

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1900.

ART. I.—THE PROTESTANTISM OF OUR GREAT
ENGLISH DIVINES.

V. BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

BISHOP TAYLOR is the most rhetorical of our English divines—the Chrysostom or Golden-Mouth of the seventeenth century. In consequence of this characteristic an eloquent clause here or a rhetorical flourish there lends itself to a misrepresentation of the general views of the writer, and this peculiarity is taken advantage of by men of disloyal sentiments to present Bishop Taylor as a supporter of opinions which he was energetically combating. We have seen an instance of this treatment of the Bishop lately. A Declaration of Doctrine, professing to be Catholic, but really Roman, was issued. This Declaration was supported and justified by a number of quotations, the majority, if not all, of which were at once shown to misrepresent the authors quoted. Among them the most striking was a passage from Jeremy Taylor, the fallacious character of which was immediately demonstrated by the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, the Bishop of Edinburgh, and others. The props on which the Declaration was supported were struck away, and not one effort has been made by those who issued the Declaration to show either that they were honestly though mistakenly trusted to at the first, or that other props can be supplied in their places.

The following passages will show what were Jeremy Taylor's real sentiments on points at issue between the Roman Church and ourselves.

Holy Scripture.

“If we inquire upon what grounds the primitive Church did rely for their whole religion, we shall find they knew none

else but the Scriptures. *Ubi Scriptum?* was their first inquiry. 'Do the prophets and the Apostles, the Evangelists or the Epistles, say so?' Read it there, and then teach it, else reject it; they call upon their charges in the words of Christ—'Search the Scriptures.' They affirm that the Scriptures are full, that they are a perfect rule, that they contain all things necessary to salvation, and from hence they confuted all heresies. This I shall clearly prove by abundant testimonies" ("Dissuasive," Part II., I., ii. 7).

The Bishop then quotes Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine. "By the concurrence of these testimonies of so many learned, orthodox, and ancient Fathers we are abundantly confirmed in that rule and principle upon which the whole Protestant and Christian religion is established. From hence we learn all things, and by these we prove all things, and by these we confute heresies and prove every article of our faith. According to this we live, and on these we ground our hope, and whatsoever is not in these we reject from our canon" (*ibid.*).

"That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament do contain the whole will and law of God is affirmed by the primitive Fathers and by all the reformed Churches. That the Scriptures are not a perfect rule of faith and manners, but that tradition is to be added to make it a full repository of the Divine Will is affirmed by the Church of Rome" ("Ductor Dubitantium," ii. 3, 14).

Interpretation of Scripture.

"God hath made the Scriptures plain and easy to all people that are willing and obedient. The Fathers say that in things in which our salvation is concerned the Scriptures need no interpreter, but a man may find them out for himself. The way of the ancient and primitive Church was to expound the Scriptures by the Scriptures. In pursuance of this, the ancient Fathers took this way, and taught us to do so too, to expound difficult places by the plain. . . . If you inquire where or which is the Church, from human teachings you can never find her; she is only demonstrated in the divine oracles" (*ibid.*, ii., 3, 14).

Traditions.

Having stated that tradition is "any way of communicating the notice of a thing to us," the Bishop points out that there may be a tradition or handing down of things true, of things indifferent, or of things false. All matters of faith, he argues,

are now delivered to us in Scripture; indifferent things do not rest on Apostolical authority, and need not be observed. The third class of traditions he enumerates as follows:

“There are, indeed, a great many pretended-to-be traditions, but they are false articles, or wicked practices, or uncertain sentences at the best. I reckon some of those which the Roman Church obtrudes, such as are invocation of saints and angels, adoration of them, and worshipping of images, the doctrine of Purgatory, prayer in the unknown tongue, the Pope’s power to depose kings and to absolve from lawful and rate oaths, the picturing of God the Father and the Holy Trinity, the half-communion, the doctrine and practice of indulgences, canon of the Mass, the doctrine of proper sacrifice in the Mass, monastical profession, the single life of priests and bishops. Now, these are so far from being Apostolical traditions that they are some of them apparently false, some of them expressly against Scripture, and others confessedly new, and either but of yesterday, or like the issue of the people, born where and when no man can tell” (“*Ductor Dubitantium*,” ii. 3, 24).

Romish Innovations.

“There are very many more things in which the Church of Rome hath greatly turned aside from the doctrine of Scripture and the practice of the Catholic, Apostolic and primitive Church. Such are these: The invocation of saints; the insufficiency of Scripture without the tradition of faith unto salvation; their absolving sinners before they have by canonical penance and the fruits of a good life testified their repentance; their giving leave to simple presbyters by papal dispensation to give confirmation of chrism; selling Masses for ninepence; circumgestation of the Eucharist to be adored; the dangerous doctrine of the necessity of the priest’s intention in collating Sacraments, by which device they have put it in the power of the priest to damn whom he pleases of his own parish; their affirming that the Mass is a proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead; private Masses, or the Lord’s Supper without communion, which is against the doctrine and practice of the ancient Church of Rome itself, and contrary to the tradition of the Apostles, if we may believe Pope Calixtus, and is also forbidden under pain of excommunication. . . . We have done this the rather (verified the charge of novelty) because the Roman emissaries endeavour to prevail amongst the ignorant, and prejudicate by boasting of antiquity and calling their religion the ‘old religion’ and the ‘Catholic,’ so ensnaring others by ignorant words, in which is no truth; their religion, as it is distinguished from the religion of

the Church of England and Ireland, being 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. But they have taught every priest that can scarce understand his breviary (of which in Ireland there are too many), and very many of the people, to ask where our religion was before Luther, whereas it appears by the premises that it is much more easy for us to show our religion before Luther than for them to show theirs before Trent. And although they can show too much practice of their religion in the degenerate ages of the Church, yet we can, and do, clearly show ours in the purest and first ages, and can, and do, draw lines pointing to the times and places where the several rooms and storyes of their Babel was builded, and where polished, and where furnished " (*"Dissuasive,"* I, i. 11).

Romish Superstitions.

"Some of the Roman doctrines are a state of temptation to all the reason of mankind, as the doctrine of transubstantiation; some are at least of a suspicious improbity, as worship of images and of the consecrated elements, and many others; some are of a nice and curious nature, as the doctrine of merit, of condignity and congruity; some are perfectly of human invention, without ground of Scripture or tradition, as the forms of ordination, absolution, etc. When men see that some things can never be believed heartily, and many not understood fully, and more not remembered or considered perfectly, and yet all imposed upon the same necessity, and as good believe nothing as not everything—this way is apt to make men despise all religion or despair of their own salvation" (*ibid.*, II., i. 7).

Romish Impieties.

"You are gone to a Church in which you are to be a subject of the King so long as it pleases the Pope; in which you may be absolved from your vows made to God, your oaths to the King, your promises to men, your duties to your parents in some cases; a Church in which men pray to God, and to saints in the same form of words in which they pray to God; a Church in which men are taught to worship images with the same worship with which they worship God and Christ, or him or her whose image it is; a Church which pretends to be infallible, and yet is infinitely deceived; from receiving the whole Sacrament to receive it but half; from Christ's institution to a human invention; from Scripture to uncertain traditions, and from ancient traditions to new pre-

tences ; from prayers which you understood to prayers which you understand not ; from confidence in God to rely upon creatures ; from entire dependence on inward acts to a dangerous temptation to resting too much in outward ministries, in the external work of Sacraments and sacramentals ; to a Church where men's consciences are loaded with a burden of ceremonies greater than that in the days of the Jewish religion ; to a Church that seals up the fountain of God's Word, and gives you drink by drops out of such cisterns as they first make, and then stain, and then reach out. It is now become part of your religion to be ignorant, to walk in blindness, to believe the man that hears your confessions, to hear none but him, not to hear God speaking but by him, and so you are liable to be abused by him, as he please, without remedy. You are taught to worship saints and angels with a worship at least dangerous and in some things proper to God ; for your Church worships the Virgin Mary with burning incense and candles to her, and you give her presents, which by the consent of all nations used to be considered a worship peculiar to God ; and it is the same thing which was condemned for heresy in the Collynidians, who offered a cake to the Virgin Mary. A candle and a cake make no difference in the worship" ("Letter to a Gentlewoman seduced to the Church of Rome").

Universal Bishopric.

"This doctrine, though it be not so scandalous as their idolatry, so ridiculous as their superstitions, so unreasonable as their doctrine of transubstantiation, so easily reprov'd as their half-communion and service in an unknown tongue, yet it is as of dangerous and evil effect, and as false, and as certainly an innovation, as anything in their whole congregation of errors" ("Dissuasive," I., i. 1).

Supremacy.

"The Pope hath power *in omnia, per omnia, super omnia*—in all things, through all things, over all things ; and 'the sublimity and immensity of the supreme bishop is so great that no mortal man can comprehend it.' This is not the private opinion of a few, but the public doctrine owned and offered to be justified to all the world" (*ibid.*, iii. 3).

"Since the Bishop of Rome by acts which all the world knows had raised an intolerable empire, he used it as violently as he got it, and made his little finger heavier than all the loins of princes. . . . Every bishop hath from Christ equal power, and there is no difference but what is introduced by

men—that is, by laws positive, by consent, or by violence. . . . From hence it must needs follow that by the law of Christ one bishop is not superior to another” (“*Duct. Dub.*,” III., iv. 16).

Deposition of Kings.

“It were an endless labour to transcribe the horrible doctrines which are preached in the Jesuits’ school to the shaking of the regal power of such princes which are not of the Roman Communion. The whole economy of it is well described by Bellarmine, who affirms that ‘it does not belong to monks or other ecclesiastics to commit murders, neither do the popes care to proceed that way; but their manner is first fatherly, to correct princes, then by ecclesiastical censures to deprive them of the communion, then to absolve their subjects from the oath of allegiance and to deprive them of their kingly dignity; and what then? the execution belongs to others.’ This is the way of the popes, thus wisely and moderately to break kings in pieces” (“*Dissuasive*,” I., iii. 3).

Transubstantiation.

“The doctrine of transubstantiation is so far from being primitive and apostolic that we know the very time it began to be owned publicly for an opinion, and the very Council in which it was said to be passed into a public doctrine, and by what arts it was promoted, and by what persons it was introduced. For all the world knows that by their own parties—by Scotus, Ockam, Biel, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and divers others—whom Bellarmine calls most learned and most acute men, it was declared that the doctrine of transubstantiation is not expressed in the canon of the Bible; that in the Scriptures there is no place so express as (without the Church’s declaration) to compel us to admit of transubstantiation; and therefore at least it is to be suspected of novelty. But, further, we know it was but a disputable question in the ninth and tenth centuries after Christ; that it was not pretended to be an article of faith till the Lateran Council in the time of Innocent III., twelve hundred years and more after Christ; that since that pretended determination divers of the chiefest teachers of their own side have been no more satisfied with the ground of it than they were before, but still have publicly affirmed that the article is not expressed in Scripture, particularly John de Bassolis, Cardinal Cajetan, and Melchior Canus, besides those above reckoned. And, therefore, if it was not expressed in Scripture, it will be too clear that they made their articles out of their own heads; for they could not declare it to be there, if it was not; and if it was

there but obscurely, then it ought to be taught accordingly, and at most it could be but a probable doctrine, and not certain, as an article of faith. But that we may put it past argument and probability, it is certain that as the doctrine was not taught in Scripture expressly, so it was not at all taught as a Catholic doctrine or an article of the faith by the primitive ages of the Church. Now for this we need no proof but the confession and acknowledgments of the greatest doctors of the Church of Rome." Having quoted Scotus, Peter Lombard, Durandus, Alphonsus à Castro, and—"from the first and best ages of the Church"—Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Origen, Eusebius, Macarius, Ephrem, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Theodoret, Gelasius; and having put aside "the horrid and blasphemous questions, such as, whether it may be said the priest is in some sense the creator of God Himself," and "whether a priest before he say his first Mass be the son of God, but afterwards the father of God and the creator of His body," against which a book was written by John Hugo, he lays down five propositions, the first two of which are: "1. That what the Church of Rome teaches of transubstantiation is absolutely impossible, and implies contradictions very many, to the belief of which no faith can oblige us and no reason can endure. For Christ's body being in heaven, glorious, spiritual and impassible, cannot be broken. And since by the Roman doctrine nothing is broken but that which cannot be broken—that is, the colour, the taste, and other accidents of the elements—yet if they could be broken, since the accidents of bread and wine are not the substance of Christ's body and blood, it is certain that on the altar Christ's body naturally and properly cannot be broken. 2. And since they say that every consecrated wafer is Christ's whole body, and yet this wafer is not that wafer, therefore either this or that is not Christ's body, or else Christ hath two bodies, for there are two wafers" ("Dissuasive," I., i. 5).

Objective Presence.

"We may not render Divine worship to Him as present in the blessed Sacrament according to His human nature without danger of idolatry; because *He is not there according to His human nature*, and therefore you give Divine worship to a *non ens*, which must needs be idolatry; for *idolum nihil est in mundo*, saith St. Paul, and Christ, as present by His human nature in the Sacrament, is a *non ens*; for it is not true; there is no such thing. He is present there by His divine power and His divine blessing, and the fruits of His body, the real effective consequents of His passion; but for

any other presence, it is *idolum*, it is nothing in the world. Adore Christ in heaven, for the heavens must contain Him till the time of the restitution of all things" ("Fifth Letter to a Gentleman that was Tempted to the Communion of the Roman Church").

Adoration.

"Since by the decree of the Council of Trent they are bound to exhibit to the Sacrament the same worship which they give to the true God, either this Sacrament is Jesus Christ or else they are very idolaters; I mean materially such, even while in their purpose they decline it. I will not quarrel with (dispute against) the words of the decree commanding to give Divine worship to the Sacrament, which by the definition of their own schools is an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace, and so they worship the sign and the grace with the worship due to God. But that which I insist upon is this: that 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; for which they had no warrant ever till they made one of their own, which themselves so little understand that they know not how to explicate it, nor agree in their own meaning, nor cannot tell well what they mean; if, I say, they be deceived in their own strict article (besides the strict sense of which there are so many ways of verifying the work of Christ, upon which all sides do rely), then it is certain they commit an act of idolatry in giving Divine honour to a mere creature, which is the image, the sacrament, and representment of the body of Christ. . . . The commandment to worship God alone is so express; the distance between God and bread dedicated to the service of God is so vast; the danger of worshipping that which is not God, or of not worshipping that which is God, is so formidable, that it is infinitely to be presumed that, if it had been intended that we should have worshipped the Holy Sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have called it God or Jesus Christ, or have bidden us in express terms to have adored it; that either by the first, as by a reason indicative, or by the second, as by a reason imperative, we might have had sufficient warrant, direct or consequent, to have paid a Divine worship. Now, that there is no implicit warrant in the sacramental words of 'This is My body,' I have given very many reasons to evince, by proving the words to be sacramental and figurative.

“Add to this that supposing Christ present in their senses, yet as they have acted the business, they have made it superstitious and idolatrical; for they declare ‘the Divine worship does also belong to the symbols of bread and wine as being one with Christ’—they are the words of Bellarmine; that ‘even the species also with Christ are to be adored’—so Suarez. But then let it be considered that since these species or accidents are not inherent in the holy body, nor have their existence from it, but wholly subsist of themselves (as they dream), since between them and the holy body there is no substantial, no personal, union, it is not imaginable how they can pass Divine worship to those accidents which are not in the body, nor the same with the body, but (by an impossible supposition) subsist of themselves, and *were* proper to bread and *now* not communicable to Christ; and yet not commit idolatry.

“At the best we may say to these men, as our blessed Saviour to the woman of Samaria, ‘Ye worship ye know not what; but we know what we worship.’ For concerning the action of adoration, this I am to say, that it is a fit address in the day of solemnity, with a *sursum corda*, with our hearts lift up to heaven, where Christ sits (we are sure) at the right hand of the Father; for *Nemo digne manducat nisi prius adoraverit*, said St. Austin (‘No man eats Christ’s body worthily but he that first adores Christ’). But to terminate the Divine worship to the Sacrament, to that which we eat, is so unreasonable and unnatural, and withal so scandalous, that Averroes, observing it to be usual among the Christians with whom he had the ill-fortune to converse, said these words: *Quandoquidem Christiani adorant quod comedunt, sit anima mea cum philosophis* (‘Since Christians worship what they eat, let my soul be with the philosophers’). If the man had conversed with those who better understood the article and were more religious and wise in their worshippings, possibly he might have been invited by the excellency of the institution to become a Christian. But they that give scandal to Jews by their images and leaving out the Second Commandment from their Catechisms, give offence to the Turks by worshipping the Sacrament, and to all reasonable men by striving against two or three sciences and the notices (observations) of all mankind. We give no Divine honour to the signs; we do not call the Sacrament our God” (“Real Presence,” § xiii.).

“This is a thing of infinite danger. God is a jealous God. He spake it in the matter of external worship and of idolatry, and therefore do nothing that is like worshipping a mere creature, nothing that is like worshipping that which you are

not sure it is God. And if you can believe the bread, when it is blessed by the priest, is God Almighty, you can, if you please, believe anything else.

“If it be transubstantiated, and you are sure of it, then you may pray to it and put your trust in it, and believe the holy bread to be co-eternal with the Father and with the Holy Ghost” (“Fifth Letter”).

Spiritual Presence.

“By ‘spiritually’ they mean ‘present after the manner of a spirit’; by ‘spiritually’ we mean ‘present to our spirits only’—that is, so as Christ is not present to any other senses but that of faith or spiritual susception. But their way makes His body to be present no way but that which is impossible and implies a contradiction; a body not after the manner of a body; a body like a spirit; a body without a body; and a sacrifice of body and blood without blood; *corpus incorporeum, cruor incruentus*. They say that Christ’s body is truly present there as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place. That’s *their* ‘spirituality’; but we by the ‘real spiritual presence’ of Christ do understand Christ to be present, as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace. And this is all which we mean besides the typical and figurative presence” (“Real Presence,” § i.).

“We think it our duty to give our own people caution and admonition. First, that they be not abused by the rhetorical words and high expressions alleged out of the Fathers calling the Sacrament ‘the body’ or ‘the flesh of Christ,’ for we all believe it is so, and rejoice in it; but the question is after what manner it is so, whether after the manner of the flesh, or after the manner of spiritual grace and sacramental consequence. We with the Holy Scriptures and the primitive Fathers affirm the latter; the Church of Rome, against the words of Scripture and the explication of Christ and the doctrine of the primitive Church, affirm the former. Secondly, that they be careful not to admit such doctrines under the pretence of being ancient; since, although the Roman error hath been too long admitted and is ancient in respect of our days, yet it is an innovation in Christianity, and brought in by ignorance, power and superstition very many ages after Christ. Thirdly, we exhort them that they remember the words of Christ when He explicates the doctrine of giving us His flesh for meat and His blood for drink, that He tells us ‘the flesh profiteth nothing, but the words which He speaks

are spirit and they are life.' Fourthly, that if these ancient and primitive doctors above cited say true, and that the symbols still remain the same in their natural substance and properties, even after they are blessed and when they are received, and that Christ's body and blood are only present to faith and to the spirit, that then whoever tempt them to give Divine honour to these symbols or elements (as the Church of Rome does) tempts them to give to a creature the due and incommunicable propriety of God, and that then this evil passes further than an error in the understanding, for it carries them to a dangerous practice, which cannot reasonably be excused from idolatry" ("Dissuasive," I., i. 5).

"I have manifested the nature and operations and the whole ministry to be spiritual; and that *not* the natural body and blood of Christ is received by the mouth, but the word and the spirit of Christ by faith and a spiritual hand; and upon this account have discovered their mistake who think the secret lies in the outside, and suppose that we tear the natural flesh of Christ with our mouths.

"This (His natural body) He gave us but once then, when upon the Cross He was broken for our sins; this body could die but once, and it could be but at one place at once, and heaven was the place appointed for it.

"This body, being carried from us into heaven, cannot be touched or tasted by us on earth; but yet Christ left to us symbols and Sacraments of this 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 procured for us by the breaking of that body and the effusion of that blood; which blessings, being spiritual, are therefore called 'His body' spiritually, because procured by that body which died for us, and are therefore called our food, because by them we live a new life in the Spirit, and Christ is our bread and our life, because by Him after this manner we are nourished up to life eternal.

"The sum is this: The Sacraments and symbols, if they be considered in their own nature, are just such as they seem—water, and bread and wine; they retain the names proper to their own natures; but because they are made to be signs of a secret mystery, and water is the symbol of purification of the soul from sin, and bread and wine of Christ's body and blood, therefore the symbols and Sacraments receive the names of what themselves do sign (are signs of); they are the body and they are the blood of Christ—they are metonymically such" ("The Worthy Communicant," i. 3).

One Kind.

“They innovate in their doctrine of the half-communion. For they deprive the people of the chalice, and dismember the institution of Christ, and prevaricate His express law in this particular, and recede from the practice of the Apostles; and though they confess it was the practice of the primitive Church, yet they lay it aside and curse those who follow Christ and His Apostles and His Church, while themselves deny to follow them. Now for this we need no other testimony but their own words in the Council of Constance. Here is the acknowledgment both of Christ’s institution in both kinds, and Christ’s ministering it in both kinds, and the practice of the primitive Church to give it in both kinds, yet the conclusion from these premisses is: ‘We command under the pain of excommunication that no priest communicate the people under both kinds of bread and wine.’ The opposition is plain: Christ’s testament ordains it, the Church of Rome forbids it; it was the primitive custom to obey Christ in this, a later custom is by the Church of Rome introduced to the contrary. To say that the first practice and institution is necessary to be followed is called heretical, to refuse the latter subintroduced custom incurs the sentence of excommunication. And this they have passed not only into a law, but into an article of faith; and if this be not teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, and worshipping God in vain with men’s traditions, then there is, and there was, and there can be, no such thing in the world” (“Dissuasive,” I., i. 6).

“It is too much that any part of the Church should so much as in a single instance administer the Holy Sacrament otherwise than it is in the institution of Christ, there being no other warrant for doing the thing at all but Christ’s institution, and therefore no other way of learning how to do it but by the same institution by which all of it is done. But if a man alters what God appointed, he makes to himself a new institution, for which in this case there can be no necessity, nor yet excuse. That men are not suffered to receive it in Christ’s way, that they are driven from it, that they are called heretic for saying it is their duty to receive it as Christ gave it and appointed it, that they should be excommunicated for desiring to communicate in Christ’s blood by the symbol of His blood, according to the order of Him that gave His blood—this is such a strange piece of Christianity that it is not easy to imagine what Antichrist can do more against it unless he take it all away. I only desire those persons that are here concerned to weigh well the words of Christ and the consequents of them: ‘He that breaketh one of the least of My

commandments, and shall teach men so (and what if he compel men so?), shall be called the least in the kingdom of God'” (“Dissuasive,” II., ii. 4).

F. MEYRICK.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY
SINCE THE RESTORATION.

VII. WILLIAM WAKE (*concluded*).

THE primacy of Wake marked a time of more peaceable character than those of the predecessors of whom I have had to write. George I. was King, and was well established on the throne. There was no longer any serious fear of a Stuart Restoration. The peace of Utrecht in 1711 had ended a period of warfare which had gone on with only five years' break since the Revolution of 1688. The twenty-five years that followed were almost entirely years of peace. And England was the main preserver of it, the main barrier for Europe against the ambition of the house of Bourbon. It is not too much to say that the policy of England has been, on the whole, in favour of peace ever since, eager for the observance of treaties and international friendship.

When George I. became King parties were still talking loud, but much of the old bitterness was gone, inasmuch as very few people wanted the Stuarts back. The Tories were Churchmen hating the Papists, and more loath than ever to see the attempts of King James renewed. But King George knew what their principles had been of yore, and he gave his support to the Whigs. Consequently the party was all but dead in the first years of the House of Hanover. They were in such a minority in the House of Commons that they hardly numbered fifty men; and a mighty cleavage existed in the party outside, for there were still some Tories who longed for the Restoration of the Stuarts, though the majority would not hear of it. It was, indeed, in consequence of this that the Jacobite rising of 1715 took place. It had no hold in England; it was an act of despair on the part of the uncompromising members of the party. Bolingbroke, who, as we have already seen, had split the party and had gone with Atterbury to the side of the Pretender, was in hopes of the co-operation of Charles XII. and Louis XIV.; but the latter died in the very crisis, the Swedish King failed, and the rising of 1715 was an abject failure. The Whigs were stronger than ever, and took