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PREFACE

ONE of the most marked characteristics of historical studies in England at the present day is the increasing attention devoted to ecclesiastical history. Since this century began five societies have been founded for the study of the history of particular religious bodies and the publication of documents relating to them. The Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Friends, all publish periodicals containing dissertations on historical questions and materials for history, while the Jewish Historical Society and the Catholic Records Society have already published many volumes of original documents. Enterprising editors during the same period have collected and printed by subscription materials of the same kind, or reprinted rare tracts. And besides this the University presses of Cambridge, Oxford, and Manchester have published a number of books either containing new documentary evidence or utilising unpublished materials. A bibliography of these works would be a useful but a considerable task, and would take too much space for this Preface. While some of them deal with what may be termed purely sectarian history, others have a wider scope and deal with periods anterior to the definite separation of particular religious societies from the English Church. To this last class Dr Peel’s book belongs, and it should be regarded as a contribution to English ecclesiastical history as a whole.

Elizabethan Puritanism has attracted many investigators in recent years. Mr Burrage’s Early English Dissenters and his works on Robert Browne, Mr Usher’s Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, Dr Powicke’s Henry Barrow, Mr Pierce’s Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts, are recent examples of the increasing interest in this subject.
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The collection of manuscripts calendared by Dr Peel is a very useful and necessary addition to the materials already in print for the period. The manuscripts in question had been already utilised by older writers such as Neal and Brook but only partially employed, and somewhat uncritically and inaccurately dealt with. A calendar was the best way of making them accessible to students, for the cost of printing them all in extenso would have been prohibitive, and many of them were not of sufficient value to deserve reproduction at length. To provide a key to the whole collection by indicating the contents of each particular document, and to print in full the essential portions of those which were important were tasks requiring judgment as well as industry, and Dr Peel has performed his work in a scholarly fashion.

The documents calendared cover the period from 1570 to 1590. Amongst them are a number of projected bills and acts which show clearly the aims of the Puritan party. For instance, An Act for the reformation of the Ministerie in the Church of England, An Act for the restitution of Christian discipline in the Churche of England (i. 304; ii. 1), and some others mostly drawn up about 1586 (ii. 4, 196, 198, 231, 282). Coupled with these are a number of supplications, requests, and petitions to the Queen, to Parliament, and to the Council (e.g. i. 75, 163; ii. 70, 208). These collective demands are reinforced by appeals from single persons or local groups, either of ministers or laymen. This great mass of evidence sets forth in detail, with an immense amount of repetition it is true, but with the greatest clearness and fulness, what the Puritan party wanted to effect and what their grievances and complaints were. As Dr Peel observes, this is “probably the most important collection of Puritan documents extant,” and “while remembering that they are of an ex parte nature, and that it is impossible for the scientific historian to accept them indiscriminately, it is safe to say that no accurate account of the eccesiastical history of the years 1570–1590 can be written without consulting them.”

The complaints of the Puritans fall roughly into three classes: some concerned the ceremonies and doctrine of the
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Church, others its government, a third class the character of the clergy.

To remove from the Church “the remnants, relics, and leavings of the Pope and papistry” was the first object: the two treatises by a Separatist summarised in vol. i. pp. 55–8, are a characteristic expression of this desire. The doctrines and teaching of foreign reformers were set up as the standard by which the Church was to be judged and its reformation completed. They appealed to Calvin, Bucer, and Beza. “John Calvin, one of the most singular men of God that hath bene since the Apostles time” (ii. 60); Martin Bucer, “that deep, learned, politique, and experienced souldiour in God’s Church” (ii. 7); Theodore Beza, who declared that a church without discipline “is but a schoole of all wickedness and a licentious life” (i. 56). The ceremonies to which the Puritans objected were “badges, signes, and sacraments of Idolatry and Idolatrous priests,” or, as another put it, “had there beginning from the Divell and Antichrist whose implements and trappings they are” (i. 66, 79). The faults of the Book of Common Prayer are set forth in many documents, and a number of omissions and alterations demanded (e.g. i. 96, 211, 256; ii. 214). Because the Book “cast some light in a time of great darkness” it is not therefore to be imposed upon men for ever. For all Christians continued progress is necessary “that as the Lord may encrease our knowledge we may still be fashionyng of ourselves according to his worde &c.” It is necessary for rulers too. “King Henry of famous memorie was made an instrument of God to banish the Pope, to overthrow these Caterpillars the Monks and the Friers, to set out the Bible in English, and to do manie other good things....And yet it were no reason that all princes following should take him as a paterne, and keepe things at the state he left them. King Edward, that blessed ympe, his sonne, went further and made a better reformation, to the comforte of all the godlie...and yet it is no reason that the Queene’s Majesty now should maintaine those abuses that remaine” (i. 96). The drawback was that the Queen was not disposed to carry the work of reformation any further; she thought it had gone too far already. Elizabeth’s backslidings
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are set forth with the utmost frankness in “Mr Fuller’s booke to the Queene,” which was presented to her in 1586 (ii. 49).

The complaints of the government of the Church start from the same standpoint: it was a survival of the unreformed church. “The Lord Bishops, Deans, Chancellors, Commissaries and such like” are compendiously described as “the Popes bastards,” and “the body of Antichrist” (i. 58; ii. 65). But later the demand for the complete abolition of bishops developed into the more moderate proposal for the limitation of their authority. Perhaps the fullest and most consecutive statement of the case of the Puritans against the existing system is the tract entitled “Certaine points concerning the policie and government of the Ecclesiastical State” (ii. 5). Another document of the same year, 1586, explains the nature of the courts of ministers and elders to which the Puritans desired to transfer the disciplinary jurisdiction of the existing spiritual courts (ii. 1).

More interesting to the average reader than these treatises are the “conferences” between various bishops and recalcitrant ministers, in which the human side of the conflict is brought out with singular vividness. Axton’s discussion with the Bishop of Lichfield (i. 68), the Archbishop of Canterbury’s with the Chichester ministers (i. 209), and the Bishop of Winchester’s with John Edwin (i. 249), are good specimens. (See also ii. 221, 254.) By these questions and answers and the interchange of arguments the position of the two parties to the controversy is often stated more clearly and concisely than it is in lengthy controversial documents. Often, as their reports show, the bishops argued with the non-subscribing ministers with civility and kindness, but not always. “First,” says one, speaking of the Bishop of Peterborough, “he endeavored by faire speeches to draw me to subscribe, but not so prevaileringe, he used scoffes and taunts all that he could to disgrace mee,” finally “calling mee princox” (i. 292). Another complains of the Bishop of London, “poseinge me very strangely in many odd pointes of Hebrue and greeke words with grammatical questioninge” (i. 246). “Thou art an arrogant puritane,” said the Archbishop of York to a third, who answered that the name was “unjustly and uncharitably” given him. It is interesting to
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note the repudiation of the name Puritan by those to whom modern writers would apply the term (i. 117, 119, 181, 231, 234; ii. 224).

Another long series of documents sets forth the complaint of the Puritans about the character of the parish clergy, their unfitness for their office, their idleness and worldliness, their ignorance and inability to preach. It begins with “a supplication to her Majestie in the third yeare of her raigne” (i. 50), and in 1586 a number of measures were proposed in the shape of drafts of Acts for Parliament to secure “the reformation of the Ministerie in the Church of England and for the supplyinge of the same with convenient and sufficient Ministers” (i. 304, cf. ii. 70, 196, 198). Undoubtedly, as Dr Peel says elsewhere, “the moral and intellectual tone of the clergy was low,” but he is right in concluding that there was “some little improvement as the reign went on, though by 1603 nothing in the nature of a well equipped, well supported ministry had been obtained” (English Historical Review, 1911, p. 341). Nevertheless it was but a slight improvement. The complaints of the Elizabethan Puritans against “idol shepherds” and “dumb dogs” are echoed in the seventeenth century. Milton summarises them in Lycidas in his attack on “the corrupted clergy” of 1637:

Such as for their bellies’ sake
Creep and intrude, and climb into the fold.
Of other care they little reck’ning make
Than how to scramble at the shearsers’ feast
And shove away the worthy bidden guest.
Blind mouths! that scarce themselves know how to hold
A sheep-hook, or have learn’d aught else the least
That to the faithful herdman’s art belongs!
What recks it them? What need they? They are sped;
And when they list, their lean and flashy songs
Grate on their scannel pipes of wretched straw,
The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed,
But swoln with wind, and the rank mist they draw,
Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread:
Besides what the grim wolf with privy paw
Daily devours apace, and nothing said.

The whole passage might be annotated from Dr Peel’s documents. Milton insists on the importance of preaching
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just as the Elizabethan Puritans did: the metaphor of the shepherd and his flock was always in their mouths. How came you to be parson of Moreton Corbett? says a Bishop to a minister. “I am no parson” is his answer. “What are you? Vicar” asks the Bishop. “No,” says he, “I am no vicar. I abhor their names as Anti-christian. I am pastor of the congregation there” (i. 71). In another case a congregation, appealing to their minister to come back to them, describe him as “our shepherd to feed us with the spiritual food,” and sign themselves “your hungrie sheep” (i. 274). The “grim wolf” would have needed no explaining to sixteenth century readers. The “General Supplication” made to Parliament in 1586 speaks of the “Jesuits, Seminaries, and other priests, as grievous and hungrie wolves entring in among us, and finding us in a great part as sheepe without sheepeards, spoile and carie awae at their pleasure the flocke of Christ” (ii. 72, cf. ii. 177).

To prove their case, the Puritan leaders compiled annotated lists of the clergy in various counties, distinguishing between those fit for their office and capable of preaching and those disqualified by ignorance, idleness or immorality. “How true this our complaint is maie appeare by notes of the surveies herunto annexed of some shiers and countries, even some of the best, whereby the rest maie be esteemed” (ii. 77). Eleven counties and the city and archdeaconry of London are thus catalogued: Cornwall, Lincoln (Lindsey only), Rutland, Oxford, Berks, Bucks, Middlesex, Surrey, Norfolk, Essex, and Warwick. The lists contain 2537 parishes, in which there were 472 “preachers” and 1773 “no preachers”: amongst the clergy about 353 were noted as non-resident and about 467 as double beneficed. The lists will be of value to local historians from the personal information they contain. Of one it is noted: “He by misedemeanor spoiled his patrimonie, became a minstrel, and for refuge a minister.” Another “was a painter and an Interlude plaier.” After two are the words “a conjurer suspected.” Mr John Beale, of Juxta Foye, deserves special mention: he was “the best Wraslier in Cornwall.” After many Warwickshire names there is the note “he was a popish
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priest.” Of one of these, John Frith, vicar of Grafton, it is added “he can neither preach nor read well, his chiefest trade is to cure hawks that are hurt or diseased, for which purpose many do usuallie repaire to him.” Anyone undertaking to write an account of the Warwickshire clergy in Shakespeare’s time would find the materials here. Stratford-on-Avon was more fortunate than most places: its minister was “learned, zealous and godlie... a happy age if our church were fraught with manie such.” The information which these lists supply is, of course, prejudiced and partial; there are surveys made for the bishops which would no doubt present a more favourable view both of individuals and of the clergy as a whole, but they are not accessible in print for the purpose of comparison. However, Bishop Hooper’s Visitation of Gloucester in 1551, which Dr James Gairdner printed in the English Historical Review for 1904, shows that most of the clergy in that diocese were ignorant, and some excessively ignorant. There is no reason to suppose that those of other dioceses were any better, and the revolutions through which the Church passed after 1551 were not calculated to increase the learning and efficiency of the clergy. Puritans and Bishops alike aimed at raising the standard, by different methods, and each with some success, though the process was a slow one.

Though one would not accept as gospel any Puritan’s account of an opponent, sometimes a character is so vividly drawn that it seems to present the real man. Giles Wigginton describes his enemy Edward Hampton as “a prophane shameless, unlearned, and furious fellow.” At Cambridge he spent his time “very unthrifely, with roysters and alehouses, etc., so that he was called lustie Hampton” (as Justice Shallow was when he was at Clement’s Inn). Hampton boasted “that he had never broken his braine about study, but had bene good at a sword and buckler.” His dress was more appropriate to his character than his profession. “He goeth up and downe dailye, like a swashbuckler and royster, with a narrow brimmed hatte, with crosse garters, great ruffes, a paunch bellied coate, and other such like unseemely apparell for his calleinge, and so setteth up and downe, not onely in the high wayes and
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alehouses, but also in the church yarde and church, keepeinge companye with the vilest persons and most notorious sinners” (ii. 251). The account of the quarrel between Knight and Stevens for the possession of the pulpit in Palgrave church in Suffolk, is another vivid scene.

These documents are not merely materials for ecclesiastical history: they contain a large number of words and phrases interesting to the literary historian, much that will be of use to the social historian, and incidentally much miscellaneous information of interest. One of the acts of Mr Minge, at Ashford, in Kent, was “to deface a monument of superstition, to put away a font-case, coloured, gilded and pictured story-like with the seven popish sacraments, the Bishop giving holy orders and confirming children, the priest saying masse and christening, with exorcismes, marryinge, shrivinge and annealing, as theye call it, these things being slubbered over with a white wash that in an houre may be undone, standing like a Dianaes shrine for a future hope and daily conforte of old popish beldames and young perking papists, and a great offence to all that are christianly minded” (i. 239). A Chichester Puritan complains in 1586 that “In the Cathedrall Church, there standeth the passion of Christ (as it is called) even whole, saving that about two or three yeres past, it was washed over with some white colours; but since that time some well wishers of that waie (as there are too manie) have taken some paines that it is allmost as bright as ever it was” (ii. 191). The Queen herself was reminded that the walls and windows of the royal chapels were filled with images and pictures, and admonished to see them “cleansed and purged away” (ii. 53).

There are a number of references to the Universities. One Puritan proposed that they should be entirely devoted to training ministers, or at least the chief colleges, and “that the students should be prevented from spending so much time in other vaine and unprofitable studies as commonly thei do” (i. 169). A scheme for their training, drawn up by Chaderton (afterwards first master of Emmanuel), included however Rhetoric, Logic and Greek and Latin history, as well as knowledge of the tongues (i. 134). It was estimated in 1586
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that there were 194 men at Oxford and over 140 at Cambridge fit to hold livings, but unprovided for (ii. 199). A “Supplication of some of the Students of the Universitie of Cambridge to Parliament” in 1586, says: “It cannot be denied but this our Universitie doth flourish at this present in all kind of good literature as much as at any time heretofore…yet it cannot be denied likewise but that this part of us which have chosen the studie of the Sacred Scriptures and have prepared ourselves for the holie ministerie do find lesse lawfull entrance into the Church of God and preferment for our labours than in former times.” “Unlearned ministers, the verie scumme of the people” obtain livings. “If we ourselves use some meanes to have entrance to a charge the covetousness of patrons is such, and so insatiable for the most part, that there is no waie by them but by simonie, perjurie, and afterwards almost plaine beggerie” (ii. 186).

Another curious document is Wigginton’s account of his differences with Whitgift when he was a scholar under him at Trinity. Having to reprove him for a small breach of discipline, Whitgift refused to hear his excuses, and said he would use “shorter arguments with me, meaninge the rodd.” Other “petty brabling matters” concerning college discipline are mentioned to prove that the Archbishop had been Wigginton’s enemy from his youth up, and was not fit to be his judge (ii. 241).

The details about Queen Elizabeth given by William Fuller are curious. He rebuked her for swearing, “Your gracious Majesty in your anger hath used to sweare, some time by that abominable idoll the Masse, and often and grievouslylie by God, and by Christ, and by manie parts of his glorified bodie, and by Saints, faith, troth, and other forbidden things”; and “by your Majesty’s evill example and sufferance, the most part of your subjects and people of everie degree, do commonlie sweare and blaspheme” (ii. 54).

The Queen’s hostility to the Puritan movement in all its aspects was so clear that it needs no proving. “I will tell you what the Queene’s Majestie saide, that these puritans were greater enemmis to hir than the papists,” the Archbishop of York remarked to John Wilson in 1587 (ii. 224).
xiv
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The question of the extent to which the Puritan movement was supported by the nation is one which is often discussed and more difficult to determine. To represent it as an entirely clerical movement is going too far, but it is evident that it had no very wide or strong popular support. It was not till the seventeenth century that it became a national movement; and its development into one then was due to political rather than religious reasons. The lists of non-subscribing clergy and preachers printed by Dr Peel show that the Puritans were strong in particular centres and districts, but they were weak elsewhere, and the gradual spread of their influence beyond its original limits has not been exactly traced. The documents printed here show that in Elizabeth's time a few of the nobility were favourable to them. The Earl of Leicester for instance “procured the libertie and restoring againe of sundrie learned and painfull preachers to their places that were dismissed” (i. 135). He said “it was a pitifull thing that so many of the best mynisters and painfull in their preching, stood to be deprived for these things” (i. 282). Burghley more than once intervened in their favour (i. 143; ii. 207); Sir Walter Mildmay (ii. 58, 240), Sir Nicholas Bacon (i. 163), and some other noblemen and officials were their friends. There are also petitions from the gentlemen of Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex and Cambridge-shire on behalf of their ministers (i. 48, 225, 230; ii. 191). There are petitions also from a number of places in Essex (ii. 187—192), from London (ii. 219), of the same nature. It is evident that there was a widespread feeling that good ministers and effective preachers ought not to be deprived of their livings for nonconformity in points of ritual and ceremonial or non-subscription. On the other hand it is probable that many congregations were prepared to submit to a rite or a vestment they disliked rather than lose a good preacher, and thought their ministers over-scrupulous. “It is one great grief that your mouth is shut up,” wrote the inhabitants of Leigh in Essex to Mr William Negus. “Wee do also understand that your libertie maye be redeemed only by wearinge the surplice at some times, and that you shall not be urged any further. It is a thing which we wrote with all our harts, if it pleased
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God and our prince, were removed. But yet we take yt not to be a matter of such weighte, as that to the hazard of our souls and losse of our spiritual conforte, the not wearinge of yt should deprive us of your ministerie, for then we looke to have such an one thrust upon us, that we shall be constrained to beare with greater things than the surplice, and want our godly instruction” (i. 275).

Apart from this letter and the petitions of various congregations on behalf of their ministers these volumes contain little evidence as to the attitude of the people towards the Puritan movement. Incidentally there are occasional indications of their feelings. For instance, in a document referring to the suppression of the “Prophesyings,” it is stated “that poore vulgar people, whome it was fitter to have bene at their labours and occupations, leaving their ordinarie parishes, resorted thither from places farre distante, to heare matters and points of divinitie disputed and decided” (i. 153). These were exceptions: the labourers and artizans who formed the mass of the nation were no doubt correctly described as “simple and ignorant people, which as yet both old and younge remaine in most places without all knowledge of the grounds and principles of Christian religion” (i. 154). Quarrels about doctrine or ceremonies or church government were over their heads and did not touch them. There is some evidence that the Puritans thought of appealing to the nation for support as well as to Parliament. There are three pieces of verse, written apparently about 1584, to set forth the case of the Puritans against the rulers of the Church. One is entitled “An humble supplication to our Sovereigne Queene Elizabeth” (i. 267–9) in which her “poore subjects” complain that they are almost famished for want of “the food of life, God’s word,” because the Bishops thrust out good preachers. The second, “The renewing of the Crie of the poore to the Parliament,” develops the same theme (i. 269–70). The third, “A view of the Bishops’ extreme proceedings against their brethren the godly and painfull preachers throughout the whole Realme for trifles” (i. 271–4), is more argumentative, attacks the Bishops for engrossing so many livings in their own hands, and demands the revision of the
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Prayer Book and the establishment of Discipline “according to God’s holy lawes” (i. 271–4). These were clearly meant to be printed as broadsides and sold for popular consumption, but there is no evidence that they ever were so printed. Elizabethan ballads are a source of information as to the ideas of the masses which historians have too much neglected, probably because they have never been collected, and must be sought for in many different books. Many of them deal with moral and religious subjects; there are rhymed versions of most Scriptural stories, and a large number of ballads against the Pope and the Papists. There is one, published in 1564, entitled “The redifying of Solomon’s Temple and the Laborers thereof,” in praise of Parker, Horne, Sampson and other bishops and divines, who took a leading part in the Elizabethan settlement of the Church. There is another, published in 1572, entitled “Daniel’s sistyng in these our dayes: aptly applied to the true Preachers of the Gospell” (Collman, Ballads and Broadsides of the Elizabethan period now at Britwell Court, 1912).

But there are practically no ballads which testify to any popular interest in the struggle between the Puritans and the Bishops, or any sympathy with the former. The world-wide conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism overshadowed in the eyes of the people the minor domestic conflicts amongst English Protestants. Opposition to the existing system of Church government did not, I think, find expression in ballads till the seventeenth century. There are two extant ballads directed against the Church Courts, both written in the reign of James I. One is “A new Ballad of the Parrator and the Divell” (Shirburn Ballads, p. 306): the other is “A Citation sent to To-Bad the Pariter” (10th Report of the Historical MSS. Commission, iv. 491). Ballads against the Bishops begin in the next reign, about 1637. The value of negative evidence of this kind must not be over-estimated, but it helps to fix the limits of the sphere of influence of Puritanism during the earlier stages of the movement.

C. H. Firth.

October 1915
PREFATORY NOTE

THE purpose of this work is to draw attention and facilitate reference to the earliest—and probably the most important—collection of Puritan manuscripts extant.

The manuscripts speak for themselves, and it is unnecessary to say anything here about their nature or contents. For a long period students of Elizabethan ecclesiastical history have desired a Calendar; now an attempt is made to meet the need.

Of imperfections in the work one is only too conscious; often reasons of space have compelled a brief and unworthy summary of items which one would have liked to print in full; often laboriously compiled references—valuable for the general reader, but superfluous for the scholars for whose use the Calendar is intended—have had to be omitted; occasionally all efforts to trace allusions have failed.

Nevertheless, if the Calendar but saves time for hard-pressed workers, and leads students to what the Puritans themselves say, rather than to what others, be they friends or enemies, say about them, it will serve its purpose.

It should be added that much care has been expended on the Indexes, in order that they might be of use to local antiquaries, as well as exhaustive for more general workers.

My thanks are due to numerous scholars and friends who have helped me, thanks sincerely felt to many who are unnamed as to those now mentioned. To Professor A. J. Grant, of the University of Leeds, who first taught me the meaning of history.
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I owe much, as I do also to Professor C. H. Firth, of Oxford, who has not only guided me by his sound judgment and wide learning, but also contributed a Preface to the work.

Rev. W. Pierce and Rev. T. G. Crippen—familiar names to all interested in the early history of Nonconformity—have always been ready to assist me when I have found it necessary to appeal to them; Dr W. A. Shaw, of the Record Office, very kindly placed at my disposal many transcripts he had made from the “Register”; Rev. W. Beresford, of Leek, gave generous help to a complete stranger in inquiries concerning Morrice’s abode in Staffordshire.

I have also to thank Rev. F. H. Jones, ex-Librarian of Dr Williams’s Library, together with the staff of the Library, for courteous attention and for patience with a student who has been a constant source of trouble to them for some years.

Finally I am indebted to Dr Williams’s Trustees for permission to print these manuscripts, and to the Hibbert Trustees for support in the publication.

ALBERT PEEL.

Great Harwood,
Lancashire.
1 May, 1915.
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ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

1. 1, note 2, l. 6. For "Bishop of Bristol" read "Dr G. F. Browne, late Bishop of Bristol."

1. 12, note 2. Add:

"Until recently Bancroft's statement that 'A parte of a register' was printed by Waldegrave in Scotland has always been accepted without question. In October 1910, however, a paper (reprinted separately in 1912 under the title Richard Schilders and the English Puritans), was read before the Bibliographical Society by Mr J. Dover Wilson, in which it was contended that the actual printer of the work was Schilders and not Waldegrave. Basing his arguments on the similarity between the types, ornaments, &c. used in 'A parte of a register' and in works admittedly printed by Schilders, Mr. Dover Wilson makes out a strong case, and his arguments are deserving of very careful consideration. The present writer hopes to go into the whole matter fully in the introduction to a reprint of 'A parte of a register.'"

1. 19, note 4. Catalogue should be in Roman type.

1. 52, l. 14. For "Brokley" read "Broklesby."

1. 56, note 2 should be in italics.

1. 87, note, l. 4. For Reprints read Transcripts.

1. 129, l. 6. After "lines" add "They are practically identical with Mr Browne's Ten Questions (above, i. 62)."

1. 154, note. Register should be in Roman type.

1. 245, l. 2. Add: "The extract is printed in full in Browne, History of Congregationalism in Norfolk and Suffolk, 605."

II. 20. Note 1 should read: "i.e. 'too too,' that is, 'exceedingly apparent.' Cf. Hamlet, Act I. Sc. ii. l. 128:

'O that this too solid flesh would melt,' and the notes on this passage in the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare (Hamlet, Vol. i. p. 41)." I am indebted to Professor Firth for this correction.

II. 59, note. Add: "i.e. How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their Subjects &c."

II. 111, 4th line from bottom. After "'Bingham" add "[? Bingham]."

II. 123, 2nd line from bottom. Add a note to "Silke":

"Probably this should read Silke Willoughbie Hughie [Tuks], p., suspended."

II. 159, l. 11 from bottom. Add note to "'St Nicholas," reading:

"This and the following four churches are in Colchester."

II. 170, l. 6. After "Lancashire" add "[sic, Leicestershire]."