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CHAPTER III.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING JAMES I. TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF KING CHARLES I. IN THE YEAR 1628.

Before we enter upon this reign, it will be proper to take a short view of the court, and of the most active ministers under the king for the first fifteen years.

King Charles I. came to the crown at the age of twenty-five years, being born at Dunfermline in Scotland, in the year 1600, and baptised by a Presbyterian minister of that country. In his youth he was of a weakly constitution, and stammering speech; his legs were somewhat crooked, and he was suspected (says Mr. Echard) to be of a perverse nature. When his father [king James] came to the English crown, he took him from his Scots tutors, and placed him under those who gave him an early aversion to that kirk, into which he had been baptised,[[1]](#footnote-1) and to those doctrines of Christianity which they held in the greatest veneration. As the court of king James leaned towards Popery[[2]](#footnote-2) and arbitrary power, so did the prince, especially after his journey into Spain; where he imbibed not only the pernicious maxims of that court, but their reserved and distant behaviour.[[3]](#footnote-3) He assured the pope by letter, in order to obtain a dispensation to marry the infanta, “that he would not marry any mortal whose religion he hated: he might therefore depend upon it, that he would always abstain from such actions as might testify a hatred to the Roman-Catholic religion, and would endeavour that all sinister opinions might be taken away; that as we all profess one individual Trinity, we may unanimously grow up into one faith.” His majesty began his reign upon most arbitrary principles, and though he had good natural abilities, was always under the direction of some favourite, to whose judgment and conduct he was absolutely resigned. Nor was he ever master of so much judgment in politics, as to discern his own and the nation’s true interest, or to take the advice of those who did. With regard to the church, he was a punctual observer of its ceremonies, and had the highest dislike and prejudice to that part of his subjects who were against the ecclesiastical constitution, “looking upon them as a very dangerous and seditious people, who would under pretence of conscience, which kept them from submitting to the spiritual jurisdiction, take the first opportunity they could find or make (says lord Clarendon[[4]](#footnote-4)), to withdraw themselves from his temporal jurisdiction; and therefore his majesty caused this people (the Puritans] to be watched and provided against with the utmost vigilance.”

Upon his majesty’s accession, and before the solemnity of his father’s funeral, he married Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. and sister of Lewis XIII. then king of France. The marriage was solemnised by proxy; first at Paris, with all the ceremonies of the Romish church, and afterward at Canterbury, according to the rites of the church of England; and the articles being in a manner the same with those already mentioned in the Spanish match. Her majesty arrived at Dover, June 13, 1625, and brought with her a long train of priests and menial servants of the Romish religion; for whose devotion a chapel was fitted up in the king’s house at St. James’s. “The queen was an agreeable and beautiful lady, and by degrees (says lord Clarendon) obtained a plenitude of power over the king.—His majesty had her in perfect adoration,[[5]](#footnote-5) and would do nothing without her, but was inexorable as to every thing that he promised her.” Bishop Burnet says, “the queen was a lady of great vivacity, and loved intrigues of all sorts, but was not secret in them as she ought; she had no manner of judgment, being bad at contrivance, but worse at execution. By the liveliness of her discourse, she made great impressions upon the king; so that to the queen’s little practice, and the king’s own temper, the sequel of all his misfortunes were owing.” Bishop Kennet adds; “that the king’s match with this lady, was a greater judgment to the nation than the plague, which then raged in the land; for considering the malignity of the Popish religiori, the imperiousness of the French government, the influence of a stately queen over an affectionate husband, and the share she must needs have in the education of her children [till thirteen years of age], it was then easy to foresee it might prove very fatal to our English prince and people, and lay in a vengeance to future generations.” The queen was a very great bigot to her religion;[[6]](#footnote-6) her conscience was directed by her confessor, assisted by the pope’s nuncio, and a secret cabal of priests and Jesuits. These controlled the queen, and she the king; so that in effect the nation was governed by Popish counsels, till the long parliament.

The prime minister under the king was G. Villiers duke of Buckingham, a graceful young gentleman, but very unfit for his high station. He had full possession of the king’s heart, insomuch that his majesty broke measures with all his parliaments for his sake. “Most men (says lord Clarendon[[7]](#footnote-7)) imputed all the calamities of the nation to his arbitrary councils; so that few were displeased at the news of his murder by Felton, in the year 1628, when he was not above thirty-four years of age.”

Upon the duke’s death, Dr. William Laud, then bishop of London, became the chief minister both in church and state.[[8]](#footnote-8) He was born at Reading, and educated in St. John’s college, Oxford, upon the charitable donation of Mr. White, founder of Merchant-Taylors’ school. Here he continued till he was fifty years of age, and behaved in such a manner that nobody knew what to think of him. “I would I knew (says the pious bishop Hall in one of his letters) where to find you: today you are with the Romanists, tomorrow with us; our adversaries think you ours, and we theirs; your conscience finds you with both and neither: how long will you halt in this indifferency?” Dr. Abbot says, “He spent his time in picking quarrels with the lectures of public readers, and giving advice to the then bishop of Durham, that he might fill the ears of the king [James I.] with prejudices against honest men, whom he called Puritans.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Heylin confesses it was thought dangerous to keep him company. By the interest of bishop Williams, he was first advanced[[10]](#footnote-10) to a Welsh bishopric, and from thence by degrees to the highest preferments in church and state. He was a little man, of a quick and rough temper, impatient of contradiction even at the council-table, of arbitrary principles both in church and state, always inclined to methods of severity, especially against the Puritans; vastly fond of external pomp and ceremony in divine worship; and though he was not an absolute Papist, he was ambitious of being the sovereign patriarch of three kingdoms.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Lord-chief-justice Finch was a man of little knowledge in his profession, except it was for making the laws of the land give place to orders of council. Mr. attorney-general Noy[[12]](#footnote-12) was a man of affected pride and morosity, who valued himself (says lord Clarendon[[13]](#footnote-13)) upon making that to be law which all other men believed not to be so. Indeed, all the judges were of this stamp, who instead of upholding the law as the defence and security of the subjects’ privileges, set it aside upon every little occasion, distinguishing between a rule of law, and a rule of government: so that those whom they could not convict by statute law, were sure to suffer by the rule of government, or a kind of political justice. The judges held their places during the king’s pleasure; and when the prerogative was to be stretched in any particular instances, Laud would send for their opinions beforehand, to give the greater sanction to the proceedings of the council and star-chamber, by whom they were often put in mind, that if they did not do his majesty’s business to satisfaction, they would be removed. Upon the whole, they were mercenary men, and (according to lord Clarendon) scandalous to their profession.

The courts of Westminster-hall had little to do between the crown and the subject; all business of this kind being transferred to the council-table, the star-chamber, and the court of high commission.

The council-table was the legislature of the kingdom; their proclamations and orders being made a rule of government, and the measure of the subject’s obedience. Though there was not one single law enacted in twelve years, there were no less than two hundred and fifty proclamations; every one of which had the force of a law, and bound the subject under the severest penalties. The lord-keeper Finch, upon a demurrer put into a bill that had no other equity than an order of council, declared upon the bench, that while he was keeper, no man should be so saucy as to dispute those orders, but that the wisdom of that board should always be ground good enough for him to make a decree in chancery. Judge Berkeley, upon a like occasion, declared, that there was a rule of law, and a rule of government, that many things that might not be done by the rule of law, might be done by the rule of government:[[14]](#footnote-14) his lordship added, that no act of parliament could bind the king not to command away his subjects’ goods and money.

“The star-chamber (says lord Clarendon[[15]](#footnote-15)) was in a manner the same court with the council-table, being but the same persons in several rooms: they were both grown into courts of law, to determine right; and courts of revenue, to bring money into the treasury: the council-table by proclamations enjoining to the people what was not enjoined by law, and prohibiting that which was not prohibited; and the star-chamber censuring the breach and disobedience to those proclamations, by very great fines and imprisonment; so that any disrespect to any acts of state, or to the persons of statesmen, was in no time more penal, and those foundations of right, by which men valued their security, were never in more danger of being destroyed.

“The high-commission also had very much overflowed the banks that should have contained it, not only in meddling with things not within their cognizance, but in extending their sentences and judgments beyond that degree that was justifiable, and grew to have so great a contempt of the common law, and the professors of it, that prohibitions from the supreme courts of law, which have and must have the superintendency over all the inferior courts, were not only neglected, but the judges were reprehended for granting them, which without perjury they could not deny.[[16]](#footnote-16)—Besides, from an ecclesiastical court for reformation of manners, it was grown to a court of revenue, and imposed great fines upon those who were culpable before them; sometimes above the degree of the offence, had the jurisdiction of fining been unquestionable, which it was not; which course of fining was much more frequent, and the fines heavier, after the king had granted all that revenue for the reparation of St. Paul’s which made the grievance greater and gave occasion to an unlucky observation, that the church was built with the sins of the people. These commissioners, not content with the business that was brought before them, sent their commissaries over the whole kingdom to superintend the proceedings of the bishops’ courts in their several diocesses, which of themselves made sufficient havoc among the Puritans, and were under a general odium for the severe exercise of their power: but if the bishop or his officers were negligent in their citations, or showed any degree of favour to the Puritan ministers, notice was immediately sent to Lambeth, and the accused persons were cited before the high-commission, to their utter ruin. They also detained men in prison many months, without bringing them to a trial, or so much as acquainting them with the cause of their commitment. Sir Edward Deering says, that “their proceedings were in some sense worse than the Romish inquisition, because they do not punish men of their own religion established by law; but with us (says he) how many scores of poor distressed ministers, within a few years, have been suspended, degraded, and excommunicated, though not guilty of a breach of any established law!” All which was so much the worse, because they knew that the court had no jurisdiction of fining at all; for the house of commons, in the third and seventh of king James I. resolved that the court of high commission’s fining and imprisoning men for ecclesiastical offences, was an intolerable grievance, oppression, and vexation, not warranted by the statute 1 Eliz. chap. 1. And sir Edward Coke, with the rest of the judges, at a conference with the prelates, in the presence of king James, gave it as their unanimous opinion, that the high-commission could fine in no case, and imprison only in cases of heresy and incontinence of a minister, and that only after conviction, but not by way of process before it, so that the jurisdiction of the court to fine was not only questionable, but null and void. Notwithstanding which, they hunted after their prey with full cry, “and brought in the greatest and most splendid transgressors; persons of honour and great quality (says the noble historian) were every day cited into the high-commission, upon the fame of their incontinency, or scandal of life, and very heavy fines were levied upon them, and applied to the repairing of St. Paul’s cathedral.”

Upon the accession of king Charles to the throne, the duke of Buckingham threw off the mask, and shook hands with his old friend Dr. Preston, whom he never loved any farther than as a tool to promote his interest among the people. Laud was his confessor and privy-counsellor for the church, whose first care was to have none but Arminian and anti-Puritanical chaplains about the king: for this purpose, he drew up a small treatise and put it into the duke’s hand, proving the Arminian doctrines to be orthodox; and showing, in ten particulars, that the anti-Arminian tenets were no better than Doctrinal Puritanism. Agreeably to the scheme, he presented the duke [April 9] with a list of divines for his majesty’s chaplains, distinguishing their characters by the two capital letters O. for Orthodox [that is, Arminian], and P. for Puritans [that is, Calvinists]. At the same time he received orders to consult bishop Andrews how to manage, with respect to the five distinguishing points of Calvinism, in the ensuing convocation; but the wise bishop advised his brother by all means to be quiet, and keep the controversy out of the house: “for (says he) the truth in this point is not so generally entertained among the clergy; nor is archbishop Abbot, nor many of the prelates, so inclinable to it, as to venture the deciding it in convocation.” It was therefore wisely dropped, the majority of the lower house being zealous Calvinists; and forty-five of them (according to Dr. Leo, who was one of the number) had made a covenant among themselves to oppose every thing that tended towards Pelagianism, or semi-Pelagianism: but the controversy was warmly debated without doors, till the king put a stop to it by his royal declaration.

Popery advanced hand in hand with Arminianism, and began the disputes between the king and his first parliament, which met June 16, 1625. His majesty, towards the close of his speech, having asked their assistance for the recovery of the Palatinate, assured them that, though he had been suspected as to his religion, he would let the world see, that none should be more desirous to maintain the religion he professed than himself. The houses thanked the king for his most gracious speech; but before they entered upon other business, joined in a petition against Popish recusants, which his majesty promised to examine, and give a satisfactory answer to the particulars.

The petition sets forth the causes of the increase of Popery, with the remedies: the causes are,

The want of the due execution of the laws against them. The interposing of foreign powers by their ambassadors and agents in their favour. The great concourse of Papists to the city, and their frequent conferences and conventicles there. Their open resort to the chapels of foreign ambassadors. The education of their children in foreign seminaries. The want of sufficient instruction in the Protestant religion in several places of the country. The licentious printing of Popish books. The employment of men ill-affected to the Protestant religion in places of government.[[17]](#footnote-17)

They therefore pray that the youth of the kingdom may be carefully educated under Protestant schoolmasters; which his majesty, in his answer to their petition, promised: That the ancient discipline of the universities may be restored; which his majesty approved: That the preaching of the word of God may be enlarged; and that to this purpose the bishops be advised to make use of the labours of such able ministers as have been formerly silenced, advising and beseeching them to behave themselves peaceably; and that pluralities, nonresidences, and commendams,may be moderated. Answer, “This his majesty approved, so far as the ministers would conform to church government. But he apprehends that pluralities, &c. are now so moderated, that there is no room for complaint; and recommends it to the parliament to take care that every parish allow a competent maintenance for an able minister.” That provision might be made against transporting children to Popish seminaries, and for recalling those that were there. Answ. “To this his majesty agreed.” That no Popish recusant be admitted to come to court, but upon special occasion, according to statute 3 Jac. Answ. “This also his majesty promised.” That the laws against Papists be put in execution, and that a day be fixed for the departure of all Jesuits and seminary-priests out of the kingdom, and that no natural-born subject, nor strange bishops, nor any other by authority from the see of Rome, confer any ecclesiastical orders, or exercise any ecclesiastical function, upon your majesty’s subjects. Answ. “It shall be so published by proclamation.” That your majesty’s learned council may have orders to consider of all former grants of recusant lands, that such may be avoided as are avoidable by law. Answ. “It shall be done according as is desired.” That your majesty give order to your judges and all officers of justice, to see the laws against Popish recusants duly executed. Answ. “His majesty leaves the laws to their course.” That your majesty will remove from places of authority and government all Popish recusants. Answ. “His majesty will give order accordingly.” That order be taken for disarming all Popish recusants convicted according to law, and that Popish recusants be commanded to retire to their houses, and be confined within five miles of home. Answ. “The laws shall be put in execution.” That none of your majesty’s natural-born subjects go to hear mass at the houses or chapels of foreign ambassadors. Answ. “The king will give order accordingly.” That the statute of 1 Eliz. for the payment of twelvepence every Sunday by such as absent from divine service in the church without a lawful excuse, be put in execution. Answ. “The king promises the penalties shall not be dispensed with.” That your majesty will extend your princely care to Ireland, that the like courses may be taken there for establishing the true religion. Answ. “His majesty will do all that a religious king can do in that affair.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

It is surprising that the king should make these promises to his parliament within six months after he had signed his marriage articles, in which he had engaged to set all Roman Catholics at liberty, and to suffer no search or molestation of them for their religion, and had in consequence of it pardoned twenty Romish priests, and (in imitation of his royal father) given orders to his lord-keeper to direct the judges and justices of peace all over England, “to forbear all manner of proceedings against his Roman-Catholic subjects, by information, indictment or otherwise; it being his royal pleasure that there should be a cessation of all and singular pains and penalties whereunto they were liable by any laws, statutes, or ordinances, of this realm.”[[19]](#footnote-19) But, as a judicious writer observes,[[20]](#footnote-20) it seems to have been a maxim in this and the last reign, that no faith is to be kept with parliaments. The Papists were apprized of the reasons of state that obliged the king to comply outwardly with what he did not really intend; and therefore, though his majesty directed a letter to his archbishop [December 15, 1625], to proceed against Popish recusants, and a proclamation was published to recall the English youths from Popish seminaries, little regard was paid to them. The king himself released eleven Romish priests out of prison, by special warrant the next day; the titular bishop of Chalcedon by letters dated June 1, 1625, appointed a Popish vicar-general and archdeacons all over England,[[21]](#footnote-21) whose names were published in the year 1643.[[22]](#footnote-22) And when the next parliament petitioned for the removal of Papists from offices of trust, it appeared, by a list annexed to their petition, that there were no less than fifty nine of the nobility and gentry of that religion then in the commission.[[23]](#footnote-23)

But the king not only connived at the Roman Catholics at home, but unhappily contributed to the ruin of the Protestant religion abroad. Cardinal Richelieu having formed a design to extirpate the Huguenots of France, by securing all their places of strength, laid siege to Rochelle, a seaport town with a good harbour, and a number of ships sufficient for its defence. Richelieu, taking advantage of the king’s late match with France, sent to borrow seven or eight ships, to be employed as the king of France should direct, who appointed them to block up the harbour of Rochelle; but when the honest sailors were told where they were going, they declared they would rather be thrown overboard, or hanged upon the top of the masts, than fight against their Protestant brethren. Notwithstanding admiral Pennington and the French officers used all their rhetoric to persuade them, they remained inflexible. The admiral therefore acquainted the king, who sent him a warrant to the following effect: “That he should consign his own ship immediately into the hands of the French admiral, with all her equipage, artillery, &c. and require the other seven to put themselves, into the service of our dear brother the French king; and in case of backwardness or refusal, we command you to use all forcible means, even to their sinking.” In pursuance of this warrant, the ships were delivered into the hands of the French, but all the English sailors and officers deserted except two. The French having got the ships and artillery quickly manned them with sailors of their own religion, and joining the rest of the French fleet, they blocked up the harbour, destroyed the little fleet of the Rochellers, and cut off their communication by sea with their Protestant friends, by which means they were reduced to all the hardships of a most dreadful famine; and after a long blockade both by sea and land, were forced to surrender the chief bulwark of the Protestant interest in France, into the hands of the Papists.

To return to the parliament. It has been remembered, that Mr. Richard Montague, a clergyman, and one of the king’s chaplains, published a book in the year 1623, entitled, “A new gag for an old goose,” in answer to a Popish book, entitled, “A gag for the new gospel.”[[24]](#footnote-24) The book containing sundry propositions tending to the public disturbance, was complained of in the house of commons, who, after having examined the author at their bar, referred him to the archbishop of Canterbury, who dismissed him with an express prohibition to write no more about such matters. But Montague, being encouraged from court, went on and published “An appeal to Cæsar,” designing it for king James; but he being dead before it was ready, it was dedicated to king Charles, and recommended at first by several court-bishops, who upon better consideration artfully withdrew their names from before it; and left Dr. Francis White to appear by himself, as he complained publicly. The appeal was calculated to promote Arminianism, to attempt a reconciliation with Rome, and to advance the king’s prerogative above law. The house appointed a committee to examine into its errors; after which they voted it to be contrary to the articles of the church of England, and bound the author in a recognizance of £2,000. for his appearance.

Bishop Laud, apprehending this to be an invasion of the prerogative, and a dangerous precedent, joined with two other bishops in a letter to the duke of Buckingham, to engage his majesty to take the cause into his own hands: the letter says,[[25]](#footnote-25) “that the church of England when it was reformed would not be too busy with school-points of divinity; now the points for which Mr. Montague is brought into trouble, are of this kind; some are the resolved doctrines of the church of England, which he is bound to maintain; and others are fit only for schools, wherein men may abound in their own sense. To make men subscribe school-opinions is hard, and was one great fault of the council of Trent. Besides, disputes about doctrines in religion ought to be determined in a national synod or convocation, with the king’s licence, and not in parliament; if we submit to any other judge, we shall depart from the ordinance of Christ, we shall derogate from the honour of the late king, who saw and approved of all the opinions in that book; as well as from his present majesty’s royal prerogative, who has power and right to take this matter under his own care, and refer it in a right course to church-consideration. Some of the opinions which are opposite to Mr. Montague’s will prove fatal to the government, if publicly taught and maintained: when they had been concluded upon at Lambeth, queen Elizabeth caused them to be suppressed, and so they continued, till of late some of them received countenance from the synod of Dort; a synod, whose conclusions have no authority in this country, and it is to be hoped never will.” Signed, Jo. Roffensis, Jo. Oxon, and Gulielmus Menevensis, August 2, 1625.

This letter had its effect, and procured Montague his *quietus* at present. The king declared he would bring the cause before the council, it being a branch of his supremacy to determine matters of religion. He expressed his displeasure against the commons, for calling his chaplain to their bar, and for alarming the nation with the danger of Popery. But these affairs, with the king’s assisting at the siege of Rochelle, made such a noise at Oxford; where the parliament was reassembled because of the plague at London, that the king was obliged to dissolve them [August 12], before they had granted the supplies necessary for carrying on the war. Nor did his majesty pass any act relating to religion, except one, which was soon after suspended by his royal declaration; it was to prevent unlawful pastimes on the Lord’s day. The preamble sets forth, that the holy keeping of the Lord’s day is a principal part of the true service of God—“Therefore it is enacted that there shall be no assemblies of people out of their own parishes, for any sports or pastimes whatsoever; nor any bearbaiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, or any other unlawful exercises or pastimes, within their own parishes, on forfeiture of three shillings and sixpence for every such offence to the poor.” However, this law was never put in execution. Men were reproached and censured for too strict an observation of the Lord’s day, but none that I have met with for the profanation of it.

His majesty having dismissed his parliament before they had given him the necessary supplies for the war with Spain, resolved to try his credit in borrowing money, by way of loan, of such persons as were best able to lend; for this purpose gentlemen were taxed at a certain sum, and had promissory letters under the privy seal to be repaid in eighteen months.[[26]](#footnote-26) With this money the king fitted out a fleet against Spain, which, after it had waited about two months for the Plate fleet, returned without doing any action worth remembrance.

The ceremony of the king’s coronation, which was not performed till the beginning of February, was another expense which his majesty thought fit to provide for by issuing out a proclamation, that all such as had £40 a year or more, and were not yet knights, should come and receive the order of knighthood, or compound for it.[[27]](#footnote-27) This was a new grievance loudly complained of in the following parliaments. The coronation was performed by archbishop Abbot, assisted by bishop Laud as dean of Westminster,[[28]](#footnote-28) who besides the old regalia which were in his custody, that is, the crown, the sceptre, the spurs, &c. of king Edward the Confessor, brought forth an old crucifix, and placed it upon the altar. As soon as the archbishop had put the crown upon the king’s head, and performed the other usual ceremonies,[[29]](#footnote-29) his majesty being seated on the throne, ready to receive the homage of the lords, bishop Laud came up to him, and read the following extraordinary passage, which is not to be found in former coronations. “Stand, and hold fast from henceforth the place to which you have been heir by the succession of your forefathers, being now delivered to you by the authority of Almighty God, and by the hands of us, and all the bishops and servants of God. And as you sec the clergy to come nearer to the altar than others, so remember, that in all places convenient you give them greater honour, that the Mediator of God and man may establish you in the kingly throne, to be a mediator between the clergy and the laity, and that you may reign for ever with Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.”[[30]](#footnote-30) This and sundry other alterations were objected to the archbishop at his trial, which we shall mention hereafter.

The king’s treasury being exhausted, and the war continuing with Spain, his majesty was obliged to call a new parliament; but to avoid the choice of such members, as had exclaimed against the duke of Buckingham, and insisted upon redress of grievances, the court pricked them down for sheriffs, which disqualified them from being rechosen members of parliament; of this number were, sir Edward Coke, sir Robert Philips, and sir Thomas Wentworth, afterward lord Strafford. The houses met February 6, 1626, and fell immediately upon grievances. A committee for religion was appointed, of which Mr. Pym was chairman, who examined Mr. Montague’s writings, viz. his “Gag,” his “Appeal,” and his treatise of the “Invocation of the saints;” out of which they collected several opinions contrary to the book of homilies and the thirty-nine articles, which they reported to the house; as,

1. “That he maintained the church of Rome is, and ever was, a true church, contrary to the sixteenth homily of the church of England.

2. “That the said church had ever remained firm upon the same foundation of sacraments and doctrine instituted by God.

3. “That speaking of the doctrines of faith, hope, and charity, he affirmed that none of these are controverted between the Papists and Protestants; but that the controverted points are of a lesser and inferior nature, of which a man may be ignorant without any danger of his soul.

4. “That he maintained the use of images, for instruction of the ignorant, and exciting devotion.

5. “That in his treatise of the “Invocation of saints,” he affirmed that some saints have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power (as angels have), over certain persons and countries.

6. “That in his “Appeal” he maintained that men justified may fall away from grace, and may recover again, but not certainly nor necessarily.

7. “That the said R. Montague has endeavoured to raise factions among the king’s subjects, by casting the odious and scandalous name of Puritans upon those who conform to the doctrine and ceremonies of the church. That he scoffed at preaching, at lectures, and all shows of religion; and, that the design of his book was apparently to reconcile the church of England with the see of Rome.”[[31]](#footnote-31)

In what manner the commons designed to prosecute this impeachment is uncertain, for Montague was not brought to his defence, the king having intimated again to the house, that their proceeding against him without his leave, was displeasing to him; that as to their holding him to bail, he thought his servants might have the same protection as an ordinary burgess, and therefore he would take the cause into his own hands; and soon after dissolved the parliament.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Though the Arminian controversy was thus wrested out of the hands of the parliament, it was warmly debated without doors; Montague was attacked in print by Dr. Carleton, bishop of Chichester; Dr. Sutcliffe, dean of Exeter; Dr. Featly, Dr. Goad, Mr. Ward, Burton, Yates, Wotton, Prynne, and Fran. Rouse, esq. &c. Conferences were appointed to debate the point, of the possibility of the elects’ falling from grace.[[33]](#footnote-33) One was at York-house, February 11, 1625–6, before the duke of Buckingham, earl of Warwick, and other lords; Dr. Buckeridge, bishop of Rochester, and Dr. White dean of Carlisle, being on one side; and Dr. Moreton bishop of Coventry, and Dr. Preston, on the other. The success of the dispute is variously related; but the earl of Pembroke said, that none went from thence Arminians, save those who came thither with the same opinions. Soon after, February 17, there was a second conference in the same place, Dr. White and Mr. Montague on one side, and Dr. Moreton and Preston on the other;[[34]](#footnote-34) Dr. Preston carried it clear at first, by dividing his adversaries, who quickly perceiving their error, united their forces, says my author, in a joint opposition to him; but upon the whole, these conferences served rather to increase the differences than abate them. The king therefore issued out a proclamation, containing very express commands, not to preach or dispute upon the controverted points of Arminianism. It was dated January 24, 1626, and sets forth, “that the king will admit of no innovation in the doctrine, discipline, or government, of the church, and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, not to publish, or maintain in preaching or writing, any new inventions or opinions, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law, assuring them that his majesty will proceed against all offenders against this order, with all that severity their contempts shall deserve, that by the exemplary punishment of a few, others may be warned against falling under the just indignation of their sovereign.”[[35]](#footnote-35)

One would have thought this proclamation to be in favour of Calvinism, but the execution of it being in the hands of Laud, and the bishops of his party, the edge was turned against the Puritans, and it became, says Rushworth,[[36]](#footnote-36) the stopping of their mouths, and gave an uncontrolled liberty to the tongues and pens of the Arminian party. Others were of opinion that Laud and Ncile procured this injunction, in order to have an opportunity to oppress the Calvinists who should venture to break it, while the disobedience of the contrary party should be winked at. The Puritans thought they might still write in defence of the thirty-nine articles; but the press being in the hands of their adversaries, some of their books were suppressed, some were castrated, and others that got abroad were called in,[[37]](#footnote-37) and the authors and publishers questioned in the star-chamber and high-commission, for engaging in a controversy prohibited by the government. By these methods effectual care was taken, that the Puritan and Calvinian writers should do their adversaries no harm; bishop Laud, with two or three of his chaplains, undertaking to judge of truth and error, civility and good manners, for all the wise and great men of the nation, in doing of which they were so shamefully partial, that learning and industry were discouraged, men of gravity and great experience not being able to persuade themselves to submit their labours to be mangled and torn in pieces by a few younger divines, who were both judges and parties in the affair. At length the booksellers being almost ruined, preferred a petition to the next parliament[[38]](#footnote-38) [1628] complaining, that the writings of their best authors were stifled in the press, while the books of their adversaries [Papists and Arminians] were published and spread over the whole kingdom. Thus Cheney’s “Collectiones theologicæ,” an Arminian and Popish performance, was licensed, when the learned Dr. Twisse’s answer to Arminius, though written in Latin, was stopped in the press.[[39]](#footnote-39) Mr. Montague’s book, entitled, “God’s love to mankind,” was licensed and published, when Dr. Twisse’s reply to the same book was suppressed. Many affidavits of this kind were made against Laud at his trial, by the most famous Calvinistical writers, as will be seen hereafter.

The case was just the same with regard to books against Popery; the queen and the Roman Catholics must not be insulted, and therefore all offensive passages, such as calling the pope antichrist, the church of Rome no true church, and everything tending to expose images in churches, crucifixes, penance, auricular confession, and Popish absolution, must be expunged. Sir Edward Deering compares the licensers of the press to the managers of the *index expurgatorius* among the Papists, “who clip the tongues of such witnesses whose evidences they do not like; in like manner (says he) our licensers suppress the truth, while Popish pamphlets fly abroad *cum privilegio;* nay, they are so bold as to deface the most learned labours of our ancient and best divines. But herein the Roman *index* is better than ours, that they approve of their own established doctrines; but our innovators alter our settled doctrines, and superinduce points repugnant and contrary. This I do affirm, and can take upon myself to prove.”

Terrible were the triumphs of arbitrary power over the liberty and property of the subject, in the intervals between this and the succeeding parliament; gentlemen of birth and character, who refused to lend what money the council was pleased to assess them, were taken out of their houses and imprisoned at a great distance from their habitations;[[40]](#footnote-40) among these were, sir Thomas Wentworth, sir Walter Earle, sir John Strangeways, sir Thomas Grantham, sir Harbottle Grimstone, John Hampden, esq. and others; some were confined in the Fleet, the Marshalsea, the Gate-house, and other prisons about London, as, sir John Elliot, Mr. Selden, &c.

Upon the whole, there were imprisoned by order of council, nineteen knights, thirteen esquires, and four gentlemen, in the county jails; three knights, one esquire, and four wealthy citizens, in the Fleet, besides great numbers in other places. Those of the lower sort who refused to lend were pressed for the army, or had soldiers quartered on them, who by their insolent behaviour disturbed the peace of families, and committed frequent felonies, burglaries, rapines, murders, and other barbarous cruelties, insomuch that the highways were dangerous to travel, and the markets unfrequented. The king would have borrowed £100,000. of the city of London, but they excused themselves. However his majesty got a round sum of money from the Papists, by issuing a commission to the archbishop of York, to compound with them for all their forfeitures that had been due for recusancy, since the tenth of king James I. or that should be due hereafter. By this fatal policy (says the noble historian) men well-affected to the hierarchy, though enemies to arbitrary power, were obliged to side with the Puritans to save the nation, and enable them to oppose the designs of the court.

To convince the people that it was their duty to submit to the loan, the clergy were employed to preach up the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, and to prove that the absolute submission of subjects to the royal will and pleasure, was the doctrine of Holy Scripture;[[41]](#footnote-41) among those was Dr. Sibthorp, a man of mean parts, but of sordid ambition, who in his sermon at the Lent assizes at Northampton, from Romans xiii. 7, told the people, “that if princes commanded any thing which subjects might not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature, or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment, without resisting, or railing, or reviling; and so to yield a passive obedience where they cannot yield an active one.” Dr. Manwaring went farther in two sermons preached before the king at Oatlands, and published under the title of “Religion and allegiance.” He says, “the king is not bound to observe the laws of the realm, concerning the subjects’ rights and liberties, but that his royal will and pleasure, in imposing taxes without consent of parliament, doth oblige the subject’s conscience on pain of damnation; and that those who refuse obedience, transgress the laws of God, insult the king’s supreme authority, and are guilty of impiety, disloyalty, and rebellion. That the authority of both houses of parliament is not necessary for the raising aids and subsidies, as not suitable to the exigencies of the state.” These were the doctrines of the court; “which (says the noble historian) were very unfit for the place, and very scandalous for the persons, who presumed often to determine things out of the verge of their own profession, and in *ordine ad spiritualia,* gave unto Cæsar that which did not belong to him.”

Sibthorp dedicated his sermon to the king, and carried it to archbishop Abbot to be licensed, which the honest old prelate refused, for which he was suspended from all archiepiscopal functions, and ordered to retire to Canterbury or Ford, a moorish unhealthy place, five miles beyond Canterbury. The sermon was then carried to the bishop of London, who licensed and recommended it as a sermon learnedly and discreetly preached, agreeable to the ancient doctrine of the primitive church, both for faith and good manners, and to the established doctrine of the church of England.

Archbishop Abbot had been out of favour for some time, because he would not give up the laws and liberties of his country, nor treat the great duke of Buckingham with that servile submission that he expected.[[42]](#footnote-42) Heylin says, the king was displeased with him for being too favourable to the Puritans, and too remiss in his government; and that for this reason he seized his jurisdiction, and put it into hands more disposed to act with severity. Fuller says,[[43]](#footnote-43) that a commission was granted to five bishops, whereof Laud was one, to suspend him for casual homicide that he had committed seven years before, and of which he had been cleared by commissioners appointed to examine into the fact in the reign of king James; besides, his grace had a royal dispensation to shelter him from the canons, and had ever since exercised his jurisdiction without interruption, even to the consecrating of Laud himself to a bishopric. But the commission mentions no cause of his suspension, and only takes notice, that the archbishop cannot at present, in his own person, attend the services which are otherwise proper for his cognizance and jurisdiction. But why could he not attend them? Because his majesty had commanded him to retire, for refusing to license Sibthorp’s sermon. The blame of this severity fell upon Laud, as if, not having patience to wait for the reverend old prelate’s death, he was desirous to step into the archiepiscopal chair while he was alive; for no sooner was Abbot suspended, than his jurisdiction was put into the hands of five bishops by commission, of whom Laud was the chief.

There was another prelate that gave the court some uneasiness, viz. Dr. Williams bishop of Lincoln, late lord-keeper of the great seal, who being in disgrace retired to his diocese, and became very popular among his clergy.[[44]](#footnote-44) He declared against the loan, and fell in with the Puritans and country party, insomuch that sir John Lamb and Dr. Sibthorp informed the council, that they were grieved to see the bishop of Lincoln give place to unconformable ministers, when he turned his back upon those who were conformable; that the Puritans ruled all with him; and that divers of them in Leicestershire being convened before the commissaries, his lordship would not admit proceedings to be had against them. That they [the commissaries for the high-commission] had informed the bishop, then at Bugden, of several of the factious Puritans in his diocese who would not come up to the table to receive the communion kneeling; of their keeping unlawful fasts and meetings; that one fast held from eight in the morning till nine at night; and that collections for money were made without authority, upon pretence for the Palatinate; that therefore they had desired leave from the bishop to proceed against them *ex officio;* but the bishop replied, that he would not meddle against the Puritans, that for his part he expected not another bishopric; they might complain of them if they would to the council-table, for he was under a cloud already. He had the duke of Buckingham for his enemy, and therefore would not draw the Puritans upon him, for he was sure they would carry all things at last. Besides, he said, the king, in the first year of his reign, had given answer to a petition of the lower house at Oxford in favour of the Puritans.

It appeared by the information of others, that Lamb and Sibthorp pressed the bishop again to proceed against the Puritans in Leicestershire; that the bishop then asked them, what sort of people they were, and of what condition? To which sir John Lamb replied, in the presence of Dr. Sibthorp, “that they seemed to the world to be such as would not swear, whore, nor be drunk, but yet they would lie, cozen, and deceive; that they would frequently hear two sermons a day, and repeat the same again too, and afterward pray, and that sometimes they would fast all day long.” Then the bishop asked whether the places where those Puritans were, did lend money freely upon the collection for the loan. To which sir John Lamb and Dr. Sibthorp replied that they did. Then said the bishop, No man of discretion can say, that that place is a place of Puritans: for my part (said the bishop) I am not satisfied to give way to proceedings against them: at which Sibthorp was much discontented, and said he was troubled to see that the church was no better regarded. This information being transmitted to the council, was sealed up for the present, but was afterward, with some other matters, produced against his lordship in the star-chamber, as will be seen hereafter.

Though the king was at war with Spain, and with the house of Austria, and (if I may be allowed to say it) with his own subjects; though he had no money in his exchequer, and was at the greatest loss how to raise any; yet he suffered himself to be prevailed with to enter into a new war with France, under the colour of maintaining the Protestant religion in that country, without so much as thinking of ways and means to support it. But when one considers the character of this king and his ministry, it is hard to believe that this could be the real motive of the war: for his majesty and the whole court had a mortal aversion to the French Huguenots,[[45]](#footnote-45) Buckingham had no religion at all; Weston and Conway were Catholics; Laud and Neile thought there was no salvation for Protestants out of the church of England; how then can it be supposed that they should make war in defence of a religion for which they had the utmost contempt? Lord Clarendon says, the war was owing to Buckingham’s disappointment in his amours at the French court;[[46]](#footnote-46) but it is more likely he advised it to keep up the misunderstandings between the king and his parliaments, by continuing the necessity of raising money by extraordinary methods, upon which his credit and reputation depended. War being declared, the queen’s domestics were sent home, and a fleet was fitted out, which made a fruitless descent upon the isle of Rhee, under the conduct of the duke of Buckingham, with the loss of five thousand men. This raised a world of complaints and murmurs against the duke, and obliged the weak and unhappy king to try the experiment of another parliament, which was appointed to meet March 17, 1627‒8.

As soon as this resolution was taken in council, orders were dispatched to all parts of the kingdom, to release the gentlemen imprisoned for the loan, to the number of seventy-eight, most of whom were chosen members for the ensuing parliament. In the meantime, his majesty went on with raising money by excise; and instead of palliating and softening the mistakes of his government, put on an air of high sovereignty, and told his parliament, that if they did not provide for the necessities of the state, he should use those other means that God had put into his hands, to save that which the follies of other men would hazard. “Take not this (says his majesty) as a threatening, for I scorn to threaten my inferiors,[[47]](#footnote-47) but as an admonition from him, who by nature and duty has most care for your preservation and prosperity.”[[48]](#footnote-48)

But the parliament not being awed by this language, began with grievances; and though they voted five subsidies, they refused to carry the bill through the house, till they had obtained the royal assent to their petition of right, which asserted, among others, the following claims contained in magna charta:

1. That no freeman shall be detained in prison by the king and privy council, without the cause of commitment be expressed, for which by law he ought to be detained.

2. That a *habeas corpus* ought not to be denied, where the law allows it.

3. That no tax, loan, or benevolence, shall be imposed without act of parliament.

4. That no man shall be forejudged of life or limb, or be exiled or destroyed, but by the judgment of his peers, according to the laws of the land, or by act of parliament.

The king gave the royal assent to this bill in the most ample manner, which I mention, that the reader may remember what regard his majesty paid to it in the twelve succeeding years of his reign.

In the meantime, the house of lords went upon Manwaring’s sermons already mentioned, and passed the following sentence upon the author; “that he be imprisoned during pleasure, and be fined one thousand pounds; that he make his submission at the bar of the house, and be suspended from his ministry for three years; that he be disabled for ever from preaching at court, be incapable of any ecclesiastical or secular preferment, and that his sermons be burnt in London, and both universities.”[[49]](#footnote-49) Pursuant to this sentence, Manwaring appeared upon his knees at the bar of the house, June 23 [1628], and made ample acknowledgment and submission, craving pardon of God, the king, the parliament, and the whole commonwealth, in words drawn up by a committee: but the houses were no sooner risen, than his fine was remitted, and himself preferred first to the living of Stamford-Rivers, with a dispensation to hold St. Giles’s in the fields, then to the deanery of Worcester, and after some time to the bishopric of St. David’s.

Within a month after this [August 22], Montague was promoted to the bishopric of Chichester, while he lay under the censure of parliament. At his consecration at Bow-church, Mr. Jones, a stationer of London, stood up, and excepted against his qualification for a bishopric, because the parliament had voted him incapable of any preferment in the church; but his exceptions were overruled, not being delivered in by a proctor; though Jones averred that he could not prevail with any one to appear for him, though he offered them their fees: so the consecration proceeded.

Sibthorp, the other incendiary, was made prebendary of Peterborough, and rector of Burton-Latimer in Wiltshire; though the Oxford historian[[50]](#footnote-50) confesseth he had nothing to recommend him but forwardness and servile flattery.

While the money-bill was going through the house of lords, the commons were busy in drawing up a remonstrance of the grievances of the nation, with a petition for redress: but as soon as the king had obtained his money, he came to the house June 26, and prorogued the parliament, first to the 20th of October, and then to the 26th of January. The commons being disappointed of presenting their remonstrance, dispersed it through the nation; but the king called it in, and after sometime published an answer drawn up by bishop Laud, as was proved against him at his trial.

The remonstrance was dated June 11, and besides the civil grievances of billeting soldiers, &c. complains with regard to religion.

1. Of the great increase of Popery, by the laws not being put in execution: by conferring honours and places of command upon Papists; by issuing out commissions to compound for their recusancy, and by permitting mass to be said openly at Denmark-house and other places.

The answer denies any noted increase of Popery, or that there is any cause to fear it. As for compositions, they are for the increase of his majesty’s profit, and for returning that into his purse, which the connivance of inferior officers might perhaps divert another way.

2. The remonstrance complains of the discountenancing orthodox and painful [diligent] ministers, though conformable and peaceable in their behaviour, insomuch that they are hardly permitted to lecture where there is no constant preaching.—That their books are prohibited, when those of their adversaries are licensed and published.—That the bishops Neile and Laud are justly suspected of Arminianism and Popish errors; and that this being the way to church-preferment, many scholars bend the course of their studies to maintain them.

The answer denies the distressing or discountenancing good preachers, if they be, as they are called, good; but affirms, that it was necessary to prohibit their books, because some whom the remonstrance calls orthodox, had assumed an insufferable licence in printing.—That great wrong was done to the two eminent prelates mentioned, without any proof: for should they or any others attempt innovation of religion, says his majesty, we should quickly take order with them, without staying for the remonstrance; and as for church-preferments, we will always bestow them as the reward of merit; but as the preferments are ours, we will be judge, and not be taught by a remonstrance.

3. The remonstrance complains of the growth of Arminianism, as a cunning way to bring in Popery.

The answer says, this is a great wrong to ourself and government; for our people must not be taught by a parliamentary remonstrance, or any other way, that we are so ignorant of truth, or so careless of the profession of it, that any opinion or faction should thrust itself so fast into our dominions without our knowledge. This is a mere dream, and would make our loyal people believe we are asleep.

But the following letter, written at this time by a Jesuit in England, to the rector of the college at Brussels, sufficiently supports the parliament’s charge, and shows how Arminianism and Popery, which have no natural connexion, came to be united at this time against the Protestant religion, and the liberties of England.

“Let not the damp of astonishment seize upon your ardent and zealous soul (says the Jesuit), in apprehending the unexpected calling of a parliament; we [the Papists] have not opposed, but rather furthered it.—

“You must know the council is engaged to assist the king by way of prerogative, in case the parliament fail. You shall see this parliament will resemble the pelican, which takes pleasure to dig out with her beak her own bowels.

“The elections have been in such confusion of apparent faction, as that which we were wont to procure with much art and industry, when the Spanish match was in treaty.—

“We have now many strings to our bow, and have strongly fortified our faction, and have added two bulwarks more; for when king James lived, he was very violent against Arminianism, and interrupted our strong designs in Holland.

“Now we have planted that sovereign drug Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy, and it flourishes and bears fruit in due season.

“The materials that build up our bulwark, are the projectors and beggars of all ranks and qualities; however, both these factions co-operate to destroy the parliament, and to introduce a new species and form of government, which is oligarchy.

“These serve as mediums and instruments to our end, which is the universal Catholic monarchy; our foundation must be mutation, and mutation will cause a relaxation.—

“We proceed now by counsel and mature deliberation, how and when to work upon the duke’s [Buckingham’s] jealousy and revenge; and in this we give the honour to those that merit it, which are the church Catholics.

“There is another matter of consequence which we must take much into our consideration and tender care, which is, to stave off Puritans, that they hang not in the duke’s ears: they are impudent subtle people, and it is to be feared lest they should negotiate a reconciliation between the duke and the parliament at Oxford and Westminster; but now we assure ourselves, that we have so handled the matter, that both the duke and parliament are irreconcilable.

“For the better prevention of the Puritans, the Arminians have already locked up the duke’s ears, and we have those of our own religion that stand continually at the duke’s chamber, to see who goes in and out. We cannot be too circumspect and careful in this regard. I cannot choose but laugh to see how some of our own coat have accoutred themselves; and it is admirable how in speech and gesture they act the Puritans. The Cambridge scholars, to their woeful experience shall see, we can act the Puritans a little better than they have done the Jesuits. They have abused our sacred patron in jest, but we will make them smart for it in earnest.

“But to return to the main fabric, our foundation is Arminianism; the Arminians and projectors affect mutation; this we second and enforce by probable arguments. We show how the king may free himself of his ward, and raise a vast revenue without being beholden to his subjects, which is by way of excise. Then our church Catholics show the means how to settle the excise, which must be by a mercenary army of foreigners and Germans; their horse will eat up the country where they come, though they be well paid, much more if they be not paid. The army is to consist of twenty thousand foot, and two thousand horse; so that if the country rise upon settling the excise, as probably they will, the army will conquer them, and pay themselves out of the confiscation. Our design is to work the Protestants as well as the Catholics to welcome in a conqueror. We hope to dissolve trade, to hinder the building of shipping, and to take away the merchant-ships, that they may not easily light upon the West-India fleet,” &c.

It appears from this letter, that Puritanism was the only bulwark of the constitution, and of the Protestant religion, against the inroads of Popery and arbitrary power.[[51]](#footnote-51)

4. To go on with the parliament’s remonstrance, which complains farther of the miserable condition of Ireland, where the Popish religion is openly professed, and their ecclesiastical discipline avowed, monasteries, nunneries, and other religious houses re-edified, and filled with men and women of several orders, even in the city of Dublin itself.

The answer says, that the Protestant religion is not in a worse condition than queen Elizabeth left it; and adds, that it is a disparagement to the king’s government to report the building of religious houses in Dublin, and other places, when the king himself had no account of it.

But it seems the parliament knew more of the affairs of Ireland than bishop Laud; the agents for that kingdom had represented the Protestant religion in great danger, by the suspending all proceedings against the Papists ever since the king came to the crown; by this means they were become so bold, that when lord Falkland summoned their chiefs to meet at Dublin, 1626, in order to a general contribution for defence of the kingdom against a foreign invasion, they declared roundly, that they would contribute nothing without a toleration, and liberty to build religious houses; upon which the assembly was dismissed. This awakened the Protestant bishops, who met together, and signed the following protestation, November 26, 1626.

“The religion of Papists is superstitious and idolatrous, and their church anti-apostolical; to give them therefore a toleration is a grievous sin, because it makes ourselves accessory to all the abominations of Popery,[[52]](#footnote-52) and to the perdition of those souls that perish thereby; and because granting a toleration in respect of any money to be given, or contribution to be made by them, is to set religion to sale, and with it the souls that Christ has redeemed with his blood; we therefore beseech the God of truth, to make those who are in authority, zealous for God’s glory, and resolute against all Popery, superstition, and idolatry.” Signed by archbishop Usher, and eleven of his brethren.

But notwithstanding this protestation, the Papists gained their point, and in the fourth year of the king’s reign had a toleration granted them, in consideration of the sum of £120,000. to be paid in three years.[[53]](#footnote-53)

With regard to the building religious houses, it is wonderful that neither the king nor his prime minister should know anything of it, when the lord-deputy Falkland had this very summer issued out a proclamation with this preamble: “Forasmuch as we cannot but take notice, that the late intermission of the legal proceedings against Popish pretended or titular archbishops, bishops, abbots, deans, vicars-general, and others of that sort, that derive their authority and orders from Rome, hath bred such an extraordinary insolence and presumption in them, as that they have dared of late, not only to assemble themselves in public places, but also have erected houses and buildings, called public oratories, colleges, mass-houses, and convents of friars, monks, and nuns, in the eye and open view of the state and elsewhere, and do frequently exercise jurisdiction against his majesty’s subjects, by authority derived from Rome, and by colour of teaching schools in their pretended monasteries, to train up youth in their superstitious religion, contrary to the laws and ecclesiastical government of this kingdom: we therefore will and require them to forbear to exercise their jurisdiction within this kingdom, and to relinquish and break up their convents and religious houses, &c.” Could such a proclamation be printed and dispersed over the kingdom of Ireland, without being known to the English court?

But farther, to show that bishop Laud himself was not long-ignorant of the dangerous increase of Popery in Ireland, the bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, Dr. Bedell, sent him the following account soon afterward; it was dated April 1, 1630. “The Popish clergy are more numerous than those of the church of England; they have their officials and vicars-general for ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and are so hardy as to excommunicate those who appear at the courts of the Protestant bishops. Almost every parish has a priest of the Romish communion; masses are sometimes said in churches, and excepting a few British planters, not amounting to the tenth part of the people, the rest are all declared recusants. In each diocese there are about seven or eight of the reformed clergy well qualified, but these not understanding the language of the natives cannot perform divine service, nor converse with their parishioners to advantage, and consequently are in no capacity to put a stop to superstition.”[[54]](#footnote-54)

Let the reader now judge, whether the answer to the remonstrance be not very evasive. Could this great statesman be ignorant of so many notorious facts? was the growth of Arminianism and arbitrary power, a dream? was any wrong done to himself, or his brother of Winchester, by saying they countenanced these principles? was not the increase of Popery both in England and Ireland notorious, by suspending the penal laws, ever since the king came to the crown, and granting the Papists a toleration for a sum of money? where then was the policy of lulling the nation asleep, while the enemy were increasing their numbers, and whetting their swords for a general massacre of the Protestants, which they accomplished in Ireland about twelve years afterward?

The bishop observes in his diary, that this parliament laboured his ruin, because they charged him with unsoundness of opinion; but his lordship had such an influence over the king as rendered all their attempts fruitless; for the see of London becoming vacant this summer, Laud was translated to it July 15;[[55]](#footnote-55) and the duke of Buckingham being stabbed at Portsmouth by Felton, August 23, following, this ambitious prelate became prime minister in all affairs both of church and state.

One of the bishop’s first enterprises, after his translation to London, was to stifle the predestinarian controversy, for which purpose he procured the thirty-nine articles to be reprinted, with the following declaration at the head of them.[[56]](#footnote-56)

*By the King.*

“Being by God’s ordinance, and our just title, defender of the faith, &c. within these dominions, we hold it agreeable to our kingly office, for the preservation of unity and peace, not to suffer any unnecessary disputations which may nourish faction in the church or commonwealth: we, therefore, with the advice of our bishops, declare, that the articles of the church of England which the clergy generally have subscribed, do contain the true doctrine of the church of England, agreeable to God’s word, which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said articles.—We take comfort in this, that all clergymen within our realm have always most willingly subscribed the articles, which is an argument that they all agree, in the true usual literal meaning of them; and that in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the articles to be for them, which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the articles established: wherefore we will, that all curious search into these things be laid aside, and these disputes be shut up in God’s promises, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles according to them; and that no man hereafter preach or print to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it, in the plain and full manner thereof, and shall not put his own sense or comment to the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense: that if any public reader in the universities, or any other person, shall affix any new sense to any article, or shall publicly read, or hold disputation on either side; or if any divine in the universities shall preach or print anything either way, they shall be liable to censure in the ecclesiastical commission, and we will see there shall be due execution upon them.”[[57]](#footnote-57)

Surely there never was such a confused unintelligible declaration printed before; but the Calvinist divines understood the king’s intention, and complained in a petition of “the restraints they were laid under by his majesty’s forbidding them to preach the saving doctrines of God’s free grace in election and predestination to eternal life, according to the seventeenth article of the church. That this had brought them under a very uncomfortable dilemma, either of falling under the divine displeasure, if they did not execute their commission, in declaring the whole counsel of God, or of being censured for opposition to his majesty’s authority, in case they preached the received doctrines of the church, and attacked the Pelagian and Arminian heresies boldly published from the pulpit and the press, though censured by king James as arrogant and atheistical; and those who avow them to be agreeable to the church of England are called gross liars. Therefore, they humbly entreat, that his majesty would be pleased to take the forementioned evils and grievances into his princely consideration, and, as a wise physician, apply such speedy remedies as may both cure the present distemper, and preserve the church and state from those plagues with which their neighbours had not been a little distressed.” But this address was stopped in its progress, and never reached the king’s ears.

In pursuance of his majesty’s declaration, all books relating to the Arminian controversy were called in by proclamation and suppressed, and among others Montague’s and Manwaring’s, which was only a feint to cover a more deadly blow to be reached at the Puritans; for at the same time Montague and Manwaring received the royal pardon, and were preferred to some of the best livings in the kingdom (as has been observed), while the answer to their books, by Dr. Featly, Dr. Goad, Mr. Burton, Ward, Yates, and Rouse, were not only suppressed, but the publishers questioned in the star chamber.

The king put on the same thin disguise with regard to Papists; a proclamation was issued out against priests and Jesuits, and particularly against the bishop of Chalcedon; orders were also sent to the lord-mayor of London, to make search after them, and commit them to prison, but at the same time his majesty appointed commissioners to compound with them for their recusancy; so that instead of being suppressed, they became a branch of the revenue and sir Richard Weston, a notorious Papist, was created earl of Portland, and made lord high-treasurer of England.

When the parliament met according to prorogation, January 20, they began again with grievances of religion; Oliver Cromwell, esq. being of the committee, reported to the house the countenance that was given by Dr. Neile bishop of Winchester, to divines who preached Arminian and Popish doctrine; he mentioned the favours that had been bestowed upon Montague and Manwaring, who had been censured the last sessions of parliament; and added, “If this be the way to church-preferment, what may we expect?” Upon debating the king’s late declaration, the house voted, “that the main end of that declaration was to suppress the Puritan party, and to give liberty to the contrary side.” Several warm and angry speeches were likewise made against the new ceremonies that began now to be introduced into the church, as images of saints and angels, crucifixes, altars, lighted candles, &c.

Mr. Rouse stood up and said, “—I desire it may be considered, what new paintings have been laid upon the old face of the whore of Babylon, to make her show more lovely. I desire it may be considered, how the see of Rome doth eat into our religion, and fret into the very banks and walls of it, the laws and statutes of this realm. I desire we may consider the increase of Arminianism, an error that makes the grace of God lackey after the will of man.—I desire we may look into the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny, for an Arminian is the spawn of a Papist, and if the warmth of favour come upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rose out of the bottomless pit; these men having kindled a fire in our neighbour-country, are now endeavouring to set this kingdom in a flame.”[[58]](#footnote-58)——

Mr. Pym said, “that by the articles set forth 1562, by the catechism set forth in king Edward VI.’s days, by the writings of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr; by the constant professions sealed with the blood of many martyrs, as Cranmer, Ridley, and others; by the thirty-six articles of queen Elizabeth, and by the articles agreed upon at Lambeth as the doctrine of the church of England, which king James sent to Dort, and to Ireland, it appears evidently what is the established religion of the realm. Let us therefore show wherein these late opinions differ from those truths; and what men have been since preferred who have professed the contrary heresies; what pardons they have had for false doctrine; what prohibiting of books and writings against their doctrine, and permitting of such books as have been for them. Let us inquire after the abettors, and after the pardons granted to them that preach the contrary truth before his majesty. It belongs to parliaments to establish true religion, and to punish false. We must know what parliaments have done formerly in religion. Our parliaments have confirmed general councils. In the time of king Henry VIII. the earl of Essex was condemned [by parliament] for countenancing books of heresy. The convocation is but a provincial synod of Canterbury, and cannot bind the whole kingdom. As for York it is distant, and cannot bind us or the laws; and as for the high commission, it is derived from parliament—.”[[59]](#footnote-59)

Sir John Eliot said, “——If there be any difference in opinion concerning the interpretation of the thirty-nine articles, it is said, the bishops and clergy in convocation have power to dispute it, and to order which way they please. A slight thing, that the power of religion should be left to these men! I honour their profession; there are among our bishops such as are fit to be made examples for all ages, who shine in virtue, and are firm for religion; but the contrary faction I like not. I remember a character I have seen in a diary of king Edward VI. where he says of the bishops, that ‘some for age, some for ignorance, some for luxury, and some for Popery, were unfit for discipline and government.’ We see there are some among our bishops that are not orthodox, nor sound in religion as they should be, witness the two bishops complained of the last meeting of this parliament; should we be in their power, I fear our religion would be overthrown. Some of these are masters of ceremonies, and labour to introduce new ceremonies into the church.——Let us go to the ground of our religion, and lay down a rule on which all others may rest, and then inquire after offenders.”[[60]](#footnote-60)

Mr. secretary Cook said, “that the fathers of the church were asleep; but, a little to awaken their zeal, it is fit (says he) that they take notice of that hierarchy that is already established, in competition with their lordships, for they [the Papists] have a bishop consecrated by the pope; this bishop has his subaltern officers of all kinds, as vicars-general, archdeacons, rural deans, apparitors, &c. neither are these nominal or titular officers only, but they all execute their jurisdictions, and make their ordinary visitations throughout the kingdom, keep courts, and determine ecclesiastical causes; and, which is an argument of more consequence, they keep ordinary intelligence by their agents in Rome, and hold correspondence with the nuncios and cardinals both at Brussels and France. Neither are the seculars alone grown to this height, but the regulars are more aetive and dangerous.——Even at this time they intend to hold a concurrent assembly with this parliament.—” After some other speeches of this kind, the house of commons entered into the following vow.

“We, the commons, in parliament assembled, do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the articles of religion which were established by parliament in the thirteenth year of our late queen Elizabeth, which by the public act of the church of England, and by the general and current exposition of the writers of our church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others that differ from us .”[[61]](#footnote-61)

Bishop Laud, in his answer to this protestation, has several remarks. “Is there by this act (says his lordship) any interpretation of the articles or not? If none, to what end is the act? If a sense or interpretation be declared, what authority have laymen to make it? for interpretation of an article belongs to them only that have power to make it.” To which it might be answered, that the commons made no new interpretation of the articles, but avowed for truth the current sense of expositors before that time, in opposition to the modern interpretation of Jesuits and Arminians. But what authority have laymen to make it? Answer. The same that they had in the 13th of Elizabeth to establish them, as the doctrine of the church of England; unless we will say with Mr. Collyer, that neither the sense of the articles, nor the articles themselves, were established in that parliament or in any other.[[62]](#footnote-62) If so, they are no part of the legal constitution, and men may subscribe the words without putting any sense upon them at all: an admirable way to prevent diversity of opinions in matters of faith! But his lordship adds, “that it is against the king’s declaration, which says, we must take the general meaning of them, and not draw them aside any way, but take them in the literal and grammatical sense.”[[63]](#footnote-63) Has the king then a power, without convocation or parliament, to interpret and determine the sense of the articles for the whole body of the clergy? By the general meaning of the articles, the declaration seems to understand no one determined sense at all. Strange! that so learned and wise a body of clergy and laity, in convocation and parliament, should establish a number of articles with this title, “for the avoiding of diversity of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion,” without any one determined sense! The bishop goes on, and excepts against the current sense of expositors, “because they may, and perhaps do, go against the literal sense.” Will his lordship then abide by the literal and grammatical sense! No, but “if an article bear more senses than one, a man may choose what sense his judgment directs him to, provided it be a sense, according to the analogy of faith, till the church determine a [particular] sense; but it is the wisdom of the church to require consent to articles in general as much as may be, and not require assent to particulars.” His lordship had better have spoken out, and said, that it would be the wisdom of the church to require no subscriptions at all. To what straits are men driven to comply with the laws, when their sentiments differ from the literal and grammatical sense of the articles of the church! Mr. Collyer says, they have no established sense; king Charles, in his declaration, that they are to be understood in a general sense,but not to be drawn aside to a particular determined sense; bishop Laud thinks, that if the words will bear more senses than one, a man may choose what sense his judgment directs him to, provided it be a sense, according to the analogy of faith, and all this for avoiding diversity of opinions! But I am afraid this reasoning is too wonderful for the reader.

While the parliament were expressing their zeal against Arminianism and Popery, a new controversy arose, which provoked his majesty to dissolve them, and to resolve to govern without parliaments for the future; for though the king had so lately signed the petition of right in full parliament, he went on with levying money by his royal prerogative. A bill was depending in the house to grant his majesty the duties of tonnage and poundage; but before it was passed, the custom-house-officers seized the goods of three eminent merchants, viz. Mr. Rolls, Mr. Chambers, and Mr. Vassal, for nonpayment. Mr. Chambers was fined £2,000. besides the loss of his goods, and suffered six years imprisonment: Mr. Rolls’s warehouses were locked up, and himself taken out of the house of commons and imprisoned. This occasioned some warm speeches against the custom-house-officers and farmers of the revenues; but the king took all the blame on himself, and sent the house word, that what the officers had done, was by his special direction and command, and that it was not so much their act as his own. This was a new way of covering the unwarrantable proceedings of corrupt ministers, and was said to be the advice of the bishops Laud and Neile; a contrivance that laid the foundation of his majesty’s ruin. It is a maxim in law, that the king can do no wrong, and that all maleadministrations are chargeable upon his ministers; yet now, in order to screen his servants, his majesty will make himself answerable for their conduct. So that if the parliament will defend their rights and properties, they must charge the king personally, who in his own opinion was above law, and accountable for his actions to none but God. It was moved in the house, that notwithstanding the king’s answer, the officers of the customs should be proceeded against, by separating their interests from the king’s; but when the speaker, sir John Finch, was desired to put the question, he refused, saying, the king had commanded the contrary.[[64]](#footnote-64) Upon which the house immediately adjourned to January 25, and were then adjourned by the king’s order to March 2, when meeting again, and requiring the speaker to put the former question, he again refused, and said he had the king’s order to adjourn them to March 16, but they detained him in the chair, not without some tumult and confusion, till they made the following protestation:—

1. “Whosoever shall, by favour or countenance, seem to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, shall be reputed a capital enemy of the kingdom.

2. “Whosoever shall advise the levying the subsidies of tonnage and poundage, not being granted by parliament, shall be reputed a capital enemy.

3. “If any merchant shall voluntarily pay those duties, he shall be reputed a betrayer of the liberties of England, and an enemy of the same.”[[65]](#footnote-65)

The next day warrants were directed to Denzil Hollis, sir John Eliot, William Coriton, Benjamin Valentine, John Selden, Esqrs. and four more of the principal members of the house, to appear before the council on the morrow: four of them appeared accordingly, viz. Mr. Hollis, Eliot, Coriton, and Valentine; who refusing to answer out of parliament for what was said in the house, were committed close prisoners to the Tower. The studies of the rest were ordered to be sealed up, and a proclamation issued for apprehending them; though the parliament not being dissolved, they were actually members of the house. On the 10th of March, the king came to the house of lords, and without sending for the commons, or passing one single act, dissolved the parliament, with a very angry speech against the leading members of the lower house, whom he called vipers, that cast a mist of undutifulness over most of their eyes: “and as those vipers (says his majesty) must look for their reward of punishment; so you, my lords, must justly expect from me that favour that a good king oweth to his loving and faithful nobility.”[[66]](#footnote-66)

The undutifulness of the commons was only their keeping the speaker in the chair, after he had signified that the king had adjourned them, which his majesty had no power of doing, and no king before king James I. pretended to adjourn parliaments, and when he claimed that power, it was complained of as a breach of privilege. It is one thing to prorogue or dissolve a parliament, and another to adjourn it, the latter being the act of the house itself, and the consequence of vesting such a power in the crown might be very fatal; for if the king may adjourn the house in the midst of their debates, or forbid the speaker to put a question when required, it is easy to foresee the whole business of parliament must be under his direction.[[67]](#footnote-67) The members above mentioned were sentenced to be imprisoned during the king’s pleasure; and were accordingly kept under close confinement many years, where Sir John Eliot died a martyr to the liberties of his country.[[68]](#footnote-68) Mr. Hollis was fined a thousand marks, Sir John Eliot £2,000. Valentine £500. and Long two thousand marks.

Great were the murmurings of the people upon this occasion: libels were dispersed against the prime minister Laud; one of which says, “Laud, look to thyself, be assured thy life is sought. As thou art the fountain of wickedness, repent of thy monstrous sins before thou be taken out of this world; and assure thyself, neither God nor the world ean endure such a vile counsellor or whisperer to live.”[[69]](#footnote-69) But to justify these proceedings to the world, his majesty published “a declaration of the causes of dissolving the last parliament.”

The declaration vindicates the king’s taking the duties of tonnage and poundage, from the examples of some of his predecessors, and as agreeable to his kingly honour. It justifies the silencing the predestinarian controversy, and lays the blame of not executing the laws against Papists, upon subordinate officers and ministers in the country: “We profess (says his majesty) that as it is our duty, so it shall be our care, to command and direct well; but it is the part of others to perform the ministerial office; and when we have done our office, we shall account ourself, and all charitable men will account us, innocent, both to God and men; and those that are negligent, we will esteem culpable, both to God and us.” The declaration concludes with a profession that “the king will maintain the true religion of the church of England, without conniving at Popery or schism: that he will maintain the rights and liberties of his subjects, provided they do not misuse their liberty, by turning it to licentiousness, wantonly and frowardly resisting our lawful and necessary authority; for we do expect our subjects should yield as much submission to our royal prerogative, and as ready obedience to our authority and commandments, as has been performed to the greatest of our predecessors. We will not have our ministers terrified by harsh proceedings against them; for as we expect our ministers should obey us, they shall assure themselves we will protect them.”[[70]](#footnote-70)

This declaration not quieting the people, was followed by a proclamation, which put an end to all prospects of recovering the constitution for the future. The proclamation declares his majesty’s royal pleasure, “that spreaders of false reports shall be severely punished; that such as cheerfully go on with their trades, shall have all good encouragement: that he will not overcharge his subjects with any new burdens, but will satisfy himself with the duties received by his royal father, which he neither can nor will dispense with. And whereas, for several ill ends, the calling of another parliament is divulged, his majesty declares, that the late abuse having for the present driven his majesty unwillingly out of that course, he shall account it presumption for any to prescribe any time to his majesty for parliaments, the calling, continuing, and dissolving, of which, is always in the king’s own power.”[[71]](#footnote-71)— Here was an end of the old English constitution, for twelve years. England was now an absolute monarchy: the king’s proclamations and orders of council were the laws of the land; the ministers of state sported themselves in the most wanton acts of power; and the religion, laws, and liberties, of this country lay prostrate and overwhelmed by an inundation of Popery and oppression.

This year died the reverend Dr. John Preston, descended of the family of the Prestons in Lancashire. He was born at Heyford in Northamptonshire, in the parish of Bugbrook, 1587, and was admitted of King’s college, Cambridge, 1604, from whence he was afterward removed to Queen’s college, and admitted fellow in the year 1609.[[72]](#footnote-72) He was an ambitious and aspiring youth, till having received some religious impressions from Mr. Cotton, in a sermon preached by him at St. Clary’s church, he became remarkably serious, and bent all his studies to the service of Christ in the ministry. When the king came to Cambridge, Mr. Preston was appointed to dispute before him: the question was, Whether brutes had reason, or could make syllogisms? Mr. Preston maintained the affirmative; and instanced in a hound, who coming to a place where three ways meet, smells one way and the other; but not finding the scent runs down the third with full cry, concluding that the hare not being gone either of the two first ways, must necessarily be gone the third. The argument had a wonderful effect on the audience, and would have opened a door for Mr. Preston’s preferment, had not his inclinations to Puritanism been a bar in the way. He therefore resolved upon an academical life, and took upon him the care of pupils, for which he was qualified beyond most in the university. Many gentlemen’s sons were committed to his care, who trained them up in the sentiments of the first reformers; for he affected the very style and language of Calvin. When it came to his turn to be catechist, he went through a whole body of divinity with such general acceptance, that the outward chapel was usually crowded with strangers before the fellows came in, which created him envy. Complaint was made to the vice-chancellor of this unusual way of catechising, and that it was not safe to suffer Dr. Preston to be thus adored, unless they had a mind to set up Puritanism, and pull down the hierarchy; it was therefore agreed in the convocation-house, that no stranger, neither townsman nor scholar, should upon any pretence come to those lectures, which were only designed for the members of the college.

There was little preaching in the university at this time, except at St. Mary’s, the lectures at Trinity and St. Andrew’s being prohibited; Mr. Preston therefore, at the request of the townsmen and scholars of other colleges attempted to set up an evening sermon at St. Botolph’s belonging to Queen’s college; but when Dr. Newcomb, commissary to the bishop of Ely, heard of it, he came to the church and forbade it, commanding that evening prayers only should be read; there was a vast crowd, and earnest entreaty that Mr. Preston might preach, at least for that time, but the commissary was inexorable, and to prevent farther importunities, went home with his family; after he was gone, Mr. Preston was prevailed with to preach; and because much time had been spent in debates, they adventured for once to omit the service, that the scholars might be present at their college-prayers. Next day the commissary went to Newmarket, and complained both to the bishop and king; he represented the danger of the hierarchy, and the progress of nonconformity among the scholars, and assured them that Mr. Preston was in such high esteem, that he would carry all before him if he was not thoroughly dealt with. Being called before his superiors, he gave a plain narrative of the fact; and added, that he had no design to affront the bishop or his commissary. The bishop said, the king was informed that he was an enemy to forms of prayer, which Mr. Preston denying, he was ordered to declare his judgment upon that head, in a sermon at St. Botolph’s church, and so was dismissed.

Some time after, king James being at Newmarket, Mr. Preston was appointed to preach before him, which he performed with great applause, having a fluent speech, a commanding voice, and a strong memory, to deliver what he had prepared without the assistance of notes. The king spoke familiarly to him; and though his majesty expressed a dislike to some of his Puritan notions, he commended his opposing the Arminians. And the duke of Buckingham not knowing what friends he might want among the populace, persuaded the king to admit him one of the prince’s chaplains in ordinary, and to wait two months in the year, which he did. Soon after this he was chosen preacher of Lincoln’s inn, and upon the resignation of Dr. Chadderton, master of Emanuel-college, in the year 1622, at which time he took his degree of doctor of divinity. The doctor was a fine gentleman, a complete courtier, and in high esteem with the duke of Buckingham, who thought by his means to ingratiate himself with the Puritans,[[73]](#footnote-73) whose power was growing very formidable in parliament. The duke offered him the bishopric of Gloucester, but the doctor refused, and chose rather the lectureship of Trinity-church, which he kept till his death. By his interest in the duke and the prince, he did considerable service for many silenced ministers; he was in waiting when king James died, and came up with the young king and duke in a close coach to London. But some time after the duke having changed measures, and finding that he could neither gain over the Puritans to his arbitrary designs, nor separate the doctor from their interests, he resolved to shake hands with his chaplain. The doctor foreseeing the storm, was content to retire quietly to his college, where it is apprehended he would have felt some farther effects of the duke’s displeasure, if God in his providence had not cut him out work of a different nature, which engaged all his thoughts to the time of his death.

Dr. Preston lived a single life, being never married; nor had he any cure of souls. He had a strong constitution, which he wore out in his study and in the pulpit. His distemper was a consumption in the lungs, for which, by the advice of physicians, he changed the air several times; but the failure of his appetite, with other symptoms of a general decay, prevailed with him at length to leave off all medicine, and resign himself to the will of God. And being desirous of dying in his native country, and among bis old friends, be retired into Northamptonshire, where he departed this life in a most pious and devout manner, in the forty-first year of his age; and was buried in Fawsley-church, old Mr. Dod, minister of the place, preaching his funeral-sermon to a numerous auditory, July 20, 1628. Mr. Fuller[[74]](#footnote-74) says, “He was an excellent preacher, a subtle disputant, a great politician; so that his foes must confess, that (if not having too little of the dove) he had enough of the serpent. Some will not stick to say, he had parts sufficient to manage the broad-seal, which was offered him, but the conditions did not please. He might have been the duke’s right hand, but his grace finding that he could not bring him nor his party off to his side, he would use him no longer;” which shows him to be an honest man. His practical works and sermons were printed by his own order after his decease.

1. The expression here, whether it be Mr. Neal’s own or that of any writer of the times, is inaccurate, improper, and proceeds upon a wrong notion of the design of baptism. This rite, resting solely on the authority of Christ, refers not to the peculiar sentiments of the church, or the particular party of Christians, amongst whom a person may happen to have it administered to him. It expresseth a profession of Christianity only, and refers exclusively to the authority of its Author, acting in the name of God the Father, and having his ministry sealed by the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The notion of being baptized into the kirk of Scotland, or into the church of England, is entirely repugnant to the reasoning of Paul in 1 Cor. i. who, as Dr. Clarke expresses, “we find was very careful, was very solicitous, not to give any occasion to have it thought, that there was any such thing as the doctrine of Paul, much less any such thing as the doctrine of the church of Corinth or Rome, or of any other than Christ only—in whose name only we were baptized.” Clarke’s Sermons, vol. 4 p. 95. 8vo.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Dr. Grey controverts this assertion of Mr. Neal, and calls it “groundless;” with a view to confute it, he quotes Rymer, Clarendon, and bishop Fleetwood. The first and last authorities go to prove only the king’s firm adherence to Protestantism and the church of England, so far as concerned his own personal profession of religion; the former alleges that the attempt of the court of Spain to convert him to Popery was inefficient; the latter is only a pulpit eulogium to the memory of Charles on the 30th of January. The quotation from lord Clarendon apparently proves more than these authorities; for it asserts, “that no man was more averse from the Romish church than he [*i.* *e.* king Charles] was.” But, to be consistent with himself, his lordship must be understood with a limitation; as speaking of his remoteness from a conformity to Popery in his own belief and practice; not of his disposition towards that religion, as professed by others. Dr. Harris has produced many proofs, that the king was not a Papist himself. But he has also evinced, by many authorities, that professed Papists were favoured, caressed, and preferred at court. The articles of the marriage-treaty, to which he signed and solemnly swore, sanctioned the profession of that religion in his kingdom. The clergy, who enjoyed the smiles of the court, preached in favour of the practices and tenets of Popery. And Popish recusants were not only tolerated, but protected by this prince. See Harris’s Life of Charles I. p. 198 to 204, and from p. 204 to 208. The facts of this nature are also amply stated in “An essay towards attaining a true idea of the character and reign of king Charles I.” chap. 9. On these grounds Mr. Neal is fully vindicated; for he speaks, it should be observed, not of the king’s being a Papist, but of his “leaning towards Popery.” But it might be sufficient to quote, against Dr. Grey, even lord Clarendon only, who tells us, “that the Papists were upon the matter, absolved from the severest parts of the law, and dispensed with for the gentlest. They were looked upon as good subjects at court, and as good neighbours iu the country; all the restraints and reproaches of former times being forgotten.” His lordship expatiates largely on the favours they received, aud on the boldness they assumed. History of the Rebellion, vol. 1. p. 148, 8vo. edit, of 1707.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In confutation of this assertion, Dr. Grey quotes Rushworth; who says, that at the court of Spain “prince Charles gained a universal love, and earned it, from first to last, with the greatest affability.” The doctor did not observe that his authority was not to the point; for Mr. Neal speaks of Charles’s deportment after he had been in Spain, and of his general temper: Rushworth’s delineation is confined to his conduct at court, where he was treated with all imaginable respect; and when the object of his visit would of course animate a youth to good-humour, politeness, and gallantry. Mr. Neal is fully supported by many authorities, which the reader may see collected by Dr. Harris, p. 68—72; and an essay towards attaining a true idea, &c. chap. 1.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 81. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. “Whoever sees her charming portrait at Windsor (says Mr. Granger) will cease to admire at her great influence over the king.” The Biographical History of England, vol. 2. p. 96, 8vo.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. As the demand to have the solemnity of the coronation performed by the bishops of her own religion was refused, and such was her bigotry it would not permit her to join in our church-ceremonies; she appeared therefore as a spectator only on that occasion. Granger, as before, vol. 2. p. 96, note.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 837. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. “As to his preferments in the state (says Dr. Grey), I should be glad to know what they were.” Though the doctor, who was ignorant of them, is now out of the reach of a reply; for the information of the reader they shall be mentioned. In 1635 he was put into the great committee of trade; and on the death of the earl of Portland, was made one of the commissioners of the treasury and revenue; “which (says lord Clarendon) he had reason to be sorry for, because it engaged him in civil business and matters of state.” History of the Rebellion, vol. 1. p. 98, 8vo. 1707. British Biography, vol. 4. p. 269.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 444. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. To refute this account of the cause of Laud’s preferment, Dr. Grey quotes Mr. Wharton. The circumstance in itself is of no importance to the credit or design of Mr. Neal's history. And the passage even admits the fact that Laud owed his preferments to bishop Williams's solicitations, on the authority of Laud’s diary and bishop Hacket, Williams’s biographer; but the drift of Mr. Wharton is to exculpate Laud from the charge of ingratitude to bishop Williams on this ground; that the latter, in the service he rendered the former, was not actuated by kindness, but by selfish and interested views. This does not confute, in any degree, Mr. Neal: who says nothing about the motives by which bishop Williams was governed. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 99. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Bishop Warburton censures Mr. Neal, for not informing his reader that Noy was a great lawyer. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 71, 73, 74. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Clarendon, vol. I. p. 74.         [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Ibid. p. 68, 69.           [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Ibid. p. 283. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Rushworth, p. 183‒186. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Rushworth, p. 173. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
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