

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

THEIR ATTEMPTS FOR A FARTHER REFORMATION IN THE CHURCH, THEIR SUFFERINGS, AND
THE LIVES AND CHARACTERS OF THEIR MOST CONSIDERABLE DIVINES.

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

WITH HIS LIFE OF THE AUTHOR AND ACCOUNT OF HIS WRITINGS.

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

R. GRIFFIN AND CO., GLASGOW; T. T. AND H. TEGG, DUBLIN;

ALSO J. AND S. A. TEGG, SYDNEY AND HOBART TOWN.

1837.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT TO THE DEATH OF KING JAMES I.

BANCROFT was succeeded by Dr. George Abbot, bishop of London, a divine of a quite different spirit from his predecessor. A sound Protestant, a thorough Calvinist, an avowed enemy to Popery, and even suspected of Puritanism, because he relaxed the penal laws, whereby he unravelled all that his predecessor had been doing for many years; “who, if he had lived a little longer (says lord Clarendon¹), would have subdued the unruly spirit of the Nonconformists, and extinguished that fire in England which had been kindled at Geneva; but Abbot (says his lordship) considered the Christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled Popery, and valued those men most who did that most furiously. He inquired but little after the strict observation of the discipline of the church, or conformity to the articles or canons established, and did not think so ill of the [Presbyterian] discipline as he ought to have done; but if men prudently forbore a public reviling at the hierarchy and ecclesiastical government, they were secure from any inquisition from him, and were equally preferred. His house was a sanctuary to the most eminent of the factious party, and he licensed their pernicious writings.” This is the heavy charge brought by the noble historian against one of the most religious and venerable prelates of his age, and a steady friend of the constitution in church and state. If Abbot’s moderate measures had been constantly pursued, the liberties of England had been secured, Popery discountenanced, and the church prevented from running into those excesses, which first proved its reproach and afterward its ruin.

The translation of the Bible now in use, was finished this year [1611]; it was undertaken at the request of the Puritan divines in the Hampton-court conference; and being the last, it may not be unacceptable to set before the reader in one view, the various translations of the Bible into the English language.

The New Testament was first translated by Dr. Wickliffe out of the Vulgar Latin, about the year 1380, and is entitled, “The New Testament, with the lessons taken out of the old law, read in churches according to the use of Sarum.”

The next translation was by William Tyndal, printed at Antwerp 1526, in octavo, without a name, and without either calendar, references in the

¹ Book 1. p. 88.

margin, or table at the end; it was corrected by the author, and printed in the years 1534 and 1536, having passed through five editions in Holland.

In the meantime Tyndal was translating several books of the Old Testament, as the Pentateuch, and the book of Jonah, printed 1531; the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, and Nehemiah. About the same time George Joy, some time fellow of Peter-college, Cambridge, translated the Psalter, the prophecy of Jeremiah, and the song of Moses, and printed them beyond sea.

In the year 1535, the whole Bible was printed the first time in folio, adorned with wooden cuts, and Scripture references; it was done by several hands, and dedicated to king Henry VIII. by Miles Coverdale. In the last page it is said to be printed in the year of our Lord 1535, and finished the fourth day of October. This Bible was reprinted in quarto 1550, and again with a new title 1553.

Two years after the Bible was reprinted in English, with this title, “The Holy Byble, which is all the Holy Scripture, in which are containd the Olde and Newe Testament, truelye and purelye translated into English by [a fictitious name] Thomas Matthew, 1537.” It has a calendar with an almanac; and an exhortation to the study of the Scripture, signed J. R. John Rogers; a table of contents and marriages; marginal notes, a prologue; and in the Apocalypse some wooden cuts. At the beginning of the prophets are printed on the top of the page R. G. Richard Grafton, and at the bottom E. W. Edward Whitchurch, who were the printers. This translation, to the end of the book of Chronicles, and the book of Jonah, with all the New Testament, was Tyndal’s; the rest was Miles Coverdale’s and John Rogers’s.

In the year 1539 the above-mentioned translation, having been revised and corrected by archbishop Cranmer, was reprinted by Grafton and Whitchurch, “cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.” It has this title, “The Bible in Englyshe, that is to say, the content of the Holy Scriptures, both of the Oide and Newe Testament, truely translated after the veritie of the Hebrue and Greke texts, by the diligent study of divers excellent learned men, expert in the foresayde tongues.” In this edition Tyndal’s prologue and marginal notes are omitted. It was reprinted the following year in a large folio, proper for churches, begun at Paris, and finished at London. In the year 1541 it was printed again by Grafton, with a preface by Cranmer, having been revised by Tonstal and Heath, bishops of Durham and Rochester. But after this time the Popish party prevailing at court, there were no more editions of the Bible in this reign.

Soon after king Edward’s accession [1548–9], the Bible of 1541 had been reprinted, with Cranmer’s prologue; and the liturgy of the church of England, being first composed and established, the translation of the

Psalter, commonly called the old translation, in use at this day, was taken from this edition. Next year, Coverdale's Testament of 1535 was reprinted, with Erasmus's paraphrase; but there was no new translation.

In the reign of queen Mary [1555], the exiles at Geneva undertook a new translation, commonly called the Geneva Bible; the names of the translators were Coverdale, Goodman, Gilby, Whittingham, Sampson, Cole, Knox, Bodleigh, and Pullain, who published the New Testament first in small twelves, 1557, by Conrad Badius. This is the first that was printed with numerical verses. The whole Bible was published afterward with marginal notes, 1559, dedicated to queen Elizabeth. The translators say, "they had been employed in this work night and day with fear and trembling—and they protest from their consciences, that, in every point and word, they had faithfully rendered the text to the best of their knowledge." But the marginal notes having given offence, it was not suffered to be published in England¹ till the death of archbishop Parker, when it was printed [1576] by Christopher Barker, in quarto, "cum privilegio," and met with such acceptance, that it passed through twenty or thirty editions in this reign.

Cranmer's edition of the Bible had been reprinted in the years 1562 and 1566, for the use of the churches. But complaint being made of the incorrectness of it, archbishop Parker projected a new translation, and assigned the several books of the Old and New Testament to about fourteen dignitaries of the church, most of whom being bishops, it was from them called the Bishops' Bible, and was printed in an elegant and pompous folio, in the year 1568, with maps and cuts. In the year 1572, it was reprinted with some alterations and additions, and several times afterward without any amendments.

In the year 1582, the Roman Catholic exiles translated the New Testament for the use of their people, and published it in quarto, with this title, "The New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated faithfully into English out of the authentic Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred with the Greek and other editions in divers languages; with arguments of books and chapters, annotations, and other necessary helps for the better understanding of the text, and especially for the discovery of the corruptions of divers late translations, and for clearing the controversies in religion of these days. In the English college of Rheims. Printed by John Fogny." The Old Testament of this translation was first published at Doway in two quarto volumes, the first in the year 1609, the other 1610, by Lawrence Kellam, at the sign of the Holy Lamb, with a

¹ Here Mr. Neal, as Dr. Grey observes, appears to be mistaken; as Lewis says, "that the Geneva Bible was printed at London, in folio and quarto, in 1572." Lewis's *History of the Translations of the Bible*, in 8vo. p. 264, second edition, 1739.—ED.

preface and tables; the authors are said to be cardinal Allen, some time principal of St. Mary-hall, Oxford; Richard Bristow, fellow of Exeter-college; and Gregory Martyn, of St. John's college. The annotations were made by Thomas Worthington, B. A. of Oxford; all of them exiles for their religion, and settled in Popish seminaries beyond sea. The mistakes of this translation, and the false glosses put upon the text, were exposed by the learned Dr. Fulke and Mr. Cartwright.

At the request of the Puritans in the Hampton-court conference, king James appointed a new translation to be executed by the most learned men of both universities, under the following regulations, (1.) That they keep as close as possible to the Bishops' Bible. (2.) That the names of the holy writers be retained according to vulgar use. (3.) That the old ecclesiastical words be kept, as *church* not to be translated *congregation*, &c. (4.) That when a word has divers significations, that be kept which has been most commonly used by the fathers.¹ (5.) That the division of chapters be not altered.² (6.) No marginal notes but for the explication of a Hebrew or Greek word. (7.) Marginal references may be set down. The other regulations relate to the translators comparing notes, and agreeing among themselves; they were to consult the modern translations of the French, Dutch, German³, &c. but to vary as little as possible from the Bishops' Bible.

The king's commission bears date 1604, but the work was not begun till 1606, and finished 1611. Fifty-four of the chief divines of both universities were originally nominated; some of whom dying soon after, the work was undertaken by forty-seven, who were divided into six companies; the first translated from Genesis to the First Book of Chronicles; the second to the prophecy of Isaiah; the third translated the four greater prophets, with the Lamentations and twelve smaller prophets; the fourth had the Apocrypha; the fifth had the four gospels, the Acts, and the Revelations; and the sixth the canonical epistles. The whole being finished and revised by learned men from both universities, the publishing it was committed to the care of bishop Bilson and Dr. Miles Smith, which last wrote the preface that is now prefixed. It was printed in the year 1611, with a dedication to king James, and is the same that is still read in all the churches.

Upon the death of Arminius, the curators of the university of Leyden chose Conradus Vorstius his successor. This divine had published a very

¹ Dr. Grey states more fully and accurately these rules from Lewis and Fuller, "used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogic of faith."—ED.

² "The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require." Lewis, p. 317. Fuller's Church Hist. b. 10, p. 46. ED.

³ The translations pointed out by name, as Dr. Grey remarks, were those of Tyndal, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch, and Geneva.—ED.

exceptionable treatise¹ concerning the nature and properties of God, in which he maintained that God had a body; and denied his proper immensity and omniscience, as they are commonly understood. He maintained the Divine Being to be limited and restrained, and ascribed quantity and magnitude to him. The clergy of Amsterdam remonstrated to the States against his settlement at Leyden, the country being already too much divided about the Arminian tenets. To strengthen their panels, they applied to the English ambassador to represent the case to king James; and prevailed with the curators to defer his induction into the professorship till his majesty had read over his book;² which having done, he declared Vorstius to be an arch heretic, a pest, a monster of blasphemies; and to show his detestation of his book, ordered it to be burnt publicly in St. Paul's churchyard, and at both universities; in the conclusion of his letter to the States on this occasion he says, "As God has honoured us with the title of defender of the faith, so (if you incline to retain Vorstius any longer) we shall be obliged not only to separate and cut ourselves off from such false and heretical churches, but likewise to call upon all the rest of the reformed churches to enter upon the same common consultation, how we may best extinguish and send back to hell these cursed [Arminian] heresies that have newly broken forth? And as for ourselves, we shall be necessitated to forbid all the youth of our subjects to frequent a university that is so infected as that of Leyden."³ His majesty also sent over sundry other memorials, in which he styles Vorstius a wicked atheist: Arminius an enemy to God. And Bertius having written that the saints might fall from grace, he said the author was worthy of the fire.

At length [1612] the king published his royal declaration, in several languages,⁴ containing an account of all that he had done in the affair of Vorstius, with his reasons; which were, his zeal for the glory of God, his

¹ It may be wished that Mr. Neal had rather said "a treatise against which great exceptions were taken." His mode of expression intimates that those exceptions were justly grounded; this Vorstius himself denied, and solemnly declared his belief of the immensity and omniscience of the Divine Being, and ascribed the imputations cast on him to wresting his words to a meaning contrary to the scope and the connexion of the discourse. His abilities, learning, and virtues, were highly esteemed by those who differed from him. *Præstantium ac Eruditorum Virorum Epistolæ*. Amsterdam 1660; p. 350, &c. and p. 385; and the *Abridgment of Brandt's History*, vol. 2. p. 727, 728. —ED.

² *Brandt's History*, vol. 2. p. 97; or the *Abridgment*, vol. 1. p. 318.

³ "Nothing (it is well observed by Gerard Brandt) can be less edifying, than to see a Protestant prince, who, not contented to persecute the heterodox in his own kingdom, exhorts the potentates of the same religion to imitate his conduct." *Brandt Abridged*, vol. 1. p. 319.—ED.

⁴ It was printed in French, Latin, Dutch, and English; on which Dr. Harris well remarks, that "consequently his monstrous zeal, his unprincipled revilings, and his weak and pitiful reasonings, were known throughout Europe." Yet it was not held in any high reputation; for Mr. Norton, who had the printing of it in Latin, swore "he would not print it, unless he might have money to print it." *Harris's Life of James I.* p. 120.

love for his friends and allies [the States], and fear of the same contagion in his own kingdom; but their high mightinesses did not like the king of England's intermeddling so far in their affairs. However, Vorstius was dismissed to Gouda, where he lived privately till the synod of Dort, when he was banished the Seven Provinces; he then retired to Tonninghen, in the dukedom of Holstein, where he died a professed Socinian, September 19, 1622.¹

His majesty had a farther opportunity of discovering his zeal against heresy this year, upon two of his own subjects. One was Bartholomew Legate, an Arian:² he was a comely person, of a black complexion, and about forty years of age, of a fluent tongue, excellently well versed in the Scriptures, and of an unblamable conversation. King James himself, and some of his bishops, in vain conferred with him, in hope of convincing him of his errors. Having lain a considerable time in Newgate, he was at length convened before bishop King in his consistory at St. Paul's, who, with some other divines and lawyers there assembled, declared him a contumacious and obdurate heretic, and certified the same into chancery by a significavit, delivering him over to the secular power; whereupon the king signed a writ³ *de heretico comburendo* to the sheriffs of London, who

¹ His sickness was a short one; but long enough to afford him an opportunity to teach his physician and other friends, how a Christian ought to die. He was wholly intent upon prayer, and scarcely repeated anything but passages out of the Scriptures. At his request, Acts ii. and 1 Cor. xv. as mentioning the resurrection, were read to him: and this doctrine was much the subject of his last discourses. He expired, recommending his soul to God and Jesus Christ his Saviour. And it is said, that the piety, holiness, faith, and resignation, which he showed, and the fervency of his prayers, cannot be well expressed. Brandt Abridged, vol. 2. p. 722, 723.—ED.

² Fuller, b. 10. p. 63.

³ The reader will perhaps be curious to see the form of the king's writ for burning Legate; the latter part of which is as follows:

—“Whereas the holy mother-church hath not farther to do and to prosecute on this part; the same reverend father hath left the aforesaid Bartholomew Legate, as a blasphemous heretic, to our secular power, to be punished with condign punishment, as by the letters patent of the same reverend father in Christ, the bishop of London, in this behalf above made, hath been certified to us in our chancery. We, therefore, as a zealot of justice, and a defender of the catholic faith, and willing to maintain and defend the holy church, and the rights and liberties of the same, and the catholic faith: and such heresies and errors every where what in Us lieth, to root out and extirpate, and to punish with condign punishment, such heretics so convicted, and deeming that such a heretic, in form aforesaid convicted and condemned according to the laws and customs of this our kingdom of England in this part accustomed, ought to be burned with fire; we do command you that the said Bartholomew Legate, being in your custody, you do commit publicly to the fire, before the people, in a public and open place in West Smithfield, for the cause aforesaid; and that you cause the said Bartholomew Legate to be really burned in the same fire, in detestation of the said crime, for the manifest example of other Christians, lest they slide into the same fault; and this that in nowise you omit, under the peril that shall follow thereon. Witness,” &c. A Narration of the Burning of Bartholomew Legate, &c. in Truth brought to Light, 1692, as quoted by Mr. Lindsey in his Conversations on Christian Idolatry, p. 119, 120.—ED.

brought him to Smithfield, March 18, and in the midst of a vast concourse of people burnt him to death. A pardon was offered him at the stake if he would recant, but he refused it.

Next month Edward Wightman, of Burton-upon-Trent, was convicted of heresy by Dr. Neile, bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, and was burnt at Litchfield, April 11th.¹ He was charged in the warrant with the heresies of Arius, Cerinthus, Manichæus, and the Anabaptists.²—There was another condemned to the fire for the same heresies; but the constancy of the above-mentioned sufferers moving pity in the spectators, it was thought better to suffer him to linger out a miserable life in Newgate, than to awaken too far the compassions of the people.

Nothing was minded at court but luxury and diversions. The affairs of the church were left to the bishops, and the affairs of state to subordinate magistrates, or the chief ministers, while the king himself sunk into a most indolent and voluptuous life, suffering himself to be governed by a favourite, in the choice of whom he had no regard to virtue or merit, but to youth, beauty, gracefulness of person, and fine clothes, &c. This exposed him to the contempt of foreign powers, who from this time paid him very little regard. At the same time he was lavish and profuse in his expenses and grants to his hungry courtiers, whereby he exhausted his exchequer, and was obliged to have recourse to arbitrary and illegal methods of raising money by the prerogative. By these means he lost the hearts of his people, which all his kingcraft could never recover, and laid the foundation of those calamities, that in the next reign threw church and state into such convulsions, as threatened their final ruin.

But while the king and his ministers were wounding the Protestant religion and the liberties of England, it pleased Almighty God to lay the foundation of their recovery by the marriage of the king's daughter

¹ Fuller, b. 10. p. 64.

² Some of the opinions imputed to Wightman savoured of vanity and superstition, or rather enthusiasm; such as, his being the prophet foretold Deut. xviii. and by Isaiah; the Elijah to come, of whom Malachi speaks. "But (as Mr. Lindsey justly remarks) we may well hesitate here, whether such were the man's real sentiments, or only those which his adversaries would fix upon him." These proceedings show, as Brandt observes, it was high time to repeal the act *de heretico comburendo*. The sentiments of Limborch on them deserve to be mentioned here. "These things (says he in a letter to Mr. Locke) are a scandal to the Reformation. A court of inquisition into men's faith, is alike contrary to Christian charity, whether it be erected on the banks of the Tiber, or the lake of Geneva, or by the side of the river Thames: for it is the same iniquitous cruelty, though exercised in another place, and on different subjects." A fine observation of Brandt on this occasion shall close this note. "It is a very glorious thing for the United Provinces (says he), that the blood of no heretic has been shed in that country ever since the Reformation; which ought to be ascribed to the moderation and great knowledge of the states-general, and the states of each of those provinces." Brandt Abridged, vol. 1. p. 319. Lindsey's Historical View of Unitarian Doctrine, &c. p. 294—ED.

Elizabeth to Frederick V. elector palatine of the Rhine, from whom the present royal family is descended. The match was promoted by archbishop Abbot, and universally approved by all the Puritans in England, as the grand security of the Protestant succession in case of failure of heirs from the king's son. Mr. Echard says, they foretold, by a distant foresight, the succession of this family to the crown; and it must be owned, that they were always the delight of the Puritans, who prayed heartily for them, and upon all occasions exerted themselves for the support of the family in their lowest circumstances.

The solemnity of these nuptials was retarded some months, by the untimely death of Henry prince of Wales, the king's eldest son, who died November 6, 1612, and was buried the 7th of December following, being eighteen years and eight months old. Some have suspected that the king his father caused him to be poisoned, though there is no sufficient proof of it;¹ the body being opened, his liver appeared white, and his spleen and diaphragm black, his gall without choler, and his lungs spotted with much corruption, and his head full of blood in some places, and in others full of water. It is certain the king was jealous of his son's popularity, and asked one day, if he would bury him alive; and upon his death commanded, that no person should appear at court in mourning for him.² This prince was one of the most accomplished persons of his age, sober, chaste, temperate, religious, full of honour and probity, and never heard to swear an oath: neither the example of the king his father, nor of the whole court, was capable of corrupting him in these respects. He had a great soul, full of noble and elevated sentiments, and was as much displeased with trifles as his father was fond of them. He had frequently said, that if ever he mounted the throne, his first care should be to try to reconcile the Puritans to the church of England. As this could not be done without each party's making

¹ These suspicions arose from the popular odium the king had incurred, from the behaviour of the court at the time the prince lay dead, and from the disappointment which the great expectations of the people from this prince suffered. There were insinuations to this effect from respectable persons: and colonel Titus assured bishop Burnet, that he had heard king Charles I. declare, that the prince his brother was poisoned by means of viscount Rochester. This evidence amounted to a kind of proof, yet, as to these suggestions were opposed the opinions of the physicians, and the appearances of the body when it was opened, and the presumptive evidence did not come home to the king, it is to be wished that Mr. Neal had used more guarded language: for the words, "no certain proof," seem to imply, that there was probable proof of it. Bishop Warburton is therefore very angry, and says it "is abominable:" it is indeed a heavy charge to impute to a parent, his being accessory to the poisoning of a son. See Dr. Birch's *Life of Henry Prince of Wales*, p. 101—109. Dr. Grey, as well as the bishop, also censures our author, and refers to main authorities to disprove, as he calls them, "Mr. Neal's unfair insinuations." These insinuations did not originate, it should be observed, with Mr. Neal, but were sanctioned by the prevailing opinion of the times; and were countenanced by the conduct of James, who showed himself quite unaffected with the death of his virtuous and amiable son.—ED.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 181. folio edit.

some concessions, and as such a proceeding was directly contrary to the temper of the court and clergy, he was suspected to countenance Puritanism. To say all in one word, prince Henry was mild and affable, though of a warlike genius, the darling of the Puritans, and of all good men; and though he lived about eighteen years, no historian has taxed him with any vice.

To furnish the exchequer with money several new projects were set on foot, as, (1.) His majesty created a new order of knights-baronets: the number not to exceed two hundred, and the expense of the patent £1,095. (2.) His majesty sold letters patent for monopolies. (3.) He obliged such as were worth ?40. a year to compound for not being knights. (4.) He set to sale the highest honours and dignities of the nation: the price for a baron was ?10,000., for a viscount £15,000, and £20,000 for an earl. (5.) Those who had defective titles were obliged to compound to set them right. And, (6.) The star-chamber raised their fines to an excessive degree.¹ But these projects not answering the king's necessities, he was obliged at last to call a parliament. When the houses met, they proceeded immediately to consider of and redress grievances, upon which the king dissolved them, before they had enacted one statute, and committed some of the principal members of the house of commons to prison, without admitting them to bail, resolving again to raise money without the aid of parliament.

This year the articles of the church of Ireland were ratified and confirmed; the reformation of that kingdom had made a very slow progress in the late reign, by reason of the wars between the English and the natives, and the small proportion of the former to the latter. The natives had a strong prejudice against the English, as coming into the country by conquest; and being bigoted Papists, their prejudices were inflamed by king Henry VIII. throwing off the pope's supremacy, which threatened the loss of their religion, as well as their civil liberties. In the reign of Philip and Mary they were more quiet, when a law was passed against bringing in the Scots and marrying with them, which continued in force during the whole reign of queen Elizabeth, and was a great hindrance to the progress of the Protestant religion in that country; however, a university was erected at Dublin in the year 1593, and furnished with learned professors from Cambridge of the Calvinistical persuasion. James Usher, who afterward was the renowned archbishop of Armagh, was the first student who entered into the college. The discipline of the Irish church was according to the model of the English; bishops were nominated to the Popish dioceses, but their revenues being alienated, or in the hands of Papists, or very much diminished by the wars, they were obliged to throw the revenues of several bishoprics

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 185.

together, to make a tolerable subsistence for one. The case was the same with the inferior clergy, 40s. a year being a common allowance for a vicar in the province of Connaught, and sometimes only sixteen. Thus, says Mr. Collyer, the authority of the bishops went off, and the people followed their own fancies in the choice of religion.

At the Hampton-court conference the king proposed sending preachers into Ireland, complaining that he was but half monarch of that kingdom, the bodies of the people being only subject to his authority, while their consciences were at the command of the pope; yet it does not appear that any attempts were made to convert them till after the year 1607, when the act of the third and fourth of Philip and Mary being repealed, the citizens of London undertook for the province of Ulster. These adventurers built Londonderry, fortified Coleraine, and purchased a great tract of land in the adjacent parts. They sent over considerable numbers of planters, but were at a loss for ministers; for the beneficed clergy of the church of England, being at ease in the enjoyment of their preferments, would not engage in such a hazardous undertaking, it fell therefore to the lot of the Scots and English Puritans; the Scots, by reason of their vicinity to the northern parts of Ireland, transported numerous colonies; they improved the country, and brought preaching into the churches where they settled; but being of the Presbyterian persuasion, they formed their churches after their own model. The London adventurers prevailed with several of the English Puritans to remove, who, being persecuted at home, were willing to go anywhere within the king's dominions for the liberty of their consciences, and more would have gone, could they have been secure of a toleration after they were settled. But their chief resource was from the Scots. The first minister of that persuasion that went over was Mr. Edward Bryce, who settled in Broad Island in the county of Antrim 1611; after him Mr. Robert Cunningham, in Hollywood in the county of Down. At the same time came over three English ministers, all Puritans trained up under Mr. Cartwright, viz. Mr. Ridges of Antrim, Mr. Henry Calvert, and Mr. Hubbard of Carrickfergus. After these, Mr. Robert Blair came from Scotland to Bangor, Mr. Hamilton to Bellywater, and Mr. Levingston to Killinshy in the county of Down, with Mr. Welsh, Dunbar, and others.¹ Mr. Blair was a zealous Presbyterian, and scrupled episcopal ordination, but the bishop of the diocese compromised the difference, by agreeing that the other Scots presbyters of Mr. Blair's persuasion should join with him, and that such passages in the established form of ordination, as Mr. Blair and his brethren disliked, should be omitted or exchanged for others of their own approbation. Thus was Mr. Blair ordained publicly in the church of Bangor;

¹ Loyalty Presb. p. 161–163.

the bishop of Raphoe did the same for Mr. Levingston; and all the Scots who were ordained in Ireland from this time to the year 1642, were ordained after the same manner; all of them enjoyed the churches and tithes, though they remained Presbyterian, and used not the liturgy; nay, the bishops consulted them about affairs of common concernment to the church, and some of them were members of the convocation in 1634. They had their monthly meetings at Antrim, for the promoting of piety and the extirpation of Popery. They had also their quarterly communions, by which means great numbers of the inhabitants were civilized, and many became serious Christians. Mr. Blair preached before the judges of assize on the Lord's day, at the desire of the bishop of Down, and his curate administered the sacrament to them the same day; so that there was a sort of comprehension between the two parties, by the countenance and approbation of the great archbishop Usher, who encouraged the ministers in this good work. And thus things continued till the administration of archbishop Laud, who, by dividing the Protestants, weakened them, and made way for that enormous growth of Popery which ended in the massacre of almost all the Protestants in the kingdom.

It appears from hence, that the reformation of Ireland was built upon a Puritan foundation, though episcopacy was the legal establishment; but it was impossible to make any considerable progress in the conversion of the natives, because of their bigotry and prejudice against the English nation, whose language they could not be persuaded to learn.

The Protestant religion being pretty well established, it was thought advisable to frame some articles of their common faith, according to the custom of other churches: some moved in convocation to adopt the articles of the English church, but this was overruled, as not so honourable to themselves, who were as much a national church as England, nor so consistent with their independency; it was therefore voted to draw up a new confession of their own; the draught was referred to the conduct of Dr. James Usher, provost of Dublin-college, and afterward lord-primate; it afterward passed both houses of convocation and parliament with great unanimity, and being sent over to the English court was approved in council, and ratified by the lord-lieutenant Chichester this year in the king's name.

These articles being rarely to be met with, I have given them a place in the Appendix¹, being in a manner the same which the Puritans requested at the Hampton-court conference: for, first, The nine articles of Lambeth are incorporated into this confession. Secondly, The morality of the Lord's-day is strongly asserted, and the spending it wholly in religious exercises is

¹ Vol. 5. Appendix, No. 6.

required, [art. 56.] Thirdly, The observation of Lent is declared not to be a religious fast, but grounded merely on political considerations, for provision of things tending to the better preservation of the commonwealth, [art. 50.] Fourthly, All clergymen are said to be lawfully called and sent, who are chosen and called to this work, by men who have public authority given them in the church to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard, [art. 71.] which is an acknowledgment of the validity of the ordinations of those churches which have no bishops. Fifthly, The power of the keys is said to be only declarative, [art. 74.] Sixthly, The pope is declared to be antichrist, or that man of sin whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming, [art. 80.] Seventhly, The consecration of archbishops, bishops, &c. is not so much as mentioned, as if done on purpose, says Mr. Collyer, to avoid maintaining the distinction between that order and that of priests. Lastly, No power is ascribed to the church in making canons, or censuring those who either carelessly or wilfully infringe the same. Upon the whole, these articles seem to be contrived to compromise the difference between the church and the Puritans; and they had that effect till the year 1634, when, by the influence of archbishop Laud and the earl of Strafford, these articles were set aside, and those of the church of England received in their room.

To return to England. Among the Puritans who fled from the persecution of bishop Bancroft, was Mr. Henry Jacob, mentioned in the year 1604. This divine, having conferred with Mr. Robinson, pastor of an English church at Leyden, embraced his peculiar sentiments of church-discipline, since known by the name of Independency. In the year 1619, Mr. Jacob published at Leyden a small treatise in octavo, entitled "The Divine beginning and institution of Christ's true visible and material church:" and followed it next year with another from Middleburgh, which he called "An explication and confirmation of his former treatise." Some time after he returned to England, and having imparted his design of setting up a separate congregation, like those in Holland, to the most learned Puritans of those times, as Mr. Throgmorton, Wring, Mansel, Dod, &c. it was not condemned as unlawful, considering there was no prospect of a national reformation. Mr. Jacob therefore, having summoned several of his friends together, as Mr. Staismore, Mr. Browne, Mr. Prior, Almey, Throughton, Allen, Gibbet, Farre, Goodal, and others; and having obtained their consent to unite in church-fellowship, for obtaining the ordinances of Christ in the purest manner, they laid the foundation of the first Independent or congregational church in England, after the following manner:—having observed a day of solemn fasting and prayer for a blessing upon their undertaking, towards the close of the solemnity each of them made open confession of their faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and then

standing together they joined hands, and solemnly covenanted with each other in the presence of Almighty God, to walk together in all God's ways and ordinances, according as he had already revealed, or should farther make them known to them. Mr. Jacob was then chosen pastor by the suffrage of the brotherhood, and others were appointed to the office of deacons, with fasting and prayer, and imposition of hands. The same year [1616] Mr. Jacob published a protestation or confession in the name of certain Christians, showing how far they agreed with the church of England, and wherein they differed, with the reasons of their dissent drawn from Scripture; to which was added a petition to the king for the toleration of such Christians. And some time after he published "A collection of sound reasons, showing how necessary it is for all Christians to walk in the ways and ordinances of God in purity, and in a right church way." Mr. Jacob continued with his people about eight years; but in the year 1624, being desirous to enlarge his usefulness, he went with their consent to Virginia, where he soon after died. Thus, according to the testimony of the Oxford historian, and some others, Mr. Henry Jacob was the first Independent minister in England, and this the first congregational church. Upon the departure of Mr. Jacob his church chose Mr. Lathorp their pastor, whose history will be resumed in its proper place.

The king was so full of his prerogative, that he apprehended he could convince his subjects of its unlimited extent; for this purpose he turned preacher in the star-chamber and took his text, Psalm lxii. 1. "Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness to the king's son."¹ After dividing and subdividing, and giving the literal and mystical sense of his text, he applied it to the judges and courts of judicature, telling them, "that the king sitting in the throne of God, all judgments centre in him, and therefore for inferior courts to determine difficult questions without consulting him, was to encroach upon his prerogative, and to limit his power, which it was not lawful for the tongue of a lawyer nor any subject to dispute. As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do (says he), so it is presumption, and a high contempt, to dispute what kings can do or say; it is to take away that mystical reverence that belongs to them who sit in the throne of God."² Then addressing the auditory, he advises them, "not to meddle with the king's prerogative or honour. Plead not (says he) upon Puritanical principles, which make all things popular, but keep within the ancient limits."

In speaking of recusants, he says, there are three sorts, (1.) "Some that come now and then to church; these [the Puritans] are formal to the laws,

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 192, 193, and note (9).

² Mr. Neal abridges Rapin, and gives the sense rather than the exact words.— ED.

but false to God. (2.) Others that have their consciences misled, some of these [the Papists that swear allegiance] live as peaceable subjects. (3.) Others are practising recusants, who oblige their servants and tenants to be of their opinion. These are men of pride and presumption. I am loath to hang a priest only for his religion, and saying mass; but if they refuse the oath of allegiance, I leave them to the law.” He concludes with exhorting the judges to countenance the clergy against Papists and Puritans; adding, “God and the king will reward your zeal.”

It is easy to observe from hence that his majesty’s implacable aversion to the Puritans was founded not merely or principally on their refusal of the ceremonies, but on the principles of civil liberty and enmity to absolute monarchy; for all arguments against the extent of the prerogative arc said to be founded on Puritan principles. A king with such maxims should have been frugal of his revenues, that he might not have stood in need of parliaments; but our monarch was extravagantly profuse, and to supply his wants delivered back this year to the Dutch their cautionary towns, which were the keys of their country, for less than a quarter part of the money that had been lent on them.

This year [1617] died the learned and judicious Mr. Paul Baynes, born in London, and educated in Christ-collegc, Cambridge, of which he was a fellow. He succeeded Mr. Perkins in the lecture at St. Andrew’s church, where he behaved with that gravity and exemplary piety which rendered him universally acceptable to all who had any taste for serious religion, till archbishop Bancroft sending Dr. Harsnet to visit the university, called upon Mr. Baynes to subscribe according to the canons, which he refusing, the doctor silenced him, and put down his lecture. Mr. Baynes appealed to the archbishop, but his grace stood by his chaplains, and threatened to lay the good old man by the heels, for appearing before him with a little black edging upon his cuffs. After this Mr. Baynes preached only occasionally, as he could get opportunity, and was reduced to such poverty and want, that he said, ‘he had not where to lay his head;’ but at length death put an end to his sufferings in the year 1617. He published “A commentary upon the Ephesians;” “The Dioclesian’s trial” against Dr. Downham; and some other practical treatises. Dr. Sibbes says, he was a divine of uncommon learning, clear judgment, ready wit, and of much communion with God and his own heart. What pity was it, that such a divine should be restrained, and in a manner starved!”¹

¹ See Clarke’s Lives, annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 24; who tells us, that Mr. Baynes, being summoned on a time before the privy council, on pretence of keeping conventicles, and called on to speak for himself, made such an excellent speech, that in the midst of it a nobleman stood up and said, “He speaks more like an angel than a man, and I

The disputes in Holland between the Calvinists and Arminians, upon the five points relating to election, redemption, original sin, effectual grace and perseverance, rose to such a height as obliged the states-general to have recourse to a national synod, which was convened at Dort, November 13, 1618. Each party had loaded the other with reproaches, and in the warmth of dispute charged their opinions with the most invidious consequences, insomuch that all good neighbourhood was lost, the pulpits were filled with unprofitable and angry disputes, and as each party prevailed, the other were turned out of the churches. The magistrates were no less divided than the ministers, one city and town being ready to take up arms against another. At length it grew into a state faction, which endangered the dissolution of government. Maurice, prince of Orange, though a Remonstrant, put himself at the head of the Calvinists [or Contra-Remonstrants], because they were for a stadtholder, and the magistrates who were against a stadtholder sided with the [Remonstrants, or] Arminians, among whom the advocate of Holland, Oldenbarnevelt, and the pensionaries of Leyden and Rotterdam, Hogerberts and Grotius, were the chief. Several attempts were made for an accommodation, or toleration of the two parties; but this not succeeding, the three heads of the Remonstrants [Arminians] were taken into custody, and the magistrates of several towns and cities changed, by authority of the prince, which made way for the choosing such a synod as his highness desired. The classes of the several towns met first in a provincial synod, and these sent deputies to the national one, with proper instructions. The Remonstrants were averse to the calling a synod, because their numbers were as yet unequal to the Calvinists, and their leaders being in custody, it was easy to foretell their approaching fate. They complained of injustice in their summons to the provincial assemblies; but Trigland says, that where the Remonstrants [Arminians] were weakest they were equally regarded with the other party; but in truth their deputies were angry and dissatisfied, and in many places absented from their classes, and so yielded up their power into the hands of their adversaries, who condemned their principles, and deposed several of their ministers.

The national synod of Dort consisted of thirty-eight Dutch and Walloon divines, five professors of the universities, and twenty-one lay-elders, making together sixty-one persons, of which not above three or four were Remonstrants. Besides these, there were twenty-eight foreign divines, from Great Britain, from the Palatinate, from Hussia, Switzerland, Geneva, Bremen, Embden, Nassau, and Wetteravia; the French king not admitting his Protestant divines to appear. Next to the States' deputies sat the English

dare not stay here to have a hand in any sentence against him." Upon which speech he was dismissed, and never heard any more from them—ED.

divines; the second place was reserved for the French divines; the rest sat in the order recited. Upon the right and left hand of the chair, next to the lay-deputies, sat the Netherland professors of divinity, then the ministers and elders, according to the rank of their provinces; the Walloon churches sitting last. After the divines, as well domestic as foreign, had produced their credentials, the reverend Mr. John Bogerman, of Leewarden, was chosen president, the reverend Mr. Jacob Roland and Herman Faukelius, of Amsterdam and Middleburgh, assessors; Heinsius was scribe, and the reverend Mr. Dammon and Festius Hommius, secretaries; a general fast was then appointed, after which they proceeded to business.

The names of the English divines were, Dr. Carlton bishop of Llandaff, Dr. Hall dean of Worcester, afterward bishop of Norwich; Dr. Davenant, afterward bishop of Salisbury; and Dr. Samuel Ward, master of Sidney-college, Cambridge;¹ but Dr. Hall not being able to bear the climate, Dr. Goad prebendary of Canterbury, was appointed in his room. Mr. Balcanqual, a Scotsman, but no friend to the kirk, was also commissioned by king James to represent that church. He was taken into consultation, and joined in suffrage with the English divines, so as to make one college; for the divines of each nation gave only one vote in the synod, as their united sense; and though Balcanqual did not wear the habits of the English divines, nor sit with them in the synod, having a place by himself as representative of the Scots kirk, yet, says the bishop of Llandaff, his apparel was decent, and in all respects he gave much satisfaction. His majesty's instructions to them were, (1.) To agree among themselves about the state of any question, and how far it may be maintained agreeably to the Scriptures and the doctrine of the church of England. (2.) To advise the Dutch ministers not to insist in their sermons upon scholastic points, but to abide by their former confession of faith, and those of their neighbour reformed churches. (3.) That they should consult the king's honour, the peace of the distracted churches, and behave in all things with gravity and moderation.

When all the members of the synod were assembled, they took the following oath, in the twenty-third session, each person standing up in his place, and laying his hand upon his heart:

"I promise before God, whom I believe and worship, as here present, and as the searcher of the reins and heart, that during the whole course of the transactions of this synod, in which there will be made an inquiry into, and judgment and decision of, not only the well-known five points, and all the difficulties resulting from thence, but likewise of all other sorts of doctrine, I will not make use of any kind of human writings, but only of the

¹ Fuller's Worthies, p. 159.

word of God, as a sure and infallible rule of faith. Neither will I have any other thing in view throughout this whole discussion, but the honour of God, the peace of the church, and, above all, the preservation of the purity of doctrine. So help me my Saviour Jesus Christ, whom I ardently beseech to assist me in this my design, by his Holy Spirit.”¹

This was all the oath that was taken, says bishop Hall, as I hope to be saved. It was therefore an unjust insinuation of Mr. John Goodwin, who in his “Redemption redeemed,” p. 395, charged them with taking a previous oath to condemn the opposite party on what terms soever. “It grieves my soul (says the bishop), to see any learned divine raising such imaginary conjectures; but since I have seen it, I bless my God that I yet live to vindicate them [1651] by this my knowing and clear attestation, which I am ready to second with the solemnest oath, if required.”

The synod continued to the 29th of May, in which time there were one hundred and eighty sessions. In the hundred and fortyfifth session, and 30th of April, the Belgic confession of faith was debated and put to the question, which the English divines agreed to, except the articles relating to the parity of ministers and ecclesiastical discipline. They said they had carefully examined the said confession, and did not find any thing therein, with respect to faith and doctrine, but what was, in the main, conformable to the word of God.² They added, that they had likewise considered the Remonstrants’ [Arminians] exceptions against the said confession, and declared that they were of such a nature as to be capable of being made against all the confessions of other reformed churches. They did not pretend to pass any judgment upon the articles relating to their church-government, but only maintained, that their own church-government was founded upon apostolical institution.

Mr. John Hales of Eton, chaplain to the English ambassador Carlton, sat among the hearers for some weeks, and having taken minutes of the proceedings, transmitted them twice or thrice a week to his excellency at the Hague. After his departure, Dr. Balcanqual, the Scots commissioner, and Dr. Ames, carried on the correspondence. Mr. Hales observes, that the Remonstrants behaved on several occasions very imprudently,³ not only in the manner of their debates, but in declining the authority of the synod, though summoned by the civil magistrate in the most unexceptionable manner. The five points of difference between the Calvinists and Arminians, after a long hearing, were decided in favour of the former. After which the Remonstrant ministers were dismissed the assembly, and banished the country within a limited time, except they submitted to the

¹ Brandt, vol. 3. p. 62; or the Abridgment of Brandt, 8vo. vol. 2. p. 417.

² Brandt, vol. 3. p. 288; or Abridgment, vol. 2. p. 508, 509.

³ Hales’s Remains, p. 507. 512. 526. 586, 587.

new confession; on which occasion some very hard speeches were mutually exchanged, and appeals made to the final tribunal of God.

When the opinion of the British divines was read, upon the extent of Christ's redemption, it was observed that they omitted the received distinction between the sufficiency and efficacy of it; nor did they touch upon the received limitation of those passages, which, speaking of Christ's dying for the whole world, are usually interpreted of the world of the elect, Dr. Davenant and some of his brethren inclining to the doctrine of universal redemption.¹ In all other points there was a perfect harmony; and even in this Balcanqual says, king James and the archbishop of Canterbury desired them to comply, though Heylin says, their instructions were not to oppose the doctrine of universal redemption. But Dr. Davenant and Ward were for a middle way between the two extremes: they maintained the certainty of the salvation of the elect, and that offers of pardon were sent not only to all who should believe and repent, but to all who heard the gospel; and that grace sufficient to convince and persuade the impenitent (so as to lay the blame of their condemnation upon themselves), went along with these offers; that the redemption of Christ and his merits were applicable to these, and consequently there was a possibility of their salvation. However, they complied with the synod, and declared their confession, in the main, agreeable to the word of God; but this gave rise to a report, some years after, that they had deserted the doctrine of the church of England; upon which bishop Hall expressed his concern to doctor Davenant in these words: "I shall live and die in suffrage of that synod of Dort; and I do confidently avow, that those other opinions [of Arminius] cannot stand with the doctrine of the church of England." To which bishop Davenant replied in these words: "I know that no man can embrace Arminianism in the doctrines of predestination and grace, but he must desert the articles agreed upon by the church of England; nor in the point of perseverance, but he must vary from the received opinions of our best approved doctors in the English church." Yet Heylin has the assurance to say, "that though the Arminian controversy "brought some trouble for the present to the churches of Holland, it was of greater advantage to the church of England, whose doctrine in those points had been so overborne by the Calvinists, that it was almost reckoned for a heresy to be sound and orthodox [i. e. an Arminian] according to the book of articles established by law in the church of England." He adds, "that king James did not appear for Calvinism out of judgment, but for reasons of state, and from a personal friendship to prince Maurice, who had put himself at their head. He therefore sent such divines as had zeal enough to condemn the Remonstrants, though it was well

¹ Brandt, p. 526.

known that he had disapproved the articles of Lambeth, and the doctrine of predestination; nor was it a secret what advice he had given prince Maurice before he put himself at the head of the Calvinist.”¹

When the synod was risen, people spake of it in a very different manner;² the states of Holland were highly satisfied; they gave high rewards to the chief divines,³ and ordered the original records of their proceedings to be preserved amongst their archives. The English divines expressed full satisfaction in the proceedings of the synod. Mr. Baxter says, the Christian world since the days of the apostles never had an assembly of more excellent divines. The learned Jacobus Capellus, professor of Leyden, declared, that the equity of the fathers of this synod was such, that no instance can be given since the apostolic age, of any other synod in which the heretics were heard with more patience, or which proceeded with a better temper or more sanctity. P. du Moulin, Paulus Servita, and the author of the life of Waleus, speak the same language. But others poured contempt upon the synod, and burlesqued their proceedings in the following lines:

Dordrecht synodus, nodus; chorus integer, æger;
Conventus, ventus, sessio, stramen, Amen.

Lewis du Moulin, with all the favourers of the Arminian doctrines, as Heylin, Womack, Brandt, &c. charge them with partiality and unjustifiable severity. Upon the whole, in my judgment, they proceeded with as much discretion and candour as most assemblies ancient or modern have done, who have pretended to establish articles for other men’s faith with penal sanctions. I shall take leave of this venerable body with this farther remark, that king James sending over divines to join this assembly, was an open acknowledgment of the validity of ordination by mere presbyters; here being a bishop of the church of England sitting as a private member in a synod of divines, of which a mere presbyter was the president.

In the summer of the year 1617, king James made a progress into Scotland, to advance the episcopal cause in that country; the chapel of Edinburgh was adorned after the manner of Whitehall; pictures being carried from hence together with the statues of the twelve apostles, which were set up in the church. His majesty treated his Scots subjects with a haughty distance; telling them, both in the parliament and general assembly, “that it was a power innate, a princely special prerogative which Christian kings have, to order and dispose external things in the outward

¹ Hist. Presb. p. 381.

² Brandt, p. 307, 308; or Abridgment, vol. 2. p. 531.

³ Each divine of the United Provinces received four florins a day. The synod cost ten tons of gold, i. e. a million of florins. Brandt Abridged, vol. 2. p. 531.—ED.

polity of the church, or as we with our bishops shall think fit; and, sirs, for your approving or disproving; deceive not yourselves, I will not have my reason opposed.” Two acts relating to the church were passed this session; one concerning the choice of archbishops and bishops, and another for the restitution of chapters; but the ministers protesting against both, several of them were suspended and deprived, and others banished, as, the Melvins, Mr. Forbes, &c. and as the famous Mr. Calderwood, author of the *Altare Damascenum*, had been before; which book, when one of the English prelates promised to answer, the king replied, “What will you answer, man? There is nothing here than Scripture, reason, and fathers.”¹

Next year a convention or assembly was summoned to meet at Perth, August 25, 1618. It consisted of some noblemen, statesmen, barons, and burgesses, chosen on purpose to bear down the ministers; and with what violence things were carried, God and all indifferent spectators, says my author, are witnesses. In this assembly the court and bishops make a shift to carry the following five articles:

1. That the holy sacrament shall be received kneeling.
2. That ministers shall be obliged to administer the sacrament in private houses to the sick, if they desire it.
3. That ministers may baptize children privately at home, in cases of necessity, only certifying it to the congregation the next Lord’s day.
4. That ministers shall bring such children of their parish as can say their catechism, and repeat the Lord’s prayer, the Creed, and ten commandments, to the bishops to confirm and give them their blessing.
5. That the festivals of Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and the Ascension of our Saviour, shall for the future be commemorated in the kirk of Scotland.²

The king ordered these articles to be published at the market-crosses of the several boroughs, and the ministers to read them in their pulpits; which the greatest number of the latter refused, there being no penalty, except the king’s displeasure: but the vote of the assembly at Perth not being sufficient to establish these articles into a law, it was resolved to use all the interest of the court to carry them through the parliament. This was not attempted till the year 1621, when the parliament meeting on the 1st of June, the ministers had prepared a supplication against the five articles, giving

¹ This bishop Warburton understands as said ironically.—ED.

² “A prince (observes a judicious historian) must be strangely infatuated, and strongly prejudiced, to employ his power and influence in establishing such matters as these! Let rites and ceremonies be deemed ever so decent; who will say, they are fit to be imposed by methods of severity and constraint? Yet, by these ways, these matters were introduced amongst the Scots, to the disgrace of humanity, and the eternal blemish of a prince, who boasted of his learning, and was for ever displaying his abilities.” Dr. Harris’s *Life of James*, p. 230, 237.—ED.

reasons why they should not be received or confirmed, and came to Edinburgh in great numbers to support it. Upon this, the king's commissioner, by advice of the bishops and council, issued a proclamation, commanding all ministers to depart out of Edinburgh within twenty hours, except the settled ministers of the city, and such as should have a licence from the bishop. The ministers obeyed, leaving behind them a protestation against the articles, and an admonition to the members of parliament not to ratify them, as they would answer it in the day of judgment. They alleged, that the assembly of Perth was illegal, and that the articles were against the privileges of the kirk, and the established laws of the kingdom; but the court interest prevailed, and with much difficulty the articles were ratified, contrary to the sense of the kirk and nation. This bred a great deal of ill blood, and raised a new persecution throughout the kingdom, many of the Presbyterian ministers being fined, imprisoned, and banished, by the high-commission, at a time when by their interest with the people it was in their power to have turned their taskmasters out of the kingdom.¹

Thus far king James proceeded towards the restitution of episcopacy in Scotland; but one thing was still wanting to complete the work, which was a public liturgy, or book of common prayer. Several consultations were held upon this head; but the king, being assured it would occasion an insurrection over the whole kingdom, wisely dropped it, leaving that unhappy work to be finished by his son, whose imposing it upon the kirk, without consent of parliament or general assembly, set fire to the discontents of the people, which had been gathering for many years.

To return to England. This year the learned Mr. Selden was summoned before the high-commission, for publishing his History of Tithes, in which he proves them not to be of divine but human appointment; and, after many threatenings, was obliged to sign the following recantation:

“My good lords,

“I most humbly acknowledge my error in publishing the History of Tithes, and especially in that I have at all (by showing any interpretation of Holy Scriptures, by meddling with councils, fathers, or canons, or by what else soever occurs in it) offered any occasion of argument against any right of maintenance, *jure divino*, of the ministers of the gospel; beseeching your lordships to receive this ingenuous and humble acknowledgment, together with the unfeigned protestation of my grief, for that I have so incurred his

¹ Bishop Warburton is not willing to allow them the praise of acting with this caution and temper: “for (he remarks) soon after they used their interest to this purpose, and I believe they began to use it as soon as they got it.” The bishop did not consider, that it is not in human nature, any more than it is consistent with wisdom and moderation, to proceed, though injured and provoked, to extremities at first. That the Scotch Presbyterian ministers should have great interest with the people, was the necessary consequence of their being sufferers for the principles of the kirk and the nation. —Ed.

majesty and your lordship's displeasure conceived against me in behalf of the church of England.

“January 28, 1618. JOHN SELDEN.”

Notwithstanding this submission, Mr. Fuller says it is certain that a fiercer storm never fell upon all parsonage barns¹ since the Reformation, than what was raised by this treatise; nor did Mr. Selden quickly forget their stopping his mouth after this manner.

This year died the reverend Mr. William Bradshaw, born at Bosworth in Leicestershire, 1571, and educated in Emanuel-college Cambridge. He was afterward removed, and admitted fellow of Sidney-college; where he got an easy admission into the ministry, being dispensed with in some things that he scrupled. He preached first as a lecturer at Abingdon, and then at Steeple- Morton. At length, by the recommendation of Dr. Chadderton, he was settled at Chatham in Kent, in the year 1601; but, before he had been there a twelvemonth, he was sent for by the archbishop to Shorne, a town situate between Rochester and Gravesend, and commanded to subscribe; which he refusing, was immediately suspended. The inhabitants of Chatham, in their petition for his restoration, say, that his doctrine was most wholesome, true, and learned, void of faction and contention; and his life so garnished with unblemished virtues and graces, as malice itself could not reprove him. But all intercessions were to no purpose: he therefore removed into another diocese, where he obtained a licence, and at length was chosen lecturer of Christ-church in London. Here he published a treatise against the ceremonies, for which he was obliged to leave the city, and retired to his friend Mr. Red-riche's at Newhall in Leicestershire. The bishop's chancellor followed him thither, with an inhibition to preach, but by the mediation of a couple of good angels, says my author, the restraint was taken off.² In this silent and melancholy retirement he spent the vigour and strength of his days. At length, as he was attending Mrs. Redriche on a visit to Chelsea, he was

seized with a violent fever, which in a few days put an end to his life, in the forty-eighth year of his age. He was full of heavenly expressions in his last sickness, and died with great satisfaction in his nonconformity. Dr. Hall, bishop of Norwich, gives him this character: “that he was of a strong

¹ Bishop Warburton, because he himself approved of the principle of Mr. Selden's book, as placing the claim of tithes “on the sure foundation of law, instead of the feeble prop of an imaginary divine right,” carps at this expression of Mr. Neal, though the words of Fuller; and asks “Where was the storm, except in the author's fanciful standish?” The answer is, the storm was in the offence Mr. Selden's doctrine gave the clergy, and the indignation of the court which it drew on him. The clergy published angry animadversions on it, and the king threatened to throw him into prison, if he replied in his own defence. *British Biography*, vol. 4. p. 377.—ED.

² Gataker's *Life of Bradshaw*, in Clarke's *Lives*, annexed to his general Martyrology.

brain, and of a free spirit, not suffering himself, for small differences of judgment, to be alienated from his friends, to whom, notwithstanding his seeming austerity, he was very pleasing in conversation, being full of witty and harmless urbanity; he was very strong and eager in arguing, hearty in friendship, regardless of the world, a despiser of compliments, a lover of reality, full of digested and excellent notions, a painful labourer in God's vineyard, and now, no doubt, gloriously rewarded." Such was this light, which, by the severity of the times, was put under a bushel!

In order to put a stop to the growth of Puritanism, and silence the objections of Papists against the strictness of the reformed religion, his majesty this year published, "A declaration to encourage recreations and sports on the Lord's day," contrary to his proclamation in the first year of his reign, and to the articles of the church of Ireland, ratified under the great seal, 1615, in which the morality of the Lord's day is affirmed. But (says Heylin) the Puritans, by raising the sabbath, took occasion to depress the festivals, and introduced, by little and little, a general neglect of the weekly fasts, the holy time of Lent, and the Embering days, reducing all acts of humiliation to solemn and occasional fasts."¹ Sad indeed! "But this was not all the mischief that ensued (says the doctor), for several preachers and justices of the peace took occasion from hence to forbid all lawful sports on the Lord's day, by means whereof the priests and Jesuits persuaded the people in the northern counties, that the reformed religion was incompatible with that Christian liberty which God and nature had indulged to the sons of men: so that, to preserve the people from Popery, his majesty was brought under a necessity to publish the book of sports."

It was drawn up by bishop Moreton, and dated from Greenwich, May 24, 1618, and it was to this effect:—"That for his good people's recreation, his majesty's pleasure was, that after the end of divine service, they should not be disturbed, letted, or discouraged, from any lawful recreations; such as dancing, either of men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreations; nor having of may-games, whitson-ales, or morrice-dances, or setting up of may-poles, or other sports therewith used, so as the same may be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or let of divine service; and that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church for the decoring of it, according to their old customs; withal prohibiting all unlawful games to be used on Sundays only; as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, and at all times (in the meaner sort of people prohibited) bowling." Two or three restraints were annexed to the declaration, which deserve the reader's notice: (1.) No recusant [i. e. Papist] was to have the benefit of this declaration. (2.) Nor such as were not

¹ Heylin's Hist, of Presb. 389, 390.

present at the whole of divine service. (3.) Nor such as did not keep to their own parish-churches, that is, Puritans.

This declaration was ordered to be read in all the parish churches in Lancashire, which abounded with Papists; and Wilson adds, that it was to be read in all the churches of England; but that archbishop Abbot, being at Croydon, flatly forbid its being read there. It was certainly an imprudent project, as well as a grief to all sober Protestants; and had the king insisted upon its being read throughout all the churches at this time, I am apt to think it would have produced the same convulsions as it did about fifteen years afterward.

It is hard to account for the distinction between lawful and unlawful sports on the Lord's day: if any sports are lawful, why not all? what reason can be given why morrice-dances, revels, may-games, whitson-ales, wakes, &c. should be more lawful than interludes, bull-baiting, or bowls? It cannot arise from their moral nature; for the former have as great a tendency to promote vice, as the latter. But the exceptions to the benefit of this declaration are more extraordinary: could his majesty think that the Puritans, who were present at part of divine service, though not at the whole; or that those who went to other parish-churches for their better edification, would lay hold of the liberty of his declaration, when he knew they believed the morality of the fourth commandment, and that no ordinance of man could make void the law of God? farther, his majesty debars recusants [i. e. Papists] from this liberty, which their religion had always indulged them; but these are now to be restrained. The Papist is to turn Puritan, with regard to the sabbath, being forbid the use of lawful recreations on the Lord's day; and Protestants are to dance and revel, and go to their may-games on that sacred day, to preserve them from Popery! This subject will return again in the next reign.

This year and the next proved fatal to the Protestant interest in Germany, by the loss of the Palatinate into the hands of the Papists, and the ruin of the elector Frederic V. king of Bohemia, who had married the king's only daughter. This being a remarkable period, relating to the ancestors of his present majesty king George II. it will be no useless digression to place it in its proper light. The kingdom of Bohemia was elective, and because their king did not always reside with them, a certain number of persons were chosen by the States, called defenders, to see the laws put in execution. There were two religions established by law;¹ one was called

¹ These are the words of Rapin; but bishop Warburton says, "this is a mistake. There were not two religions, but one only, administering a single rite differently." This remark would be accurate, if the difference between the two parties had lain only in this point; but this could not be the case between the Catholics and Hussites; the difference between whom extended to many essential heads, though they were, with respect to this matter,

sub-una, the other *sub-utraque*; the professors of the former were Roman Catholics, and communicated under one kind; of the latter Hussites, and since the Reformation Protestants, who communicated under both kinds. The emperor Sigismund, in order to secure his election to this kingdom, granted the Hussites an edict in the year 1435, whereby it was decreed that there should be no magistrate or freeman of the city of Prague, but what was of their religion. This was religiously observed till the year 1570, when, by order of the emperor Maximilian, a Catholic was made a citizen of Prague, after which time, the edict was frequently broken, till at length the Jesuits erected a stately college, and put the Papists on a level with the Protestants.¹ Matthias, the present emperor, having adopted his cousin Ferdinand of Austria, had a mind to get him the crown of Bohemia; for which purpose he summoned an assembly of the States, without sending as usual to the Protestants of Silesia, Moravia, and the Upper and Lower Alsatia; these therefore not attending (according to the emperor's wish) made the Catholics a majority, who declared Ferdinand presumptive successor to Matthias; after which he was crowned at Prague, and resided at Gratz. The defenders taking notice of this breach of their constitution, and perceiving the design of the imperial court to extirpate the Protestant religion, summoned an assembly of all the States, and among others, those of Silesia, Moravia, and Alsatia, who drew up a petition to the emperor, to demand the execution of the laws, and a reasonable satisfaction for the injuries they had received; after which they adjourned themselves to the Monday after Rogation week, 1618. The emperor, instead of granting their requests, ordered his lieutenant to hinder the reassembling of the States, as being called without his licence; but the States assembled according to the adjournment, and being informed of the force that was designed against them, went in a body to the chancery, and having seized the emperor's chief-justice, the secretary, and another of his council, they threw them out of the castle-window, and then drove the Jesuits out of the city. In order to justify their proceedings, they published to the world an apology, and having signed a confederacy, to stand by one another against all opposers, they chose twenty-four protectors, empowering them to raise forces, and levy such taxes as they should find necessary.

In this situation of affairs, the emperor, who was also king of Bohemia, died, and on the 18th of August 1619, Ferdinand was chosen his successor in the empire, but the Bohemians not only disowned him for their king, but

denominated from one single point. But the bishop asserts, that "the fancy of two established religions in one state is an absurdity." But absurdities may exist, and this very absurdity exists, and did exist at the time his lordship wrote, in Great Britain: in one part of which episcopacy is the established religion, and in the other, Scotland, Presbyterianism.—ED.

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 197. folio edit.

declared the throne vacant, and on September 5 chose Frederic elector palatine, king James's son-in-law, for their sovereign. Deputies were immediately sent to acquaint him with the choice, and pray him to repair immediately to Prague. Frederic dispatched an express to England, to desire the advice of his father-in-law; but the affair not admitting of so long delay, he accepted the kingdom, and was crowned at Prague, November 4.

All the Protestant electors rejoiced at this providence, and gave him the title of king of Bohemia; as did most of the Protestant powers of Europe, except the king of England. It was acceptable news to the English Puritans, to hear of a Protestant prince in Bohemia; and they earnestly desired his majesty to support him, as appears by archbishop Abbot's letter, who was known to speak the sense of that whole party. This prelate being asked his opinion as a privy counsellor, while he was confined to his bed with the gout, wrote the following letter to the secretary of state. "That it was his opinion, that the elector should accept the crown; that England should support him openly; and that as soon as news of his coronation should arrive, the bells should be rung, guns fired, and bonfires made, to let all Europe see that the king was determined to countenance him."¹ The archbishop adds, "It is a great honour to our king, to have such a son made a king; methinks I foresee in this the work of God, that by degrees the kings of the earth shall leave the whore to desolation. Our striking in will comfort the Bohemians, and bring in the Dutch and the Dane, and Hungary will run the same fortune. As for money and means, let us trust God and the parliament, as the old and honourable way of raising money. This from my bed (says the brave old prelate), September 12, 1619, and when I can stand I will do better service."

But the king disliked the archbishop's letter, as built upon Puritan principles: he had an ill opinion of elective kingdoms, and of the people's power to dispose of crowns; besides, he was afraid of disobliging the Roman-Catholic powers, and in particular the king of Spain, a near relation of the new emperor, with whom he was in treaty for a wife for his son; so that the elector's envoy, after long waiting, was sent back with an admonition to his son-in-law to refuse the crown; but this being too late, he took it into his head to persuade him to resign it, and stood still, offering his mediation, and sending ambassadors, while the emperor raised a powerful army, not only to reduce the kingdom of Bohemia, but to dispossess the elector of his hereditary dominions. Several princes of Europe gave king James notice of the design, and exhorted him to support the Protestant religion in the empire; but his majesty was deaf to all advice, and for the sake of a Spanish wife for his son, suffered his own daughter, with a

¹ Cabala, b, 1. p. 12; or p. 18 of the edition in 1663.

numerous family of children, to be sent a begging, and the balance of Protestant power to be lost in the empire; for the next summer the emperor and his allies having conquered the Palatinate, entered Bohemia, and about the middle of November fought the decisive battle of Prague, wherein Frederic's army was entirely routed; his hereditary dominions, which had been the sanctuary of the Protestants in queen Mary's reign, were given to the duke of Bavaria, a Papist; the noble library of Heidelburgh was carried off to the Vatican at Rome, and the elector himself, with his wife and children, forced to fly into Holland in a starving condition.

Had the king of England had any remains of honour, courage, or esteem, for the Protestant religion, he might have preserved it in the Palatinate, and established it in Bohemia, by which the balance of power would have been on that side; but this cowardly prince would not draw his sword for the best cause in the world; however, this noble family was the care of Divine Providence, during a long exile of twenty-eight years; after which they were restored to their dominions by the treaty of Munster, 1648, and declared presumptive heirs of the crown of Great Britain, in the last year of king William III. of which they took possession upon the death of queen Anne, 1714, to the inexpressible joy of the Protestant dissenters, and of all who loved the reformed religion and the liberties of their country.

Among the Brownists in Holland we have mentioned the reverend Mr. John Robinson, of Leyden, the father of the Independents, whose numerous congregations being on the decline, by their aged members dying off, and their children marrying into Dutch families, they consulted how to preserve their church and religion; and at length, after several solemn addresses to Heaven for direction, the younger part of the congregation resolved to remove into some part of America, under the protection of the king of England, where they might enjoy the liberty of their consciences, and be capable of encouraging their friends and countrymen to follow them. Accordingly they sent over agents into England, who having obtained a patent from the crown, agreed with several merchants to become adventurers in the undertaking. Several of Mr. Robinson's congregation sold their estates, and made a common bank, with which they purchased a small ship of sixty tons, and hired another of one hundred and eighty. The agents sailed into Holland with their own ship, to take in as many of the congregation as were willing to embark, while the other vessel was freighting with all the necessaries for the new plantation. All things being ready, Mr. Robinson observed a day of fasting and prayer with his congregation, and took his leave of the adventurers with the following truly generous and Christian exhortation.

“Brethren,

“We are now quickly to part from one another, and whether I may ever live to see your faces on earth any more, the God of heaven only knows; but whether the Lord has appointed that or no, I charge you before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no farther than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ.

“If God reveal anything to you, by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry; for I am verily persuaded, the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word. For my part, I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are come to a period in religion,¹ and will go at present no farther than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; whatever part of his will our God has revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it; and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things.

“This is a misery much to be lamented, for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but were they now living, would be as willing to embrace farther light as that which they first received. I beseech you remember, it is an article of your church covenant, that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written word of God. Remember that, and every other article of your sacred covenant. But I must here withal exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth,—examine it, consider it, and compare it with other scriptures of truth, before you receive it; for it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick antichristian darkness, and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.

“I must also advise you to abandon, avoid, and shake off, the name of Brownists; it is a mere nickname, and a brand for the making religion and the professors of it odious to the Christian world.”

On July 1 (1620), the adventurers went from Leyden to Delfthaven, whither Mr. Robinson and the ancients of his congregation accompanied them; they continued together all night, and next morning, after mutual embraces, Mr. Robinson kneeled down on the sea-shore, and with a fervent

¹ The remarks of Acontins are pertinent here. “The cause (says he) that the relics of error and superstition are perpetuated is, that as often as there is any reformation of religion, either in doctrine or worship, men think that every thing is not to be immediately reformed at first, but the most distinguishing errors only are to be done away; and that when some time has intervned, the reformation will be completed with less difficulty. But the event hath, in many places, shewn that it is more difficult to remove the relics of false worship and opinions, than it was at first to subvert fundamental errors. Hence it is better to correct every thing at once.” “Sed ex eo etiam fieri potest, ut maneant errorum atque superstitionum reliquiæ,” &c. Acontii Stratagematum Satanæ, libri octo. ed. 1652, p. 330.—ED.

prayer committed them to the protection and blessing of Heaven. The adventurers were about one hundred and twenty, who, having joined their other ship, sailed for New-England, August 5; but one of their vessels proving leaky they left it, and embarked in one vessel, which arrived at cape Cod November 9, 1620. Sad was the condition of these poor men, who had the winter before them, and no accommodations at land for their entertainment; most of them were in a weak and sickly condition with the voyage, but there was no remedy; they therefore manned their long-boat, and having coasted the shore, at length found a tolerable harbour, where they landed their effects, and on the 25th of December began to build a storehouse, and some small cottages to preserve them from the weather. Their company was divided into nineteen families, each family having an allotment of land for lodging and gardens, in proportion to the number of persons of which it consisted; and to prevent disputes, the situation of each family was decided by lot. They agreed likewise upon some laws for their civil and military government, and having chosen a governor, they called the place of their settlement by the name of New Plymouth.

Inexpressible were the hardships these new planters underwent the first winter; a sad mortality raged among them, occasioned by the fatigues of their late voyage, by the severity of the weather, and their want of necessaries. The country was full of woods and thickets; their poor cottages could not keep them warm; they had no physician, or wholesome food, so that within two or three months half their company was dead, and of them who remained alive, which were about fifty, not above six or seven at a time were capable of helping the rest; but as the spring came on they recovered, and having received some fresh supplies from their friends in England, they maintained their station, and laid the foundation of one of the noblest settlements in America, which from that time has proved an asylum for the Protestant Nonconformists under all their oppressions.

To return to England; though the king had so lately expressed a zeal for the doctrines of Calvin at the synod of Dort, it now appeared that he had shaken them off, by his advancing the most zealous Arminians, as Buckeridge, Neile, Harsnet, and Laud, to some of the best bishopricks in the kingdom. These divines, apprehending their principles hardly consistent with the thirty-nine articles, fell in with the prerogative, and covered themselves under the wing of his majesty's pretensions to unlimited power, which gave rise to a new distinction at court between church and state Puritans. All were Puritans with king James, who stood by the laws of the land in opposition to his arbitrary government, though otherwise never so good churchmen; these were Puritans in the state, as those who scrupled the ceremonies, and espoused the doctrines of Calvin, were in the church. The church Puritans were comparatively few, but being joined by those who

stood by the constitution, they became the majority of the nation. To balance these, the king protected and countenanced the Arminians and Papists, who joined heartily with the prerogative, and became a state faction against the old English constitution. The parties being thus formed grew up into a hatred of each other. All who opposed the king's arbitrary measures were called at court by the name of Puritans; and those that stood by the crown in opposition to the parliament, went by the names of Papists and Arminians. These were the seeds of those factions, which occasioned all the disturbances in the following reign.

The Palatinate being lost, and the king's son-in-law and daughter forced to take sanctuary in Holland, the whole world murmured at his majesty's indolence, both as a father and a Protestant; these murmurs obliged him at length to have recourse to a parliament, from whom he hoped to squeeze a little money to spend upon his pleasures; at the opening of the session, January 20, 1620-1, his majesty told them, "that they were no other than his council, to give him advice as to what he should ask. It is the king (says he) that makes laws, and ye are to advise him to make such as will be best for the commonwealth."—With regard to his tolerating Popery, on the account of his son's match, he professes "he will do nothing but what shall be for the good of religion."—With regard to the Palatinate, he says, "if he cannot get it restored by fair means, his crown, his blood, and his son's blood, shall be spent for its recovery." He therefore commands them not to hunt after grievances, but to be quick and speedy in giving him money. Though the parliament did not credit the king's speech, yet the occasion was so reasonable, that the commons immediately voted him two entire subsidies, and the clergy three; but finding his majesty awed by the Spaniard, and making no preparation for war, they began to inquire into grievances, upon which the king adjourned the houses (a power not claimed by any of his predecessors); but upon the day of adjournment the commons drew up a declaration, wherein they say, "that being touched with a true sense and fellow-feeling of the sufferings of the king's children, and of the true professors of the same Christian religion professed by the church of England in foreign parts, as members of the same body, they unanimously declare, that they will be ready, to the utmost of their power, both with their lives and fortunes, to assist his majesty, so as that he may be able to do that with his sword, which by a peaceable course shall not be effected."

Upon their reassembling in the month of November, finding the king still amused by the Spanish match, while the Protestant interest in the Palatinate was expiring, the commons drew up a large remonstrance, in which they represent the danger of the Protestant religion from the growth of Popery; from the open resort of Papists to the ambassador's chapels; from the frequent and numerous conventicles both in city and country; from

the interposing of foreign ambassadors in their favour; from the compounding of their forfeitures for such small sums of money as amount to little less than a toleration; from the education of gentlemen's children in Popish seminaries, and the licentious printing and publishing Popish books; wherefore they pray his majesty to take his sword in hand for the recovery of the Palatinate, to put the laws in execution against Papists, to break off the Spanish match, and to marry his son to a Protestant princess. The king, hearing of this remonstrance, sent the speaker a letter from Newmarket to acquaint the house, "that he absolutely forbid their meddling with anything concerning his government, or with his son's match;" and to keep them in awe, his majesty declared, "that he thinks himself at liberty to punish any man's misdemeanours in parliament, as well during their sitting as after, which he means not to spare hereafter upon occasion of any man's insolent behaviour in the house."¹ In answer to this letter, the commons drew up a petition to present with their remonstrance, in which they insist upon the laws of their country, and the freedom of debates in parliament. The king returned them a long answer, which concludes with denying them, what they call their "ancient and undoubted right and inheritance." The commons, in debate upon his majesty's answer, drew up a protestation in maintenance of their claim, and caused it to be entered in their journal-book. Upon this, the king, being come to London, declared in council the protestation to be null, and with great indignation tore it out of the book with his own hand. A few days after he dissolved the parliament, and issued a proclamation forbidding his subjects to talk of state-affairs.² He also committed the leading members to prison, as, sir Edward Coke, sir Robert Philips, Mr. Selden, Mr. Pym, and Mr. Mallery; others were sent into Ireland, and the earls of Oxford and Southampton were confined in the Tower.³

The king having parted with his parliament, was at liberty to gratify the Spaniards, by indulging the Papists; for this purpose the lord-keeper Williams, by his majesty's command, wrote to all the judges, "that in their several circuits they discharge all prisoners for church-recusancy; or for refusing the oath of supremacy; or for dispersing Popish books; or hearing or saying mass; or for any other point of recusancy that concerned religion only."⁴ Accordingly the Jesuits and Popish recusants of all sorts were enlarged, to the number, says Mr. Prynne, of four thousand;⁵ all

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 208. 211, folio ed.

² Wilson, p. 190, 191; Rapin, vol. 2. p. 212, and note 4, fol. edit.

³ According to Tyndal, as observes Dr. Grey, the earl of Southampton was committed to the dean of Westminster.—ED.

⁴ Fuller, b. 10, p. 101.

⁵ Dr. Grey quotes here the authority of Fuller against Prynne's account, who says, that, according to John Gee's perfect list, all the Jesuits in England did not amount to more than

prosecutions were stayed, and the penal laws suspended. Upon this, great numbers of Jesuits, and other missionaries, flocked into England; mass was celebrated openly in the countries; and in London their private assemblies were so crowded, that at a meeting in Blackfriars [November 5, 1622, N. S.] the floor sunk under them, and killed the preacher and ninety-three of the hearers.

While the Papists were countenanced, the court and the new bishops bore hard upon the Puritans, filling the pulpits with men of arbitrary principles, and punishing those who dared to preach for the rights of the subject. The reverend Mr. Knight, of Broadgate-hall, in a sermon before the university of Oxford, on 2 Kings xix. 9, advanced this proposition, that “subordinate magistrates might lawfully make use of force, and defend themselves, the commonwealth, and the true religion, in the field, against the chief magistrate, within the cases and conditions following, 1. When the chief magistrate turns tyrant. 2. When he forces his subjects upon blasphemy or idolatry. 3. When any intolerable burdens or pressures are laid upon them. 4. When resistance is the only expedient to secure their lives, their fortunes, and the liberty of their consciences.” The court being informed of this sermon, sent for the preacher, and asked him, what authority he had for this assertion; he answered, Paræus on Romans xiii.; but that his principal authority was king James himself, who was sending assistance to the Roehellers against their natural prince. Upon this bold answer, Mr. Knight was confined in the Gatehouse; Paræus's commentaries were burnt at Oxford and London; his assertions were condemned as false and seditious; and the university of Oxford in full convocation passed a decree that it was not lawful for subjects to appear offensively in arms against their king on the score of religion, or on any other account, according to the Scripture. How this was reconcilable with the king's assisting the French Huguenots, I must leave with the reader. But to bind the nation down for ever in principles of slavery, all graduates of the university of Oxford were enjoined to subscribe the above-mentioned decree, and to swear, that they would always continue of the same opinion. Was there ever such an unreasonable oath? for a man to swear he will always be of the same mind! Yet such was the severity of the times!

But to distress the Puritans more effectually, the king sent the following directions to the archbishop, to be communicated to all the clergy of his province, dated from Windsor, August 10, 1622.

two hundred and twenty-five. But Prynne's account, which Mr. Neal adopts, is on the other hand confirmed by Tyndal, who informs us, on the testimony of Wilson, that Gondamar used to boast that four thousand recusants had been released through his intercession. Rapin's History, vol. 2. p. 215, note 7.—ED.

1. “That no preacher, under a bishop or dean, shall make a set discourse, or fall into any common place of divinity in his sermons, not comprehended in the thirty-nine articles.¹

2. “That no parson, vicar, curate, or lecturer, shall preach any sermon hereafter, on Sundays or holidays in the afternoon, but expound the catechism, creed, or ten commandments;² and that those be most encouraged who catechise children only.

3. “That no preacher, under a bishop or dean, presume to preach in any popular auditory on the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation; or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility, of God’s grace.

4. “That no preacher of any degree soever, shall henceforth presume in any auditory to declare, limit, or set bounds to, the prerogative, power, or jurisdiction, of sovereign princes, or meddle with matters of state.

5. “That no preacher shall use railing speeches against Papists or Puritans, but endeavour to free the doctrine and discipline of the church in a grave manner from the aspersions of both adversaries.

6. “That the archbishop and bishops be more wary for the future, in licensing preachers; and that all lecturers throughout the kingdom be licensed in the court of faculties, by recommendation from the bishop of the diocese, with a fiat from the archbishop, and a confirmation under the great seal of England.

“Those that offended against any of these injunctions were to be suspended *ab officio et beneficio* for a year and a day, till his majesty should prescribe some further punishment with advice of convocation.”

Here is nothing that could affect Papists or Arminians, but almost every article points at the Puritans. The king had assisted in maintaining these doctrines in Holland, but will not have them propagated in England. The thirty-nine articles were established by law, and yet none under a bishop or dean may preach on the seventeenth, concerning predestination. The ministers of God’s word may not limit the prerogative, but they may preach concerning its unlimited extent; and though the second injunction admits of their expounding the catechism, Fuller says, “the bishops’ officials were so active, that in many places they tied up preachers in the afternoon to the very letter of the catechism, allowing them no liberty to expound or enlarge upon any of the answers.”³ The Puritans had suffered hitherto only for the neglect of ceremonies, but now their very doctrine is an offence. From this time, all Calvinists were in a manner excluded from court preferments. The

¹ Or, as Dr. Grey would add, “some of the homilies of the church of England.”—ED.

² Or, as the same writer would subjoin, “the Lord’s Prayer” (funeral sermons alone excepted).—ED.

³ Book 10. p. 111.

way to rise in the church, was to preach up the absolute power of the king, to disclaim against the rigours of Calvinism, and to speak favourably of Popery. Those who scrupled this were neglected, and distinguished by the name of Doctrinal Puritans; but it was the glory of this people that they stood together, like a wall, against the arbitrary proceedings of the king, both in church and state.

Archbishop Abbot was at the head of the Doctrinal Puritans; and often advised the king to return to the old parliamentary way of raising money. This cost him his interest at court; and an accident happened this year, which quite broke his spirits, and made him retire from the world. Lord Zouch invited his grace to a buck-hunting in Bramshill-park in Hampshire; and while the keeper was running among the deer to bring them to a fairer mark, the archbishop, sitting on horseback, let fly a barbed arrow, which shot him under the arm-pit, and killed him upon the spot. His grace was so distressed in mind with the accident, that he retired to one of his own almshouses at Guildford; and though upon examination of the case it was judged casual homicide, he kept that day as a fast as long as he lived; and allowed the keeper's widow £20. a year for her maintenance. The king also, being moved with compassion, sent for him to Lambeth, and gave him a royal pardon and dispensation to prevent all exceptions to his episcopal character; but he prudently withdrew from the council-board, where his advice had been little regarded before, as coming from a person of unfashionable principles.

The Puritans lost an eminent practical writer and preacher about this time, Nicholas Byfield, born in Warwickshire, and educated in Exeter-college, Oxford. After four years, he left the university, and went for Ireland; but preaching at Chester, the inhabitants gave him a unanimous invitation to St. Peter's church in that city, where he resided seven years. From thence he removed to Isleworth in Middlesex, and remained there till his death. He was a divine of a profound judgment, a strong memory, quick invention, and unwearied industry, which brought the stone upon him, which sent him to his grave, in the forty-fifth year of his age. His body being opened, a stone was taken out of his bladder, that weighed thirty-three ounces, and was in measure about the edge, fifteen inches and a half; about the length and breadth thirteen inches, and solid like a flint; an almost incredible relation! But Dr. William Gouge, who drew up this account, was an eye-witness of it, with many others. Mr. Byfield was a Calvinist, a non-conformist to the ceremonies, and a strict observer of the sabbath. He published several books in his lifetime; and his commentaries upon the

Colossians and St. Peter, published after his death, show him to be a divine of great piety, capacity, and learning.¹

The archbishop being in disgrace, the council were unanimous, and met with no interruption in their proceedings. The Puritans retired to the new plantations in America, and Popery came in like an armed man. This was occasioned partly by the new promotions at court, but chiefly by the Spanish match, which was begun about the year 1617, and drawn out to a length of seven years, till the Palatinate was lost, and the Protestant religion in a manner extirpated out of the kingdom of Bohemia and other parts of Germany; and then the match itself was broke off.

To trace this affair from its beginning, because it was the source of the ensuing calamities of this and the following reign. Prince Charles being arrived at the state of manhood, the king had thoughts of marrying him, but could find no Protestant princess of an equal rank. He despised the princes of Germany, and would hear of nothing beneath a king's daughter. This put him upon seeking a wife for him out of the house of Austria, sworn enemies to the Protestant religion; for which purpose he entered into a treaty with Spain for the infanta. Under colour of this match, Gondamar, the Spanish ambassador, made the king do whatever he pleased. If he inclined to assist his son-in-law in recovering the Palatinate, he was told he must keep fair with the house of Austria, or the match was at an end. If he denied any favours to the Papists at home, the court of Rome, and all the Roman-Catholic powers, were disobliged, and then it could never take place. To obviate these and other objections, his majesty promised, upon the word of a king, that no Roman Catholic should be proceeded against capitally; and though he could not at present repeal the pecuniary laws, that he would mitigate them to the satisfaction of the Catholic king; and the lengths his majesty went in favour of Papists on this occasion, will appear by the following articles, which were inserted both into the Spanish and French treaty which afterward took place.

The articles of the intended Spanish match relating to religion, were these:

Art. 6. "The infanta herself, her men and maid servants, their children and descendants, and all their families, of what sort soever, serving her highness, may freely and publicly profess themselves Catholics."²

Art. 5, 7, and 8. "Provide a church, a chapel, and an oratory, for her highness, with all Popish ornaments, utensils, and decorations.

Art. 10, 11, and 12. "Allow her twenty-four priests and assistants, and over them a bishop, with full authority and spiritual jurisdiction.

¹ Wood's Athen. Oxon, vol. 1. p. 4 02; Fuller's Worthies, 1681, p. 833.

² Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 86; Rapin, vol. 2. 217, 218, folio edit.

Art. 14. “Admits the infanta and her servants to procure from Rome dispensations, indulgences, jubilees, &c. and all graces, as shall seem meet to them.

Art. 17. “Provides, that the laws made against Roman Catholics in England, or in any of the king’s dominions, shall not extend to the children of this marriage; nor shall they lose their succession to the crown, although they be Roman Catholics.

Art. 18 and 21. “Authorize the infanta to choose nurses for her children, and to bring them up in her religion till they are ten years of age.”—But the term was afterward enlarged to twelve: and in the match with France, to thirteen.

King James swore to the observation of these articles, in the presence of the two Spanish ambassadors, and twenty-four privycounsellors, who set their hands to the treaty. Besides which, his majesty and the prince of Wales swore to the four following private ones, (1.) “That no laws against Papists should hereafter be put in execution. (2.) That no new laws shall be made against them: but that there shall be a perpetual toleration of the RomanCatholic religion in private houses, throughout all his majesty’s dominions, which his counsel shall swear to. (3.) That he will never persuade the infanta to change her religion. (4.) That he will use all his authority and influence to have these conditions ratified by parliament, that so all penal laws against Papists may not only be suspended, but legally disannulled.”

The words of the prince of Wales’s oath were these: “I Charles, prince of Wales, engage myself—that all things contained in the foregoing articles, which concern as well the suspension as abrogation of all laws made against Roman Catholics, shall within three years infallibly take effect, and sooner if possible; which we will have to lie upon our conscience and royal honour: and I will intercede with my father that the ten years of education of the children that shall be born of this marriage, which the pope of Rome desires may be lengthened to twelve, shall be prolonged to the said term. And I swear, that if the entire power of disposing this matter be devolved upon me, I will grant and approve of the said term.¹ Furthermore, as oft as the infanta shall desire that I should give ear to divines and others, whom her highness shall be pleased to employ in matters of the Roman-Catholic religion, I will hearken to them willingly, without all difficulties, and laying aside all excuses.”

Under these advantages, the Papists appeared openly, and behaved with an offensive insolence; but the hearts of all true Protestants trembled for themselves and their posterity. And archbishop Abbot, though under a

¹ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 89.

cloud, ventured to write to the king upon the subject; beseeching him to consider, “whether by the toleration which his majesty proposes, he is not setting up that most damnable and heretical doctrine of the church of Rome, the whore of Babylon? How hateful must this be to God, and grievous to your good subjects (says he), that your majesty, who hath learnedly written against these wicked heresies, should now show yourself a patron of those doctrines, which your pen has told the world, and your conscience tells yourself, are superstitious, idolatrous, and detestable.—Besides, this toleration, which you endeavour to set up by proclamation, cannot be done without a parliament, unless your majesty will let your subjects see that you will take a liberty to throw down the laws at your pleasure. And above all, I beseech your majesty to consider, lest by this toleration your majesty do not draw upon the kingdom in general, and on yourself in particular, God’s heavy wrath and indignation.”¹

But this wise king, instead of hearkening to the remonstrances of his Protestant subjects, put the peace of his kingdom, and the whole Protestant religion, into the hands of the Spaniard, by sending his son with the duke of Buckingham to Madrid, to fetch home the infanta; a piece of confidence that the “Solomon of the age” should not have been guilty of. When the prince was gone, it is said, that Archy, the king’s fool, clapped his cap upon the king’s head. The king asking him the reason, he answered, because he had sent the prince into Spain. But, says his majesty, What if he should come back safe? Why then, says Archy, I will take my cap off from your head, and put it on the king of Spain’s.² The Spaniards gave out, that the design of the prince’s journey was to reconcile himself to the church of Rome. It is certain the pope wrote to the bishop of Conchen, to lay hold of this opportunity to convert him;³ and directed a most persuasive letter to the prince himself to the same purpose, dated April 20, 1623, which the prince answered June 20, in a very obliging manner, giving the pope the title of the Most Holy Father, and encouraging him to expect, that when he came to the crown there should be but one religion in his dominions, seeing, says he, that both Catholics and Protestants believe in one Jesus Christ. He was strongly solicited to change his religion by some of the first quality, and by the most learned priests and Jesuits, who caressed his highness with speeches, dedicated books to him, invited him to their processions, and gave him a view of their most magnificent churches and relics; by which artifices, though he was not converted, he was confirmed in his resolution

¹ Fuller, b. 10. p. 106.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 226, the note, folio edit.

³ Wilson, p. 230: Rapin, vol. 2. p. 221, folio edit.

of attempting a coalition of the two churches;¹ for the attempting of which he afterward lost both his crown and life.² It was happy, after all, that the prince got safe out of the Spanish territories, which, as Spanheim observes, that politic court would not have permitted, had they not considered, that the queen of Bohemia, next heir to the crown, was a greater enemy to Popery than her brother.³ But after all, when this memorable treaty of marriage had been upon the carpet seven years, and wanted nothing but celebration, the portion being settled, the pope's dispensation obtained, the marriage-articles sworn to on both sides, and the very day of celebration by proxy appointed, it was broke off by the influence of the duke of Buckingham upon the prince, who ordered the earl of Bristol not to deliver the proxy till the time limited by the dispensation was expired; the king of Spain, suspecting the design, in order to throw all the blame upon the king of England, signed a promise with his own hand, and delivered it to the ambassador, wherein he obliged himself to cause the Palatinate to be restored to the elector palatine, in case the marriage took effect; but his highness was immovable, and obliged the king to recall his ambassador.

¹ "This (says bishop Warburton) is an utter calumny; a coalition of the two churches was never in the king's thoughts; happy for him if he had never had worse; what he aimed at was arbitrary power." It is strange, how his lordship could give his pen a licence to pass this unjust censure on Mr. Neal: when the conduct of Charles I. furnished so many proofs of his wishes and endeavours to coalesce with the church of Rome. His letter to the pope from Madrid; the articles of the marriage-treaty to which he solemnly signed and swore: and the private articles to which he also swore, are witnesses to the truth of Mr. Neal's assertion. If he had not aimed at this, why did he disown the foreign Protestants? Why did he restrain the press with respect to books written against Popery, and license publications in favour of it? Why was Popery not only tolerated, but countenanced and favoured? See the facts to this purpose fully stated in Towgood's "Essay towards a true idea of the character of Charles I." chap. 9. So far did he carry his views and endeavours, on this business. Whitelocke informs us, a scheme was in agitation to set up a new Popish hierarchy by bishops in all the counties in England, by the authority of the pope. Memorials, p. 72. And the Jesuit Franciscus a Clara, the queen's chaplain, certainly thought things were in a train for such a coalition; for in one of his publications, he asserted, "that if any synod were held *non intermixtis Puritanis*, setting Puritans aside, our articles and their religion would soon be agreed." May's History of the Parliament, p. 74. Dr. Grey also aims to controvert this passage of Mr. Neal, and with this view refers us to Rushworth, Frankland, Hacket, and Burnet; but the quotations he adduces from these writers are not to the point: and prove only, as Mr. Neal allows, that Charles was not converted to Popery. See Dr. Grey's examination of Neal, vol. 2. p. 71.—ED.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 226, vide note, fo. edit.

³ Dr. Grey censures Mr. Neal for not quoting Spanheim fairly; and this writer, as Tyndal and Welwood, from whom he borrows the passage, represent his words, does not, it is true, say that the queen of Bohemia was a greater enemy to Popery than her brother; but only resolves the conduct of the court of Spain into the consideration of her and her children being next heirs to the crown of England. Mr. Neal therefore is to be understood as suggesting the reason, why the consideration of her and her children had so much weight with the court of Spain. Few who reflect on the firm attachment of that lady to the Protestant cause, will suspect Mr. Neal of mistaking the cause of the Spanish policy. It would have been, however, more accurate in him to have quoted at large the words of Spanheim; and then to have subjoined his own suggestion as explanatory of them.—ED.

From this time the prince and duke seemed to turn Puritans, the latter having taken Dr. John Preston, one of their chief ministers, into his service, to consult him about alienating the dean and chapter lands to the purpose of preaching. They also advised the king to convene a parliament, which his majesty did, and made such a speech to them, as one would think impossible to come from the same lips with the former. “I assure you (says he, speaking of the Spanish match), on the faith of a Christian king, that it is *res integra* presented unto you, and that I stand not bound nor either way engaged, but remain free to follow what shall be best advised.” His majesty adds, “I can truly say, and will avouch it before the seat of God and angels, that never did king govern with a purer, sincerer, and more uncorrupt heart than I have done, far from ill-will and meaning of the least error and imperfection in my reign.—It has been talked of my remissness in maintenance of religion, and suspicion of a toleration [of Popery;¹] but as God shall judge me, I never thought nor meant, nor ever in word expressed, anything that savoured of it.—I never in all my treaties agreed to anything to the overthrow and disannulling of those laws, but had in all a chief regard to the preservation of that truth which I have ever professed.” The reader will remember how this agrees with the marriage-articles above mentioned, to which the king had sworn.

But the parliament, taking things as the king had represented them, advised his majesty to break off the match, and to declare war for the recovery of the Palatinate; and at the same time petitioned his majesty, that all Jesuits and seminary priests might be commanded to depart the realm; that the laws might be put in execution against Popish recusants; that all such might be removed from court, and ten miles from London.² To which the king made this remarkable answer, which must strike the reader with surprise and wonder,—What religion I am of my books declare; I wish it may be written in marble, and remain to posterity as a mark upon me, when I shall swerve from my religion; for he that dissembles with God is not to be trusted with men.—I protest before God, that my heart hath bled when I have heard of the increase of Popery. God is my judge, it hath been such a grief to me, that it hath been as thorns in my eyes and pricks in my sides.—It hath been my desire to hinder the growth of Popery; and I could not be an honest man, if I had done otherwise.—I will order the laws to be put in execution against Popish recusants, as they were before these treaties, for the laws are still in being, and were never dispensed with by me; God is my judge, they were never so intended by me.”

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 227, 228, folio edit.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 229, 230, folio edit.; Rushworth, p. 141–143.

What solemn appeals to heaven are these against the clearest and most undeniable facts! It requires a good degree of charity, to believe this prince had either religion or conscience remaining. For though he assured his parliament, that his heart bled within him when he heard of the increase of Popery, yet this very parliament presented him with a list of fifty-seven Popish lords and knights who were in public offices, none of whom were displaced, while the Puritan ministers were driven out of the kingdom, and hardly a gentleman of that character advanced to the dignity of a justice of peace.

The parliament being prorogued, the king, instead of going heartily into the war, or marrying his son to a Protestant princess, entered into a treaty with Louis XIII. king of France, for his sister Henrietta Maria.¹ Upon this occasion the archbishop of Ambrun was sent into England, who told the king, the best way to accomplish the match for his son, was to grant a full toleration to Catholics. The king replied, that he intended to grant it, and was willing to have an assembly of divines to compromise the difference between Protestants and Papists, and promised to send a letter to the pope to bring him into the project. In this letter, says Monsieur Deageant in his memoirs, the king styles the pope, Christ's vicar, and head of the church universal, and assures him, he would declare himself a Catholic as soon as he could provide against the inconveniences of such a declaration; but whether this was so or not, it is certain he immediately relaxed the penal laws against Papists, and permitted Ambrun to administer confirmation to ten thousand Catholics at the door of the French ambassador's house, in the presence of a great concourse of people. In the meantime the treaty of marriage went forwards, and was at last signed November 10, 1624, in the thirty-three public articles, and three secret ones, wherein the very same or greater advantages were stipulated for the Catholics than in those of Madrid;² but before the dispensation from the pope could be obtained, his majesty fell sick at Theobalds of a tertian ague, which put an end to his life, not without suspicion of poison, March 27, 1625, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.³

To review the course of this reign. It is evident that both Popery and Puritanism increased prodigiously, while the friends of the hierarchy sunk into contempt; this was owing partly to the spiritual promotions, and partly to the arbitrary maxims of state that the king had advanced. In promoting of bishops the king discovered a greater regard to such as would yield a servile compliance to his absolute commands, than to such as would fill

¹ Ibid. vol. 2. p. 231, 232, folio edit.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 233, 234.

³ Rapin, p. 235; Welwood's Memoirs, 9th edit. p. 35; and Dr. Harris's Life of James I. p. 237—242.

their sees with reputation, and be an example to the people of religion and virtue, of which number were, bishop Neile, Buckeridge, Harsnet,¹ Laud, &c. The fashionable doctrines at court were such as the king had condemned at the synod of Dort, and which, in the opinion of the old English clergy, were subversive of the Reformation. The new bishops admitted the church of Rome to be a true church, and the pope the first bishop of Christendom. They declared for the lawfulness of images in churches; for the real presence; and that the doctrine of transubstantiation was a school nicety. They pleaded for confession to a priest; for sacerdotal absolution, and the proper merit of good works. They gave up the morality of the sabbath, and the five distinguishing points of Calvinism, for which their predecessors had contended. They claimed an uninterrupted succession of the episcopal character from the apostles through the church of Rome, which obliged them to maintain the validity of her ordinations, when they denied the validity of those of the foreign Protestants. Further, they began to imitate the church of Rome in her gaudy ceremonies, in the rich furniture of their chapels, and the pomp of their worship. They complimented the Roman-Catholic priests with their dignitary titles, and spent all their zeal in studying how to compromise matters with Rome, while they turned their backs upon the old Protestant doctrines of the Reformation, and were remarkably negligent in preaching or instructing the people in Christian knowledge. Things were come to such a pass, that Gondamar the Spanish ambassador wrote to Spain, that there never were more hopes of England's conversion, for "there are more prayers (says he) offered to the Mother than to the Son [of God]."² The priests and Jesuits challenged the established clergy to public disputations; the duke of Buckingham's mother being a Papist, a conference was held in her

¹ This prelate, bishop Warburton says, "was a man of the greatest learning and parts of his time." This he might be, and yet advanced not on account of his learning, but because his courtly dispositions recommended him to the royal taste. Fuller speaks of him "as a zealous asserter of ceremonies, using to complain of conformable Puritans." So that the justness of his claims to be considered as a man of erudition being admitted, neither the candour or veracity of the historian, for classing him as he does, is impeached by it. Learning and soundness of mind are by no means inseparable.—ED.

² This is not a just or accurate representation of the words. As Rapin relates it, Gondamar, perceiving most addresses for preferment were made first to the mother of the marquis of Buckingham, and by her conveyed to her son, who could deny her nothing, amongst his other witty pranks, wrote merrily in his dispatches to Spain, "that never was there more hope of England's conversion to Rome than now; for there are more prayers offered here to the mother than to the son." The words, "of God," as bishop Warburton and Dr. Grey observe, should be erased. It was a mere joke of the Spanish ambassador, speaking of court-corruption under the terms of religion. Mr. Neal, by not referring to his authority, appears to quote it by recollection, and indeed to have mistaken the matter. Bishop Warburton is, however, very severe in his reflections on him, calling his statement of it "a vile perversion of facts." The reader will decide on his lordship's candour here.—ED.

presence between Fisher, a Jesuit, on the one part, and Dr. White, Williams, and Laud, on the other. Each of them disputed with the Jesuit a day before a great concourse of people, but not to the countess's conversion, which was not at all strange, upon their principles. Among other Popish books that were published, one was entitled, "A new gag for the the old gospel;" which Dr. Montague, rector of Stamford-Rivers, answered in such a manner, as gave great offence to the old clergy, yielding up all the points above mentioned, and not only declaring for Arminianism, but making dangerous advances towards Popery itself. The book occasioning a great noise, Mr. Ward and Yates, two ministers at Ipswich, made a collection of the Popish and Arminian tenets it contained, in order to lay them before the next parliament; but the author, with the king's leave, took shelter under the royal wing, and prepared for the press his "Apello Cesarem," or a just appeal from two unjust informers; which White, bishop of Carlisle, licensed in these words, that "there was nothing contained in the same but what was agreeable to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline, established in the church of England." But before the book was published, the king died.

These advances of the court-divines towards Popery, made most of the people fall in with the Puritans, who, being constant preachers, and of exemplary lives, wrought them up by their awakening sermons to an abhorrence of everything that looked that way.¹ Many of the nobility and gentry favoured them. Lady Bowes, afterward lady Darcy, gave £1,000. per annum, to maintain preachers in the north, where there were none, and all her preachers were silenced Nonconformists. Almost all the famous practical writers of this reign, except bishop Andrews, were Puritans, and sufferers for nonconformity, as Dr. Willet, Mr. Jer. Dyke, Dr. Preston, Sibbs, Byfield, Bolton, Hildersham, Dod, Ball, Whately, and others, whose works have done great service to religion. The character of these divines was the reverse of what the learned Selden² gives³ of the clergy³ of these

¹ Rothwell, p. 69, annexed to his General Martyrology.

² In Preface, p. 1, second edit. 1618.

³ Bishop Warburton severely censures Mr. Neal for applying the words of Selden as if spoken of the episcopal clergy. "Here (says he) is another of the historian's arts; Selden speaks of the Puritan clergy." Not to urge in reply, that Selden can be understood as speaking of those clergy only, to whom his doctrine of tithes would be offensive, who could not be the Puritan clergy; it is fortunate for our author, that his interpretation of Selden's words is sanctioned by Heylin; who represents Selden's work as the execution of "a plot set on foot to subvert the church, in the undoing of the clergy. The author (he adds) was highly magnified, the book held unanswerable, and all the clergy looked on but as pigmies to that great Goliah." And then to shew, that the reproach cast on the clergy was not well founded, he appeals to the answers given to Selden by Nettles, fellow of Queen's college, Cambridge, Dr. Montague, and archdeacon Tillesly. "By which (says Heylin) he found that some of the ignorant and lazy clergy were of as retired studies as himself; and

times, in his “History of tithes,” where he taxes them with ignorance and laziness; and adds, “that they had nothing to support their credit but beard, title, and habit; and that their learning reached no farther than the postils and the polyanthia.” Upon the whole, if we may believe Mr. Coke, the Puritan party had gathered so much strength, and was in such reputation with the people, that they were more in number than all the other parties in the kingdom put together.

With regard to king James himself, it is hard to draw his just character, for no prince was ever so much flattered who so little deserved it. He was of a middle stature, not very corpulent, but stuffed out with clothes, which hung so loose, and being quilted, were so thick, as to resist a dagger. His countenance was homely, and his tongue too big for his mouth, so that he could not speak with decency. While he was in Scotland he appeared sober and chaste, and acquired a good degree of learning;¹ but, upon his accession to the English crown, he threw off the mask, and by degrees gave himself up to luxury and ease, and all kinds of licentiousness. His language was obscene, and his actions very often lewd and indecent. He was a profane swearer, and would often be drunk, and when he came to himself would weep like a child, and say, he hoped God would not impute his infirmities to him. He valued himself upon what he called kingcraft, which was nothing else but deep hypocrisy and dissimulation in every character of life, resulting from the excessive timorousness of his nature. If we consider him as a king, he never did a great or generous action throughout the course of his reign,² but prostituted the honour of the English nation beyond any of his predecessors. He stood still while the Protestant religion was suppressed in France, in Bohemia, in the Palatinate, and other parts of Germany. He surrendered up the cautionary towns³ to the Dutch for less than a fourth part

could not only match, but overmatch him too, in his philology.” If Mr. Neal misrepresented Selden, so did Heylin. Heylin’s *Hist. of Presb.* p. 391.—ED.

¹ “His learning (observes Dr. Warner) was not that of a prince, but a pedant; and made him more fit to take the chair in public schools than to sit on the throne of kings.” He was one of those princes “who (as bishop Shipley expresses it) were so unwise as to write books.” The only thing that does him honour as an author is, that Air. Pope pronounced his version of the psalms the very best in the English language. Warner’s *Eccles. Hist.* vol. 2. p, 508.—ED.

² To this, Dr. Grey opposes his bounty to the church of Ripon in Yorkshire, in which he founded a dean and chapter of seven prebendaries; and settled £247. per annum of crown-lands for their maintenance. The doctor also quotes from Fuller, Wilson, and Laud, warm encomiums of his liberality. But it ought to be considered, whether a liberality, which did not, as Dr. Warner says, “flow from reason or judgment, but from whim, or mere benignity of humours,” deserved such praises. Besides, Mr. Neal evidently refers to “such great and generous actions,” as advance the interest and prosperity of a kingdom, and add to the national honour. This cannot be said of favours bestowed on parasites and jovial companions; or on a provision made that a few clerical gentlemen may loll in stalls.—Ed.

³ These were the Brill and Flushing, with some other places of less note; and Dr. Grey, to screen the reputation of James from Mr. Neal’s implied reflection, observes, that the

of the value, and suffered them to dispossess us of our factories in the East Indies. At home he committed the direction of all affairs in church and state to two or three favourites, and cared not what they did if they gave him no trouble. He broke through all the laws of the land, and was as absolute a tyrant as his want of courage would admit.¹ He revived the projects of monopolies, loans, benevolences, &c. to supply his exchequer, which was exhausted by his profuseness towards his favourites, and laid the foundation of all the calamities of his son's reign. Upon the whole, though he was flattered by hungry courtiers as the Solomon and phoenix of his age, he was, in the opinion of bishop Burnet, "the scorn of the age, a mere pedant, without true judgment, courage, or steadiness, his reign being a continued course of mean practices."

It is hard to make any judgment of his religion; for one while he was a Puritan, and then a zealous churchman; at first a Calvinist and Presbyterian, afterward a Remonstrant or Arminian, and at last a half, if not an entire, doctrinal Papist. Sir Ralph Winwood, in his Memoirs, says, that as long ago as the year 1596, he sent Mr. Ogilby, a Scots baron, to Spain, to assure his Catholic majesty he was then ready to turn Papist, and to propose an alliance with that king and the pope against the queen of England; but for reasons of state the affair was hushed. Rapin says, he was neither a sound Protestant, nor a good Catholic, but had formed a plan of uniting both churches, which must effectually have ruined the Protestant interest, for which indeed he never expressed any real concern. But I am rather of opinion that all his religion was his boasted kingcraft. He was certainly the meanest prince that ever sat on the British throne.² England never sunk in

Dutch had pawned these towns to queen Elizabeth for sums of money which she lent them, when they were distressed by the Spaniards. The sum borrowed on this security was eight millions of florins; and they were discharged for ten millions seven hundred and twenty-eight thousand florins, though eighteen years' interest was due. In equity and by stipulation the Dutch had a right, on repaying the money, to reclaim the towns they had mortgaged. This Dr. Grey must be understood as insinuating, by setting up the fact of the mortgage in defence of James's character. Yet, in all just estimation, his character must ever suffer by his surrender of these towns. He restored them without an equivalent, and without the advice or consent of parliament, to raise money to lavish on his favourites. And by this step he lost the dependance those provinces before had on the English crown. See this matter fully stated in Rapin's History, vol. 2. p. 122. and 191, 192; and by Dr. Harris in his Life of James I. p. 162—167.—ED.

¹ In this book, entitled, "The true law of free monarchy," he asserted, that "the parliament is nothing else but the head court of the king and his vassals; that the laws are but craved by his subjects; and that, in short, he is above the law." This is a proof that his speculative notions of regal power were, as Mr. Granger expresses it, "as absolute as those of an eastern monarch." Secret History of Charles II. vol. 1. Introd. p. 20. the note.—ED.

² To Mr. Neal's character of James, Dr. Grey particularly opposes that drawn of him by the pen of Spotswood, who was preferred by him to the archbishopric of St. Andrews. "In this, Dr. Harris (says Grey) did not quite so right. For court-bishops, by some fate or other, from the time of Constantine, down at least to the death of James, and a little after, have had the characters of flatterers, panegyrist, and others of like import; and therefore are

its reputation, nor was so much exposed to the scorn and ridicule of its neighbours, as in his reign. How willing his majesty was to unite with the Papists, the foregoing history has discovered; and yet in the presence of many lords, and in a very remarkable manner, he made a solemn protestation, “that he would spend the last drop of blood in his body before he would do it; and prayed, that before any of his issue should maintain any other religion than his own [the Protestant] that God would take them out of the world.” How far this imprecation took place on himself, or any of his posterity, I leave, with Mr. archdeacon Echard, to the determination of an omniscient Being.¹

always to have great abatements made in the accounts of their benefactors; it being well known that such they endeavour to hand down to posterity under the notion of saints, as they always blacken and deface their adversaries.” *Life of James I.* p. 246, 247.—ED.

¹ The reader will be pleased to hear the sentiments of a learned foreigner on the reign and character of king James. The same bias will not be imputed to him as to Mr. Neal. “In the year 1625 died James I. the bitterest enemy of the doctrine and discipline of the Puritans, to which he had been in his youth most warmly attached; the most inflexible and ardent friend of the Arminians, in whose ruin and condemnation in Holland he had been singularly instrumental; and the most zealous defender of episcopal government, against which he had more than once expressed himself in the strongest terms. He left the constitution of England, both ecclesiastical and civil, in a very unsettled and fluctuating state, languishing under intestine disorders of various kinds.” *Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History*, translated by Maclaine, second edit. vol. 4, p. 517, 518.—ED.