IV.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM PRYNNE TO ARCHBISHOP LAUD.^a

[Add. MS. 5994, fol. 187.]

My Lord,

It is the divyne asseveracion of the wisest of men, Ecclesiastes, vii. 7, "Surely oppression maketh a wise man mad." Soe that I presume your Lordship will easily pardon me if the present pressures under which I languish cause me a little to forgett my self whiles I commemorate them unto you, not to mencion all or any of your *Lordship's private verball suggestions* against me to his Majesty (my most gracious soveraigne), which I hope I could with ease disprove upon an indifferent hearing; nor yet to recount those selected scatterd fragments or dimidiated sentences which *Dr. Heylin, and others your Lordship's charitai^l agents*, have consarcinated into one intire Informacion out of severall pages of my book in the method they were prosecuted at the hearing, annexing such horrid, seditious, disloyall, false glosses, applicacions, constructions, and inferences of theyr owne forging to them (contrary to the very letter, scope, and meaning of the passages themselves), as none but heads intoxicated with malice, disloyalty, and private revenge could ever fancye, wherewith *your Lordship* (if common fame speake truth) hath severall *tymes before* and since my censure

Who as *himself* reported was specially employed by your Lordship to collect the severall passages in my booke that were offensive, that you might present them to his Majesty to incense him the more against me.

^a From a copy in Dell's hand. The original was torn up by Prynne in the presence of Attorney-General Heath. The words in italics are underlined in the MS.

exasperated his Majesty *against me*. I shall onely acquaint your Lordship with some publicke passages of your episcopall candor towards me, both in wordes and deeds, of which the world takes too much notice, wherein I doubt not but you will doe me such right against yourself as your Xtianity, place, and function joyntly require, in case I make it evident you have done me wronge, anticipating the fruit of all my petitions, and of the Queen's most gracious intercessions to his Majesty for his most royall grace and pardon, of which your *calumnyes and insolent solicitations have alone deprived me*. To beginn with your verball injurys, which in truth are reall wronges:—First, my Lord, you have not onely privatly informed his Majesty and others, but publickely averred in the Starr Chamber, though extra-judicially before the sentence, that I have been ever factious and seditious since I came into the world; and that in the memory of man there never arose such a pestilent, factious, seditious person, both in Church and State, and soe great an enemy to both, as I have been. Certainly did your Lordship know what a good *opinion the whole kingdome hath* of your owne innocency in these particulars you object to me without prooffe or truth, I suppose you would *have excepted yourself in this hyperbolicall accusacion*; which as it displayed your Lordship's archcharity and justice towards me to the auditors, what a true freind you had been unto me, and what equity I might expect from you in this cause; for it seemed unto most who heard it a me e malicious slantler, proceeding onely from your Lordship's overgrowne spleen, and derived to you *by succession from Ananias* the High Preist, who by Tertullus his orator forged the very selfsame calumny against innocent S. Paule, Actes xxiv. 1. “Wee have found this man a pestilent fellowe, a mover of sedicion among the Jewes throughout the world, a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarens.” For, my Lord, it is well knowne to many who then heard, and since have heard, of this your encomium, that I have ever from my cradle to this present demeaned my self religiously to my God, loyally to my soveraignes, dutifully to my superiors, lovingly to my

Seditionis olim accusatus est etiam Christus, et omnes propemodum sancti viri et evangelici prædicatores. Pet. Martyr, Loc. Com. class 1, locus 30, sect. 1, 2. Solenne est ut Christianis nomina falsa seditionis blasphemiae et læsæ Majestatis a persecutoribus affingantur, quibus tamen non sunt obnoxii. Centur. Magd. cent. 2, collat. 420.

equalls, curteously to my inferiors, inoffensively and peaceably towards all men's persons, though I have oppugned some men's innovacions, superstitions, errors, vices (the onely faction and sedition of which I was ever guilty, and of which your Lordship can accuse me), and that not out of any factious or seditious humour but to preserve the established receyved doctrines of our Church, and to doe the best good I could to the Church, the State, and soules of men. Yea I dare safely averr that there is noe man (how malicious soever) who hath knowne my life and conversacion but will acknowledge upon oath, if called to it (as three witnesses of credit examined by me in this cause have done), that I have been allwayes conformable to the doctrine and discipline by lawe established in the Church of England (having kept and dissuaded many from inconformity and schisme, of which the cruelty, insolency, violence, malice, pride, and such other vices of some prelates have been the cheif occasions for ought that I can fynde); that my life hath been soe innocent, blameles, peaceable, and free from faction or sedition, as I was never yet soe much as questioned or taxed for any the least misdemeanour or dissention during my four years' abode in the University of Oxford, or thirteen years' residence in Lincolnes Inne, where I prevented and composed sundry discordes, never occasioning or fomenting any; nor having the least personall quarrell or jarre with any one member of those societies where I have lyved, but demeaning my self in such a manner as gained me both theyr generall respect and love, as they can joyntly testifye. All which considered, I hope your Lordship will doe me soe much justice as to retract this odious scandall (consisting onely of generalls, to which noe particular answere can be given) which I wish may not truly reflect upon your self, whiles you endeavour to fasten it upon me, I trust without a ground. Secondly, my Lord, you have in private suggested to his Majesty and others, and openly affirmed in Starr Chamber before the hearing, *that my Histriomastrix was compiled by combinacion*; that I had many handes and heads to assist me in it besides my owne, it being impossible for any man of what

"Peragit tranquilla potestas, quod violenta nequit mandataque fortius urget." Claudian. "Cruelty and violence have made many heretiques in all ages, but never reclaimed any."

profession soever, though sixty years old, to peruse or read all those authorities quoted in it. This, my Lord, I must profess of my owne certaine knowledge to be a notorious untruth, unbecoming an Archbishop's sacred lippes, who should be ashamed to be a false accuser or slanderer of any man, especially in a publicke court of justice, as a judge, where nothing should be affirmed but what is undoubtedly true, and appear by proofes, confession, or certaine knowledge to be soe, neyther of which I am sure you had to justify this slander. Yea, you had my owne answere and examinacion upon oath, the written cōpye under my owne hand, and Mr. Attorney's confession in the informacion to ascertain you that it was compiled by my self alone, without the helpe or assistance of any other whatsoever, which I challenge all the world to disprove. Strange therefore was it, that your Lordship, not onely without, but against such apparent evidence, should judicially publish such a falshod. And, wheras you then professed *you did vehemently suspect a party (and I heare you have nominated some particular man in private)* who had a hand in composing it, if your Lordship will be pleased to examine that party, or any other you suspect, upon oath, theyr very deposicions shall proclaime you a slanderer in this particular. Yea your owne severe censure of me, *your violent execucion* of my sentence upon me, even to the loss of my cares and effusion of my blood (in which you alone would have noe voyce in the sentence, ~~that~~ soe you might have the onely hand, and be more singularly bloody in the execucion, *which all wholly attribute to your despightfull malice to me and my profession*), as the onely author of the booke (which your selfe confessed to be lycensed, though you still prosecute me for it with all extremity—I say not to your shame), is an apparent proofe that you beleived me in your conscience to be the sole author of it, though you published the contrary with your mouth of purpose to defame me. Else why should I suffer soe much from you for it as noe man ever yet endured for an authorized booke of such a subject, which noe Archbishop ever yet *oppugned but your selfe who should have patronized it*. And wheras you

"Dicimini pastores cum
sitis raptores; paucos habemus
heu pastores multos tamen
excommunicatores. Et utinam
sufficeret vobis lac et lana,
sititis enim sanguinem," &c. Bern.
ad Clericum "erm.

This is vox populi; how true it is your Grace may best determine.

affirmed that noe man of whatever profession could in sixty years space peruse those bookes I have quoted in it, therefore I must needs have the helpe of others; I here profess to your Lordship that, though I am not above thirty-three years old, yet I have perused all those bookes and quociations with my owne eyes alone, and not taken them upon trust or relacion from others (*as your Lordship doth many things, and in particular your cavills against some passages and sillogismes in my booke, which you confessed at the sentence you had noe leysure to read, though tyme and conscience enough to censure, how justly you shall see anon*), and not onely those, but all such I have quoted in my other treatises, with diverse more authors in my owne profession, in which I was noe ill proficient, though now deprived of it, yet never offending in it, a case seldome heard of untill now; and I doubt not but hundreds in this kingdome, not many years elder than my selfe, have read more authors then I have cited, though perchance your Lordship and other great prelates (whose many secular employments, and it may be they *over laborious preaching once or twice a yeare, permit them not to read* or studye halfe soe much as meaner men) have not perused or read neare soe many, and therefore hate or envye such as are more studious or industrious then themselves; wheras they should favour and respect them most of any, giving all encouragements to promote theyr studyes for the publicke good, which oft tymes they most ungratefully reward with hatred and slanders, and a world of oppositions. This second slander therefore being totally untrue, if there be any equity or justice in your Lordship I hope you will recant it (and the precedent too), both to his Majesty and others who have been seduced by it, through your false informacions, to my irreparable prejudice and great inquietacion. Thirdly, my Lord, you have exceedingly injured both your selfe and me, in misreciting some arguments and wresting some passages of my booke in your very censure, which in justice you should have read your self before you did condemne them, and not trusted onely to Dr. Heylin's notes, which have deceived both your self and

It hath been ever a constant rule in Star Chamber in former times that noe man ought to be put from his profession (it being his freehold and livelyhood) unless he hath grievously offended in it, and that offence to be particularly charged and proved against him. Yet I without any such charge, offence, or prooffe at all, must be debarred and put from my calling, that soe I may have nothing left me to subsist by, which most men thinke hard justice, especially for a lycensed booke, compiled out of counsellis, fathers, and other approved authors, whose wordes and opinions I have but transcribed.

others. The first sillogisme you were pleased to quarrell at was this. Page 9:

“That which had its birth and primary concepcion from the very devill himself (who is all and onely evill) must needs be sinfull, pernicious, unseemly, yea altogether unlawfull unto Xtians.”

“But stage playes had theyr birth and primary concepcion from the very devill himself, who is all and onely evill.” *Ergo, &c.* The minor you acknowledged for a truth fully manifested by the authors I there quoted, which made all the judicious auditors wonder to heare your Grace soe earnestly plead for stage playes, whose birth and originall you confessed to proceed from the very devill himself, and which the fathers with sundry others define to be the works and pompes of the devill wee all renounce in baptisme, which any Xtians and much more an Archprelate should be ashamed to plead for in a Court of Justice, *where none else argued for them but disclaimed theyr defence.* The onely thing you here excepted against was, not to the forme or substance of the major (which are undenyable if there be any logicke or truth in the fathers *or Scriptures* there quoted to confirme it, neyther did nor can you refell it), but onely to this parenthesis in it (who is all and onely evill), without which both the proposicion and sillogisme are compleat and firme, which you there affirmed to be both an absurdity, implying that all evill was inclusively in the devill, and soe none at all in man; and alsoe plaine manichisme, intimating the very entity of the devill to be evill, as he is a creature. But, had your Lordship been soe just as to knowe before you judged, you would have forborne this rash censure, since I thus explaine this very expression. Pages 14, 15 (which it seems you never read), “That the devill is all and onely evill,” I mean in his quality as a devill, not in his entity as a creature, quoting this sentence of St. Ambrose in the margent, “*Diaboli naturæ non improba, sed opera iniqua.*” And whether this be an absurdity or manichisme to stile the devill all and onely evill, that is onely evill in respect of his quality onely, and *quatenus* a devill, not of his entity as a creature

Exod. xxiii. 1, 2; Psal. xv.
2, 3; Isa. v. 20; Psa. xciv.
20, 21, 23.

(in which sense it is most true), I referr to all men's judgments and your Lordship's too, who must needs confess it an error in yourself, if not a slander, to impute that heresy to me in a publicke court of justice, as I thus *in terminis* denye. Which how great a sinne, a shame it is for an Archbishop a judge to doe in his very censure in such an high court in the audyence of soe great an assembly, and that upon a premeditacion too, your owne conscience (if it be not scared) must informe you, if not condemne you for it.

The second syllogisme you undertooke to confute and shamefull misrecited was that of page 713.

That which forty heathen writers, philosophers, historians, orators, and poets of cheifest note have unanimously censured and condemned, from the very principles and remainders of corrupt nature, and theyr owne experimentall knowledge of its pernicious effects (all which you omitted), must doubtles be sinfull and alltogether abominable unto Xtians. Witness Rom. 2, 14, 15, to 29, Jer. 2, 10, 11, &c.

But these forty recited heathen writers, philosophers, historians, orators, and poets of cheifest note have unanimously censured and condemned stage playes from the very principles and remainders of corrupt nature, and theyr owne experimentall knowledge of theyr pernicious effects. *Ergo, &c.*

The minor you granted as true, whence iverse admired with what face your Lordship could justify stage playes in a court of publicke justice, when as you acknowledged that forty heathen authors of cheifest note had soe seriously condemned them as abominable and intolerable corrupcions, unless you meant to profess to all the world that you are more licentious and *farr worse than pagans*. The major you exceedingly triumphed over as a most absurd proposition, when as I dare confidently affirme that noe Xtians nor pagan whatsoever, but onely a *professed Atheist, can be soe shameless to deny* it in that forme and with those limitacions as I propound it. But your Lordship looking upon it in hast, or with other men's eyes (and those perchance malicious), recited it but by fragments thus:—

“ That which forty heathen philosophers, historians, orators, and poets, have unanimously condemned, must doubtless be unlawfull unto Xtians,” omitting the limitacion which makes it every waye undenyable, (to witt from the very principles and remainders of corrupt nature and theyr owne experimentall knowledge of its pernicious effects). Which unfaithfull dealing how well it became your Lordship’s rochet and justice in such a publicke place of judicature and such a judicious assembly let the world determine. This propoſicion then which your Lordship ſoe learnedly, ſoe copiously refelled, was onely your owne, not myne, ſoe as you might have well ſpared all your paines to refute it. *But, admit the major had been ſuch as your Lordſhip fancyed, yet I ſay it is moſt true and undenyable in caſe of manners and abuſes* (and ſoe of ſtage playes to which I onely applye it), and in all divine truthes founded in the lawe of nature, of which heathen men by the light of nature are competent judges; witneſſe, Acts 17, 27, 28, 29; Rom. 1, 20, 21; cap. 2, 14, 15; Jer. 2, 9, 10, cap. 18, 13, 14; 1 Cor. 5, 1, cap. 11, 14, 15; Tit. 1, 12, 13; Ezek. 16, 47 to 60; Prov. 24, 24; which conclude that there is a God, and He inviſible, becauſe heathen poets and Gentils acknowledge it, and that inceſt, lying, forſakeinge of God, iniuſtice, flattery, and ſuch like ſinns are evill, becauſe the very heathen themſelves and theyr writers doe condemne them, which texts muſt be expugned out of the booke of God, and God himſelf taxed for an ill logician; if this propoſicion you quarrell with be untrue, the commonest argument in all ſortes of writers (eſpecially in Chryſoſtome, Salvian, and other Xtian authors, who moſt ſharply declaime againſt men’s vices), and the frequentest medium in pulpits and all invectives againſt vices to manifeſt them to be evill; in ſhaking in cenſuring of which you ſhake and cenſure all theſe Scriptures, yea blame all Xtian writers and preachers for injudiciousnes, in preſſing thinges to be evill, becauſe pagans themſelves deteſt and write againſt them; and wheras your Lordſhip learnedly objected that, if this medium were good, then it would followe that Xtian religion is ill becauſe heathen

writers condemne it, I answere, first, that noe such consequent can be inforced from it as I propound it, because they condemned religion not from the light of nature or theyr owne experimentall knowledge of its pernicious effects, but onely out of ignorance, the instigation of Satan, the pravity of theyr natures and antipathy to the truth. Secondly, your instances in Xtian religion and the Creacion are impertinent and fallacious, for, these being revealed truthes above the sphere of nature, heathen philosophers and others are not competent judges of them, because they are spiritually discerned, and apprehended onely by the eye of faith, 2 Cor. 2, 6, to 16, Hebr. 11, 3 ; wheras they are all able umpyres of all vices and vertues, of thinges that are morally good or evill, as the fore-quoted scriptures and all Xtian writers graunt, and soe of stage playes too. Soe that your owne indefinite proposicion is universally true in all poyntes of morallity (in which sense I onely intended and applye it) though not in poyntes of supernaturall revealed truthes, which were not in dispute; all which well weighed your Lordship had small reason to proclaime your selfe a conqueror in overthrowing both my syllogismes, before you had vanquished eyther of them, even as yourself propounded them; and truly, my Lord, had you seriously considered the weaknes of your owne two arguments to prove stage playes lawfull, you would have had little cause to except against my syllogismes to manifest them unlawfull. Your first argument, if reduced into forme, was thus:

Gregory Nazianzen (even then when himself and other fathers condemned stage playes, as directlye contrary to Xtian religion and good manners) wrote a tragedy called Christus patiens: ergo, common stage playes are commendable and lawfull in a Xtian state.

Had your Lordship concluded thus, Ergo, it is lawfull for common actors to play Xtians passion on the stage, the consequent had been more formall though farr more impious and unchristian then now, it being the very height of all impiety and prophanenesses to bring our Saviours *person or passion on the stage*, which not onely Protestants but even Popish counsells, writers, and our owne statutes

have most severely censured as most abominable and prophane, though your Lordship (who taxed one for stiling it a Jesuiticall practise when as I might have added a diabolicall too) then seemed to approve it, or else this instance of Nazianzen's were improper. But this argument (as it was then propounded) hath noe coherence or solidity in it; for first the antecedent is false, that tragedy of Christus patiens which you soe confidently affirmed to be Nazianzen's being none of his, but a mere spurious bratt, though printed with his workes, as both Baronius, Bellarmine, Lewenclavius, Possevine, with other learned Papists, and Mr. Cooke in his *Censura*, p. 125, with other Protestants, joyntly testify, and I have proved in my *Histriomastix*, p. 833, 834, 835, where you might have read a satisfactory answer to this and your following arguments; I wonder therefore for your Lordship should soe farr forgett yourselfe, even in poynt of schollership, as to affirme this tragedy to be his, when all learned men affirme the contrary, an oversight not pardonable in your Lordship at such a tyme and place of expectacion. Secondly, admitt it is, yet what consequence is this? Nazianzen penned a poeme of Christ's passion onely to be read, which to act were most prophane; ergo, it is lawfull and commendable to act common stage playes. Certainly graunt every action, and this act of Nazianzen lawfull (which is not a thinge soe de fide, though your Lordship lay it downe as a positive ground, but that it may be safely denied); yet this argument is so illogicall (though your Lordship's best to prove stage playes lawfull) that a puniest sophister would deride it, as I have largely proved in my booke, which might have rectified this your gross mistake had you been pleased to read it ere you censured it. Your Lordship's second argument for playes was this: Buchanan compiled a tragedy of Jephtha's daughter; Beza himself a tragedy called *Abrahamus Sacrificans*; a late Lutheran hath turned some other Scripture storyes into tragedies; ergo, common stage playes are lawfull and tollerable in a Xtian Republike.

Had your Lordship concluded properly, ergo, it is lawfull for common players to act sacred Scripture storeys on the stage, as the

antecedent seems to imply, the whole auditory then present would have cryed shame upon you, since our owne statutes, with sundry counsellis and authors quoted in my booke, condemne this impious practise as most execrably prophane. However, the argument itself (which I have there largely answered) is but a mere inconsequent, these tragedyes being penned onely to be read, not acted, as I have proved, p. 833, 834, 835, and elsewhere. And whatever Buchanan and Beza wrote (the sole medium to make good your argument), being not soe authentique as to pass for current truth, since they wrote against bishopps and some ceremonyes of our Church, which I presume your Lordship dares not conclude to be unlawfull because they writt against them, though you argue stage playes to be lawfull for this reason, onely because they penned these two tragedyes; a very sandy foundation, on which I thought noe bishopps would or could have built unless those authors had been more freindly to them. And here, my Lord, to paye you with your owne coyne, give me leave to inform you thus much, that in both these arguments you use that very medium or substance as irrefragable which you censured as absurd and false in me. I concluded stage playes unlawfull because forty heathen writers (even from the principles of corrupt nature and the experyence of theyr lewdnes) had condemned them; which you, misreciting, endeavoured to prove absurd, and yet you argue stage playes to be lawfull onely because Nazianzen, Buchanan, Beza, and a Lutheran had penned four sacred tragedyes. A medium of the selfe same nature, and not soe authentique as myne, since forty are more likely to be orthodox then four, and that which is condemned by the principles of nature and experyence of its illnes is more probable to be ill then that which those four did (perchance in theyr younger dayes), without any divyne precept or example, is likely to be good. Your Lordship therefore might have in charity forborne to quarrell with my two syllogismes against stage playes (which are both formall and substantiall too) till you had produced some better of your owne in theyr defence; these two being neyther formall nor substantiall,

all together unworthy your Lordship's place and learning, or that judicious court or auditory for whose satisfaccion you were pleased to propound them. From your excepcions against my sillogismes I shall proceed to some passages in the book which your Lordship proclaimed to implye the lawfulness of subjects laying violent handes upon the sacred persons of princes, and to be noe less then high treason, of both which I hope your Lordship will pronounce me innocent when you have heard my answer, though I have allready suffered for them as a nocent. The maine passages upon which you grounded this accusacion were those of fol. 555: "These Emperors' stage delights being the just occasions of theyr untimely deaths." And p. 489: "An end most suitable to his vitious, tyrannical, and play-adoring life." Written of Caligula slayne by Cheræa. But under your Lordship's favour I conceyve that neyther of these two passages are treason or sedetion, or any tacit approbacion of this disloyall assertion, as I use them: not treason, because not within the statute of 25 Ed. III. c. 2, nor any wayes reflecting upon his Majestyes or his royall Consort's persons, being applyed to other purposes and transcribed out of other approved authors: not seditious, intimating the lawfulness of murdering princes in some cases; for first, this phrase (just occasion) can have noe such implicacion as I there use it; first, because I stile these Emperors' stage-delights the just occasions of theyr untimely deaths in respect of God's avenging justice onely, who sometimes takes occasion for small offences to punish wicked men, not onely with eternall, but even with temporall, death; the wages due to every sinne, if God please in justice to render it, in this sense alone is evident by the whole scene, wherein it is being nothing else but a particular commemoracion of God's just judgments upon play-poets, players, and playhaunters, whose deaths, as I there stile just judgments of God, soe I phrase those stage delights which occasioned them just occasions with referrence onely to God's just judgments, as the whole context and the intencion of it manifest, both which may be truly called just in regard of God in a good and proper

Indeed Dr. Heylin, im-
ployed by your Lordship
to peruse my booke, re-
ported to diverse that
he had found high
treason in it (perhaps
against his S. George),
meaning those two pas-
sages, and that he hoped
he should have my life and
head for it, though himself
be guilty of the self-same
treason, and worse, in his
Geography, and S. George,
as I could easily prove.
And his learned judgment
perchance directed your
Lordship's verdict to finde
and stile these passages
treason.

sense (as Mr. Attorney himself acknowledged), and yet their murders be most impious in respect of those which slew them; as was our Saviour's death, most just and justly occasioned in regard of God, as a surety for our sinnes, yet most unjust and sinfull in respect of Pilat, Judas, and the Jews. Math. 21, 3, 4, 18 to 26; Acts 2, 23, c. 4, 27, 28; Isay. 53, 4 to 12. Secondly, because I call these their untimely deaths (not execucion, as was pretended, but) murder, treason, and conspiracye, in reference to those who slew them (fol. 555, p. 118, 465, 799, 826, 849), the very greatest brandes of dislike, of unlawfulness, that I could cast upon them. This phrase therefore of just occasion can never imply their murders lawfull unless you will proclaime murder, treason, and conspiracy lawfull, which were a contradiction. Thirdly, because I in terminis condemne this very position of murdering princes, for faction and rebellion, and the practise of it for treason, p. 826, and 796, 823 to 828, quoting such scripture and English writers against me, in the margin, as doe most solidly displaye and refute it. What therefore I thus professedly condemne, malice it self cannot justly affirme I tacitly impley, since *expressum facit cessare tacitum*, as all lawes accord. Fourthly, because I condemne all murders in generall, upon any pretended good, or publike end whatsoever, p. 943, 182, f. 519; all murders at stage playes in speciall, and stage players themselves as the occasions of murders, fol. 516 to 520. Therefore I must necessarily condemne those Emperors' murders occasioned by stage playes, and committed at them, it being a direct contradiction to conceyve those murders at or occasioned by stage playes lawfull, when as I condemne all murders at them or caused by them as unlawfull, and censure playes themselves as the occasions of them. Fifthly, because I directly averr in my answer upon oath that I doe and did ever detest and renounce this doctrine of the lawfulness of subjects laying violent hands upon the sacred persons of princes for any cause whatsoever, as wicked, hereticall, and disloyall, contrary to the very oath of allegiance which I had thrice taken to the lawes and statutes of our realme and doctrine

of our Church, which must severely censure it; and what I thus expressly disclaime upon my oath noe lawe, noe charity, can presume me to approve upon a bare surmised implicacion from those two phrases, which doe not necessarily implie it, as Mr. Attorney himself acknowledged. The rather because I was never soe much as once suspected to be of this opinion, nor taxed of the least disloyalty to my Sovereigne; neyther doe eyther of these two expressions, or the places where they are cited, tend to justify or insinuate any such doctrine. And wheras your Lordship was pleased to reply in your sentence that I condemne this assertion in my book and answeare, as the doctrine of popish priests and Jesuits onely, but yet insinuate and approve it as the doctrine of the Puritans, whom ye endeavoured to prove farr worse than any priests or Jesuites (*who are much beholding to you for your good opinion of them*) by a discourse stollen almost verbatim out of *Barford the Jesuite's answeare* to Deus and Rex, where all the Puritan authors you then quoted are recited (the very worst of all which you then confessed to be Ponet, Bishop of Winchester, one of your owne rochet, and a bishop Puritan, if a Puritan). My Lord, I would have you knowe that as I detest this doctrine as jesuiticall soe I abhorre all jesuiticall equivocations too (in which your Lordship, perchance, is too well versed), and yet I absolutely condemne this doctrine in all respects by whomsoever justified; the very wordes of my answeare being, that the popish priests' and Jesuites' doctrine, *and the doctryne of all others*, of the lawfulness of destroying princes (which I doe and did allwayes detest from my heart as impious, hereticall, and abominable, &c.), is noe other than faction and rebellion; and the practise of it treason, murder, and conspiracy, a direct falsificacion of your Lordship's forged replye. Sixthly, admit I had stiled them just occasions in regard of the Emperors themselves, or those who slew them as you pretended, yet it follows not thereupon that theyr murders were just and lawfull. David's adultery was a just, a great occasion for the enemyes of God to blaspheme, 2 Sam. 12, 14, yet theyr blasphemy though thus justly occasioned was a sinne. The Jewes' ill lives were a just occasion for the Gentils

Indeed bishops have been guilty of soe many treasons in doctrine and practise in former tymes here in England that one had written a particular treatise, de prodicionibus Prælatorum et conquestu; though I never found any treatise de prodicionibus Puritanorum.

to blaspheme the name of God, Rom. 2, 24, yet the Gentills' blasphemy was unlawfull. One Xtian may give a just occasion of scandall to another, yet it may be a sinne in him to be scandalized at it. Rom. 14, 13, 15. One man by his reproachfull speeches or actions may give just occasion (the commonest expression wee use in all such cases) to another to revile or strike him, a case which every day falls out, yet his reviling or striking of him ^a [are unlawful] for such an indignity noe legall or just waye of punishmente, [Pet. 3. And not in point of conscience but law, he being meet judge to avenge or rig himself and his reviling or striking him;] Rom. 12, 17, 19, 20. One man assaults another with a resolution to kill him in such a place and manner as he must eyther kill or be killed, wherupon he killes the assailant in defence of his owne life. All men in such cases graunt that the assailant gave the defendant just occasion to slay him, yet his killing of him is unlawfull and manslaughter by our lawe, for which he shall be arraigned and loose his goodes, and life too in case he cannot read. By all which instances (and hundred others of this nature) it is evident, that, though I stile the occasions of those Emperors' murders just in respect of those who slew them (in which sense I never meant it, but in reference to God alone), yet it follows not thereupon that theyr murders were just; since the occasion may be just, yet the consequent, the manner of murdering them, unjust in those who did it, as all those parallel examples evidence. Lastly, this phrase of just occasions is common in many authors, and in most men's mouths especially upon injuries or discourses receyved; yet none ever tooke such offence, or made such construccion of it in others, as your Lordship hath made of it in my case. Yea, though Mr. Attorney confessed it might have a good interpretacion in this very place with reference unto God alone, and that schollers who understood distinctions would take it in this sense, but the ignorant vulgar might be seduced by it, yet this would not move your Lordship (though lawe and equity doe ever enjoyne the most favourable construction to be made in all courts of justice), being a scholler, yea, a father by place and profession in our Church (who should be

loe S. Pet. writes, 1 Pet. 3, 16. That the unlearned and unstable wrest S. Paul's Epistles and the other Scriptures to theyr owne destruction. Yea, the Jesuites and others wrest them to the destruction of princes. Shall wee therefore condemne and burne the Scriptures as seditious and dangerous

^a The words in brackets are in the margin in the original, having been omitted by Dell in copying.

full of charity), to conster it in that fayre inoffensive sense in which I onely meant it, as the premises evydence; not in that uncharitable, seditious, disloyall, wrested sense alone, for which there is (as I conceyve) noe ground or shadowe as the premised reasons infallibly demonstrated; and as this phrase (just occasions) warrants noe such seditious inference as your Lordship pretended, soe neyther doth that other expression, "And end most sutable to his vitious, tyrannicall, play-adoreing life." Which, as it implyes his untimely death to be ill (not just or lawfull) because his life was such, and yet it was sutable to his life in regard of God's justice onely, which suffers wicked men to come to evill endes, soe it is the very expression of Grimston in his Imperiall History, printed and published by authority, 1623, pages 160, 250. Who both there and in pages 104, 147, 156, 180, 184, 194, 222, 246, 52, 552, writes thus of Caligula, Domitian, Heliogabalus, Gallienus, Valentinian, and other Emperors' murders and untimely deathes. They dyed according to theyr defects, and conformable to their lives they had lyved; for it is the will of God that wicked princes make evill endes. They had such a death as theyr filthy life deserved. They were slayne and poysoned by God's just judgment and as they deserved, &c.; which very expressions are contained in Speed's Chronicle, page 445; in Howe's Chronicle, dedicated to his Majesty, 1631, pages 119, 325; in Dr. Beard's Theatre of God's Judgments, edit. 4. 1631, pages 42, 43, 117, 134, 180, 181, 290, 331, 337, 493, 546, 558; in Sir Walter Raleigh's History of the World and the preface to it; in Raynolds, his treatise of M , and in all authors who have written of God's judgments, or collected any examples of his justice upon sinners. These have ever passed free from all excepcions or the least suspicion of any such seditious insinuacion as your Lordship hath inferred from them in my booke. You must now eyther make all authors who use these or such like phrases guilty of treason, sedition, or this pretended doctrine of murdering princes, as well as I, or else acquit me of it in excusing them; the rather because I have answered on my oath that I had noe such disloyall intention in all or any of those

writings because they are thus abused? Yet my booke must suffer because some ignorants may misconster or misapply this phrase of just occasions and the insuing passages contrary to theyr sense and myne.

expressions as your Lordship censured me for, from these very phrases onely without any other proofes. Soe superabundant hath your Lordship's charity towardes me been as thus to interpret my meaning quite contrary to my oath, intencion, scope, words, and the usuall acceptacion of those very phrases in all other authors, of purpose to make me guilty of sedicion and disloyalty by mere implications, and wrested inferences, of which my heart was never conscious, neyther doe my wordes implye; and is this your Lordship's arch-charity, piety, clemencye, or justice to racke your wittes, your power, my wordes and meaning, thus to make me culpable and disloyall where my heart, my expressions too (at least in my intention, opinion, and vulgar acceptacion), are innocent and sincere? Would your Lordship be well pleased to have been dealt with thus by others as you have dealt with me in these particulars and in the whole prosecution of this cause? Alas, what author shall be innocent in judgment; whose life, whose liberty, or estate exempt from danger every hower, if neyther his oath, his owne express determination, his innocency of conversacion, the publike allowance, entry, or lawful printing and publishing of his booke by those whom the state appoyntes, the common acceptacion of his expressions in all other authors, nor his very scope and intencion (the best interpreters of his meaning) can acquit him from such a seditious, harsh, strained interpretacion of his wordes, as never soe much as entered his heart to conceyve: every of which in former ages and cases have been sufficyent to clear poore accused innocents; yet all of them combined together have yeelded noe such priviledge to me, or those objected passages; who have been not onely censured *but executed by your Lordship as seditious* and disloyall, though I trust it now most evidently appears unto you (as it doth to most men else who have eyther heard or read them or knowne me) that neyther they nor I are such? As your Lordship hath misused those two passages, soe have you dealt with that of page 321: "Not to mencion the over prodigall disbursments upon playes and maskes of late penurious tymes which have been well nigh as expensive as

the warrs, and more chargeable to many then theyr soules," &c. (recited onely by peece-meale, by which fayre kynde of dealing the most innocent passages may be made offensive); which, though I intended merely of the over prodigall expenses of our ordinary play-haunters upon common playes and maskes in our publike theatres (as the whole scene and subsequent wordes demonstrate), at which our playhaunters annually spend as much well nigh as is or hath been yearly contributed to or spent upon the warres, or given by them to ministers to instruct theyr soules (the cleare and onely scope and meaning of this passage), yet your Lordship was pleased to conster it a great intollerable scandall, both to his Majesty and the tymes, implying that his Majesty had spent the subsidies given him by Parliament to mainteyne the warres upon playes and maskes, and that our present tymes were beggerly and base. When as his Majesty (whom I never mencion but with all honorable and dutifull expressions, stiling him our most gracious soveraigne lord, and his lawes most pious lawes, p. 715, 500, and in the table, the onely places where I name him) is neyther named, intimated, or intended in this passage, neyther can it be applyed to him, since it speakes onely of the expenses of common play-haunters at publike playes and theatres, as the whole scene, the context, and last clause here recited (omitted in the reading evidence). Neyther are the present tymes soe much as named in it, but onely late penurious tymes indefinitely, by which I meant those two late years of scarcity, plague, and famine, wherein I penned this passage; which his Majesty by his proclamacions and orders to the justices to cease the dearth, together with the cryes of poore men, then wanting both bread and worke in many places, and every man's experience proclaimed to be penurious tymes in regard to the present dearth, the scarcity of corne and worke. Wherefore it could be noe scandall or offence in me to stile those tymes penurious in that sense, as all men then and since have called them. It hath been a receyved maxime in divinity, lawe, and conscience, that dubious wordes, which may have a good and bad interpretacion,

To whom I dedicated my booke intituled Health's Sickness, and whom I have ever honoured and obeyed as my most gracious soveraigne.

ought ever to be construed in the most favourable and benigne sense in courtes of judicature, that the hardest sense which may expose the party to censure ought ever to be rejected, and that none ought to be censured for other men's inferences (for who then could be secure against malignant misconstruccions) but for his owne express posicions and wordes. Had this rule taken place in your Lordship's censure of the three preceding passages (upon which alone you grounded your sentence, as I and others apprehended) I doubt not but you had absolved me and them, whereas you passed sentence against us. But your Lordship hath been soe charitable in your construccion of all those passages (to omitt the other in my Perpetuity,^a brought in by head and shoulders for want of other matter, which booke you burnt in private, without any sentence past against it) as to invert this rule to make me lyable to the severest censures the high court of justice could impose or thinke of. Which censures though they have been allready inflicted and for the *most part fully executed upon me by procuring*, yet as if they were farr too little, and I had not suffered enough as yet for a licensed booke (the very subject whereof as was then confessed was not offensive but the stile alone), or for other men's false applicacions and misconstructions of my wordes, *you still proceed to exasperate his Majesty against me, to drawe me to a second censure and tribunall (where you are and shall be, as most suspect you have been hitherto, both my cheif accuser, prosecutour and judge) for the self same booke.* Alas, my Lord, is this your pæty, charity, pitty, grace, or justice, to delight in men's perpetuall vexacion, for theyr very paines and *industry to advance the publike good*, and suppress those common abuses which all ages, all places, have constantly decryed, and our owne lawes condemned, or thus to racke theyr well meaning wordes, contrary to theyr express intended sense and scope, to make them scandalous and offensive by strained inferences, when in themselves they are not soe? Did ever our Savior, or any Apostle or saint of his, teach you such a lesson, or leave you such a

Soe are the express statutes of 26 Hen. VIII. c. 13; 1 Ed. VI. c. 12; 5 Ed. VI. c. 11; 1 Eliz. c. 6; 13 Eliz. c. 1; 14 Eliz. c. 1, 2, and other statutes.

Yet the fryers late booke of *Deus Natura and Gratia, &c.*, to reconcile us to Rome and other such Popish pamphlets can be published, sold and printed without controll or question.

The statute of 1 Car. c. 1, to which your Lordship consented, thrice together called stage plays unlawful pastimes.

^a Prynne's first book, *The perpetuity of the regenerate man's estate.*

president?^a Nay, he commandes you to be mercifull, as your heavenly father is mercifull, Luc. 6, 36, yet you (*as your actions* towards me proclaime unto the world) delight in *nothing soe much as in being more cruell, merciless, oppressive, and vexatious then any other, and in shewing noe pitty at all.* He exhortes you to be meeke and lowly of heart as he was, Mat 11, 29, and you are noted of most men to be of an exceeding fiery, insolent, virulent, implacable, malicious, and revengefull spirit in all your proceedings; verifying the old proverb, *Asperius humili nihil est cum surgit in altum.* He enjoynes you to put on bowells of mercyes, kindnes, humblenes of mynde, meeknes and long suffering, forbearing and forgiving others, even as Xt forgave you, Col. 3, 12, 13. And you, in many men's judgment, have quite unbowelled yourself of all mercyes, kyndnes, humblenes, meeknes, and long suffering, forbearing and forgiving none whom you are able to crush and ruyne, being soe brimfull of enmity and malignity towards me (that I speake not of others), even for that wherein most expected. I should have had your best proteccion and encouragement the better to suppress those vicious abuses, which your dignity and function engage you to oppugne more then any; that though you have allready ruyned me in my body, profession, liberty, state, and reputacion, by expelling me the University of Oxford, and degrading me there in the most disgracefull manner, albeit I never offended in it, *exiling me Lincolnes Inne, and thrusting me from my practise of the lawe, though I was never a delinquent in eyther,* fining me 5000^l, a summe infinitely beyond my estate, causing me to stand upon two severall pillories, and there to loose both my eares, a punishment seldome or never inflicted upon any gent, graduat, or barrister, unless for such offences as the statutes of the realme expressly mulct with such a penalty), martyring my bookes before my face in the most despitefull manner, shutting me up fast in prison, both before and since my censure, tossing me to and fro from prison to prison, for greater vexacion and expence. And all this for the foremencioned misconstrued passages, perused and lycensed in a due accustomed

"Peccat ante in Deum quicunque episcopus qui non quasi conservat servis ministrat sed quasi Dominus; frequenter autem et quasi amarus Dominus, per vim similis constitutus Egyptiis qui affligebant vitam filiorum Israel." Orig. Hom. 31, in Matth.

Multi cum Regiminis Jura suscipiunt ad lacerandos subditos inardescunt. Terrorem potestatis exhibent et quibus prodesse debuerant nocent. Et quia charitatis visura non habent Domini videri appetunt. Patres se esse minimi recognoscunt humilitatis locum in elationis dominacionem immutant. Et si quando extrinsecus claudiantur intrinsecus saeviant. De quibus veritas dicit veniant ad vos in vestimentis ovium intus autem sunt lupi rapaces." Greg. Mag. Hom. 17, in Evangelia.

^a i. e. "precedent."

manner, both in the written and printed copye (lycensed May 31, 1630, entered into the booke of licenses, under the warden of stacioners, the lycenser's, clarke of the stacioners handes, Octob. 16, 1630, finished at the press above x. weekes, and by the lycenser's owne appointment published in the country above four weekes before her Majesty's pastorall, against which it could not possibly be intended, as your Lordship and others surmised, being soe longe written, lycensed, and printed before it), yet your malice and enmity against me are still implacable, and all this I have undergone is too to little in your Lordship's most charitable opinion for such haynous lycensed offences. You will yet have a second encounter *with me, begging of his Majesty and the Star Chamber a further suite against me in the High Commission* (which I prayse God I feare not) that soe your Grace and the Church may disgorge and powre out the full and furious violls of your outrageous wrath and vengeance on me, *as the state (I say not by your Lordship's sole instigation) hath done.* That soe I may have noe being, noe rest or peace in eyther, and may (if possible) be sent suddenly packing quick to hell, for *wounding the Church and clergye in theyr beloved vices and corruptions* (though with theyr owne authorized canons and writings onely), which are growne now soe delicate, soe arrogant, that they must not be touched, noe not to worke theyr cure. Which strange unparalleled violence and vexacion of your Grace *makes the world beleyve* (how truly I cannot, y rself upon serious examinacion of your owne hart and wayes may well determyne), *that you are wholly composed of rancor, malice, oppression, vexacion, cruelty, implacablenes, mischeif, and revengefull spleen, having noe bowells of compassion, Xtianity, charity, humanity, generosity, or goodnes in you, & which are allwayes* pitteful, courteous, compassionate, mild, and just, abhorring all vexatious extremityes, especially towards such who have been innocent, pious, and industrious in theyr courses. Truly, my Lord, did you but seriously consider with your self that you have been advanced (*almost from the very dunghill*) to that transcendent place of honour and power wherein now you are seated only by his Majesty's most gracious

^A Videtur omissum towards them aut aliquid simile.

favour, and that you now stand, and are, and have been supported by it alone, without which you might have been longe ere this (*and who knowes how soone you may be yet*) a more contemptible spectacle of misery and justice then myself; methinkes it should make you more moderate, just, and compassionate towardes others, since you need soe much compassion, pardon, and proteccion from others, *without which you could not long subsist in that state wherein you are.* I doubt not but you know that as you have some faultes and oversights, soe you have enemyes enough *already (I will not say farr more then other man or prelate)* who would rejoyce to see your fall, your ruine (which nothing will sooner procure then your false, scandalous accusacions, and violent vexatious proceedings, *both in Church and State, which all men generally detest and grone under*), and will you yet every day raise up more enemyes (yea more cryes and teares to God) against you by your illegall *exorbitant vexacions*, which make you *the common odium* of the world and times? Certainly he who makes *noe better use* of his soveraignes superlative grace, but valere ad *nocendum*, immoderately to vexe, oppress, undoe, and injure others, *to purchase* all men's hatred noe man's love, is unworthy such a *blessing, and cannot longe enjoye himself or it.* The philosophers could say, Nullum violentum est duiturnum; and the poet, Immodicis brevis est ætas, ac rara senectus. Yea, God himself hath positively resolved, Psal. 140, 11, "Evill shall hunt the violent man to overthrow him. His mischeif shall returne upon his owne pate, and his violent dealing shall come downe upon his owne head." Psal. 7, 16. And therefore lest self love instruct your Lordship to be more just and moderate, less violent and vexatious in your proceedings, to take heed of vexing or trampling downe others (especially innocents) without just cause, or by illegall means, for feare God and others, even in justice, tread downe you. *My Lord, you have been observed of late to grow more strangely violent and exorbitant every daye, and I have cause to beleive it.* Every man supposed that the loss of my eares and effusion of my bloud would have quenched (at least allayed) the furye of your rage against me. Yet, whiles my woundes were bleeding

"Nescio an nemo ad dandam veniam difficilior sit quam qui illam petere sæpius meruit." Senec. de Clementia, l. 1, cap. 6. Which booke and theme your Lordship maye doe well to studie.

Eccles. 4, 1; Exod. 2, 23, 29. Prelati pulvinos his exhibent a quibus se noceri posse in studio gloriæ temporalis timent. Quos verò contra se nil valere conspiciunt hos nimium asperitate rigidi semper invectionis premunt, nunquam clementer admonent sed pastoralis mansuetudinis obliti jure dominacionis terrent. Jactanter erga subditos erigunt nec quid agere debeant sed quid valeant attendunt. Libet ut licenter illicita faciant et subditorum nemo contradicat. Quos recte per prophetam divina vox increpat dicens, vos autem cum austeritate imperabitis iis et cum potentia." Grego. Mag. Past. part 2. cap 8.

(oh! the abundant compassion and relentancye, or rather barbarous inhumane mercilesnes, of your obdurate heart) *you caused*^a *Cross the pursevant*, in a strange, *illegall, unheard of waye, by your mere verball command*, without *showing any warrant*, to seize upon my bookes, to carry them to his *house and there* to prayse if not to sell them, against all lawe, all *justice, without any legall ground*, there being yet noe extent *against me for my fyne*, and your Lordship having noe authority by lawe *to graunt it* after, much less before, the fyne estreated; which notable act of your Lordship's new justice and oppression (of one soe much afflicted by you before) in the middest of my corporall sufferings, makes many suspect the equity of your former proceedings, and to divyne what justice I must looke for at your hands in the High Commission, since you thus unjustly seise upon my bookes, the onely instruments to justify and defend my cause against your proceedings there; it being the very extremity of injustice thus illegally to disarm me of the means of my just defence, and then to proceed against me. Had my fyne been estreated, and the sheriff by a legall process extended my bookes, there had been some coulour of justice in it (though it hath been reputed lawe in former tymes that a scholler could not be distrained by his bookes noe more then a smith by his anvill or an husbandman by his plowe, because they are the necessary instruments of his profession); or had not Sir William Beecher and Mr. Attorney severally surveyed my studye by order from your Lordship and other the Lords of his Majesty's Privy Counsell, and after by theyr direccion restored those bookes unto me (which they neyther would nor could detayne from me in justice after these surveys, they being my proper goods), your Lordship might have had some seeming pretence to seise them (though I knowe no lawe or precedent for it), to see whether there were any unlawfull bookes amonge them; but to doe it before my fyne estreated, and that by a pursevant, not a sheriff or his bayly, without any legall process, by your owne immediate authority, after two surveyes and restitution of them to me by order, and that not to peruse but to prayse

^a Laud denied having given the order.

and sell them, of purpose (as some conjecture) to anticipate my defence in the *High Commission*, is such a transcendent straine of oppression and injustice as all men wonder at and exclaime against. Some saye (*I made Will Lau*) is your Lordship's anagram,^a who oft tymes make your will (not lawe or canons) the onely rule of many actions. I am sure of this your seizure, in which your anagram is truly verified. And how extravagantly unjust that man must be in all his courses who makes his will his onely lawe (as if he had noe God, noe Scripture, noe conscience, noe reason, noe justice, noe humane lawes to bound, direct, or oversway him), how precipitately he must post on to temporall and eternall ruyne, all moderate upright men may easily discern. Wherefore, my Lord, though you are great be you not unjust; though you thinke yourself above the lawes eyther of God or man, yet be not lawless in your actions; though you are powerfull, yet be not vexatious, malicious, and despitefull, to^b remember that for all your power and favour you are but dust and ashes, a man and not a god, a subject not a soveraigne, and therefore doe to others as you would have them doe to you were you in theyr condicion, and they in yours. And knowe withall if you will still proceed to prosecute, to oppress an innocent with violence and vexacion, that there is one in heaven and another in earth above you, to whom I shall appeale for justice in case you refuse to doe me voluntary right against yourself, in all the premised particulars of your injustice towards me; of whiche perchance you have been ignorant, or altogether senseless heretofore, but cannot be misconusant or regardless now, after soe large a private discovery and relation of them to yourselfe, which I had never made had not I found your spleen against me restless, endles, without all boundes or reason; in which involuntary relation, if I have manifested more distemper, choler, or dealt more plainly, more uncomely with your Lordship then beseems me, I hope you will consider that *lasa patientia fit furor*, and that your violence,

Yet God enjoynes Bishops
not to be self willed nor
soone angry. Tit. 1. 7.

^a For "William Laud."

^b Sic in orig.

your injustice, have given me just occasion a little to forgett myself, whiles I thus privately sent my manifold greivances and pressures *to your Lordship, from whom they originally springe*. Neither can I doubt your Lordship's pardon for such *distempered oversights, who are every day farr more subject to them yourselfe*. All I requyre of your Lordship is, but to doe me right for all the forenamed *injuries, in the self same waye and manner as you have wronged me, and to the self same persons, and to make such restitution to me both of my profession, liberty, goodes, and good name which you have taken from me, as may prepare you to receyve remission at the handes of God, upon your true repentance*. Non remittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum, is a receyved canon among all casuists and divynes. *If therefore you expect forgiveness at God's handes or myne, pray make me now such voluntary, publike, and private satisfacion as divinity, charity, and justice call for at your handes for all your former wronges*. If you will be soe spontaneously just as to doe me right yourself upon this my private demande of justice from you, I shall hereupon complaine noe further. *If not, I can, I shall then with greater cause and safety openly sue for justice against you to those who are able to doe me right, and to give me that recompence as your self denye me*. And thus desiring God of his infinite mercy to pardon, to purge out all the venome, malice, and violence of your heart against my self and others, to put bowells of mercy, pittie, meeknes, and aff ction towards all good men into you, and to give you grace unfa..edly to repent of all your *violent, unjust, extravagant, oppressive, vexatious, despitefull courses and proceedings which crye aloud for vengeance against you, and will certainly end in misery, ruyne, if not in hell it self, if you runne on madding in them, without restraint or feare, I humbly take my leave, and rest*

Your Grace's oppressed one, seeking, not
grace, but justice from you,

WILLIAM PRYNNE.

From the Tower of London,
June xi. 1634.

Tit. 1, 8, &c.

Audiant hoc Prelati qui
sibi commissis semper
nolunt esse formidini
utilitati raro. Discite
subditorum matres nos
esse debere non dominos.
Studeat magis amari, quam
metui. Et si interdum
severitate opus est, paterna
sit non tyrannica. Matres
fovendo, patres nos cor-
ripiendo exhibeat. Man-
suecite, ponite feritatem.
Suspendite verbera, pro-
ducite ubera, pectora lacte
pinguescant, non typho
turgeant. Quid jugum ves-
trum super eis aggravisatis,
quorum potius contra

James 2, 13. Matth. 7, 2.

He shall have judgment without mercye that hath shewed noe mercye. With what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you againe.

portare debetis. Cur
morsus a serpente parvulus
fugit conscientiam sacer-
dotis, ad quem eum magis
oportuerat tanquam ad
sinum recurrere matris.
Si spirituales estis instruito
tales spiritu lenitatis con-
siderans unusquisque
seipsum ne et ipso tenetur.
Bern. super Cant. Secu.
23.

[Indorsed in Laud's hand.]

Junii 11, 1634.

A cōpye of a letter sent unto me June 11, 1634, from Mr. Prynn; conteyning, with much libelling bitternes, a confutacion of what I sayd in Star Chamber at the tyme of his censure, and threatning to call for justice against me, &c.

2 (3, 6).

Junii 16, 1634. Mondaye.

I sent the originall of Mr. Prynn's leter to Mr. Atturneye Generall by the King's command.

Junii 17.

Mr. Atturneye sent for Mr. Prinn to his chamber, shewed him the leter, asked him wheather it wear his hand. Mr. Prinn sayd he could not tell unless he might reed it. The leter beinge given into his hand, he tear the leter into small peecees, and threwe it out at windowe, and sayd that should never rise in judgment against him; fearing (it seemes) an ore tenus for this.

Junii 18, 1634.

Mr. Attorney brought him into the Star Chamber, whear all thiss appeared, with shame enough to Mr. Prinne.