all the ministers in the surrounding districts. Then, of course, Cromwell died, and nobody could agree as to how to carry on after him, and the result was that Charles II was invited back. Charles II I do not think really wanted to be oppressive. He was not like his father. His father wanted to really rule. He wanted to be the real king, but Charles II greatest feelings was that he did not want to start off on his travels again. He was wanted to enjoy such pleasures, such luxuries, such liscentious living as he felt inclined to, and was quite content to leave government in general to others. But for twenty-five years while he ruled, there came a reaction against the rule of the saints, and Baxter, who was invited up to London to preach before the king, when he refused to submit to the control that had been established, was ordered never again to go back to Kidderminster, and was strictly forbidden to preach, as were all others who would not be absolutely under control/the established authorities, and these were pretty well examined. They had to declare, for instance, that rebellion against the king for any reason whatever was unBiblical and wrong and wicked, and if they could not declare such a thing, they were forbidden to preach anywhere. John Bunyan was in prison for many years and he could have gotten up at any minute and walked out if he would promise not to preach. That was all he would have to do. But he refused to promise, and so he stayed there, and for twenty-five years, under Charles II, all except those who were strictly in ix line with the commands of the government, were forbidden to preach at all, and the Reformation pretty well died out as far as the mass of the people was concerned. It was not like it had been before the Reformation. The Bible was still read. Mostly fox-hunting parsons who tixed were drunk a great deal of the time and who spent their time in pleasures, carried on the service, and in the service, therem were those wonderful words of Cranmer's from