

# The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS.—JEREMIAH VI. 16.

VOLUME IV.]

TORONTO, UPPER CANADA, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1840.

[NUMBER 17.]

## Poetry.

To the Editor of the Church.

Sir,—The idea of the following papers, on the Language of Flowers, is taken from an article in an old number of Blackwood's Magazine. From this article are extracted all the poetical specimens to which the name of the author is not attached; and the prose remarks are, in many cases, abridged from the same, or altered so as to suit the character of this paper.

RIVIGNUS.

### THE LANGUAGE OF FLOWERS.

No. I.

Flowers are a delight to every one, to some, perhaps, merely for their beauty and fragrance; to others, independently of these acknowledged charms, for the varied pleasurable associations and thoughts they suggest,—and foremost of these is the assurance they afford of the exuberant goodness of God. "The provision which is made of a variety of objects not necessary to life, and ministering only to our pleasures, shows," says an eloquent and learned author, "a farther design than that of giving existence." And who does not feel this when he looks on the hedgerow and the mead,

"Full of fresh verdure and unnumber'd flowers,  
The negligence of nature."

Nor is this the only lesson they impart; they remind us also of the superintending providence of the Almighty. After contemplating the more stupendous features of creation, "the heavens, the work of His fingers, the moon and the stars, which he has ordained," till overwhelmed with a sense of littleness, we exclaim, almost with feelings of despondency, "Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?" Has not the sight of a flower, so carefully provided for, so exquisitely wrought, and so lavishly endowed with fragrance, recalled the mind to its proper tone, and given emphasis to the question, "Are ye not much better than they?"

Each of us may have some especial favourites among flowers: some may prefer the lily, the rose, and the violet; but yet each flower, as it comes before us, arrayed in a religious light, seems lovely as the last. Who would exclude the meadow of them all from his love? "A dew-drop trembling in a happy little flower's golden eye—is it not a work magnificent?"

#### FIELD FLOWERS.

Flowers of the field, how meet ye seem,  
Man's frailty to portray,  
Blooming so fair in morning's beam,  
Passing at eve away.  
Teach this, and oh! though brief your reign,  
Sweet flower, ye shall not live in vain.

Go, form a monitory wreath  
For youth's unthinking brow;  
Go, and to busy manhood breathe  
What most he fears to know;  
Go, strew the path where age doth tread,  
And tell him of the silent dead.

But whilst to thoughtless ones and gay  
Ye breathe these truths severe,  
To those who droop in pale decay  
Have ye no word of cheer?  
Oh yes, ye weave a double spell,  
And death and life be token well.

Go, then, where wrap in fear and gloom,  
Fond hearts and true are sighing,  
And deck with emblematic bloom  
The pillow of the dying;  
And softly speak, nor speak in vain,  
Of your long sleep and broken chain.

And say that He, who from the dust  
Recalls the slumbering flower,  
Will surely visit those who trust  
His mercy and His power;  
Teach them, where sleeps their peaceful clay,  
And roll, ere long, the stone away.

If such be the holy language of Field Flowers, let us see how the "Dew-drop trembling" spake its moral to Andrew Marvell:

#### THE DROPPING OF DEW.

See how the orient dew,  
Shed from the bosom of the morn,  
Into the blowing roses,  
Yet careless of its mansion new,  
For the clear region where 'twas born  
Round in its little incloses:

And in its little globe, extent,  
Frames as it can its native element,  
How it the purple flower does slight!  
Scarce touching where it lies:  
But gazing back upon the skies,  
Shines with a mournful light,

Like its own tear,  
Because so long divided from the sphere.  
Restless it rolls and insecure,  
Trembling lest it grow impure,  
Till the warmer sun pities its pain,  
And to the skies exhales it back again.

So the soul, that drop, that ray  
Of the clear fountain of eternal day,  
Could it within the human form be seen,  
Remembering still its former height,  
Shuns the sweet leaves and blossoms green;  
And recollecting its own light,  
Does in its pure and circling thoughts express  
The greater heaven in an heaven less.

In how coy a figure wound,  
In every way it turns away;  
So the world excluding round,  
Yet receiving in the day;  
Dark beneath, but bright above,  
Here disdaining, there in love,  
How loose and easy hence to go;  
How girt and ready to ascend;  
Moving but on a point below,  
It all about does upwards bend;

Such did the manna's sacred dew distil,  
White and entire although congeal'd and chill;  
Congeal'd on earth, but does dissolving run  
Into the glories of the Almighty sun.

## BIOGRAPHY.

### THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT GRANT, GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY.

The vast responsibility upon Great Britain, as a professedly Christian nation, to extend, as far as her territories may reach, the knowledge of that only name whereby sinners are to be saved, has been frequently referred to in the pages of this work, and the attention of its readers has been in a peculiar manner directed to the religious condition of India. Each succeeding year leads us to contemplate with thankfulness the breaking down of the great barriers which opposed the dissemination of divine truth. Our own church seems at length to have gained, in the vast possessions in the east, a firm footing; and, considering the prejudices of the human heart, attachment to long habits, and, above all, the natural tendency of man to idolatry, and his repugnance to embrace the truth as it is in Jesus, as much has been accomplished as could have been within the time expected. It is almost needless to say that the great object of those devoted ministers of God, who labor in foreign parts, must necessarily be materially furthered by the co-operation of laymen, more especially persons of influence;

and it was the privilege of those called on to labour in the presidency of Bombay, to have in their late governor, an individual deeply anxious for the salvation of the millions of benighted heathens around him.

Sir Robert Grant was the second son of Charles Grant, Esq., of whom a memoir has appeared in this magazine, and who was long distinguished for his thorough practical acquaintance with the affairs of India; and—what was of more consequence—his deep spirituality of religious feeling. After the usual course of preparatory study, Robert became a member of Magdalen College, Cambridge, with his brother Charles (Lord Glenelg).—In 1799 he was appointed Craven scholar, and his name appears in the tripos of 1801, as third wrangler, his brother being the fourth. He was also second medallist, Charles being first; such honours—truly no paltry ones—testify that his acquirements could have been of no ordinary grade, and the circumstance that he took such honours, added very considerably to his influence. It is very true that, of themselves, academical distinctions are, in reality, valueless, if not accompanied by sound religious principle; still they are not, on that account, to be regarded as unworthy the aim of the Christian student. Perhaps there has been no little error on this point. If a man's heart is really dedicated to God he will feel it an incumbent duty to bring to the service of God talent, study, and assiduity; and it may be well for those who despise academical pre-eminence, under the plea that it has a tendency to foster pride, to nourish vanity, and to withdraw the affections from things above, to consider whether, in many cases, it may not be the indulgence of idle habits and an unwillingness to undergo patient labour and unwearying toil, which has proved the stumbling block in the way of their aiming at distinction.

Having graduated as M. A. in 1806, Mr. Grant was called to the bar by the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn, in 1807. He ultimately became King's sergeant in the Duchy Court of Lancaster, a Commissioner of Bankrupts, and a member of the Privy Council in 1831. He was appointed Judge-Advocate in 1832; he was returned as member of the House of Commons, for the Inverness Burghs, in 1826, for Norwich in 1830, and for Finsbury in 1834. It would be entirely foreign from the design of this memoir to make any allusion to Mr. Grant's parliamentary conduct, or any comment on his political views; my object is to bring him under the reader's notice in a still higher character—that of a Christian, and the various institutions which he supported and zealously advocated, the object of which was the advancement of religion, and proofs that his mind was occupied with a deep concern for the best interests of his fellow creatures.

Mr. Grant having been appointed governor of Bombay, in 1834, and received the honour of knighthood, proceeded to that presidency. He was not destined, however, to retain long the reins of government. In the summer of 1838, having left the presidency for the hills, he rode out in heavy rains, and in consequence was seized with fever. The disorder abated, and recovery was expected, but a relapse taking place, the brain became affected, and he sank in July, in his 58th year.

The efficiency of Sir Robert's Government—the immense load of business he was compelled to transact, are so fully set forth in the appendix to the last charge of the Bishop of Calcutta, that I may be well to extract the whole passage referring to them, as much more valuable than any that the writer of this memoir could give.

"One instance has just taken place, and thrown all India, and especially the heart of my dear brother of Bombay, into the deepest dejection—the sudden death of his and my mutual friend, the late governor of that presidency. You must forgive me if I pause for a moment on the loss of so distinguished a person. I had hardly given utterance to these expressions which you will find in the commencement of the charge, on occasion of the death of two of the leading personages in my own diocese, when the tidings of the fall of Sir Robert Grant struck a coldness to my very heart. I had passed, as the Lord Bishop of Bombay will remember, a fortnight under his hospitable roof, when on my primary visitation in the winter of 1835. There I had learned something of his devotion to India, his indefatigable application to business, his attention to moral and religious character in his promotions, his love to the native population, his high conception of the capabilities, in almost every respect, of that fine country, in the government of which he had been called to share, his zeal to raise its position amongst the nations of the world, his ceaseless activity in diffusing that information, and exciting that spirit of inquiry and enterprise in commercial pursuits, on which national greatness so materially depends.

"I had witnessed also the transcendent importance which he attached to Christianity, as the most stupendous benefit ever vouchsafed by Almighty God to a lost world, and for the promotion of which, in every safe and discreet method, he fully believed India was entrusted, almost miraculously, to the sceptre of the greatest, and freest, and most enlightened of the Western nations.—Nor had I omitted to notice his family happiness, his personal and domestic piety, his prayers daily with his household, his attendance twice on the Lord's Day on the public worship of God, and the honour he always put on religion in his most ordinary converse.

"It is soothing to my feelings to dwell on such Christian excellencies—gratitude demands it of me. The ebullition of grief and sympathy which your Lordship witnessed at the public meeting (the most numerous ever recollectcd at Bombay) at which you presided after his death, did not so much surprise me; but I confess I read with no little emotion the simple but affecting testimony borne by different persons to the efforts he had made to serve India. A whole life seems to have been crowded into his very few years of government (only three and a half—March 1835 to July 1838.) The enumeration of 'public measures, which he either originated or carried into effect,' to use the terms of one of the resolutions, 'for improving the agricultural resources of the country, facilitating communication with Europe, and also between the different towns and provinces of the presidency, and advancing its commercial and general prosperity,' had scarcely been made by one public functionary, when a similar series of proceedings was detailed by another distinguished person for his putting himself in communication with individuals of all classes, and eliciting information on the subject of education; for establishing schools and promoting the interests of science; for founding medical colleges and native dispensaries, and for encouraging, by public employment and private munificence, the rising native youth.

"Nor was it the least affecting to me to read the declaration of the Archdeacon of Bombay (the Rev. H.

Jeffrey,) towards the close of the meeting:—"For my own part, I should be very ungrateful indeed if I did not bear testimony to his personal kindness and courtesy to myself; and not only to myself, but to the whole body of the clergy of our church establishment, in whose name I now speak, and whose unanimous feeling and opinion I am certain that I faithfully represent. But his praise stood on far higher ground than this—on the ground of genuine piety and love to God. The general interests of religion, and of our own church establishment in particular, occupied a large share of his attention; and when I consider the vast amount of correspondence which passed under his eye, as stated by the secretary, all of which he examined for himself, I am quite astonished at the readiness with which all correspondence was answered which passed through my department; and I cannot but feel bound to acknowledge that, amidst his various and extensive engagements, the church occupied even more than its share of his attention."

"The allusion to which this statement refers, as made by one of the secretaries of government, to the sources of his premature disease and death, is indeed most touching. Yes, our noble-minded and lamented friend fell a sacrifice to his exertions, somewhat increased perhaps beyond the strictest necessity, by a scrupulous, an over-scrupulous anxiety we must say, to examine every thing for himself, to save the feelings of every individual with whom he had concern, and to wait till he had the time and materials for a rigid and impartial investigation into the merits of each case, which carried him far beyond his strength, though it inspired such unlimited love and confidence in those placed under his authority. The proceedings of the Bombay government, in only one or two departments, occupied 24,000 folios in the year 1837. Embarrassing circumstances may possibly have concurred to harass his mind. The arrangements of his government with the Supreme Council at Calcutta, in consequence of the Charter Act of 1833, are supposed to have created, from their novelty, continual impediments to his exertions. If he incurred any unpopularity on this score, either at home or with the government of India, it adds at least to the proof of his zeal for his own presidency. The secret of all this distinguished reputation and success was not so much his fine talents, nor his diligent habits of public business, nor his zeal and perseverance, as his thorough knowledge of India, and the high and elevated principles which directed his whole conduct. He had not to acquire as other governors; he brought to his chair an acquaintance with the most minute affairs of his Presidency. He inherited from his eminent father (the late Charles Grant, Esq., whose life and character are far too little known—what he accomplished for the religious interests of India during a period of fifty years, will only be fully disclosed at the last great day,) an inextinguishable love for the country which he left at the age of nine, to return to it as governor after a lapse of forty-seven years; having not wholly lost the language of Hindostan during the long interval, whilst he had been collecting the most copious and valuable stores of information.

"Such a governor soon becomes known, especially in our Eastern empire. When it is once understood that there is a zeal and promptitude in the head of the state equal to the most ardent wishes of every applicant—a passion for India—a determination to promote, not private objects, nor the aggrandizement of a family, nor the accumulation of wealth, nor even the ordinary ends of government only, but the good of the prostrate millions committed to his care—and especially when this is seen to be connected with a thorough understanding of what Christianity really is, and what it demands of man, it operates like a charm; it penetrates the remotest ramifications of the administration. It elicits and rewards individual enterprise of every kind. Sir Robert Grant's years in Bombay, few as they were, are the brightest spot in his life. The period of peace during which his government fell, afforded him the fairest field for his beneficent labours. Unlike some of his most eminent predecessors, his attention and resources were not diverted from the one grand object of his heart.

"For myself I can only say, that a friendship of nearly thirty years thus suddenly snapped asunder, leaves me desolate indeed. I feel as if I had lost a brother. His private tokens of friendship I dare not, and ought not to particularize. It may, however, interest his friends to know that his able pen may be traced in the large aid afforded me in the two sermons on Habit, in my first volume of sermons of 1817; in my Defence of the Church Missionary Society in 1818; and in the Funeral discourse for his honoured father in 1823. It is known, however, that I owe to his honoured father's friendship, continued in the present generation, the appointment which Lord Glenelg, his eldest son, when President of the India Board, was pleased to intrust to me in this country. I may add in this connexion, that it fell under my own notice to witness, before I left England in 1832, Sir Robert's zeal in preparing a bill for the erection of two bishoprics, now so happily filled by my right reverend brethren, and which was incorporated into the New Charter Act the following year. What share he took in the general enactments of that charter, as well as of the preceding one of 1813, and in the provisions more especially for the freest diffusion of Christianity, all acquainted with the detail of those great measures well know. The two large and valuable volumes on the subject, which he published in 1813, testify his powers of mind, his elegance and force in composition, and the vast fund of information on which he could draw.

"It has pleased, however, the Almighty to remove him from us. Happy for himself the transition from an earthly to a heavenly kingdom! He has 'served his generation according to the will of God.' Nor did his humble, holy, pious death, his poignant confessions of sin, his fear of himself, his delight in hearing holy scripture, his firm but trembling reliance alone on the merits of his Saviour, leave any thing to desire to his family and friends in the way of alleviation for his irreparable loss. Irreparable to them it undoubtedly is; nor can it be soon even partially supplied as to his public station; for it is the confession of all who can best judge of the case, that for capacity and variety of talent, for sincerity and singleness of purpose, for purity of private life, for bright example as a husband and parent, for deep religious principle, for calmness and impartiality in his decisions, for undissembled and active philanthropy, and for a statesmanlike knowledge of India, no governor has surpassed, and few have equalled, Sir Robert Grant."

This testimony is the more valuable, as coming from the pen of one who had, for a long series of years, had constant opportunities of being intimately conversant with the feelings and views, as well as the conduct of Sir Robert; who from personal observation could give

a candid statement of his mode of conducting the affairs of the presidency; and his own zeal for the stability of the church, of which he is himself so valuable an overseer, and his willingness to make personal sacrifice for its welfare, is now more than ever displayed, by his munificent donation to the cathedral now erecting in his diocese.\*

\* We take the opportunity of cordially recommending to our readers "Sacred Poems, by the late Right Hon. Sir R. Grant, London. Saunders and Otley. 1839." Lately edited by Lord Glenelg.

### CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HIS MAJESTY KING CHARLES I. AND MR. ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

(Continued from our last.)

For Mr. Alexander Henderson.

HIS MAJESTY'S THIRD PAPER.

1. It were arrogant, besides loss of time, in me to vie preambles with you; for it is truth I seek, and neither praise nor victory; therefore I shall only insist upon those things which are merely necessary to my own satisfaction, in order to which I desired the assistance of some divines; whereupon I will insist no further, save only to wish that you may not, as I have known many men do, lose time, by being mistaken in the way to save it; wherein I have only sought to disburden myself, but to lay no blame upon you; and so I leave it.

2. Nor will I say more of the second than this, that I am glad you have so well approved of what I have said concerning my education and reason; but then remember, that another man's will is at least as weak a ground to build my faith upon as my former education.

3. In this there are two points: first, concerning the reforming power; then ancient the English Reformation. For the first, I confess you now speak clearly, which before you did but darkly mention, wherein I shall mainly differ with you, until you shall shew me better reason; yet thus far I will go along with you, that when a general council cannot be had, several kingdoms may reform themselves (which is learnedly and fully proved by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in his disputation against Fisher); but the inferior magistrates and other people, take it which way you will, hath this power, I utterly deny; for which, by your favour, you have made no sufficient proof, to my judgment.—Indeed, if you could have brought, or can bring, authority of Scripture for this opinion, I would, and will, yet, with all reverence submit; but as for your examples out of the Old Testament, in my mind they rather make for than against me, all those reformations being made by kings; and it is a good probable, though I will not say convincing, argument, that if God would have approved of a popular reforming way, there were kings of Judah and Israel sufficiently negligent and ill to have made such examples by; but, by the contrary, the sixteenth chapter of Numbers shews clearly how God disapproves of such courses. But I forget this assertion is to be proved by you; yet I may put you in the way; therefore, let me tell you that this pretended power in the people must, as all others, either be directly, or else declaratorily, by approbation, given by God; which, how soon you can do, I submit; otherwise you prove nothing. For the citing of private men's opinions, more than as they concern with the general consent of the Church in their time, weighs little with me, it being too well known that "rebels never wanted writers to maintain their unjust actions;" and though I much reverence Bishop Jewel's memory, I never thought him infallible; for Bilson, I remember well what opinion the king my father had of him for those opinions, and how he shewed him some favour in hope of his recantation, (as his good nature made him do many things of that kind);\* but whether he did or not, I cannot say. To conclude this point; until you shall prove this position by the word of God, (as I will regard authority), I shall think all popular reformations little better than rebellions; for I hold that no authority is lawful but that which is either directly given, or at least approved, by God.—Secondly, concerning the English Reformation: the first reason you bring why Queen Elizabeth did not finish it, is, because she took away episcopacy—the hints of reasons against which government you say I take no notice of. Now, I thought it was sufficient notice, yes, and answer too, when I told you a negative, as I conceived, could not be proved, and that it was for me to prove the affirmative; which I shall either do, or yield the argument, as soon as I shall be assisted with books, or such men of my opinion, who, like you, have a library in their brain. And so I must leave this particular, until I be furnished with means to put it to an issue; which had been sooner done, if I could have had my will. Indeed, your second well proved is most sufficient, which is, that the English Church-government is not builded upon the foundation of Christ and the apostles. But I conceive your probation of this doubly defective; for first, albeit our archbishops and bishops should have professed Church-government to be mutable and ambulatory, I conceive it not sufficient to prove your assertion; and, secondly, I am confident you cannot prove that most of them maintained this walking position (for some particulars must not conclude the general), for which you must find much better arguments than their being content with the constitution of the Church, and the authority and munificence of princes, or you will fall extremely short. As for the retaining of the "Roman leaven," you must prove it as well as say it, else you say little; but that the conforming of the Church-discipline to the civil policy should be depraving of it, I absolutely deny; for I aver, that without it the Church can neither flourish nor be happy. And for your last instance, you shall do well to shew the prohibition of our Saviour against the addition of more officers in the Church than he named; and yet, in one sense, I do not conceive that the Church of England hath added any; for an archbishop is only a distinction for order of government, not a new officer; and so of the rest: and of this kind I believe there are divers now in Scotland which you will not condemn, as the moderators of assemblies, and others.

4. Where you find a bishop and presbyter in Scripture to be one and the same, which I deny to be always so, it is in the apostles' time. Now, I think to prove the order of bishops succeeded that of the apostles, and that the name was chiefly altered in reverence to those who were immediately chosen by our Saviour, albeit in their time they caused divers to be called so, as Barnabas, and others—so that I believe this argument makes little for you. As for your proof of the antiquity of Presbyterian government, it is well that the Assembly of Divines at Westminster can do more than Eusebius could—and I shall believe when I see it; for your former paper affirms that those times were very dark for matter of fact, and will be so still for me, if there be no clearer arguments to prove it than those you mention; for because there were divers congregations in Jerusalem, ergo, what? are there not divers parishes in one diocese? (your two first I answer but as one argument); and because the apostles met with those of the inferior orders for acts of government, what then? even so, in these times, does the deans and chapters, and many times those of the inferior clergy, assist the bishops: but I hope you will not pretend to say that there was an equality between the apostles and other presbyters; which not being, doth in my judg-

\* This stands in the original as a marginal addition.

ment quite invalidate these arguments. And if you can say a more for the Churches of Corinth, Ephesus, Thessalonica, &c., than you have for Jerusalem, it will gain no ground on me. As for St. Jerome, it is well known that he was no great friend to bishops, as being none himself; yet take him altogether, and you will find that he makes a clear distinction between a bishop and a presbyter, as yourself confesses; but the truth is, he was angry with those who maintained deacons to be equal to presbyters.

5. I am well satisfied with the explanation of your meaning concerning the word *falsity*, though I think to have had reason for saying what I did; but, by your favour, I do not conceive that you have answered the strength of my argument; for when you and I differ upon the interpretation of Scripture, and I appeal to the practice of the primitive Church, and the universal consent of the Fathers, to be judge between us, methinks you should either find a fitter, or submit to what I offer; neither of which, to my understanding, you have yet done; nor have you shewn how, waving those judges I appeal unto, the mischief of the interpretation by private spirits can be prevented. Indeed, if I cannot prove by antiquity that jurisdiction belongs to bishops, thereby clearly distinguishing them from other presbyters, I shall then begin to misdoubt many of my former foundations. As for Bishop Davenant, he is none of those to whom I have appealed, or will submit unto. But for the exception you take to Fathers, I take it to be a begging of the question; as likewise those great discoveries of secrets, not known to former ages, I shall call new-invented fancies, until particularly you shall prove the contrary; and for your Roman authors, it is no great wonder for them to seek shifts whereby to maintain novelties, as well as the puritans. As for Church-ambition, it doth not at all terminate in seeking to be pope; for I take it to be no point of humility to endeavour to be independent of kings, it being possible that papacy in a multitude may be as dangerous as in one.

6. As I am no judge over the reformed Churches, so neither do I censure them; for many things may be allowable upon necessity, which otherwise are unlawful; but know, once for all, that I esteem nothing the better because it is done by such a particular Church, though it were by the Church of England, which I avow most to reverence; but I esteem that Church most which comes nearest to the purity of the primitive doctrine and discipline, as I believe this doth. Now, concerning ordination, I bade you prove that presbyters without a bishop might lawfully ordain, which yet I conceive you have not done; for (2 Tim. i. 6) it is evident that St. Paul was at Timothy's ordination; and albeit that all the seventy had their power immediately from Christ, yet it is as evident that our Saviour made a clear distinction between the twelve apostles and the rest of the disciples, which is set down by three of the evangelists, whereof St. Mark calls it an ordination, (Mark iii. 15); and St. Luke says, "and of them he chose twelve," &c. (Luke vi. 13); only St. Matthew doth but barely enumerate them by their name of distinction (Matt. x. 1), I suppose out of modesty, himself being one; and the other two, being none, are more particular. For the administration of baptism, giving, but not granting, what you say, it makes more for me than you; but I will not engage upon new questions, not necessary for my purpose.

7. For my oath, you do well not to enter upon those questions you mention; and you would have done as well to have omitted your instance; but out of discretion, I desire you to collect your answer out of the last section; and for your argument, though the intention of my oath be for the good of the Church collective, therefore can I be dispensed withal by others than the representative body? Certainly no more than the people can dispense with me for them oaths I took in their favours without the two houses of Parliament; as for future reformations, I will only tell you that *incommodum non solvit argumentum*.

8. For the king my father's opinion, if it were not to spend time, (as I believe needlessly), I could prove, by living and written testimonies, all more than I have said of him, for his persuasions in these points which I now maintain; and for your defensive war, as I do acknowledge it is a great sin for any king to oppress the Church, so I hold it absolutely unlawful for subjects, upon any pretence whatsoever, to make war, though defensive, against their lawful sovereign; against which no less proofs will make me yield but God's word; and let me tell you, that upon such points as these, instances, as well as comparisons, are odious.

Newcastle, June 22, 1646. C. R.

For His Majesty.

MR. ALEX. HENDERSON'S THIRD PAPER.

Having in my former papers pressed the steps of your Majesty's propositions, and finding, by your Majesty's last paper, controversies to be multiplied, I believe beyond your Majesty's intentions in the beginning—as concerning the reforming power; the reformation of the Church of England; the difference between a bishop and a presbyter; the warrants of presbyterian government; the authority of interpreting Scripture; the taking and keeping of public oaths; the forcing of conscience; and many other inferior and subordinate questions, which are branches of those main controversies;—all which in a satisfactory manner to determine in a few words, I leave to more presuming spirits, who either see no knots of difficulties or can find a way rather to cut them asunder than to unloose them; yet will I not use any tergiversation; nor do I decline to offer my humble opinion, with the reasons thereof, in the own time concerning each of them; which, in obedience to your Majesty's command, I have begun to do already. Only, sir, by your Majesty's favourable permission, for the greater expedition, and that the present vitiations may be brought to some issue, I am bold to treat that the method may be a little altered, and I may have leave now to begin at a principle, and that which should have been *inter premissa*; I mean the rule by which we are to proceed and to determine the present controversy of Church-policy; without which we will be led into a labyrinth, and want a thread to wind us out again. In your Majesty's first paper, the universal custom of the primitive Church is conceived to be the

\* "If servants ought to obey their masters, not only being gentle, but such as be forward; as well and much more ought subjects to be obedient, not only to their good and courteous, but also to their sharp and rigorous princes. . . . A rebel is worse than the worst prince, and rebellion worse than the worst government of the worst prince that hitherto hath been. . . . What if the prince be unchristian and evil inclined, and it is also evident to all men's eyes that he is so? I ask again, what if it belong to the wickedness of the subjects, that the prince is unchristian and evil? Shall the subjects both, by their wickedness provoke God for their deserved punishment, to give them an unchristian or evil prince, and also rebel against him, and withal against God, who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a prince?"—An *Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion*. First Part. Homilies, edit. 1587.