quickly appended paraphrase may be to the quotation Taylor has just introduced in the original; but the hints, the fleeting glances at something the ancients said and which the author will assume because they said it, all these will most likely be beyond him.

Still there is enough beauty of an inescapable sort left to assure the book its readers so long as anyone takes any interest at all in what Jeremy Taylor wrote. Taylor did not intend it to be used only, or even chiefly, by those who were nearing their end. He wanted it to be read while men were in their health and strength so that they might fitly prepare themselves for sickness and death.<sup>1</sup> The book is too long for any sick person except those whose illness does not make them incapable of sustained mental effort. Lovers of pure literature who have no objection to a solemn theme, if it is treated adequately, will always come to "Holy Dying" with delight. Its continued publication with "Holy Living" has made it difficult to gauge how much popularity it has gained on its own merits, for the earlier of the two works so adequately filled an obvious need in the Church of England that it has been regularly republished for its devotional value ever since its first appearance.<sup>2</sup> The two books together have had a vast influence over countless lives. Captain Thomas Verney, that interesting if rather unstable member of a notable family, wrote home to request "A provision for my soul,

1. Works. Vol: 3. p.258.

2. Some idea of the great popularity of these two books may be gained from the fact that Holy Living reached its 14th edition in 1686 and Holy Dying its 21st edition in 1710.

Doctor Taylor his Holy Living and Dying both in one volume"<sup>1</sup> when he was contemplating a voyage to the west Indies. Later, when the Duchess of Marlborough was attempting to reduce Queen Anne to her obedience again she sent the Queen a lecture on the duty of forgiveness before coming to communion and a copy of "Holy Living and Dying" with the leaves turned down at suitable places.

It was the reading of "Holy Living and Dying" while he was at Oxford which caused the first spiritual awakening in John Wesley.<sup>2</sup> So, though partially and indirectly, it had a share in the founding of Methodism. It had an influence that might have been expected upon one who launched the greatest religious revival within the Church of England in the next century. John Keble, writing to his friend J.F. Coleridge in 1817, says,

"I never read 'Holy Living and Dying' regularly till this spring, and I cannot tell you the delight it has given me; surely that book is enough to convert any infidel, so gentle in heart, and so high in mind, so fervent in zeal, and so charitable in judgement, that I confess I do not know any other author, except perhaps Hooker, (whose subjects are so different that they will hardly bear comparison), worthy to be likened to him. Spenser I think comes nearest to his spirit in all respects. Milton is like him in richness and depth, but in morality seems to me as far below him as pride is below humility."<sup>3</sup>

The same great qualities appear in the "Sermons" which Taylor made his next publication. He claims that they were all actually preached,<sup>3</sup> but although there are fifty two of them and they are arranged to fit the Sundays of the year it is not very likely that they were consecutively produced, one a week, throughout any one year of Taylor's life. They were probably the flower of his preaching throughout the time he had been at Golden Grove and therefore belong to a period contemporary with the "Liberty of Propheying", "The Great Exemplar" and "Holy Living and Dying", as well as the smaller works of this time. It is important to recognise this fact because although it is impossible to sort them all out and to fit each sermon into its proper place in Taylor's

1. 'Verney Memoirs' Vol: 1 p 540.

2. Coleridge. J.F. "Memoir of John Keble". p.68.

3. "Preached at Golden Grove" is on the title page of each Half Year: see Works. Vol: 4.

literary ability as proof that his strength was still on the increase. It is probable that after "Holy Dying" Taylor never did anything else as good in the ornate style though some of these sermons, which were published later, were in a quieter way, quite equal to the best passages in that book. From 1651 the calm which Taylor seems to have found so necessary to good writing was passing from him.

Taylor's main collection of sermons is divided into two parts; the first, containing "Twentyseven Sermons", is called "The Summer Half;" the second, with "Twentyfive Sermons", entitles "The Winter Half"; and the whole, called "Eniautos", or a Course of Sermons for all the Sundays of the Year, fitted to the great necessities, and for the supplying the wants of preaching in many parts of this Nation".<sup>1</sup> The Summer Half was published in 1651 with some doubts about the reception the sermons were likely to receive. In the dedication to Lord Carbery the preacher says,

"My lord, I confess the publication of these sermons can so little serve the ends of my reputation, that I am therefore pleased the rather to do it because I cannot at all be tempted in so doing to minister to any thing of vanity. Sermons may please when they first strike the ear, and yet appear flat and ignorant when they are offered to the eye and to an understanding that can consider at leisure".<sup>2</sup>

Taylor apparently had a very graceful delivery and was not quite sure how his sermons would bear being deprived of that aid. He was afraid they might not have learning enough to please the popular fancy and he puts in his protest early, "It were well if men would not enquire after the learning of the sermon or its deliciousness to the ear or fancy, but observe its usefulness."<sup>3</sup> That was his excuse for publishing; these sermons were useful. Taylor did not did not leave Wales to see this book through the press. The fact that his wife was dead and his family now wholly in his care would make it impossible for him to get away. So Royston, his publisher, added a short note apologizing for any printers errors which might be found.

1. ἔνιαυτός = a year.
2. Works. Vol: 4. p. 323.
3. Ibid. p.324.

"The absence of the author, and his inconvenient distance from London hath occasioned some lesser escapes in the impression of these Sermons". This is quite an important little statement for it not only gives us some news of Taylor's whereabouts at this time but leads us to suppose that generally, if he was in or near London, he corrected his own proofs.

The second or Winter Half Year he carried up to London himself, and on that visit either stayed with or was in close contact, with the family of his late wife, as a letter of his makes clear.

"Deare Brother. Thy letter was most welcome to me, bringing the happy news of thy recovery. I had notice of thy danger, but watched for this happy relation, and had layed wayte with Royston to enquire of Mr. Rumbould. I hope I shall not neede to bid thee be carefull for the perfecting thy health, and to be fearful of a relapse. Though I am very much, yet thou thyself art more concerned in it. But this I will remind thee of, that thou be infinitely (careful) to perform to God those holy promises which I suppose thou didst make in thy sickness; and remember what thoughts thou hadst then, and beare them along upon thy spirit all thy lifetime. For that which was true then is so still, and the world is really as vain a thing as thou didst then suppose it. I durst not tell thy mother of thy danger (though I heard of it) till at the same time I told her of thy recovery. Poore woman! she was troubled and pleased at the same time, but your letter did determine her, I take it kindly that thou hast writt to Bowman. If I had been in condition you should not have been troubled with it; but, as it is, both thou and I must be content. Thy mother sends her blessing to thee and her little Mally. So doe I, and my prayers to God for you both. Your little cozens<sup>1</sup> are your servants; and I am

thy most affectionate and endeared brother,

JER. TAYLOR.

November 24, 1653.

To my very dear Brother, B. LANGSDALE, at his Apothecary's House in Gainsborough."<sup>2</sup>

He was still apparently struggling with debt but Bowman had been written to and, no doubt, satisfied for the time being, so that worry was quieted. There was no uneasiness whatever in his mind about the reception his new book would meet. The tone of its dedication which was also to Lord Carbery was clear and confident, the writer feels no need to prepare the ground for his readers as he had done earlier.

These two halves were intended to form one book and are

1. Cozens, i.e. Taylor's children. Comp: "How now, brother! Where is my cousin, your son?" "Much Ado about Nothing" Act.1. Sc.11. Line 2.
2. Brit: Mus.: Sloane MSS.4274. No.125. Heber(Life of Jeremy Taylor. Taylor's Works. Vol: 1. p.xxv) misread the date as 1643 and then reasoning from the fact that Taylor does not mention his wife in the letter, considered it as additional evidence that the first wife died before Taylor left Uppingham.

now always published together though the order in which they are arranged, the Winter Half first to coincide with the beginning of the church's year, is not the best. Placed so the reader comes first to the confident second dedication and until he makes a comparison of dates is a little puzzled by the tentative air of the earlier dedication which he meets later in the book.

The author is insistent that his sermons are a course for all the Sundays of the year. There are fiftytwo of them and to that extent the description is correct, but apart from the first on "Doomsday Book; or Christ's advent to Judgement" which does, in a measure, fit Advent Sunday, and the first in the Summer Half, "Of the Spirit of Grace", which coincides with Whitsunday there is no reference to, or apparent special fitness of the discourse for, the day on which it is supposed to be preached. Easter and Christmas are both passed by unnoticed. It might have been suggested that this was in deference to the dominant party if there had been anything else in Taylor's life which gave the least encouragement to the idea. But the man who dedicated the "Apology of Liturgy" to the King, whom a purged Parliament had just executed, is not likely to have ignored the feasts of the church because notice of them would give offence. It is odd because, even if Taylor was only publishing a selection of the most presentable of his discourses, one would have expected that the mighty themes of the Incarnation and the Resurrection would have inspired him more than once. He had already inserted discourses on these subjects in the "Great Exemplar".<sup>1</sup>

There is, also, very little dealing directly with the Life of Our Lord in this collection. There are sermons on Prayer, Godly Fear, The Flesh and the Spirit, The House of Feasting, The Marriage Ring, Christian Simplicity, Mercy, Sin, The Righteous Cause Oppressed, and his permanent bugbear Deathbed Repentance, but nothing to do with the main incidents of the Gospel story. He

1. In "Rules and advices to the Clergy of Down and Connor" he tells his clergy to "Take care to explicate to the people the mysteries of the great festivals, as of Christmass, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, Trinity Sunday, the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary; because these feasts containing in them the great fundamentals of our Faith, will with most advantage convey the mysteries to the people." Works. Vol: 1. p.110.

is practical throughout. There is no set pursuit of theological controversy and very little attention to it as a side issue. He observed his own precept, given when he was Bishop, to the clergy of Down and Connor, "Let the business of your sermons be to preach holy life, obedience, peace, love among neighbours."<sup>1</sup>

The speculation as to whether the Sermons were preached exactly as they are printed, or if a simpler version was given from the pulpit and this was afterward worked over and polished before it appeared in book form has occupied a good many minds. It has been objected that these sermons would have been far above the heads of an ordinary country congregation but, in all probability, the congregation gathered in Lord Carbery's private chapel at Golden Grove was not composed entirely, or even mainly, of country people. There would be the master of the house and his family, such guests as they might have and possibly some neighbouring clergy would be sufficiently attracted by Taylor's fame to obtain permission from Lord Carbery to hear his chaplain's sermons. These and the servants of the estate would make up the congregation. But, no matter who was in the congregation, anything that Taylor preached would be both beautiful and learned. He had the true artist's joy in his work, the delight which comes from the creation of a lovely thing. One who thinks beautifully must speak beautifully and Taylor shows always an habitual love of beauty. The Latin and Greek was a convention of the day and even country people have shown often enough that they value the appearance of those languages in sermons addressed to them however little they may understand them.

In the seventeenth century the sermon was one of the greatest of mental activities. Never since then has the pulpit exercised so great an influence, or the clergy as a whole been so conscious of the power the preaching office gave them, or so eager to utilize that power. The severe training in rhetoric which all except the most illiterate of self-appointed apostles had undergone ensured that the preacher should come to his task fully equipped to fulfil it adequately. In addition to the ordinary training

1. Works. Vol. 1. p.108.

in school themes the sacred art of pulpit oratory had been studied by itself. So the methods of the seventeenth century preachers may be said to have all grown from the same soil and, only as the theology and cultural outlook of the party to which he belonged forced him to one side or the other did he branch out. On the whole the Puritan preacher's sermons were plain and unadorned. It suited well with the temperament of their party, which reduced the external expression of worship to the barest essentials. But the Anglo-catholic school of preachers to which, as far as method went, Taylor belonged, though his theology was not in all points what we mean by Anglo-catholic, carried that love of beauty in religion, which made them adorn their churches and their ritual, into the adornment of their sermons.

Both sides displayed immense learning drawn in general from the same sources, though selected to fit the taste of the audience to which they were to appeal and to support the particular case which each had to present. On the whole the Puritans made more use of the classical moralists than the High Churchmen;<sup>1</sup> though Jeremy Taylor, borrowing freely from the whole field of classical literature, is as frequent in his appeal to them as Adams or Hall. Anglo-catholic preachers loved the fathers and turned to them with great frequency. Perkins, the oracle of the Puritans, condemned the habit<sup>2</sup> and Baxter, at a later date, agreed with him.<sup>3</sup> But to whatever extent the taste in theology of the preacher influenced his method it had the same origin and the same end as the work of those from whom he differed.

Sermons in the seventeenth century were not solely religious exercises, intended only for the edification of the particular congregation which assembled to hear<sup>them</sup> from the preacher's lips; but, they were, as much as anything else, exercises in rhetoric, intended for the widest possible public. Consequently every preacher of any ability had publication in view and the market

1. Mitchell. "English Pulpit Oratory". p.203.

2. Perkins Works. (London. 1631.) Vol: 2. p.664.

3. Baxter. Works. (London. 1707) Vol: 4. p.428.

was deluged with their works. It did not, however, follow that before going into the pulpit the preacher who later intended to publish his work wrote it down word for word just as he intended to give it to the printer. He might do so. On the other hand, he might submit it to an elaborate editing before parting with it and then state on the title page that the sermon was published with additions, or he might preach from notes which he afterwards wrote out in full. A good many of the sermons which found their way into book shops were there without the consent of their authors. Some pious hearer, struck by the power and godliness of the address, might take it down in shorthand and have it printed to advance the views of the party or of his favourite preacher's fame or even to make a little money. Posthumous sermons, edited by the executors of the deceased, or spurious work fathered on to him because his name had a sales value, added their number to the overflowing supply.<sup>1</sup>

we know that none of the sermons in "Eniautos" came to the printer from any other hands than Taylor's own. In all probability he delivered them from manuscript in the form in which we now have them. If they are read with attention there is nothing in them to suggest a patchwork of spoken and written pieces, indeed, if all the quotations and highly wrought passages were taken from some of them there would be very little sermon left. There are only two methods whereby they could have been produced. The teaching in them might first have been delivered quite simply in an extempore manner from notes and then the whole ground gone over again and the elaborate sermon for publication produced, though what inducement there would be for Taylor to use this method it is hard to say, unless his congregation consisted mainly of illiterates which we have shown cause to believe was not the case. It is more reasonable to suppose that the sermons were preached as they are printed.

Unfortunate as the present arrangement of "Eniautos" is

1. For a full discussion of the subject see: Mitchell.  
"English Pulpit Oratory" pp.14 ff.

from a chronological point of view, it has the advantage of presenting the reader with some of Taylor's best work first. The three introductory sermons for the winter Half, those on Doomsday Book, are exalted in tone, full of awe and at times of loveliness. In construction, they are similar to those which follow. Three sermons are preached on the same text. Sometimes he did not attempt more than two, but in none of the discourses in "Eniautos" does the preacher try to exhaust his subject matter in one address. These sermons follow on each other and could easily be delivered as one if anyone desired such length. Not even in the full form would they have been much longer than the normal pulpit effusion of the age. Divided as they are, each is notably short and can be read through comfortably in twenty minutes or half an hour.

After the text has been announced some general considerations on it are offered, and the subject divided into heads. A good deal of thought is given to the opening. Sometimes the hearer is to be startled into attention, as, for instance, at the opening of the first sermon on "The Descending and Baited Gurse cut off."

"It is not necessary that a commonwealth should give pensions to orators to dissuade men from running into houses infected with the plague, or to entreat them to be out of love with violent torments, or to create in men evil opinions concerning famine or painful deaths; every man hath a sufficient stock of self-love, upon the strength of which he hath entertained principles strong enough to secure himself against voluntary mischiefs, and from running into states of death and violence. A man would think that this I have now said were in all cases certainly true; and I would to God it were for that which is the greatest evil, that which makes all evils, that which turns good into evil, and every natural evil into a great sorrow, and makes that sorrow lasting and perpetual; that which sharpens the edge of swords, and makes agues to be fevers, and fevers to turn into plagues: that which puts stings into every fly, and uneasiness to every trifling accident, and strings every whip with scorpions; you know I must needs mean SIN; that evil men suffer patiently, and run after it greedily, and will not suffer themselves to be divorced from it; and therefore God hath hired servants to fight against this evil:"<sup>1</sup>

Sometimes interest is engaged by a brief textual discussion such as that which introduces the first of the three sermons on "Godly Fear". Sometimes the passage of scripture lends itself to satirical comment like the tremendous outburst which

1. Works. Vol: 4. p.356.

stands at the head of the sermon quaintly named "The House of Feasting". His text is "Let us eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow we die" and the preachers comment -

"This is the epicure's proverb, begun upon a weak mistake, started by chance from the discourses of drink, and thought witty by the undiscerning company; and prevailed infinitely, because it struck their fancy luckily, and maintained the merry meeting; but as it happens commonly to such discourses, so this also, when it comes to be examined by the consultations of the morning and the sober hours of the day, it seems the most witless and the most unreasonable in the world."<sup>1</sup>

There are a good many classical illustrations in this sermon, more than in most, but the morality is all for the preacher's own age and the people who heard him. If any more evidence of Taylor's attitude toward eating and drinking were needed other than that provided in "Holy Living and Dying" it is given here. Moderate pleasure in the table is not condemned.

"It is lawful when a man needs meat to choose the pleasanter, even merely for their pleasures; that is, because they are pleasant, besides that they are useful; this is as lawful as to smell of a rose, or to lie in feathers, or to change the posture of our body in bed for ease, or to hear music, or to walk in gardens rather than the highways; and God hath given us leave to be delighted in those things which He made to that purpose, that we may also be delighted in Him that gives them. For so as the more pleasant may better serve for health, and directly to refreshment, so collaterally to religion; always provided that it be in its degree moderate, and we temperate in our desires, without transportation and violence, without unhandsome usages of ourselves, or taking from God or from religion any minutes and portions of our affections."<sup>2</sup>

But for the surfeiting and beastliness of which his age saw a good deal he can find no words too severe.

The two sermons on "The Marriage Ring" which follow on "The House of Feasting" have attracted a good deal of attention both because of the quaintness of much of the thought in them and the carefully wrought beauty with which they abound, but they are by no means devoid of that sort of commonsense in matrimonial affairs which is never out of date. For example his advice on the early

1. Works. Vol: 4. p.180.  
2. Ibid. p.202.

days of marriage might be given today.

"Man and wife are equally concerned to avoid all offences of each other in the beginning of their conversation; every little thing can blast an infant blossom; and the breath of the south can shake the little rings of the vine when first they begin to curl like the locks of a new-weaned boy; but when by age and consolidation they stiffen into the hardness of a stem, and have by the warm embraces of the sun and the kisses of heaven brought forth their clusters, they can endure the storms of the north and the loud noises of a tempest and yet never be broken: so are the early unions of an unfixed marriage, watchful and observant, jealous and busy, inquisitive and careful, and apt to take alarm at every unkind word. For infirmities do not manifest themselves in the first scenes, but in the succession of a long society; and it is not chance or weakness when it appears at first, but it is want of love or prudence, or it will be so expounded:"<sup>1</sup>

If Taylor himself had not had a very happy home life it is not very likely that he could have written this:-

"No man can tell but he that loves his children, how many delicious accents make a man's heart dance in the pretty conversation of these pledges; their childishness, their stammering, their little angers, their innocence, their imperfections, their necessities, are so many little emanations of joy and comfort to him that delights in their persons and society; but he that loves not his wife and children, feeds a lioness at home, and broods a nest of sorrows."<sup>2</sup>

It is religion in the home and in individual lives which is here as elsewhere his chief interest. He makes no reference to Milton's acrimonious pamphlets on divorce or to any other of the theories of marriage which were being discussed in his time. Neither does he think it necessary to make more than the slightest mention of the church's right to bless the union of her children; though this might have been expected, for the sectaries who were now strongly in power hated all religious ceremonies and were soon to enact that only those marriages celebrated before a justice of peace were legal. It has been conjectured that this sermon was preached about the time of his wife's death,<sup>3</sup> from the fact that it would occur in the yearly course about Ascensiontide; but "Eniautos" was not Taylor's sermons for 1651 merely, and that conjecture falls to the ground.

Jeremy Taylor was never a Boanerges; his preaching was

1. Works. Vol: 4. p. 216.
2. Ibid. p.224.
3. "Famous Sermons." Edited by Maclean. p.83.

for the increase of holiness, it did not degenerate into a tirade against political or church enemies as many of the pulpit effusions of his age were apt to do. He makes very few references to the events of the times and called names on rare occasions. He does however refer to the exaggerated zeal of the Puritans; and he makes a reference to Charles the first and Stafford.

Only one set of sermons definitely seems to have had its origin in the events of the day. The three which were preached on 1. Peter. IV. 17-18, and entitled "The Faith and Patience of the Saints; or the Righteous Cause oppressed" by implication generally, and here and there by direct statement set themselves to the work of encouraging the distressed Anglican church. Preached as they probably were at some time between 1647, the year of Charles the first's abduction from Holmby House, and 1651, when the Royal cause seemed to have met total extinction at the battle of Worcester, it is easy to imagine the effect which the lyrical descriptions of good men suffering wrong must have had upon a congregation Royalist in sympathy.

As a rule Taylor does not address his sermons to the exigencies of the times but rather to the universal needs of men and so does he avoid a habit, very widespread among his contemporaries, of giving his addresses fantastic names. His sermons are generally supplied with simple titles which sum up the subject rather than with extraordinary ones which will catch the eye of the purchaser.

Besides the collection in "Eniautos" there are extant eleven unconnected sermons and the twenty discourses embedded in the "Great Exemplar" which probably represent Taylor's preaching before 1649. Of the addresses published separately only one falls within Taylor's greatest period, the wonderful years between 1647 and 1655, that is the funeral sermon on Lady Carbery already mentioned. The tie which bound the preacher to the deceased was a peculiarly close one. In none of his other funeral addresses did he achieve quite the same union of exalted contemplation and the sense of personal loss as he did then. "The Sermon preached at the funeral of the Lord Primate" was also an act of mourning for one of

his own friends, though the relationship between Taylor and Bramhall was neither so close nor so tender as that which bound him to Lady Carbery. Yet, here again, it was the personal interest which the preacher had in him they mourned which inspired his eloquence.

The weakest of Taylor's three funeral addresses is the sermon for Sir George Dalston and in that case Taylor had no more interest in the deceased than he had in any other of the worthy Royalists to whom he occasionally ministered.<sup>1</sup> There is far more Latin and Greek quotation and argument about etymologies in it than there is in the other two. It is not until Taylor began to speak from his own knowledge of the religious behaviour of Sir George Dalston and, of his composure in his last illness, that the sermon warms up at all. From a theological point of view the sermon is more interesting. Preaching from the text "If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable", he takes the opportunity to develop his views about an intermediate state. He rejects the Roman theory of purgatory without hesitation but refuses to hold that the souls of the dead pass immediately either to heaven or hell. His belief is that the just wait in a place of peace and refreshment until the last day when they shall be admitted to heaven. The intermediate state of the damned he is not so clear about, but for them their final abode is in "Tophet". Except for a very few touches in the place mentioned the sermon is dry and constrained. It is an effort with the smallest possible amount of personal feeling behind it.

The funeral sermon for the Lord Primate is far different. It falls only just short of Taylor's best work. Bramhall died in 1663. He had been a great scholar as well as a wise and kindly diocesan bishop. He was willing to go farther in concession to the Puritans than some of his brethren on the episcopal bench. If he had

1. This is the only one of his funeral sermons which Taylor did not publish himself. Sir George Dalston was buried on Sept: 28th. 1657; but the sermon was not printed until 1683.

lived longer it is possible that his moderating influence would have had some real effect upon the dispute with the Presbyterians. When he died Taylor was called upon to preach the funeral sermon. It was only natural, for his reputation was greater than that of any bishop then living in Ireland. His address took the form of a meditation upon the Resurrection. Very little Latin and Greek found their way into it and for the most part his prose is as direct as it is strong.

"But this article (the Resurrection) was so clearly proved, that presently it came to pass that men were no longer ashamed of the cross, but it was worn upon breasts, printed in the air, drawn upon foreheads, carried upon banners, put upon crowns imperial; presently it came to pass that the religion of the despised Jesus did infinitely prevail; a religion that taught men to be meek and humble, apt to receive injuries, but unapt to do any; a religion that gave countenance to the poor and pitiful, in a time when riches were adored, and ambition and pleasure had possessed the heart of all mankind; a religion that would change the face of things, and the hearts of men, and break vile habits into gentleness and counsel; that such a religion, in such a time, by the sermons and conduct of fishermen, men of mean breeding and illiberal arts should so speedily triumph over the philosophy of the world, and the arguments of the subtle, and the sermons of the eloquent; the power of princes and the interests of states, the inclinations of nature and the blindness of zeal, the force of custom and the solicitation of passions, the pleasures of sin and the busy arts of the devil; that is, against wit and power, superstition and wilfulness, fame and money, nature and empire, which are all the causes in this world that can make a thing impossible, this is to be ascribed to the power of God and is the great demonstration of the Resurrection of Jesus".<sup>1</sup>

The essential simplicity of a passage like this is easily seen, in spite of the long sentences made by the addition of clause after clause where most people would have been content to put in a full stop and begin again. There is only one of that type of simile with which he loved to adorn his earlier sermons and that is neither so striking nor so elaborate.

"So have we seen a poor condemned criminal, the weight of whose sorrows sitting heavily upon his soul, hath benumbed him into a deep sleep, till he hath forgotten his groans, and laid aside his deep sighings, but on a sudden comes the messenger of death, and unbinds the poppy garland, scatters the heavy cloud that encircled his miserable head, and makes him return to acts of life, that he may quickly descend into death and be no more. So is every sinner that lies down in shame, and makes his grave with the wicked; he shall indeed rise again, and be called upon by the voice of the archangel, but then he shall descend into sorrows greater than the reason and the patience of a man, weeping and shrieking louder than the groans of the miserable children in the valley of Hinnon."<sup>2</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.399.
2. Ibid. p.405.

Each of these three funeral sermons is constructed upon the same plan. First of all comes the sermon proper, drawn out of the text in the usual manner. This is followed by a short sketch of the life of the deceased. In all three cases the transition is made by a similar remark.<sup>1</sup>

Before Taylor there was very little that could be called a funeral oration in the English language. Fisher had delivered two noble sermons one at the death of Henry the seventh and one at the death of that King's mother. Donne had produced one or two addresses at funerals, but they were more by way of putting a sad occasion to religious use than an oration over the departed. So Taylor had to discover his own method and he drew as far as we can say without his own direct confession from St. Basil and St. Chrysostom. And if there was very little funeral eloquence before Taylor not very much that has survived came after him. Rust preached a beautiful and impressive sermon at Taylor's funeral exactly in the style which Taylor himself had used, and Bishop Burnet eulogized Boyle and Tillotson but with some of the French manner.

It is inevitable that some comparison should be made between Taylor and Bossuet or Taylor and Bourdaloue for they represent the best of their kind in their own country. There are points of contrast rather than similarity between the English preacher and the great Frenchman. Bossuet stands preeminent as the orator of the "Oraisons Funèbres".

If they are placed side by side with Taylor's sermon on the death of Lady Carbery or at the funeral of the Lord Primate it is easy to see that in the realms of pure oratory Bossuet is undoubtedly superior. Bossuet goes into the pulpit to astonish his audience with a marvellous rhetorical display and, at the

1. "I have now done with my text, but yet am to make you another sermon. "Countess of Carbery". works. Vol: 8. p.442. "I have now done with my meditation of the Resurrection; but we have a new and a sadder subject to consider" "The Lord Primate". Ibid. p.406. "I have now done with my text, and been the expounder of this part of the divine oracle; but here is another sermon yet". "Sir George Dalston". Ibid. p.563.

same time, furnish the utmost amount of panegyric which his artistry will allow. It is with conscious power that he marshals all his forces, and he had many; sublimity and range of thought, poetic, almost lyric feeling, expressed in language both splendid and concise and, blending all this, dominating his hearers, compelling their subordination to himself and his theme, was the personality of the born orator.

Taylor seeks the beautiful phrase or the striking image because he loves it, not because he is thinking of the effect it will make on his hearers. No one can read Bossuet without feeling that he went into the pulpit conscious of a great occasion and a magnificent auditory and determined to satisfy both. Taylor, on the other hand, is far more natural. It ought perhaps to be observed that he was never called upon to preach at a state funeral. The nearest approach to it was the burial of Bramhall and so there was not the same kind of demand made upon him as there was upon Bossuet. He assumes that the minds of his hearers will be preoccupied with the death of their friend and the religious issues involved; there is nothing besides this to be considered. So the main part of his sermons deal with what Christianity has to say upon death, and life after death, so that his hearers may be comforted; and then, fortified, he takes them on to consider the life of the one the mourned, without attempting any high flights but with reverent affection. It was not his object to glorify the corpse. In the case of Lady Carbery, both Taylor's gratitude to her and his sincere respect for her character which he had been allowed peculiar opportunities of studying, led him to speak of her with the tenderest admiration. Bossuet never said anything more delicately fine in thought and language than "She lived as we all should live, and she died as I fain would die"<sup>1</sup>

Bourdaloue disliked funeral orations and was only induced to preach two of what he called *éloges*, those on Henri and Louis Condé. In his sermons, taken generally, there is the same

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.450.

emphasis upon practical religion as there is in "Eniautos", but there is not the same feeling for language or beauty of imagery that there is in Taylor. Bourdaloue's sentences are short, his reasoning plain and convincing, and, like Taylor, he makes great use of the fathers though he does not seem to have been influenced in his style by them. Bourdaloue exercises more persuasion upon his hearers than Taylor does because Taylor would never leave a good argument to stand by itself, but the continued disregard of literary graces is apt to make the French author very dull. In charm and interest Taylor is far above Bourdaloue but he falls below him in the power to convince. Bossuet had more oratorical grandeur but far less sincerity and naturalness.

Jeremy Taylor's abilities and methods as a preacher are fully displayed in "Eniautos", in the twenty discourses in the "Great Exemplar", and in the funeral sermons. His other addresses, which were published by themselves, add little to our knowledge of him as a preacher though the sermon at the opening of the Dublin Parliament throws some light on the state of his opinions at that very interesting time.

As a preacher Taylor's fame was made and his greatest work done by 1653. It is to the "Sermons" and to "Holy Living and Dying" that we must turn for the best examples of Taylor's work when considering him as a literary artist. The stylistic attractions of both books are much the same. He could utilize the same kind of thought, the same type of glowing passage, in what he intended to be read and in what he intended to be preached. It is largely because of this that the loss of Taylor's presence does not reduce the sermons to that level of dryness to which so many printed sermons fall. But Taylor does not only excel in the highly-wrought, superbly decorated manner with which his name is commonly associated, he had also, when he saw fit to use it, an excellent plain style which would have enabled him to take his place among the writers of the generation which succeeded his own. This fact cannot be too often insisted upon since it is as the

author of one or two purple patches that Taylor is so often recalled to the general reader. He was something more than this. It is however only natural that the great beauty, as well as the great care bestowed in presenting that beauty, which is exhibited in, say, the simile of the lark,<sup>1</sup> should attract attention. The particular illustration just mentioned is especially interesting because one very much like it is found in a sermon of Henry Smith's.<sup>2</sup> This is again some indication that for borrowing purposes Taylor made no distinction in his own mind between the classics and his own contemporaries. He took a beautiful or striking simile whenever he could find it just as he and every other student of rhetoric in his age had been taught to do. But a comparison of the passage in Part Two of the Sermon on the Return of Prayers and that from Smith will show how immeasurably Taylor improved what he borrowed.

In his search for apt illustrations Taylor, as might be expected, turns most often to the classics. There was no other literature which had such treasure to lend, none which would be so well known to the public or with which the preacher was himself more familiar. It must never be forgotten that Taylor intended his work for an educated public and for them a considerable portion of the delight they drew from him would derive from the skill with which he treated themes and similes well known to them. Lord Carbery himself as a student had no doubt copied into his commonplace book some of the passages from the classics which Taylor afterward hit upon for his sermons, and possibly noted with admiration what excellent use his chaplain made of them. One of Taylor's most exquisite little sections is the development of a passage borrowed from Virgil an author whom everyone read at school.<sup>3</sup> Taylor's greatness lies not so much in the coining of a new comparison as in the perfect elaboration of an old. There can be no suggestion that the preacher hoped to fob off the image as entirely his own, the

1. Works. Vol: 4. p.61.

2. Henry Smith. "A Caveat for Christians", published in "Sermons and other Learned Treatises" London. 1675. p. 427.

3. Works. Vol: 3. p. 319. Virgil. "Aen." Bk: 8. Ln: 4-11.

new guise in which it appeared would be all that he claimed as original. He has a catholic taste for all classical literature and quotes from all impartially, though, as Sir Edmund Gosse has noticed, the particular book he was reading at the time was apt to make its way into what he was writing more than any other.<sup>1</sup>

Taylor's borrowings from the classics came under three heads. Sometimes, as in the cases just mentioned, he takes with or without acknowledgment some striking image and develops it with all his skill. Most frequently he is content with an allusion, the mention of a name or a glance at a line or a fact. He compares the feasting of his own day to the Roman banquets where they had "many vessels filled with Campanian wine, turtle of Liguria, Sicilian beeves, wheat from Egypt, wild boars from Illyrium and Grecian sheep<sup>2</sup> In another place, when speaking of the omniscience of God, he says that to Him the thoughts of men, "are visible as Chian wine in the purest crystal". When he wants an example of that very homely product a bore, he fetches one from Rome and refers to "the gentleman Martial speaks of" who though he was good was not to be endured because "he would read his nonsense verses to all companies"<sup>3</sup>

Taylor is an adept at making these skilful little references not only to the classics but to every part of his voluminous reading. He has assimilated it all perfectly. When he writes it is already in his mind and pours itself out naturally upon paper. The "Sermons" are particularly rich in this type of allusion but his other works, especially his devotional writing, share much of the same sort.

His other method of utilizing his classical learning is in direct quotation. This he frequently does, but never so often as to overload his page and always he either adds a translation of the passage he has quoted or weaves a paraphrase of it into the next sentence or two. Because of this it would not damage the sense of the work very greatly if all the Latin and Greek were removed

1. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor" p.103.
2. Works. Vol: 4. p.191.
3. Ibid. p.277.

from the books. He is not always as accurate in these quotations and paraphrases as he might be, though in his controversial writings he took more care than he did elsewhere. In the quotations his memory might have been at fault, but what produced some of the ludicrous mistranslations it is impossible to guess, certainly it was not because he did not know better.<sup>1</sup>

This frequent use of the classics in Taylor's work has often been commented on and speculation offered as to the reason. Undoubtedly he loved them himself, but it was not mere inability to control his enthusiasm which led to his turning so frequently to the literature of Greece and Rome. In the preface to the "Great Exemplar" he gives an emphatic opinion that the classics are far more profitable reading than the triflings of the later schoolmen who "Added nothing to Christianity but trouble, scruple and vexation." The wisest persons, he says, will turn from them to "Those excellent moral, and perfective discourses, which with much pain and great pleasure, we find respersed and thinly scattered in all the Greek and Roman poets, historians and philosophers."<sup>2</sup> He never quotes anything from the more indecent of classical poets which should not be quoted.

Taylor's citations served two purposes; they were didactic and they were entertaining, for the classics were still the most interesting books which the world had to offer. But it was not only from the classics that Taylor drew his illustrations. He had an omnivorous literary appetite and the most amazing of retentive memories. Making all the allowance necessary for the use of the commonplace book, the word or two borrowed here or there, the hint of an author or a story, the mere mention of a name, is enough to prove how full of remembered learning he was. He must have read everything he came in contact with, mediaeval legend, speculation and chronicles, as well as casuistry, secular history, theology and

1. See for example. Works. Vol: 4. p.426. where Taylor quotes a phrase from Arrian, obviously from memory, ὀβελίσκον καταπιόντες περιπατούμεν and translates "We walk by the obelisk".
2. Works. Vol: 2. p.36.

Hebrew. He refers with the ease which only perfect knowledge can give to all the major fathers of East and West. He had read masses of school theology, as well as the works of the Rabbins, "those poets of religion". His knowledge of church history, martyrology, of monastic legends and of Roman Catholic books of devotion was immense, and besides all this he seems to have read everything of any importance which had been produced in his own time.<sup>1</sup>

apart from bewildering the modern reader with such a number of references to authors who are now forgotten, another result of all this learning is to make Taylor's work very often strangely impersonal. It is not so much what he himself has seen and felt which is reproduced. He does, as we have said, make one or two references to natural scenery which may have been inspired by his own surroundings in Wales, and there are quite a few taken from the life of a soldier which were no doubt recollections of his army days, but by far the greater part of his illustrations, certainly of human nature and human frailty, were taken from books.

In considering this, one thing must not be overlooked. In all probability he was the spiritual director of a good many of those who heard him preach, and who would be among his earliest and closest readers. He would therefore avoid any reference, however veiled, to anything which any who might have come in contact with him might consider a breach of confidence. When he does look up from his books it is a very engaging face that he shows us. He is fond of a mild joke now and then. In discussing the prohibited degrees of marriage he remarks that some have held that there is consanguinity "As long as any memory of kindred remains and that will be very far in Wales where they reckon eight degrees and special names of kindred after cousin germain".<sup>2</sup> Of things that turn out not quite as we intend he says "He that threw a stone at

1. In the ten volumes of his works Taylor quotes or refers to in a recognizable way over 1300 different authors. Most of the citations are short but there are often very many from one writer. For instance, St. Augustine is quoted or referred to 684 times, St. Chrysostom 286, Cicero 216, Seneca 190, Juvenal 116.

2. Works. Vol. 9. p. 396. The whole of this passage is full of gentle humour at the niceties of Roman Catholic Canon Law.

a dog and hit his cruel stepmother, said that although he intended it otherwise, yet the stone was not quite lost,"<sup>1</sup> and he even finds opportunity in his sermon at Bramhall's funeral for a sly dig at Rome, remarking that when St. Peter came back and told the disciples that their Lord was risen as "He was not yet got into the chair of the Catholic Church they did not think him infallible and so they believed him not at all".<sup>2</sup>

Taylor produced several short tracts between 1651, the year when "Holy Dying" appeared, and 1653, when the Winter Half of "Eniautos" appeared. The first of these "Clerus Domini", published in 1651, is a glorification of the ministerial office, and it is stated on the title page that it was "Written by the special command of Charles the first."<sup>3</sup> It is probably that this command arose out of the King's reading of "Episcopacy Asserted" for the book is in some sense a study of the divine origins as well as of the holy duties of the priesthood. It is quite possible that when Taylor first received the command to write he intended to produce an elaborate defence of a sacerdotal ministry for the book reads rather like a collection of material for a larger work, but while he was still brooding over his subject he discovered his talent for devotional writing and contented himself with putting in order and publishing what he had brought together.

He begins with an appeal to antiquity. The wisest nations have always had their priests, which proves that the office of priesthood is reasonable in its institution. Christ appointed a ministry and gave them various powers. The first was that of binding and loosing and, by this, Taylor means the exercise of disciplinary authority rather than the power of absolution exercised in the confessional. The second power was that of preaching the gospel and this leads him into a discussion of the ministry of women which he concludes was subordinate to that of men

1. Works. Vol: 3. p.88.
2. Ibid. Vol: 8. p.398.
3. This is one of the rarest of Taylor's writings, it can be found now and then bound up with "Eniautos".

and exercised either among women or in the care of the churches.

This is followed by a long argument against preaching by unauthorised and irresponsible people. Taylor's weakness in logic is sometimes commented upon but the point can be made too much of. Certainly he was very fond of putting an argument into the shape of formal logic whenever he wished to be concise.

Another power received by the priesthood was that of administering baptism. Somewhat surprisingly he condemns lay baptism, contending "That the lay person shall convey rem sacramenti or be the minister of sacramental grace is nowhere revealed in scripture"<sup>1</sup> The hard case is not to be urged for unbaptised children may be safely left to the mercy of God.

The priest also celebrates the Holy Communion, "The great mystery of Christianity, and the only remanent expression of Christ's sacrifice on earth."<sup>2</sup> But before any of the functions inherent in this office can be exercised the person must be chosen and ordained of God and, the church must proclaim the divine election. By the bestowal of the rite of ordination the chosen are made ministers and stewards of the Gospel, separated and sanctified for their work. The ministry when it grows corrupt can be reformed but it cannot be abolished. This is a tract with more in it than tracts generally have upon the dignity of the priesthood.

Two other short writings of Taylor's appeared in 1651 owing to the enterprise of a London publisher who collected the prayers which favourite preachers were accustomed to use before and after their sermons. Taylor's contribution is quite interesting. The first prayer is rather long, the first half of it being taken up with expressions of repentance and the last half with intercessions rather on the lines of a bidding prayer. The prayer at end of the sermon is much shorter consisting of a few brief thanksgivings and intercessions.<sup>3</sup> In the next year Taylor put

1. Works. Vol: 1. p.28.
2. Ibid. p.33.
3. Ibid. p.64.

out a "Short Catechism, with an explication of the apostles Creed, for the use of schools in Wales"<sup>1</sup> The title is interesting for it suggests that the book comprised the teaching which the author gave in his own school, and that his experience had taught him the need for something similar in other places in the vicinity. From the Reformation to the Civil War poverty and neglect had done more harm to the church in Wales than the dissenters had been able to accomplish. Year after year in Laud's "Annual Accounts of his Province" the Welsh bishops report that there is very little dissent among them but the poorness of the livings and the want of good men to fill them are the chief causes for anxiety.<sup>2</sup> These two evils persisted throughout the Civil War and long afterward until the neglect of church fabrics and church teaching in Wales became a byword even in the general neglect of the eighteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

Three years later he revised and expanded this "Short Catechism" and then republished it as "The Golden Grove". It was a similar process to that which the "Apology for Liturgy" went through.

In 1654 Taylor once more appeared in print as a controversialist, this time with one of the fullest examinations of Eucharistic theology which he ever made in any of his work. It is clear from a letter to Sheldon dated April eleventh, 1653,<sup>4</sup> that the book was already written by that date and also that Taylor was short of money for he mentions, besides the fact that he is sending to Sheldon a "Second volume of sermons, for the Winter Half Year, and the Life of Christ in a fairer character and with some enlargement and advantages"<sup>5</sup>, that he is grateful to Sheldon for forgiving him a debt and also that he has sent his "Real Presence" to the printer "but first to My Lord Bishop of Salisbury to be perused"<sup>6</sup>

1. London. 1652. 12mo.
2. Laud's Works. Vol: 5. pt.2. pp.320,354, 359.
3. Saunders."A View of the State of Religion in the Diocese of St.David's". London. 1721.
4. Tanner MSS. 52.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.

The exact circumstances which gave rise to "The Real Presence and Spiritual in the Blessed Sacrament" are obscure though Taylor has made some references to them both in the letter to Sheldon and in the dedication of the book itself to Warner, Bishop of Rochester, which he prefixed to the volume. He states that he is engaged in controversy again, by accident and against his will; but he had come in contact very lately with one of the Roman emissaries, who were apparently rather pleased with the condition in which the Church of England found herself and very active in proselytizing. This man Taylor attacks, but without mentioning his name, merely saying that he once belonged to the Church of England but has now "Run away from her sorrow and disinherited himself because she was not able to give him a temporal portion".<sup>1</sup> This has generally been understood as an attack upon John Sergeant who was at one time secretary to Bishop Morton of Durham. Taylor hardly puts his adversary's action in its best light if that were so. The special part of Romanist teaching which has roused Taylor more than any other is the "horrible doctrine" that man can "create God".<sup>2</sup> He of course means the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The whole of the book that follows is therefore an attack on that theory.

Much as Taylor disliked referring to himself in his books something can generally be gleaned from them about his circumstances at the time of writing. It would seem from the concluding words of this dedication that he was in need of money again and that Warner had helped him as he had helped so many others.<sup>3</sup> The Parliament had done its best to put such acts of generosity as those to which Taylor refers out of the power of the aged bishop. It had sequestrated the revenues of his see; it had attempted to take from him the large private fortune that he possessed, but the indomitable old man still kept himself personally out of harm's way and managed to find money enough for

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.8.

2. Ibid. p.4.

3. Works. Vol: 6. p.10.

himself and for his friends.

Taylor begins his book in a tone very closely resembling Hooker's famous statement of his attitude toward the Holy Communion.<sup>1</sup> It is in itself a mystery and one that were far better left to everyman to make his own explanation of according to his ability. Such a freedom Taylor alleges was allowed before the Lateran Council and he supports this contention with masses of quotation, including among his authorities "Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham". The attempt to define has brought in nothing but the bitterest and saddest of controversies. He states that the doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of Protestants, is that after the minister hath "Ritely<sup>2</sup> prayed and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ after a sacramental, that is a spiritual, real manner, so that all that worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, effectually to all purposes of His Passion; the wicked receive not Christ but the bare symbols only."<sup>3</sup>

The church catechism, he declares, supports this doctrine. He interprets "real" as meaning "present to our spirits only",<sup>4</sup> and is it significant that when he used this interpretation previously he supported it with a reference to Calvin which probably shows where his own thought on this subject had received a good deal of stimulus. This, he states, is the Anglican doctrine. He now sets out briefly the Roman Catholic doctrine.

1. Hooker. "Ecclesiastical Polity." Bk: 5. sec: ixvii. Par. 12.
2. "Ritely", i.e. used liturgical prayer.
3. Works. Vol: 6. p.13.
4. Works. Vol: 6. p.17. Upon this Bishop Gore remarks. "There is a passage in Jeremy Taylor in which he contrasts two meanings of the word spiritual as applied to the Eucharistic presence: (a) the presence of the body after the manner of a spirit, and (b) a presence to our spirits only and he declares only the latter to be what "we (Anglicans) mean". But the latter explanation proves to be highly ambiguous when analysed, because, as already shown, subject and object cannot be thus put in contrast to one another; and also it is not congenial to the language of the Prayer Book". "The Body of Christ". p. 235-6.

"First, that after the words of consecration, on the altar there is no bread, in the chalice there is no wine. Secondly, that the accidents, that is, the colour, the shape, the bigness, the weight, the smell, the nourishing qualities of bread and wine do remain; but neither in the bread, nor in the body of Christ, but by themselves, that is, so that there is whiteness and nothing white, sweetness and nothing sweet, etc. Thirdly, that in the place of the substance of bread and wine there is brought the natural body of Christ, and His blood that was shed upon the cross. Fourthly, that the flesh of Christ is eaten by every communicant, good and bad, worthy and unworthy. Fifthly, that this is conveniently, properly, and most aptly called Transubstantiation, that is a conversion of the whole substance of bread into the substance of Christ's natural body, of the whole substance of the wine into His Blood."<sup>1</sup>

This teaching he now proposes to try by "Scripture - by Reason - By sense - and by Tradition."

The places in scripture alleged as proof of their doctrine by the Roman Catholic apologists are St. John VI., and the words of Institution, but many of their own theologians admit that these passages are not sufficient to prove Transubstantiation without the declaration of the church, upon which Taylor comments that the church cannot put a meaning into words which is not there.

He now begins a long examination of the teaching in St. John VI. Taylor affirms that in this chapter Christ does not speak of the physical act of eating at all, or of the sacrament at all, and, in accordance with his method throughout the book, brings forward Roman Catholic theologians who support his point of view. If, he says, physical eating is supposed then there is an obligation upon infants to receive the Holy Communion, as some of the fathers have claimed, but since we suppose that the eating meant is spiritual and performed by an act of faith, then, since infants are incapable of that act, they are not commanded to receive the Sacrament. This, which he claims to be the teaching of the Church of England is obviously the more reasonable. That, however, Christ's words are to be understood spiritually is clearly proved by his own declaration to the men of Capernaum when they were scandalized at his words. Our Lord also said that whoever eats has life abiding in him, therefore the eating meant cannot be merely physical, for the wicked perform the action of eating but

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.19.

cannot be said to have life abiding in them. Both Our Lord and St. Paul condemned Transubstantiation since in the teaching of both it is clearly affirmed that the natural eating of Christ's Flesh, could it be done, would do no good but the spiritual eating gives life. The author notes in passing that this spiritual eating can be performed in other ways apart from the sacrament and this is obvious since the word of God, Christ's Doctrine, is the "flesh" he speaks of and receiving and practising this is what is meant by "eating".

In considering the words of Institution Taylor asks how it can be proved that "take and eat" are not as effective as "this is My Body" and that the act of eating does not itself consecrate. Certainly Christ Himself did not tell us which were the consecrating words, He bid us do something. The next point considered is when the consecration can be said to take place. The Roman Church stresses "Hoc est corpus meum" but supposing these words are as important as it is alleged, "est" states a thing in being and therefore the consecration must have already taken place. A more reasonable point of view than this would be that the consecration took place at the previous blessing of the elements. The Greek Church has universally taught consecration is brought about by the prayers of the minister. Taylor goes on to contend that "Hoc est corpus meum" is not to be understood literally and he refers to the same phrase in Hebrew and Syriac remarking that it is a characteristic of these languages to fuse the sign with the thing signified.

The two main arguments in support of Taylor's general contention for a spiritual interpretation are that the Sacrament is the same now as when it was Instituted, yet Christ did not give his natural Body then, neither can he now, and that, as many of the fathers have held, the wicked, though they take the outward sign, do not take the spiritual sacrament. The consecration of the chalice offers a problem even greater than the consecration of the bread for the accounts given of the words used by Christ differ and therefore it is impossible to say which were actually used. The Church of

Rome, however, uses words which have no biblical authority at all.

Taylor turns from refuting the Roman argument to state a positive case of his own against them, and, in doing so, he builds a great deal more upon Our Lord's words in Matthew XV.17. than one would think either reverent or necessary. This is another example of Taylor's habit of never letting well alone. If a thing occurred to him which seemed in any way to be making in his direction he must put it in. The same thing is true to a considerable extent of the next argument. If he had stayed to think it out he would probably agreed that the properties of Our Lord's Risen Body might not be entirely the same as those of a normal human body but he argues as if they were. If, says Taylor, Christ is in Heaven in a bodily presence how can he at the same time be bodily present in the Sacrament. In the scripture Christ is spoken of as "going from hence and coming again", therefore, he urges, the Bible does not lead us to suppose that Our Lord could be in two places at once. When he promised his disciples to be with them always even unto the end of the world he meant "present in a spiritual manner".

The book now develops another line of attack. The doctrine of Transubstantiation is against the evidence of the senses and it is useless to reply to this that the senses may perceive the accidents but not the substance of a thing, for it is of the nature of accidents to reveal the substance if they be sufficiently, closely and accurately observed. On no account must the value of sense perception be disparaged for, in the last resort, all the testimony regarding Christ's Life in the world depends upon its reliability.

Since there are other explanations of the sacrament more reasonable in themselves Taylor concludes that it is unnecessary to adopt Transubstantiation which involves so many difficulties and contradictions. Such a doctrine was undoubtedly not that of the Primitive Church and to prove this it will only be necessary to cite one or two of the fathers since their non-acceptance of the teaching would be sufficient to disprove its catholicity according to

Vincent of Lerins' rule. Actually, however, Taylor quotes from a very large number including Tertullian, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and many others whose names are less well known. None of these, nor any other of the fathers, Taylor asserts, condemn what he claims to be the Anglican interpretation of the Sacrament.

Here, as throughout the book, the author arranges his arguments in numbered headings which, if it makes for clarity, does not entirely prevent his repeating himself and certainly helps to make the book one of the driest he ever wrote.

His concluding section deals with the adoration of the Sacrament. He states his conclusions simply and forcibly.

"If they be deceived in this difficult question, against which there lie such infinite presumptions and evidence of sense, and invincible reason, and grounds of scripture and in which they are condemned by the primitive church, and by the common principles of all philosophy, and the nature of things, and the analogy of the sacrament; then it is certain they commit an act of idolatry in giving divine honour to a mere creature, which is the image, the sacrament of the Body of Christ, and at least it is not certain that they are right; there are certainly very great probabilities against them, which ought to abate their confidence in the article; and though I am persuaded that the arguments against them are unanswerable; for if I did not think so, then I should be able to answer them, and if I were able to answer, I would not seek to persuade others by that which does not persuade me."<sup>1</sup>

"These", he declares in almost the last words of his book, "are the grounds by which I am myself established, and by which I persuade and confirm others in this article." In these days when controversy is not read with any great appetite the book, which contains few digressions from its theme and is, for the most part, very baldly written is not likely to give much pleasure to the general reader. The student of theology may summon up some interest in it for it contains the fullest consideration Taylor ever gave to Eucharistic doctrine.

While both from this and from other places in his works the outline of what he believed seems to be clear, it is always a little difficult to be absolutely sure since he was given to making apparently contradictory statements. It may be doubted whether in his own mind Taylor ever classed himself with any one school of

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.162.

Eucharistic theologians. He knew what he did not believe; he was not quite so sure of what he did believe. There is one important place in the "Great Exemplar"<sup>1</sup> and one in "Holy Living and Dying"<sup>2</sup> in which Taylor treats of the Eucharist, besides several relevant passages in the "Worthy Communicant".<sup>3</sup> "The Collection of Offices"<sup>4</sup> in the "Reverence due to the Altar"<sup>5</sup> and the "Dissuasion from Popery"<sup>6</sup> Taking all these passages together it would seem that if we were compelled to put Taylor into some category it would be with receptionists like Calvin or virtualists such as Cranmer. But must always be remembered that Taylor is a hard man to classify. His mind resolutely refused to divide itself into watertight compartments. His doctrine concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice for instance was certainly not that which would be expected from his apparent views on the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament. In the "Great Exemplar"<sup>7</sup> and also in "Holy Living and Dying"<sup>8</sup> he states his conviction that the priesthood is a sacrificial office and throughout the whole of this <sup>later</sup> passage the way in which he links up the Sacrament of the Altar with the perpetual pleading of Christ's Sacrifice in Heaven shows how much he had been influenced by the fathers and by Western as well as Greek liturgical writers of the Early Middle Ages.

Taylor is undoubtedly far more Protestant in his teaching than many of the clergy who belonged to the same political party as himself. Both Andrewes and George Herbert would have repudiated his views and certainly Laud, whose doctrine came fairly near to Transubstantiation as stated by its more theologically minded exponents, would have found his teaching uncongenial.<sup>9</sup> But his practice was more in line with the Laudian School than his theology

1. Works. Vol: 2. pp.637-639.
2. Ibid. Vol: 3. pp.214-221.
3. Ibid. Vol: 8. pp. 4-43. also, pp.96-114 and pp.616-627.
4. Works. Vol: 5. p.330.
5. Ibid. Vol: 6. pp.572-600
6. Ibid. Vol: 6. p.201. ff.
7. Ibid. Vol: 2. p.642.
8. Ibid. Vol: 3. p.214.
9. Laud himself repudiated the charge of teaching Transubstantiation. (See Works. Vol: III. p. 354. Vol: IV. p.284.

and in this he shows little hesitation and no contradiction.<sup>1</sup> His mental attitude toward the Sacrament is as all times that of the greatest awe and reverence. He insists over and over again on the great benefits which a worthy reception of It confers, but is always more eager to spend his rhetoric on the glorification of these gifts than to describe them clearly. He teaches that the Eucharist should frequently be celebrated both for the sake of the communicant and as a solemn and efficacious act of intercession.<sup>2</sup> It should, wherever possible, be received fasting, but he will not lay down any invariable rule on this point for necessity and charity are always to be considered.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, if Transubstantiation were ruled out, Taylor was willing to leave everything concerning the Sacrament to the individual conscience except the frequency and reverence with which it was to be received, but since he believed the Sacrament to be vital to the life of the soul he will accept no compromise in these.

1. Taylor, though differing in other respects, comes near to Cosin both in his rejection of Transubstantiation and in his insistence on the sacrificial element in the Eucharist.
2. Works. Vol: 2. p.655.
3. Ibid. Vol: 8. p.221. See also Vol: 10. p.358.

## CHAPTER SIX.

From time to time during his life in Wales Taylor had left his retreat, either to attend to the publication of his books or to visit his friends, in 1654, we have incontestable proof of his being once more in London. On April fifteenth, 1654, Evelyn noted in his diary, "I went to London to hear the famous Dr. Jeremy Taylor (since Bishop of Downe and Connor) at St. Greg:<sup>1</sup> on 6 Math:48 concerning evangelical perfection". This is the first light we get upon another of the important friendships in Taylor's life. This facility for making friends is a trait which deserves to be noticed for it fully bears out all the encomiums which Rust bestowed upon the winning personality of his dead bishop and enables us to say with some confidence that his character was as attractive as his sermons.

Wherever Taylor went he made friends and it was not until the last years of his life that he had anything like a personal enemy. Evelyn had been a young undergraduate at Balliol College when Taylor preached his Gunpowder Plot sermon. The outbreak of the civil war had driven him abroad and he had spent most of the next ten years wandering over Europe, for some part of the time the companion of the poet Waller and always keenly interested in every form of art and learning. In 1647 he married a daughter of Sir Richard Browne who was acting as Charles the second's ambassador at the French Court, and, in 1653, he came back to England to settle at Sayes Court, near Deptford, for the greater part of his busy life.<sup>2</sup> In 1654 Evelyn was hard at work supervising the decoration of his new house and the laying out of those famous gardens which his tenant in later times, Peter the Great, did his best to ruin by the curious pastime of riding in a wheelbarrow through the hedges.<sup>3</sup> Evelyn was as devoted to the Church of England as he was to Royalty and his

1. The Church of St. Gregory stood near St. Paul's Cathedral. Under the Commonwealth it was a favourite resort of Anglicans and the Government did not shew themselves to be too eager to interfere.
2. Evelyn. "Diary", from the beginning to the year 1654.
3. Ibid. Vol: 1. p.lxxix. Evelyn had let Sayes Court to Admiral Benbow, who sub-let it to Peter the Great.

acquaintances among the dispossessed clergy were very numerous. He would be certain to take an early opportunity of meeting so well known an author and scholar as Jeremy Taylor. There is no indication however that the intimacy developed to any extent on this occasion.

Taylor returned home to Wales, but not to be forgotten by Evelyn. We know nothing of his family life at the period and we can only suppose that he was spending as good part of his time on the next two books which he was to publish. These were "The Golden Grove" and "Unum Necessarium". Both these books were entered at Stationer's Hall in 1655 but a letter from Evelyn to Taylor, written most probably in the early part of 1655, suggests that "Golden Grove" was quite possibly in print by the end of 1654 and "Unum Necessarium" early in 1655.<sup>1</sup> There was no rule that a book must be entered before publication, a month or two afterward was sufficient.

On April twentieth 1653, Cromwell went to the House of Commons and with bitter words sent them about their business. From that time until his death in 1658 he and the army which supported him were the rulers of England. With the passing of Parliament and the coming of Cromwell Presbyterianism lost the ascendancy and Independency came into its own. It was therefore a bold thing for Taylor to attack as he did in the preface to "The Golden Grove" that total want of restraint and decency in religion which the government now seemed to encourage. In place of the orderly worship of the church "The people are fallen under the harrows and saws of impertinent and ignorant preachers".<sup>2</sup> These people think that all sermons ought to be libels and, as a result, their congregations have "reaped the fruit that grows upon such crabstocks"<sup>3</sup> and "grow both idle and irreligious" so, in order to do what he can to convey religion "in all its material parts the same, as it was by a new and permitted instrument"<sup>4</sup>, Taylor is

1. Evelyn. "Diary," from the beginning to the year 1654. Vol: 3. p.204.
2. Works. Vol: 6. 590.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

publishing his book which will convey its teaching under three heads, "What we are to believe, What we are to do, What we are to desire". This short explanation of the origin and aim of the book is given in a dedication to the pious and devout reader. The little book which follows was based upon the shorter catechism for children which Taylor had written in 1651.

"Golden Grove" opens with a brief instruction in question and answer form, nowhere near as comprehensive or as succinct as the Prayer Book catechism for which it was no doubt intended to act as a substitute. Taylor deals with the nature of God the Father and his work as the Creator, with God the Son as our Redeemer and Mediator, but unaccountably makes no mention of the work of the Holy Ghost. It is natural that, the times being what they were, there should be very little said about the nature of the church. But in the next section of Credenda, in which he expands, rather than explains, each clause of the Apostles' Creed, he makes up for this deficiency to some extent for he includes a paragraph on the Holy Spirit and a shorter one on the Church, though he is careful to limit his description of it to those things to which a Presbyterian would be willing to agree. The next section consists of Aggenda, or things to be done, and, though it is admirable in intention, it is too complicated a rule of life for any ordinary person and must always have demanded more time for prayer and Bible reading than an active life allows. This is followed by a section called "Via Pacis" which was meant to supply subjects for meditation for each day of the week, many of which were taken from St. Thomas a Kempis "Imitation of Christ". The third section consists of prayers, beginning with a set of prayers of which each has a phrase from the Lord's Prayer as its keynote. The book concludes with four litanies and some prayers arranged for each day of the week.

Together with "Golden Grove" Taylor published Festival Hymns according to the manner of the Ancient Church, probably because there were too few of them to make a book by themselves. It is a pity he published them for everyone who reads them must say the

same thing about them, they are ingenious, they are full of fancy, they are written in a complicated metre, but they are not poetry nor do they approach near it.<sup>1</sup> The short poem on Ascension Day may serve as an example.

"He is risen higher, not set  
Indeed a cloud  
Did with His leave make bold to shroud  
The sun of glory from mount Olivet.  
At Pentecost He'll show Himself again,  
When every ray shall be a tongue  
To speak all comforts and inspire  
Our souls with their celestial fire;  
That we the saints among  
May sing, and love, and reign" 2

A poet would have made something of the underlying idea in this verse but it would have been necessary for him first to entirely recast it Taylor only leaves us with the impression that he is struggling with something too difficult for him. It has been suggested, that when Taylor chose to write in broken, irregularly rhyming, lines he was influenced by the *Silex scintillans* of Henry Vaughan the Silurist and, possibly, by a friendship with the poet himself since they were at that time living fairly near together,<sup>3</sup> and had a common friend in Mrs. Katharine Philips.<sup>4</sup> It may have been so, but the convention of religious verse at that time rather favoured oddity in style.<sup>5</sup> However, the two attempts Taylor made in a less ambitious metre, as well as the short verse translations scattered about his books, are very little better poetry than the rest and confirm the opinion, if such a thing is necessary, that Taylor was working in a medium unsuited to his genius.<sup>6</sup>

The other publication upon which Taylor was working during his last months at Golden Grove did him more permanent harm than

1. Oscar Wilde's remark about Browning can with more truth be applied to Taylor. "He used poetry as a medium for writing in prose". Wilde. "The Critic as Artist".
2. Works. Vol: 7. p.660.
3. Henry Vaughan. (1622-1695) Entered Jesus College, Oxford, 1638. Began to practise as a physician at Brecknock in 1645. Removed to his native place, Newton-by-Usk, in 1650. Published the first part of "*Silex scintillans*" in the same year, the second part did not appear until 1655.
4. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor" p.115.
5. Comp: George Herbert. "The Temple".
6. His hymn "Of Heaven", which is one of the least unsuccessful of his efforts is still sung in Gonville and Caius College when founders and benefactors are commemorated.

anything else he ever wrote. This was the "Unum Necessarium" which for a while at least, estranged his most valuable friends and plunged him into theological controversy just at the time when he had need of both friends and peace of mind. For a number of years Taylor had been meditating a great work on Casuistry which would prevent the English Church being reproached with neglecting that study, and do away with any need for her priests to read Roman works on the subject.<sup>1</sup> He had spoken of his intention to Duppa as early as sixteenfiftytwo or three.<sup>2</sup> When he actually started the work he saw that it would be necessary to publish some preliminary examination of the doctrine of repentance unless he was to assume a good deal more in his book than he ought to do. He discussed the matter with Brian Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, when they met in London in March, 1655, and Duppa encouraged him in the project.<sup>3</sup> Taylor did not then mention that he intended to discuss Original Sin and Duppa did not think he would do so for he did not consider the matter relevant.

In 1655 Taylor published "Unum Necessarium". There is some confusion about the actual date of the book's appearance. Evelyn, in a letter which is sometimes assigned to February 1655,<sup>4</sup> says that he has already seen it and the terms of his reference make it clear that the book was then known widely enough for its teaching to have received a good deal of criticism.<sup>5</sup> But "Unum Necessarium" was not entered at Stationer's Hall until the third of May, 1655. That is of course no guarantee that it appeared then. A letter of Brian Duppa to his friend Mr. Bayly dissociating himself from

1. The mediaeval casuists were of course common property. Of the post-reformation Roman casuists the most popular among Protestants were Cajetan (1469-1534) Vasques (1551-1604) Reginaldus (- 1623)

2. See letter from Duppa to Bayly, in Tanner, MSS. No. 52.

3. Ibid.

4. Evelyn, "Diary", Vol: 3, p. 20. This letter is dated Feb. 9th. 1654 but the references in it to "Golden Grove" and "Unum Necessarium" make this utterly impossible. Evelyn probably followed the common practice of beginning the year at Lady Day, so that a letter written on Feb. 9th, 1655, would be reckoned as belonging to the previous year but in that case one would expect him to write 1654/5, which he does not do. It is however possible that he intended to use the modern style but wrote 1654 in mistake for 1655 a fairly easy thing to do while the change is still recent.

5 (see page 196)

Taylor's views on original sin would put the publication in July or August for he dates his letter October twentysixth, 1655, and states that some two or three months earlier Royston had sent him some loose sheets of "Unum Necessarium", the book being then more than half printed.<sup>1</sup> Duppa's references to dates throughout this letter are all approximate but they indicate the later part of the summer of 1655 as the date of "Unum Necessarium's" appearance. Evelyn most likely saw the book in manuscript for Taylor admits that during the time of writing he had shown it to people in Wales and he is not likely to have neglected to obtain the still more profitable criticism of some of his London acquaintances. It was just at this time that his friendship with Evelyn was beginning to ripen and Taylor would have no objection to helping it on by the little flattery of pretending to consult Evelyn on a matter about which he himself had quite made up his mind. The opinion of a possible patron is always of peculiar value.

Taylor dedicated his book to Lord Carbery. It was the last gift of this kind which he was ever to offer him, for their association was soon to be broken. Possibly Taylor's growing preoccupation with casuistry had found its way more frequently into his sermons than altogether suited his congregation for he apologizes to Lord Carbery for his increasing discourses on repentance. It is because he feels the supreme importance of the subject that he has set <sup>himself</sup> down to write his book. People turn away from repentance, "They find sin pleasant, prosperous, gay and in the fashion"<sup>2</sup> and it is hard to convince them that it is a thing to be left. They may perhaps, at times, be brought to something resembling contrition, but it of the sort which envisaged sin following again almost immediately and that sin in its turn being

5.(from page 195) "I have perused that excellent "Unum Necessarium" of yours to my every great satisfaction and direction: and do not doubt but it shall in time gain upon all those exceptions which I know you are not ignorant appear against it". Evelyn. Diary. Vol: 3. p.204.

1. Duppa to Bayly. Tanner MSS. No.52.  
2. Works. Vol: 7. p.4.

wiped out by one single act of repentance. But those who think so "infinitely abuse" themselves. So Taylor has written "this severe book"<sup>1</sup> to set out the true doctrine and practice of repentance.

This dedication is followed by a preface to Brian Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, and John Warner, Bishop of Rochester, and to the whole clergy of England. It is ironical in the sequel that the preface opens with an attack on the prevalent love for religious controversy, for this book was to fling Taylor deeper into disputation than he had ever been before and draw from him a few examples of the acrimony which he here reprobates so strongly. Men had far better turn their attention away from that and teach men the ways of truth and holiness for there are too many who are satisfied with themselves because they avoid crime and "sin like a gentleman".<sup>1</sup>

In order to make the conduct of souls easier for the clergy he has been persuaded to set his own "weak hand" to the work of providing a book of cases of conscience, but, unless he had previously shown that a state of repentance was necessary to a holy life and that death-bed repentance was the weakest of all broken reeds, his book of casuistry would be in vain. He refers again to the Roman attackers of the Church of England who were saying that she was no church because she was suffering persecution.<sup>2</sup> The charge is the same as that made in the "Real Presence" and probably Taylor had the same person in mind. There is a reference to  
<sup>3</sup>Arnauld which showed that Taylor's interests went beyond his own country;<sup>4</sup> and, rather surprizingly, for he is not fond of referring to his own religious life, he speaks of himself having received "many of the mercies of a repenting sinner" and reiterates his own

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.11.

2. Ibid. p.14.

3. Arnauld, Antoine. (1612-94) Lived chiefly in seclusion at Port-Royal. He was both a doctor and a priest and acted as religious director of the nuns of Port-Royal des Champs of which convent his sister was abbess. He was a prolific author his published works running to fortyfive volumes. His most important writings are controversial on behalf of the Jansenists against the Jesuits.

4. Works. Vol: 7. p.14.

sense of a divine mission in writing the book.<sup>1</sup> There is an earnestness and a deep sense of responsibility running throughout this preface. Necessity is laid upon him and he gives utterance to a profound conviction.

"Unum Necessarium" is hard to classify. It is generally accepted as a controversial work because of the dispute which raged round it but it could equally well be classed as devotional. Taylor plainly intended it for devotional use. The whole tone is that calculated to awaken repentance in the individual reader not merely to supply him with the theory of repentance. At the end of each chapter there are practical directions for the application of what has been taught to one's own life, and these are followed by the necessary prayers and suggestions for meditation. It is theological in the sense that he goes very carefully into the grounds of all that he says and, though he knew that his doctrine of Original Sin would provoke comment,<sup>2</sup> he never suspected that the storm would be as serious as it proved or that people could not easily be made to see that his doctrine was compatible with Anglicanism. He is transparently sincere and filled with a deep sense of the justice and goodness of God and of man's sinfulness and it is this profound feeling which is the inspiration of his work.

In the first chapter he declares that the law of God is, positively, to love Him with all our faculties and degrees and, negatively, not to lust or desire and, since it is obvious that no one keeps this perfectly, all need repentance. God calls upon us to do all that we can and to do it with complete sincerity. If we fulfil this demand then the christian life is one of "perfection all the way",<sup>3</sup> though it is only perfection in the particular stage at which we have arrived and must be followed by reaching out to the perfection of the next stage.

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.17.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. p.44.

In chapter two Taylor makes a detailed examination of what repentance is in itself, beginning with a discussion of μεταμέλεια and μετάνοια<sup>1</sup> and concluding that "however the grammarians may distinguish them the words are used promiscuously."<sup>2</sup> He follows this with various instances and descriptions of repentance taken from the Bible.

The succeeding chapter contains an attack upon the practice of dividing sins into those which are mortal and those which are venial;<sup>3</sup> he complains that men enquire not what is lawful but what is mortal and venial, consequently no division could be more strongly condemned since it suggests that there is some lesser form of offence which can be committed with impunity since pardon is easy and sure.<sup>4</sup> Against this Taylor declares emphatically that the smallest sin is destructive of our friendship with God and therefore can in no sense be called venial.<sup>5</sup> It is this strictly theological view of sin which leads Taylor to discard a distinction which is scriptural in origin and helpful in the actual dealing with souls. In such parables as that of the mote and the beam and in that of the king and his servants Our Lord Himself clearly teaches that there are degrees of sin. Both St. Paul and St. John speak of sins which carry spiritual death as their penalty and those which do not.

This division into mortal and venial sin is one which is early and wide-spread in the history of the church. If no

1. "The distinction so often laid down between these words (μεταμέλεια AND μετάνοια), seems hardly to be sustained by usage. But that μετανοέω is the fuller and nobler term - - - - - is indicated not only by its derivation but by the greater frequency of its use" Thayer. "Greek English Lexicon of N.T." Edinburgh. 1898.
2. Works, Vol. 7, p. 61.
3. "Venial sin may be taken to denote sin in which the danger to the soul is not immediate or urgent, and which therefore admits of treatment by gradual and innocuous means. Mortal sin is sin in which the danger is great and urgent, and against which every means of treatment gradual or sudden, harmless or dangerous must be employed in spite of the risks involved." Kirk. "Principles of Moral Theology". p. 248.
4. Works. Vol: 7. p. 83.
5. Sanderson is equally vigorous in his repudiation of this time honoured division. He calls it, "putida illa distinctio, quo velut fermento totam theologiae moralis massam foede corruperunt (Casuistae)" "De Juramenti Obligatione". Prael. iii. Par: 15.

such distinction were made it would be impossible not to treat all sins either as if they were venial, with a consequent lowering of all ethical standards, or fall into the opposite error by insisting that all were mortal and driving many weak souls into despair. Actually Taylor himself does not discard all classification. He declares that one who sins deliberately, of malice prepense, in a small thing, is a greater sinner than one who is carried away by temptation in a greater fault. Accordingly from the point of view of a modern casuist, his repudiation of the classification into mortal and venial sin is by no means so thorough-going as it might be thought. What Taylor really attacks is a rigid listing of sins into mortal and venial without consideration of the spiritual state in which the offence may be committed. He follows this discussion with a catalogue of those sinners whom we do not usually treat as hardly as the Bible does, numbering among them those who have too great a love of pleasure, busybodies, the fearful and unbelieving and those that take delight in other men's sin.<sup>2</sup>

A discussion of sinful habits as distinct from single acts of sin follows in chapter five. Taylor's chief concern is to show that one act of repentance cannot wipe out the effects of an ingrained evil habit. That can only be done by the introduction of the contrary virtue.

"The Church of Rome", he says, "whose chairs and pulpits are dangerous guides in the article of repentance, affirms that sin, or any habit of sin, may be pardoned by any single act of contrition: the continued sin of forty years may be washed off in less than forty minutes, nay, by an act of attrition with the priestly absolution: which proposition if it be false, does destroy the interest of souls; and it cannot be true, because it destroys the interest of piety, and the necessities of a good life."<sup>3</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.86.
2. Ibid. p.124.
3. Ibid. p.178. Taylor gives no authorities for this statement he possibly had the Council of Trent (Sess.xiv. c.4) in mind. On this a modern Roman Catholic casuist writes "The Council (of Trent) then, seems to teach that sorrow for sin because of the fear of Hell, or its moral turpitude, or on account of the punishment with which God afflicts the sinner even in this life (attrition) will be sufficient for the remission of sin in the Sacrament of Penance, provided that it destroys all affection for sin in the heart of the penitent and converts him from sin to God. Slater.'Manual of Moral Theology.' Vol: 2. p.135

This subject leads him on to discuss death-bed repentance again. He concludes that for those who trust so it there is no ground of hope but in the goodness of God "whose mercy is as great as His power".<sup>1</sup> How can such people really repent, he asks, when a change of habit is an essential part of repentance and dying men have no time for this. But no one will bid them absolutely despair and Taylor concludes with some quotations from the ancient doctors to open a little door of hope to those dying and wishing to repent. If Taylor had thought out his doctrine of the intermediate state more clearly he might have found many of his difficulties with regard to death-bed repentance disappear.

It was chapter six in which Taylor put forward his view on Original Sin which plunged him into so much controversy and, in an effort to make his position quite clear he wrote after the controversy was started "A Further Explication of the Doctrine of Original Sin" which he published in a later edition of "Unum Necessarium" as chapter seven. Both these chapters will be better examined when we have finished the rest of the book, they can then be taken in relation to the controversy they aroused. So we pass on to chapter eight which is occupied with the question of what are sins of infirmity. This section consists very largely of a discussion of Romans VII. 15-20 and Taylor concludes that St. Paul was speaking of himself as one unregenerate and under the law and from this state of continual sin the Gospel delivered him. The real sins of infirmity are whatever natural imperfections each may suffer from, but not delight in and, are more of the nature of sins of omission than sins of commission. The remedy for them is to work and pray.

In the next chapter Taylor deals with the effect of repentance, viz: the remission of sin. There is no sin he declares which may not be pardoned is properly repented of. Even sins after Baptism upon which the Early Church were so severe are not

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.222.

irremediable, but, in every case, the fullest, completest, repentance which is in the sinner's power is the least that can be offered. Over and over again he stresses this point. Always there must be dissatisfaction with our own efforts for none but God can tell if we have gone as far as we might. The sin against the Holy Ghost, which shall have no remission, Taylor concludes, from the examination of the case of the Pharisees, to be a refusal to recognise the truth. The following passage from this chapter is actually the gist of the whole book. It expresses a truth which Taylor felt to be vital for the christian life, namely, that repentance is an attitude rather than an act.

"If a man repents of his repentance and returns to his sins, all his intermedial repentance shall stand for nothing: the sins which were marked for pardon shall break out in guilt, and be exacted of him in fearful punishments, as if he never had repented. For if good works crucified by sins are made alive by repentance, by the same reason those sins also will live again, if the repentance dies; it being equally just that if the man repents of his repentance, God also should repent of His pardon"<sup>1</sup>

The final chapter of the whole book Taylor devotes to the consideration of 'Ecclesiastical Penance' by which he means private confession. The story already mentioned shows that Taylor, in his Uppingham days, enjoined penance on those who came to him and at the actual moment of writing this book he was soon to become Evelyn's Confessor. This chapter is particularly valuable both for those who exercise and those who receive the benefit of this ministry. Taylor writes not only as one who has a very wide knowledge of the theory of the Confessional, but as one whose actual experience of it is also very great. He is by no means inclined to borrow slavishly from Rome. He has read the Roman Catholic casuists but with a critical eye. It is quite clear that, in his opinion, the practice of private confession in the English Church is indigenous to it and imitated from nowhere else whatsoever. He traces the origin of private confession to the inconveniences which resulted from public confession of sin and looks upon the priest as the deputy of the church rather than as one exercising in his own right the authority bestowed by Our Lord to remit and retain sins. The priest does not grant

1. Works. Vol; 7. p.417.

absolution but he declares to those in whom he sees signs of true repentance that God has forgiven their sin. Because of this Taylor refused to believe that there could be a real confession at all until the sorrow for sin is as deep as Grace and human effort combined can make it. Such a confession does not consist in a mere enumeration before a priest of the sins committed, in the hope that by this one act of repentance pardon may be obtained, but it is a deep-seated condemnation of ourselves and, justification of God, with humiliation before Him and whoever has been injured by our sin. It is obvious that where the priest is not the person injured confession to him alone is not sufficient. It must be supplemented by confession to the person injured. But, on this account, private confession to the priest is not to be neglected. Those who do so are "Neither lovers of the peace of conscience nor are careful for the advantages of their souls."<sup>1</sup> There are some pages of admirable advice to direct the self-examination of one who intends to make his confession. In accordance with what he advocates throughout the book, he does not draw attention so much to breaches of particular commandments, but aims at inculcating a horror of sin itself and suggesting ways whereby the repentance may be made as perfect as possible.

at the end of the book he advises that the penances given be such as fit the gravity of the sin and which are not such as endanger the health or oppress the spirit. To the book so far there was no objection made, but in chapter seven Taylor elaborated his doctrine concerning Original sin and concupiscence and it was this which involved him in the most serious controversy of his life, the one which drew upon him that suspicion of semi-pelagianism which persistently injured him in after days.

He did not reach his opinions suddenly. Certainly in the "Great Exemplar"<sup>2</sup> there are germs of the idea which he set out fully in "Unum Necessarium" and the resultant controversial literature. But these ideas upon Original sin were in strong

1. Works: Vol: 7. p.446.
2. Ibid. Vol: 2. p.101.

opposition to the Calvinism which was the official Presbyterian teaching and from the theologians of that school Taylor expected criticism.<sup>1</sup> It differed to some extent from the Arminian theory which some of his friends held but he can hardly have thought the difference serious enough to provoke the rebukes which he received. The story of Taylor's unorthodoxy has so often been glibly repeated that it is worth while seeing what it was that he differed from and, how he differed.

He begins his chapter by stating quite briefly the effect which sin had upon Adam. It reduced him to the condition of his own nature. It made him certain to die a bodily death and deprived him of all those gifts beyond human nature with which God had originally endowed him. What these gifts precisely were we do not know for God has nowhere revealed it to us. Taylor now proposes to discuss what effect this sin and loss had upon Adam's posterity and he does so by means of an examination of Romans V. 12. f. The conclusion he comes to, after minute examination of the passage involved, is that the sin imputed to mankind was a "legal impurity" only and nothing actually sinful in itself. Adam's sin neither made us "Heirs of damnation" nor "naturally and necessarily vicious"<sup>2</sup> To say therefore that infants could be punished for Adam's sin, that is to say merely for being born into a state which they could not avoid, is to accuse God of the grossest injustice. It is to say that God acts worse by men than he did by devils, for he punished them only for their own wilful sin and not for something they could not avoid.

1. "Original sin is that wherewith all that naturally descend from Adam are defiled even from their first conception, infecting all the powers of their souls and bodies and thereby making them drudges and slaves of sin; for it is the immediate effect of Adam's first sin, and the principal cause of all other sins." "Archbishop Ussher's "Body of Divinity" p.175. "The sinfulness of that state whereinto man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called Original Sin; together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it". "All mankind by their fall lost communion with God, are under His wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell for ever". "The Assembly's Shorter Catechism." answers 18 and 19.

2. Works: Vol: 7. p.252.

Sin, he contends, is essentially a thing of the will, Adam, therefore, could not transmit his sin to us. We share Adam's loss merely but not his guilt. Taylor's creationism here comes in useful for it strengthens his argument that the soul could not receive guilt from Adam since it in no way derives from him. But he goes on to say it may be argued that God undoubtedly punishes the son for the sin of the father and to this he replied that "He does not do to him as a judge, that is, He is not angry with him, but with the parent; but to the son, He is supreme Lord and may do what seemeth good in his own eyes"<sup>1</sup> This is rather inconclusive for the result seems to be the same whatever the motive.

Taylor passes on to consider the fact of universal sin. He concludes that it is because we do not naturally know, nor yet naturally love, those supernatural excellencies which are appointed and commanded by God as a means of bringing us to a supernatural condition. And things were made worse because at first God did not offer any reward to encourage men to strive after holiness. Another reason for universal sin is that God's laws place restraint upon our nature in things which apart from the forbidden instances, are indifferent. The natural inclination of a man to a woman, for instance, in some cases becomes lust. This is an interesting example. It emphasises again the sanity of Taylor's views of sex - a thing which, generally lawful, in some cases becomes sinful. He differs from St. Augustine's conception of sex as something generally sinful but in some cases redeemed into lawfulness. But no matter how strongly disposed toward sin Adam's fall may have left man there remains to each one of us freedom of choice. We may choose good or evil, whichever we will. Original Sin being such as Taylor has described it to be it is nothing that we can repent of, though it be remitted in baptism.

Taylor had so far escaped pretty well from the

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.271.
2. St. Augustine. "Confessions" Sec.xxix. and xxx.

persecution which had overwhelmed so many of his brethren, but in the spring of 1655 he suffered imprisonment. A letter from Evelyn to Taylor is the only source of this information and all that it gives is the bare fact that in February 1655 Taylor had been imprisoned but was then released.<sup>1</sup> It then goes on to refer to the preface to "Golden Grove" in such a way as to make it almost certain that it was the strong outburst against the Independents contained there which was the cause of the imprisonment. However, he can hardly have been shut up for long for throughout the late spring of 1655 Taylor was quite obviously free.

On March the eighteenth Evelyn heard him preach on 14. Math. 17. on "the conditions of obtaining eternal life" and on the thirtyfirst went to "confer with him about some spiritual matters using him thenceforward as my ghostly father"<sup>2</sup> Then a letter of Evelyn's again provides us with a puzzle in the matter of dates for in a letter which he dated Lond. 18 Mar. 1655, he says that he has just heard from Taylor and been relieved of "my apprehension of your danger"<sup>3</sup> The writer goes on to bewail the increasing severity of the persecution which the Anglican Church was suffering and to suggest that Taylor might write something which would help the afflicted members of the church to remain true to their allegiance.

In the course of the letter Evelyn remarks that he has not yet seen the papers in defence of "Unum Necessarium" which "Royston tells me are printing". That all this was written on

1. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.205.

2. "Diary".

3. In this letter supposedly written on March 18th. 1655. Evelyn remarks "I have not yet been so happy as to see those papers which Mr. Royston tells me are printing, but I greatly rejoice that you have so happily fortified that batterie, and I doubt not but you will maintain the siege" "Diary". Vol: 3. p.207. This would seem to refer to the "Further Explication". Taylor writing to Evelyn on Nov. 21st. 1655 says "I have also this last week sent up some papers in which I make it appear that the doctrine which I have now published was taught by the fathers within the first four hundred years". Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.208. One sentence in Evelyn's letter which has hitherto been overlooked conclusively proves the date of writing to be after Nov. 1655. "Julianus redivivus can shut the schools indeed and the temples; but he cannot hinder our private intercourses and devotions." "Diary". Vol. 3. p.207. This clearly refers to the edict of September 1655.

March the eighteenth of that year is an obvious impossibility for on that day Evelyn listened to Taylor preaching on Math. 14. 17. and had no need of communication by letter. Heber proposed to amend eighteenth of March into eighteenth of Mai, but, although this avoids an obvious difficulty, it is not nearly late enough to account for the contents of the letter, the whole tone of which belongs to some date after September 1655 when the most severe of all the regulations against the Anglican clergy were published, and when Taylor was most likely safely back home.

Sometime during the summer of 1655 Taylor was imprisoned at Chepstow, in the castle, probably for not more than three or four months, since on March the thirtyfirst Evelyn conferred with him on spiritual matters<sup>1</sup> and on November the twentyfirst Taylor answered "kind and friendly letters" which he had received not long after his coming from prison.<sup>2</sup>

The cause of this second imprisonment remains obscure. It has been surmised that some Welsh creditor had Taylor imprisoned for debt and that Evelyn allowed him to remain under arrest in order to teach him prudence.<sup>3</sup> This can hardly be so for not only does Evelyn's letter misdated March the eighteenth, 1655, say that Taylor had been in danger through "the general persecution re-inforce"<sup>4</sup> but if it had been in Evelyn's power to have released Taylor, as he could have done if a mere payment of a debt had been required, all the solicitude the letter displays would have been the sheerest hypocrisy. Taylor answered this letter in January 1655/6 which would against suggest that it was not sent to him until the autumn of 1655. It is possible that some zealous local official had anticipated legislation which he knew was likely to come and had imprisoned Taylor merely as a known Royalist clergyman who was still exercising his calling.

While he was in Chepstow Castle suffering a not too rigorous imprisonment, with a kindly gaoler who allowed him to borrow books in the neighbourhood, the controversy round chapter

1. Evelyn. "Diary".
2. Ibid. p.208.
3. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor". p.117.
4. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol; 3. p.207

seven of "Unum Necessarium" began to reach Taylor. Warner must have written almost as soon as the book came into his hands and quite possibly before it was generally published. The bishop's letter is now lost but Taylor replied to it at some length. He begins:

"R. R. FATHER AND MY GOOD LORD,

Your lordship's letter, dated July 28th, I received not till Septemb. 11; it seems R. Royston detained it in his hands, supposing it could not come safely to me while I remain a prisoner now in Chepstow castle. But I now have that liberty that I can receive any letters, and send any; for the gentlemen under whose custody I am, as they are careful of their charges, so they are civil to my person"<sup>1</sup>

Taylor is as polite as he can be but he shows no disposition whatever to retreat from his central position. The Bishop of Rochester had apparently written as much to pass on the complaints which he had heard from other people as to advance any himself, though his sympathies were certainly with Taylor's critics. His great concern was that the doctrine of the Church of England, as he believed it to be set out in the Prayer Book, should be upheld and that Taylor should carefully considered Romans V. 17-19. Taylor reiterates his contention that there is nothing in his doctrine which is contrary to the Articles if they are interpreted with any liberality and, that in Romans V. St. Paul means that death is imputed to us because of Adam and righteousness because of Christ, neither was absolutely made ours.<sup>2</sup> This letter by no means silenced Warner's doubts for he wrote again requesting Taylor to weigh that of St. Paul. Ephesians II. 5, and a number of the fathers whom he considered Taylor had overlooked, especially "St. Austin who is so frequent so full and clear in his assertions, that his words and reasons will require your most judicious examination, and more strict weighing of them"<sup>3</sup> Taylor replied still very politely without the slightest suggestion that he would change his mind.<sup>4</sup>

The matter was agitating all Taylor's old Oxford

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.541.
2. Ibid. p.550.
3. Ibid. p.558
4. Ibid. p.560.

friends and acquaintances. In October Duppa wrote to Dr. Bayly the letter already referred to disclaiming any responsibility whatsoever with Taylor's doctrine, in which he claimed no more share than all the other clergy of England whom Taylor had included in his dedication. Sanderson, now an old man and in retirement from Oxford, was deeply distressed and would have had some sort of authority invoked to silence the views which he believed to be contrary to the teaching of the Church of England and harmful to her reputation.<sup>1</sup> He was also very eager that Thomas Barlow, who afterward succeeded him in the see of Lincoln, should publish some refutation of Taylor but Barlow declined.<sup>2</sup>

It was this widespread alarm which made Taylor write, while still in prison, a yet more complete explanation and defence of his teaching. The manuscript he kept by him until he was free, it is most likely that he wished to revise it when he was near to books for he did not send it up to Royston for publication until November 1655. He called his pamphlet "A Further Explication of the Doctrine of Original Sin" and issued it at first as a separate booklet, though in later editions he published it with "Unum Necessarium" as chapter eight. He prefaced it with a dedication to the Bishop of Rochester emphasizing his own unbiased desire for truth, his devotion to the Church of England, his hatred of any thought of schism in her and, at the same time, reaffirms his belief that the doctrine he has set out is the one which most advances God's glory.

In the booklet itself he goes patiently over the old ground again. He states once more what he believes to be the real significance of Adam's fall. It entailed the loss of those additional gifts which God has bestowed upon Adam over and above his human nature and, therefore, it meant that mortality became Adam's certain portion since he had lost the divine gifts which

1. Sanderson's Works. Vol: vi. p.382.  
2. Kennet's "Register". p.633.

might have saved him from it. This weakened condition is one which we all, as Adam's children, inherit, "it is a consequent of Adam's sin only but in itself no sin"<sup>1</sup> and from it Christ alone can save us.

His doctrine, set out perfectly plainly with lettered headings so that there could be no mistake about it, is this.

- α "Original sin is Adam's sin imputed to us to many evil effects.
- β It brings death and the evils of this life.
- γ Our evils and necessity being brought upon us, bring in a flood of passions which are hard to be bridled or mortified.
- δ It hath left us in pure naturals, disrobed of such aids extraordinary as Adam had.
- ε It deprives us of all title to heaven or supernatural happiness, that is, it neither hath in it strength to live a spiritual life, nor title to a heavenly.
- ζ It leaves in us our natural concupiscence, and makes it much worse.

Thus far I admit and explicate this article.

But all that I desire of the usual propositions which are variously taught nowadays, is this.

- α Original sin is not an inherent evil; not a sin properly, metonymically; that is, it is the effect of one sin, and the cause of many; a stain, but no sin.
- β It does not destroy our liberty which we had naturally.
- γ It does not introduce a natural necessity of sinning.
- δ It does not damn any infant to the eternal pains of hell."<sup>2</sup>

He defends his teaching with many references to the early fathers and the continental reformers, and, among them, "the incomparable Hugo Grotius"<sup>3</sup> who had obviously had a strong influence upon Taylor.

In defending his teaching from the accusation that it was contrary to the Articles of the Church of England, Taylor takes up the modern position. The Thirtynine articles, he says, were framed in the interests of peace. They ought not, therefore, to be interpreted with great rigidity but with all the tolerance that is honestly possible.<sup>4</sup> This however does not prevent his entering

1. Works: Vol: 7. p.309.  
 2. Ibid. pp.319-320.  
 3. Ibid. p.330.  
 4. Ibid. p.331.

into a phrase by phrase interpretation of the Articles to suit his own views. He ends this chapter with a very eloquent plea that men would be more zealous for the reputation of God's goodness and justice than for their own opinions or the doctrine of their sect.

Taylor made one more lengthy explanation of his doctrine of Original Sin and wrote that also apparently in Chepstow Castle. It was, like its predecessor, written in response to a personal request, this time one coming from Lady Christiana, the Countess Dowager of Devonshire.<sup>1</sup> This lady, who was a good Anglican, had been considerably troubled by Presbyterian attacks on her church generally but particularly on Jeremy Taylor and the supposed unorthodoxy of his lately published views on Original Sin. From the tone in which he writes his dedication Taylor also suspects that some people whom he might have expected to be his friends had also been disparaging him to the Countess, but it is against the Presbyterians that he chiefly objects. In fact he goes so far as to lay all the blame for the misunderstanding of the doctrine of Original Sin upon them.<sup>2</sup>

He knows, he says, the arts of these men. They put him in mind of what he was told by Mr. Sackville, the late Earl of Dorset's uncle, "That the cunning sects of the world (he named the Jesuits and the Presbyterians) did more prevail by whispering to ladies, than all the Church of England and the more sober Protestants could do by fine force and strength of arguments."<sup>3</sup> So, in order to disabuse her mind, Taylor wrote his long letter. It would seem that the Countess had also been to some extent a patroness of Taylor for he hopes that his letter will be a little return for the "divers obligations" to her under which he lies. The long letter which follows was published under the title of "Deus Justificatus" or a Vindication of the Glory of the Divine Attributes in the Question of Original Sin". Royston issued it at first

1. Daughter of Edward Bruce, Baron Kinloss, and wife of William, second Earl of Devonshire. Died. 1675.
2. Works. Vol: 7. p.502.
3. Ibid. p.496.

without Taylor's permission and appended a long explanation to the reader as to why he had done so. He was, apparently, animated only by the noblest motives, the good of humanity at large, though there is a possibility that the postscript which made the profession was intended not only to declare the singular purity of the publishers aims but to placate the Countess who is asked not to grudge to others the benefit she now feels of being freed from her scruples. The letter must have come into Royston's hands in some surreptitious manner for apparently neither the recipient nor the author let him have a copy. When Taylor himself authorised an edition of the booklet, as he did a year later, he suppressed the lady's name though it was restored in the folio edition of 1673.

"Deus Justificatus" is the most eloquent of all Taylor's writing in this controversy. It is less technical, as befits something written for a lady, and he is at pains to set out the whole controversy clearly; what the Presbyterians believe about Original Sin, as well as what his own friends had objected against his doctrine. He states his own position with great force and skill and in the way that it would be most likely to appeal. He lay great emphasis on the hideous injustice and cruelty of predestination. To affirm it of God is to charge upon the Almighty Father a savagery from which any earthly parent would recoil.

"Could you have smiled if the hangman had snatched your eldest son from his nurse's breasts, and dashed his brains out against the pavement; and would you not have wondered that any father or mother could copy the innocence and pretty smiles of your sweet babes, and yet tear their limbs in pieces, or devise devilish artifices to make them roar with intolerable convulsions? Could you desire to be thought good and yet have delighted in such cruelty? I know I may answer for you; you would first have died yourself. And yet I say again, God loves mankind better than we can love one another, and He is essentially just, and He is infinitely merciful, and He is all goodness, and therefore though we might possibly do evil things, yet He cannot; and yet this doctrine of the presbyterian reprobation says He both can and does things, the very apprehension of which hath caused many in despair to drown or hang themselves"<sup>1</sup>

Here Taylor is most likely expressing the feeling which gave rise to his own doctrine. The tenderness of his nature, his affection for his own children, his spirit of love and devotion

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.504.

toward God is far more likely than his reading to have led him to revolt against one of the most widely held theological tenets of his time. Taylor had nothing now to add to his position and he certainly intended to retract nothing. The arguments which the controversy had brought out against him certainly left him unimpressed though, for the Countess' sake, he is at pains to deal with them all carefully and at times with a colloquial force not usual with him. When, for instance, he mentioned the objection of some of his friends that, even supposing his doctrine were true, he ought not to have troubled man's peace by its publication, he replies, "I will answer with the labouring man's proverb, a pennyworth of ease is worth a penny at any time; and a little truth is worth a little peace every day of the week."<sup>1</sup> This letter as we have seen, answered its purpose, the Countess was convinced

In the autumn of 1655 Taylor was released from prison but not from the toils of controversy which dragged on until 1657. A Presbyterian named John Gaule of Slaughton, Huntingdonshire, wrote a book called "Sapientia Justificata"<sup>2</sup> defending the Calvinistic interpretation of Romans V and Taylor refers, without naming them, to two or three others who had published attacks on his interpretation of the same chapter. None of them were sufficient note to draw any answer from him.

The most important incident in the controversy occurred in 1657 and centred round a certain Mr. T.C. of Bridgewater whom Heber conjectured to have been Thomas Cartwright.<sup>3</sup> There is nothing to support or refute this identification. It is pure guess work. But whoever Mr. T.C. was he was a friend of both Jeremy Taylor and Henry Jeans, the Presbyterian who had been lately installed minister of Chedzoy in Somerset. Dr. Kaleigh who was the former incumbent had been removed because he was a Royalist according to Jeans' own account he and Mr. T.C. were chatting together at Chedzoy in a clerical way when Mr. T.C. broke out into

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.519.

2. London, 1657.

3. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works, Vol: 1.) p.ixxi.

"extraordinary praise of Dr. Jeremy Taylor". Jeans agreed with his friend to an extent. He admired Dr. Taylor's "admirable wit, great parts, quick and elegant pen, his abilities in critical learning, and his profound skill in antiquity" but expressed himself dissatisfied with his doctrine of Original Sin. Taylor's "Further Explication" "lay then casually in the window" and Jeans, taking it up, turned to a certain passage and showed that "therein was gross nonsense and blasphemy". Mr. T.C. with great modesty declined to take the dispute on his own shoulders but offered to tell Taylor what his friend had said. Jeans agreed and a little time later received a letter from Taylor offering that if Jeans would send him his exceptions Taylor would give them a good reception. So the objections were written out and sent through Mr. T.C.<sup>1</sup>

Jeans' criticism was focussed on one very short passage in the "Further Explication". Taylor there states that it is true that "Every man is inclined to evil but this is no sin properly. 1. Because that which is unavoidable is not a sin; 2. Because it is accidental to nature, not intrinsical and essential; 3. It is superinduced to nature, and is after it"<sup>2</sup> "This argument", says Jeans, "May be reduced into two syllogisms"

"The first:

Sin, properly, is not accidental to the nature of man.  
An inclination to evil is accidental to the nature of man:  
therefore  
An inclination to evil is no sin properly.

A second syllogism is:-

Sin, properly so called, is intrinsical, and essential to the nature of man.  
An inclination to evil is not intrinsical, and essential to the nature of man; therefore,  
An inclination to evil is not sin, properly so called."<sup>3</sup>

The major premise of both these syllogisms Jeans declared to be false and went on to argue that Taylor had, at least by implication, declared sin to be essential to the nature of man, and this, says

1. Preface of "Certain Letters of Henry Jeans". Oxon. 1660. Reprinted in Taylor's works. Vol: 7. p.572.
2. Works: Vol: 7. p.335.
3. Ibid. p.573.

Jeans, is "nonsense blasphemy and libertinism".<sup>1</sup>

Actually before this paper was sent to Taylor. T.C. had given him an account of the conversation and received from him a letter which for some reason or other he did not show to Jeans until he had written out and despatched the objections just quoted. The tone of Taylor's letter is a little acid; if, he complains, "Mr. Jeans had as much ingenuity as he pretends to have logic"<sup>2</sup> he would have seen that for Taylor to say sin was essential to man was to contradict his whole book. Jeans probably knew that well enough and if he had any purpose beyond love of a dispute it was much more likely to have been a desire to upset Taylor's doctrine that concupiscence is not, of itself, a sin by showing that, in this case at least, it rested upon an absurdity. But Taylor had used other arguments as he pointed out. Jeans, however, was not to be silenced by one letter and so long as he could keep the discussion on these two propositions he was on logically strong ground. He replied at once to Taylor's letter, again through his friend Mr. T.C. though he complained that the letter he was answering had not been shown to him earlier. This second letter was like his first, though longer. It was concerned with showing up Taylor's bad logic. Jeans was obviously proud of his letters. He stated that he intended to publish them<sup>3</sup>, and, indeed, he quite clearly enjoyed the whole controversy for he slipped in a little paragraph to stir up his opponent still more. He says,

"I have heard that the Doctor hath printed a very good Grammar. If he will also publish a Logic for the better information of such triflers as myself, I do assure you that I will very diligently peruse it; and if it be more solid, weighty, and serious, than those which I have hitherto read, give him many thanks for it"<sup>4</sup>

Mr. T.C. who, no doubt, felt himself very much edified by the brilliance of his two friends dutifully passed on Jeans' letter.

If Taylor has been wise he would have declined all further controversy. After all his book was really clear enough.

1. Works. Vol: 7. p.575.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. p.580.
4. Ibid. p.580.

Only by a logical contortion could he be made to assert that sin is essential to the nature of man. But, as far as the strict rules of disputation were concerned Jeans was right and Taylor should have left him alone. Instead he replied with a very angry letter addressed directly to Jeans, explaining himself once again but recommending his critic to pay more attention to theology and less to formal logic. This time he definitely closed the controversy as far as he was concerned.

Jeans, however, replied with another long letter commenting sentence for sentence on what Taylor had written to him. In 1660, the year in which Taylor was made a bishop, Jeans published the correspondence. Why he had delayed so long it is hard to say but publication when it did come not only served to revive the charge of Pelagianism against Taylor but showed what clever fellow Mr. Jeans was in arguing so well with a great man. The whole controversy was rather on that level. Taylor's teaching was unmistakable. He had stated it often enough and clearly enough, though in this particular logical exercise he was in the wrong.

Taylor wrote nothing else on this Original Sin controversy which has come to light but he never succeeded afterwards in entirely throwing off the reputation for a leaning towards semi-pelagianism which he had gained.<sup>1</sup> It alienated his Oxford friends at a time when he needed them very badly and it is suggested that when promotion did at last come to him he was preferred in Ireland because there were many who did not want him, with his reputation for unorthodoxy, nearer home.

It will be necessary to make a short examination of the Church's teaching about Original Sin if we are to form an opinion on the truth of the heresy charge against Taylor. The Early Church did not concern itself very much with theories of Original Sin or disputes about the effects of the Fall. It was not until the fourth or fifth centuries that the matter was at all considered

1. Not too much importance should be attached to this charge. It was a theological missile much thrown about at this time.

and then only in response to the stimulation of controversy. Pelagius in an effort to arouse men to a life of virtue laid great stress upon the ability of everyone to be holy if he would. He denied altogether that Original sin was inherited from Adam. The fall of our first parent had its bad effect, it had set us a wrong example which we are only too prone to follow but it nevertheless lay within our power to act independently if we wished. In response to this St. Augustine, who had thought about the problem of evil ever since his conversion, formulated his full doctrine on that subject. Man, according to him, was created with a perfection of character. He had both free will and the ability to refrain from sin and enjoyed the bliss of immortality and communion with God. But sin put an end to his felicity. He lost all the good with which he had been endowed. His soul was cut off from God and suffered death. Concupiscence took possession of him and he fell into a state of utter degradation for which the just end was eternal death. As all mankind are the children of Adam, deriving from him, we are all involved in his sin and its consequences and, since we are all born of concupiscence, the Original Sin in our nature is added to yet more. From this state it is an utter impossibility that any should be delivered except by the Grace of the Redeemer and this saving Grace comes only to those upon whom God chooses that it should descend. For them it is irresistible but their number is strictly determined in the foreknowledge of God. For those to whom this mercy is not given there is no hope and they are inescapably doomed to eternal damnation.

St. Augustine had pushed certain texts in St. Paul's writings to the extreme limit of their logical implication. The result was to set aside a vast portion of mankind as doomed to torment on account of a sin in which they had no willing part and which they were granted no opportunity of repudiating. But St. Augustine was a man of transcendent genius and because of this he remained through many centuries the dominant theologian of the West. His teaching regarding the meaning of the Fall and on Original Sin was that commonly accepted as the teaching of the Church. Protests

were made such as that of Vincent of Lerins who saw that the fathers before Augustine had not been nearly so sure of the nature of the Fall and its results and, therefore, proclaimed that only to be catholic doctrine which had been believed "ubique, semper et ab omnibus".

St. Thomas Aquinas lent the weight of his vast authority to a position similar to that of St. Augustine. He held Predestination to be necessary in order that the full nature of God might be known to men; his love and mercy in the elect, his justice in the case of the reprobate. This point of view was that of the Dominicans generally. Their great rivals the Franciscans had, almost from the beginning of their existence as an order, been inclined to soften the asperity of Augustinian theology. Two of their early teachers, Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventura, had done much in this direction, but the greatest theologian of their Order, John Duns Scotus, had carried their thought in a direction still further from Augustine. According to him God created Adam with all that was necessary to complete human nature and, in addition, granted him a "donum supernaturale". By this gift he might have lived in happiness and might have escaped physical death, but, because of an inordinate love for his wife which made him desire not to be separated from her even though she had sinned, Adam himself did evil and lost the noble treasure which God had given him in addition to his own proper nature. This loss was irrevocable and Adam's descendants therefore shared in it; but, in Duns Scotus' teaching, Original Sin meant very little more than the continuance of this deprivation among Adam's offspring.

But this theory did not entirely do away with original guilt in every sense. Adam had lost God's splendid gift he therefore remained in debt to God for it and, viewing the matter legally, Scotus saw this debt inherited perpetually by Adam's descendants. This view was difficult to fit in with his other doctrine that every soul born into the world is newly created by God and in no way derived from the child's parents, for that would

seem necessarily to break the connection by which at least the spiritual portion of the debt might descend. The guilt, which this state of indebtedness created, Scotus held to be purely forensic; it did not imply corruption in the essential nature of man, it left his will free. It is therefore quite possible for heathen and non-christian people to do works of purely natural virtue which, though they are done without grace, will be pleasing to God. The foreknowledge of God makes it possible for him eternally to harmonise his decrees with the way in which men exercise their freedom of will.<sup>1</sup>

It will be readily seen how closely the teaching which Taylor elaborated in "Unum Necessarium" approximates to that of the Scotists. Until the Reformation the Thomists and the Scotists were the two chief schools. The Thomists upheld Augustinianism. The Scotists by a good deal of verbal ingenuity managed to avoid a serious break with Augustine but, none the less, weakened his main position to a great extent.<sup>2</sup> At the Reformation both Luther and Calvin returned to the full Augustinian doctrine. As their authority was for a long time paramount in the Protestant churches their teaching on Original Sin, as on everything else, became the standard of orthodoxy. The "Institutes" were made the normal text<sup>book</sup> in the English Universities so that<sup>a</sup> whole generation of theologians grew up under their influence. Hooker made some protests against setting up the authority of Calvin against the fathers<sup>3</sup> but, in spite of that, Heylyn remarks that "when Laud commenced his university career it was safer to have been looked upon as a heathen or a publican than an antiCalvinist."<sup>4</sup>

The Lambeth Articles which were drawn up as a protest against Peter Barro's Arminian teaching at Cambridge were as uncompromising an assertion of Predestination and Original Sin as anything which the Reformation produced. Though they were never formally adopted by the Church of England they had the

1. Williams. "Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin". pp. 408 ff.

2. Ibid.

3. Hooker. "Ecclesiastical Polity." Pref: Sec: II. Par: 9. Note 2.

4. Heylyn. "Life of Laud". p.62. (1668 edition)

support of Whitgift and of a number of other bishops and there is little doubt that they did represent, as they were claimed to do, the doctrine of the Church of England at that time.

The Arminians, whose tenets these articles were intended to condemn, though they differed from Calvin in the matter of Predestination and the universal sufficiency of Christ's death, none the less asserted Original Sin and the want of freedom in man's will, though perhaps they were less eager in this assertion than their rivals. The Roman Church at the Council of Trent laid down that the free will of Adam remained after his fall though in a weakened state; that Original Sin was remitted by baptism and that concupiscence is not properly a sin. While the Council of Trent was sitting, the Church of England was drawing up her own Thirtynine articles with a bias against the position the Romans had formulated.

The articles take over the Augustinian conception of the Fall and Original Sin though they do not explicitly proceed to all that Calvin taught on these subjects. In article nine it is stated that the "Fault and corruption of the nature of every man" - "deserveth God's wrath and damnation." On its most restricted interpretation this would condemn eternally all unbaptized persons. Article ten asserts that after the Fall man's condition is such that he cannot "Turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength", thus denying the freedom of the will. When Taylor thought out his doctrine of Original Sin he had the whole Augustinian school of theologians against him. This meant a very large proportion of the teachers of the West since the death of Augustine, including St. Thomas Aquinas. In his own day the bulk of the orthodox Roman Catholics and Protestants

If the Thirtynine articles could be taken as the complete standard of Anglican Doctrine then Taylor had rebelled

against the teaching of his own church<sup>1</sup>. But in the wider sense it is impossible to call him a heretic. In the fathers of the first three centuries to which Anglicans particularly loved to appeal a great deal could be found to support him. The Scotists, as we have tried to show, were wholly on his side and, in spite of this the Remonstrance, the trend of opinion of such a leading Arminian as Episcopius was toward a position similar to that of Taylor.<sup>2</sup> And Taylor had time on his side. Long before the theory of evolution made theologians approach the problem of <sup>the</sup> evil which is in the world from a totally different angle, men were beginning more and more to revolt from a doctrine which, as Taylor truly said, fastened on God cruelties from which a human being of moderate standards would recoil with horror.<sup>3</sup> In "Unum Necessarium" Taylor was in much the same position as he was in writing the "Liber of Propheying", he could find precedents in antiquity if he looked for them. There was some support in his own age but his chief incentive toward the position he asserted was his own instinct for goodness.<sup>4</sup>

1. By his subscription to the thirty-nine articles Taylor had of course agreed to the statement in article 35 that the "Homilies contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine" yet the "Homily of the Misery of Man", part 2, states "How evil we be of ourselves how of ourselves and by ourselves, we have no goodness, help or salvation but contrariwise, sin, damnation and death everlasting."
2. Episcopius, Simon (1583-1643) A pupil of Arminius and Gomarus. Became a leader of the Remonstrants. Professor at Leyden (1612) Banished by the Synod of Dort (1618) but allowed to return (1626) Professor at Amsterdam from 1634. His chief works are "Confessio Remonstrantium" (1624) and "Institutiones Theologicae" He stresses mans responsibility in the use of God's grace, first put on one side, then denied Original Sin; reduced the essentials of Christianity to those propositions of which the subject predicate and connexion can be plainly found in the Bible. Of Episcopius Taylor remarks his "Whole works are excellent and contain the whole body of orthodox religion". Letter to Graham in Dopping's "Common place book," Trinity College Library. Dublin.
3. For some modern theories of Original Sin. See "Original Sin and the Fall". T.C.Lacey. "Church Quarterly Review," Oct. 1927.
4. (see page 222)

4. S. T. Coleridge wrote on the blank page of his copy of "Deus Justificatus" his opinion of that work. It is really his opinion of Taylor's position in the controversy as a whole. "This most eloquent Treatise may be compared to a statue of Janus, with one face, which we may suppose fronting the Calvinistic tenet, entire and fresh as from the masters hand; beaming with life and force witty scorn on the lip and a brow at once bright and weighty with satisfying reason:- the other looking toward the "something to be but in it's place" maimed, featureless and weather bitten into an almost visionary confusion and indistinctness" Coleridge. "Aids to Reflection". pp.187-8.

## CHAPTER SEVEN.

When Taylor was released from Chepstow he went, not to Golden Grove as might have been expected but to Joanna Bridge's estate at Mandinam in Wales. It would seem that he never visited Golden Grove again. What the causes were which led to his separation from Lord Carbery we do not know. There is no indication in Taylor's writings that there was ever a quarrel and certainly the tone of the dedication to Carbery of "Unum Necessarium" shows no hint of any estrangement and it was the publication of that book which had been the occasion of Taylor's going to London. Perhaps we need seek no further explanation of the apparent break than that which lies in the history of the time.

In September 1655 Cromwell's government ordered that after November the first no Royalist could keep a chaplain, or a tutor for his children, under pain of having his fine doubled. No clergyman might preach, or administer the Sacrament, officiate at a marriage service, use the Prayer Book or even keep a school without running the risk of a three months imprisonment for the first offence, six for the second and banishment for the third. It is not very likely that the actual persecution was as severe as the orders issued would lead one to suppose but, none the less, another regulation in much the same terms as the first was issued on November the twentyfourth to come into operation in the following January.<sup>1</sup> Taylor was both a chaplain and a schoolmaster and the ordinance of September 1655 forbade him to exercise either of his professions. Carbery was not very likely to take any risks in a matter like this. He had made his peace with

1. Gee and Hardy. "Documents Illustrative of English Church History." Doc: 112.

In spite of this Doctor William Fuller, afterwards Dean of St. Patricks, Dublin, and Bishop of Lincoln, a known Royalist, kept a school at Twickenham up to the restoration. Sir Edward Montague, afterward Earl of Sandwich, sent his sons to this school. Fuller was intimate with Pepys and Evelyn and also became the patron of Taylor's friend, William Wyatt.

Parliament once, and would have no wish to get into trouble again. Taylor was too well known a figure among the Royalists for his whereabouts to be unknown, and his two recent imprisonments showed that he was certainly not in favour with the ruling powers. Under the circumstances Carbery might well think that it would be best for them to part, though with the friendliest feelings on both sides. So, no doubt, when Taylor left Chepstow it was conveyed to him that, all things considered, it would be best if he did not return to Golden Grove.<sup>1</sup>

Taylor had lost his patron, but he was not entirely destitute. He still had Joanna Bridges' house at Mandinam to go to. In this matter he was far better off than a great number of his fellow clergy. Dr. Walter Raleigh, Dean of Wells and a nephew of the great Sir Walter, had been for some time the incumbent of Chedzoy but he had been among the defenders of Bridgewater and that had ruined him. He was sent back to his living with his legs tied under the belly of the broken-down horse he was set to ride upon and, after being exhibited to his own parishioners as a warning of what happened to malignants, he was taken off to be imprisoned at Wells. Here he was killed in a scuffle by his gaoler, an ex-shoemaker. There was some investigation into the events of his death and, as a result, the gaoler was acquitted and the clergyman who read the Prayer Book burial service at the funeral was sentenced to imprisonment for life.

At Worcester Bishop Prideaux had gone to live with his son-in-law and was supposed to receive from his diocese a small weekly allowance, enough to keep him alive. It can hardly have sufficed for its purpose for a friend met him one day going into the town with something hidden under his cloak and when he asked him what he was carrying the bishop answered that he was like an

1. The Declaration was not enforced very firmly but probably with the less courageous Royalists the threat was enough. None of the Majors General report evictions from private Houses. Gardiner "History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate". Vol: 3. p.336.

ostrich living upon iron and, opening his cloak, showed some pots and pans that he was taking to pawn.

Sanderson after being "several times plundered and once wounded in three places"<sup>1</sup> had his living sequestrated and was put in prison. But by an exchange of prisoners he got his living back and had a little to keep him until better times. It was while he was dispossessed that Isaac Walton met him in London "In sad coloured clothes and God knows far from being costly". "The place of our meeting", says Walton, "was near to Little Britain, where he had been to buy a book, which he then had in his hand. We had no inclination to part presently, and therefore, turned to stand in a corner under a penthouse, (for it began to rain), and immediately the wind arose, and the rain increased so much that both became so inconvenient as to force us into a cleanly house, where we had bread, cheese, ale, and a fire, for our money".<sup>2</sup> and there they sat while Sanderson told his friend all his sadness at the strange disruption of the times, and, no doubt, when they had finished Walton paid his friend's score.

Cosin and many more of the Anglican clergy were in exile, sometimes with enough to live on, more often without.<sup>3</sup> Juxon and Sheldon had both gone quietly into retirement. Hundreds of the lesser clergy were compelled either to take up some trade or beg what help they could get from their former parishioners. Some incumbents conformed out of self-interest, but a number of them thought that it was their duty to stay with their people at all costs and submitted themselves to the demands made on them by the Parliamentary authorities in order that they might still be allowed to minister to their flocks even though they were not permitted to use the formulae of the church. For Anglicanism had

1. Walton's "Lives". "Sanderson." 9 p.340.
2. Ibid. p.42.
3. See the Cosin Correspondence Published by the Surtees Society. Branhall was so poor that for a time during the war between the English and the Dutch he acted as Charles the second's prize master and sold the prizes in person. "Thurloe's Papers". Vol: 1. pp.464. 514. 585. 586.

been proscribed.

From 1646 to 1660 Presbyterianism was on the whole the form of church government most favoured by the Puritans in England though, throughout that time the Independents were gaining more and more freedom of worship. Under the Rump the Committee of Plundered Ministers was responsible for seeing that the character and opinions of the clergy were such as the authorities would approve, but when Cromwell sent the remains of the Long Parliament home that Committee ceased to exist. In its place the Trustees for Maintenance were set up by an act of Parliament. Cromwell and his Council entirely dominated this body. By them church funds were diverted from their true purpose to be spent on military projects or to disappear in the expenses of the Trustees' administration. Very little was to spare either for the salaries of the acting clergy or for the small pensions which were supposed to be paid to the dispossessed. From 1641 it was regarded as an offence for a bishop to ordain, but ordinations did take place in spite of the effort to suppress them, though they were necessarily unobtrusive.

After March 1654 those who were put forward to fill the vacancies which occurred had their qualifications tested by a Committee of thirtyfive people called the Committee of Triers.<sup>1</sup> The demands they made upon candidates were often absurd and always irresponsible.<sup>2</sup> By an Act of August the twentyfourth, 1653, only those marriages which were solemnized before a Justice of Peace were regarded as legal. The parish registers<sup>for</sup> the next seven years were in some cases imperfectly kept in some cases taken into the hands of laymen and subsequently lost. By two ordinances, one issued in January and one in August 1645, the use of the Prayer Book both in public and in private had been forbidden but its prayers were still said for all who could assemble at quiet gatherings in private houses. Many of the country gentry even

1. Gee and Hardy. "Documents Illustrative of English Church History." Dec: 111.
2. There is the well known story of how the learned Pococke was only saved from ejection for insufficiency by the efforts of the Puritan doctors Owen and Wilkins. Pocock's real crime, whatever the pretext, was loyalty to the Prayer Book. See Twell's "Life of Pococke". p. 17.

though their political allegiance was to the Parliament loved the Prayer Book enough to take a good deal of trouble to find out where it was being used and to attend. In some cases, by a little ingenuity, the clergy managed to retain a rough similarity to the order of service and the devotions of the Prayer Book even in public worship. Sanderson was advised by a friend in the Parliamentary party to vary the Liturgy a little, especially when the soldiers came to church; so he disobeyed the rubrics now and then and paraphrased the prayers and no one seems to have objected though the actual words he used were not a great deal different from those in the book.<sup>1</sup>

Some priests who were either braver or had better friends than others continued to exercise their ministry publicly right up to the end of 1655. Evelyn noted in his Diary for that year that in December Dr. Wild afterward Bishop of Derry preached and celebrated the Holy Communion at St. Peter's, Paul's Wharfe, and nobody apparently interfered.

Cromwell was now in every sense the ruler of the country, more autocratic in church and state than either Laud or Charles the first had ever been. In the Instrument of Government the Independents expressed their ideal of religious policy. It was, in essence, freedom for all "Provided that this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as under the profession of Christ hold forth and practise licentiousness."<sup>2</sup> This statement was reaffirmed in the Humble Petition and Advice of 1657. Anglicans had little to hope for, even though, from time to time, the actual execution of the government's decree against them was slackened. Efforts were made to obtain some withdrawal of the

1. Walton's "Lives". "Sanderson". p.332.
2. Gee and Hardy. "Documents Illustrative of English Church History". Doc: 110.

heavy restrictions against them but in vain.<sup>1</sup>

After his release from Chepstow Taylor does not seem to have been interfered with by the government any more. It may be convenient to review here all the difficulties which we have previously mentioned connected with Taylor's marriages. He was first of all married to Phoebe Langsdale at Uppingham in 1639. It is supposed that she died sometime in 1642. The supporters of this theory go on to suggest that Taylor was attracted to Wales by the prospect of a second marriage, that he did marry and that this wife was the plank on which he escaped from the shipwreck of which he speaks. It is then suggested that this second wife died in 1651 and that Taylor married a third time a wife who survived him, and one of these two later wives was Joanna Bridges, a lady of some property at Mandinam in Wales. But the evidence on which this complicated hypothesis is built is slight. The most tenable theory seems to be that Phoebe, the first wife, died in 1651. Taylor's own words at that time prove that he had just lost his wife. After his second imprisonment at Chepstow Taylor retired to the estate at Mandinam which belonged to Joanna Bridges. It is reasonable to suppose that a recent marriage to that lady had opened this retreat to him and that Joanna Bridges of Mandinam was the wife who survived him. The strongest argument against placing this marriage so late is that Taylor's youngest daughter, who is plainly stated to have been the daughter of Joanna Bridges, was married in 1668. This is not insuperable for many brides were very young in those

1. In 1655 the Anglican clergy in London asked Archbishop Ussher to use his influence with Cromwell on their behalf. Ussher saw Cromwell who promised that the clergy should not be molested if "they meddled not with any matters relating to his government". Ussher went a second time to get this promise in writing but was then told that the Protector's council had advised him against granting any liberty to the Anglican clergy who were "restless and implacable enemies to him and his government". There are many curious details in the story of these interviews. See Parr, "Life of Ussher" p.75. Gardiner is of the opinion that this and other representations did have some effect on the actual policy of the government though there was no withdrawal of the Declarations. "History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate". Vol: 3. p.336.

days.<sup>1</sup> The marriage registers of South Wales offer no help in straightening out this tangle.

Taylor stayed quietly at Mandinam occasionally making visits to London or into other parts of the country, but absorbed for the most part of his time in working at the great book of Cases of Conscience which he afterward published as "Ductor Dubitantum". He was poor but there is no evidence that he ever suffered from actual want, or that his poverty approached destitution. Echoes of the Original Sin controversy reached him. In November he wrote again to Warner giving him notice that he was sending the "Further Explication" to press and also that he had asked Royston to let Warner have the manuscript to revise or suppress as his Lordship thought best. He promises that if there is any letter from Warner on the way offering advice or suggestions he will see that they are included in the pamphlet.

Taylor's friends were beginning to understand his position and he was glad of it for all that he wanted was leisure to continue his studies so that he could publish fairly soon the first three books of his Cases of Conscience.

Taylor was carrying on a continual correspondence with Evelyn throughout this winter. On November the twentyfirst he wrote thanking him for several "kind and friendly letters" which he had found waiting for him when he came home from prison and mentioning the fact that he had just sent up his "Further Explication" to be printed and also that he had some other papers by him relating to the controversy and which he had thoughts of publishing.<sup>2</sup> The fairly long letter to the Countess of Devonshire which Taylor had written at Chepstow was probably the

1. Lady Grace Grenville and "Sir George Cartwright's grandson" were married by the Bishop of Durham when the bride was six years old and the bridegroom a little over eight (Verney Memoirs. Vol: 2. p.176) This case roused a good deal of comment and Crew, the Bishop of Durham, was criticised for his share in it. Another very young marriage was that in 1672 between Henry Fitzroy, first Duke of Grafton, then aged nine and Isabella Bennet aged five. Evelyn Diary. Aug.1st.1672; Also Swift "Journal to Stella,"(Everyman Edition) p.272. note. Pepys married Elizabeth Le Marchant de St.Michel when the bride was fifteen and it does not seem to have been thought remarkable.

2. Evelyn." Diary". Vol: 3. p.208.

paper he referred to. It had been written with care and would naturally suggest itself for publication if the Countess was willing. A good deal of the correspondence which passed between the two friends has undoubtedly been lost. In the letters the persecution is a perpetually reoccurring subject and the tone of every reference makes it certain that Taylor had suffered from it recently and that Evelyn felt himself none too safe. The next letter, dated St. Paul's Conversion, 1656, makes it possible to guess at some of the things which had been discussed between them.

There had obviously been a suggestion that Taylor should write a book of religious consolations for the use of Anglicans in those distressing times. Taylor readily agreed that a book of that kind ought to be written but he thought that it could be better done by someone who was nearer London and, on that account, had a more precise idea of the need to be met. He had however thought about it very seriously and had brought together such of his papers as he thought might be useful but his Cases of Conscience took up so much of his time that he had been forced to give up the idea.<sup>1</sup> He says rather sadly:

"I know not when I shall be able to come to London; for our being stripped of the little reliques of our fortune remaining after ye shipwrecke, leaves not cordage nor sailes sufficient to beare me thither. But I hope to be able to commit to the presse my first bookes of Conscience by Easter time; and then, if I be able to get up, I shall be glad to waite upon you".<sup>2</sup>

Apparently he had thought of publishing his Cases of Conscience a few books at a time and was working himself hard to get a sufficient amount done by the spring. But either the publisher dissuaded him or he changed his mind for when the work did appear it came out as a whole, not, however, until 1660.

It would seem that he had somehow lost the Mandinam

1. The task which Taylor declined was adequately performed by an unknown writer. The "Whole Duty of Man" which appeared in 1658, has been attributed to Henry Hammond to Richard Allestree and to John Fell as well as to some others, but to none conclusively, though Hammond who put his initials to a prefatory letter must have known the author. It set a commonly accepted standard of Anglican piety for a century and a half.
2. Evelyn, "Diary." Vol: 3. p.210-1.

property, possibly it had been confiscated by the government.<sup>1</sup> Money was forthcoming from more friends than one during this period. Warner, as we already know, had lent him various sums. Evelyn seems to have frequently done so and it appears from a letter written about this time that he was indebted to Sheldon as well. This is quite interesting because obviously Sheldon at least had not yet been estranged by the Original Sin controversy. There were two debts we know, both money debts. One had been forgiven and Taylor promised that he would see that Royston paid ten pounds to Sheldon's nephew before Candlemas to discharge the other. Besides this there was the debt of unkindness which Taylor owes but that was incurred when the writer neither understood his benefactor nor himself. This reference is to the old misunderstanding which occurred when Sheldon, at All Soul's College, had refused to support Laud's nomination of Taylor to the vacant fellowship. That debt must have been forgotten for some time since Sheldon knew all about the great book on casuistry which was being written and he was interested enough in it to send a quantity of good advice regarding it, which Taylor promised faithfully to follow.

Someone, however, took the trouble to influence Sheldon for another long letter to him belongs to this period.<sup>2</sup> Taylor complains a little that after Sheldon had been acquainted with his doctrine of Original Sin and made no objection somebody should be so officious as to "blow the coals" and stir up his friend. Taylor says that he has had letter after letter from the Bishops of Salisbury and Rochester on the matter and, in obedience to them, he has taken pains to make his attitude to the Thirtynine Articles quite clear. He asks for no more latitude in this matter than Chillingworth claimed and no one objected to his demand. Taylor thinks himself ill-used but he will complain of no man.

Money for the London journey was forthcoming, possibly a little earlier than was expected for on April the twelfth Taylor dined at Sayes Court with Evelyn. Berkley, Boyle and Wilkins were

1. That is what the extract quoted above would seem to mean.  
2. Tanner. MSS. No.52.

of the company. After dinner Evelyn presented Dr. Wilkins with a rare burning glass and the whole party went off to see "Colonel Blount's newly invented plows"<sup>1</sup> Evelyn must have thought this entertainment insufficient for he wrote to Taylor making some excuses for the hospitality which had been offered and Taylor replied in a very lengthy, courtly letter praising Sayes Court and its owner's translation of Lucretius and, suggesting that some of the poetical gifts which that work had exhibited should be used in the production of some christian hymns. Praise of his translation of Lucretius was a subject of which Evelyn never wearied. It was published on the twelfth of the following May.<sup>2</sup> Taylor hardly ever wrote to his friend after that date without inserting a little flattery about the work in his letter, although the book was badly printed and not very successful.

Evelyn and Taylor saw one another at least twice more during this visit to London. On the sixth of May Evelyn took a young Frenchman named Le France to talk with Taylor and they discussed the "Unum Necessarium" theory of Original Sin in Latin. This interview was something in the nature of an ordination examination for after Taylor had professed himself very satisfied with the young man he was persuaded by Evelyn to recommend him to the Bishop of Meath for ordination. The candidate for orders was accepted and was ordained both deacon and priest on the same day. Evelyn paid the fees and the bishop was glad to get them for he "was poor and in great want".<sup>3</sup>

Soon after this Taylor went home. He wrote to his friend from Wales on July the nineteenth. In the letter he showed how much he wished to be near London both for the sake of the company and the books he would find there. Mr. Thurland, afterward one of the Barons of the Exchequer, had made some financial offer which would apparently make the removal possible but Taylor does

1. Evelyn. "Diary". April 12th. 1656.
2. "An Essay on the First Book of Lucretius". London 1656. 8 vo.
3. Evelyn. "Diary". May 7th. 1656. The See of Meath had been vacant since 1650 it was not filled up until 1660 when Bishop Leslie was translated thither from Down and Connor. Leslie had however been intended for that See for some time it is therefore possible that he is the bishop whom Evelyn had in mind. This would be an interesting early association of Taylor with Leslie.

not intend to write directly to him about it until after the publication of "Deus Justificatus" which was then in the publisher's hands. It is clear that he had learned from the episode with Warner and Duppa and would commit his friends to nothing which they did not fully understand. We get from this letter one of the rare pieces of news about Taylor's family. He has just lost a "little child", "a boy which lately made us very glad".<sup>1</sup> This is just mentioned and is followed immediately by one of the compliments to the Lucretius. It was the first sign of disasters which were to touch him more closely than controversy or imprisonment.

The next letter to Evelyn is about the Lucretius again. A printed copy had just come to Taylor's hand and his enthusiasms were renewed. He would like Evelyn to translate the whole and suggested to him that it would be an excellent thing if someone were to translate the ancient church hymns into English. The "Dies Irae" for instance, he suggested, would make a "divine song" if it were a little changed. Evelyn took the hint. He translated the "Dies Irae" but when Taylor wrote next in September 1656 he had not seen the version though obviously the letter he was answering had told him of its existence.

Compliments had not all come from one side. Evelyn had said some nice things about Taylor's English poetry though the writer of it had "certain knowledge of his own great weakness in it."<sup>2</sup> It appears from the letter that the controversy he had just been in had become known in foreign countries for Taylor had lately received certain extracts of Eastern and Southern antiquities from a "learned person beyond the sea"<sup>3</sup> which had greatly confirmed him in his opinion. "Deus Justificatus" was just out and Evelyn approved of it.

A few days after this a letter sent off to Dugdale acknowledging the receipt of his "History of Warwickshire" and complimenting him upon it. Dugdale and Taylor were old

1. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.217.
2. Ibid. p.218.
3. Possibly Isaac Barrow who at this time was travelling in Southern Europe.

correspondents and it is a great pity that more of their letters have not survived.

"Deus Justificatus" was the only work which Taylor published in 1656. An attempt has been made to fasten upon him the authorship of a rather silly little book in defence of women painting their faces which appeared in this year under the title of a "Treatise on Artificial Handsomeness".<sup>1</sup> It is not now seriously considered to be Taylor's so that discussion of it can be best taken later with several other psuedo Tayloriana.

There is a probability that in January 1657 Taylor was imprisoned in the Tower. The reason generally given is that Royston had prefixed a picture of Christ in an attitude of prayer to Taylor's *Collection of Offices*, but as this book was not published until 1658 this can hardly have been the cause. The only knowledge we have of this incident is from a letter which Evelyn sent through a common friend to the Lieutenant of the Tower. After some apologies for the trouble he is causing Evelyn writes:

"Sir I speak in behalfe of Dr. Taylor, of whom I understand you have concieved some displeasure for the mistake of his printer, and the readiest way that I can thinke of to do him honour and bring him into esteem with you, is to beg of you that you will please to give him leave to waite upon you, that you may learn from his owne mouth, as well as the world had done from his writings, how averse he is from any thing that he may be charged withall to his prejudice, and how great an adversary he has ever bin in particular to the popish religion, against which he has employed his pen so signally, and with such success."<sup>2</sup>

It would be hard to find another Dr. Taylor whom this description would fit but what the mistake of the printer was it is impossible to say if the letter was actually written in January 1656-7, which is the date it bears. But, as every student of Taylor's life has sad cause to know, the dating of Evelyn's letters often presents an insoluble puzzle and it is possible that this one was not written until 1658. If this is so then it falls easily into place for

1. Wood. "Ath: Ox:" Art: "Taylor". Kennet. "Register". p.787. Evelyn in his "Diary" under date April 11th. 1654, noted that the habit, which had previously been considered disreputable, was now becoming common.
2. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.227-8. The letter is dated from Greenwich. 14th January, 1656-7.

Taylor was then living in London, the Tower would be a possible place of imprisonment and the "Collection of Offices" was published with the frontispiece to which objection might have been made. The records of the Privy Council contain no entry of Taylor's commitment to the Tower but neither do they of his imprisonment at Chepstow.

England was at this time under the rule of the Majors General and the legal preliminaries of imprisonment were not always observed. Evelyn's letter would lead one to suppose that the actual prosecutor was the Lieutenant of the Tower. But in whichever year it occurred the imprisonment was of short duration.

In the February of 1657 an unaddressed letter of Taylor's tells of the death of two more of his children. The recipient was a friend of Taylor's and acquainted with Thurland and was, in all probability, Evelyn.<sup>1</sup> Whoever he was Taylor could open his heart to him and be sure of understanding. He has passed he says, through a dark cloud which has wetted him deeper than the skin. God has been pleased to send small pox and fever among his children so that he has buried two sweet, hopeful, boys. He has now but "one son left"<sup>2</sup> whom he intends to bring up to London before Easter and then he will wait upon his correspondent and hopes in his society to relieve his sorrow. The real quality of Taylor's religion comes out in this letter. In spite of his pain he can still see revealed in it, mercies that are infinitely sweet and, judgment that is inexpressibly gracious.

Taylor had now lost three children and had but one son left. This letter caused Heber a good deal of trouble for it clashed with a supposed statement of Lady Wray who claimed to have had two uncles who lived to manhood both the sons of her grandfather by his first marriage. Heber ingeniously proposes to get over this obstacle by supposing that the children of the first wife were living with their mother's family. But there seems to be no need for any such

1. Evelyn. "Diary." Vol: 3. p.233-4.
2. Ibid. "Dr. Jeremy Taylor had been committed prisoner to the Tower for setting the picture of Christ praying before his collection of Office contrary to do a new act concerning scandalous pictures as they called them" Ibid. Bray's note to this letter.

supposition as the statements attributed to Lady Wray are completely unreliable. In later life one adult son is all that can be traced.<sup>1</sup> It was while he was still feeling the bitterness of this loss that he wrote the defence of Infant Baptism which was inserted in the later edition of the "Liberty of Propheſying" and no doubt much of the gentle brooding over the sweet innocency of childhood was due to memories of the little ones he had just buried.

Already he had felt the inconvenience of living in Wales, so far away from books and friends, as his earlier letters to Evelyn show. The loss he had just sustained made him more eager to leave the country and go to London. It has been pointed out<sup>2</sup> that once in London one would expect the friendship with Evelyn to have grown much closer but it seems to have gone on much as before. If the Diary records all their meetings they were no more frequent than they would have been if Taylor had been living in the country and going up to town once or twice a year. But Rust<sup>3</sup> and Anthony à Wood<sup>4</sup> were both emphatic that soon after the death of his children Taylor went to live in London and Wood adds that he "for a time officiated in a private congregation of Loyalists to his great hazard and danger".<sup>5</sup> The glimpses which we have of Taylor's intercourse with Lord Conway's London household remove all doubts which may hitherto have been entertained on this subject.

But a great deal of his usefulness consisted in dealing with cases of conscience which seem to have been sent to him from all over England. Probably it was this same sort of business which took him now and then into the country, journeys of which his letters give one or two indications. From time to time Evelyn lent or gave Taylor money. A letter of May fifteenth, 1657 acknowledges the receipt of a letter and a token from Evelyn for both of which Taylor

1. Charles buried August 2nd. 1667 in St. Margaret's, Westminster. The son Edward buried at Lisnagarvey March 10th. 1661, must have been born after 1657 if Taylor's words quoted above are true.
2. Heber. 'Life of Jeremy Taylor'. (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p. ixiv.
3. Rust. "Funeral Sermon". (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1. ) p. cccxxiii.
4. Wood. "Ath: Ox:" Art: Taylor.

is very grateful. From this time on these tokens seem to have come to Taylor with such regularity that they may have been part of a settled pension. Certainly the gratitude expressed in this letter is so warm that it would seem that the writer was under some more than usual obligation at the time.

On the ninth of the following June Taylor wrote again to congratulate him upon the birth of another child and accedes to a request that he should baptize the baby. Evelyn's entry in his Diary for the seventh of June records the birth of the child, a son, and under the same date goes on to say that he was "Christened George, after my Grandfather, Dr. Taylor officiating in the drawing room".<sup>1</sup>

Taylor had just published a new edition of the "Liberty of Propheying" in folio with the additional argument against the Anabaptists and was discussing with Evelyn the need for a treatise De Providentia. Evelyn had got into difficulties about the immortality of the soul. He could not understand how it could exist in the interval between death and the day of Judgement, when, according to the teaching of the church, eternal death or eternal life are bestowed. Taylor sent him a long letter on the subject<sup>2</sup> arguing that even if the soul is quiescent during the time spoken of it would not follow that it was dead. He promised also to talk the matter over with Evelyn when they next met. Evelyn was apparently in deep water for he had also asked how it appears that God made all things of nothing. This is dealt with very shortly. Either God is the sole Eternal or he is nothing.<sup>3</sup>

The controversy with Jeans was embittering Taylor during this summer and some of the irritation he felt made its way into the most notable of the works he issued in this year. A little duodecimo Volume entitled "A Discourse of the Nature and Offices of Friendship in a letter to the most ingenious and excellent M.K.P". The initials stood for Mrs. Katharine Phillips.

1. Evelyn. "Diary". June 7th. 1657.
2. Dated August 29th. 1657.
3. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.240-44.

This lady was a provincial blue stocking of some note. Aubrey who was her contemporary and knew her as a child left an account of her precocious learning and goodness.<sup>1</sup> Her father was a London merchant and like many city men a Presbyterian, but as soon as the girl was old enough she thought things out for herself and became enthusiastic for Church and King. This was probably about the time of the outbreak of the civil war, for in 1646, when she was seven teen years old, she married a Royalist and changed her maiden name of Fowler for that of Phillips. Her husband lived at Cardigan Priory in Wales and soon the young wife was intimate with all the literary society in the neighbourhood. She published nothing until 1651 when a congratulatory poem to Henry Vaughan, the Silurist, made its appearance. It revealed her as a capable poet of the same type as Waller and Denham. Her friends called her "the Matchless Orinda". She may be said to have made friendship her speciality and she sought friends with avidity. Among them was Henry Lawes the musician and Samuel Cooper the miniature painter, as well as Henry Vaughan and a good number of other men and women notable in their day. Jeremy Taylor was admitted to her circle some time during his residence in Wales and in accordance with her custom of distinguishing her acquaintance with a romantic name he was called the "Noble Palaemon". The appellation did not come to him brand new for she had previously called Francis Finch, first the "Excellent Palaemon" and, then the "Noble Palaemon", the name was obviously too good to lose.

Friendship was the theme of nearly all her writing and generally it was the excellence of friendship as exhibited in her female friends. She was feeling after a new school in literature, something of the sort that Sterne afterward founded but without his indecency. Her friendship with Taylor was as lasting as any she made, for she pursued it as late as 1662 when they enjoyed each others society in Ireland. This lady wrote to Taylor, probably about the beginning of 1657, asking him one or two questions about

1. Anthony a Wood also inserted an account of her in his article on Taylor in Ath: Ox:.

the legitimacy of friendship for a Christian. The enquiries were rather of the type which a good many divines with a reputation for skill in casuistry received from their correspondents, but Taylor's reply was very different. He produced a pleasant little essay on friendship which <sup>must</sup> have gladdened the heart of the literary lady to whom it was sent. Taylor could be a courtier when he chose. His ability for writing agreeable dedications has already been commented upon. He opens his letter with a remark that Mrs. Phillips was really more competent to deal with the question at issue than he whose advice she had asked. But when he comes to examine the actual question which has been propounded to him, that is how far Christianity authorizes a perfect friendship, he answers at once that the New Testament takes no notice of that virtue at all. He then bids his reader hasten on and not think this in the least strange for if by friendship is meant "The greatest love, the greatest usefulness, and the most open communications and the noblest sufferings, and the most exemplar faithfulness and the severest truth, the heartiest counsel, and the greatest union of minds of which brave men and women are capable"<sup>1</sup> this is what the New Testament calls charity. We are bound to give this to all the world. He quotes Cicero in support of this opinion and says he is glad to be able to do so for, he continues:

"I have been so pushed at by herds and flocks of people that follow anybody that whistles to them, or drives them to pasture, that I am grown afraid of any truth that seems chargable with singularity."<sup>2</sup>

One cannot help thinking that this little piece of irritation comes in rather oddly just where he is celebrating the duty of universal charity.

The answer to Orinda's question, therefore, really is that Christianity not only warrants friendship but bids us extend it to all mankind. The good man is grieved at each distress which comes to men. "I am troubled", he says, "when I hear of a pretty bride murdered in her bride chamber by an ambitious and enraged rival; I shed a tear when I am told that a brave King was

1. Works. Vol: 1. p. 72.

2. Ibid.

misunderstood, then slandered, then imprisoned, and then put to death by evil men."<sup>1</sup> This last reference was too obvious to escape the notice of anybody who read the book and Taylor showed a good deal of courage in making it for his previous trouble with the authorities must have rendered him to some extent a marked man.

The answer to the question had now been given and he would have fulfilled his obligation if he had written no more, but he was not content to leave it. He goes on to make an enquiry concerning this special friendship of which he has spoken and to ask three questions.

- "1. How it can be appropriate, that is, who to be chosen to it;
2. How far it may extend; that is, with what expressions signified;
3. How conducted." <sup>1</sup>

The answer to these questions he concludes will be neither useless nor unpleasant. They occupied the rest of the book but they may be given here briefly. The answer to the first is that a good man is the best friend since from him we may get most real good. In answer to the second question he concludes that our friendship must only be limited by some former duty either to God or ourselves or some "pre-obliging relative".<sup>2</sup> In answer to the third question he gives a list of ten rules for conducting a friendship, which really amount to this, that there are limits to the closest attachment and they ought to be respected. For instance, too great demands ought not to be made upon it and neither treachery nor back-biting should be tolerated. One ought to give friends good counsel but never let oneself be a judge in disputes between them, because, when the decision is given one is almost sure to be offended and possibly lost Taylor exemplifies his own wisdom in dealing with his friends by introducing this section with another little compliment, this time to the abilities of women for friendship.

"A woman can love as passionately, and converse as pleasantly, and retain a secret as faithfully, and be useful in her proper ministries; and she can die for her friend as well as the bravest Roman knight."<sup>3</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 1. p.75.
2. Ibid. p.84.
3. Ibid. p.94.

This comes with a particular force in a composition intended for a lady who was a connoisseur in female friendship.

"The Discourse on Friendship" is the only secular theme which Taylor ever handled and he treated that very much like a divine. The subject is stated and split up into its appropriate divisions as if it were a sermon; texts are quoted and explained in support of what is said and a gently pious air hangs over the entire writing. In spite of this gravity, the whole essay is delightfully mellow and spontaneous. There are Greek and Latin quotations, for the Matchless Orinda was a learned lady. There are also references to "Madame de Scuderies' Grand Cyrus"<sup>1</sup> and to "Promos and Cassandra" a comical discourse by G. Whetstone,<sup>2</sup> as well as to "a pretty apologue that Bromiard tells". This last, the story of the thrush and the fowler, is very old but Taylor puts it well and uses it to point a moral very much in the manner of the elaborate similes in "Holy Living and Dying" and the "Sermons".

"A fowler in a sharp frosty morning having taken many little birds for which he had long watched, began to take up his nets, and nipping the birds on the head laid them down. A young thrush espying the tears trickling down his cheeks by reason of the extreme cold, said to her mother, that certainly the man was very merciful and compassionate that he wept so bitterly over the calamity of the poor birds. But her mother told her more wisely, that she might better judge of the man's disposition by his hand than by his eye; and if the hands do strike treacherously, he can never be admitted to friendship, who speaks fairly and weeps pitifully. Friendship is the greatest honesty and ingenuity in the world."<sup>3</sup>

1. Works. Vol: p.81. Madame de Scudery (1607-1701) while still young became a notable figure at the Hotel Rambouillet, began to help her brother in his literary work, and between them they composed many romances which were issued in the brother's name. "Artamene ou le Grand Cyrus" (1649-1653) is a meandering romance of 15,000 pages with its dulness only relieved by its naiveté.
2. Ibid. George Whetstone. Born, about 1544; died about 1587. After wasting his inheritance served in the Low Countries against the Spaniards. Wrote considerably both in prose and verse. He published in 1578 "Promos and Cassandra" a play in rhyming verse which was never acted. The plot is similar in some respects to Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure". "Mirour for Magistrates" published 1584 is his best known work and contains some interesting descriptions of low life in London.
3. Works. Vol: 1. p.98. John de Bromyard. Fl.1390. A Dominican Friar, scholar of Oxford and an opponent of Wycliff. His "Summa Praedicatorum" is a collection of moral tales and poems similar to the "Gesta Romanorum."

Taylor had of course read De Amicitia and borrowed from it a few quotations but he did not rely on Cicero to any extent the thought and manner of the work are all his own. He wrote with the possibility of publication in view. He probably knew that the lady, having persuaded one of the most popular religious authors of the day to write her so long a letter, was not likely to keep her treasure hid, so he added a postscript to the effect that if "the papers were to pass further than the lady's own eye"<sup>1</sup> they should first be submitted to the scrutiny of Dr. Wedderburne whom Taylor reckoned among the best of physicians and the best of friends. This Dr. Wedderburne was, first of all, professor of Philosophy at St. Andrew's University but afterward gained a great reputation and a great fortune as a medical doctor. He was a staunch Royalist and well known to all the King's friends. We have no more information about his friendship with Taylor though the reference in this postscript hints at a particularly warm attachment between them. But one of the most remarkable things in Taylor's life is the great number of his friends and the very small records of these friendships which remain.

We know very little more of his acquaintance with the Matchless Orinda beyond the visit she paid him in Ireland which has just been mentioned. The lady's literary reputation continued to increase. The "Discourse of Friendship" made her widely known, and the long poem in which she returned answer to "Palaemon on his incomparable Discourse of Friendship" added still more to her fame.<sup>2</sup> She translated Corneille and Horace and wrote poems which were published with commendatory verses by Cowley, Flatman, Tyrrel and others. She died in 1664.

In the summer of 1657 Taylor was doing what he could to give spiritual help to members of the Church of England who were living in **ernd** near London. Among them was Sir George Dalstone, a Loyalist knight. One day while the gentleman was in church

1. Works. Vol: 1. p.98.
2. Because she had also given Francis Finch the title of "The Excellent Palaemon" the poem has been sometimes thought to be addressed to Finch.

listening to a sermon he was suddenly taken ill, and through the fairly lengthy illness which followed he was attended by Jeremy Taylor to whose sermon he had probably been listening. When Sir George died in September 1657 Taylor preached at his funeral the sermon which has already been noticed.

From the nature of things a good deal of Taylor's pastoral work at this time would have to be secret and would carry with it some risk. There does not seem to have been any attempt to organize the work of the priests or the time and place of such clandestine ministry as could be given. A good many of the dispossessed clergy found their way up to London and lived there as best they could, very often in great want. Taylor apparently knew a number of these for in February 1657/8 Robert Rich sent him a letter couched in very pious phrases and ten pounds to bestow upon such episcopal ministers as should be in want.<sup>1</sup> The fact that Taylor himself was not included in this benefaction may be a slight indication that, compared with his brethren, he was at this time moderately well provided for.

Juxon who had presented Taylor to his first living was now residing at Richmond as unobtrusively as possible. It was however natural that his house should become the centre of all the anglican work which was being attempted in London. Taylor had considerable influence in the circle which gathered there, and was sufficiently trusted by the rank and file of the clergy to act as their spokesman. A letter of Hammond's to Sheldon gives an interesting glimpse of the way in which some of the clergy had reacted to Cromwell's order of 1655:

"Your presence" he says to Sheldon "will be very useful at Richmond, where some of our ecclesiastical affairs are now afoot, and by what I hear concerning a report made to the Bishop of London by Dr. Jeremy Taylor concerning the clergy's sense to have the Common Prayer taken off and some other forms made. I cannot but wish you were there to interpose your judgement and authority. I heard also from the Bishop of Sarum (Brian Duppa) this week who much depends upon your coming."<sup>2</sup>

This proposal was probably only intended to tide things over for a

1. "Abstracts of some letters written by Mr. Robert Rich, etc". London. 1680.
2. Harleian. MSS. No. 6942.

time in the hope that some appearance of complying with the government would make it easier to keep a flock together. But the older men would not hear of change and their opposition was right, though for the time it meant that the church must follow the harder road. The bulk of the people of England loved the Prayer Book more than any thing else in the Anglican system and to cling to it, and if necessary to suffer for it, was the surest of all ways to increase their respect for the clergy. Alternative forms were however licenced for use in special circumstances. It was in order to meet this necessity that Taylor produced his "Collection of Offices."

Early in 1658 Taylor published his "Collection of Offices" which he describes on the title page as being "Taken out of the scriptures and the ancient liturgies of several churches, especially the Greek."<sup>1</sup> In all probability they represented the forms he himself used in public now that the Prayer Book was suppressed. The book was prefaced with a vindication of the Liturgy of the Church of England. This preface was afterward taken from its place in the "Collection of Offices" and published with the "Apology for Liturgy". Besides this he added an advertisement directing how the prayers were to be said, and emphasising their temporary nature, with a short paragraph stressing that they were only to be used publicly if the bishops gave consent. Most of the corporate devotional needs of the church are satisfied by the book. There are forms of Morning and Evening Prayer to be used in public, and shorter forms for a family and both are provided with additional devotions for special occasions. These are followed by an office for the Holy Communion and one for Baptism with two other forms of prayer, one for a safe delivery and one for thanksgiving after childbirth. This seems to be an improvement on the Prayer Book where only the short petition for "women labouring of child" and a thanksgiving office is furnished. Women's needs were well provided for since there were prayers for a newly married wife, prayers for the gift of children,

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.571.

for an afflicted wife, on behalf of children and prayers to be used by widows. Following on this is an office to be used in time of persecution, prayers for an army or navy, an office for prisoners and a form of prayer for mariners. These are succeeded by prayers before a journey, various prayers including one on behalf of "fools and changelings", a service for the visitation of the sick and the burial of the dead, prayers to be used in sorrow and affliction, a form of thanksgiving and a penitential litany.

Of all these the service for the Holy Communion is most interesting liturgically. Taylor does not indicate his sources beyond saying that they are from the Greek, actually many of the prayers are taken from the Liturgy of St. James and some of them are translated with singular beauty. That, for instance, beginning "Let all corruptible flesh be silent"<sup>1</sup> is a piece of very lovely and harmonious prose. But, besides the prayers, there are a good many extracts from the Bible. Taylor divides his service into three parts, the Ante Communion, the Communion and the Post Communion. The Ante Communion contains prayers for purity and the Beatitudes, said in place of the Commandments with the response "Lord pardon our faults, and incline our hearts to obey Thee that we may inherit this blessing". This is followed by a rather expanded version of the prayer of the offertory from the Liturgy of St. Basil<sup>2</sup> which is itself followed by an Epistle and a Gospel and, what Taylor called an Ecclesiastical Hymn, made up of passages of scripture strung together, and comminatory readings from the Apocalypse. Next comes Confession and Absolution, collection of alms and reading of offertory sentences and an address to the Holy Mysteries. This is followed by the beginning of the Anaphora as far as the Trisagion from the Liturgy of Saint James.<sup>3</sup> That ends the Ante Communion.

The Communion begins with the Cherubic Hymn and goes on to the Consecration which again follows in a modified form the Liturgy of St. James.<sup>4</sup> But it is interesting to note that the priest

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.642. See Brightman. "Liturgies Eastern and Western". Vol: 1. p.41.
2. Ibid. p.618. See Brightman. Ibid. p.401.
3. Ibid. p.628. See Brightman. Ibid. p.49-50.
4. Ibid. p.625. See Brightman "Liturgies Eastern and Western". Vol: 1. p.52.

communicates the people with words which are a paraphrase of those in the Prayer Book. The Post Communion begins with the Lord's Prayer. It is strange that Taylor should imitate the Prayer Book here for the Lord's Prayer is not usually found in this position in other Liturgies. It is followed by a prayer for the Catholic Church which is reminiscent of the prayer of intercession which in most of the ancient offices comes before the Consecration. The service closes with three Eucharistic prayers and the blessing.

The Baptismal prayers are based on those in the Prayer Book being in many cases hardly more than a paraphrase of them. The structure of the services for Morning and Evening Prayer again follows the precedent of the Prayer Book, though the actual wording of the Collects and Canticles used is different. The King is not prayed for by name but there is an intercession for all christian kings, princes, governors and states. Both Morning and Evening Prayer are provided with a good selection of collects to be used on special occasions and special intercessions and prayers are supplied to be added to the ordinary services on Great Festivals. The most note-worthy prayer in the private offices for morning and evening is the confession "Taken out of the prayer of Ephraim the Syrian".<sup>1</sup> All the four prayers provided for use in the time of war were taken from the special office published by the authority of Queen Elizabeth in 1597. It would seem that, perhaps because he thought that the Puritan authorities would object, Taylor did not attempt to provide direct and obvious translations of ancient offices. He kept them in mind and modelled his own prayers on them but only using, now and then where it suited him, their exact phraseology. In the Holy Communion service he felt himself least free to depart from the precedent.

In 1658 Evelyn's two sons, Richard and George, died and on February the seventeenth, as soon as he heard of his friend's loss, Taylor sent the bereaved father a very manly and sympathetic letter of condolence<sup>2</sup> and on February the twentyfifth, as Evelyn

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.606.

2. Dated. Feb. 17th. 1657-8.

tells us, Dr. Taylor called in person "to visite and condole with us".<sup>1</sup> On the seventh of the following March Evelyn entered in his Diary. "To London to hear Dr. Taylor in a private house on XIII Luke 23-4. After the sermon followed the Blessed Communion of which I participated. In the afternoon Dr. Gunning at Exceter house expounding part of the creed". Taylor and Gunning seem to have been working in conjunction in London. Gunning made it his business to dispute with the multitudinous sects which were springing up everywhere at that time and the practice developed in him a rather critical habit of mind. Taylor regretted this but thought that when once Gunning published something of his own he would be a little less censorious of others.<sup>2</sup>

It is in 1658 that we get the first intimation of Taylor's association with the Conway family, a connection which was to rival the famous friendship with the Vaughan household at Golden Grove. On April the ninth, Lady Conway writing to her husband from Kensington remarks that out of a hundred pounds which she has just received she has set aside thirty to pay Dr. Taylor as her husband had requested. Apart from whatever special purpose may have been in view Taylor had need of money just then for his wife was expecting soon to bear him another child.<sup>3</sup> Eighteen days later a little boy had both been born and died leaving Taylor to suffer the pain of his loss as cheerfully as he might. Within a few days he was to leave London for a visit to Ragley Hall the Warwickshire seat of the Conway family, travelling in the Worcester coach as far as Pershore where Lord Conway's horses would meet him.<sup>4</sup> The object of this journey was probably to enable Lord Conway to study Taylor

1. Evelyn. "Diary". Feb.25th.1658.
2. Letter to a person unnamed. Tanner MSS. No.52. Peter Gunning. 1614-1684. Fellow and tutor of Clare Hall, Cambridge. 1633. Ministered during the Commonwealth at Exeter Chapel, Strand. Bishop of Chichester 1669-75, Bishop of Ely 1675-84.
3. Brit: Mus: Add: MSS. 23,214. Fol: 14. Printed "Conway Letters". p.147. Taylor's remark in the letter of Feb.22nd. 1657, that he had "but one son left" would seem to prove that the child whose birth was expected on April 9th, 1658 was the boy whose death was referred to on April 27th, though it is not definitely stated, since Charles buried at St. Margaret's Westminster, August 2nd. 1667, aged about twentyfour, must have been the "one son left".
4. Brit: Mus: Add: MSS. 23,214. Fol. 15. Printed. "Conway letters". p.148.

at close quarters, so that, if the result was satisfactory he could make him an offer which he already seems to have had in mind. The thirty pounds paid out a few days previously was no doubt partly for the expenses of this journey.

Edward, the third Viscount Conway had inherited estates in Northern Ireland where he lived in the magnificent mansion of Portmore, about eight miles away from the town of Lisnagarvey. He was at this very time looking for an Anglican priest who would be more acceptable to his family and to that of his brother-in-law, Major Rawdon, the commandant of the garrison at Lisnagarvey, than the minister who since 1651 had been intruded upon them by the government. This was a man named Andrew Wyke<sup>1</sup>, an Anabaptist whom Adair described as "Void of human learning, never educated in that way but a tradesman and imprudent."<sup>2</sup> Such a person was not likely to be pleasing to a cultured valetudinarian like Lady Conway. Mrs. Dorothy Rawdon, Lord Conway's sister, had taken a strong dislike to this man. She wrote to her brother in London, "There is nothing I dislike here but Mr. Wyke, whom I never can like. You would very much oblige me if you would send a good minister here, as it is hard to live by such a one as he".

Accordingly ever since 1657 Conway had been looking for a suitable man to invite over to Ireland. He would have been very glad if he could have induced either Henry More or Cudworth to go but both wisely declined. Whether More, who probably already knew Taylor, suggested him instead is difficult to say. Whoever first brought his name forward the formal offer of a post in Ireland, when it was made, came to him through Evelyn. It was, however, anything but attractive and Taylor wrote to Evelyn refusing it. The salary for one thing was so inconsiderable. "It will not," he says, "Pay the charge and trouble of removing myselfe and family. It is wholly arbitrary; for the triers may over throw it; or the vicar may forbid it; or the subscribers may die or grow weary, or poore, or be absant"<sup>3</sup>

1. His name is sometimes spelled Wyke, sometimes Week, sometimes Weeks.
2. Adair. "True Narrative". p.186.
3. Evelyn. "Diary: Vol: 3. p.248.

It would appear from this that Conway did not offer a very lavish amount or intend to provide even that entirely out of his own pocket. What the precise sum offered was we do not know but Wyke himself received an annual salary of £150 and tithes; Taylor could not expect so much. There was the additional drawback of serving under a vicar, Taylor did not relish the idea of himself and Wyke "like Castor and Pollux", "the one up the other down".<sup>1</sup> Lord Conway, however, was not to be put off and Major Rawdon, when he heard that Taylor had been approached, was very eager to have him, so a second application was made to Taylor and again he refused. But the offer was renewed a third time and accepted.

The negotiations had not taken very long. The first certain news we hear of it is in a letter to Evelyn dated May 1658 when, after giving his reason for refusing, Taylor seems to have considered the matter closed.<sup>2</sup> He goes on in the same letter to answer some question about taking interest on money which Evelyn had asked him. The latter part of the letter is lost so it is impossible to know how Taylor developed his reply though it is easy to understand the gist of it since in the part which remains he argues that if you may let your farm to another man for hire then you may justly let him your money.<sup>3</sup>

The project of going to Ireland was settled by June the fifteenth for on that date Lord Conway wrote to Major Rawdon that Dr. Taylor had already left for Ireland to undertake his new office.

1. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.248.

2. Ibid.

3. In "Ductor Dubitantium" (Works: Vol:10. p.245) Taylor gives another opinion on the subject. "Supposing usury to be unlawful ..... yet the civil laws permit it, and the church forbids it. In this case the canons are to be preferred". R.H.Tawney (Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. p.160) quotes this as the theory "held by almost all the ecclesiastical writers who dealt with economic ethics in the sixteenth (sic) century" But as the passage in Duc: Dubt is only an illustration of the relative authority of civil and canon law and even though the letter referred to is only a fragment it is still a fuller treatment of the subject, Taylor cannot be supposed to forbid all interest. In "Holy Living (Works: Vol: 3. p.131) he allows a merchant to "sell dearer by reason he sells not for ready money" which is again allowing interest.

He mentions some of the inducements which had obviously been instrumental in making Taylor change his mind. Dr. Petty, who was afterward the famous Sir William Petty, had written to Dr. Harrison and to several others and had promised to help Taylor buy some land cheaply and other intimate kindnesses had been promised in which Major Rawdon's advice was to be asked.<sup>1</sup> Petty could very well have got Taylor the land since he was the surveyor set to demark the many forfeited estates in Ireland. Dr. Harrison also had it in his power to be a very useful friend for he was the minister of a dissenting church in Dublin and very influential in government circles. Taylor had besides very strong letters to Sir Mathew Tomlinson, to the Chancellor, to the Lord Chief Baron and it would seem that he was already friendly with Dr. Dudley Loftus, the Irish Vicar-General and judge of the Prerogative Court.<sup>2</sup> If all the letters Taylor carried over to Ireland with him were effective he began life there with many friends in the Cromwellian government.

Lord Conway adds in his letter to Major Rawdon that the Lord Protector had given Taylor a pass for himself and his family under his own "sign manual and privy signet". This was a considerable favour to grant to one who had several times been in prison for his opinions and who was known as a staunch Royalist, but Lord Conway had influence and Cromwell himself was not one who gladly persecuted religious opinions.

As soon as the news of Taylor's coming got about among the Presbyterians of Down and Connor they showed themselves anything but pleased. He was known to be a staunch Anglican and an able defender of Episcopacy and, although they claimed to be unshaken in their loyalty to the King their Royalism was of a different type to Taylor's. The synod as a body disliked his coming and, Dr. Harrison to whom Taylor had been recommended, told Rawdon point blank that it would be certain to give offence. But opposition made no difference, Rawdon went on with his preparations to receive the new

1. Rawdon Paper. pp.187-191. Lord Conway to Major Rawdon. June 15th. 1658.

2. Ibid.

chaplain just the same.<sup>1</sup>

When Taylor went to Ireland the entire country was undergoing a drastic change. By the Articles of Kilkenny which were signed in May 1652, the wars which with brief intervals had devastated Ireland for eleven years were brought to an end. Shortly after the outbreak of the rebellion of 1641 the Long Parliament had formulated a plan for the permanent subjugation of the country by the confiscation of its lands. This design was carried out by the Act of Settlement of August twelfth 1652. By it the whole of Ireland was regarded as forfeited property and many owners in addition to the loss of their estates were condemned to lose their lives also unless they could prove their complete innocence from any taint of rebellion. To this act was appended a list of those for whom no pardon of any kind was available, among whom were both Ormonde and Bramhall. The vast tract of land made vacant by this act was divided into two parts one including the province of Connaught and County Clare, the other the remainder Ireland. In to the first were huddled all the native proprietors who by hook or by crook had managed to retain a title to some shred of land, the other was to be divided between the friends of Parliament who were mostly English and Scottish adventurers. With unsparing strength the forfeited lands were cleared of their former owners, satisfactorily measured by Sir William Petty and by May 1659 the new possessors were settled upon their new estates. The landless Irish either emigrated as soldiers, were indentured to labour in the plantations of the West Indies, or wandered about their native country begging for their bread. No attempt that was afterward made to overthrow this settlement had more than slight success.<sup>2</sup>

Toward the end of June 1658 Taylor arrived in the North of Ireland. He intended at first to live in Lisnagarvey. This was a town of fairly recent growth in Taylor's day. It had sprung up round the castle which Sir Fulke Conway had built when he obtained

1. "Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland." (addenda) 1625-1660. p.667.
2. S.R.Gardiner. "The Transplantation to Connaught." "Eng: Hist: Review." Vol: XIV. pp.700-734

the territory of Killultagh somewhere about 1609. Sir Fulke had brought with him a good number of English and Welsh settlers and it was these settlers who had built the town. The Conway family erected for themselves a castle and a church and settled down to enjoy their new possessions in a land of pleasant fields, water brooks rivers full of fish, forests full of game. In 1641 the rebels burnt the whole town, church and castle but were driven from the site by a small force under Sir George Rawdon. Everything was rebuilt as soon after the rebellion as possible and the town was still called Lisnagarvey. It was not until 1662 that it is referred to in the parish registers as Lisburn, the name by which it is known to most of those who are acquainted with the life of Taylor.<sup>1</sup>

Here Taylor intended to settle and he got the plans for a new house from a gentleman in Dublin who had very good skill in architecture. His first letter to Evelyn, written on April the sixth, 1659, shows that he was still living in the town, but on June the fourth, he wrote from Portmore. Either the desire for safety or for economy had made him take up his quarters in Lord Conway's own house. Portmore was not so convenient, but it was a quieter and more splendid place in which to live. The house had been built from designs by Inigo Jones soon after the rebellion of 1641. Nothing remains of it to-day but a few broken traces of brick walls and some old trees which may or may not have been part of Lord Conway's garden.<sup>2</sup>

The house was beautifully situated on the Eastern bank of a small lake which was sometimes called Lough Beg and sometimes Portmore Lough. The house had a charming view all across the lake and away to Lough Neagh where the old round tower on Ram Island stood up against the sky. On both sides and behind it were green

1. The origin of the name Lisburn is unknown. For a reasonable attempt to provide an explanation and an interesting account of the town see, Carmody. "Lisburn Cathedral and its Past Rectors" pp.1-7.
2. See a short paper, "Jeremy Taylor at Portmore" (passim) by Clason Porter, printed in the "Northern Whig" and reprinted in "Ulster Biographical Sketches" (second Series.) Belfast. 1884.

meadows and bog land. There was a church nearby in which Taylor ministered to Lord Conway's household but neither church nor house lasted long, for the church was dismantled by Taylor himself, when, a little before his death, he built his new chapel at Ballindery and the house itself was pulled down in 1761 when the Conway peerage became extinct.

From Portmore Taylor rode over Sunday by Sunday to Lisnagarvey to preach in the church there alternately with Mr. Wyke, Probably one in the morning and the other in the afternoon. But, while there was such a shortage of efficient ministers as there was in Ireland at that time, Taylor would not be able to content himself with merely doing his duty in Lisnagarvey. He is also said to have preached in the parish church of Templecormac and once a fortnight at Ballindery, Soldierstown, Derriaghy, and Magheragall.<sup>1</sup> Tradition alone is the authority for this and it may not be true that he preached at all in these places. No doubt as many churches as possible would like to be linked with Taylor.

The income received for all this was not as great as he had been lead to expect. In spite of Dr. Petty's promise to help him to buy land cheaply he did not get any, and while it is just possible that he was paid some small salary by the authorities in Dublin for acting as alternate lecturer there is no record of such a payment being made in the list of ministers receiving money from the Cromwellian government in Ireland.<sup>2</sup> That body treated Mr. Wyke quite generously. They allowed him to receive the tithes of the parish of Lisnagarvey which came to about £50 a year and, in addition paid him £150 a year out of the civil establishment, besides giving him a grant of £200 with which to build a house. It is argued that the government could hardly pay one lecturer so well and give the other nothing.<sup>3</sup> But Wyke had been specially sent down by the authorities who believed him to be a "man of meek spirit and apt to preach the Gospel". Taylor had been brought in by Lord Conway and his

1. Classon Porter. "Jeremy Taylor at Portmore. p.8.
2. Among Taylor's property when he died was a small farm, but there is no indication that he owned it prior to being a bishop.
3. Classon Porter. Ibid.

very presence was a criticism of the government's nominee. Under such circumstances they were not very likely to pay him. He would receive the subscription, which was one of the inducements to him to live in Ireland, but it is not likely that he had much more.

On April the ninth 1659 Taylor writes to Evelyn, still from Lisnagarvey. He wishes for news of the outside world, what scholars are making a name for themselves, what new books have been published since he left England. He particularly wishes for some information about the new sect of the Perfectionists who are said to be rising in England and who held an opinion of Castelio's that it is possible to give God perfect and entire obedience in this life. The leaders of this new body he says were Dr. Drayton and Dr. Gell. He has himself been busy all the winter with his cases of conscience which are now ready for the press.<sup>1</sup>

Evelyn continued his generosity for writing from Portmore on June the fourth, 1659, Taylor expresses himself infinitely obliged "much for your pension but exceeding more for your affection"<sup>2</sup> The rest of his acquaintances were beginning to forget him and he quotes a little sadly the Spanish proverb which says "the dead and the absent have but few friends". Evelyn's brothers had also assisted Taylor in some way for he writes "I shall be ashamed to make any address, or pay my thanks in words to them till my rule of conscience be publicke and that is all the way I have to pay my debts".<sup>3</sup> In this letter, as in the one from Lisnagarvey which preceeded it, Taylor is very anxious to get from Evelyn some information about Perfectionists. The best known of their leaders was Dr. Robert Gell who in 1659 published a letter criticising the authorized translation of the Bible. He was at this time Rector of St. Mary's Aldermanbury. A good deal of what the Perfectionists taught was to be found in Dr. Gell's writings but three of their leaders had written an "Examen" of the Westminster Confession which Taylor thinks well worth reading. They studied the scriptures a

1. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. pp.253-255.
2. Ibid. pp.256-260.
3. Ibid.

good deal, but gave them an almost entirely mystical meaning. They were also, to some extent, indebted to Jacob Behmen whom Taylor said they understood "as nurses do children" "something by use and much by fancy". Nevertheless he has heard that "some very learned and very sober persons have given up their names to it", and he adds they, "In many things speak rationally, and in some things very confidently." Evelyn promised to enquire about them.

Taylor maintained a regular system of transmitting letters from London. At one time he asks that communications for him may be sent to Mr. Allestree, stationer at the Bell in St. Paul's Churchyard,<sup>1</sup> and at another time to Mr. Martin, bookseller at the Bell in St. Paul's Churchyard.<sup>2</sup> Possibly, as the address is the same, these two were successors in the same business. Royston, Taylor adds, would send letters but he did not often employ him.

Though the London friends were becoming a little forgetful Taylor was making up for it by gaining new friends in Dublin. Among these was Dr. John Stearne who, after the Restoration, founded the Irish College of Physicians and for whose "Thanatologia", published in 1658, Taylor wrote a Latin letter, the only composition of his in that language to survive except the long epitaph on Lady Carbery. Stearne was at this time a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and Cowley, Sheridan and Graham, also members of that College, were friends of Taylor. It was in reply to an enquiry which these gentlemen made of him that Taylor sent them a list of books which he considered suitable as the nucleus of a theological library. The suggestions are listed under four heads, Prayer Book, Government and Discipline of the Church, Doctrine and School Divinity. It is amusing to see how in every section except the last Taylor recommended his own books as among the minimum which was indispensable<sup>3</sup>

He was writing a good deal all this time, struggling

1. Evelyn's "Diary". Vol: 3. pp.253-255. Letter of April 9th.1659.
2. Ibid. pp. 256-260. Letter of June 4th. 1659.
3. Letter in Dopping's "Common Place Book." Trinity College Library. Printed in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Journal". Jan.1849. The letter is dated Jan.13th.1659, but since Taylor generally used the old method of beginning the year at Lady Day it probably belongs to 1660.

hard to finish his Cases of Conscience the progress of which he mentioned in almost every letter to Evelyn. There is a tradition in the neighbourhood of Portmore that Taylor did most of his work in a little study which Lord Conway had built for him on a small Island in Lough Beg which was called Sally Island because of the many willows which grew on it. He is also said, with less likelihood, to have studied sometimes on Ram Island, which is about a mile from Portmore in Lough Neagh. But even here he was not to have a great deal of quietude. In the letter to Evelyn which he wrote on June the fourth, 1659, he complains, "I fear my peace in Ireland is likely to be short; for a Presbyterian and a madman have informed against me as a dangerous man to their religion; and for using the sign of the cross in baptism. The worst event of the information which I fear is my return into England; which although I am not desirous it should be upon these terms yet if it can be without much violence, I shall not be much troubled."<sup>1</sup> Who the madman was has never come to light but the Presbyterian was a Mr. Tandy. Some days before he wrote this letter to Evelyn he had written about his difficulty to Lord Conway for on June the fourteenth, 1659, Conway, who was then in London, wrote to Major Rawdon;

"I received a letter yesterday from Dr. Taylor: it hath almost broken my heart. Mr. Tandy hath exhibited articles against him to the Lord deputy and council, so simple, (as Colonel Hill writes) that it is impossible it should come to anything: the greatest scandal being that he christened Mr. Bryer's child with the sign of the cross. I have written to Hyrne to supply him with money for his vindication, as if it were my own business. I hope therefore, when you come over, you will take him (Tandy) off from persecuting me, since none knows better than yourself whether I deserve the same at his hands. I would have sent you the Doctor's letter to me, but I know not whether this will ever come to you. The quarrel is, it seems, because he thinks Dr. Taylor more welcome to Hillsborough than himself".<sup>2</sup>

The Hillsborough mentioned in the letter was Colonel Hill's house a little way from Lisnagarvey. It would seem from the letter that Tandy wished to strike at Lord Conway through his protégé and at the same time get a little revenge because Taylor was more

1. Evelyn. "Diary". vol: 3. pp.256-260.

2. "Rawdon Papers". pp.195-197. Lord Conway to Major Rawdon. June 14th.1659.

popular than himself. Possibly Tandy was a preacher though his name does not occur in any of the lists of ministers. Conway remarked that he would do better to set himself against the Anabaptists and Quakers than to trouble his peaceable and best neighbours.

Whatever influence Conway used he could not prevent the prosecution from going on, for, on the eleventh of August, the Council ordered Lt: Col: Smyth, the Governor of Carrickfergus, to see that Taylor was sent in safe custody to Dublin to answer for his offences before the commissioners. The order was not executed at once. When he wrote to Evelyn again on the third of November Taylor either did not know of its existence or did not think the threat of it sufficiently serious to mention to his correspondent. Instead he is concerned with the state of England. On account of a recent disturbance there a letter from Evelyn, written on July twentythird, was not received until All Saint's Day. Taylor writes as one who is puzzled and not a little worried by the state of affairs. He is not very clear about the disturbance he has mentioned, whether it was for or against the church, but one thing was clear God did not intend to send relief through its means. He was probably referring to Sir George Booth's rebellion<sup>1</sup> but his remarks are very cryptic. Taylor obviously did not want to get anyone into trouble should his letter go astray.<sup>2</sup>

But his distress and that of his church were coming to an end. Cromwell had died in September 1658 and Richard Cromwell's rule had only lasted until May 1659. It was succeeded by a confused scene of struggle and intrigue in which generals and party leaders sought to realise either their own personal power or their own ideal of government. On the second of the following January, Monk was to cross the Tweed into England and begin to bring this chaos to an end.

1. George Booth, first Baron Delamer. (1622-1684) Joined the parliamentary force and was military commissioner for Cheshire. Changed to the King's side and commanded forces for him in Cheshire, Lancashire and North Wales in 1659 but was defeated by Lambert at Nantwich. Raised to the Peerage at Charles the second's coronation.
2. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.274-5.

One last piece of persecution Taylor was called upon to endure.

According to his own account of it to Evelyn written in February 1660, the delayed warrant for his arrest was executed about Christmas time and he was forced to travel to Dublin in the worst winter weather. As a result he was ill on the journey up and worse on the way back but by February he was well enough to write in comfort.<sup>1</sup> Allowing for a journey to Dublin and back and for his illness, however short, there seems to be little time left between Christmas and February for him to have been detained by the commissioners. In all probability the charge was dismissed as soon as he arrived.

It was not a time for petty persecution, especially of a churchman, for a change of regime was already well under way. In the previous year Lord Broghill, who was commanding Parliamentary troops in Munster, and Sir Charles Coote, one of the commissioners for the government of Ireland, had opened a correspondence with Ormonde and with Charles himself and they finally made a bold stroke for the King by seizing Dublin castle and sending Sir Hardress Waller, one of the regicides, as a prisoner to England. The army as a whole was on their side. A Convention Parliament met at Dublin in February 1660, the very time when Taylor was writing his letter. The members decided both to restore Charles and to grant him large sums of money. In the following May the King was solemnly proclaimed in Dublin.

All that winter, as his letters to Evelyn show, Taylor was looking forward to the spring when he intended to go to London. His Cases of Conscience, which he considered the greatest task of his life, was now finished and, as he seems to have liked whenever possible to see his own work through the press, the publication of this latest book was drawing him to London. Ireland had not been such a pleasant place to live in that he did not welcome the distraction of visiting his old friends again. Although every letter to Evelyn acknowledges a 'token' and it would seem that his

1. Evelyn. "Diary." Vol: 3. pp.275-77.

lectureship did not completely provide for his necessities he makes no suggestion that poverty may keep him from effecting his journey. Rust would lead us to suppose that the news of the unrest and excitement in England was one of the reasons why he decided to go over to London.<sup>1</sup> He had an excellent excuse if he wanted one for the manuscript of "Ductor Dubitantium" was now ready and had to be seen through the press.

If he passed through Dublin on his way, as he probably did, he would see how promising the affairs of the Royalist party were beginning to look. The church was already receiving a good deal more respect than she had known for a good many years. With the prospect of the King's return becoming every day more and more clear, the leading Presbyterian laymen were beginning to pay their court to the bishops. Churchmen, who a few months before had been refused access to the commissioners and ignored or insulted in the streets, now found themselves sought after once more, their salaries paid them and even their titles afforded to them again.<sup>2</sup> There was no outstanding personality among the Presbyterian ministers or anyone at all capable of dealing with the situation they were in, for it was very difficult.<sup>3</sup> None of them had any more love for bishops than they had ever had, but many of them were eager for the King's return and the bishops were among the King's closest friends. It was hard to continue to ignore one and court the other.

Taylor arrived in London some time in 1660 and so was in time to affix his signature to the declaration which the Loyalists published on April twentyfourth in support of the measures Monk had initiated.<sup>4</sup> On May twentyninth, his birthday, the King entered London. Charles the second was come into his own again. With a heart as full of thankfulness as any in England, Taylor sat down to write a short dedication of his Cases of Conscience to the King.

1. Rust. "Funeral Sermon". (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p.cccxxiii. "This loyal subject went over to congratulate the prince and peoples happiness, and bear a part in the universal triumph." But as his letters to Evelyn show Taylor had been looking forward to visiting London for some time.
2. Adair. "True Narrative". p.240.
3. Ibid. p.229.
4. Kennet's "Register". p.121.

The great book, which he confidently expected to establish his fame, was now on the eve of publication. Two joys had come to him together, the return of the King with the end of persecution for the church he loved and the close of a great labour which had extended over many years, absorbed so much of his time and, in its preliminary studies, brought him so much distress of mind and misunderstandings.

When he wrote his dedication he probably knew that he was certain to receive some preferment. His joy overflowed.

"God has left off to smite us with an iron rod", he says, "and has once more said to these nations 'they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king whom I have raised up unto them' and now our duty stands on the sunny side; it is our work to rejoice in God and in God's anointed, and to be glad and worthily to accept of our prosperity in all our business; for so good a God we serve that he hath made it our duty to be happy and we cannot please Him unless we be infinitely pleased ourselves."

His dedication goes on in a strain of lyrical gratitude to God and welcome to the King to whom he begs to present his two volumes, which, like the widows two mites, make up a contemptible sum and yet are all that he has. This dedication must have been rushed through the press and the original one, to whomsoever it was offered, hastily suppressed; for the book, which he has all along referred to as his Cases of Conscience, was published soon after the King's return under the title of "Ductor Dubitantium".

It was not to be expected that such a large work, written for specialists, should have the immediate success which Taylor's other publications had met with, but "Ductor Dubitantium" was not given to a world which was entirely needless of casuistry. Since the Reformation controversy had taken up so much of the theologians time that very little had been written upon anything else. But the discussion which originated in the divorce of Henry the eighth found expression in a good many pamphlets on marriage which really belong to moral theology. Andrewes in his "Tortura Torti" had discussed political issues from the theological point of view and therefore may be said to have made some contribution to

casuistical literature. Every scholar of any pretensions had read books of casuistry and fitted himself to answer the nice questions of personal conduct which his flock were almost certain to ask. There were however very few attempts on the Protestant side to treat casuistry at any length. Dr. Perkins<sup>1</sup>, an Elizabethan divine who had an extraordinary reputation among the Puritans, published a book of Cases of Conscience in 1606. Among the Lutherans, Frederick Baldwin, professor of theology at Wittenburg who died in 1627, had also written on morals. In Jeremy Taylor's own generation a good many of the outstanding men had published books which, however, restricted in scope, showed their author's interest in casuistry, Cosin, for instance, who wrote "On the Dissolution of Marriage", and Hammond who, between 1645 and 1650, wrote three quarto volumes, one of Conscience, another of Sins of Weakness and Willfulness and another of the Power of the Keys. Selden was writing on a subject very nearly akin to casuistry when in 1640 he published his "De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta disciplinam Ebraeorum"<sup>2</sup> in which he tried to examine the opinion of the Jews on what moral obligation existed outside the Mosaic law and which therefore bound all men.

A far greater book and one that had a profound influence on European thought for many generations to come was Grotius' "De Jure Belli et Pacis"<sup>3</sup>. In it he examined the foundations of justice among men and nations and particularly the rights and duties connected with war. On the continent the reputation of the book was great immediately, in England it made its way more slowly. Taylor had studied it, however, and made considerable use of it in "Unum Necessarium" and "Ductor Dubitantium".

Bishop Hall of Norwich wrote Cases of Conscience but his treatment of the new problems of commercial life which were beginning to arise shows that he was hardly at home in cases for

1. William Perkins. (1558-1602) Fellow of Christ's College Cambridge. A strong Calvinist whose works were considered almost the equal of Calvin's own. His books were translated into Dutch, Spanish, Welsh and Irish. Fuller included a short sketch of him in his "Holy State" Bk. 2. Chap. 10.
2. London. 1640.
3. Paris. 1635.

which authority had not provided. Another Anglican, Thomas Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, who managed to accommodate himself successfully to the political changes of a life which stretched from 1607 to 1691 wrote a number of casuistical works, but it was Sanderson, his predecessor in the See of Lincoln, who was "esteemed the most known casuist this nation ever produced" and his "De obligate Conscientiae"<sup>1</sup> was an outstanding work.

Taylor most likely saw it in manuscript and it had its influence on his own work, though to say as Bishop Wordsworth does that "Ductor Dubitantium" seems to have been derived from it"<sup>2</sup> is to overstate the case. Walton mentions the extensive correspondence he carried on with individuals upon cases of conscience. On the Puritan side Baxter's "Christian Directory" attempted to cover every problem with which a minister might be confronted either in theology or the practical direction of souls. Possibly because Puritanism was strong among the merchant class, Baxter shows himself particularly well aware of the problems which arise in the relationship between master and servant and shopkeeper and customer.

But with all this interest in casuistry and all this practical application of it to daily life<sup>3</sup> no Protestant had attempted to provide a complete system. The mediaeval and later Romanist manuals were all there was in use. There was a recognised need for a Protestant book of casuistry. Fuller in his "Life of Mr. Perkins" complains

"In case divinity Protestants are defective. For (save that a smith or two of late have built themselves forges, and set up shop) we go down to our enemies to sharpen all our instruments, and are beholden to them for offensive and defensive weapons in cases of conscience".<sup>4</sup>

Taylor himself says much the same thing and uses the same Biblical illustration in his preface.<sup>5</sup> After mentioning

1. London. 1659. The lectures were delivered at Oxford. in the year 1647-1648.
2. Sanderson's lectures on "Conscience and Human Law: Wordsworth. Ed.) p.v.
3. The Puritan interest in casuistry would seem to indicate that the neglect of that study after the Restoration was not due to its supposed taint of Romanism, as is sometimes stated, but to the lack of a pastorally minded clergy.
4. Fuller. "Holy State". Bk.II. Chap.10. Para.4.
5. Works. Vol: 9. p.v.

by name almost all the Protestant writers on casuistry, he goes on to acknowledge both the debt that moral theologians of his time owed to Rome and also the unsuitability for Protestants of many of the books they were compelled to use. And so, for want of somebody better he has been forced to write the book himself. It is, he says, rather long but even then he has not been able to do what some will expect, produce a "collective body of cases of conscience", for such cases are infinite and his life is not so. Instead he has taken for his pattern Tribonianus who made a digest of the Roman Law to fit all cases and, in the same way, the cases of conscience he discusses will be found to throw light on most difficulties.<sup>1</sup> His words make it quite clear that he never intended his work for the general reader but only for the guides of souls. He concludes his preface with words of thankfulness to God who has given him health and leisure in which to write but it would have taken much longer, he says, if "God by the piety of one of his servants had not provided comfortable retirement and opportunity of leisure."<sup>2</sup> His expression of gratitude was probably meant for Lord Conway who, if Charles the second had not returned, would most probably have received the dedication.

"Ductor Dubitantium" is divided into four books. "The first of Conscience, the kinds of it and the general rules of conducting them; the second of Divine Laws and all collateral obligations;" the third of Human Laws and the fourth of "The nature and cause of good and evil". It would have simplified his task considerably and made the result much clearer if he had adopted more divisions. Taylor opens his first chapter with a definition of conscience. He declares it to be "The mind of a man governed by a rule, and measured by the proportions of good and evil, in order to practice; viz, to conduct all our relations, and all our intercourse between God, our neighbours, and ourselves; that is in all moral action".<sup>3</sup> If in his effort to be precise he had not been so wordy

1. Works. Vol: 9. p.xix.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. p.3. Comp: Sanderson. "Conscience and Human Law". (Wordsworth Ed:) p.2. "Conscience therefore I define in short to be, a Faculty or Habit of the Practical Understanding, which enables the mind of man, by the use of reason and argument, to apply the light which it has to particular moral actions."

his meaning might have been clearer.

After a general introduction he spends one chapter each in discussing the right or sure conscience, the confident or erroneous conscience, the probable or thinking conscience, the doubtful conscience and the scrupulous conscience. In all of these he is at pains to stress the paramount obligation of conscience, declaring in chapter three that it is a greater sin to do a good action against our conscience than to do an evil action in obedience to it. He is, however, careful to add that "This rule is true only in equal cases and when there is no circumstance aggravating one part."<sup>1</sup>

Chapter four, on the probable or thinking conscience, is chiefly occupied with probabilism in one or other of its applications. He insists that the probable conscience must make itself certain by the accumulation of such aids as it can obtain and that where, after every effort, two courses of action lie open the safe course must be followed. In some cases, even if the balance of probability seems to incline against what appears the safer course, still safety must be sought. He gives an example. "It is", he says, "safer to restore all gains of usury; but it is more probable that a man is not obliged to it. In which case the advantage lies not on that side that is more probable but on that which is more safe,"<sup>2</sup> and the reason for it is, of course, that while in the one case there is a negative avoidance of sin, in the other there is an active virtue.

In order to convince the doubting conscience Taylor inserted in this chapter his famous "Moral Demonstration or a conjugation of probabilities proving that the religion of Jesus Christ is from God."<sup>3</sup> The argument which is rather lengthy takes the form of enumerating many of the incidents in the Incarnation and claiming that each one of these is so remarkable in origin and effect that all of them, taken together, may be considered cumulative proof that Jesus was Divine. There is more

1. Works. Vol: - 9. p 139.
2. Ibid. p.181
3. Ibid. Vol: 10. pp.156-178.

sustained eloquence in this passage than anywhere else in "Ductor Dubitantium".

"Taylor gives a very salutary warning against one who is in doubt enquiring of several doctors until he finds one answering according to his mind, though he concludes that, in certain cases, as, for instance, when a man is tempted to despair he may go from one teacher to teacher until he can find the one who can give him comfort on grounds that are acceptable as well as right."<sup>1</sup> In his discussion of the doubtful conscience he introduces the following story which is as likely as not some little incident which happened to him at Golden Grove or Mandinam.

"A little child came to my door for alms, of whom I was told he was run from his mother's house and his own honest employment; but in his wandering he was almost starved; I found that if I relieved him, he would not return to his mother, if I did not relieve him, he would not be able. I considered that indeed his soul's interests were more to be regarded and secured than his body, and his sin rather to be prevented than his sickness, and therefore not to relieve him seemed at first the greater charity. But when I weighed against these considerations, that his sin is uncertain, and future, and arbitrary, but his need is certain, and present, and natural; that he may choose whether he will sin or no; but cannot in the present case choose whether he will perish, or no; that if he be not relieved he dies in his sin, but many things may intervene to reform his vicious inclination; that the natural necessity is extreme, but that he will sin is no way necessary, and hath in it no degrees of unavoidable necessity; and above all, that if he abuses my relief to evil purposes which I intended not, it is his fault, not mine; but the question being concerning my duty and not his, and that therefore if I do not relieve him, the sin is also mine and not his; and that by bidding of him to do his duty I acquit myself on one side, but by bidding him to be warm and fed, I cannot be acquitted on the other, I took that side which was at least equally sure and certainly more charitable."<sup>2</sup>

It is a pleasing picture. The beggar boy waits outside and hopes for his dinner while the moralist inside debates, with many weighty reasons for and against, whether he should give him any. The result is never in doubt, but kindness is not allowed to prevail until it can call itself tutiorism.

In the course of the same chapter on the doubtful

1. Taylor is much less severe on this point than Sanderson. Comp: "Conscience and Human Law". (Wordsworth's Ed.) The Third Prelection. passim.
2. Works. Vol. 9. p.229.

conscience he introduces a discussion on the extremely difficult question of whether it is ever right to advise a lesser sin in order that the greater may be avoided. He mentions an instance in the trial of Our Lord. Pilate knew that Christ was innocent, nevertheless, in order to save himself from being forced to crucify a just man, he proposes to scourge Jesus and let him go. Taylor concludes that Pilate's conscience was not perplexed and he had it in his power to free Jesus, but, if circumstances had been different and he had seen the Jews absolutely insisting on some punishment so that to save Jesus entirely was out of his power, then the suggestion of scourging would have been lawful as the only alternative to crucifixion.<sup>1</sup> In the last chapter of this book, that on the scrupulous conscience, he defines a scruple as "A great trouble of mind proceeding from a little motive"<sup>2</sup> and his best advice to anyone troubled in that way is to rely on the judgment of a prudent guide.

Having dealt so very fully with the act of judging and applying laws, Taylor now feels himself free to go on and discuss law itself. He opens the next book with a consideration of the law of nature.<sup>3</sup> In spite of many words it is not very easy to find out what Taylor actually meant by the law of nature. He says it is "The law of mankind, concerning common necessities, to which we are inclined by nature, invited by consent, prompted by reason",<sup>4</sup> and it is bound upon us only by the commands of God who alone can dispense man from it. The two chief bands of this law are fear of punishment and love. As is natural there is more of his old strain of eloquence in discussing love than there is on some other subjects. He says that to love virtue for virtue's sake does not put all idea of reward out of the question. "The man, for instance, who "Serves

1. Works. Vol: 9. p.239. Comp: Sanderson. "Conscience and Human Law." (Wordsworth Ed.) p.50. "I observe thirdly that if two sins are proposed to a person's choice, and he is persuaded in his conscience that both of them are really sins, he ought to make choice of neither but to avoid both."
2. Ibid. p.262.
3. For the first two chapters of this book Taylor drew largely on Belden. "De Jure Naturali".
4. Works: Vol: 9. p.279.

God for hope of glory, loves goodness for goodness' sake, for he pursues the interest of goodness that he may be filled with goodness, he serves God here that he may serve Him hereafter, he does it well that he may do it better, a little while that he may do it over again for ever and ever. Nothing else can be a loving virtue for virtue's sake; this is the greatest perfection and the most reasonable and practicable sense of doing it."<sup>1</sup> Rewards of the right kind must be a proper inducement to the service of God, for if they were not the Bible would not be so full of gracious promises. Christianity perfectly comprehends the law of nature within itself as it does all that is of perpetual obligation in the law of Moses.

He admits that there are some situations which, at first sight, seem not to be provided for by Christ's laws. War is such a one. But, he quickly adds, Christianity has nothing to say about war, as such, because it aims at making war impossible by uprooting all the seeds of it in individuals. If men be subjects of Christ's law they can never go to war with one another. The aggressor can hardly ask how he can conduct his war on moral lines because he is engaged in a completely immoral act. The innocent party is not forbidden by the law of God to defend himself. If the innocent party is an individual he must appeal to the laws, if it is a commonwealth it must defend itself by force, because it is necessary to defend the laws and what is necessary is lawful. Taylor's rules are excellent, except for modern wars where both parties are vociferously innocent.

In addition to the law of nature and equally binding for ever upon all persons there are certain superinduced laws given by Christ himself and from these there can be no dispensation. It would seem that Taylor not only considered Holy Orders to be of divine origin but held that the ritual bestowal of them was an intrinsic part of them for he notices

1. Works: Vol: 9. p.317.

the claims of some Roman theologians that the Pope can "with one word and without all solemnity consecrate a priest or a bishop" and concludes that these pretences are "insolent and strange".<sup>1</sup> In the same consideration of the Pope's dispensing power he examines the case of a man who has solemnly vowed himself to a woman and then changes his mind and wishes to enter a monastery. Taylor supposes that the Pope would give him a dispensation to do so and, holds that such an action would be wrong unless it could be clearly proved that a celibate life in religion is better than holy matrimony, a thing which Taylor refuses to believe.

Human laws, while not absolutely binding, still are, in most circumstances, obligatory upon men's consciences whether they have been accepted by them or not. They must only be set aside when they are not just or good; if they have not been sufficiently promulgated or if they are founded upon a false presumption. They do not compel us to an active obedience if, to obey, would involve us in some moral evil or place us in a danger of death which had not been envisaged by the law giver. But "The supreme power can command the curate of souls to attend a cure in the time of a plague, to go to sea in a storm, to stand in a breach for the defence of an army,"<sup>2</sup> because the danger of death is of the essence of the law; it was indeed made because it was necessary for the risk of death to be run. This leads on to a discussion of how far a man may defend himself from the penalties of the law or from any other danger by a lie.

He affirms unhesitatingly that lying is in all instances wrong, but an ingenious definition which he supplies allows him a good many opportunities of providing for hard cases. "Lying" he says, "is to be understood to be something said or written to the hurt of our neighbour, which cannot be understood otherwise than to differ

1. Works. Vol: 9. p.560. It is difficult to find authority for this statement in modern Roman theologians.
2. Works. Vol: 10. p.37. Comp: Sanderson "Conscience and Human Laws" The fifth Prelection, passim. After discussing the matter very carefully in a manner rather more academic than Taylor's he concludes "that whenever a law forbids what is so simply necessary that it cannot be omitted without sin, or commands what is so unjust that it cannot be obeyed without sin, that law does not lay any obligation upon the conscience." Ibid. p.129.

from the mind of him that speaks."<sup>1</sup> This would seem to make a lie which was told to save someone from danger, or a subterfuge which could possibly be made to fit "the mind of him that speaks", properly no lie. Taylor grounds the obligation to speak the truth upon a universal contract implied in all discourses that the persons engaged will faithfully declare their mind. Children and madmen, because they have no power to distinguish true from false, have no right to the truth provided that the lie told them is charitable and useful. Children's right to the truth is a little more valued today than it was in the seventeenth century, but certainly in his contention that madmen may sometimes be deceived for their own good Taylor is in the right. He has illustrated this same meaning in an earlier part of his work with a rather quaint story of a man who imagined himself to be the prophet Elijah and under an obligation to fast, whose life was saved by the doctor sending him "a fellow dressed like an angel"<sup>2</sup> who had him rise and eat.

As soon as he begins to discuss the spheres in which the state and church operate Taylor shows an Erastianism unexpectedly complete. Kings, he says, must be supreme in religion or they are but half kings at best, for the affairs of religion are more than half the interests of mankind. The civil power is supreme in all causes ecclesiastical and secular for under no circumstances is it lawful for the subject to rebel or take up arms against it. In the matter of excommunication, the bishop, he says, can be restrained in the actual exercise of this part of his spiritual authority "if there be anything in it of temporal concernment."<sup>3</sup> Considering that there is remarkably little in which the modern state does not touch the life of the individual it would seem that excommunication is a weapon which the church has lost. It might be argued that when Taylor wrote men and women were not so closely governed as they are to-day. But the argument he uses for his contention, namely that "there is temporal evil consequent to such separation" has even more force now

1. Works. Vol: 10. p.102.
2. Ibid. Vol: 9.p.254.
3. Ibid. Vol: 10. p.314.

when character is so highly valued that the law guards it very zealously from any defamation.

The power of the church, Taylor insists again and again, is solely spiritual. She may make laws which bind the conscience but until they have been accepted by the state they only bind those who are willing to submit to them. After the civil power has accepted them even the wicked are compelled to obey. But on the Christian there is a double obligation. All the ancient canons of the church oblige the conscience, in so far as they are accepted by the modern church, but all that is of divine institution is perpetually obligatory. The mere fact that a custom is laudable and in use in modern times does not give it power over the conscience unless it is formally accepted by the church to which the individual belongs. No church can bind the conscience of any but its own members. The Pope of Rome, for instance, has no power except over those of his own communion. Taylor saw the modern church as a collection of national or provincial churches. Each of these are catholic in so far as they hold to the Apostolic teaching.

Taylor occupies chapter five of book three in asserting the absolute sway, qualified only by what is owed to God, of the father's authority over his children, and chapter six is an enquiry where the power to dispense or abrogate human law may lie. Laws become obsolete when the reason for which they are made ceases or when the power that made them abrogates them. Whether they have been accepted by the people or not makes no difference.

"The obligation of the law does not depend upon the acceptation of the people; and as a law hath not its beginning, so neither can it have its perpetuity dependently upon them; and no man thinks it hath but he who supposes the supreme power to be originally in the people, and in the King by trust; and there are too many to think that, for there have been so many democratical governments that many wise men have said so, because then they had reason, but so many popular governments have also produced popular opinions, which being too much received even by wise men, have still given the people occasion to talk so still, and to very many to believe them".<sup>1</sup>

The republican theories of his time had made no impression upon Taylor. The most relief he will allow is to say that<sup>if</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 10. p.540.

is the letter of a law is burdensome and unjust then the spirit of it, only, obliges the conscience. Teaching of this sort is so hopelessly obsolete that if the whole of "Ductor Dubitantium" was on these lines it would be of little use to us. But he does deal with many questions of perennial interest. In discussing the ethics of contracts he has a common-sense, if not over exalted, view of human nature.

"In all laws and obligations of conscience by contract, when any doubt arises, we are to consider what is most likely and what is most usual, and rest upon that. In contrahendo quod agitur pro cauto habendum, says the law. We must suppose that the contractor did intend that sense that is the wariest, because that is the most likely; nothing being so reasonable as to think the man intended that which all the world does, that is, to buy cheap and to sell dear. If this will not do it, then we must run to the custom of the country; because the things and manners of custom, though they were not in the contract, yet veniunt in bonae fidei iudiciis, they are to be of weight in judgements, as being a reasonable decision of questions and obscurities."<sup>1</sup>

As usual Taylor illustrates his meaning with a case or two.

The last book of "Ductor Dubitantium" is the shortest, yet it is in many ways the most interesting. It is there that he discusses "the efficient causes of all human action good or evil".<sup>2</sup> He finds this in the will, for which he uncompromisingly claims an entire freedom.

"God intending to be glorified by our true obedience hath set before us good and evil; we may put our hand to which we will; only what we choose that shall be our portion: for all things of this nature He hath left us to ourselves; not to our natural strengths, but to our own choice."<sup>3</sup>

In the rest of this section he stresses as vigorously as ever he had done in "Unum Necessarium" the necessity of free will in men if God is to be considered a Moral Being. And the same doctrine, he asserts, brings emancipation to men, for nothing external to ourselves can ultimately determine our fate. It matters nothing whether we are born illegitimate or of evil parents or whether we suffer injustice from other men, "God will judge us according to our works, not according to his or to any man's else, or by any measures but by his own law and our obedience."<sup>4</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 10. p.508.
2. Ibid. p.548.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. p.555.

There is a mine of real common sense in some of the cases which Taylor discusses in this part of his book. Take, for instance, the question of whether the host sins when he provides the wine on which the guest gets drunk. He answers that "For our guests we do something more than ordinary, yet our greatest care should be for ourselves, that we do nothing which may misbecome the house of one of Christ's servants."<sup>1</sup> We ought to provide all that is necessary for hospitality but nothing which may abuse it. On the question of betting and gambling which was as hotly debated by moralists in his day as it is in ours, Taylor remarks.

"That cards and dice are of themselves lawful I do not know any reason to doubt. For if they be unlawful, it is because they are forbidden, or because there is in them something that is forbidden. They are nowhere of themselves forbidden; and what is in them that is criminal or suspicious? Is it because there is chance and contingency in them? There is so in all human affairs; in merchandise, in laying wagers, in all consultations and wars, in journeys and agriculture, in teaching and learning, in putting children to school or keeping them at home, in the price of the market and the vendibility of commodities. And if it be said that there is in all these things an overruling providence; though no man can tell in what manner or by what means the divine providence brings such things to a determinate event, yet it is certain that every little thing as well as every great thing is under God's government, and our recreations as well as our wages. But what if it be, and what if it be not? He can never be suspected in any criminal sense to tempt the divine providence, who by contingent things recreates his labour, and having acquired his refreshment, hath no other end to serve, and no desires to engage the divine providence to any other purpose; and this end is sufficiently secured by whatsoever happens. I know nothing else that can be pretended to render the nature of these things suspicious; and this is perfectly nothing."<sup>2</sup>

As will be seen he looks at the matter purely from the point of view of those who play moderately and can afford to lose. The effects of gambling as a habit upon individuals and, ultimately, on the nation as a whole is beyond his view; yet it is to gambling as a social evil undermining thrift and transferring property without adequate return that it is most often objected to today.<sup>3</sup>

Taylor is willing to admit that there are evil appendages to this

1. Works. Vol: 10. p.581.
2. Ibid. p.592-3.
3. Comp: Temple. "Personal Religion and the Life of Fellowship." p. 43. "The fundamental objection to gambling is that it is a distribution of wealth on the basis of chance, and that is socially unwholesome".

as there are to every other kind of sport but these lie chiefly in immoderate use and a Christian who in everything remembers the duty he owes to God will not be likely to fall into them.

It was natural that at the end of so bulky a work Taylor should be conscious of the task he had accomplished. He concludes with the words Nomini Tuo Da Gloriam and he hardly seems to have doubted that glory would accrue. Actually the success it met with was reasonable but not overwhelming. It was scarcely to be expected that a technical work, written for specialists, should have the same sale which popular devotional literature like the "Sermons" and "Holy Living and Dying" attained; but four editions of it were printed between 1660 and 1696. A book of the same scope would be thought to have done very well nowadays if it were printed as often.

Because some of the cases cited in "Ductor Dubitantium" are by no means pleasant Taylor has been accused of a certain "perduration of mind" and his great familiarity with the classics given as the cause.<sup>1</sup> But such a point of view entirely leaves out of account the object with which the book was written. Physicians of souls have unfortunately to deal with as many disgusting cases as physicians of bodies and Taylor, who aimed at supplying a text book which would meet every need the casuist has, would have entirely failed in his purpose if he had refused to consider certain sins merely because the treatment of them did not afford nice reading. If religion is real it must often handle things which are revolting. Taylor's age probably had no more moral turpitude than our own, but it generally stated itself plainly. His long experience as a confessor had given him a peculiarly wide acquaintance with the sins and difficulties of his time and it is not its least value that "Ductor Dubitantium" shows us what these were. Hallam offered a deeper and more pertinent criticism. "Taylor", he says, "seems too much inclined to side with

1. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor". p.166.

those who resolve all right and wrong into the positive will of God" Taylor would have been the first to admit that since God is the source of all reason His acts spring from reason and that therefore the motives which underlie His commands may to some extent be sought out and comprehended by man. But when he wrote "Ductor Dubitantium" Taylor's aim was not so much to discover principles as to offer a trustworthy guide which depended upon a consensus of opinion and experience.

That does not mean that the book was useful only to the age in which it was produced. Casuists still quote Taylor's opinion with respect and it is probable that they will continue to do so. His book was founded upon an extensive personal experience in the conduct of souls and an extraordinarily wide reading in the best casuistical literature of all ages. Although Taylor's literary skill is not so evident in this as in some other of his works it is still present, here and there, in sufficient quantity to encourage the reader at least to turn over the pages in search of it. The greatest fault of the whole book and the one which has done it most harm is its length, and this, if Taylor had controlled himself a little more and paid more attention to method, could have been avoided. Kirk complains that "Ductor Dubitantium" is erudite, tortuous and garrulous, and its author's promise to "avoid all questions which are curious and unprofitable", and to give rules "whereby a wise guide of souls will be enabled to answer most cases that shall occur", is altogether forgotten in a maze of discussion, illustration and digression".<sup>1</sup> This is true but, in spite of this the book substantiates Taylor's claim to be the father of casuistry in the Church of England. And that is undoubtedly a great honour.

1. Kirk. "Conscience and its Problems" p.205.

## CHAPTER EIGHT.

When Charles the second came back everyone regarded the restoration of the Church of England as certain. Petitions for the settlement of the church, requests from influential people for notice to be taken of clergy whom they wished befriended, application for preferment from those who only had themselves to recommend them, all poured in. It was a foregone conclusion that bishops and King would flourish together again. The Presbyterians were not inclined to make abolition of episcopacy the price of the support they offered the King, and the Anglican gentry, who had suffered with and for the church, were not likely to desert her now. There seemed a chance that some reasonable adjustment might be made which would enable to moderate Presbyterians to accept the restoration of Anglicanism without entirely denying their own principles. If some means could not be found either to reconcile the Presbyterians as a body or to split them so that only one part was dangerous Charles and his advisers were in a difficult position. The Declaration from Breda had promised that the King would do his best to procure liberty to tender consciences<sup>1</sup> and, in the early days of the return at any rate, it was difficult for the new government to know how safe it was to disappoint the hopes it had raised.

The Independents who, under Cromwell, had received most of the favour could never be comprehended within the Anglican church but for a time it looked as if a fair number of Presbyterians would conform, if it was made at all possible for them to do so. The irreconcilables, weakened by the loss of valued leaders and reduced in number, would undergo whatever treatment was offered to the Independents. It seemed to the authorities that such men as Baxter and Reynolds could be won over. They had both been brought up in a time prior to the civil war. They had not been so utterly committed to a purely

1. Gee and Hardy! "Documents Illustrative of English Church History." Doc: 114.

Presbyterian form of government as some. Neither were much more fond of bishops now than at the beginning of the civil war, but an Episcopacy controlled by synods of clergy might be acceptable to them. Overtures were made to these two. Reynolds told the authorities quite plainly that he was not in favour of government by bishops and then accepted the Bishopric of Norwich. At one time it looked as if Baxter would be persuaded to accept that of Hereford.

When, however, the first optimism induced in men's minds by the happy return of the King died down, it was seen how deep and fundamental the division was between Presbyterian and Anglican. Each held a totally different conception of the church. One party saw the church as both catholic and apostolic, needing by her formularies and ritual to declare to all the world her true nature. The other party wished for a church which expressly denied these things. Presbyterianism could no longer hope to convert the church from within as it had in the early part of the century. Laud had not lived in vain. He had made the Church of England determined to hold, at least, to the essentials of catholicity. All this was not seen at once. It took a little time for men to clarify their minds. But as soon as the King was back in England something had to be done to put the church into working order again.

At once the Prayer Book came back into use. Those who for worthy or unworthy reasons had dissembled during the Puritan régime now made haste to declare their true opinions by using again the Anglican formularies.<sup>1</sup> Many of these men had held their livings through the whole period of the civil war and so had received them from undisputed authority. There were also a good

1. One Oct. 25th. 1660, the King issued a "Royal Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs". It stated the King's wish that ministers should use those parts of the Prayer Book which were not objected to, though it promised that no one should be punished for neglecting to do so until it had been reviewed by a national synod. Cardwell, "Conferences" p. 286.

many ministers who had been put in to replace the sequestered clergy who were now flocking back and expecting to take up their livings once more. Some order was necessary. The Convention Parliament therefore passed an act which authorised the clergy who had been ejected by the Puritans to return to their benefices, but which allowed those who had obtained their preferment before the rebellion to remain and to continue to receive their tithes.<sup>1</sup> By virtue of this Jeremy Taylor could have got back his former livings of Uppingham and Overstone. He never made any attempt to do so as far as we know. New bishops were needed and his reputation was such that he might well expect to be promoted.

The Archbishopric of Canterbury had been vacant since Laud's death in 1645, but his inevitable successor was Juxon. He was now old, and past the active duties of the primacy yet he had too many links with the régime before the civil war and with those who had suffered for it for him to be overlooked. On September the twentieth, 1660, his election to Canterbury was solemnly confirmed in Henry the Seventh's Chapel and the occasion was one of deep thanksgiving for it was the first great act in the church's restoration. A little over a month later, on October the twentyeighth, in the same place, Gilbert Sheldon was consecrated to the Bishopric of London and from then on the real work of the primacy fell upon his shoulders. Four other bishops were consecrated at the same time to other English dioceses, on September the second seven more, and at Epiphany still another four. Episcopacy was reestablished. In his Royal Declaration, issued on October twentyfifth 1660, Charles had declared that it was his intention to support the government of the Church of England but that he would appoint divines from both the Anglican and Puritan parties to review the Prayer Book, to see if some concession in ceremonial observance could not be made and, also, to excuse those of tender consciences from subscribing to canonical obedience

1. The bishops did not sit in this Parliament since they had been legally excluded in 1641 though Charles the First had declared that their presence in the House of Lords was a fundamental part of the constitution.

before ordination. The declaration was offered to Parliament as a bill and rejected. Nevertheless the conference began to sit at the Savoy.<sup>1</sup>

From the first it was obvious that the two parties were leaning in opposite directions. The Presbyterians wished the Prayer Book to approximate more closely to the service books of the foreign Protestant bodies while the Anglicans thought that the nearer all their formularies came to those of the Catholic church the better. The commission, which gave the conference legal authority, was issued on March the twenty-first, 1661, and empowered twelve bishops with twelve Puritan divines and nine other assistants on either side to begin their work.<sup>2</sup> Sheldon acted as chairman. The Presbyterians on their side presented written objection to the Prayer Book and to them the bishops presented written answers. In substance the dispute between the two parties had changed very little since the Hampton Court Conference and the early days of the civil war. Objection was made to keeping saint's days and to the use of the Apocrypha. Kneeling at the communion and the sign of the cross in baptism they wished to be abolished and no reference to be made in the Prayer Book to baptismal regeneration.<sup>3</sup> Charles the second had obviously intended the conference to be a discussion between two equal parties, so that a compromise could be arrived at. The bishops considered themselves as receiving the petition of some dissatisfied subordinates. unless an overwhelming case was made out they were not very willing to make changes. Baxter put the Presbyterian case. The only contribution to toleration he made was to talk about it. Pearson and Gunning, neither of them yet bishops, replied. It was unfortunate that Gunning's authority weighed as heavily with the bishops as it did, for his former habit of seeking out sectaries and disputing with them as often as he could had not endowed him with

1. The warrant was issued on the 25th of March 1661 but the first meeting did not take place until April 15th.
2. Gee and Hardy. "Documents Illustrative of English Church History." Doc: 115.
3. Cardwell. "Conferences". p.262. Ibid. p.345.

that judicial frame of mind which advises compromise.<sup>1</sup> At the end of the conference all united in expressing their loyalty to the King and their desire for peace but admitted that they had found no means of harmony.<sup>2</sup>

It became even clearer as time went on that the restoration church was to approach very closely to Laud's ideal. Presbyterianism had never been really at home in England. Convocation revised the Prayer Book but not in any way that made it more acceptable to Baxter and his friends. Later on all ministers who would not repudiate the Covenant and accept the Prayer Book were ejected from their benefices.<sup>3</sup> The Prayer Book was made the only legal service book, and no one might use any other within the Church of England. Presbyterian and Independent ministers were driven into a position of disobedience to authority similar to that in which the Anglicans had been in Cromwell's time. But for a while authority was nowhere near so severe against them. Their leading men, Baxter, Manton and Cotton preached openly to crowded congregations and the lesser divines, ministering as they did chiefly to a wealthy merchant class whose prosperity was continually increasing, never had to face dire poverty.<sup>4</sup> When the generation which knew the civil war died out Presbyterianism rapidly declined in fervour and ceased to be a power in the religious life of England.<sup>5</sup>

Charles the second had not lived up to the expectation which the Presbyterians at least conceived of him at Breda and at his first coming home. There is a good deal to be said for him. Parliament and people showed such loyalty that it was hard for him to be kind to those who were believed to be his and the church's enemies. It was perhaps too much to expect that Charles would

1. It must however be admitted that many of the Presbyterian objections were so trivial as scarcely to deserve consideration.
2. Baxter, "Life and Times" (Ed: Lloyd) p.167.
3. On St. Bartholomew's day. 1662.
4. Bryant, "The England of Charles II" p.82.
5. For its subsequent history and drift toward Unitarianism see: Griffiths, "Religion and Learning" Cambridge.1935.

risk popularity of this easily acquired sort on behalf of people who though they had welcomed him home had also undoubtedly driven him out. His personal predilections did not lead him to offend the Loyalists. Charles liked Anglicans better than Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics better than either. If he had any religion of his own it was probably Deism, though his long familiarity with the Roman Church made him look upon it favourably.<sup>1</sup> As head of the English Church he attended its services and listened to its sermons though he liked them plain and short. But everywhere there was loyalty and this last characteristic was said to proceed from the high principles of art which the King had learned in France.<sup>2</sup>

When so many of Taylor's old friends were receiving English bishoprics it might have been expected that he also would have been given one. His reputation for learning was as great as any. He had never wavered in his devotion to church and King. He had suffered for his loyalty and he had sufficient friends among those who had influence with the King to expect that his name would be brought forward at an opportune moment. Yet his chances of preferment were much more slight than he probably supposed, for after the shocks administered to orthodoxy first by the "Liberty of Propheying" and then by "Unum Necessarium" those in authority considered him unsafe. Sheldon writing in August 1667 when the news of Taylor's death had just reached him referred to him as "A man of dangerous temper, apt to break out into extravagancies"<sup>3</sup> and no doubt that was the opinion he held of him in 1660. Such an opinion in such a man would be fatal to all chances of English preferment; for, after the restoration, though Juxon was the nominal Archbishop of Canterbury, he was too old to exercise much real authority and all the effective power was in the hands of Sheldon. There was no

1. Hutton. "Church of England from Charles the first to Anne". p.181.
2. Burnet. "History of My Own Times." (Ed: 1753) Vol: 1. p.267. Sir Charles Firth in an unpublished paper, quoted Mitchel. "English Pulpit Oratory." p.311. note. draws attention to the fact that although the King's taste was not without its influence, the simplification of sermon style was only a part of a general movement manifesting itself throughout all English literature at this time.
3. Carte. MSS. fol. 222.

open breach and Taylor on his side does not seem to have been aware that there was any cause for reserve between them, but Sheldon was running no risks. It is ironic in the sequel that the two greatest proofs we have of the width of Taylor's charity should have been the cause of lasting distrust of him in his friends. Taylor was given a bishopric, but it was an Irish one. On the sixth of August, 1660, the King nominated him under the Privy Seal to the diocese of Down and Connor. A little later the Duke of Ormonde who was now once more Chancellor of Dublin University recommended him for the Vice Chancellorship. Perhaps Taylor received less than he might be thought to have deserved, but, in spite of its general low standard, the Irish Church had been served by some famous men. Ussher and Bramhall, to mention only two of its bishops in the seventeenth century, were certainly outstanding. Taylor was not dishonoured when sent to join their company.

There were some obvious reasons why he should be made Bishop of Down and Connor. His residence in the district had given him a knowledge of conditions there. Colonel Hill and Sir George Rawdon would like to have a man whom they already knew, and respected for their neighbour.<sup>1</sup>

Ireland at the Reformation produced no outstanding figures similar to those of England and Scotland. Whatever reforms came to that country arrived from the government in London and did not greatly recommend themselves on that account. The Irish Parliament met on May the first 1536 and, chiefly by the influence of George Browne the Archbishop of Dublin, passed the Act of Supremacy though with great difficulty. George Cromer the Archbishop of Armagh led the opposition and was followed by most of the clergy of his jurisdiction. He laid a solemn curse on all who

1. Heber. 'Life of Jeremy Taylor: (Taylor's works. Vol: 1.) p.xciii. building on the fantastic story attributed to Lady Wray that Joanna Bridges was a natural daughter of Charles the first, suggests that possibly the fact of her union with Taylor had something to do with it since the king would not wish the pious husband of his half sister to be in a position where he could reprove his vices. It may however be doubted whether a possible rebuke in the future for sins he had not yet committed would influence Charles to that extent.

should own the Kings supremacy and maintained an active correspondence with Rome.<sup>1</sup> The act of Edward the sixth directing the communion to be given to the people in both kinds was intended to apply to Ireland as well as England, but attempts to introduce it led to strong opposition. The Prayer Book of 1549 was taken up to some extent. It was first used in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, on Easter Day 1551 by the King's command, but was not universally adopted throughout the country.<sup>2</sup> At Queen Mary's accession everyone went quietly back to the old ways until the reign of Elizabeth began and in 1560, after much opposition, an act of Uniformity similar to that already passed in England was forced through the Irish Parliament. But no attempt was ever made to give the Reformation a reasonable chance of succeeding in Ireland. The Englishmen who went over in Elizabeth's day carried their theological opinions with them but little effort was spent in trying to convert the natives. Neither the Bible nor Prayer Book were translated into Irish for some years. The bishops, after a time, professed reformed principles. The bulk of the clergy were too ignorant and neglectful to count for much, though some of them, especially those who were immigrants, were Protestants of a sort; but the majority of the people remained, devoted, if ignorant, Roman Catholics, ready to receive the Roman missionaries which the counter reformation brought them.

Spenser attributed the slow progress of the Reformation in Ireland to the perpetual disturbances there. It was, he said, "an ill time to preach amongst swords."<sup>3</sup> Yet he also instanced the poverty of the livings, the remoteness and insecurity of habitation

1. See "Historical Collections of the Church of Ireland. During the reigns of King Henry the eighth, Edward the sixth and Queen Mary". London .1681. Reprinted, 'Harleian Miscellany'. Vol: 5. pp.595-606.
2. "He (Edward VI) sent over an order for the Liturgy of the Church of England to be read in Ireland dated Feb: 6th.1550-1. Which was first done in Christ Church Dublin on the Feast of Easter 1551 before the said Anthony (St.Leger) George Browne, and the mayor and baliffs of Dublin. John Lockwood being the Dean of the said Cathedral" "Historical Collections of the Church of Ireland." "Harleian Miscellany." Vol: 5. p.600.
3. Spenser. "View of the Present State of Ireland." Works. (Globe Ed:) p.646.

which discouraged respectable men from coming over from England, and, above all, the fact that none of the Protestant ministers who had any ability understood Irish.<sup>1</sup> With the noble exception of Bishop Bedell, no one made any attempt to reach the people in their own language. He learned Irish himself and wrote a grammar of it, corrected a version of the Old Testament in Irish, in his time the New Testament and the Prayer Book had already been translated, and he did his best to promote Irish speaking priests to the livings in his diocese. But, in spite of this one splendid effort, for many years the history of the Irish church is one gloomy story of war, neglect, robbery and wretched incompetence. Bramhall, when he first went to Ireland in 1633, wrote to Laud an account of the church there. In Dublin

"We find our parochial church converted to the Lord Deputy's stable, a second to a nobleman's dwelling house, the quire of a third to a tennis court and the vicar acts the keeper. In Christ Church, the principle church in Ireland, whither the Lord Deputy and the Council repair every Sunday, the vaults, from one end of the minster to the other, are made into tippling rooms for beer, wine and tobacco, demised all to Popish recusants, and by them and others so much frequented in time of Divine Service, that though there is no danger of blowing up the assembly above their heads, yet there is of poisoning them with fumes. The table used for the administration of the Blessed Sacrament in the midst of the choir, made an ordinary seat for maids and apprentices."<sup>2</sup>

He goes on to report that the clergy are below all contempt for poverty and ignorance. One bishop held three and twenty benefices with cure and the Earl of Cork had obtained the "whole Bishopric of Lismore at the rent of forty shillings or five marks by the year."<sup>3</sup> Bramhall mentions the vigorous measures which Wentworth had put into execution to try and remedy this appalling condition and Bramhall himself was behind them all.

Wentworth complained to Laud that the clergy of his time were ignorant and without any of the outward appearance of ministers. The churches and the parsonages were in ruins, the people untaught and, in many cases, with no hope of teaching since their clergy

1. Spenser. "View of the Present State of Ireland." Works. (Globe Ed.) p.657.
2. Bramhall. Works. (Lib: Ang: Cath: Theol:) Vol: 1. p.lxxix.
3. Ibid. p.lxxx1. Ussher who was appointed to the see of Meath and Clonmacnoise in Feb: 1620-1 in his "Certificate of the State of the Diocese," issued May 22nd.1622 gave an equally depressing account of the church in his jurisdiction. Elrington, "Life of Ussher". Appendix v.

were non-resident. Where the services were said they were run over without decency of habit, order or gravity. Some of the clergy had wives and children who were recusants. Most of the incumbents were wretchedly paid and consequently tried to hold as many livings as they could. In Ulster at the time of the plantation things were as bad as anywhere. Often there had been no service for years together. There was the old story of bishops holding livings in commendam or by sequestration and making no attempt to provide for the people. There were only a very few in Ireland who seemed to feel any responsibility for the souls of the native Irish.<sup>1</sup>

In 1615 a convocation was held at Dublin which set itself the task of providing a series of articles embodying reformed principles for the Irish Church. Up to that time Mathew Parker's eleven articles, numbered in Ireland as twelve, were the only legal ones. In their place was now substituted a list of one hundred and four grouped under nine heads. They were mainly the work of Ussher, and were based upon the articles of 1559 which had been in use, those of 1562 and the Lambeth articles. They were violently Calvinistic and anti-papal, and they did not contain any reference to clerical orders or any form of ordination. Apparently no one was compelled to subscribe to these articles but silence and deprivation was the punishment provided by convocation for any who openly taught against them.

In the Irish convocation of July the fourteenth, 1634 it was proposed that the English Articles and Canons should be adopted by the Irish Church also. Ussher strenuously opposed taking over the Canons on the ground that to do so would be derogatory to the position of the Church of Ireland as a national church though Bramhall was eager for their adoption. The Canons were rejected but the Articles were accepted in November 1634 without discussion, chiefly through Strafford's vigorous insistence. The Irish Articles were never formally repealed, it was hoped, that

1. Wentworth. "State Letters." Vol: 1. p.187. Also Carte. "Life of Ormonde." Vol: 1. p.68.

if they were neither affirmed nor denied, they would in time quietly die out. There is no doubt that Bramhall and Laud at least considered them to have been suspended, but one or two bishops, notably Bedell of Kilmore, are said to have insisted on a double subscription, though the point has been disputed.<sup>1</sup> If they did it was a practice which soon died out.

This insistence on a less Calvinistic standard of doctrine was only one sign of the interest which Charles the first and his servants Strafford and Laud took in the Irish Church. The King issued a Royal letter against abuses, in 1633 he made a Royal visitation, he encouraged education and appointed better bishops. A commission was issued for the repair of church buildings and Parliament passed several acts for the improvement of church finances. With the King's full authority behind them the three men Strafford, Laud and Bramhall had done great things for the restoration of the Irish Church when the rebellion of 1641 and the subsequent wars came and nullified their efforts.<sup>2</sup>

During and after that time conditions could do nothing but grow even worse. The desperate slaughter of those days led to an irremediable hatred between the settlers and the natives, that is between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics. Archbishop Ussher retired to England and stayed there until his death in 1656. Bramhall, apart from one visit to Ireland in 1648-9, also was an absentee from the outbreak of the civil war

1. "There were no thoughts of two distinct standards at that time. And if any Bishop had been known to have required any man to have subscribed to the Irish Articles after the English were received and authorized under the great seal of Ireland, he would have been called to account for it". Bramhall. "Discourse of the Sabbath". Works. Vol: 5. p.81. Heylyn in his "History of the Sabbath" pt: 2. chap: 8. par: 9. and again in his Life of Laud, Pt: 2. pp.271-274, asserted that the Irish Articles were called in, which occasioned an angry dispute with Bernard, Ussher's biographer. A case instanced by Bernard in which Bedell is supposed to have examined Thomas Price in the Irish Articles when conferring Priest's orders on him must have occurred before 1634 since at that date Price was Archdeacon of Kilmore.
2. Phillips. (Ed.) "History of the Church of Ireland." Vol: 3. Chap: 1. passim.

to the restoration. Under Cromwell it was impossible to attempt to repair the damage. It was not until 1660 that this could be done. Ormonde who had left his post as Lord Lieutenant in 1650 came into authority again automatically as soon as the return of Charles the second was certain.<sup>1</sup> His resumption of power meant that Anglicanism would be restored in Ireland. Although the Presbyterians made some efforts to influence the authorities the feeling of the gentry was definitely in favour of Episcopacy. No law had been passed to suppress either the Liturgy or Episcopacy while Ormonde was away, consequently his first act was to recommend that the vacant sees should be filled with the best men available. Since the death of Ussher there had been no Primate of all Ireland. Now, Bramhall, who since 1634 had been Bishop of Derry, was chosen for that office. He was an old man but he had struggled bravely to reform the Church of Ireland once and had all the courage necessary to begin the work again.<sup>2</sup>

How much of the Irish Church's depressing history Taylor knew it is hard to say. He had lived in the country some years and therefore it could not have been entirely unknown. This can certainly be said, that Taylor was aware of the opposition from the Presbyterians which would confront him as soon as he took up his jurisdiction.

When Ulster was planted in 1609 a good proportion of the incoming settlers had been Scots. They were not men of remarkably high moral conduct and at first they had very little religion among them.<sup>3</sup> But when Episcopacy was restored in Scotland there were a good many Presbyterian ministers there who could not reconcile their consciences to it and these left their homes and began evangelistic work among their countrymen in the north of Ireland. They were devoted and many of them able men, as well as unflinching believers in the divine right of presbyters. They

1. He was not however formally reappointed until November 4th, 1661.
2. Bramhall, works. Vol: 1. Life, passim. See also Phillips. (Ed:) "History of the Church of Ireland". Vol: 3. Chap: 2. "The Church of the Restoration: passim.
3. Dunlop. "History of Ireland." pp.90-91.

became one of the strongest influences in the colony. With such a history of self-sacrificing and continuous opposition to Episcopacy over half a century the Presbyterians of Ulster were not likely to accept any bishops willingly, however learned and holy. They did their best to prevent one being sent over to them. They held a large synod at Ballymena, with all the Presbyterian ministers in the north of Ireland present.<sup>1</sup> Patrick Adair, one of their leaders who had just been in Dublin, gave them an account of the state affairs there. He had managed to get them warrants to receive their tithes for that year and the next until the bishops were established. The brethren solemnly considered what might be their duty at this juncture and decided to send two of their members to the King with an address.

"In this address they humbly reminded His Majesty of God's wonderful dealing with him in his preservation and restoration, on which they heartily congratulated him; but withal, they humbly petitioned the settling of religion according to the rule of Reformation against Popery, Prelacy, heresy, etc., according to the covenant."<sup>2</sup>

Everybody signed the address and it was taken to London by Mr. Richardson of Killeagh and Mr. Keyes of Belfast. Keyes was chosen chiefly because he was an Englishman. The deputation started in May 1660 but the nearer they got to England the lower their hopes sank. When they arrived in London they went first, as was natural, to Sir John Clotworthy who was an Irish Presbyterian magnate. He took them to see Drs. Calamy, Ashe and Manton who told the deputation at once that "The plainness of the address, for the covenant and against prelates, would make it unacceptable to the court."<sup>3</sup> Richardson and Keyes hardly knew what to do. They had no authority to alter the address but they did want to get an interview with the King. Matters were more complicated for by this time the King had nominated bishops to the Irish sees and some of them were getting ready to go to their new duties. The deputation went the rounds of everybody who might be expected to help them. Lord Manchester, Lord Broghill

1. Adair. "True Narrative". p.241.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. p.242.

and Mr. Annesley and, at last, with a good deal of difficulty, managed to see General Monk, the new Duke of Albemarle. He would have nothing to do with the address but told them that if they would petition the King he would help them. His advice was taken. Mention of the Covenant and Prelacy was dropped.

The deputation were introduced to the King, and their expurgated address read by Mr. Annesley. The King listened with "an awful, majestic countenance"<sup>1</sup> but he spoke to the deputation kindly and told them that he had appointed a Deputy for Ireland who would be their friend and that he would give him the royal commands concerning them.<sup>2</sup> The two ministers went back to Ireland very pleased. They had seen the King, which was more than another deputation sent at the same time by Presbyterians in another part of Ireland had managed to do, but they had not accomplished much else. The Deputy whom the King said he had appointed and who would be their friend was never sent and the Presbytery, when a report was given them of what had been done, saw clearly that the effort had failed. Richardson and Keyes got more blame for leaving out the Covenant and Prelacy than they got for praise for seeing the King.

Taylor must have been well aware of the presence of this deputation in London and the knowledge that such strong efforts were being made to oppose Episcopacy can hardly have cheered him to his task. It is essential to an understanding of the situation which afterward developed to realise that the opposition to bishops in Down and Connor was deeprooted and irreconcilable from the start. The Presbyterians there would not be placated with the concessions which might have satisfied Baxter and Calamy in England. Episcopacy in itself was hateful and nothing could make it otherwise.

Before leaving for Ireland Taylor handed to Royston

1. Adair. "True Narrative". p.245.
2. John, 2nd Baron Robertes (1606-1685) Colonel in Essex's Army and a strong Presbyterian. At the Restoration he was made Lord Deputy of Ireland but exchanged the office for that of Lord Privy Seal. On Ormonde's recall in 1669 he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland but was recalled in the following year. Created Earl of Radnor 1679.

the manuscript of the "Worthy Communicant" and this was published in the late summer of 1660. Taylor dedicated his book to Princess Mary of Orange<sup>1</sup>. This lady whose court in Holland had been a refuge for a good many of the exiled Royalists was, in the summer of 1660, expected to come over to England to share her brother's triumph. She did not arrive actually until the thirtieth of September when Taylor had returned to Ireland. But although he had probably never met her personally, he was not unknown to her, for Taylor says he had received from her the great honour of her "reading and using divers of my books"<sup>2</sup>. It is on that account that he makes bold to offer her the dedication of this one. It was not his intention this time to write a controversial book. He intended, "Not to dispute but to persuade; not to confute anyone, but to instruct those who need; not to make a noise but to excite devotion"<sup>3</sup>.

But, since he intended to produce a manual of instruction it was necessary to lay down the theological assumptions upon which his arguments would be based. He does this quite briefly in the first chapter. His point of view shows no change from that which he had expressed in the "Real Presence". The bread and wine are "symbols and sacraments" of his natural body "Not to be or to convey that natural body to us, but to do more and better for us, to convey all the blessings and graces produced for us by the breaking of that body."<sup>4</sup> He used all the power of language he had at his command to express the tremendous veneration he felt for the Blessed Sacrament and his deep sense of the its necessity to Christians. By means of it our faith is increased. It is of "great efficacy for the remission of sins"<sup>5</sup> not because of any formal efficacy because it is "the ministry of Christ's death". "It is the greatest solemnity of prayer, the most powerful liturgy and means of

1. Princess Royal of England and Princess of Orange. (1631-1700). Eldest daughter of Charles the first and Queen Henrietta Maria. Mother of William the third of England. Visited England at the Restoration and died there of small pox.

2. Works. Vol: 8. p.4.

3. Ibid. p.9.

4. Ibid. p.25.

5. Ibid. p.35.

impetration in this world".<sup>1</sup> By means of it our bodies "are made capable of the resurrection to life and eternal glory".<sup>2</sup> These and similar expressions occur on almost every page.

The object of the whole book was to teach Christians how to receive this sacrament worthily. According to his usual method in writing devotional books every chapter ends with a collection of prayers suitable for the use of those who wish to apply the lessons which have just been taught. Many of the intercessions in this book are of great beauty. All of them breathe the most intense sincerity, a feeling which was perhaps more easily conveyed in this case because the style is a little less florid. The second chapter deals with self-examination. It must be not only for gross sins but for the smallest act of uncharity. The object of this is not that we may come without sin but that we may come cherishing none. Therefore our examination must not stop at the interval between this and the last communion but spread over all our life and establish itself in a continual state of watchfulness against sin. Self-examination deals only with the negative side but there must be the positive possession of Faith, Charity and Repentance before "we can ever approach to these divine mysteries with worthiness, or depart with joy".<sup>3</sup>

This necessity for faith leads Taylor to the enquiry whether infants, innocents, fools and madmen may be admitted to the Holy Communion. He concludes that as no command had been given the practice of the church must be our guide. The early church communicated infants. The later church did not and there is reason on both sides. Therefore the best we can do is to obey the commands our own church lays upon us. In the other cases mentioned the priest must use his own judgment. All who come must have not only a faith in the efficacy of the sacrament but that faith must issue in good works. In the actual reception of the Blessed Sacrament itself the work of faith is not to contradict the evidence of our sense, but so to enlighten the heart that

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.37.
2. Ibid. p.40.
3. Ibid. p.87.

"It tastes more than the tongue does but nothing against it".<sup>1</sup>

This faith is entirely necessary to the reception of the Sacrament.

"For unless a man be a member of Christ, unless Christ dwells in him by a living faith, he does not eat the bread that came down from Heaven"<sup>2</sup>. Taylor closes this chapter with a meditation and prayer of St. Bernard and a confession of faith from the Clementine Liturgy.

The chapter which follows deals with the duty of forgiving men and is mainly occupied with the discussion of seven different cases of conscience, all bearing on the question of forgiveness. He follows a similar method in the chapter on repentance. With his usual insistence on practical religion he is at pains to point out again and again that repentance is hardly worthy of the name until it has resulted in changed deeds. The Sacrament should be received frequently. "It is without peradventure very much better to receive It every day than every week; and better every week than every month".<sup>3</sup> Only for the gravest reasons ought a Christian to abstain from frequent Communion and only those who are excommunicated or are publicly known to be guilty of grave sin are to be refused.

Taylor had no doubts about the usefulness of private confession in preparation for Holy Communion. "Concerning this thing I shall never think it fit to dispute, for there is nothing to enforce it but enough to persuade it; but he that tries will find the benefit of it himself, and will be best able to tell it to all the world".<sup>4</sup> No one can read this book without being impressed by the tremendous solemnity of spirit with which Taylor approached the altar. That he was a popular writer and this book a popular manual says a great deal for the spiritual life of our ancestors. It is humiliating for those who like to think that religion has advanced in the last two hundred and fifty years to compare this with the little books of theological colouring matter which are supposed to supply the needed preparation for communicants today.

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.106.
2. Ibid. p.114.
3. Ibid. p.184.
4. Ibid. p.205.

The "Worthy Communicant" has aroused different opinions regarding the date of its composition. On one side it has been described as hastily written to teach the Royalists their duty and on the other as composed during the Commonwealth while Taylor was surreptitiously in London.<sup>1</sup> To some extent both of these theories are probably right, for it bears all the marks of a book compiled from previously existing papers. It includes cases which could easily come from that vast collection accumulated for "Ductor Dubitantium", sermons which might have been preached at any time when the Holy Communion was celebrated and a brief resume of the general line of argument used in the "Real Presence". The summer of 1660 would not seem to be a very propitious time for a bishop-designate to engage in serious writing. It would be a far easier task for him to occupy what leisure he had in arranging and welding into one, some of his scattered papers. But, however it was achieved, the result was a book of devotion that is deep, persuasive and sincere. The style is attractive but is less enriched than that produced in Taylor's most abundant period. It is interesting to note that the only elaborate simile it contains occurs in what might easily be a fragment of an early sermon.<sup>2</sup>

Taylor's first work in Ireland seems to have been to visit the University. He began his work at once though he did not take the oaths which admitted him legally to his office until early in 1661. Since its foundation in Queen Elizabeth's time the University of Dublin had suffered many vicissitudes, but it had always retained a close connection with Cambridge and its statutes had always been remarkably tolerant in matters of religion, though

1. Gosse. "Jeremy Taylor". p.169.
2. "So we sometimes espy a bright cloud, formed into an irregular figure, when it is observed by unskilful and fantastic travellers, looks like a centuar to some, and as a castle to others; some tell that they saw an army with banners, and it signifies war, but another, wiser, that his fellow says that it looks for all the world like a flock of sheep, and foretells plenty and all the while it is nothing but a shining cloud by its own mobility and the activity of a wind cast into a contingent and inartificial shape". "So is this great mystery of our religion". (i.e. Holy Communion). Works. Vol: 8. p.8. The likeness of this to the highly wrought comparisons in "Eniautos" is apparent.

its teachers were predominantly Puritan. Bishop Bedell, who was appointed Provost in 1627, found everything in the greatest of disorder. The college estates had been scandalously mismanaged and were involved in lawsuits which none of the college authorities seemed to understand. Discipline was in abeyance. The fellows were quarrelling among themselves and there had been hardly any observance of religion for years. Bedell's task was made more onerous by the lack of any proper constitution, for the statutes had never been put in order; they were just a bundle of loose papers, some of them in English, and some of them in Latin. He set to work with great energy. Once more the fellows and masters were made to attend prayers. Holy Communion was regularly celebrated again. The Statutes collected and revised and the accounts kept in an orderly system which began to make the college solvent. One of the most striking of all Bedell's accomplishments was his introduction of the Irish language into the life of the institution. Prayers were said in it, lectures were given in it and arrangements were made for those who wished to do so to make it a subject of study.

It has often been said that if only Bedell's labours in this direction had been continued the reformation might have been as successful in Ireland as it was in England and Scotland. But his work at Trinity College only lasted two years. In 1629 he was made Bishop of Kilmore, where his devoted life ended in the midst of the rebellion of 1641 when the chiefs of the insurgents, out of respect for his memory, fired their guns over his grave as they shouted "requiescat in pace ultimus anglorum". He had been succeeded at Trinity College by Robert Ussher, a kinsman of the Primate's. He was a conscientious man but too weak to govern the unruly elements which Bedell had controlled. He tried to keep on his predecessor's work but he was a failure and was promoted to make way for a better man.<sup>1</sup>

1. He was given the Archdeaconry which Bramhall had just vacated and on Feb: 12th. 1635 he was consecrated Bishop of Kildare.

In 1633 when Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury he also became Chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin, and brought his usual energy to bear there also.<sup>1</sup> A new charter was procured from Charles the first. It was, to some extent, narrower in its religious sympathies than the previous statutes. Roman Catholics, were, for instance, debarred from fellowships and the Provost was bidden to drive away any heretical or Popish doctrine. None the less Roman Catholic students were admitted and allowed to retain their faith provided they renounced the Pope's temporal authority over the realm of England. The charter also made the government of the college considerably less democratic. It was adhered to, on the whole, until modern times and proved its usefulness.

The Provost whom Laud appointed at Strafford's suggestion was William Chappel, Milton's old Cambridge tutor. He was not a great success. He abolished the professorship of Irish and stopped the lectures in Hebrew and Mathematics. When he resigned his Provostship in 1640 the college authorities wrote a panegyric of him in their books, but in the next year the Irish Parliament, on a petition of the junior fellows, examined and condemned his conduct. The same Parliament also voted that the new charter should be abolished and the old restored. Chappel's successor, and Martin, fled to England during the rebellion of 1641/although he returned later on, for the next ten years everything went to rack and ruin.<sup>2</sup> On his death Cromwell appointed a strong Puritan, Samuel Winter, as Provost, and 1653 Henry Cromwell became Chancellor instead of Ormonde. The times were difficult but Winter seems to have honestly done his best for the college. He helped poor scholars out of his own pocket. He did what he could to promote the study of Irish and mathematics and tried to get the finances straight. At the Restoration Ormonde, of course, took up his

1. See his letters to Strafford, in which Trinity College business frequently occurs. Laud's Works. Vol: 6. part 2. pp.374, 398, 464, 465, 467, 497.
2. Anthony Martin. He was Bishop of Meath from 1625 until his death of the plague in Dublin 1650. Appointed Provost of Trin. Coll: Dub: in 1641. See Ware Works. (Ed:Harris) Vol: 1. "Irish Bishops." See also p. 232, note. of this Thesis.

chancellorship again. He dismissed Winter and his associates and appointed Taylor to the vice-chancellorship, and Thomas Steele to the provostship. He was the first graduate of the college to hold that office. Taylor thus became the heir to the thirty years of perpetually changing government and unsuccessful attempts at reform which have been sketched.<sup>1</sup>

By October the third 1660 he had completed a preliminary survey of his task, for on that date he made a first report to Ormonde. "I found", he says, "all things in a perfect disorder indeed so great as can be imagined to be consequent to a sad war, and an evil incompetent government set over them".<sup>2</sup> To call Winter evil and incompetent was not very just. One of the greatest obstacles to beginning any reform was to find anybody with some legal title to his place. Taylor in his report goes on to say, "There is indeed a heap of men and boys, but no body of a college, no one member, either fellow or scholar, having any legal title to his place but thrust in by tyranny and chance."<sup>3</sup> According to the college statutes no election could be made except by the Provost and four senior fellows. Taylor proposed to remedy the situation by obtaining from Ormonde authority for himself, the Provost, and the Archbishop of Dublin as visitor, to appoint seven senior fellows who would be able legally to proceed with all the other elections.

This suggestion was agreed to in principle but Ormonde asked for five persons to be recommended to him so that they might be made fellows by royal authority. Taylor sent the names. Among them was that of Dr. John Sterne his old friend. He was a married man and, therefore, strictly speaking, ineligible for the office, but Taylor specially asked that this disability might be overlooked, both on account of his learning and his great familiarity with the college affairs. Sterne certainly justified the choice. The names of the others were Joshua Cowley, Richard Lingard, William Vincent

1. Dixon. "Trinity College." Dublin. pp.1-51.
2. Letter from Taylor to Ormonde. Carte MSS. fol. ss. Carte inserted an account of Trinity College at the Restoration in his Life of Ormonde. Vol: 2. p.208. He based his statements on the letter quoted above dated Oct. 3rd.1660.
3. Ibid.

and Patrick Sheridan. Cowley and Sheridan were acquaintances of Taylor and as they had previously asked his guidance in their reading it is possible to conclude that he had personal knowledge of their abilities. In the same letter in which these names were sent for the chancellor's approval and the King's confirmation, Taylor also asked for authority to "collect and frame" necessary statutes. "We have", he says, "no public statutes relating to an University, no established forms of collating degrees, no public lectures, no schools; no Regius professor of Divinity, and scarce any ensignes academical".<sup>1</sup>

Taylor and Steele worked hard at their task. While the Vice-chancellor saw to the organization of the University, the Provost restored discipline. But funds were short and there were no able men available for the vacant positions. The troublous times that Ireland had been through had not been conducive to study. The disorderly bachelors and scholars were, however, brought under control. The chapel services were regularly conducted once more and both an organist and a university preacher were appointed. Steele continued to be Provost after Taylor's death and went on with the excellent work which they had begun together. They firmly and finally set Trinity College on its feet.

While he was away in Dublin Taylor sent down orders to his diocese that the Presbyterians should be closely watched and their activities reported upon to him. Early in October 1660 he received a letter from his agent which was anything but reassuring. The Presbyterians, his correspondent writes, had held a meeting a week or so before and appointed a committee of four people, Mr. Greg, Mr. Drysdale, Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Hutcheson<sup>2</sup> to examine Taylor's writings and draw up a list of what they considered objectionable

1. Taylor to Ormonde. Dec: 19th. 1660. Carte. MSS. Fol: 88.
2. These four were associated on many occasions. Drysdale came over from Scotland as a layman to preach in Lord Claneboye's regiment, and was ordained by the presbytery at Carrickfergus. He was afterward sent as a special deputy from Northern Ireland to the Assembly in Scotland. Ramsay was the minister of Bangor, County Down. All four were arrested in 1663 for alleged complicity in Blood's plot. Drysdale retired to Scotland with Ramsay, Hutcheson was protected by Lord Duncannon. Greg, who seems to have been implicated suffered imprisonment and "hard usage". All four were again in trouble in 1670 with Bishop Boyle, Taylor's successor. See Adair. "True Narrative". pp. 27, 277, 281, 296, 298.

features in them.<sup>1</sup> The committee must have had the greater part of their task done before they were appointed, or else been very familiar with the works of their diocesan for they presented their report a week after they had been chosen. They charged Taylor with being a socinian, that he denied original sin, that he was arminian and "so heretic in the grain"<sup>2</sup> and their charges were accepted by the synod. It was decided to send the four men who had drawn up the indictment to carry it up to Dublin and, if they could get a hearing, they were to lay it before the authorities; if not the document was to be sent on to their correspondent in England to be laid before the King. In the meantime all ministers were to preach vigorously against bishops and the Book of Common Prayer.<sup>3</sup> One of their number Mr. Richardson carried out this part of the resolution very thoroughly. After some wholehearted abuse of bishops and the Prayer Book he warned his hearers that it would be as well for them to get the Bible by heart for the time was coming when no one would be allowed to have a copy of their own and when it would be safer to break the sabbath than a holyday. He concluded with a prayer of thanksgiving for "the little mite of liberty which the King had granted them".<sup>4</sup>

Taylor immediately laid the letter before the Lords Justices and wrote an account of what he had heard to Ormonde. It must have thrown him into a fit of the profoundest depression for his immediate reaction was to offer his resignation. He knew that if once he went to his diocese, distasteful though the task might be, he would be compelled to face an open clash with the Presbyterian unless he was content to betray both his commission and his order by staying on while his authority was ignored and his person insulted. So, rather than fight, Taylor wished to resign. On December the nineteenth, 1660, the same day on which he sent Ormonde the names

1. "Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland." Car.2. cccv. No.7.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

of the five men recommended for fellowships, Taylor wrote another long letter to Ormonde asking to be allowed to give up his bishopric. The King and Ormonde both, he says, intended to prefer him when they sent him to Down but the income is not what it was represented to be and many of the rents uncertain, but he will not complain about that. He has, he says, been thrown into a place of torment and the chief offenders are the Scotch ministers. The nobility and gentry, all except one, are very right, but the ministry are implacable.

"They have for these four months past solemnly agreed, and very lately renewed their resolution, of preaching vigorously and constantly against episcopacy and liturgy; they defy them both, publicly they disparage his Majesty's government; they slight and undervalue his most gracious concessions in his late excellent and princely declaration; they talk of resisting unto blood, and stir up the people to sedition, doing things worse than can be expressed by any but themselves.

My lord; I have invited them to a friendly conference, desired earnestly to speak with them, went to them, sent some of their own to invite them, offered to satisfy them, in anything that was reasonable; I preach every Sunday amongst them, somewhere or other; I have courted them with most friendly offers, did all things in pursuance of his Majesty's most gracious declaration; but they refused to speak with me; they have newly covenanted to speak with no bishop, and to endure neither their government nor their persons."<sup>1</sup>

The Presbyterians were trying to undermine his popularity with the "Better sort of people" by calling him an Arminian and a Socinian and a Papist or a half a Papist. They had bought his books and appointed a committee of "scotch spiders"<sup>2</sup> to see whether they could find any poison in them, and the spiders having found one or two little things they had put them into a paper which they sent across to London for presentation by their agent to the King. Their object, Taylor thinks, is not so much to remove him as to discredit him. Against all this Taylor asks for the "countenance" of the authorities. The letter shows some fear that the government might not be willing to support him very strongly in the face of the Presbyterian agitation. If it did not, says Taylor, "It were better for me to be a poor curate in a village church than a bishop over such intolerable persons; and I will petition your excellency to give me some parsonage in Munster, that I may end my days in peace, rather than abide here, unless I may

1. Taylor to Ormonde. Dec. 19th 1660. Carte MSS. fol. ss.

2. See page 299. note.

be enabled with comfort to contest against such violent persons".<sup>1</sup> Taylor added to the letter a brief extract of some of the most outrageous things which were being said in his diocese. The facts contained in the letter and in the list of charges were drawn apparently from his agent's report. They were sent in a covering letter to Sir George Lane, Ormonde's secretary, asking for his support. He wrote much the same things as he had written to Ormonde about his difficulties and he added that the Scots Presbyterians get their encouragement from the delay in the justices coming over and in the consecration of the bishops.<sup>2</sup>

Taylor's difficulties with the Presbyterians have been the subject of some disputes and misunderstandings, but the facts are not too difficult to obtain. Most fortunately we have the case presented from both sides. Taylor's own letters on the subject are lengthy and Adair, one of the Presbyterian leaders, wrote their story with full personal knowledge of what had happened and at a time when the events he described were fairly recent.<sup>3</sup> There are of course some things slurred over which we should like to have in more detail, but nothing really necessary is missing. In all essentials, allowing for the inevitably different points of view, the two accounts agree.

There was a chance, toward the end of 1660, that Taylor might be able to avoid for a little while longer the battle which he knew was awaiting him in Down and Connor. The Irish Church proposed to send a deputation, consisting of one bishop and clerk, over to England with a petition to the King for the

(From Page 298) 2. Taylor to Ormonde, Dec: 19th. 1660. Carte MSS. fol. ss. Taylor signs this letter "Jerem. Dunensis Elect", a wrong style since the Irish bishops were appointed by the King's letters Patent simply.

1. Ibid.

2. Taylor to Lane. Dec: 19th. 1660. Carte MSS. fol. ss.

3. "A True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland by the Rev. Patrick Adair, Minister of Belfast". Adair intended to bring his work down to the beginning of the reign of William the third but he died in 1694 leaving his MS unfinished, but fairly completed up to 1670. The book stayed unprinted until it was edited by W.D. Killen and published in Belfast, 1866.

reorganizing and settlement of church finances. The Episcopal representative was to be either Jeremy Taylor, or Michael Boyle of Cork and Ross, but before this point was decided a letter from the King gave the clergy the prospect of obtaining their wishes, the deputation was therefore never sent.<sup>1</sup>

Taylor had probably been waiting for his consecration before he did more than take stock of his diocese. On January the twentyseventh he and nine other bishops were consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral at Dublin and Taylor preached the sermon.<sup>2</sup> He took Luke XII. 42-32 for his text and his sermon on the faithful and wise steward was a defence of Episcopacy on the same lines as his larger work. It was published in response to the desire of those who heard it, without a dedication but with a short address to the christian reader. It is one of the least distinguished of all Taylor's sermons and is chiefly valuable as indicating the state of mind in which he was about to take up the active work of his diocese. His sermon shows him as strongly convinced as ever that Episcopacy is the divinely ordered system of government of the church. In his address to the christian reader he quotes the words of St. Cyprian "he that is not with the bishop is not in the church"<sup>3</sup> Yet that is only one half of his thought, the other is the heavy sense of responsibility a bishop must feel toward all those who are the lost sheep of his flock.

Taylor at this time when in his diocese was not living in any house of his own but had a lodging at Hillsborough House. This mansion belonged to Colonel Hill and had been built in the reign of Charles the first as an outpost against the rebels. There was a little church nearby which served as the bishop's chapel.

1. Bramhall's Works. Vol: 1. p.cii. Bramhall to Ormonde Dec. 5th. 1660.
2. Bramhall himself drew up the order of service. The paper, entitled "The Manner of Consecration of the Bishops in Dublin by the Lord Primate in the year 1660" was lost until it was republished for controversial purposes in the eighteenth century, in a book entitled "The Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy Shaken" by Richard Baron, 8vo. London. 1768. It consists of a careful programme of Procession, Service, Anthem, Sermon, and was sent by the primate "to those concerned, to the end that all things might be done in order." see also, Mason. "St. Patrick's Cathedral". p. 192.

## CHAPTER NINE.

When Taylor arrived in his diocese a little before February the seventeenth, 1661,<sup>1</sup> he found<sup>that</sup> the Presbyterian leaders were away in Dublin. They had been forbidden by a proclamation issued by the Justices<sup>2</sup> in the previous year to hold any meeting, but they had managed to gather at their old meeting place at Ballymena and to transact their business before the party of horse sent by sir George Rawdon to disperse them had arrived.<sup>3</sup> They had decided to send four of their number to remind the Justices there of the King's kindness toward them when they were in London. They were encouraged to hope for some leniency toward them because Sir John Clotworthy, who had now become Lord Massereene, had got the King to promise that the Presbyterians in Ireland should be treated with special leniency. It was probably against this seeming double dealing on the part of the court that Taylor had protested in his letter to Ormonde on December nineteenth.

The deputation saw the Irish Privy Council but did not get much encouragement.<sup>4</sup> Adair states that there were several bishops belonging to the council then. Jeremy Taylor was sworn a member, but as Adair himself says that the deputation was in Dublin when Taylor came to his diocese it is hardly likely that he sat when his own malcontents appeared. As soon as they came back Taylor summoned them all to meet him at his Episcopal visitation at Lisnagarvey. The Presbyterians were expecting some such summons and were in distress because they could not hold a meeting to discuss what their attitude toward it should be. But as it happened, Lady Clotworthy, Lord Massereene's mother, died just at that time and, since her son was such a support to their cause, the Presbyterians of Down and Connor flocked to her funeral, and so were able, after all,

1. "Rawdon Papers." p.125.

2. Ireland was temporarily under the rule of three Justices, Lord Broghill, Earl of Orrery; Sir Charles Coote, Earl of Mountrath; Sir Maurice Custace the Chancellor.

3. Adair. "True Narrative". p.246.

4. Ibid. p.247.

to talk over the bishop's summons.<sup>1</sup> But they could not agree on any line of action.<sup>2</sup> The majority met together next day at Belfast and went together to Lisnagarvey. The bishop was out at Hillsborough House. The Presbyterians stayed in the town and the evening before the visitation sent three of their number out to see the bishop and tell him that they would on no account submit to his jurisdiction or appear at his visitation.<sup>3</sup> If he wished they would see him privately and talk over things. Taylor received the deputation but asked them to submit what they had to say on paper. The deputation refused to do so on the ground that many of their brethren were not present. Adair is not clear whether the deputation did this on their own responsibility or whether they first went back to Lisnagarvey and consulted those who sent them. Taylor told the deputation that he could not recognise the Presbyterian clergy as a body, but they replied that however he regarded them it was their wisest course to advise with one another on matters of importance. All this seems to have been by way of a preliminary. As soon as Taylor saw that they would not commit their position to writing he asked them if they considered government by presbyters to be "jure divino". They replied at once that they did.<sup>4</sup> Taylor replied that if that was the case there would be little purpose in any further discussion. The Presbyterians saw their opportunity. They were persuaded, they said, in their conscience that their form of government was "jure divino" and if to give that answer would only cause trouble it was best for them to stay away from the visitation. The bishop agreed, adding that if they made any profession contrary to law in public they would smart for it and he advised them as a friend to stay away. They thanked him but, none the less, thought that they might still hold government by presbyters to be "jure divino" and not

1. There is doubt about the actual date but according to the entry in the Office of Arms, Dublin Castle, the funeral must have taken place between Dec.5th.1660 and March 5th.1661. Since Taylor did not arrive in his diocese until Feb.17th.1661, it narrows the date of the visitation to late February or early March.

2. Adair. 'True Narrative'. p.247.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. p.248.

break the law, since they were not actually using that form of government, for they realised that "affirmative precepts bound not ad semper"<sup>1</sup> This remark would seem to imply that the presbyters had ceased to function in an organised way and that the real position of their body was now similar to that of the independents. Since Major Rawdon's troop of horse had arrived at one of their meetings perhaps this was the case, but they still acted in concert as far as they were able and were certainly no nearer accepting any government other than presbyters.

Taylor relied that the government they then exercised was contrary to law and went on to say that though the King's declaration on matters of religion were extended to Ireland it would not do them any good.<sup>2</sup> The Presbyterians had obviously hoped a good deal from that declaration. Taylor who had been nearer the centre of things than they probably knew how much or how little it was going to be acted upon. The deputation replied that there were a good many in England who thought as they did and yet enjoyed the benefit of the King's declaration. Taylor disagreed.

His next question was about the oath of supremacy. Would they take it? They replied that they would not answer for their brethren but they thought that if it was put to them in the sense in which Archbishop Ussher had explained it, and King James accepted it, then the oath would be taken, though they admitted when questioned that such an interpretation was contrary to law. Taylor said he would offer them the oath in its grammatical sense, but he had never known anyone to take it that way except Jesuits and Presbyterians "Who were the greatest enemies to monarchy and most disobedient to Kings which he instanced in the case of the Assembly of Scotland, and in Calvin, Knox, Buchanan, etc."<sup>3</sup> And he went on to stress that disagreeable parallel. Adair adds that none of the bishops actually administered the oath to Presbyterians because

1. Adair. "True Narrative" p.248.
2. The King is said to have promised Lord Maasereene that the "Declaration Concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs" would have "some favourable addition put to it for the presbyterians in Ireland". Adair. "True Narrative" p.246.
3. Ibid. 249.

by law they were not allowed to force it on any but officers of church and state. The bishops did not recognise Presbyterian orders and therefore could not admit them to office in the church, neither did they think it possible for them to hold any office under the King.<sup>1</sup>

The conversation had never shown any possible opening for compromise. On both sides it had been root principles which were called in question. Taylor told the deputation that he saw they were in a difficult situation for "If they did conform contrary to their consciences they would be knaves; and if not, they could not be endured contrary to law;" he wished them therefore "deponere conscientiam erroneam"<sup>2</sup> The Presbyterians were very upset at being classed with Jesuits and by the bishop's reflection on the Assembly of Scotland and the worthy reformers and they did their best to disabuse his mind. They were probably not successful for it was a long standing idea of Taylor's.

The day after this meeting the bishop held his visitation at Lisnagarvey. There were only two Presbyterians there. The bishop's sermon was on "The Minister's Duty in life and Doctrine" As we have it now it is in two parts, "As it was preached in so many several visitations".<sup>3</sup> This probably means that the sermon was preached twice in its entirety for it undoubtedly reads as one work. Possibly the first half was delivered on one morning the other the next day or on the same afternoon but both actually at the same visitation. The first part is an exhortation to those present to live a holy life and preach sound doctrine. It is plain and simple, never rising to any great heights. The second half deals more precisely with the substance of what the minister's are to preach. It is all to be taken from the scripture, sensibly expounded with the best help that can be got. Taylor recommends a few books. None of them are English. Among them are St. Augustine's "De Utilitate Credendi" and "De Doctrina Christiana", the Proems of Isidore, St. Jerome, Andreas Hyperias and Ambrosius Catherinus.<sup>4</sup> This

1. Adair. "True Narrative" p.250.
2. Ibid.
3. Works. Vol: 8. p.497.
4. Ibid. p.520.

sounds stiff and argues a high standard of learning among the clergy of Northern Ireland or at any rate, in this case, a want of common sense in Jeremy Taylor.

With a good many of the ministers of the district rebellious and absenting themselves Taylor might have been expected to refer to the situation at some length. But only toward the end of the second of the two sermons does he make any mention of it. There he exhorts his hearers to preach such in things as shall be useful. They shall teach the people.

"To fear God and honour the King, to keep the commandments of God; learn them to be sober and temperate, to be just and to pay their debts, to speak well of their neighbours and to think meanly of themselves; teach them charity, and learn them to be zealous of good works. Is it not a shame that the people shall be filled with sermons against ceremonies, and declamations against a surplice, and tedious harangues against the poor airy sign of the cross in baptism? These things teach them to be ignorant; it fills them with wind, and they suck dry nurses; it makes them lazy and useless. Troublesome and good for nothing. Can the definition of a Christian be, that a Christian is a man that rails against bishops and the Common Prayer Book? and yet this is the great labour of our neighbours that are crept in amongst us; this they call the work of the Lord; and this is the great matter of the desired reformation; in these things they spend their long breath, and about these things they spend earnest prayers, and by these they judge their brother, and for these they revile their superior, and in this doughty cause they think it fit to fight and die."<sup>1</sup>

Besides the sermon Taylor delivered a pastoral charge which is quite unaffected by the dispute. It took the form of eightythree short "Rules and Advices to the Clergy of the Diocese of Down and Connor for their deportment in their personal and public capacity". It is wholly admirable. Although time has necessarily made it obsolete here and there by changing the circumstances of men's lives, even to-day no minister could read it without profit. It is divided into five sections, "First, Personal duty; second, of prudence required in ministers; third, the rules and measures of government to be used by ministers. in their respective courses; fourth, Rules and advices concerning preaching; fifth, Rules and advices concerning catechism." The temptation is to quote and to go on quoting, but two extracts, those numbered X and XV in the first section, must suffice.

"X. Let every curate of souls strive to understand himself best; and then to understand others. Let him spare himself least; but most severely judge, censure and condemn himself. If he be learned, let him show it by wise teaching and humble manners; if he be not learned, let him be sure to get so much knowledge as to know that, and so much humility, as not to grow insolent, and puffed up by his emptiness. For many will pardon a good man that is less learned; but if he be proud no man will forgive him".<sup>1</sup>

"XV. Pray much and very fervently for all your parishioners, and all men that belong to you, and all that belong to God; but especially for the conversion of souls; and be very zealous for nothing, but for God's glory, and the salvation of the world, and particularly for your charges; ever remember that you are by God appointed as the ministers of prayer, and the ministers of good things, to pray for all the world, and to heal all the world, as far as you are able."<sup>2</sup>

It is a pity that some early publisher did not bind up this little gem with "Holy Living and Dying" so that it could have become more widely known.<sup>3</sup>

The bishop called the names of all the absent Presbyterian ministers when he called the names of the rest of his clergy during the visitation, but did nothing further about their absence. When the bishop had got back home after the visitation and had finished his dinner, another deputation from the malcontents went out to see him. They were three in number this time. Two had belonged to the deputation of the night before and the other had not. Their object was to see if Taylor would call all their brethren to his house to talk things over privately as they had thought his words of the previous night had suggested. But if that had been his intention Taylor had now changed his mind. His words, as Adair reports them, only seem to suggest that, in the bishop's opinion, it would be wisest for the Presbyterians to stay away from the official visitation if their going would cause trouble, but obviously there was some misunderstanding. But Taylor refused to consider the possibility of meeting them as a body and "fell angrily on reflection on Presbyterian Government"<sup>4</sup> He also told them that contempt was

1. Works. Vol: 1. p.102.
2. Ibid. p.103.
3. It was republished at Oxford in 1847 in a volume entitled "The Clergyman's Instructor" together with seven other booklets on the ministerial life.
4. Adair. "True Narrative". p.250.

the real cause of their not appearing at the visitation. They replied it was awe of God and their consciences, to which the bishop responded that a Jew or a Quaker would defend themselves with the same argument as indeed anybody would who was on a wrong course.

Although Taylor would have nothing to do with the Presbyterians as a body he did what he could to win over individuals. He interviewed those whom he thought likely to respond, one by one and "Gave them offers of great kindness and preferment but he obtained not his purpose"<sup>1</sup> Both singly and collectively the Presbyterians had remained staunch in their opinions. Judging by their past history time was not likely to change them. But thirtysix of them were in possession of church livings. It was obviously an intolerable situation for any bishop to be in. Taylor had tried to resign but the government had not allowed him to do so. There was nothing left for him to do but to exercise his authority. He did exercise it and declared the thirtysix churches vacant.<sup>2</sup>

The date of this action is uncertain but as it took place at the end of Taylor's first visitation it must have been about the end of March 1661. The legality of this act has been frequently questioned. One thing we may take as fairly certain namely that Taylor believed himself to have the law on his side, the question is what particular law did he have in mind. The Irish Articles did not demand episcopal ordination and the English Articles are not specific on that point. The Irish Convocation which sat from August to November 1662 examined and unanimously approved the Prayer Book which had just been revised and established by law in England, but not until the Irish Parliament of 1666 met was its use enjoined under penalties. Both these happenings came much too late to provide Taylor with any authority for what he did. Yet he can scarcely be said to need more authority than already existed in the Ordinal. As part of the Prayer Book it had been passed into law by the Irish Parliament of January 1560 and it had not been legally superseded by anything which happened during the Commonwealth.

1. Adair. "True Narrative." p.251.
2. Ibid.

Its preface is uncompromising. No man shall be

"Suffered to execute any of the said Functions (of Bishop, Priest or Deacon) except he be called tried, examined and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination".

The Presbyterian ministers had not been ordained according to the forms provided, Taylor therefore held them to be no ministers and ejected them from their livings.<sup>1</sup>

Some authorities, without examining too closely into the charge, have been willing to allow that Taylor was guilty of persecution and that he repudiated his own principles expressed in the "Liberty of Propheying". Of course, whenever discipline is brought to bear the cry of persecution is raised by those who undergo it. But every organised body must have principles which bind it together and if these are disregarded that body cannot continue to exist. It is useless to argue that a devotion to Christ is all that can be demanded of christians. The Presbyterians of Down and Connor would have repudiated that as violently as anyone else in the seventeenth century.

The Anglican church is essentially an episcopal church. By 1661 that had been finally settled and the Presbyterians in England were not questioning the principle, though they might suggest a considerable limitation of the bishop's powers. How could any part of that church tolerate within itself those who resolutely stood for a complete extirpation of episcopacy. Those who disregard the fundamental laws of a society have no place in that society, though they may rightly claim the liberty to organise a body of their own. This is what Taylor's action forced the Presbyterians to do. We may regret the schism but it was unavoidable, if each side was to keep its selfrespect. To say as is sometimes done that Taylor was the cause of a separated Presbyterian church existing in Ulster is to put the fact the wrong way round. More truly, it was due to him that the Anglican church continued to exist in that

1. Adair bears out this point of view. "He did not make any process against the ministers, nor suspend or excommunicate; but simply held them not to be ministers, they not being ordained by bishops. Adair. "True Narrative". p.251.

part of Ireland.

To accuse Taylor of disregarding his own teaching in the "Liberty of Propheying" is to misunderstand that book. It pleaded that all men of good will should be allowed to keep their own opinions so long as they were not inimical to good morals or the welfare of the state, not that they should be allowed to receive the emoluments which belonged to another body. Taylor never punished a Presbyterian as such. Later on he was instrumental in arresting Drysdale and holding him for trial but it was because of his suspected complicity in a plot against the government, not solely because of his religion. It must however be pointed out that it seems to have been increasingly Taylor's opinion that Presbyterianism was incompatible with genuine loyalty. That it was professors of it who were the chief leaders in beginning the civil war was a thing which he found hard to get out of his memory. The Presbyterian case against Taylor is that he deprived men whose Presbyterian orders previous bishops had not called into question, whose work had been abundantly blessed and who were men of ability. This of course in no way alters the fact that they were legally incapable of holding the preferment they had and therefore in strict justice could not complain when it was taken from them. The negligence of previous bishops could make no difference to the law and was all the less likely to be favourably construed since it was but a part of a scandalous mismanagement which extended through all their work.

If Taylor was ever a persecutor his whole character becomes a puzzle. There was, then, something inherently wrong in all the holy attitude and pious teaching of the Golden Grove days if, the moment that Taylor was made a bishop, he was no longer ruled by it, but was either swept away by a burst of irritation or was filled by the advent to power with pride and self-will. If love and mercy have been the principles of a lifetime an honest man is not likely suddenly to be converted to tyranny. But persecution is hard to prove against him. There is every sign that the task Taylor was compelled to perform was distasteful and yet it is hard

to see how he could have done anything else and remain faithful to his own principles. It is perhaps too much to expect that the Presbyterians should have given him as much credit for being true to his conscience as they took for loyalty to their own.

Taylor filled the vacant livings with new men, some brought over from England, some able men on the spot who were willing to accept ordination. All seem to have been of English extraction. It is a pity perhaps that when Scots had to be displaced Irishmen should not have been preferred, but conditions had not been such as conduced to the training of scholars. Among the new comers was George Rust who became Dean of Connor and afterward Bishop of Dromore. Taylor seems to have had no particular person in mind when he sent over to Cambridge for some "learned and ingenious man" who might be suitable for the vacant deanery.<sup>1</sup> Henry More recommended Rust, his friend and pupil, and, since there was a longstanding friendship between More and Taylor as well as between More and the Conway family his nominee was naturally appointed.<sup>2</sup> Thomas Bayley, who had at one time been chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, worked in the diocese until 1664 when he was made Bishop of Killala; and Lemuel Mathews, Taylor's own chaplain, was a Welshman who settled down in the church of Ireland. But the new Archdeacon of Down, Jeremiah Piddock, was ordained priest on the spot by Taylor on the third of March, 1661.<sup>3</sup> The Chancellor of the diocese, James Mace, was an Englishman who, though a scholar of the Perse School and a sizar of Trinity College, Cambridge, had been in Ireland longer than Taylor.<sup>4</sup>

1. Cambridge University Library. Baker MSS. c. 2. 24. Fol: 109. See also "Diary of Dr. John Worthington" Published Cheetham Soc: p.301.

2. There were complaints later on that Rust did not keep in touch with Taylor. He lived at Carrickfergus where he was Rector of Island Magee and was nearly always absent from Lisburn. The complaints about this were many. (Mawdon Papers". Sept. 5th. 1665. March 1666. April 25th 1666). His name does not occur once in the Lisburn Registers. A letter of his to Lord Conway is a little highly coloured even for the 17th century. "I thought Ireland a pleasant country and Lisburn a delightful place, but now I see it was your presence made it so. The sun does not shine as it used to do when you were here and the verdure of the fields is not the same. I love my dear Lord as my Guardian Angel". See Carmody. "Lisburn Cathedral and its Past Rectors." pp.23-25.

3. Ibid. p. 20.

4. Ibid. p.25.

He was ordained deacon and priest on the same day as Piddock.

By the early part of 1661 Taylor had appointed most of the officers of his diocese but he had no cathedral. The old cathedral of Down had been in ruins for one hundred and fifty years. Bishop Leslie in days before the civil war, had tried to get something done but had not succeeded.<sup>1</sup> The church at Lisnagarvey was suitable and therefore became the centre of the diocese. Its new importance was officially recognised by a charter granted by the King in 1662 in which it was not only styled "cathedral" but provision made for its endowment out of impropriations granted to the church, as the bishop of the diocese, the archbishop and the governor-general should see convenient.<sup>2</sup> It is odd, as Dean Carmody observes, that when these three offices were held by zealous churchmen the cathedral should never have obtained any endowments.<sup>3</sup>

On the tenth of March, 1661, Taylor buried his son Edward at Lisnagarvey,<sup>4</sup> or as it was now increasingly called Lisburn. He was a child of the marriage with Joanna Bridges and must have been quite young. With such a blow to his hopes and the struggle with the Presbyterians which was going on it is no wonder that Taylor felt neither happy nor settled. In the same month, when Bishop Leslie of Meath lay dying, Taylor wrote to Ormonde asking that as soon as a vacancy occurred he might be translated.<sup>5</sup> Meath lay near to Dublin and so would make his attendance to the duties of Vice-Chancellor much easier. He claims that he has "broken the knot of the scotch ministers"<sup>6</sup> in Down and Connor and his successor would find a comparatively easy task. The tone of the letter suggests that the writer thought his request so reasonable that he hardly contemplated refusal. In a postscript he added that

1. Carmody. "Lisburn Cathedral and its Past Rectors" p.22.

2. The original charter is in the keeping of the rector of Lisburn, it is printed in Carmody, "Lisburn Cathedral and its Past Rectors" p.93.

3. Ibid. p.99.

4. Ibid. p.87. quoting the Burial Register of Lisburn, Book 2, page 1661-1720.

5. Taylor to Ormonde. March 28th.1661. Carte MSS. fol: ss.

6. Ibid.

the "Nobilitie and gentree of this diocese are something passionate"<sup>1</sup> for the little diocese of Dromore to be added to that of Down.

It had besides dignitaries only five clergy. The Bishop at the time was Robert Leslie, a son of the Bishop of Meath. Taylor suggests that when the father's expected death occurred the subsequent changes would almost certainly involve the son and so make it easy to carry out the idea put forward.<sup>2</sup> His words are not clear but he probably wished the two dioceses to be united under Leslie. The request made in the body of the letter was ignored. When Bishop Leslie of Meath died Henry Jones was translated from Clogher to fill the vacancy. The postscript of the letter however was attended to. Robert Leslie was sent to Raphoe and on the thirtieth of April Taylor was made administrator of the Diocese of Dromore. He is often referred to as Lord Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore as if the two sees were united, but this can hardly have been the case. Before this could have been done there would have to have been an act of the Irish Parliament and a petition to the Privy Council.<sup>3</sup> It would also have been necessary to go through the same process to separate the dioceses again. There is no trace of this ever being done. At Taylor's death Rust became Bishop of Dromore without any special legal proceedings.

Taylor still continued to live at Hillsborough for some part of his time, visiting both the dioceses in his charge from there. Dromore Cathedral had been in ruins since it was burnt in the rebellion of 1641. Taylor rebuilt it in a simple style, the nave out of public funds and the chancel paid for out of his own pocket. One of his family, a Joanna Taylor, who may possibly have been his daughter, but is far more likely to have been his wife, presented the communion plate.

It was when all his struggles with the Presbyterians and the knowledge that there was to be no immediate escape from them was

1. Taylor to Ormonde. March 28th. 1661. Carte MSS. fol; ss.
2. Ibid.
3. Le Mattheus on the title page of his Elegy calls Taylor "Lord Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore". It would be natural for the bishop's household to give him the title although he had no legal right to it.

fresh in his mind that Taylor went up to Dublin to take his seat in the House of Lords, and, on the eighth of May, preach before the new Parliament. The two Houses a few days later publicly thanked him for his sermon and asked for it to be printed.<sup>1</sup> Both the short epistle dedicatory to the Houses of Parliament, and, the sermon itself are occupied with the duty of obedience. It is such a great virtue that nothing but the very weightiest reasons discharge us from it. He was inclined to think that the plea of tenderness of conscience was overworked. So many different people were demanding exemption from so many different things on that account. It amounted to a disease and "Must be cured by anodynes and soft usages, unless they prove ineffective, and that the lancet be necessary".<sup>2</sup> All sense of proportion must not be lost. "To stand in a clean vestment is not so ill a sight as to see men stand in separation; and to kneel at communion is not so like idolatry as rebellion is to witchcraft."<sup>3</sup>

The whole sermon throws a most interesting light on Taylor's own mental attitude toward dissent. He saw himself and his fellow bishops as the executives of the laws with only a limited discretionary power. As far as the laws allowed them they might grant toleration, provided it would do good and not increase the discontent it was meant to cure. But, outside certain narrow limits, the power to tolerate was not in their hands. In every case obedience for its own sake is a great virtue. He instances the ritual laws of the Jews which, in his opinion, were of no value except for the opportunity they offered of giving unquestioning obedience to God. Even Christ himself was baptized out of obedience and His submission was approved by the witness of the Holy Ghost. He repeats in several parts of the sermon that scruples are not to be suffered any longer than while the ignorance which begets them remains incurable. In any case "No man's opinion must be

1. "Journals of the Irish Parliament". Commons. May 11th. Lords. May 9th.
2. Works. Vol: 8. p.337.
3. Ibid.

suffered to do mischief, to disturb the peace, to dishonour the government."<sup>1</sup>

The gist of all the advice which Taylor had to offer to the Parliament can be summed up in two short quotations. He says to both Houses,

"You have no other way of peace, no better way to appease and quiet the quarrels in religion which have been too long among us, but by reducing all men to obedience, and all questions to the measures of the laws: for they on both sides pretend scripture, but one side only can pretend to the laws."<sup>2</sup>

And, at the same time, they must remember that,

"As religion teaches us to pity a condemned criminal, so mercy intercedes for the most benign interpretation of the laws. You must indeed be as just as the laws, and you must be as merciful as your religion; and you have no way to tie these together, but to follow the pattern in the mount; do as God does, who 'in judgement remembers mercy'"<sup>3</sup>

This, at least, does not seem to contradict the "Liberty of Propheying". A man with responsibility and a man without will state the same principles with different emphasis. One is concerned with winning converts, the other with the more difficult matter of practice. Taylor, as an obscure priest, presses the claim of conscience. Taylor, as a bishop, is concerned to point out to those who were pushing the plea of conscience as far as it would go, that, if it was to keep its right to be respected, it ought also only to be used on the gravest occasions.

If any proof is needed that Taylor's action in his diocese had not proceeded from a burst of irritation it is supplied by this sermon. It shows quite clearly two trains of thought in his mind. He and his fellow bishops were the executives of the law and it was incumbent upon them to discharge their duty and, while mercy is owed to everyone, a great deal of sympathy is not due to those who resist the law on trivial occasions. The only comment on this that is necessary is that the governors and the governed naturally take a different view of what are trivial occasions. Taylor

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.347.

2. Ibid. p.349. Taylor's claim to have the law on his side is here specially important because of the time and place in which it was made.

3. Ibid. p.358.

had the greatest reputation of any preacher in Ireland and this sermon did not decrease his fame. It was written in the quieter style which Taylor increasingly used toward the end of his life either because the new fashion approved, or because the old abundance was beginning to fail.

In the August of this year, Archbishop Bramhall made his Archiepiscopal Visitation of Down and Connor and Taylor preached. The sermon was afterward expanded into an address which he gave to the "little, but excellent, University of Dublin"<sup>1</sup> and published as 'Via Intelligentiae'<sup>2</sup> The magnificent hospitality which Taylor offered on the occasion of the Archbishop's visit did a good deal to increase his popularity with the local gentry.

His duties in the University and in his diocese kept him travelling up and down between the two. As Vice-Chancellor he had a regular lodging in Trinity College.<sup>3</sup> On November the fourth, 1661, Ormonde was made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Taylor sent him a graceful letter of congratulation.<sup>4</sup> He was himself in Dublin at the time probably to take part in the celebrations with which the news was received. On November sixteenth he wrote to Evelyn the last letter we have in their long correspondence.<sup>5</sup> It is short but full of warm friendship and praise of Evelyn's recent literary activity, which Taylor knew would probably give his correspondent as much pleasure as anything could do. He is himself so full of business in his diocese that he has had little time for his "old delightful employment" but Royston has in his hands the "Rules and Advices to the Clergy" and two sermons and he will present copies to Evelyn or any other of the bishop's friends who may be interested. Taylor's English friends were one by one beginning to lose touch with him. He had tried to recall himself

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.361.

2. Ibid.

3. "The middle chamber in Sir Richard Scot's Buildings adjoining unto the steeple". Dixon. "Trinity College, Dublin". p.50.

4. Taylor to Ormonde. Nov.20th.1661. Carte MSS. fol: ss.

5. Evelyn. "Diary". Vol: 3. p.281.

to his old patron, Lord Hatton, but without success. This last letter to Evelyn contains "love and dear regards to worthy Mr. Thurland".

In 1661 it took a long time to travel between England and Ireland and everyone was desperately busy with the rehabilitation of the monarchy. It is no wonder if, without any special diminution of regard, the correspondence between Taylor and his English friends should grow less. Henry More still kept in close touch with his old friend sometimes by means of very affectionate messages, and books, sent by Lady Conway; sometimes through direct correspondence with the bishop himself.<sup>1</sup> When More produced a defence of his "Cabala" Taylor read it with interest and suggested that it ought to be larger. To this More responded with a request that the bishop would "Polish and adorn it with the richness of his style" but Taylor seems to have been too busy to comply.<sup>2</sup> Rust also was a frequent writer to people in Cambridge so that there was a good deal of news and intellectual speculation exchanged between that university and Northern Ireland.

The Presbyterians had not accepted their rebuff without protest. They sent up three of their number with a petition subscribed by them all to present to Parliament.<sup>3</sup> But it was no use. They could not get their paper presented and their friends in Dublin advised them to go home again. It was clear that the Presbyterians would get very little help from headquarters; so the ministers decided that their best line of action was to go to what had formerly been their parishes, and, do what they could in an unobtrusive way. Some of them owned houses of their own and nobody interfered when they went to live in them. Whenever they could do so without drawing too much attention they held meetings and preached and tried to keep a flock together. Those were probably the older and the wiser men. After all, Ireland had seen

1. "Conway letters". pp.193, 196, 213, 218 and 219.

2. Henry More to Lady Conway. Letter undated. "Conway Letters." p.218.

3. Adair. "True Narrative". p.256.

viciissitudes enough in one generation to make reasonable people think their best course to consist in maintaining their party as well as they could while they waited for a change. In the meantime they intended to resist and continue to resist episcopacy and, at the same time, to keep in favour with government. It was fortunate for them that Lord Massereene, their patron, had influence and could be of great use in continually emphasizing their loyalty to the throne.

But this policy did not satisfy them all. Adair, who had more than a little quiet irony in his composition, remarks that "At this time there were two or three young men who had come from Scotland, and had been but lately ordained by the Presbytery here and who intending to return to Scotland and put themselves out of the bishop's reverence<sup>1</sup> in this country, resolved to do some good before they went.<sup>2</sup> These young men's idea of doing good was to stir up trouble and to leave others to bear its permanent effects. They held great field preachings and "spoke much against the bishops and the times"<sup>3</sup> While they could keep out of the hands of the authorities it was all very splendid. They went about over the country "under disguise and oft in the night time"<sup>4</sup> and, in general, behaved in a very heroic and not very sensible manner. As a result they were tremendously popular among the more hotheaded section who liberally contributed to their support while they neglected the less conspicuous, but really more difficult, services of the steadier men. But the deepest injury which the field preachers did to their own cause was to give it a taint of rebellion and consequently hinder its chances of receiving good treatment from the government. It was probably young men of this sort who had provided all the talk about 'resisting unto blood' which had been brought to Taylor and made him and all the magistrates of the district genuinely suspect that a rising was being planned. It was hard for men who had known so much upheaval to decide what was mere

1. Reverence = Authority.

2. Adair. "True Narrative" p.258.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

vapouring and what had a meaning.

Taylor was not entirely dependent on hearsay. He went about his diocese a good deal, preaching somewhere every Sunday, getting to know both the spiritual and material needs of his people, holding confirmations and visitations. It was while he was at Dromore for a visitation in the autumn of 1662 that one of the best known incidents in his life occurred.

For some time a story had been going about the country of how a young man named Francis Taverner, a servant of Lord Chichester's, was haunted by a ghost. This young man had been riding back to Belfast from Hillsborough, one night, when he was overtaken near Drum Bridge by two horsemen, though he "could not hear the treading of their feet". After them came a third who was wearing a white coat and had the likeness of James Haddock, a man who had been dead nearly five years. The ghost spoke and told Taverner his name and proved his identity by reference to some nuts which he had received from him on one occasion. Taverner asked why the ghost had appeared to him and was answered, that it was because he was a man of greater resolution than others and that if he would ride with the ghost a little way he would let him know some business he had for him. Taverner refused and, being at a cross roads, went off homeward and the two parted, at which there was a great wind and "very hideous screeches and noises". The next night, when Taverner was at home, the ghost came again and informed the young man that he must go to a woman named Welsh, who had been Haddock's wife but was now married to another man, and tell her that she must stop robbing her and Haddock's son of a certain lease. It was not a very pleasant task and Taverner put off doing it. He had no wish to be thought either officious, or mad, according to the degree of credulity in those to whom he spoke. But for a month he was haunted by the spirit, every night wearing a more terrible shape. He made one half-hearted attempt to do as he had been told but, finding that there were two women called Welsh, he gave it up. At last, to get out of the way of the ghost who was

becoming more and more obnoxious, he moved down to Belfast to the house of one Pierce, a shoemaker, and sat up all night with him and one or two of Lord Chichester's servants who adventurously wished to see a ghost. They were not disappointed. The ghost came and was more threatening than ever. The next morning the poor fellow, in despair, went and told his trouble to his master's chaplain and, on his advice, they related it all to "Dr. Downs the minister of Belfast". All three went off and delivered to Mrs. Welsh her late husband's message, at which Taverner felt a "great quietness in his mind", and, thanking the gentlemen for their help, went off to his brother's house at Drum Bridge. That night the ghost appeared again, considerably pleased at what had been done but none the less wishing to make quite sure that justice would prevail by having the executors informed of the truth about the lease.

This was the story which was told to Jeremy Taylor. He was eager to investigate it himself and ordered his secretary to bid Taverner meet the bishop at Dromore. After investigating the case very thoroughly the bishop was convinced that this "strange scene of providence", as he called it, was true. He did nothing about it at the time and on his way back home was told that Lady Conway was waiting at Hillsborough and would like to hear the case. So Taverner was sent for and the whole matter gone into again "to satisfy the curiosity of the fresh company". This time Taylor advised Taverner, if the ghost troubled him again, to ask these questions:

"Whence are you? Are you a good or bad spirit? Where is your abode? What station do you hold? How are you regimented in the other world? And what is the reason that you appear for the relief of your son in so small a matter, when so many widows and orphans are oppressed in the world, being defrauded of greater matter, and none from thence of their relations appear, as you do, to right them?"

Lady Conway must have gone home and told her husband all that she had heard for the poor haunted young man was sent for again that same night to Lisburn and, after being examined once more was ordered to stay the night there. But he was not even yet left alone. About nine or ten at night "his countenance changed and he

fell into a trembling", the usual signs that the apparition was about to present itself. So, in order not to make any trouble, he and his brother went out of doors and saw the spirit coming over a wall. The ghost asked if his message had been given and, when told that it had, promised not to hurt Taverner but threatened the executors if they did not look after the boy. Taverner's brother reminded him to ask the bishop's questions which he did, but the ghost would not answer, but "crawled on its hands and feet over the wall again, and so vanished in white, with a most melodious harmony".<sup>1</sup> Defoe included this story in his "Secrets of the Invisible World" and Increase Mather, that inveterate believer in ghosts, noted the incident in his "Diary for the Recording of Illustrious Providences"<sup>2</sup> and chided Jeremy Taylor for what he considered impertinent curiosity in matters that were beyond his ken. Taylor himself does not seem to have been very prone to believe in spirits. When he had examined Taverner he seemed to be convinced, but only by the circumstances and the number of witnesses who testified to them. There were remarkably few educated men who would have withstood such evidence in the seventeenth century. The first five suggested questions were designed to test the nature of the spirit and were of a type more or less usual. The last proceeded from Taylor's own shrewdness and hints that, in spite of what he had heard, there were still some doubts in his mind.

He had one other opportunity of studying the ways of the spirit world. His own neat herd, a man named David Hunter, was carrying a log of wood into the dairy one night when he was startled by the apparition of an old woman. He ran away from her that time but she appeared again, night after night, and the poor man was compelled to follow her all over the country. His wife went too and so did his little dog. At last, when the apparition

1. Glanvill . "Seducismus Triumphatus". Pt. 2. (Ed: More) London. 1682. p.243.
2. Boston. 1684. pp.223-229.

came on him very suddenly one day, Hunter called out, "Lord bless me; would that I were dead, shall I never be delivered from this misery". This pleased the ghost very much for apparently she had no power to speak first. Now that her tongue was loosed she told him about some money, the not very large sum of twenty eight shillings, which she had buried and wished to be used to pay her debts. She also gave him a message to a refractory son of hers. Hunter did as he was told and the ghost appeared once more to thank him. This time she said that if he lifted her up off the ground she would never trouble him again. He did so. She was like a bag of feathers in his arms. "So she vanished, and he heard most delicate music as she went off, over his head, and he never was more troubled." What Taylor thought about this is not recorded but Lady Conway took a great interest in it and Thomas Alcock, the bishop's secretary, wrote the story down.<sup>1</sup>

Archbishop Bramhall who, though he was over seventy and had had two strokes, was active to the last, died in June 1663. At the funeral Taylor preached the best of all his post-restoration sermons. The biographical details which the preacher supplied are full and interesting. They form, indeed, one of the most valuable sources for the life of Bramhall. There is in the sermon one rather curious sentence in which Taylor refers to the attempts made while Charles the second was in exile to convert him to the Roman Church, the wording of which suggests that the King did not repel the attempt very vigorously. That he was not converted Taylor put down to the efforts of Bishop Bramhall and especially to his "Answer to M. de la Milletierre". This sermon Taylor published in the same year in which it was preached, in a volume entitled Δεκάς ἑμβολιματίας or "Supplement to the Ἐνιαυτός. It contained eleven sermons all of which had been published before and all, except three, had been preached on special occasions and have already been described. These three "The Righteousness Evangelical Described", the "Christian's Conquest over the Body of Sin" and "Fides Formata or, Faith working by Love", had been

1. Glanvill. 'Saducismus Triumphatus': p.251.

preached in Christ Church, Dublin, and published with a short dedication to the Duchess of Ormonde. They are plain and sensible but, after the raptures of Taylor's earlier manner, a little dry. One sentence in the dedication gives the only hint we have of Taylor's preaching practice. After mentioning that the Duchess herself had heard the first of the three sermons and wished it to be printed, he says that he considered it too slight to be published by itself and therefore published it with two other sermons which various people had asked "to be made fit for the use of those who hoped to receive profit by them".<sup>1</sup> This suggests that the spoken word was revised before it appeared in print, and hints at a little more difficulty in creation than formerly.

He published in the same year "Χρίσις Τελειωτική 2 A Discourse on Confirmation". As the title suggests it was probably an expanded sermon which had no doubt made its appearance at a confirmation in the bishop's own diocese. For so short a work the dedication to Ormonde is fairly lengthy. It describes him as the great restorer of the Church of Ireland, one who both by inclination and duty was zealous in the interests of religion. In the discourse itself the writer undertakes to prove the divine origin of the rite of confirmation, its continuous use from the earliest times, the necessity of bishops to administer it, and, he adds, some directions both for preparing to receive it and for its reception. He refuses to consider whether it is a Sacrament or not for it is clear that it is not of the same necessity as baptism and the Lord's Supper and any further discussion would be useless. "But that it is an excellent and divine ordinance to purposes spiritual, that it comes from God and ministers in our way to God, that is all we are concerned to enquire after".<sup>3</sup> Taylor finds the origin of baptism in Christ's baptism by John in the river

1. Works. Vol: 8. p.245.

2. In the introduction. (Works. Vol: 5. p.616) Taylor quotes the phrase which gave him his title from the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" of the so-called Denys the Areopagite (Cap:ii. Par.85) "ἡ τοῦ μύρου χρίσις τελειωτική". Dr. Mason (Relation of Confirmation to baptism.p380) translates the title of Taylor's book. "The Unction which Perfecteth".

3. Works. Vol: 5. p.619.

Jordan and the origin of confirmation in the descent of the Holy Ghost which followed. This was not his own idea. He frankly admits that he had learned it from Optatus and St. Cyril.<sup>1</sup> This gives him his first argument in his attempt to establish the difference between baptism and confirmation. The theory that the descent of the Holy Ghost shows that confirmation is a part of baptism giving "fulness and consummation to it" he finds unacceptable for "reason and context are both against it".<sup>2</sup> He goes on to strengthen what he has said by pointing out that the two are different mysteries because, although many were baptized in Christ's lifetime, none received the Holy Spirit until after the Ascension. Christ himself made water and the Spirit the means of entrance to the Kingdom of God and, naming them so carefully as separate things, clearly intended them to be separate things.

Out of the Gospels he is on less debatable ground. He quotes the usual example from the Acts of the Apostles<sup>3</sup> and also Hebrews VI. 1 and 2, unhesitatingly ascribing the authorship of that Epistle to St. Paul, and he is at pains to defend his interpretation of this last passage from the charge that the laying on of hands is that of ordination. He follows up his examples from the Apostolic age with a good many citations from the fathers of the first four centuries to prove his claim that the rite had unbroken use. He closes this passage with the interesting remark, "I shall add no more, lest I overset the article and make it suspicious by a too laboured defence."<sup>4</sup> He is at last aware of his gravest weakness.

Having settled so much he goes on to prove that the ministers of confirmation were always bishops and this gives him an opportunity to introduce an interesting little account of anointing with oil in the early church. This ceremony, he contends, was never an actual part of confirmation though it was sometimes

1. Works. Vol: 5. p.619.
2. Ibid. p.621.
3. Acts. 8. 14-17.
4. Works. Vol: 5. p.642.

administered at the same time. Anointing by the priest with a Chrism consecrated by the bishop could never take the place of confirmation though he complains that the "Regulars, the Friars and the Jesuits" misled the people of England with that teaching<sup>1</sup> Earlier in his book he has blamed the Jesuits for being partly responsible for confirmation being neglected in Ireland. He affirms again that there can be no way of receiving confirmation but by the prayer and the imposition of hands of the bishop.

In Taylor's opinion confirmation is not so necessary as baptism but it is a "conditional necessity".<sup>2</sup> the same sort of necessity as there is for a man to eat his food if he would be strong. Baptism gives life, confirmation gives vigour to the christian. Because these two rites were often administered together some people have mistaken them for parts of the same thing but that is clearly not the case since some time must have elapsed between the baptism administered by Philip at Samaria and the journey of the Apostles to that city to administer confirmation.

In his concluding section Taylor stresses very earnestly the necessity for confirmation while they who are to receive it are very young.

"A little thing will fill a child's head; teach them to say their prayers, tell them the stories of the life and death of Christ, cause them to love the holy Jesus with their first love, make them afraid of sin; let the principles which God hath planted in their very creation, the natural principles of justice and truth, of honesty and thankfulness, of simplicity and obedience, be brought into act and habit, and confirmation by the holy sermons of the gospel. If the guides of souls would have their people holy, let them teach holiness to their children, and then they will, at least, have a new generation unto God, better than this wherein we live"<sup>3</sup>

The book is by no means all at this height of vigorous prose or sound commonsense. As a whole it is an exhaustive and interesting

1. Compare a modern Roman casuist. "The ordinary minister of Confirmation is a bishop, but the Pope may, and in the missions frequently does, delegate faculties to a priest to administer the sacrament (of confirmation) with crism blessed by a bishop" Slater. "Manual of Moral Theology." Vol: 2. p.89. It would seem that in seventeenth century Ireland some people claimed to have this power delegated to them from the Pope though they had not actually received it. The Roman synod of Armagh(1614) denied that any priest had received authority to confirm.
2. Works: Vol: 5. p.654.
3. Ibid. p.666.

treatise on a much neglected subject, the best book on confirmation perhaps to be written in England until the nineteenth century was well advanced, but it shows numerous signs of being put together rather hastily. Taylor omitted to take as much pains to arrange his matter and give unity to his style as he usually did. Arguments of the same type which could have been taken together are scattered all over the book and the changes from sermons to treatise are by no means smoothly made. He ends the Discourse, for instance, with a passage of direct exhortation made up of passages from the fathers which would come very well in an address to people just then confirmed but which seems to need a little reshaping at the end of a defence of confirmation. The reason was probably that he was now a busy man and had no time for polishing.

Taylor's health was also beginning to fail. In a letter written to Sheldon on May the twentyfifth, 1664, he pleads once more to be removed from his diocese.<sup>1</sup> The ostensible purpose of this letter was to recommend Sir Richard Kennedy,<sup>2</sup> a judge whose circuit had covered Down and Connor. He then goes on to speak of himself. He says, "I have been informed from a good hand in England that your grace was pleased once to say that I myself was the only hindrance to myself of being removed to an english Bishopric."<sup>3</sup> He tries most eagerly to remove this impression from the Archbishop's mind and beseeches with a humility which is very touching that "Your grace willnot wholly lay me aside, and cast off all thought of removing me; for no man shall with greater diligence, humility, and observance endeavour to make up his other disabilities, than I shall".<sup>4</sup> One feels that Jeremy Taylor ought not to have begged like this. It all came to nothing, as it was bound to do so as long as Sheldon thought Taylor's

1. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p. cxix. note, source not specified.
2. Sir Richard Kennedy was being recalled to England. He had been a little too vigorous in his action against the Presbyterians.
3. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor". (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1) p. cxix. note.
4. Ibid.

intellectual restlessness was likely to cause new embarrassment to his friends. There is a story connected with the "Liberty of Propheying" which is said to have happened about this time. Taylor is reported to have sent his chaplain over to England to buy up all the copies of that book which could be found and then, when they had been sent to him in Ireland, burned every one as a protest against its misuse by the dissenters.<sup>1</sup>

Up to this time Taylor and his family had lived principally in a part of the old fortress of Portmore, but in 1664 Lord Conway rebuilt it on a magnificent scale and the bishop and his family had to find accommodation elsewhere. It cannot have troubled him very greatly for he owned several houses himself. One had a farm of about forty acres attached to it and was called Magheralave; another was Homra House<sup>2</sup> and he is also supposed to have had a cottage by Lough Neagh, as well as a town house in Castle Street, Lisnagarvey, or as it had come to be called Lisburn.

In 1663 the ordinary state of tension and suspicion in which the people of Northern Ireland lived was intensified by the news of a plot against the government. Colonel Thomas Blood, a desperado who gained notoriety in more ways than one, got himself introduced to some of the Presbyterians in Ulster and attempted to persuade them to join him in action against the government.<sup>3</sup> No responsible person would do so and the whole affair was discovered

1. This anecdote is given in a letter from Dr. Lort to Bishop Percy the relevant part of which is printed in Nichols' "Illustrations of Literary History," Vol: 7. p.464. Its probability is strengthened by the fact that at least two post restoration baptist tracts had included copious extracts from the "Liberty of Propheying". See a "Plea for Toleration", by John Sturgeson, a member of the Baptized People". London.1661. Also, "Sions Groans for her Distressed". by Thomas Monck. Joseph Wright, George Hammon, William Jeffery, Francis Stanley. William Reynolds, Francis Smith. 1661. (No place of issue mentioned) Both these tracts are printed in "Tracts on Liberty of Conscience Ed: Underhill. London. 1844. The quotations from Taylor occur on pages 330, 333, 335, 337, 339, 378 and 382.
2. It was two miles to the west of Hillsborough on the Comber road.
3. Lecky, one of the leaders of the Plot was a Presbyterian minister and Blood's brother-in-law. Blood himself at one time professed to be a Presbyterian. Adair states that the Independents were the main supporters of the conspiracy. Adair. "True Narrative" p.270.

by the government and broken up. Blood himself got away to England. Two days before Taylor heard the news of the conspiracy he had found a Mr. John Drysdale back in his diocese from Scotland. Taylor and his brother magistrates, Lord Conway and Major Rawdon, at once jumped to conclusions and had Drysdale arrested though there was nothing to charge him with except a general suspicion that he would be certainly in the plot.<sup>1</sup> They had some thoughts of sending him up to Ormonde but compromised by letting him go on a five hundred pound bail while information about him was passed on to Dublin. Taylor took this opportunity in writing to stress the fact that, in his opinion, there would never be any peace in the countryside while the ejected ministers were allowed to remain.<sup>2</sup> It seems by that time to have become his firm belief that the Presbyterian ministers were rebels who at best were only biding their time. He returned to the same accusation in a letter which he wrote to Ormonde only a little before his death, giving it as his opinion that "the Scotch rebellion was either born in Ireland or put to nurse here"<sup>3</sup>.

With so much discontent and wild talk about it was no doubt difficult for anyone in authority to keep a calm view of things. Taylor failed to do that certainly and in failing, wronged the real local leaders among the Presbyterians. Their attitude of course was one which it was difficult for Taylor to understand. In his view the law enjoined Episcopacy upon all and those who refused to obey dishonoured the government. From dishonouring a government to attempting to overthrow it is but a step. This, together with the knowledge that the Presbyterians were the

1. Adair does not mention any arrest made by Taylor on this occasion. He says "Within three weeks of its (Blood's Plot) breaking up, the whole ministers of Down and Antrim who could be found were in one day apprehended, in the middle of June 1663." "True Narrative". p.276. They were he says "seven in number, viz: Messrs. John Drysdale, John Greg, Andrew Stewart, Alex. Hucheson, William Richardson, Gilbert Kennedy, and James Gordon. (According to Reid, "History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland". Vol: 2. p.279. note: Kennedy is probably a slip for Ramsay) Ibid. p.277. as these arrests would seem to have been made about a fortnight after Taylor's letter they may have been to some extent a consequence of it.
2. Taylor to Ormonde. June 11th. 1663. Carte. MSS. fol. ss.
3. Taylor to Ormonde. Feast of St. Stephen. 1666. Carte MSS. fol. ss.

instigators of the Great Rebellion in England and the ominous reports that were brought to him of what were being said and done in his diocese, convinced him that every Presbyterian was suspect.

## CHAPTER TEN.

The Church of Ireland stood between two fires. On one side of her were the Presbyterians and on the other the Roman Catholics. In some parts of the country one was a greater menace than the other, but always both were present.<sup>1</sup>

Taylor's reverence for catholic antiquity seems sometimes to have been mistaken for a predilection toward Rome. The "Five Letters to Persons changed or tempted to change their Religion" are his earliest examination of the grounds of difference between the two churches. The Gunpowder Plot sermon of his youth had been occupied with the particular problem of what Roman Catholic theologians taught about the obligations of subjects to their princes. The first letter was to a lady who had already gone over and Taylor rebukes her rather sharply for leaving the Church of England at a time of persecution.<sup>2</sup> He goes on to make a strong appeal to her sense of loyalty. He then sets out with perhaps too much violence of contrast the disadvantages of the Church of Rome compared with the Church of England. The lady had passed on some of the questions which had been the means of changing her allegiance. They were not profound and Taylor deals with them a little scornfully. "Where was your church before Luther?"<sup>3</sup> and similar enquiries perhaps deserved no better treatment. But the letter seems too rhetorical to be convincing, though it is possible that if the lady had been converted by the type of question she propounds a confident statement had more power to influence her than argument.

The second letter was also written to a lady but in this case to one who had reversed the process and been converted to the Church of England. The opening phrase is interesting.

1. In 1672 Petty estimated the population of Ireland at 1,200,000 of these 800,000 he classed as Roman Catholics. Of the other 400,000 he thought that a little more than half belonged to the Church of Ireland and the remainder were chiefly Presbyterians and concentrated in Ulster.
2. Works. Vol: 6. p.645.
3. This was a common question for Roman Catholics to put to Protestants. See Walton, "Life of Wotton," "Lives," p.101.

Taylor says, "I bless God I am safely arrived where I desired to be after my unwilling departure from the place of your abode and danger."<sup>1</sup> His visit to this lady had obviously entailed risk and other expressions in the letter indicate that she lived at a distance. The tone of the letter is such as will encourage the recipient to persevere in her allegiance to the church she has joined. Taylor is at particular pains to stress that although Anglicans do not compel their people to use private confession they "advise and commend it".<sup>2</sup>

The other three letters are all to the same person, this time a man who could not make up his mind whether to go over to Rome or not. He had enquired of Taylor whether the Apostles received from Our Lord a tradition of things which were not written down in scripture, and whether the things in which the Roman Church differed from the English Church were due to tradition or innovation. Taylor answers that all that is necessary to salvation is written in the scriptures, and he quotes the fathers to prove his case. It follows from this of course that whatever the Roman Church claims to be necessary to salvation which is not in the scriptures is an innovation. This letter contains a particularly vigorous repudiation of the stories that Taylor himself was going over to Rome.<sup>3</sup> This was written in January but in February the gentleman was still "much troubled" and in "great danger", as Taylor remarks in the short note that is his fourth letter.<sup>4</sup> In March the gentleman wrote two more letters about his difficulties the first of which went astray. The second Taylor answered, this time dealing with the question whether we may adore the Blessed Sacrament. He answers that it depends on what your theology is. If you believe in Transubstantiation then you may. If you hold the true doctrine such as Taylor has explained in his book then you may not.<sup>5</sup>

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.661. The letter is undated but belongs to the period of Taylors ministry in London.
2. Ibid. p.663.
3. Ibid. p.667.
4. Ibid. p.668.
5. Ibid. p.670.

These five letters give us a great part of the knowledge we have of Taylor's actual dealing with the souls that looked to him for guidance. They show him as direct and firm but at the same time full of kindness. But the most complete statement that he ever made of his attitude toward Rome was that which found expression in the two parts of the "Dissuasive from Popery" which was the last great work of his life. The Irish bishops, as soon as they had time to take stock of the national needs, felt that some effort ought to be made to counteract Roman propaganda. In Ireland as well as in England strong efforts had been made during the Commonwealth by the Roman Mission and they had met with success. So the Irish bishops decided that it was time to check "those enemies which had put fire into the bed straw."<sup>1</sup> It was proposed to publish a book against Popery and, after a good deal of discussion about whom should write it, the task was given to Taylor.<sup>2</sup> He was not very eager to accept, for he had never enjoyed controversy, but he could not very well refuse,<sup>3</sup> so, in 1664, he published "A Dissuasive from Popery"

In his preface to the reader Taylor mentions some of the customs in use among Irish Roman Catholics of his day. There was much swearing, especially by St. Patrick's Mass Book, but also by their father's soul and their gossip hand. There were visits to holy wells and the leaving of votive offerings there in the shape of "pins, ribbons, yarn and thread".<sup>4</sup> Fasting was specially severe, abstaining from both eggs and fish in Lent and Keeping a special "fast on Saturdays in honour of Our Lady".<sup>5</sup> When they died they were particularly desirous to be buried "with St. Francis cord about them".<sup>6</sup> If pressed by the parson to come to church their reasons for staying away were more ingenious than truthful, such as "Now they are old and <sup>NEVER</sup> did, or their countrymen do not, or their fathers and grandfathers never did, or that their ancestors were priests and they will not alter

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.172.

2. When the work was decided on Bramhall was alive and he was undoubtedly the ablest anti-roman controversialist in the Anglican communion at that time, but he was too old and too busy for the task.

3. Works. Vol: 6. p.173.

4. Ibid. p.175.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

from their religion."<sup>1</sup> Taylor suspects that the real reason for it lay in the rigid hold, reinforced by fear, which the Roman priests kept on their people.

He tells an odd story of an incident in which he was personally concerned to illustrate the superstition which was really the dominant religion of Ireland. A few months before the time when he was writing he had been very much troubled with petitions about a bell. During the rebellion this had come into the hands of a person of quality who had no intention of giving it up, though he was willing to pay the full value of it if necessary. This was most likely either Colonel Hill or Major Rawdon and Taylor was appealed to by the people because of his friendship with both of them. But he was completely puzzled by their insistence on getting the bell back so he enquired into it. The first reason he was given was that "A dying person in the parish desired to have it rung before him to church, and pretended he could not die in peace if it were denied him".<sup>2</sup> His family had anciently been the keepers of the bell. That seemed to Taylor an unreasonable superstition so he enquired further and found that the bell was really a very powerful piece of magic in the neighbourhood. It was supposed to have fallen from heaven and all oaths sworn upon it were of the greatest sanctity, so it was much in demand. It was used also at funerals for if it was rung before a corpse on its way to the grave it would help the soul out of purgatory. All this produced a respectable little income for the owners.

Taylor does not say what happened to this coveted piece of property but we may be fairly sure that the people never got it back. Taylor blamed the priests and friars for not ridding the nation of this kind of superstition as he did for encouraging the people to keep to Irish. It never seems to have struck him that the people were right in preferring their own language, or that by every principle, and especially those of the Reformation,

1. Works. Vol. 6 p.175.
2. Ibid. p.176.

ministers of religion are bound to teach their flocks in the common tongue. Taylor seems neither to have liked, nor understood, the Irish and it is more unaccountable in his case since he had no personal memory of 1641 to prejudice his outlook.

The three chapters of Taylor's book, correspond to the three charges, increasing in gravity as they proceed, which he brings against the Roman church. That her distinctive doctrines are innovations, that she teaches things, which, either in themselves or in their results are impieties; and, that she teaches many things which are destructive of monarchy and even of christian society in general. The very claim to declare things to be matters of faith, which are not plainly stated to be so, he contends is an innovation and possibly the greatest of them all since it lies at the root of so much else. Among other instances he mentions indulgences. He is willing to admit that certain of the early fathers mention indulgences in the limited sense of remitting a penance imposed by a confessor; but, indulgences, as they were commonly understood during the middle ages, he claims to have no catholic warrant whatsoever. Neither has purgatory, "the mother of Indulgences."<sup>1</sup>

The early church in her prayers recommended the souls of the faithful into the hands of God and prayed that they might find a good resurrection. This kind of prayer for the departed the Church of England has left open, her children may use it or not as they see fit, but prayers for the dead in any other sense are an innovation. As is to be expected Transubstantiation and the "half-communion"<sup>2</sup>, as he called it, are among the list of intruded

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.193. Taylor never seems to have given the Roman Church credit for her persistent attempts to reform the abuses which she was willing to admit did exist in relation to indulgences. This is surprising since he must have been fully aware of what the Council of Trent had said about them. (Sess. xxi. cix.
2. Ibid. p.208. The Roman Church, of course, denies that communion in one kind is half communion. Her theologians argue that by reason of the hypostatic union and of the indivisibility of the glorified humanity of Christ, Our Lord is really present and is received whole and entire under either species alone. See Council of Trent. Sess: XXI. c.iii.

doctrines but, considering Taylor's attitude toward the Irish language expressed only a few pages earlier, it argues some want of self-criticism when he stresses here Rome's wrongdoing in retaining Latin for her liturgy. He is a little sweeping in his next instance of innovating; the adoration of images. With instances quoted from the iconoclastic fathers he would seem to forbid the simple hanging of pictures in churches. The last and strongest of his charges against Rome is against her claim for the Pope's universal power.

The object of this list of accusations is to prove that

"Their religion as it is distinguished from the religion of the Church of England and Ireland, is neither the old nor the catholic religion, but new and superinduced by arts known to all who with sincerity and diligence have looked into their pretences".<sup>1</sup>

The matters dealt with in the second chapter, those which Taylor contents produce impiety, are mostly to do with sin and repentance. Such, for instance, as the teaching that repentance though it must take place some time can be deferred, and, the mechanical use of confession which results in the sinner doing what evil he wishes and trusting to "the circular and never failing hand of the priest"<sup>2</sup> to rid him of his guilt. He takes up again the matter of indulgences to which he had referred in his first chapter as an innovation. This time he studies them chiefly to show their evil effects on morality. That form of probabilism which makes the opinion of one teacher an allowable guide even though it controverts the opinion of the rest of the church, invocation of saints as deliverers,<sup>3</sup> and, exorcism, are also instanced as leading to bad conduct

1. Works. Vol: 6. p.224.

2. Wbid. p.230.

3. Ibid. p.254. Taylor supports this accusation with numerous quotations. He would seem to prove that many Roman Catholic theologians were unguarded in the language they addressed to the saints, but not all, and as usual Taylor does not put the other side. "As far as the words go it is lawful to say "St. Peter pity me, save me, open for me the gate of Heaven'; also "also give me health of body, patience, fortitude" etc. provided that we mean 'Save and pity me by praying for me, grant me this or that by thy prayers and merits'" Bellarmine. "De Laud: Beatif." l.17. See also Sess: XXII. c.iii. of the Council of Trent where it is stated that in Masses celebrated in honour of the saints the sacrifice is to God alone, while from the saint addressed the priest desires prayer and patronage.

The section on exorcism provides some curious reading. Taylor has perused a good many books on this subject some of which had the authority of the Roman church, and some of which, though put out by mediaeval priests, she was not so proud of. He spends five pages analysing these with a good deal of sarcastic and humorous comment, concluding with the remark that, "whatever the devil loses by pretending to obey the exorcist, he gains more by this horrible debauchery of christianity."<sup>1</sup> The last chapter, in which the Roman Catholic teaching which Taylor considers destructive to society is discussed, goes over much the same ground as the Gunpower Plot sermon; dealing with equivocation, the right of the clergy to be exempt from secular authority, and the Pope's power to depose and excommunicate kings.

Throughout the book Taylor is much too prone to accept the common practice of some parts of the Roman Church as her authoritative teaching. It was part of his case that Romanism led to a degraded and superstitious life, but it would have been a much fairer method if he had pointed out what superstitions she encouraged, what she only acquiesced in, and what she condemned. No church ought to be judged solely by the popular practice of the most ignorant of her believers, any more than she has a right to be judged entirely by the devotion of her saints and the most guarded statements of her theologians.

Roman Catholic theologians have never been slow in defence of their doctrines so it was not to be wondered at that such a sweeping attack, coming from such a well-known person, provoked answers. One was written by J. S. (John Sergeant)<sup>1</sup> whose

1. John Sergeant. 1622-1707. Educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. Secretary to Bishop Morton of Durham, for about a year. His researches in the ancient fathers led to his joining the Church of Rome. Studied in the English College at Lisbon, was encouraged to write controversy and did so voluminously for the next forty years. His best known efforts were directed against Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, and Tillotson. "He must doubtless be distinguished from the John Sergeant whose evidence with respect to Oates' Plot was printed by the House of Commons in 1681". "Dic: Nat: Biog:". See "Literary Life of John Sergeant". Ed: Kirk. London. 1816.

activities in Wales had formerly been the occasion of Taylor's writing his "Real Presence"<sup>1</sup> Another of his attackers was an anonymous writer referred to by Taylor as A.L. who published "A letter to a friend touching Dr. Jeremy Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, discovering above an hundred and fifty false or wrested quotations in it". A third was Edward Worsley who wrote and published in 1665<sup>2</sup> under his initials a book called "Truth will Out, or, "The Discovery of some Untruths smoothly told by Bishop Jeremy Taylor". Of them all the third was the most damaging, though Taylor only makes a few references to it and to A.L.'s letter in the "Second part of the Dissuasive" which he wrote to establish his position against Rome and to reply to his critics.

In his epistle to the reader Worsley brings up the old charge of Taylor's reputed pelagianism. More seriously he accuses him of misquoting both the fathers and Roman Catholic divines. His method is to go through the Dissuasive, criticising as he goes; rather than to produce a general line of argument against Taylor, and reoccurring in every chapter like the rhyme in a song, is a section of "The Doctor's quotations not true," "The Doctor's quotations not right", "The Doctor's quotations still amiss". In some cases the mistakes which Worsley pressed home so relentlessly were apparently due to Taylor's quoting as much as he thought fit and neglecting the rest as unimportant. In some cases he seems to have relied more than he ought to have done upon his memory.

Though Taylor left Worsley almost unanswered he dealt very fully with Sergeant's criticism in the Introductions to the "Second Part of the Dissuasive" which occupied the remaining years of his life. The art of vituperation was a very valuable part of the controversial divines equipment in former times. Now that a few centuries have elapsed and there are no longer any

1. The attack on Taylor was added to the second edition of "Sure Footing in Christianity" in the form of "An appendix subverting fundamentally and manifoldly, my Lord of Down's Dissuasive".
2. At Liège. The copy in Durham University Library, obviously belonged to the author.

feelings to be hurt, for it is to be presumed that words have no power to wound a ghost, the student is often grateful for a few pages of ingenious invective since they lighten many volumes of defunct theology. But Taylor is, in general, so beautifully alive that we can well be content with the very little of this lesser inducement which he offers us. The opening of his attack on Sergeant is probably the longest piece of abuse he ever wrote, though it only runs to a page and a half. He refers to the Appendix in which he had been attacked as a 'viper' remarking neatly that though it be "but little, it is a viper still though it hath more tongue than teeth".<sup>1</sup> He then takes the eight ways of attacking the <sup>DISSUASIVE</sup> which Sergeant had used, in their order. They were rather far-fetched and the gist of them all was that Taylor had no real authority for what he said since he admitted that "Scriptures, fathers, councils, reason, history and instances"<sup>2</sup> were all to some extent liable to err. Taylor's retort is simple in essence though going into details as it does it takes up a good deal of space. No person or thing, not even Sergeant himself, is infallible but that does not make it impossible to arrive at a reasonable degree of certainty.

The book which followed this lengthy introduction goes over much the same ground as the first part had covered, though there is a fuller discussion of the authority of scripture; which aims at showing that Anglicanism, in relying solely upon the Bible, built her doctrine on a surer foundation than Rome which relied more fully on the authority of the church. For the rest he was content to dot the i's and cross the t's of his former attack on innovations in general, purgatory, indulgences, "index expurgatorius" auricular confession, Transubstantiation and worship of images. In this last section he defended some of the quotations which had been attacked, in one case by a criticism of Worsley's scholarship

1. WORKS. Vol: 6. p. 289.

2. IBID. p. 299.

which had made εἶδωλον always equal simulacrum whereas Taylor claimed that it could be translated by formula, another by pleading a printer's error. Only the necessity of defending what he had written justified Taylor in producing his Second Part. He had already stated his position against Rome fully and clearly in the first part. Against that, the main criticisms that can be offered are the faulty quotations which his opponents laboured and, what weighs more with us to-day, the tendency to judge Rome by her worst rather than her best. There is no doubt about Taylor's general position. He is as energetic in his defence of reform as he is in his claim to be catholic.

For the last year or two his health had been failing. Lord Conway was eager that he should see Valentine Greatrakes,<sup>1</sup> the stoker and profit by the marvellous healing power which was astonishing England.<sup>2</sup> But Taylor was still an active bishop. For many years the complaint had been all over Ireland that the churches were in ruins. Conditions in Down and Connor were no better than elsewhere, and, though there was not a great deal of money to spare, Taylor had perforce to be a builder. Only one of his churches now remains

1. "Rawdon Papers" p.214.

2. Valentine Greatrakes. 1629-1683. Born of respectable middle class parents, at Affane in the County of Waterford. Was intended for the University but was driven by the troubles of the time into Cromwell's army, where he was a lieutenant in the regiment of the Earl of Orrery. When the soldiers were disbanded in 1657 he retired to his farm at Affane. It was there that he discovered his gift of healing. He was invited over to England in 1666 in order to see if he could help Lady Conway. (Conway Letters. p.247) He failed with her but had tremendous success with others in the neighbourhood and at Worcester and London. Though attacked as an imposter he was modest and apparently successful in his claims. In a pamphlet entitled "The Cloud opened or The English Hero". (Harleian Miscellany. Vol: VI. p.160) an attack upon the Duke of Albemarle, Greatrakes is described as a protégé of the Presbyterians and his power as "intrenching on that prerogative which was conferred by God on -- the kings of England and France to cure by touch". (Ibid) Apart from a short stay in England as a young man, and, two visits to display his healing powers, Greatrakes spent his life in Ireland. There is a considerable pamphlet literature for and against him. The most important is his own "A Brief account of Mr. Valentine Greatrakes" (The name is variously spelled) London. 1666.

in anything like the condition in which he left it, the little church of Ballinderry which Taylor began to build in 1665. To obtain the oak fittings for it he dismantled the chapel of Lough Beg where he had officiated in his early days in Ireland before he became a bishop. He roofed it with slates from Wales. There was nothing very remarkable about it though it was plain and decent. Even this building was deserted and fallen into ruins by 1902 when, by an act of generosity, the church was restored out of honour to Taylor's memory.

Colonel Hill died in 1663 and in the settlement of his estate Taylor became involved in a law suit about a lease with Moses Hill his old friend's son. The cause, with Viscount Conway and the Lord Bishop of Down as the defendants and Moses Hill as petitioner, came before both houses of Parliament in March and April 1666. The only effect of it seems to have been to bring on a dispute between the two houses and the cause itself was left undetermined when Parliament dissolved. Taylor was not the aggressor, but such a quarrel with an old friend's son must have pained him greatly. But the whole history of the Church of Ireland showed that only the most resolute defence of her financial rights could keep them from being alienated. This is another example of Taylor's duty forcing him to act in a way which must have been contrary to his inclination.

His connection with Trinity College, which seems to have given him as much pleasure as anything in Ireland, gave him also some opportunity of helping his friends. He is said to have sent students to study there at his own expense, and, in 1666 he offered to use his influence with the College to obtain for a Mr. Dodwell a dispensation from the statutory obligation on fellows who were M.A. of three years standing to proceed to Holy Orders.

Taylor had to bear one more sorrow in his life, though that came so late that perhaps the full bitterness of it was never known to him. Charles was the bishop's only remaining son. He

was now a young man of twentyfour and had some sort of position in the Duke of Buckingham's household. He died<sup>IN</sup> 1667 and was buried in St.Margaret's, Westminster, on the second of August. It is not clear what his complaint was, though there are indications that it may have been consumption. Nevertheless the romantic imagination at the back of the Jones MSS ascribed his early death to the wild debaucheries into which the Duke of Buckingham had initiated him.

While the son was dying in London the father lay sick in Lisburn. He had visited a fever patient and caught the disease. On the tenth of August, when the bishop had been "very ill for three or four days",<sup>1</sup> Sir George Rawdon wrote to Lord Conway to say that the bishop was that morning a little better than he had been the day before "when the Lord Primate took leave of him".<sup>2</sup> The doctors gave him some hope of recovery. He had been in a violent fever for some days, too ill to make his will, for which there was luckily no necessity as Rawdon had pressed him to this last duty before the illness had grown too severe,<sup>3</sup> though he had "not in all £2,000 to dispose of, of which £600 is for his lady and two daughters".<sup>4</sup> On the thirteenth the bishop died. He had wished to be buried in his new church at Ballinderry, but as that was not yet consecrated he desired his body to be interred in another place of his building. His last words are said to have been "bury me at Dromore".

On the fourteenth Rawdon again wrote to Lord Conway, this time to announce the bishop's death. He "died yesterday about three in the afternoon and hath left a sad family",<sup>5</sup> he wrote. There was no money in the house and "two doctors are from Dublin to be paid and his lady cannot pay them without borrowing".<sup>6</sup> Of the £2,000 he had left £1,500 was in the hands of Lord Donegal and £600 being kept by Lord Conway. Of this £100 would have to be advanced at once if the funeral expenses were to be paid.

1. "Calendar of State Papers for Ireland". Car.2. ccxxiii. No.56. Rawdon to Conway. Lisburn. August 10th.1667.
2. Ibid. The Primate was Archbishop Margetson.
3. Ibid. No.62. Rawdon to Conway. August 14th.1667.
4. Ibid. No.56. Rawdon to Conway. August 10th.1667.
5. Harrie. "History and Antiquities of Ireland"(1764) Vol: 1.p.210. says that Taylor left £10 to the poor of each of the parishes of Dromore, Lisburn and Ballintobber.
6. Ibid. No.62. Rawdon to Conway. August 14th.1667. As will be seen Rawdon's figures are all approximate.

Already a scramble was going on among those who hoped to succeed to his offices. Rawdon, who showed himself now as kind a friend as he had ever been, had put it to the Primate during his visit five days earlier that Dr. Marsh, Taylor's son-in-law, who was then Dean of Armagh, ought to succeed to the bishopric of Down, and Dr. Rust to that of Dromore.<sup>1</sup> Both these people were intimate friends of Taylor and, the succession is what he would have wished himself. Now, while the bishop's body lay in "searcloth"<sup>2</sup> waiting to be buried, Dean Marsh hurried off to Dublin to push his claim to preferment,<sup>3</sup> and, Rawdon wrote to Lord Conway to ask him to use his influence with the Lord Lieutenant both on behalf of Marsh and Rust and to stop any letters which others who sought this preferment might send to London.<sup>4</sup>

Mrs. Taylor was also in Rawdon's mind. At Michaelmas half a year's rent on the bishop's land would be due and Rawdon had been already "very importunate with the Primate and the Lord Chancellor" that these should be paid to the widow.<sup>5</sup> On the thirtyfirst of August, when Rawdon wrote once more to Lord Conway, he had received a letter from the Primate which made him think that all his requests would be granted. It only remained for Lord Conway to use his influence with the King to prevent anyone in England upsetting this plan.<sup>6</sup>

Thieves had taken advantage of the distress in which the bishop's household was plunged, to break into his orchard on the very night of the day he died and steal all his fruit, as well as a quantity of loose timber which was intended for flooring the dining room and was lying there to season.<sup>7</sup> The bishop's body was sent across to Dromore in Rawdon's old coach and there awaited the funeral which was to take place on the Tuesday following Rawdon's

1. "Calendar of State Papers for Ireland" Car.2.cccxxiii. No.56. Rawdon to Conway. Lisburn August 10th.1667.

2. Ibid. No.62 Rawdon to Conway. August 14th.1667. Searcloth = cerecloth = linen smeared with wax or gum.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid. No.87. Rawdon to Conway. August 31st.1667.

6. Ibid.

7. "Calendar of State Papers for Ireland" Car.2.cccxxiii. No.87. Rawdon to Conway. August 31st. 1667.

letter, which would be September the third.<sup>1</sup> So the bishop's last request was granted and his bones were laid to rest in the vault beneath the cathedral he had built. Rust took the funeral service and preached the sermon which he repeated at the memorial service held some days later in Dublin.

The funeral sermon is of great value biographically. Its authority has sometimes been questioned but further research has almost always shown Rust to be in the right. It is also of great eloquence, entirely in Taylor's own style though that was surely a risky thing to do when all those present must have remembered how adept the one whose obsequies they were celebrating had been in this manner. But Rust was worthy of the occasion. A part of his concluding paragraph has been quoted in almost every life of Taylor that has been written since.

"This great prelate he had the good humour of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a school-man, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a counsellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint. He had devotion enough for a cloister, learning enough for an university, and wit enough for a college of virtuosi; and had his parts and endowments been parcelled out among his poor clergy that he left behind him, it would, perhaps have made one of the best dioceses in the world.<sup>2</sup>

Some paragraphs occurring earlier give a less concentrated and therefore more understandable picture. Here he says of Taylor,

"Nature had befriended him much in his constitution; for he was a person of the most sweet and obliging humour, of great candour and ingenuity; and there was so much of salt and fineness of wit, and prettiness of address, in his familiar discourses, as made his conversation have all the pleasantness of a comedy, and all the usefulness of a sermon. His soul was made up of harmony, and he never spake but he charmed his hearer, not only with the clearness of his reason, but all his words, and his very tone and cadences, were strangely musical.

But that which did most of all captivate and enravish was the gaiety and richness of fancy; for he had much in him of that natural enthusiasm which inspires all great poets and orators; and there was a generous ferment in his blood and spirits that set his fancy bravely to work, and made it swell and teem, and become pregnant to such degrees of luxuriance, as nothing but the greatness of his wit and judgment could have kept it within due bounds and measures.<sup>3</sup>

1. Rawdon writing on August 14th refers to his letter of August 10th as written on "Saturday". On August 31st, which would therefore also be a Saturday, he says that Taylor's body is to be buried on the following Tuesday which would be the third of September as stated in the text. Gosse (Jeremy Taylor p.209) gives the date of Taylor's burial as August 21st which is clearly incorrect.
2. Rust, "Funeral Sermon". (Taylor's Works. Vol.: 1) p.cccxxvii.
3. *Ibid.* p. cccxxv.

A little later on he speaks of Taylor's academic acquirements, saying,

"There were very few kinds of learning but he was a MYSTES and a great master in them. He was a rare humanist, and hugely versed in all the polite parts of learning; and had thoroughly concocted all the ancient moralists, Greek and Roman, poets and orators; and was not unacquainted with the refined wits of the later ages, whether French or Italian".<sup>1</sup>

One other literary tribute though of a much poorer kind appeared at Taylor's death. Lemuel Mathews, his chaplain, published in Dublin "A Pandarique (sic) Elegy".<sup>2</sup> All that can be said of it is that no doubt Mathews meant well though there must have been very few chaplains in Ireland who could have written anything worse. No effort was made to raise any other monument to his memory. There is even a story that "About a century after, his bones and those of his friend Rust were disturbed from their vault to make room for another bishop"<sup>3</sup> but that they were piously gathered together again and restored by Bishop Percy. Happily the desecration has been proved by Bishop Mant to be extremely improbable.<sup>4</sup> Between 1713, and, Dr. Percy's appointment in 1781 only one bishop died in possession of the see of Dromore. That was Dr. Marley who died suddenly in Dublin on the thirteenth of April, 1763. Though his burial place has not been discovered his lineal descendant in Mant's day was sure that it could not have been Dromore. The story is itself later than Bishop Percy's time. His domestic chaplain when asked about the incident at a later date had no recollection of the happening itself nor of any reference being made to it by the bishop. Obviously tradition has been muddying the pure stream of history again.

No record was kept of the place where Taylor's body was laid. It was always supposed to have been under the Altar and when, early in the nineteenth century, the vault there was opened, a leaden coffin with the initials J.T. on the lid was discovered,

1. Rust, "Funeral Sermon." (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p.cccxxv.
2. "A Pandarique (sic) Elegie upon the death of the R.R.Father in God, Jeremy, Late Lord Bishop of Doune, Connor and Dromore. by Le Mathews, A.M. a sacr. domest." Dublin. etc.
3. Heber. "Life of Jeremy Taylor." (Taylor's Works. Vol: 1.) p. cxxi. He drew his information from the Jones. MS.
4. Mant. "History of the Church of Ireland." Vol: 1. p.673.

and assumed to be that of Taylor. In 1827, through the efforts of Bishop Mant and his clergy, a white marble monument, bearing on either side of the inscription a crosier and above it a sarcophagus surmounted by a Bible and a mitre, was erected in Lisburn Cathedral. Bishop Mant himself wrote the epitaph. It is a florid eulogy of Taylor.

Ever since he began to write Taylor's literary output had been very large, so that there could not have been a great deal left unpublished at his death. The "Second Part of the Dissuasive" was in the press when he died and a number of sermons, which had been issued as pamphlets when they were first preached, were afterwards given a more permanent form. Apart from these there are only two writings of which we have certain knowledge. One was the "Discourse upon the Beatitudes"<sup>1</sup> which the bishop was actually writing when his final illness overtook him. This unfinished manuscript never seems to have been printed. The other was a small tract entitled "The Reverence due to the Altar". The manuscript of this little work was unknown until it was discovered in the early part of the nineteenth century in the library of Queen's College, Oxford, and printed first as a separate booklet and afterward in Heber's edition of Taylor's works. It is conjectured to belong to the years when Taylor was in residence at All Souls College. If this is so it has the considerable interest belonging to it of being the first known writing of his that we possess. Taylor's signature was not attached but the handwriting, the vocabulary, the cast of thought, all proclaim it to be his. It is in letter form, addressed to someone who desired "An account of those reasons which move the Church in her addresses to the place of public worship, but especially the Altar, to adore God Almighty with lowly bendings of the body".<sup>2</sup> The argument which is stated briefly, with very little development, takes the form of asserting that the Altar is to be revered as the place of God's special presence and,

1. Rust mentions this in his sermon. Taylor's Works. Vol: 1. p.cccxxiv.
2. Taylor's Works. Vol: 5. p.317.

though this is not explicitly formulated, the implication is of God's presence in the Eucharist. This is reinforced by reference to the practice of the early church. Possibly the manuscript survived because Taylor had some idea of publishing. It would be a suitable thing for Laud's chaplain to do at a time when the new regulations about the position of the Altar were provoking comment.

Coleridge in a hastily jotted note once criticised his generation for allowing a manuscript volume of Jeremy Taylor's sermons to lie unpublished when so much ephemeral rubbish found its way through the press.<sup>1</sup> Probably he had in mind the Jones MS, which were not sermons at all but odd notes which Heber's use of them had made known. If there were any unpublished sermons extensive enquiries made by the present writer have failed to bring them to light.

1. S. T. Coleridge "Omniana." (1888 Ed.) p.365.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN.

From the meagre accounts of those who knew Taylor, and, from the indications of his personality which we draw from his works, it is possible to put together a fairly complete picture of what the man himself must have been. All agree that he was strikingly handsome, an advantage of which he seems to have been fully aware, for it was his common practice to adorn his books with his portrait. The one published with "Eniautos" shows him in his prime. The face is oval with large vivacious eyes set beneath a wide brow, there is a well shaped nose and a finely curved mouth. His hair curls gracefully from beneath a closely fitting skull cap. The cumbrous and sombre garments of a divine, which he is wearing, serve to emphasise the more than usual facial beauty. It is the portrait of someone who is both sensitive and high<sup>ly</sup> intelligent, and, one who is almost certain to be an artist in one medium or another. Taylor was of a very good height and had a charming manner. It was the comment of nearly all those who recorded their impression of his preaching that the grace of his appearance and delivery matched the grace of his style.

His personal attractiveness was not limited to the pulpit. Alcock, his secretary, said that it was a pleasure to hear him speak even to common people. Among his intimates he had that same humour and gaiety of conversation which, in the generation before his own, had endeared the character of Bishop Andrewes to <sup>many</sup> who did not love his opinions. For many years of his life Taylor associated with some of the most polished society in Britain. No one who was welcomed into and retained his place in such company could be without personal gifts, though, in Taylor's case, these might never have reached their full development if the exercise of them had been limited to the narrow circle of college society and a country vicarage. But just at the most critical years of his life, when he might have settled down a good, dull, learned man, he was thrust into the wider world of the King's army and Golden Grove, and the friendships he

formed there working upon a naturally quick-witted and good tempered disposition produced the polished divine.

Taylor's life is a record of friendships, none of which were ever marred by a serious quarrel or ended except by time or distance. The unfortunate thoughtlessness which dedicated to Duppa a book which he had not read, did, considerably irritate that good man; but it produced no bitterness, and in no way injured the respect and love which each had for the other. Right until the last years of his life there is only one trace of a grudge with anyone. In that case however it must be admitted that Taylor found it hard to forgive Sheldon his opposition to Laud's bestowal of the All Soul's Fellowship. That was perfectly understandable. Taylor, a young and ambitious man, had just had his feet planted on the bottom rung of the ladder by a patron who had the power and, apparently, the wish to help him climb. It would be difficult for most men not to harbour some resentment against one who, in face of every one else's agreement, opposed his advancement. But Taylor and Sheldon were both too good to let a difference of this sort rankle overlong.

Taylor's disagreement with Jeans can hardly be looked upon as a personal quarrel. It was a clash between two theological points of view rather than between two men. Remarkable as it may seem, in a day when personal animosities were many and bitter, Taylor had to wait until the end of his life and go to Ireland before he found an enemy. This fact alone speaks eloquently for his personal charm.<sup>1</sup>

The same society which did so much to help his development in one direction, also hindered it in another. Because of it Taylor never had that wide acquaintance with all classes of

1. Adair's character of Taylor shows us how he appeared to the opposite side. "There was set in the Bishoprick of Down and Connor, one Dr. Taylor, a man pretending civility and some courteous carriage especially before his advancement, but whose principles were contrary to Presbyterians — not only in the matter of government, modes of worship and discipline but also in doctrine. He had sucked in the dregs of much of Popery, Socinianism, and Arminianism, and was at heart enemy not only to Nonconformists but also to the Orthodox." "True Narrative". p.244-5.

people which he would ordinarily have gained if he had continued to fulfil the normal duties of a parish priest. Consequently, in his sermons, there is a complete lack of those homely intimate little stories of everyday people which some of the Puritan preachers could use with such good effect. He knew two sections of life well, the rest but little. The society to be found in universities, in a great country house and among the Loyalist congregations in London dominated his experience. In none of these spheres did he have much to do, either with the middle, or working, classes and the fact that he began life in a barber's shop never seems to have drawn him towards them. Consequently his writings lack a certain width and humanity. He could draw one or two types exquisitely, but he could not, as Bunyan did, people a highway with all the diversities of human kind. This lack of experience was not compensated for by the nature of his genius.

A similar narrowness of outlook was a defect which seems to have been common to most of the High Anglicans of that day. They understood the spiritual needs of the Hall excellently, but not many of them had any other message for the shop and the cottage than <sup>that</sup> the dwellers therein should, as far as was practicable, model themselves on the Hall. Such a restricted point of view was not all loss. It left its holders free to develop as far as they wished that literary art and learning in which they delighted. If Taylor had been habitually set to preach to middle class congregations it is doubtful if we should have had the unique treasure of "Eniautos", to permanently enrich our language.

Taylor's surroundings entirely suited his nature. He absorbed learning easily and reproduced it as easily. Certain forms of beauty he loved passionately and his auditors welcomed him in the artistic presentation of them. These beauties he found principally in books, but now and then he came across them in a garden, in some aspect of nature, or in the intimacies of family life. He never spoke with any clarity about his wife and children, but little domestic cameos with no names attached decorate his work with some frequency. Judging from these he would seem to have had a very

happy family life, which, together with the unusual calm of his religious experience, produced that inner serenity which is so noticeable a feature of all his writings. There is nothing whatever resembling egotism in his life. He was totally dependent upon the effect his abilities might have upon those in power for any advancement which he might gain; since he had, by origin, no powerful connections. That he had great powers he must have known perfectly well and yet, so far as we can learn, he never scrambled for preferment. When he wrote that sad letter to Sheldon asking that he might be removed from Down and Connor it was relief from an intolerable position for which he begged, not a better diocese.

His courage was almost as great as his modesty. Change in his circumstances produced no word of complaint from him. The shipwreck of all his fortunes at the beginning of the civil war merely left him with the determination to begin again and, without books or help as he was, produce something by which he might be remembered in after ages. Years of hard work not very lavishly rewarded followed upon this resolve. Imprisonment, misunderstanding, loss of the little fortune which his wife had brought him and, what he felt more keenly, the loss of his quiet - none of these abated his sense of God's goodness or forced him into peevishness. A book of moral theology seemed to him to be needed and his wide reading in that subject appeared to fit him for the **task**, so he set himself to its accomplishment though the deliberate restraint of his artistic faculties must have been at least as formidable to him as any of the other difficulties involved. During the civil wars so far from being timid his conduct might at times seem rash. The loyalest of men might have thought it unnecessary to exhibit his sentiments by dedicating a book to the King who had just been executed, or by a vigorous attack on the religious favourites of a government which seemed at the height of its power. But Taylor never forgot that he had been a chaplain to Laud and to the King and was forever bound in duty to them. That some parts of the "Liberty of Propheying" did not please the King must have given him great pain, for all the talk of toleration which

was in the air when he wrote would lead him to suppose that his point of view would be sympathetically received. From beginning to end of the civil wars his political opinions were never for one second in doubt.

There seem to be extraordinarily few failings to set against so many virtues. Taylor has been accused of flattery and it is true that he produced many dedications, a species of composition in which adulation is hard to avoid. Yet judged by the standard of his time, the only one applicable, such a charge is hard to substantiate. It was an age of compliment and Taylor paid many graceful ones, which were designed to appeal as much to the artistic sense of the recipient as to his self-love. There is no trace in them of the crude vulgarity with which Disraeli cynically heaped his trowel. A more serious and more easily proved charge is that of unfairness in controversy. This shows itself particularly in the two volumes of his "Dissuasive from Popery" where, instead of occupying the far stronger position which would have been his had he placed Romanism in its best light and dealt temperately with it; he was content, in addition to picking out and demolishing a few local absurdities, to repeat the often made Protestant charges without adequately considering the Roman defence. So many theologians, in so many different ages and countries, have taken upon themselves the explanation of the Roman faith that foolish arguments and unworthy teachings are sure to abound. Taylor was certainly not the best critic of the Roman position which Anglicanism has called forth. The fault which Chillingworth mentioned in his early days handicapped him to the end. He could neither listen to the other side long enough, nor sufficiently respect its conclusions. This is the fault of many quick thinkers and ready speakers and does not necessarily imply an intolerant disposition.

Inconsistency is another fault with which he is frequently charged and with much truth. Isolated extracts from his works prove almost nothing about what was in the main the balance of his opinion since he was always ready to revise his views as some new piece of study showed him another facet of the truth. At all times

he consistently and utterly repudiated the Calvinistic theories of sin and Predestination, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but it would not be easy to find any other major theological position to which he adhered throughout his life with complete wholeheartedness.

Nothing in his life suggests that he possessed that cool and judicial habit of mind which befits the controversialist. He was a generous-hearted man who inherited some of his positions from his teachers and reached a good number of the rest by way of his emotions. Taylor's attitude toward Rome was one which he shared with most of the Laudians. These found the Church which most approximated to their ideal in the first three or four centuries. Rome, they held, had corrupted the purity of the tradition to which the early times had clung and to which it was the mission of Anglicanism to bring the world again. This tradition could be explained, but ought not to be added to, and yet Rome had been so false to her trust as to continually add to a system of order and teaching which were essentially simple. In the first three centuries Taylor and his contemporaries found the two great Sacraments, a ministry of bishops, priests and deacons and a reverence for the church as the Body of Christ. They could not assure themselves that they found papal supremacy, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgences, and many minor points on which the Church of Rome set great value. Anglicanism therefore repudiated these things, or placed them in a far less important light than did the Romanists.

It is essential to the understanding of the Laudians, and those who sympathized with them, to realize that they did not reach their position by way of premeditated compromise, a concession here to Protestantism and there to Catholicism, so that they might appeal to reasonable men on both sides. They came to it by way of study, in the ages of the church which seemed to them the purest they found such and such things. To these things therefore they would hold, rejecting all later accretions. Such a resolve placed them midway between the extreme Protestant and Roman Catholic positions. It had all the advantages and disadvantages of the deliberately sought compromise which it was not. It lay very open to attack.

Rome could argue that if the church is the spirit-guided Body of Christ it will necessarily, as times goes on, develop many things which were only latent in its early teaching since it was not deserted after the first centuries by its promised guide. Protestants, on the other side, could argue that decay had set in long before the Laudians were willing to allow; those who wished for a pure church must seek it nearer to the times of Christ. On both these fronts the High Churchmen fought a long and successful fight in which Taylor was a leader. They staked their whole position on learning. They were willing to bring everything to the test of the primitive, catholic, rule which Vincent of Lerins had laid down and this necessitated a scholarship both wide in its range and minute in its attention to detail.

The amazing extent of Taylor's learning has already been commented upon, but many lesser men had read almost as widely. Selden once remarked that "all agree that we have never had a more learned clergy",<sup>1</sup> though another saying of his shows that he had only theological learning in mind.<sup>2</sup> Taylor did not differ from his contemporaries in being, as a rule, uncritical in his scholarship. He seems, for instance, fairly certain that the Athanasian Creed was not written by Athanasius<sup>3</sup> but he is quite willing to attribute the Apostles' Creed to the apostles.<sup>4</sup> As time went on learned men grew more and more inclined to compare texts in order to arrive at the most trustworthy reading, to estimate the importance of different sources, to judge the value of various traditions.

With all this deference to reason and learning the Laudians had a great reverence for the historic continuity of the Church. If they objected to Rome because she inserted things which did not belong to the true line of descent, they objected to Puritanism because it broke away from the traditional church altogether. In such matters as liturgical worship, for instance, the extreme

1. "Table Talk: Chap: xxi. Par: 5.
2. Ibid. Chap: lxxix. Par: 2. and 3.
3. Works. Vol: 5. p. 407.
4. Ibid. p.371.

Protestants wished to make a clean break and either begin again with forms of their own devising, or leave everyone untrammelled by any forms whatsoever. Taylor and his friends retorted by upholding the Prayer Book as a form of worship approaching the ideal, for it was catholic in that it accepted all that was best in the church's traditional worship and it was reformed in that it had purged all mediaeval errors.

In the general cast of his mind Taylor was at one with the Anglicans of his time. Even when, in the interests of his plea for toleration, he reduced the essentials of religion to a very great simplicity he was not unique among churchmen as has sometimes been supposed. He was but following in the footsteps of Hooker, accompanied by a good many of his contemporaries. His likeness and indebtedness to Chillingworth has already been indicated.

It is perhaps an unavoidable evil that a number of men sharing a common trend should be given a common name and classed as a school, but it is a habit which can be most misleading. If the use of the word 'Laudian' or the phrase 'Anglo Catholic' is taken to mean a group of men whose doctrines upon everything except the minutest points was in agreement a serious mistake is made. The thing which bound them together was a common point of view not a common theology or a common teacher. With this in mind it is not surprising when we find that Taylor's doctrine differed in a number of ways from the complete Catholic position, and that in some directions he had clear affinities with what was later on called Latitudinarianism. In this connection Taylor's early acquaintance with Chillingworth and his close friendship with Henry More are significant. According to Baxter, More was the leader of this group who "were mostly Cambridge men, Platonists or Cartesians, and many of them Arminians with some addition".<sup>1</sup> When Taylor was in Ireland he was an eager student of Des Cartes, references to Plato lie scattered thickly throughout his works and of his Arminianism there

1. 'Autobiography of Richard Baxter.' (Ed: Lloyd Thomas) p.177.

can be no doubt.

The study which we have attempted to make of his eucharistic theology will partly illustrate his Catholic side. In his continual emphasis on the sacrificial element in the Eucharist and his consequent insistence that the Anglican minister is in a true sense a sacrificing priest he was above most Laudians, in his views on the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament he was below them. Similarly, not all those who upheld Episcopacy as a practical system would have been so emphatic and clear in their assertion of its divine origin. In his wholehearted love for the ancient liturgies and in his desire for beauty of worship in his own day, Taylor was completely Catholic. On his Latitudinarian side his insistence on the paramount claims of reason, his willingness to tolerate all who would make themselves tolerable; his inability to accept the infallibility of either the scriptures or councils and his consistent, as well as complete, repudiation of the Calvinistic theories of predestination and original sin stand out in clear relief. But Taylor was not a man with a divided mind, keeping an uneasy allegiance to two schools, for there was not yet two schools.<sup>1</sup> Everything tended to keep together men who might otherwise have emphasised one side of their teaching to the detriment of the other. The rigidity of Puritanism and Romanism on either hand drove into the centre men who claimed their right to hold fast to tradition and, at the same time, to test it by an appeal to reason. Chillingworth and Laud both wished the Church of England to be truly catholic and, at the same time, to leave her free to make her own philosophical justification in accordance with such facts as unhampered learning should discover. Later on, as more emphasis was placed on either the historical or the rationalistic side, two schools which drifted ever wider and wider apart began to form. Incidents, purely political, helped on the process. The English Church, debilitated by the loss of the Nonjurors and by the decrease in influence which the high church clergy suffered as a consequence of their attachment to the House of Stuart, became

1. There was a considerable friendship between Laud and Hales. See Laud's Works. Vol: 6. p.120.

Latitudinarian. But this parting of the ways had not come in Taylor's time, nor were those who were most Latitudinarian yet without spiritual depth and fervour, though already some of them had exhibited that leaning toward Socinianism which was to develop disastrously later on. Of this heresy Taylor himself has not gone unaccused.<sup>1</sup> But in Chillingworth and More and their friends the motive was high and the purpose austere. They were occupied with the search for truth rather than the pursuit of happiness which seemed such a satisfying occupation to their successors. To say merely that Taylor was catholic or rationalistic and thus assign him to a party, is to state only half the truth about him. He was both, but he certainly did not look upon himself as belonging to two different camps. Probably Taylor never attempted to refine upon his intellectual position. He was for the reformed Anglican Church against both Romanism and Puritanism - that is all he recognized. For him the chief stress was not to be laid upon the intellectual but upon the moral side of religion and the highest branch of theology was that which taught men how to live aright.

He was admirably fitted by nature to carry out his own principles. His grace of style, the imaginative faculty and the depth, if restricted range, of that sympathy which underlay his literary gifts helped to place him among the greatest of devotional writers and the most valued confessors. It was in these spheres that he gave the Church of England his greatest service. There was enough theology and theologians, it was devotion that was needed and devotion that should be as catholic and reformed as the Church itself. Not everyone who wishes to can produce devotional literature that is both adequate and original, it needs great art as well as great and infectious holiness. The writer who possesses all these gifts

1. That he was called a Socinian by the Ulster Presbyterians may perhaps be considered only as proof that his theology differed from theirs, but Coleridge was admired Taylor greatly, placing him with Bacon, Shakspeare and Milton, as one of the four great geniuses of the English language, thought him "half a Socinian in heart". S.T. Coleridge. "Table Talk." June 4th. 1830.

together possesses genius. Taylor's drawbacks as a theologian, his too great elaboration of argument and a certain amount of inconsistency, could not operate to the injury of his devotional work. There argument was not so much needed as manifold illustration and vivid restatement of a few simple truths. A devotional teacher will do no harm to his subject no matter how long he may dwell upon it if he can continue to show it in a new light. In one case the aim is to convince, in the other to attract. Since the facts that underlie the pursuit of holiness are not many consistency is put to no great test.

When Anthony a Wood said that Taylor was esteemed the perfect artist he said as much about him as could be put into so few words. The artist in Taylor was always greater than the theologian. It might be interesting to speculate what kind of literature he would have produced if, when he took his degree at Cambridge, he had gone to court in some minor post and associated with the London wits instead of entering the church and associating with the Oxford clergy. But immediately that line of thought is checked by the conviction that Taylor never could have done anything else but enter the church. He was a born christian, a born priest and a born preacher. There is not one story in the brief accounts which survive of him which suggests that he was anything other than holy in character from beginning to end. The marvel is that one so good and so artistic should have been so robust. His love of goodness never degenerated into priggishness any more than his love of beauty ran off into affectation.

When we say that he had a love of beauty it is necessary to limit the meaning of the word to some extent, for not all beauty found him immediately responsive. The broad face of nature, the grandeur of mountains, the awe to be found in a great storm or in the aroused sea did not appeal to him much. It was in all the minutiae of creation that he had such a loving delight. A blossoming rose, the tendrils of a vine, the flashing of light from the ruffled surface of water, a lark in flight, the sheen on the

breast of a dove, or the little wavy marks which the tide makes on the sand; were all things which he was capable of describing with an inspired rapture, because he had observed them with the most sympathetic attention. He could play with such things with the most delicate fancy and ennoble them with striking and musical language.

Linguistically it was an age of borrowing. The intellect of the day was demanding forms of expression which the language itself could not furnish. A son of his time Taylor borrowed and, to some extent, coined the words he needed. But the years have dealt very well with Taylor's vocabulary on the whole. Certainly his language is not so obsolete as Milton's even if it is not so free from dead words and phrases as Baxter's. No one need be excessively puzzled by Taylor. Anyone who reads a page or two of his writing soon becomes familiar with the meaning of such words as 'deturpated' for deformed; 'immorigerous' for disobedient; 'intenerate', to soften; 'paranymp'h', a bridesmaid or lady's maid; 'stultiloquy' for foolish talking. It is a little more confusing when he uses a fairly common English word according to its Latin or Greek etymology, and contrary to its normal development, as, for instance, 'insolent' meaning unusual, 'extant figures' meaning figures in relief, or speaks of an 'excellent pain' when he means a pain that is very severe.

A habit of Taylor's which draws attention to itself is his peculiar fondness for giving a plural form to an abstract noun, such as 'strengths', 'tolerations', 'prudencies'. He also used the comparative degree to express a state just short of the greatest, as for example, "the Libyan lion drawn from his wilder foragings". When we have added to these idiosyncrasies a love of pairs of adjectives, almost as great as that which animated the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer, and a knack of sometimes compressing his metaphors to the point where they are so concentrated as to be almost ridiculous, Taylor's worst tricks of style have been mentioned.

The type of wit which Andrewes indulged in, consisting

in the torturing of words until they yielded up as many different meanings as possible is comparatively rare in Taylor; but he had, what was often considered a part of wit, the capacity to seize upon and bring out, the affinities of things.<sup>1</sup> It was this gift which in De Quincey's<sup>2</sup> opinion placed him with Burke among the greatest of rhetoricians. Taylor is never willing to leave his subject alone. He plays with it, presents it first in this light and then in that, ornaments it with all his gifts of thought and fancy and it is not until it has had lavished upon it all that he considers either arresting, interesting, or beautiful that he is willing to pass on. It is this habit of mind which dictates his style and makes his sentences one impetuous, "thought-agglomerating flood".<sup>3</sup>

Long as the sentences are into which this way of thinking betrayed him, their length in no way obscured their meaning. This is chiefly because they consist of a series of short statements about the same subject, strung together by the word 'and'. It would be quite possible to repunctuate Taylor's work and without altering a single word, reduce his sentences to a modern brevity. Taylor's language comes with a rush and the effect upon the reader is to hurry him forward as if he were borne upon wings. The style swoops and soars with the freedom and strength of a bird. There is a joy which in some places rises into ecstasy in Taylor's writings and most of all in the sermons. Hazlitt spoke of "the glad prose of Jeremy Taylor"<sup>4</sup> and as usual he had the right adjective. The loveliest fancies, the most musical cadences are joined in his happiest efforts. It is this joyous prodigality of beauty which is the chief attraction of Taylor's decorated style. No one else ever came quite near it.

The seventeenth century England had two of her greatest writers of ornate prose living, Taylor and Sir Thomas Browne.

1. Dr. Johnson defines wit as "A combination of dissimilar images, or the discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike". See Johnson's "Dictionary".
2. De Quincey. "Essay on Rhetoric", passim.
3. S. T. Coleridge. "Miscellanies" (London, 1892) p. 181.
4. Hazlitt. "Spirit of the Age" (Oxford 1928) p. 41.

Each offers points of similarity and dissimilarity. As far as grammar was concerned, Browne preferred to construct his sentences on the Latin model, Taylor hardly troubled to construct them at all. He seemed to write with speaking in view and trusted to the tone and inflection of voice to carry off a change of tense and to link the proper noun to the proper verb. Both were masters of rhythm and both lavished all the power of their imagination on the ornamentation of their themes. But Taylor had a spontaneity and freedom which Browne had not. Browne's sentences are more like a solemn procession following a magistrate or a bier, Taylor's like a wedding train.

Richly ornamented as his style is the ornamentation is never superfluous. The images which he elaborates, as well as those which he is content to leave undeveloped do really bring the reader a little nearer<sup>to</sup> the heart of Taylor's thought. That this thought, when apprehended, is in reality very weak is an old charge against him. Coleridge referred to it in his famous description of Taylor's prose as 'a ghost in marble'.<sup>1</sup> While it is true that, apart from the concept and style, nothing in itself very original is to be found in Taylor's work it is also to be remembered that we are nowhere promised any such things by the author himself. His mission, as he saw it, was to teach men the plain way of holiness, not to indulge in any deep philosophical discussion or propound any startling theme. Taylor may have been without the ability to do either of these things, certainly in the "Liberty of Propheying" and in the discussion on Original sin provoked by "Unum Necessarium" he showed no such gifts but it must continually be borne in mind that Taylor's style was admirably created for the purpose to which he put it, the inculcating, and encouraging people to the practice of the ordinary teachings of the Christian religion. For this purpose, argument, appeal, the compelling phrase, the arresting word are all brought into operation.

Keble drew an interesting comparison between Burke's famous

1. S. T. Coleridge. "Letters". Nov. 3rd. 1814.

passage on the Queen of France at Versailles and the sentence in which Taylor speaks of "the strange evenness and untroubled passage" of Lady Garbery's life to illustrate the difference between the rhetorical and the poetical mind. Burke deliberately speaks for a certain premeditated effect. Taylor says what he has in his mind in the way most natural to him, he would have probably clothed his thought in much the same words if he had never been called upon to give it public utterance.<sup>1</sup>

This is no doubt true, to an extent, Taylor did produce beautiful prose with extraordinary facility, but it does not mean that he paid no attention to what he had to say, and never stopped to polish. The parallel between the image and the idea he wished to present is generally too sustained to be entirely spontaneous. In this as in many other of Taylor's loveliest passages the basis is one simple observed fact, in this case the out going life, the tide merges itself in the ocean, the ocean blends with the infinite. It illustrates excellently the strength and the weakness of Taylor's mind, for it is an idea that nine out of ten preachers walking upon the seashore on a calm evening and meditating upon life and death would be likely to hit upon, but, for those nine, the temptation to spin out the parallel and moralise upon it would have been too great. Taylor describes what he sees in language which is both exact and stimulating and compresses the image to the point where it seems one with the idea suggested. This fusion of thought and image is undoubtedly a poetic characteristic.

The habit of constant enrichment has brought down upon Taylor's style the condemnation of being over gaudy. No criticism could be more blundering. Style to be good must achieve its purpose and will to some extent resemble its purpose. It would be absurd to embellish the directions on a fire alarm; but the prose which is designed to appeal to all the complex body of emotions which are bound up in religion will probably be no less effective if it employs a variety of presentment and decoration. Taylor's feeling for words

1. Keble. "Praelectiones". Annis. M.D.cccxxxii.  
The third Lecture. passim.

was very much akin to his feeling for concrete loveliness, they were things beautiful in themselves not merely as symbols. An arresting phrase presented itself to his mind as a miniature picture and, an old word of this kind was no more to be despised because of its age and rareness, than an old painting. For us, with less imagination and less knowledge, the effect is not the same; but Taylor's prose is so rich in fancy, so full of light and colour, that it is beyond the power of obsolete phrases to clog it. In general the most admired of Taylor's effects are gained by carefully selected, carefully wrought images, by language both striking and musical, in which alliteration is not disdained and by an underlying vivacity of mind.

All this helps to justify the common description of Taylor as the Shakspeare of English prose. It was Mason who, in one of his later letters to Gray, first bestowed upon him this flattering comparison and it has since been quoted with all the frequency which such an attractive piece of adulation would be likely to win. Yet such a justification is not enough. Shakspeare is the greatest of English poets because both in mind and heart he was greater than all others, not merely because he had greater gifts of expression and loved some kinds of beauty. Taylor lacked completely all the things which made the real Shakspeare. In love for humanity merely because it is human, in the ability to understand and reproduce a vast diversity of types, in the power to express the whole of some great personality in the stress of overwhelming emotion, Taylor is quite wanting. He rarely personified his argument, the different people whose troubles are mentioned in "Ductor Dubitantium" are not so much personalities as casuists counters, signifying some dilemma, or knotty point in morality, which the writer proposes to solve.

Certain characters Taylor not only failed to understand but was quite out of sympathy with, sinners for instance. Many preachers of righteousness have regarded them with that stricken love which thinks no sacrifice too great for the redemption of men fallen through weakness or ignorance. Taylor would speak in the conventional way about the fascination of sin, while all the time he was unable

to understand how anyone could find it fascinating. An evilliver was either deplorably weak or deliberately wicked. Good men were, of course, trapped by temptation now and then or puzzled in their consciences, just as they were often slack and needed to be roused. It was to fulfil these purposes that he wrote and preached. But Taylor never seems to have found the man himself interesting. It was what he might be rather than what he was which was dominant in the mind. This is not the fault of all preachers.

Anyone who reads a page of Taylor and then a page of Donne feels himself in two totally different intellectual countries. The two have entirely dissimilar conceptions of man and his saviour. Taylor is not, like Donne, perpetually awed by the immensities of God, Heaven and Hell. His aim is clear and his subject well within this power. There is no mystery and limited, if clear, vision. They differed in genius and experience. Taylor's life had always been well approved and godly. Donne had been a sinner and realised the awfulness and narrowness of his escape, if indeed he had escaped. He knew and could sympathise with all the distortion of purpose with which the strong desires of the flesh can harass the soul; Taylor understood best those, who, like himself, were christian by inheritance but who felt the need to lay a firmer hold on what they had received. Unbelief had attracted him as little as sins of the flesh, neither did he for the sake of the intellectual certainty it gave him start from the position of the atheist and think his way up as Baxter deliberately did.<sup>1</sup> The famous moral demonstration, beautiful though it be, is such a thing as faith would devise to strengthen itself rather than reason create for its own conviction. Taylor never understood the doubts and fears which may attack even the best intentioned; or that, with perfect honesty, a certain type of mind finds it hard to believe.

Very frequently a comparison is made between the genius of Taylor and Milton, possibly with the feeling that as they both

1. "Autobiography of Richard Baxter." (Ed: Lloyd Thomas)  
p. 26.

belonged to the same age and were on opposite sides each may fitly represent his party. They are by no means the best persons for that purpose and the comparison is more interesting for the dissimilarity than otherwise. In a long and eloquent passage Coleridge placed these two side by side, but after several paragraphs of differences the only likenesses he could discern were; that both were good men, both wrote in favour of intellectual liberty, both had learning and genius and wrote hymns, both endeavoured to forward the cause of education by the production of a Latin Accidence.<sup>1</sup> Such similarities, it is readily seen, are not important.

These things do however serve to emphasise Taylor's very great originality, a point which few of his biographers seem sufficiently <sup>to</sup> appreciate. He was an innovator in both the concept and the style of his books. It does not injure his claim in this respect that he used rhetorical images which were common property, for he remade them in a way which converted them into his own. He was one of the first to write a whole treatise on religious liberty, a life of Christ in English, and the first to write in English and on his own plan a complete manual of casuistry. There is proof enough in these facts of his originality. No one ever wrote like Taylor before and, though Rust in his funeral sermon produced one creditable imitation, no one else has written like him since. Possibly his isolation helped him to bring this about for, apart from the Matchless Orinda, Taylor seems to have been outside contemporary literary influences of a secular nature until he formed his acquaintance with Evelyn. It is noteworthy that from that time onward he tended more and more to avoid his characteristic exuberance and to bring his prose more into line with the increasing fashion for plainness.

There were many in his time who shared the same sincerity that possessed Taylor and had a similar high purpose. There were some who, like him consciously sought to make their prose

1. Coleridge. S.T., "Apologetic Preface to Fire, Famine and Slaughter".

beautiful, but none who could match the loveliness of their thought with such a prodigality of noble language. In ways of expression, in choice of words Taylor was unique. The nature of Taylor's prose and the usefulness of his devotional writings have together ensured his survival. His devotional books, alone, could not have perpetuated his fame among more than a small circle; though they kept it alive when his style, by itself, was unpopular. Style, and the practical usefulness of his better known writings have spared Taylor's reputation the vicissitudes which the names of many of his great contemporaries have undergone.

Yet it is frequently said that Taylor has been neglected. The lament will not bear looking into. Throughout the generation which succeeded his own, when in the natural course of things his reputation might have been expected to wane, his works continued to be, in the modern phrase, best sellers. In the middle of the eighteenth century when literary ideals were anything but the same as Taylor's, Warburton, Gray and John Wesley, to name adverse types, were not sparing in their praise. With the appearance of the romantic school, the chorus of Taylor's admirers rises more loudly still. Coleridge, De Quincey, Christopher North, Hazlet and Thackeray were all enthusiastic in their praise. More than one complete edition of his works was published then and separate books printed and reprinted. There has been very little falling off in this interest since. It would indeed be hard to name any but two or three of the very greatest in English literature whose popularity has remained so constant.

Except by the student the divines who were Taylor's contemporaries are almost forgotten yet many were definitely above him in the forcefulness of their mind, though all were below him in richness of fancy. At no other time in her history has Anglicanism produced so much great writing. Trahern and Archbishop Leighton both expressed the purest devotion in the most exquisite of silver-toned prose. George Herbert, Fuller, Chillingworth, Bramhall and Laud could all write more than competent English. Nor are Taylor

and his contemporaries now without a message. If anything, the desire to turn toward them for intellectual inspiration is growing stronger among a certain school of theologians as the fashion to admire their writing grows among one group of literary men. Our times are sufficiently similar for us to understand these particular forefathers of ours, and, for their approach to problems not unlike our own to interest us. They fought passionately for freedom both in church and state, if they disagreed it was in their ideas of where that freedom could be most securely placed.

On the continent the protagonists in a similar struggle were losing their fight. Slowly a despotism which sought to regulate every phase of men's lives was tightening its grip. Physical science and a changing social structure presented the church with hitherto unsolved problems in thought and life. All this is not unlike the situation which we ourselves are facing to-day. Those who seek some solution to these problems will do well to remember the respect for authority and, at the same time, the honesty of mind, which tried all authority, rejecting that which was spurious or useless, with which the Carolines undertook their task. Their <sup>speculative</sup> theology is of little practical use to us for the progress of learning has invalidated it to a great extent and we may suppose that, if the knowledge of this has come to them in the places wheresoever they are, they accept their fate with equanimity since they would rejoice in its cause. We may admire the style in which they dressed their thoughts as we admire the clothes in which they dressed their bodies but both are a little too fine for use in our day. It is their spirit which we need to imitate.

Among them Jeremy Taylor was an acknowledged leader and it was right for him to be so since he embodied their ideals in a peculiar degree. It is because he was one of the noblest products of a very noble age, because he was a man more than ordinarily rich in knowledge and imagination and a pre-eminent master of lovely prose that he is likely to endure.

APPENDICES.

## A.

TAYLOR'S WORKS.

In a few cases, where the title is excessively long, its short form only is given.

---

1. A Sermon Preached upon the Anniversary of Gunpowder Treason. Oxford, 1638. 4to.
2. Of the sacred Order and Offices of episcopacy. Oxford, 1642. 4to.  
The London issue of 1647 is the same edition with a new title-page.
3. A Discourse concerning Prayer extempore. Anon. London. 1646. 4to.
4. Θεολογία Ἐκλεκτικὴ or, A Discourse of the Liberty of Propheying. London. 1647. 4to.
5. An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgie. London. 1649. 4to.  
This is an expanded edition of item 3 and bore Taylor's name.
6. The Great Exemplar of Sanctity and Holy Life according to the Christian Institution; described in the History of the Life and Death of the Ever-blessed Jesus Christ, The Saviour of the World. London. 1649. 4to.  
The second edition, London. 1653, folio, has some additions to the text, a fine portrait of Taylor by Lombart, many fine large engravings by Faithorne, and the title printed in red and black.
7. Prayers before and after Sermon, in "Choice Forms of Prayer, by severall Reverend and Godly Divines, used by them before and after Sermon." London. 1651. 4to.
8. The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living. London. 1650. 12mo.  
This edition contains "Prayers for Our Rulers" which was altered in subsequent editions to "Prayers for the King".
9. A Funeral Sermon Preached at the Obsequies of the Right Honourable and Most Virtuous Lady, The Lady Frances, Countess of Carbery. London. 1650. 4to. 1651. folio.
10. The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying. London. 1651. 12mo.  
Has a folding plate by Peter Lombart.
11. Clerus Domini, or, A Discourse of the Divine Institution, Necessity, Sacredness, and Separation of the Office Ministerial. London. 1651. folio.
12. A Short Catechism for the institution of Young Persons in the Christian Religion; to which is added an explication of the Apostles Creed, composed for the use of schools in South Wales. London. 1652. 12mo.
13. A Discourse of Baptism, London. 1652. 4to.
14. Two Discourses, One, of Baptism, Two, of Prayer, London. 1653. 4to.

15. Twenty-seven sermons preached at Golden Grove; Being for the Summer Half-year, Beginning on Whitsunday and ending on the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity. London. 1651.folio.
16. Twenty-five Sermons Preached at Golden Grove; Being for the Winter Half-year, Beginning on Advent Sunday, until Whitsunday. London. 1653.folio.  
Items 15 and 16 were published together in 1653, two volumes folio. London, with the title page. "ΕΠΙΔΕΥΤΟΣ A Course of sermons for All The Sundays of The Year." There was a second edition in 1667. London. Two volumes in one, folio.
17. The Real Presence and spiritual of Christ in The Blessed Sacrament proved against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. London. 1654.8vo.
18. The Golden Grove; or a Manual of Daily Prayers and Litanies----- Also Festival Hymns, according to the manner of the ancient Church, composed for the use of the devout, especially of younger persons. By the author of The Great Exemplar. London. 1655.8vo.  
This book incorporates item 12. It has a folding frontispiece by Hollar, showing Lord Carbery's seat, Golden Grove.
19. Unum Necessarium. Or The Doctrine and Practice of repentance. London. 1655.8vo.  
Has a portrait by Lombart.
20. Deus Justificatus, or a vindication of the glory of the Divine Attributes in the question of original sin, against the Presbyterian way of understanding it. (On the next page) To the Right Honourable and Religious Lady Christian (sic), Countess Dowager of Devonshire. London. 1656. 12mo.  
The first edition bears "The Stationers Postscript to the Reader" signed, N. Royston, and was published without Taylor's permission. Taylor published it himself with other works a year later.
21. Correspondence between John Warner, Bishop of Rochester, and Doctor Taylor, concerning the Chapter of Original sin in the Unum Necessarium. London. 1656. 12mo.
22. Σύμβολον Ἠθικο-Πολεμικόν or A Collection of Polemical and Moral Discourses. London. 1657. folio.  
Has a fine portrait by Lombart. This is a reissue in one volume of items 2,4,5,17,18, 20.  
"The former impressions of these books being spent, and the world being willing enough to receive more of them, it was thought fit to draw into one volume all these lesser books which at several times were made public, and which by some collateral improvements they were to receive now from me might do some more advantages to each other, and better struggle with such prejudices with which any of them hath been at any time troubled". From the dedication to Christopher, Lord Hatton. Works. Vol; 5.pp.2-3.
23. A Discourse of the Nature and Offices of Friendship. In a letter to The Most Ingenious and Excellent M.R.P. London. 1657. 12mo.

24. Two Letters to Persons Changed in their Religion.  
London.1657.12mo.
25. A Collection of Offices, or Forms of Prayer in cases ordinary and extraordinary, taken out of the scriptures and the ancient liturgies of several churches, especially the Greek. Together with a large preface in vindication of the liturgy of the Church of England. Anon.  
London.1658.8vo.  
Has a frontispiece showing Christ in an attitude of prayer, which is said to have caused Taylor's imprisonment.
26. A Latin letter in John Sterne's *Θανατολογία*.  
Dublin. 1659.8vo.
27. Ductor Dubitantium, or The Rule of Conscience in all her general measures; serving as a great instrument for the determination of cases of conscience.  
London. 1660.folio.  
Has a portrait by Lombart.
28. The Worthy Communicant, or A Discourse of the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the worthy receiving of The Lord's Supper.  
London. 1660.8vo.
29. Certain Letters concerning Original sin, in A Second Part of a Mixture of scholastical Divinity. by Henry Jeanes.  
Oxford. 1660.4to.
30. Letter (on Prayer)prefixed to Henry Leslie's "Discourse of Praying with the Spirit and with the Understanding."  
London.1660.4to.
31. A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of Two Archbishops and Ten Bishops.  
London.1661.4to.
32. A Sermon Preached at the Opening of the Parliament of Ireland.  
London.1661. 4to.
33. Rules and Advices to The Clergy of the Diocese of Down and Connor.  
Dublin.1661.8vo.
34. Via Intelligentiae. A Sermon preached to the University of Dublin.  
London.1662.4to.  
"I had published it also to my own clergy at the metropolitcal visitation of the most reverend and learned Lord Primate of Armagh in my own diocese. "To the reader". works.Vol;8. p.361.
35. A Sermon Preached in Christ's-Church, Dublin, July 16th.1663. At the Funeral of the Most Reverend Father in God, John, late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland. With a succinct narrative of his whole life.  
London. 1663.4to.  
The first edition was printed for "John Crooke at the sign of the ship in St.Paul's Church-yard". Royston's edition was the third, though printed only a month later.

36. The Righteousness Evangelical Described. The Christian's Conquest Over the Body of sin. Fides Formata, or Faith Working by Love. In Three Sermons Preached at Christ Church, Dublin.  
Dublin. 1663. 12mo.
37. A Dissuasive from Popery.  
London. 1654. 4to.
38. Χρῆσις Τελειωτική, A Discourse of Confirmation.  
London. 1664. 8vo.  
Has a portrait.
39. The Second Part of The Dissuasive from Popery.  
London. 1667. 4to.
40. Three Letters to one tempted to the communion of the Church of Rome.  
London. 1673. folio.
41. Christ's Yoke an Easy Yoke, and yet the Gate to Heaven a Strait Gate in two excellent sermons. By a learned and reverend divine.  
London. 1675. 12mo.  
The are made up of material used in the Great Exemplar, see page 143 and notes, of this thesis.
42. Δεκάς Ἐμβολιμαῖος A Supplement to the Ἐνιαυτός,  
London. 1678. folio.  
This is a reissue in one volume of items 1, 9, 30, 31, 33, 34, with two sermons on the Whole Duty of the Clergy.
43. A sermon preached at the funeral of that worthy knight Sir George Dalstone.  
London. 1683. 8vo.
44. On The reverence Due to the Altar. Edited from the Original M.S. by J. Barrow. Oxford. (Parker) 1848. 4to.

## B.

PSEUDO TAYLORIANA.

Both during and after Taylor's lifetime his name was attached to books of which he was not the author. The first of these was "A New and Easy Institution of Grammar", published in 1647, but the facts of the authorship of this were never very clouded. It was generally reckoned to be Wyatt's and Taylor's share limited to writing a preface, possible revision of the whole and lending his name.

His association with an edition of the Psalter published in 1644 has however given rise to more difficulty. It appeared at Oxford under the title of "The Psalter, of the Psalms of David" by the Rt. Honourable Christopher Hatton, and that authorship seems to have gone unchallenged until Wood in his "Athenae Oxoniensis" made public a note which he had previously written in his copy of the Psalter to the effect that Taylor was the actual writer. On the title page of the eighth edition, published in 1672, Taylor's name was substituted for Hatton's; both of them were by that time dead. The work itself consists of a fairly long preface dealing with the causes which led the writer to undertake his work, historical proofs of the value of the Psalms and a reference to previous editions of the Psalter which had been put out on a similar plan. This is followed by the Psalms as set in the Prayer Book with a collect prefixed to each in which the sentiment of the Psalm which follows is gathered up. A reading of the preface suggests that there is too much learning for Hatton but that the tone and style, except for a touch here and there, do not belong to Taylor. Hatton can hardly be expected to have had the knowledge of early church history, the lives of the Fathers, 'the old liturgies of the Eastern and Western Churches' which the preface claims, but we know that Taylor was well acquainted with them all. On the other hand, the tone in which the writer speaks of joining the King is that of a person whose coming was of some consequence, more certainly than that of a chaplain would be. Previous to this the writer has always fortified himself against discontent abroad in his books and

retirement, circumstances which a priest, whose ordinary life might be expected to lie in those pursuits, could hardly think it necessary to mention. The writer intended his book for "an instrument of public charity to christians of different confessions", a sentiment which would fit either Taylor or Hatton who, according to the Liberty of Propheying, talked over the disagreements among christians a good deal at this time.

In style this preface is flatter and the sentences shorter than either the Gunpowder Plot sermon or episcopacy Asserted, the publications of Taylor's which came nearest to this period, and there is a striking absence of Taylor's characteristic words. This is noteworthy since Taylor's style, apart from this work shows a continuous development. One section only is at all reminiscent of his usual matter: "To rely upon the reeds of Egypt or to snatch at the bulrushes of the Nilus, may well become a drowning man whose reason is so wholly invaded and surprised by fear, so as to be useless to him in that confusion, but he whose condition (though it be sad) is still under the mastery of reason and has time to deliberate, unless he places his hopes upon something that is likely to cure his misery, or at least to ease it by making his affliction less or his patience more, doth deserve that misery he groans under."<sup>1</sup> Taylor might have written that but there is not much else in the preface of which this could be said. In the prayers the same stylistic evidence weighs against Taylor's authorship. They are generally shorter than the prayers found in Taylor's undoubted work; they express a steady but not impassioned devotion, they rarely embroider the theme, a habit which elsewhere Taylor hardly seems able to resist. All the evidence points to this edition of the Psalter not being the work of Taylor but to his having had some hand in it. Probably he supplied the learning and touched up Hatton's work. A

1. "Works of Jeremy Taylor; London 1862, 3 Vols. Vol.2. p.749. Hatton's 'Psalter' was not included in Heber's edition of Taylor.

story to that effect would be quite sufficient to make Wood set down Taylor as the author.<sup>1</sup>

The authorship of "A Discourse of Auxiliary beauty" provides a still more curious puzzle. It was issued by Royston in 1656, the author's name not being given. In 1662 it came to a second edition and this time the initials J.T.D.D. were placed upon the title page. This in itself would be liable to cause some confusion for Taylor has signed his Discourse of Friendship in the same way. The third edition claimed it as "the work of a late learned Bishop". Anthony à wood included it in his list of Taylor's writings and White Kennet strengthened the tradition by also stating the booklet to be Taylor's. This is the evidence. It would not be overwhelming even if the contents of the book made Taylor's authorship at all likely. Both Anthony à Wood and White Kennet need the support of someone stronger than the other if their evidence in a doubtful point is to be accepted. Undoubtedly the initials with which the book was signed, appearing as they did in Taylor's lifetime and going unchallenged by him, offer some difficulty though not an insuperable one. They were initials only; other people in England no doubt has a right to them; their very ambiguity offered an excellent opportunity for an unscrupulous person to foist his work off on the public with a suggestion of Taylor's authorship behind it which it would be difficult to deny.

but oddly enough the publisher did his best to upset the legend which the title page would seem to be attempting to foster for he says that the M.S. was brought to him anonymously and both the occasion and the writer of it was a woman. The book bears out this statement. It is a dialogue between two women, one an Anglican and the other a Puritan, on the sinfulness or otherwise of painting the face. It is written brightly with some attempt at imitating Taylor's style which was of course well known.

- I. In two of Royston's Catalogues, that published at the end of "The Great Exemplar" London.1653, and that published with "Sumbolon Athicopolemicon" in 1657, the work is classed as Hatton's

There is a little theology in it, but no more than anyone in that theological age was likely to possess. Downham's 'Christian Warfare' and Perkin's 'Cases of Conscience' are both mentioned but this is no great intellectual feat since they were both very popular with Puritans. Contents and style are both against the suggestion of Taylor's authorship. In addition it is extremely unlikely that in the year 1656 of all times, when Taylor's home was unhappy because of the death of his son and his time was fully occupied in writing Ductor Dubitantium, that he would turn aside to produce this smart little piece of levity so contrary to every other indication we have of his character.

It would be tempting to suppose that perhaps Mrs. Taylor herself was the author if we had any real evidence in support of such a piece of guesswork. It could have been written at sometime just after their marriage. The initials were hers as much as her husband's, though of course she laid no claim to a D.D. It would explain better than any other hypothesis Taylor's not repudiating the book and it is quite possible that the wife of such a well-known literary figure as Jeremy Taylor should herself attempt some writing and should try to imitate her husband's style. This theory would also bear out the statement made by the publisher. However there is no evidence on which a conclusive statement could be based.<sup>1</sup> Heber suggests Mrs. Katherine Phillips, but admits that he has no reason for doing so. Sir Edmund Gosse puts forward Christiana, Countess of Devonshire, as a possible author on the slight grounds that she was a blue stocking and a patroness of Taylor. That such a lady should write a little book and imitate her favourite preacher's manner is no great wonder, but when she has done so why should she wish to pass her work off as Taylor's? It would be more natural for such a lady to claim as much as possible of whatever

1. In Bliss' Sale Catalogue (pt.1. p.116) it is entered as written by Dr. Gauden and at the same time it is stated that the book is often ascribed to Jeremy Taylor and sometimes to Obadiah Walker. Bliss also in another place suggested <sup>that</sup> Obadiah Walker was the author (Wood. "Ath: Ox:" Vol. III. Col: 790, Note)

literary glory might accrue from a joint effort. If Taylor had corrected her work she, like Hatton, would have wished her name to be on the title page. There remains the possibility that it was the production of some catch penny author who did his work well enough to befog the not very strong critical powers of Wood and Kennet. This is quite likely because there is another case in which this is conclusively known to have been done.

In 1684 a book entitled "Contemplations on the State of Man" was published and at once became very popular. It went through ten editions in the next fifty years. Prefixed to it were two short addresses to the reader. One, signed B. Hale, D.D., says nothing about the author but commends the work to the "Courteous reader". The other definitely claims the book to be Taylor's.

"Candid Reader,

The most learned and pious Jeremy Taylor, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, in Ireland, having left these holy Contemplations in the hands of a worthy friend of his, with a full purpose to have printed them, if he had lived; but since it hath pleased God to take that devout and holy person to himself - the better to advance devotion and sanctity of life, and to make men less in love with this frail life, and more with that which is eternal, it is thought fit to make them public.

I beseech God to conduct us all, by the many helps and assistances which he hath been graciously pleased to afford us, to further us in piety and holiness of life, is the prayer of

Thy friend,

Robert Harris."<sup>1</sup>

Harris it will be noticed does not say who the friend was to whom Taylor left his MS. or explain why this friend passed it on to him. Neither Harris nor Hale are the names of any known acquaintances of Taylor. Hale may possibly have been Dr. Bernard Hale, Archdeacon of Ely

1. "Works of Jeremy Taylor;" London. 1862. 3 Vols.  
Vol. 1. p. 350.

but as he died in 1663 he could only have seen the Christian Consolations in MS. Probably, however, he had no connection with the book but he was a person of some importance and in 1684 he had been dead long enough to make it safe to use his name. What had happened was this. In 1672 there appeared, without a place or a publisher's name, a book entitled "A treatise of the difference between the Temporal and the Eternal composed in Spanish by Eusebius Nieremberg. S.J. translated into English by Sir Vivien Mullineaux, Knt. since reviewed according to the tenth and last Spanish Edition." It was prefixed by an address to Catherine of Portugal, signed J.W. Someone got hold of this book, reduced it to about a third of its original size by picking out sentences here and there and stringing them together. The result of this ingenious piece of book making was published in 1684 as "Contemplations on the State of Man" with the two addresses which have been described. It was a bold thing to do only twelve years after the subject of its piracy had itself appeared.

Juan Eusebio Nieremberg was a Spanish Jesuit of German extraction. He was born in Madrid in 1595, was reader in theology in the Imperial College in Madrid and died, also in Madrid, on the seventh of April, 1658. He was a writer of devotional manuals which in spite of the author's reputed tinge of Molinism were very popular. In 1640 he published a treatise called "Diferencia de lo Temporal y Eterno" which was among the most attractive of his works. It has gone through fifty four Spanish editions and has been translated into Latin, Arabic, Italian, French, German and Flemish as well as English. It is just possible that Taylor may have seen it in one of these editions but if he did that is the only connection he had with the book for the truncated version put out in his name is indisputably made from Mullineaux' translation.<sup>1</sup>

One more important book was unwarrantably connected with Taylor. When Heber in 1822 published his splendid edition of Taylor's writings he included in it a work entitled "Christian

1. The real authorship was proved by Churton, in "A Letter to Joshua Watson, Esq." London. 1848.

consolations". He went to some trouble to do so for he had it "transcribed for the printer's use from the single copy extant in Bodleian Library".<sup>1</sup> But as soon as it was published Alexander Knox saw that it was impossible to credit Taylor with the authorship of it and gave his reason in a letter to his lifelong correspondent Bishop Jebb.<sup>2</sup> Heber supposed that the book was written some time while Taylor was in retirement at Portmore to comfort Lady Conway who was somewhat subject to fits of religious depression. The author examines the five means of a Christian's comfort; faith, hope, the graces of the Holy Ghost, prayer and the two Sacraments. Whoever the author was his theology was Calvinistic and he had the habit which Taylor never had of thinking a text by itself sufficient comfort for the most complicated state of mind. The style is far more sober and restrained than anything Taylor ever wrote even in least exuberant moments. But even if Pope's aphorism that "There is nothing so foolish as to pretend to be sure of knowing a great writer by his style" holds good here the strongest argument against Taylor's authorship still remains. For it is the theology which offers the really conclusive evidence. It is admitted on all sides that Taylor was inconsistent, but Calvinism, especially its teaching on Predestination and its consequent attitude to minor sins, he uncompromisingly rejected at all periods of his life. The writer of this tract both accepts Predestination and holds views on the inevitability of sin which would make Taylor shudder. It has been suggested that Bishop Hacket was the author and some passages of it proved to be identical with his sermons. Yet here again the resemblance may prove nothing more than the fact that some industrious compiler has been at work. Halkett and Laing. (Dic: of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Lit:) continue to class this as Taylor's but, until the theology has been satisfactorily explained, the attribution is hard to accept. From time to time portions of Taylor's works have been republished by editors and given fresh titles. These added to Taylor's Bibliography add to the confusion.

1. Taylor's Works, Vol: 1. p.vi.
2. "Correspondence between Bishop Jebb and A.Knox, Esq" (Ed. Forster) London. 1826. Vol; 2. p.514.

A number of other books of less important than those described have also been attributed to Taylor. They may be briefly listed here. In no case is Taylor's authorship at all likely.

1. The Martyrdom of King Charles, or his conformity with Christ in his sufferings. Hage.1649.4to. Halkett and Laing. Dic. of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Lit: say that this is really by Henry Leslie, Bishop of Down and Connor.
2. Christ or Antichrist or the celebrated Ludolf's true and easy way to Union among Christians. London.1658.8vo. Authorship unknown.
3. The Church of England Defended. London.1674.folio, Authorship unknown.

Lowndes mistakenly gives all three as the work of Taylor.

4. The Ephesian and Cimmerian Matrons. London.1668. 8vo. "By Walter Charleton, M.D. The Ephesian Matron sometimes wrongly attributed to Jeremy Taylor." Halkett and Laing. *ibid.*

## C.

JEREMY TAYLOR'S CHILDREN.Sons.

William, buried at Uppingham, May 28th, 1642.

A boy, unnamed. His death is mentioned on July 19th, 1656, as having taken place recently.

Two boys, unnamed. Their deaths are mentioned in a letter of Feb. 22nd, 1657, as having recently taken place. Taylor has now but "one son left".

A boy, unnamed; born and died, between April 9th and April 27th, 1658. (see page 247)

Edward, buried at Lisburn, probably an infant, March 10th, 1662.

Charles, buried at St. Margaret's, Westminster, August 2nd, 1667. Aged about 24 years, Lady Wray is supposed to have stated that he took his M.A. at Dublin and was intended for the Church, but his name does not occur in the College Books and there is no support for the statement in either of its parts.

Daughters.

Phoebe, no marriage traceable.

Mary, married Francis Marsh who was successively Dean of Connor, Bishop of Limerick, and Archbishop of Dublin. Evelyn met them in London on one occasion and thought Mrs. Marsh a lady of unusual ability. (Diary. Feb: 26th. 1680)

Joanna, married to Edward Harrison, M.P. for Lisburn. Her daughter married Sir Cecil Wray and is said to be the originator of some long accepted myths regarding Jeremy Taylor.

Lady Wray is said to have mentioned a son Edward who was a captain of horse in the King's service and who was killed in a duel with a fellow officer named Vane who died of his wounds. It would seem that her imagination had been embroidering the career of Edward who was buried, most probably as an infant, at Lisburn.

## D.

RELICS OF TAYLOR.

There are a number of things which are said to have belonged to Taylor still in existence. At Uppingham is a pulpit and patten said to have been used by him. The watch said to have been given to Taylor by Charles the first was in 1909 in the possession of Colonel Jeremy Marsh, R.E., of London, a descendant of Taylor's. Bonney (The Life of Jeremy Taylor, London. 1815. p.368) described the watch as being "Plain, and having only a single case, with a gold dial-plate, the figures of which are raised. The hands are of steel, and the makers name is Jacobus Markwich, Londini. Originally it had no chain but went by means of catgut. Bishop Taylor caused a second case of copper to be made for it, covered with green velvet, and studded with gold. At the bottom the studs are so arranged as to represent a mitre, surrounded by this motto, "Nescitis horam". The gems taken from the King's Bible which he is said to have given Taylor at the same time were in the possession of Mr. J. T. Roberts of New York who claimed to have inherited them. In a letter of the 6th July 1897 (quoted in Dic: Nat: Biog: Art Taylor) he described them as "Two diamonds and a ruby set in a ring, bearing the date 1649" Dromore Cathedral possesses a chalice and patten presented by a member of Taylor's family, possibly his daughter, more probably his wife. It bears the inscription "In ministerium ss. mysteriorum in ecclesia Christi redemptoris de Dromore Deo dedit humillima ancilla D. Joanna Taylor." The date mark is obscure but would seem to be 1679. Taylor's Church at Ballinderry contains a Prayer Book said to have been used by him and a pulpit from which he is supposed to have preached. A silver teapot, the property of the Diocese of Down and Connor in the possession of the Bishop, is said to have belonged to Taylor.

One more interesting relic of Taylor's remains to be discussed. It is a small box, three and five eighths inches by one and five eighths, made of dark shell handsomely spotted with white, with a lid of silver and a large agate forming a boss. It is said

to have formerly contained a small glass vessel for holding the species of wine though this is now missing. It bears the inscription "haec pyxis quondam erat usui Jer. Taylor, Episcopo." In 1898 the box was in the possession of the Revd. P.E. George of Bath who restored it to a lineal descendent of Taylor. From the existence and supposed use of this box it was conjectured that at some time in his life Taylor was in the habit of communicating sick persons with the reserved sacrament (See Hierurgia Anglicana, 1903. Vol: 2. p.164) The communion of the sick is mentioned twice in Taylor's works, in Holy Dying (Vol:3, p.416ff.) In Holy Living (Ibid. p. 214ff.), but there is nothing in either of these places to suggest that the consecrated elements were carried to the sick person. Canon Christopher Wordsworth has shown that the likelihood of the box being a true pyx is not very great, though it may have been a receptacle for eucharistic Bread or Wafers. There is not room in it for a glass vessel however small. The inscription though in old lettering is of no value for it was composed within living memory by a clergyman named May and executed by Mr.Vokes, a Bath jeweller. Until May suggested an ecclesiastical use the box has always been known to its possessors as Jeremy Taylor's snuff box. Canon wordsworth was of the opinion that the box by itself could not have been used to carry the Communion in both kinds. See Trans. of St.Pauls ecclesiological Soc: Vol: 8. pt.2. Also, Vernon Staley, The Ceremonial of the English Church, 2nd. ed. 1900. p.223n.

There are original portraits of Jeremy Taylor at All Souls College, Oxford and at Trinity College, Dublin; many excellent contemporary engravings of him were published with early editions of his works.

## E.

## A. Extracts from the Parish register of Holy Trinity, Cambridge.

- 1589 --- Edmond Taylor, Churchwarden.
- 1605 --- Nathaniel Taylor and Mary Dean, married  
13th of October.
- 1606 --- Edmond Taylor, Churchwarden.  
Edmond, son of Nathaniel and Mary Taylor,  
baptized August 3.
- 1607 --- Edmond Taylor, buried 22nd of September.
- 1609 --- Mary Taylor, daughter of Nathaniel and Mary  
Taylor, June baptized.
- 1611 --- Nathaniel Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary,  
Baptized 8th December.
- 1613 --- Jeremy Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary,  
baptized 15th August.
- 1616 --- Thomas Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary,  
baptized 21st July.
- 1619 --- John Taylor, son of Nathaniel and Mary,  
baptized 13th April.
- 1621 --- Churchwardens, Tobias Smith and Nathaniel Taylor.

(The maiden name of Jeremy Taylor's mother is always given as Dean, though there is a doubt about the spelling, the entry being difficult to decipher.)

F.

Dean Carmody has kindly supplied me with the following account of Todd Jones of Homra.

William Todd Jones was the only son of Conway Jones M.D. of Lisburn and Mary Wray Todd, second daughter of William Todd of Dublin, (married 1753)

William Todd married, before 1725, Francis Johanna, daughter of Sir Cecil Wray Bart, by his wife Mary Harrison.

Mary Harrison was the daughter of Edward Harrison, M.P. 1692, and granddaughter of Jeremy Taylor.

Todd Jones had some connection with the United Irishmen. He contested an election against the nominee of Lord Hertford and consequently, becoming embarrassed, sold his estate to the first Marquis of Downshire, circa 1790. He took up residence at Rosstrevor and died there as a result of a carriage accident. He had three sisters and they, as well as himself, received annuities from Lord Downshire, which appears to have been a condition of the sale of the estate. Only one was married and she seems to have had no issue.

Todd Jones was a political pamphleteer. One of his tracts is entitled, "A letter to the societies of United Irishmen of Belfast on a proposed restoration of catholic rights".

G.

C. from the admission book of Gonville and Caius College.

Tailor	<u>Jeremias Tailor filius Nathanaelis Tonsoris</u>
postea	<u>Cantabrigiae natus et ibidem literis instructus</u>
episc D.	<u>in Schola publica Sub. Mro. Lovering p'</u>
	<u>decemium anno a'tatis suae 15<sup>o</sup></u>
	<u>admisus est in Collegium Nostrum</u>
	<u>Augusti 18<sup>o</sup> 1626 pauper scholaris</u>
	<u>Fidejussore Mro. Bachcroft. Solvit pro</u>
	<u>ingressu.</u>
	<u>sic est Tho Bachcroft.</u>

## H.

Taylor's use of the word 'reason' calls for some comment. Here as elsewhere he is not so careful in his application of terms as he should be, but, by the comparison of some of the outstanding passages in which 'reason' appears, it is possible to arrive at some idea of his real meaning. "It is not guided by natural arguments only but by revelation and all other good means."<sup>1</sup> "It is a transcendent that runs through all topics."<sup>2</sup> "When revelation, and philosophy and public experience and all other grounds of probability or demonstration have supplied us with matter then reason does but make use of them."<sup>3</sup> It can be prejudiced by birth, education, etc.<sup>4</sup> It may err and be inculpable.<sup>5</sup> It is clear from this that he means something more than an intellectual faculty solely. He seems to mean by 'reason' the exercise in judgment of all a man's powers, both spiritual and mental. Perhaps Bishop Butler's phrase, a "superior principle of reflection, or conscience,"<sup>6</sup> would best describe it. Chillingworth in the 'Religion of Protestants' had not used 'reason' entirely in its limited modern sense.

1. Works. Vol; v. p. 495.
2. Ibid. p. 498.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. p. 503.
5. Ibid. p. 499.
6. Butler's Works. (Oxford. 1874) Vol; II. p. 23.

## I.

Stanza V. of Le Mathew's poem will be a sufficient sample.

"So vast his knowledge, he  
 Had tasted oft of each allowed tree,  
 On all their sweets had daily fed.  
 The Bird of Paradise, he kindly bred  
 A guileless dove within the serpent's head:  
 The Cherubs bowed, and sheathed their swords;  
 For's tongue had all the charm of words,  
 All that language and wit affords,  
 And new and fitter names did wear;  
 And's lucky pen (as if a pencil twere)  
 Made gold, by gilding it, more golden to appear.  
 Ye, wisdom's sons with him there lost  
 A Vatican of learned things which cost  
 A treasury of precious time; but grieve ye most  
 For undiscovered Arts and Sciences,  
 And what is excellent in those or these;  
 What never was, what never shall be found,  
 with him lye buried under ground.

-----

such was our mitred man,  
 Our great Diocesan.

## J.

Bramhall's dealings with the Presbyterians in his diocese have often been contrasted favourably with those of Jeremy Taylor. As the following extract shows the circumstances were not the same. Bramhall had to deal with men who were willing to meet him and listen to suggestions of compromise. Taylor with total irreconcilables.

"When the benefices were called over at the visitation, several appeared, and exhibited only such titles as they had received from the late powers. He (Bramhall) told them, 'they were no legal titles, but in regard he heard well of them, he was willing to make such to them by institution and induction;' which they thankfully accepted of, - But when he desired "to see their letters of orders, some had no other but their certificates of ordination by some Presbyterian classes, which, he told them, did not qualify them for any preferment in the Church. Upon this, the question arose. "Are we not Ministers of the Gospel?" To which his Grace answered, That was not the question; at least, he desired for peace sake, that might not be the question for that time. 'I dispute not' he said, 'the value of your ordination, nor those acts you have exercised by virtue of it; what you are, or might be, here when there was no law, or in other Churches abroad. But we are now to consider ourselves as a national church limited by law, which among other things takes chief care to prescribe about ordination; and I do not know how you could receive the means of the church, if any should refuse to pay you your tithes, if you are not ordained as the law of this church requireth;<sup>1</sup> and I am desirous that she may have your labours, and you such portions of her revenue as shall be allotted you, in a legal and assured way'. By this means he gained such as were learned and sober."<sup>2</sup>

1. Note that Bramhall is as emphatic as Taylor that the law was against the Presbyterians.
2. "Athanasius Hibernicus, or, The Life of John, Lord Archbishop of Armagh" (prefixed to his works; ed; 1677) by John (Vesey) Bishop of Limerick. p. 35-36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Books to which only one or two references have been made will not be found here, but are fully described in the notes on the passage where they occur.

## A.

- Adair, Patrick. "True Narrative of the rise and progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland" Belfast, Ed. Killen, 1866.
- Andrewes, Bp. Lancelot. Works. 11 Vols: Oxford. L.A.C.T.
- Aubrey. John. "Brief Lives chiefly of contemporaries" Oxford, Ed; Clark. 2 Vols; 1898.

## B.

- Bagwell, Richard. "Ireland under the Stuarts". London. 3 Vols; 1909-1916.
- Baker. MSS.c.2.24, fol. 109. Cambridge University Library.
- Bonney, H.K. "The Life of Jeremy Taylor". London. 1815.
- Bramhall, Archb; John. Works. 5 Vols; Oxford. L.A.C.T.
- Brown. W.J. "Jeremy Taylor". London. 1925.
- Bryant. A. "The England of Charles the second". London. 1934.
- Bunyan. John. "Grace Abounding to the Chief of sinners." London. 1891.
- Burnett. Bp. Gilbert. "History of His own Times" 1753. London. 2 Vols;
- Burton. Robert. "The Anatomy of Melancholy". London. 3 Vols; 1932.

## C.

- "Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland." (1603-1670) 13 Vols;
- "Cambridge History of English Literature" Cambridge. Vols; 3-7. 1932.
- "Cambridge Modern History." Cambridge. Vols. 2-3. 1935.
- Carmody. W.P. "Lisburn Cathedral and its Past Rectors". Belfast. 1926.
- Carte. Thomas. "An History of James, Duke of Ormonde". London. 1735-6 3 Vols; Folio.
- Carte MSS. Bodleian Library. Oxford.
- Castellio, Sebastian "Concerning Heretics. An anonymous work attributed to Sebastian Castellio. Now first done into English, together with excerpts from other works, of Sebastian Castellio and David Joris on religious liberty." By Roland Bainton. London. 1936.
- Chillingworth. William. "The Religion of Protestants a safe way to salvation". London. 2 Vols; 1839.

## C.

- Churton, Edward. "A Letter to Joshua Watson, Esqr. D.C.L. giving an account of a singular literary fraud practised on the memory of Bishop Jeremy Taylor". London. 1848.
- Clarendon, Edward Earl of. "History of the rebellion and Civil wars in England". Oxford. 8 Vols: 1816-7
- Coleridge, S.P. "Notes on the English Divines - ed: by the Revd. Derwent Coleridge" London. 2 Vols: 1853.  
 "Aids to reflection". London. 1890.  
 "Table Talk and Omniana" London. 1888.  
 "Miscellanies" London. 1892.
- "Conway Letters" Ed: Marjorie Hope Nicolson. London and Oxford. 1930.
- Cooper, C.H. "Annals of Cambridge" Cambridge. 4 vols: 1842.
- Cotton, H. "Fassti Ecclesiae Hibernicae". London. 1845-78.
- Cross, F.L. "The Oxford Movement and the Seventeenth Century. London. 1933.

## D.

- De Quincey, Thomas. "Essay on Rhetoric" (Collected works. London. 1897. Ed. D. Masson. Vol: 10.) See also Vol:13. p.427, note. for an interesting comment on Taylor's style.
- 'Dictionary of National Biography.'
- Dixon. "Trinity College, Dublin". London. 1902.
- Donne, John. "Sermons, selected Passages". Oxford. Ed. L. Pearsall Smith. 1919.
- Dowden, E. "Puritan and Anglican". London. 1900.
- Doyle, Phyllis. "Church and state. The Jure Divino theory of episcopacy in the English Church". Church Quarterly Review. Jan: 1930.
- Duychinck, G.L. "Life of Bishop Jeremy Taylor" New York. 1860.

## E.

- Elrington, C.K. "Archbishop Ussher's complete works with Life" Dublin. 17 Vols: 1847-64. The first 14 volumes only are edited by Elrington the remainder by J.H. Todd.
- Encyclopedia. Catholic. The. Ed. Herbermann, New York. 15 Vols: 1913.
- "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics." Ed: Hastings. Edinburgh. 13 vols: 1908.
- Evelyn, John. "Diary of . Ed. W. Bray. New edition with Life of the Author and preface. by H.B. Wheatley." London. 3 Vols: 1906.
- Ewart. "Handbook to the Diocese of Down." Belfast. 1886.

## F.

- Fuller, Thomas. "The Church History of Britain". London. 3 Vols: 1868.

## G.

- Gardiner. J.R. "History of England. 1603-1642". London. 1883-4. 10 Vols;  
 "History of the Great Civil War". London. 4 Vols: 1893.  
 "History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate".  
 London. 4 Vols: 1903.  
 Also English Historical Review. Vol: 1. p.144. A note  
 on the authorship of "Liberty of Conscience or the  
 sole Means to obtain Peace and Truth". Vol: II. p.341.  
 "The Clergy's Paper tendered concerning Religion".  
 Vol: XIV. pp.700-34. "The Transplantation to  
 Connaught".
- Gee and Hardy. "Documents Illustrative of English Church History".  
 London. 1921.
- Gentlemans Magazine. Vols: 1783. p.144. 1790. p.301. 1791 pp.515.720.  
 1792. p.109. 1855. p.376. This last "A Gaius Man's  
 comments on Eden's edition of Heber's Taylor is the  
 most useful of these contributions.
- Glanvil. Joseph. "Sadducismus Triumphatus". 2nd edit. ed. More. London.  
 1682.
- Gooch. G.P. "English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century".  
 London. 1898.
- Gosse. Edmund. "Jeremy Taylor". London. 1903.
- Granger. J. "Biographical History of England." Vol:3. p.254.  
 4 vols: London. 1779.

## H.

- Halkett and Laing. "Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous  
 Literature". 6 Vols: London. 1932.
- Hallam. Henry. "Constitutional History of England" 3 Vols: 1930.  
 "Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the  
 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. London. 2 Vols: 1837-9.
- Hamper. William. "Life, Diary, and Correspondence of Sir W. Dugdale"  
 London. 1827.
- "Harleian Miscellany. The." 10 vols: London. 1808-13.
- Harrison. William. "Elizabethan England" ed: Furnivall. . New edition  
 by L.W. Walter Scott Publishing Co. London. no date.  
 This is Book 2 and 3 with a small portion of Book 1  
 of "The description of Britaine from Hollinshed with  
 Furnivall's and L.W.'s notes.
- Heber. Bp. Reginald "The whole works of the Right Rev. Jeremy  
 Taylor. D.D. With a Life of the Author" revised  
 and corrected by the Rev. Charles Eden. London. 10 Vols:  
 1847-52.
- Heylyn Peter. "Aerius Redivivus; or, The History of the  
 Presbyterians." Oxford. 1670.
- Herbert, George. Works. London. 2 Vols: 1859.
- Hooker Richard. "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity".  
 London. 2 Vols: 1907.
- Hughes. T.S. "Selections from Taylor's Works, with Life". London. 1831.

## H.

- Hunt. J. "Religious Thought in England from the reformation to the end of the last century." Vol:1. London. 3 Vols:1873.
- Hutchinson. "Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson." London. 1848.
- Hutton. W.H. "A History of the English Church from the Accession of Charles the First to the Death of Anne". London. 1903.  
"A Life of Laud". London. 1895.

## K.

- Kennet. Bp. White. "A Register and Chronical Ecclesiastical and Civil - From the restoration of King Charles 2nd". London. 1727. Folio.
- Kirk. K.E. "Some Principles of Moral Theology". London. 1921.  
"Conscience and its Problems." London. 1927.

## L.

- Laud. Archbishop William. works. Oxford. 7 Vols: in 9. L.A.C.T.
- Lewis. George. "Robert Sanderson". London. 1924.
- Lloyd. "Memoirs of the Lives, Actions, sufferings and Deaths of those---- That suffered for the Protestant Religion---- In our Late Intestin Wars. From the Year 1637 to the Year 1660. and from thense continued to 1666". London. 1668. folio.
- Lowndes. "The Bibliographers Manual". Ed: Bohn. London. 5 Vols: and an appendix. 11 parts. 1857-66.

## M.

- Maitland. F.W. "The Constitutional History of England. Cambridge. 1920.
- Mant. Richard. "A History of the Church of Ireland". London. 2 Vols: 1839-41.
- May. E.H. "A Dissertation on the Life, Theology and Times of Dr. Jeremy Taylor". London. 1892.
- Mason. A.J. "The Church of England and Episcopacy". Cambridge. 1914.
- Masson. D. "Life of Milton.". Cambridge. 6 Vols. 1881.
- Mathews. Lemuel. "Pandarique (sic) Elegie upon the death of the R.R.Father in God Jeremy late Lord Bishop of Doune, Connor and Dromore." By Le Mathews, A.M. a sacr. domest. Dublin. 1667.
- Milton, John. "Prose Works of". with an Introductory Review by Robert Fletcher.". London. 1836.
- Mitchell. W.F. "English Pulpit Oratory from Andrews to Tillotson" London. 1932.
- More and Cross. "Anglicanism". London. 1935.
- Mullinger, J.B. "A History of the University of Cambridge". London. 1888.

## N.

Neal, Daniel. "A History of the Puritans". London. 5 Vols: 1822.

## P.

Pattison, Mark. "Isaac Casaubon". Oxford. 1892.

Phillips, W.A. (Ed) "A History of the Church of Ireland"  
Oxford. 3 Vols: 1934.

Phillips, J.R. "Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and The Marches".  
London. 2 Vols: 1874.

Porter Classon. "Ulster Biographical Sketches" Second Series.  
Belfast. 1884.

## R.

Ranke, Leopold von. "A History of England Principally in the  
Seventeenth Century". Oxford. 6 Vols: 1875.

"Rawdon Papers". Ed: Berwick. London. 1819.

Reid, J.S. "History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland".  
Ed: Killen. Belfast. 3 Vols: 1867.

Rust, Bp. George. "A Funeral Sermon, Preached at the Obsequies of  
the Right Reverend Father in God Jeremy Lord Bishop  
of Down". Printed in Heber's edition of Taylor's Works.  
Vol: 1. p.cccxi-cccxxvii.

## S.

Sanderson, Robert. "Lectures on Conscience and Human Law".  
Ed: Ch. Wordsworth. London. 1877.

Scott. "Bishop Jeremy Taylor at his Visitation" Irish Church News.  
Sept. 1894.

Selden, John. "Table Talk" Published in Table Talk from Ben  
Johnson to Leigh Hunt. London. 1934.

Shaw, W.A. "History of the English Church during the Civil Wars  
and the Commonwealth". London. 1900.

Slater, T. "A Manual of Moral Theology". London. 1925.

Sloan MSS. British Museum.

Stone, Darwell. "A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist".  
London. 2 Vols: 1909.

Swanzy, H.B. "Biographical Succession Lists of Dromore Diocese,"  
Belfast. 1933.

## T.

Tanner MSS. Bodleian Library. Oxford.

"Tracts on Liberty of Conscience, 1614-1661" Ed. E.B. Underhill.  
London. 1846.

## T.

- Trevelyan, G.M. "England under the Stuarts" London. 1930.
- Tulloch, John. "Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century".  
Edinburgh. 2 Vols: 1872.

## U.

- Ulster Journal of Archeology. Oct. 1896. pp.13ff. Jan.1897.p.105.  
July.1897. p.277.
- Ussher. Archb: James. "A Body of Divinity". Ed. Hastings Robinson.  
London. 1841.

## V.

- Vann. John and J.A. "Alumni Cantabrigienses" Part 1, covering the  
period up to 1751. Cambridge. 1922-7.
- Vincent, Edgar. "Some Aspects of the English Reformation. 1550-1660".  
Church Quarterly Review, Oct. 1929.

## W.

- Wakeman, H.O. "The Church and The Puritans". 1570-1660. London.1897.
- Walker, John. "An Attempt towards Recovering an Account of the  
Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of  
England - in the late - Grand Rebellion". London.1714.Fol.
- Walton, Isaac."The Lives of Donne, Wotton, Hooker, Herbert and  
Sanderson". London. S.P.C.K. no date.
- Ware, Sir James. Works. Ed.Harris. Vol:("Irish Bishops", Dublin.  
3 Vols: in 2 Folio. 1739-46.
- Watson, Foster, "The English Grammar Schools 1660" Cambridge.1908.
- Wheeldon. J. "The Life of Bishop Taylor, and the Pure spirit of his  
Writings. Extracted and Exhibited for General Benefit".  
London. 1793.
- White, Newport. J.D. "Four Good Men". Dublin. 1927.
- Whiting, C.E. "Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration  
to the Revolution 1660-1688. London. 1931.
- Williams, Ethyn Morgan, "Erastianism in the Great Rebellion" Church  
Quarterly Review, April 1930.
- Willmott, Robert Aris. "Bishop Jeremy Taylor His Predecessors  
Contemporaries and Successors". London. 1864.
- Wood, Anthony A. "Athenae Oxonienses, with Additions by Philip Bliss,  
4 Vols: London. 1813-20.
- Worsley. E. "Truth will out or a Discovery of some Untruths  
smoothly told by Dr. Jeremy Taylor in his Dissuasive  
from Popery". Liege. 1665.

INDEX.

A.

Abraham, The story of 121-122.

A. L. 336.

Adair, Patrick. "True Narrative" referred to. 248.287.299.301.  
302.306.308.326

Aeschylus. 54n.

All Souls College. 33.34.

Altar. 38.56.61.345.

Anabaptists. 120.126.257.

Andrewes, Bishop Lancelot. 10.53.54.69.189.250.346.

Apology for Liturgy, an 130.131.132.

Apostles Creed. 109.112.115.116.122.193.

Areopagitica. Milton's. 106.123.

Arminianism. 6.10.27.219.220.297.

Arnauld, Antoine of Port Royal. 197.

Articles, English. 10.210. 219.220.284.307.

" Irish. 284.285.307.

Articles of Kilkenny. 251.

Asceticism. 148.168.

Assembly of Divines. 109.129.131.

Attrition. 200n.

Augustine, St. 205.208.217.218.

Augustinianism. 217.218.219.220.

Authority.

" of Bishops. 83.269.

" of the Church. 83.84.270.

" of Kings. 54.120.269.

" of Parents. (See also Power.) 270.

B.

Bacon Francis, Lord Verulam. 101.102.

Bancroft, Richard. 5.10.53.68.

Baptism. 120.143.181.322.334.

## B.

- Baptists. 101n.
- Barlow, Thomas. 65.209.262.
- Barrow, Isaac. 19n.233n.
- Batchcroft, Thomas. 25.29.
- Bate's case. 2.
- Baxter, Richard. 50.262.275.278.279.288.353.
- Bayly, Richard. 128.129.155.
- Bedell, William. 283.285.293.
- Bellarmino, Cardinal. 554n.
- Bilson, Thomas. 53.68.
- Bishops. 73.74.75.276.277n.
- Blood's plot. 326-327.
- "Bloody Tenent of Persecution", Williams'. 104.105.
- Book of Sports. 59.
- Bossuet, Jacques Benigne. 173.174.
- Bourdabue, Louis. 173.174.175.
- Boyle, Roger, Bishop. 296n.
- Bramhall, John. 171.172.225n.231.283.285.286.300n.315.  
321.331n.
- Bridges, Joanna. (See Taylor, Mrs. Joanna.) 88.226.
- Bridges, John. 67.
- Browne, Sir Thomas. 359.
- Buckingham, George, First Duke of. 4.
- " , George, Second Duke of. 340.
- Bunyan, John. 57.59.60.
- Burnet, Gilbert. 280n.
- Burton, Robert. 20.25.27.52.
- Buying and Selling, Justice in. 149.271.

## C.

- Caius College Cambridge. 18.24.
- Calvin, John. 58.99.132.184.219.
- Cambridge, Town of. 12.
- " , University of. 11.26.27.28.
- Carbery, Frances Countess of. 141.152.153.
- " John, third Earl of. 153n.

## C.

- Carbery, Richard, Second Earl of. 89.90.92.93.94.162.196.  
224.
- Cardigan Castle. 87.
- Carmody, W.P. 311.XXI.
- Carte, Thomas. 295n.
- Cases of Conscience. 197.230.256.
- Casuistry. 195.196.260-262.
- Charles the First. 66.71.76.94.95.106.107-9.126.128.136.  
138.170.227.285.294.300.
- Charles the Second. 146.191.258.275.277.279.280.287.288.297.
- Chepstow Castle. 211.223.224.228.
- Chillingworth, William. 42.44.98.102.103.104.110.123.124.  
353.354.355.
- Church. 71.118.
- Church Ales. 60.
- Church Universal. 118.
- Clara, Francis a Santa. (Christopher Davenport) 42.43.44.
- Clarendon, Edward, first Earl of. 76n.94n.
- Classics. 22.157.158.165.168.177.178.
- Clergy, under Elizabeth and James the First. 51.52.
- Clergy, under the Commonwealth. 223-228.
- Clerus Domini. 180.181.
- Clotworthy, Sir John. (See also Massereene) 41.287.301.
- Coke, Sir Edward. 2.3.
- Coleridge, S. T. 222n.345.355n.363.
- Commendam, livings held in 5.283.
- Committee of Plundered Ministers. 66.
- Communion, Frequency of. 190.
- Comus, (Milton's) 153n.
- Confession. 202.203.291.330.  
" , Seal of 47.48.
- Confirmation. 55.322.325.
- Conscience. 263-266.
- Contentedness. 150.151.
- Convocation of the Clergy, English. 52.74.  
" " " " Irish. 234.307.
- Conway, Anne Viscountess. 247.316.319.321.338n.

C.

- Conway, Edward, third Viscount. 247.248.249.250.252.256.  
327.338.339.340.341.
- Cooper's Annals of Cambridge. 12n.
- Councils of the Church. 84.103.116.117.
- Court of High Commission. 3.37.38.39.41.
- Criam. 323.324.
- Cromwell Henry. 294.
- Cromwell, Oliver. 60.93.192.226.277.290.297.286.294.
- Cudworth, Ralph. 248.

D.

- Dalston, Sir George. 171.242.
- Davenport, see Clara.
- Death, Taylor's attitude toward. 155.156.157.
- Declaration from Breda. 275.
- Dee, Bishop of Peterborough. 64.
- Defoe, Daniel. 320.
- Deus Justificatus. 211-213.222n.229.233.234.
- Devonshire, Christiana Countess of. 211.XII.
- Devotion, books of 147.159.
- Directory for Public Worship. 130.133.
- Discourse of Friendship. 237-242.
- Dissuasive from Popery. 331-338.
- Donne, John. 156.362.
- Down and Connor. 250.281.288.299.311.312.338.341.
- Dromore. 312.318.319.341.343.
- Drysdale, John. 290.300.327.
- Dublin, Christ Church Cathedral. 282.
- " University of. 292-296.315.
- Ductor Dubitantium. 63.229.259.260-274.292.
- Dugdale, Sir William. 16.233.
- Duppa, Brian. 195.197.209.

E.

- Education in Seventeenth Century. 19.20.21.22.23.24.

E.

Elizabeth, Queen. 1.7.8.46.58.63.

England, Church of 6.47.

Eniautos. 161.166.167.169.175.

Episcopacy. 67-76.78.79.80.81-89.126.276.287.288.300.  
308.317.327.

Episcopacy Asserted. 66.67-85.96.107.125.126.

Essentials of belief fewness of these. 110.114.115.141.

Eucharistic Doctrine, Taylor's. 149.181.184-190.289-292.  
354.

Evelyn John. 49.52.191.206.207.227.229.231-237.246.247.  
248.249.252.254.256.257.258.316.363.

Excommunication. 269.335.

Exorcism. 335.

F.

Faith. 114.115.143.

Faith and Patience of the saints, sermon on. 170.

Falkland, Lucius, second Viscount. 74.75.103.110.

Festival Hymns. 193.194.

Friendship. 238-242.

Fuller, Thomas. 99.105.106.262.

Funeral sermons. 173.

Funeral Sermons, Taylor's. 170-173.

G.

Gambling. 50.272.273.

Gardiner, S. R. 89n.228n.

Gerard, Charles, first Baron. 87.88.89.91.

Ghosts, belief in. 318-320.

Golden Grove. 94.

Golden Grove, The 192-193.

Greatrakes, Valentine. 338.

Great Exemplar, The 138-140.

Grotius, Hugo. 210.261.

Gunning, Peter. 247.278.

Gunpowder Plot, Sermon on 48-49.329.335.

H.

Hall, Joseph. 70.71.261.  
 Hammond Henry. 108.109.127.230n.243.261.  
 Hampton Court Conference. .89.278.  
 Harrison, Dr. 250.  
 Harrison, William (Elizabethan England referred to) 12.26.38.52.  
 Hatton, Christopher, first Baron. 77.78.90.96.110.125.  
 141.316.IX.  
 Hausted, Peter. 44.  
 Heber, Reginald. 16.17.18.29n.64.84.88.89.125.213.235.  
 XII.XIV.  
 Herbert, George. 50.55.57.61.62.189.  
 Heresy. 113.114.216.221.  
 Heylyn, Peter. 59.65.219.  
 High Church Party. 1.54.55.  
 Hill, Colonel Arthur. 256.300.332.339.  
 Hill, Moses. 339.  
 Hillsborough. 256.300.312.318.319.  
 Holy Communion, Taylor's Office for. 244-6.  
Holy Dying. 147.152.154-159.  
Holy Living. 147-152.  
 Homra House. 326.  
 Hooker, Richard. 68.69.100.215.333.  
 Human action, causes of. 271.

I.

Indulgences. 333.351.  
 Infallibility of the Pope. 117.118.124.  
 Institution, words of. 186.  
 Ireland. 248.249.251.258.  
 " Church of. 259.281-286.299.322.325.  
 " Reformation in. 281-285.

J.

James the First. 1-11.102.  
 Jeanes, Henry. 213.214-216.347.  
 John, St. Gospel According to 185.186.  
 Jones, Henry. 312.

J.

Jones, M. S. S. 15.16.340.  
Jones, Todd of Homra. 15.XXI.  
Juxon, William. 44.62.243.277.280.

K.

Keble, John. 160.  
Keyes, - of Belfast. 287.288.

L.

Lactantius. 98.  
Langsdale, Edward. 29.64.162.  
" . Phoebe. 64.150.151.228.  
Laud, William. 31.32.35-37.39-41.49.53.55.62.73.74.84n.  
182.189.276.279.283.285.294.353.  
Laudians. 53.64.61.63.351.352.353.  
Laugharne, Rowland. 87.88.89.90.  
Laws, Henry. 153n.  
Laws.  
" , Divine. 198.363.  
" , Human. 263.268.270.271.  
" , of nature. 266.267.  
Leslie, Henry. 132.232n.311.  
" , Robert. 312.  
Liberty of Conscience. See Toleration .  
Liberty of Propheying. 96.110-126.280.309.314.326.349.  
Lisburn, see also Lisnagarvey. 282.311.319.326.340.344. XVII.  
Lisnagarvey, see also Lisburn. 246.251.253.301.302.304.311  
326.  
Llanfihangel-Aberbythych. 92.  
Lombart, Peter. 155.  
London. 74.231.236.256.259.  
Lords Justices, Irish. 297.301.  
Lucretius. 232.233.  
Lovering, Thomas. 18.19.  
Ludolf of Saxony. 138.139.  
Lying. 268.269.

M.

Maidley Hall. 32.

Mandinam. 228.230.231.

Marriage.. 169.226.

Marriage Ring, Sermon on the. 168.169.

Massereene, John, first viscount, see also Clotworthy, Sir John.  
301.317.

Mercurius Aulicus. 86.87.

Millenary Petition. 8.

Milton, John. 10.13.28.106.127.

Monk, General. 257.288.

Moral Demonstration. 138.264.

More, Henry. 248.310.316.353.355.

N.

Newton Hall. 92.

Nicholson, Richard. 90.91.

Nonresistance. 149.

Northampton, Spencer Compton, second Earl of 85.139.140n.

O.

Office Ministerial. (Clerus Domini) 180-181.

Orange, Princess Mary of. 289.

Orinda, The Matchless, see Phillips, Mrs. Katherine.

Ormonde, James, first Duke of 251.258.281.286.294.295.297.  
298.311.315.322.327.

Overstone. 85.277.

Oxford, university of. 11.32.41.

P.

Parliament. 1.2.75.93.104.106.107.129.146.251.277.278.

Perfectionists. 254.255.

Perse, school. 18.20.

Perse, Stephen. 18.28.

Persecution. 46.78.98.111.119.224-228.309.

P.

Petty, Sir William. 250.251.253.329n.

Phillips, Mrs. Katherine, (The Matchless Orinda) 194.237.238.  
242.363.XII.

Pococke, Edward. 39.226n.

Portmore. 252.253.256.326.

Power of the Church. 270.

" of Kings. 54.269.

" of Parents. 270.

Prayer.

" for the dead. 157.333.

" extempory. 132.133.136.

" forms of 133.134.135.

Prayer Book. 8.9.130.132.136.226.227.243-4.246.276.277.  
278.279.282.297.307.353.

Presbyterians in England. 6.54.67.68.69.73.74.75.109.120.  
131.152.275.276.278.279.

" in Ireland. 250.256.286.287.288.290.295.299.  
301.-304.306.307.308.309.316.326

"Psalter of David" (Hattons Psalms) 89.90.IX-XI.

Pseudo Tayloriana. 234.IX-XVI.

Purgatory. 333.

Puritans. 6-9.35.54.55.61.73.170.277.352.

Q.

Quotations, habit of in seventeenth century. 25.

Quotations in Taylor's works. 97.144.159.171.172.176.177.  
178.179.

R.

Rawdon, Major Sir George. 248-250.252.256.303.327.332.  
340.341.342n.

Real Presence and spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, the.  
182-188.292.

Reason. 114.118.

" , Taylor's use of the word. XXIII.

Reformation in England. 52.58.61.62.67.99.

" in Ireland. 281-285.

Religion of Protestants, The. (Chillingworth's) 102.103.119n.

Repentance. 143.150.157.163.165.196.199.201.202.334.

Reverence due to the altar, The 344.345.

Restoration. 275.

Rhetoric, teaching of in seventeenth century. 22.23.164.165.

## R.

Richardson, Dr. 287.288.287.  
 Hiden, Thomas. 30.  
 Rome, Church of 6.7.43.46.47.105.108.112.121.187.200.220  
 329-338.352.  
 Royston, Richard, (Publisher) 96.161.162.206n.208.209.212.  
 229.289.315.XI.  
 Rust, George. 17.19.29.31.43n.90.191.259.310.316.341.  
 342.343.  
 Rutherford, Samuel. 127.

## S.

Sabbath. 57-59.  
 Sacraments. 289-291. See also, Baptism, Confirmation.  
 Sancroft, William. 33n.  
 Sanderson, Robert. 57.189n.209.225.227.262.  
 Savoy. Conference. 277-279.  
 Schism, Hales on. 103.117n.123.  
 Self examination. 290.  
 Sergeant, John. 138.139.183.335.336.337.  
 Sermons in seventeenth century. 164-166.  
 Sermons, Jeremy Taylors. 163.164.167-175.300.313.321.322  
 Shakspeare William. 3.13.361.  
 Shelton, Gilbert. 33 and n.41.182.231.243.277.278.280.  
 325.347.  
 Sizar. 25.26n.  
Silex scintillans. (Henry Vaughan s) 194.  
 Sin, mortal and venial. 199.200.  
 Sin original. 195.198.203.204.205.209-221.297.  
 Sin sense of. 196.  
 Sins of the time. 50.51.  
 Sterne, John. 255.295.

## T.

Taylor, Edmond. 14.17.  
 Taylor, Jeremy:-  
     Parentage 14-17.XX.  
     Birth. 14.  
     Education under Loving. 18.

## Taylor, (Continued)

- sizar at Gonville and Caius College. 18.  
 receives a fellowship and is ordained. 29.  
 Preaches at St.Pauls. 30.  
 Patronized by Laud. 31.  
 Leaves Cambridge for a Fellowship at All souls, Oxford. 34.  
 Friendship with Santa Clara, and reputed attraction to Rome. 42.  
 Given the rectory of Uppingham. 44.  
 Preaches sermon on Gunpowder plot. 45.  
 Chaplain to Laud. 45.  
 Marries Phoebe Langsdale. 64.  
 Accused of romanizing. 65.  
 Chaplain to Charles the First. 49.  
 Joins the King. 66.  
Episcopacy Asserted. 76.  
 Sir Christopher Hatton his patron. 77.  
 Given the living of Overstone. 85.  
 Taken prisoner by Laugharne. 87.  
 Settles in Wales as a schoolmaster. 88-92.  
 Chaplain to Lord Carbery. 94.  
Discourse concerning Prayer extemporary. 95.130.  
The Liberty of Propheying. 96.  
 In London, consulted by the King on the limits of toleration. 108.  
 said to have received gifts from the king. 137.  
The Great Exemplar. 138.  
Holy Living. 147.  
 Death of his first wife. 152.  
 Death of Lady Frances Carbery. 152.  
Funeral sermon for the Countess of Carbery. 154.170.  
Holy Dying. 154.  
Twenty-seven sermons. 161.  
Clerus Domini. 180.  
Prayers Before and After sermon. 181.  
Catechism for the use of Schools in Wales. 182.

## Taylor. (Continued)

The Real Presence. 182-188.

Preaches in London and becomes acquainted with John Evelyn.  
191.

The Golden Grove. 192.

Unum Necessarium. 192-193.

Becomes Evelyn's "Ghostly father". 206.

Imprisonment. 206.

Second imprisonment, at Chepstow. 207.

Controversy over his doctrine of original sin. 208.

A further Explication. 209.

Deus Justificatus. 211.

Controversy with Jeans. 213.

Marriage with Joanna Bridges. 228.

Retires to Mandinam. 228.

Correspondence with Evelyn. 229.

His poverty. 229.

Visit to London. 231.

Increasing friendship with Evelyn. 232.

Examines and presents to the Bishop of Meath for ordination  
a young Frenchman named Le France. 232.

Returns to Wales. 232.

Death of one of his sons. 233.

Renewed correspondence with Evelyn. 233.

Death of two more of his sons. 235.

Removes to London. 236.

Makes some journeys into the country. 236.

Receives a pension from Evelyn. 237.

Baptizes Evelyn's son George. 237.

Discourse of Friendship. 237.

Ministers to Royalists in London. 242.

Funeral Sermon for Sir George Dalston. 243.

Receives from Robert Rich funds for distressed Anglican clergy.  
243.

Speaks for the clergy who wish to have the "common prayer  
taken off" and other forms made. Is opposed in this  
by Hammond. 243.

## Taylor. (Continued)

- Collection of Offices. 131.244-246.
- Probable imprisonment in the Tower. 234.
- Evelyn hears Taylor preach and receives The Communion from him. 247.
- Receives £30 from Anne, Lady Conway. 247.
- Another child born to him. 247.
- Death of the child, a boy. 247.
- visits Lord Conway at Ragley Hall. 247.
- Offered, through Evelyn, by Lord Conway a chaplaincy at Lisnagarvey, which he refuses. 248.
- is persuaded and accepts. 249.
- Goes to Ireland. 249
- Appointment is unpopular with the Presbyterians. 250.
- Lives at Portmore. 252.
- Preaches at Lisnagarvey and in the country round. 253.
- Correspondence with Evelyn. 254.
- His friends in Dublin. 255.
- Latin letter in Stearne's Thanatologia. 255.
- attacked by Tandy. 256.
- Warrant issued for his appearance at Dublin. 257.
- Journey to Dublin. 258.
- Return home, ill. 258.
- Visit to London. 259.
- Signs "Declaration of the Nobility, Gentry and Clergy". 259
- Ductor Dubitantium published and dedicated to Charles the second. 259.
- Taylor nominated Bishop of Down and Connor. 281.
- Reasons for this. 280.281.
- Made Vice Chancellor of Dublin University. 281.
- Ulster Presbyterians object to a bishop being sent to them. 287.
- Worthy Communicant. 292.
- Visits University of Dublin. 292.
- Receives the report of his agent on Presbyterian opposition. 296.
- Wishes to resign his bishopric. 297.
- Consecrated in St. Patrick's. 300.

## Taylor. (Continued)

- Preaches the consecration sermon. 300.
- Arrives in his diocese. 301.
- First visitation held at Lisnagarvey, 301.
- Discussion with the Presbyterians. 302.
- The Ministers duty in Life and Doctrine. 304.
- Rules and Advices to the Clergy of Down and Connor. 305.
- Interviews another deputation of Presbyterians. 306.
- Tries to win over individuals. 307.
- Declares thirty six churches vacant. 307.
- Fills the livings with new men. 310.
- sends to Cambridge for a suitable Dean of Connor. 310.
- George Rust accepts the post. 310.
- Obtains charter for the parish church of Lisnagarvey to be the Cathedral. 311.
- Death of his son Edward. 311.
- Asks to be translated to Meath. 311.
- Request refused but made administrator of the Diocese of Dromore. 312.
- Rebuilds Dromore Cathedral. 312.
- Lives some part of the time at Hillsborough. 312.
- sermon before the Irish Parliament. 313.
- Via Intelligente. 315.
- Correspondence with John Evelyn and Henry More. 315. 316.
- Pastoral work in his diocese. 318.
- Investigates the story of Haddock's ghost and the haunting of David Hunter. 318. 320.
- sermon at the Funeral of the Lord Primate. 321.
- Supplement to Eniautos. 321
- Discourse of Confirmation. 322.
- Asks to be translated to England. 325.
- Arrests Drysdale for supposed complicity in Blood's Plot. 327.
- Dissuasion from Popery, The first part. 331.
- Attacked by sergeant, A.L., and others. 335. 336.
- Dissuasion from Popery, The second part. 336.
- Builds church at Ballinderry. 339.

## Taylor. (Continued)

- Ill health. 338.
- Visits fever patient and catches the disease. 340.
- Illness. 340.
- Visited by the Archbishop and attended by doctors from  
Dublin. 340.
- Death of his son Charles. 340.
- His own death. 340.
- His dependants, their financial condition. 340.341.
- Goods stolen while he lies dead. 341.
- Lawdon's kindness. 341.
- Efforts to obtain his preferment for Marsh and Rust. 341.
- Funeral, true date of. 341.342.
- Rust's Sermon. 342.
- Taylor's personal appearance and affability. 346.
- Ability to make and keep friends. 347.
- Limited acquaintance with middle and lower classes. 347.
- Home life. 348.
- His courage. 349.
- Sometimes accused of flattery. 350.
- More justly, of unfairness in controversy. 350.
- His ideal of the church and attitude toward Rome. 351.
- The position of the seventeenth century Anglo-Catholic. 351
- His theological position. 351-355.
- Devotional writing his greatest work. 355.
- His artistry. 356.
- His innate piety. 356.
- Love of beauty. 356.357.
- His feeling in regard to words. 360.
- Vocabulary, style. 357-361.
- "The Shakespeare of English Prose" 361.
- Inability to understand some types of men. 361.
- Taylor and John Donne. 362.
- Taylor and Milton. 362.

T.

Taylor. (Continued)

- His great originality. 363.
- Taylor and Sir Thomas Browne. 309.
- Similarities between the seventeenth century and the present. 365.
- Taylor neglected. 364.
- His appeal to the future. 365.
- Pseudo Tayloriana. IX-XVI.
- Taylor's children. XVII.
- His dealings with the Presbyterians compared with Bramhall's. XXV.
- Taylorian relics. XVIII.
- Taylor, Mary. 14.
- Taylor, Nathaniel. 14.
- T. C. 213.215.
- Thanatologia, Dr. Sterne's 255.
- Theological studies in seventeenth century. 304.
- Thurland, Sir Edward 232.316.
- Tillotson, John. 26n.33bn.
- Toleration. 6.97.98.112.124.313.
- Tower of London. 234.
- Towers, Bishop John 64.
- Trinity College Dublin. 292-296.315. XIX.
- Tutorism. 265.
- Twenty-Seven Sermons. 161-164.
- Twenty-Five Sermons. 161-164.

U.

- Ulster. 286.
- Unum Necessarium. 192.195.198.280.
- Uppingham. 44.45.49.50.60.63.64.65.86.277.
- Ussher, James. 71.72.228n.283n.284.285.286.303.
- Ussher, Robert. 293.

V.

- Vane, Sir Henry. 105.

## V.

Vaughan, Richard, See Carbery.

via Intellegentiae. 310.

Virgil. 176.

Virgin Mary. 142.140.

"Vita Jesu Christi" (Ludolf of Saxony's) 138.

## W.

Wales, Church in. 182.

Walton, Isaac. 225.

Walter, Edmund. 238.

War. 267.

Ware, Sir James. 14.15.18.

Warner, John. 183.197.208.229.

wedderburne, Sir John 242.

Will. 219.271.

Winter, Samuel.294.

Wood, Anthony a. 34.48.120.

Worthy Communicant. 289-292.

Wray, Lady. 16.235.236.XVII.

Wyatt, William. 90.91.95.96.223n.IX.

Wyke, Andrew. 248.249.253.

## Z.

Zeal. 170.