

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

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

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

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

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

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

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

1837.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF KING CHARLES I. TO THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP ABBOT.

THE ancient and legal government of England, by king, lords, and commons, being now suspended by the royal will and pleasure, his majesty resolved to supply the necessities of the state, by such other methods as his council should advise, who gave a loose to their actions, being no longer afraid of a parliamentary inquiry, and above the reach of ordinary justice. Instead of the authority of king and parliament, all public affairs were directed by proclamations of the king and council, which had the force of so many laws, and were bound upon the subject under the severest penalties. They levied the duties of tonnage and poundage, and laid what other imposts they thought proper upon merchandise, which they let out to farm to private persons; the number of monopolies was incredible. there was no branch of the subject's property that the ministry could dispose of, but was bought and sold. They raised above £1,000,000. a year by taxes on soap, salt, candles, wine, cards, pins, leather, coals, &c. even to the sole gathering of rags. Grants were given out for weighing hay and straw within three miles of London, for gauging red-herring-barrels, and butter-casks, for marking iron, and sealing lace;¹ with a great many others, which being purchased of the crown, must be paid for by the subject. His majesty claimed a right in cases of necessity (of which necessity himself was the sole judge) to raise money by ship-writs, or royal mandates, directed to the sheriffs of the several counties, to levy on the subject the several sums of money therein demanded, for the maintenance and support of the royal navy. The like was demanded for the royal army, by the name of coat and conduct money, when they were to march; and when they were in quarters, the men were billeted upon private houses. Many were put to death by martial law, who ought to have been tried by the laws of the land. and others by the same martial law were exempted from the punishment which by law they deserved. Large sums of money were raised by commissions under the great seal, to compound for depopulations, for nuisances in building between high and low water mark, for pretended encroachments on the forests, &c. beside the exorbitant fines of the star-chamber and high-commission court; and the extraordinary projects of loans, benevolences, and free gifts. Such was the calamity of the times, that no man could call anything his own longer than the king pleased; or might speak or write

¹ Stevens's Historical Account of all Taxes, p. 183, 184. 2d edit.

against these proceedings, without the utmost hazard of his liberty and estate.

The church was governed by the like arbitrary and illegal methods; Dr. Laud, bishop of London, being prime minister, pursued his wild scheme of uniting the two churches of England and Rome,¹ without the least regard to the rights of conscience, or the laws of the land, and very seldom to the canons of the church, bearing down all who opposed him with unrelenting severity and rigour. To make way for this union, the churches were not only to be repaired, but ornamented with pictures, paintings, images, altar-pieces, &c. the forms of public worship were to be decorated with a number of pompous rites and ceremonies, in imitation of the church of Rome: and the Puritans, who were the professed enemies of everything that looked like Popery, were to be suppressed or driven out of the land. To accomplish the latter, his lordship presented the king with certain considerations for settling the church, which were soon after published, with some little variation, under the title of “Instructions to the two archbishops, concerning certain orders to be observed, and put in execution by the several bishops.”

Here his majesty commands them to see, that his declaration for silencing the predestinarian controversy be strictly observed. and that special care be taken of the lectures and afternoon sermons, in their several dioceses, concerning which he is pleased to give the following instructions.²

1. “That in all parishes the afternoon sermons be turned into catechising by question and answer, where there is not some great cause to break this ancient and profitable order.

2. “That every lecturer read divine service before lectures in surplice and hood.

¹ Dr. Grey is much displeas'd with Mr. Neal for this representation of Laud's views. but without bringing any direct evidence to refute it, he appeals to the answer of Fisher, and the testimonies of sir Edward Deering and Limborch, to show, that the archbishop was not a Papist. This may be admitted, and the proofs of it are also adduced by Dr. Harris [Life of Charles I. p. 207], yet it will not be so easy to acquit Laud of a partiality for the church, though not the court, of Rome, according to the distinction May makes in his “Parliamentary History.” It will not be so easy to clear him of the charge of symbolising with the church of Rome in its two leading features, superstition and intolerance. Under his primacy the church of England, it is plain, assumed a very Popish appearance. “Not only the pomps of ceremonies were daily increased, and innovations of great scandal brought into the church. but, in point of doctrine, many fair approaches made towards Rome. Even Heylin says, the doctrines are altered in many things. as, for example, the pope not antichrist, pictures, free-will, &c.. the thirty-nine articles seeming patient, if not ambitious also, of some Catholic sense.”----May's Parliamentary History, p. 22, 23; and Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 252.—ED.

² A liberal mind will reprobate these instructions, as evading argument, preventing discussion and inquiry, breathing the spirit of intolerance, and persecution, and indicating timidity.—ED.

3. "That where there are lectures in market-towns, they be read by grave and orthodox divines. and that they preach in gowns, and not in cloaks, as too many do use.

4. "That no lecturer be admitted, that is not ready and willing to take upon him a living with cure of souls.

5. "That the bishops take order, that the sermons of the lecturers be observed.

6. "That none under noblemen, and men qualified by law, keep a private chaplain.

7. "That care be taken, that the prayers and catechisings be frequented, as well as sermons." Of all which his majesty requires an account once a year.

By virtue of these instructions, the bishop of London summoned before him all ministers and lecturers in and about the city, and in a solemn speech insisted on their obedience. He also sent letters to his archdeacons, requiring them to send him lists of the several lecturers within their archdeaconries, as well in places exempt as not exempt, with the places where they preached, and their quality or degree; as also the names of such gentlemen, who being not qualified, kept chaplains in their own houses. His lordship required them farther, to leave a copy of the king's instructions concerning lecturers with the parson of every parish, and to see that they were duly observed.

These lecturers were chiefly Puritans, who not being satisfied with a full conformity, so as to take upon them a cure of souls, only preached in the afternoons, being chosen and maintained by the people. They were strict Calvinists, warm and affectionate preachers, and distinguished themselves by a religious observance of the Lord's day, by a bold opposition to Popery and the new ceremonies, and by an uncommon severity of life. Their manner of preaching gave the bishop a distaste to sermons, who was already of opinion that they did more harm than good, insomuch that on a fast-day for the plague then in London, prayers were ordered to be read in all churches, but not a sermon to be preached, lest the people should wander from their own parishes. The lecturers had very popular talents, and drew great numbers of people after them. Bishop Laud would often say, "they were the most dangerous enemies of the state, because by their prayers and sermons they awakened the people's disaffection, and therefore must be suppressed."

Good old archbishop Abbot was of another spirit, but the reins were taken out of his hands. He had a good opinion of the lecturers, as men who had the Protestant religion at heart, and would fortify their hearers against

the return of Popery.¹ When Mr. Palmer, lecturer of St. Alphege in Canterbury, was commanded to desist from preaching by the archdeacon, because he drew great numbers of factious people after him, and did not wear the surplice, the archbishop authorized him to continue: the like he did by Mr. Udnay of Ashford, for which he was complained of, as not enforcing the king's instructions, whereby the commissioners, as they say, were made a scorn to the factious, and the archdeacon's jurisdiction inhibited. But in the diocese of London bishop Laud proceeded with the utmost severity. Many lecturers were put down, and such as preached against Arminianism or the new ceremonies, were suspended and silenced. among whom were, the reverend Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, Mr. Daniel Rogers of Wethersfield, Mr. Hooker of Chelmsford, Mr. White of Knightsbridge, Mr. Archer, Mr. William Martin, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Jones, Mr. Dod, Mr. Hildersham, Mr. Ward, Mr. Saunders, Mr. James Gardiner, Mr. Foxley, and many others.

The reverend Mr. Bernard, lecturer of St. Sepulchre's, London, having used this expression in his prayer before sermon, "Lord open the eyes of the queen's majesty, that she may see Jesus Christ, whom she has pierced with her infidelity, superstition, and idolatry,"² was summoned before the high-commission January 28, and upon his humble submission was dismissed; but some time after, in his sermon at St. Mary's in Cambridge, speaking offensive words against Arminianism and the new ceremonies, bishop Laud sent for a copy of his sermon, and having cited him before the high-commission, required him to make an open recantation of what he had said, which his conscience not suffering him to do, he was suspended from his ministry, excommunicated, fined £1,000. condemned in costs of suit, and committed to New-prison, where he lay several months, being cruelly used, and almost starved for want of necessaries, of which he complained to the bishop in sundry letters, but could get no relief unless he would recant. Mr. Bernard offered to confess his sorrow and penitence for any oversights, or unbecoming expressions in his sermons, which would not be accepted; so that in conclusion he was utterly ruined.

Mr. Charles Chauncey, minister of Ware, having said in a sermon, "that the preaching of the gospel would be suppressed, and that there was much Atheism, Popery, Arminianism, and heresy, crept into the church," was questioned for it in the high-commission, and not dismissed till he had made an open recantation, which we shall meet with hereafter.

Mr. Peter Smart, one of the prebendaries of Durham and minister of that city, was imprisoned by the high-commission of York this summer, for

¹ Prynne's Introd. p. 94. 361. 373.

² Rushworth, vol. 2. p. 32. 140. Prynne, p. 365. 367.

a sermon preached from these words, “I hate all those that love superstitious vanities, but thy law do I love;” in which he took occasion to speak against images and pictures, and the late pompous innovations. He was confined four months before the commissioners exhibited any articles against him, and five more before any proctor was allowed him. From York he was carried up to Lambeth, and from thence back again to York, and at length was deprived of his prebend, degraded, excommunicated, fined £500 and committed close prisoner, where he continued eleven years, till he was set at liberty by the long parliament in 1640. He was a person of a grave and reverend aspect,¹ but died soon after his release: the severity of a long imprisonment having contributed to the impairing his constitution.²

The king’s instructions and the violent measures of the prime minister, brought a great deal of business into the spiritual courts; one or other of the Puritan ministers was every week suspended or deprived, and their families driven to distress. nor was there any prospect of relief, the clouds gathering every day thicker over their heads, and threatening a violent storm. This put them upon projecting a farther settlement in New England, where they might be delivered from the hands of their oppressors, and enjoy the free liberty of their consciences; which gave birth to a second grand colony in North America, commonly known by the name of the Massachusetts-bay. Several persons of quality and substance about the city of London engaging in the design, obtained a charter dated March 4, 1628–9, wherein the gentlemen and merchants therein named, and all who should thereafter join them, were constituted a body corporate and politic, by the name of the governor and company of the Massachusetts-bay in New England. They

¹ Fuller’s Church History, b. 2. p. 173.

² “Here the historian (remarks bishop Warburton) was much at a loss for his confessor’s good qualities, while he is forced to take up with his grave and reverend aspect.” It might have screened this passage from his lordship’s sneer and sarcasm, that these are the words of Fuller, whose history furnished the whole paragraph, and whose description of Mr. Smart goes into no other particulars. His lordship certainly did not wish Mr. Neal to have drawn a character from his own invention. not to urge that the countenance is the index of the mind. It appears, as Dr. Grey observes, that the proceedings against Smart commenced in the high-commission court in Durham. See Wood’s Athenæ Oxon. vol. 2, p. 11. The doctor, and Nelson in his Collections, vol. 1. p. 518, 519, produce some paragraphs from Smart’s sermon to show the strain and spirit of it. There was printed a virulent tract at Durham, 1736, entitled, “An illustration of Mr. Neal’s History of the Puritans, in the article of Peter Smart, A. M.” It is a detail of the proceedings against Smart, and of subsequent proceedings in parliament against Dr. Cosins upon the complaint of Smart; whom the author aims to represent in a very unfavourable point of view; but without necessity, as the very persecution of him shews, that he must have been very offensive to those who were admirers of the superstitions and ceremonies against which he inveighed. He was afterward not only set at liberty, but by the order of the lords, in 1642, was restored to his prebend in Durham, and was presented to the vicarage of Aycliff in the same diocese. Nelson’s Collections, vol. 2. p. 406. The Puritans, by whom he was esteemed a protomartyr, it is said, raised £400 a year for him by a subscription. Granger’s History of England vol. 2. p. 177.—ED.

were empowered to elect their own governor, deputy-governor, and magistrates, and to make such laws as they should think fit for the good of the plantation, not repugnant to the laws of England. Free liberty of conscience was likewise granted to all who should settle in those parts, to worship God in their own way.¹ The new planters being all Puritans, made their application to the reverend Mr. Higginson, a silenced minister in Leicestershire, and to Mr. Skelton, another silenced minister of Lincolnshire, to be their chaplains, desiring them to engage as many of their friends as were willing to embark with them. The little fleet that went upon this expedition, consisted of six sail of transports, from four to twenty guns, with about three hundred and fifty passengers, men, women, and children. They carried with them one hundred and fifteen head of cattle, as horses, mares, cows, &c. forty-one goats, six pieces of cannon for a fort, with muskets, pikes, drums, colours, and a large quantity of ammunition and provision. The fleet sailed May 11, 1629, and arrived the 24th of June following, at a place called by the natives, Neumkeak but by the new planters Salem, which in the Hebrew language signifies peace.

Religion being the chief motive of their retreating into these parts, that was settled in the first place. August the 6th being appointed for the solemnity of forming themselves into a religions society, the day was spent in fasting and prayer; and thirty persons who desired to be of the communion, severally in the presence of the whole congregation, declared their consent to a confession of faith which Mr. Higginson had drawn up, and signed the following covenant with their hands.

“We covenant with our Lord, and one another. We bind ourselves, in the presence of God, to walk together in all his ways, according as he is pleased to reveal himself to us in his blessed word of truth, and do profess to walk as follows, through the power and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.²

“We avouch the Lord to be our God, and ourselves to be his people, in the truth and simplicity of our spirits.

“We give ourselves to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the word of his grace, for the teaching, ruling, and sanctifying us, in matters of worship and conversation, resolving to reject all canons and constitutions of men in worship.

“We promise to walk with our brethren with all watchfulness and tenderness, avoiding jealousies, suspicions, backbitings, censurings, provokings, secret risings of spirit against them. but in all offences to follow the rule of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to bear and forbear, give and forgive, as he hath taught us.

¹ This is a mistake: the charter did not once mention liberty of conscience or toleration. See Gordon's History of the American War, vol. I. p. 19.—ED.

² Neal's History of New England, p. 126.

“In public or private we will willingly do nothing to the offence of the church, but will be willing to take advice for ourselves and ours, as occasion shall be presented.

“We will not in the congregation be forward, either to show our own gifts and parts in speaking, or scrupling, or in discovering the weaknesses or failings of our brethren. but attend an ordinary call thereunto, knowing how much the Lord may be dishonoured, and his gospel, and the profession of it, slighted by our distempers, and weaknesses in public.

“We bind ourselves to study the advancement of the gospel in all truth and peace, both in regard of those that are within or without, no way slighting our sister-churches, but using their counsel as need shall be. not laying a stumbling block before any, no, not the Indians, whose good we desire to promote, and so to converse as we may avoid the very appearance of evil.

“We do hereby promise to carry ourselves in all lawful obedience to those that are over us in church or commonwealth, knowing how well-pleasing it will be to the Lord, that they should have encouragement in their places by our not grieving their spirits by our irregularities.

“We resolve to approve ourselves to the Lord in our particular callings, shunning idleness, as the bane of any state; nor will we deal hardly or oppressingly with any, wherein we are the Lord’s stewards.

“Promising also, to the best of our ability, to teach our children and servants the knowledge of God, and of his will, that they may serve him also. And all this not by any strength of our own, but by the Lord Jesus Christ, whose blood we desire may sprinkle this our covenant made in his name.”

After this they chose Mr. Skelton their pastor, Mr. Higginson their teacher, and Mr. Houghton their ruling elder, who were separated to their several offices by the imposition of the hands of some of the brethren appointed by the church to that service.¹ The first winter proved a fatal one to the infant colony, carrying off above one hundred of their company, and among the rest Mr. Houghton their elder, and Mr. Higginson their teacher, the latter of whom not being capable of undergoing the fatigues of a new settlement, fell into a hectic, and died in the forty-third year of his age. Mr. Higginson had been educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge, proceeding M. A., being afterward parson of one of the five churches in Leicester, where he continued for some years, till he was deprived for nonconformity; but such were his talents for the pulpit, that after his suspension, the town obtained liberty from bishop Williams to choose him for their lecturer, and maintained him by their voluntary contributions, till Laud being at the head

¹ Mather’s Hist. New England, b. 3. p. 71. 76.

of the church-affairs, he was articled against in the high-commission, and expected every hour a sentence of perpetual imprisonment; this induced him to accept of an invitation to remove to New England, which cost him his life. Mr. Skelton, the other minister, was a Lincolnshire divine, who being silenced for nonconformity, accepted of a like invitation, and died of the hardships of the country, August 2, 1634. From this small beginning is the Massachuset province grown to the figure it now makes in the American world.

Next summer the governor went over with a fresh recruit of two hundred ministers, gentlemen, and others, who were forced out of their native country by the heat of the Laudean persecution. Upon embarkation they left behind them a paper, which was soon after published, entitled, "The humble request of his majesty's loyal subjects, the governor and company lately gone for New England, to the rest of their brethren in and of the church of England, for the obtaining of their prayers, and removal of suspicions and misconstructions of their intentions." Wherein they entreat the reverend fathers and brethren of the church of England, to recommend them to the mercies of God in their constant prayers, as a new church now springing out of their bowels: "for you are not ignorant (say they) that the Spirit of God stirred up the apostle Paul to make a continual mention of the church of Philippi, which was a colony from Rome. Let the same Spirit, we beseech you, put you in mind, that are the Lord's remembrancers, to pray for us without ceasing; and what goodness you shall extend to us, in this or any other Christian kindness, we, your brethren in Christ, shall labour to repay in what duty we are or shall be able to perform. promising, so far as God shall enable us, to give him no rest on your behalf, wishing our heads and hearts may be fountains of tears for your everlasting welfare, when we shall be in our poor cottages in the wilderness, overshadowed with the spirit of supplication, through the manifold necessities and tribulations which may not altogether unexpectedly, nor, we hope, unprofitably befall us."

When it appeared that the planters could subsist in their new settlement, great numbers of their friends with their families flocked after them every summer. In the succeeding twelve years of archbishop Laud's administration, there went over about four thousand planters,¹ who laid the foundation of several little towns and villages up and down the country, carrying over with them, in materials, money, and cattle, &c. not less than to the value of £192,000, besides the merchandise intended for traffic with the Indians. Upon the whole, it has been computed, that the four settlements of New England, viz. Plymouth, the Massachusets-bay,

¹ Mather's Hist. N. E. b. 1. p. 17. 23.

Connecticut, and Newhaven, all which were accomplished before the beginning of the civil wars, drained England of four or five hundred thousand pounds in money (a very great sum in those days), and if the persecution of the Puritans had continued twelve years longer, it is thought that a fourth part of the riches of the kingdom would have passed out of it through this channel.

The chief leaders of the people into these parts were the Puritan ministers, who being hunted from one diocese to another, at last chose this wilderness for their retreat, which has proved (through the overruling providence of God) a great accession to the strength and commerce of these kingdoms. I have before me a list of seventy-seven divines, who became pastors of sundry little churches and congregations in that country before the year 1640, all of whom were in orders in the church of England. The reader will meet with an account of some of them in the course of this history. and I must say, though they were not all of the first rank for deep and extensive learning, yet they had a better share of it than most of the neighbouring clergy: and, which is of more consequence, they were men of strict sobriety and virtue; plain, serious, affectionate preachers, exactly conformable in sentiment to the doctrinal articles of the church of England, and took a great deal of pains to promote Christian knowledge, and a reformation of manners in their several parishes.

To return to England. Though Mr. Davenant, the learned bishop of Salisbury, had declared for the doctrine of universal redemption at the synod of Dort, he was this year brought into trouble for touching upon the point of predestination,¹ in his Lent sermon before the king, on Romans vi. 23, "The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." This was construed as a contempt of the king's injunctions, for which his lordship was two days after summoned before the privy council, where he presented himself upon his knees, and so had continued, for any favour he received from any of his own function then present; but the temporal lords bade him rise and stand to his defence. The accusation was managed by Dr. Harsnet, archbishop of York; Laud walking by all the while in silence, without speaking a word. Harsnet put him in mind of his obligations to king James; of the piety of his present majesty's instructions; and then aggravated his contempt of them with great vehemence and acrimony. Bishop Davenant replied with mildness, that he was sorry that an established doctrine of the church should be so distasted. that he had preached nothing but what was expressly contained in the seventeenth article, and was ready to justify the truth of it. It was replied, that the doctrine was not gainsaid, but the king had commanded these questions

¹ Fuller, b. 11. p. 138.

should not be debated, and therefore his majesty took it more offensively that any should do it in his own hearing. The bishop replied, that he never understood that his majesty had forbidden the handling any doctrine comprised in the articles of the church, but only the raising new questions, or putting a new sense upon them, which he never should do; that in the king's declaration all the thirty-nine articles are confirmed, among which the seventeenth of predestination is one; that all ministers are obliged to subscribe to the truth of this article, and to continue in the true profession of that as well as the rest; the bishop desired it might be shown wherein he had transgressed his majesty's commands, when he had kept himself within the bounds of the article, and had moved no new or curious questions. To which it was replied, that it was the king's pleasure, that for the peace of the church these high questions might be forborne. The bishop then said, he was sorry he understood not his majesty's intention, and that for the time to come he would conform to his commands.¹ Upon this he was dismissed without farther trouble, and was after some time admitted to kiss the king's hand, who did not fail to remind him that the doctrine of predestination was too big for the people's understanding, and therefore he was resolved not to give leave for discussing that controversy in the pulpit. Hereupon the bishop retired, and was never afterward in favour at court.

Soon after Mr. Madye, lecturer of Christ-church, London, was cited before the high-commission, and [March 10, 1630] was, by act of court, prohibited to preach any more within the diocese of London, because he had disobeyed the king's declaration, by preaching on predestination. Dr. Cornelius Burges, Mr. White, the famous Dr. Prideaux, Mr. Hobbes of Trinity-college, and Mr. Cook of Brazen-nose, with others, suffered on the same account.

But Dr. Alexander Leighton, a Scots divine, and father of the worthy and celebrated prelate of that name, so highly commended by bishop Burnet in the "History of his Life and Times," met with severe usage in the star-chamber, for venturing to write against the hierarchy of the church.² This divine had published, during the last session of parliament, an "Appeal to the Parliament; or, Zion's Plea against Prelacy,"³ wherein he speaks not

¹ Prynne, p. 173. 876.

² Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 55-57.

³ Dr. Harris, who had read by far the greatest part of this piece, says, that "it was written with spirit, and more sense and learning than the writers of that stamp usually showed in their productions;" and adds, "I cannot for my life see any thing in it deserving so heavy a censure." Life of Charles I. p. 225. His calling the queen "a daughter of Heth," as Mr. Pierce observes, meant no more than that she was a Papist. Bishop Tillotson afterward used a not much better expression concerning foreign Popish princes, without giving any umbrage, in styling them "the people of these abominations." Such language had much countenance from the taste and spirit of the age. Whitelocke, as well as Heylin, represents Dr. Leighton as charged with exciting the parliament to kill all the bishops, and

only with freedom, but with very great rudeness and indecency against bishops; calling them “men of blood,” and saying, “that we do not read of a greater persecution and higher indignities done towards God’s people in any nation than in this, since the death of queen Elizabeth.” He calls the prelacy of the church “antichristian.” He declaims vehemently against the canons and ceremonies; and adds, that “the church has her laws from the Scripture, and that no king may make laws for the house of God.” He styles the queen a daughter of Heth, and concludes with saying, what a pity it is that so ingenious and tractable a king should be so monstrously abused by the bishops, to the undoing of himself and his subjects. Now though the warmth of these expressions can no ways be justified, yet let the reader consider whether they bear any proportion to the sentence of the court. The cause was tried June 4, 1630. The defendant, in his answer, owned the writing of the book, denying any ill intention; his design being only to lay these things before the next parliament for their consideration. Nevertheless, the court adjudged unanimously, that for this offence “the doctor should be committed to the prison of the Fleet for life, and pay a fine of £10,000.; that the high-commission should degrade him from his ministry; and that then he should be brought to the pillory at Westminster, while the court was sitting, and be whipped; after whipping, be set upon the pillory a convenient time, and have one of his ears cut off, one side of his nose slit, and be branded in the face with a double S. S. for a sower of sedition: that then he should be carried back to prison, and after a few days be pilloried a second time in Cheapside, and be there likewise whipped, and have the other side of his nose slit, and his other ear cut off, and then be shut up in close prison for the remainder of his life.” Bishop Laud pulled off his cap while this merciless sentence was pronouncing, and gave God thanks for it!

Between passing the sentence and execution, the doctor made his escape from prison, but was retaken in Bedfordshire, and brought back to the Fleet. On Friday, November 6, part of the sentence was executed upon him, says bishop Laud in his diary, after this manner: “He was severely whipped before he was put in the pillory. 2. Being set in the pillory, he had

smite them under the fifth rib; and other writers have repeated the accusation: a circumstance not noticed by Mr. Neal. It appears to be ungrounded, for Mr. Pierce could not find it in the books, but only a call on the parliament utterly to root out the hierarchy. Nor did it form any one of the articles of information against Dr. Leighton in the star-chamber, Pierce’s *Vindication*, p. 177; and Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 55. It greatly aggravated the injustice and cruelty of the sentence passed on him; that his book was printed for the use of the parliament only, and not in England, but in Holland. The heads were previously sanctioned by the approbation of five hundred persons under their hands, whereof some were members of parliament. And when the parliament was dissolved he returned, without bringing any copies of it into the land, but made it his special care to suppress them. A letter from General Ludlow to Dr. Hollingworth, printed at Amsterdam, 1692, p. 23.—ED.

one of his ears cut off. 3. One side of his nose slit. 4. Branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron with the letters S. S. On that day sevensnight, his sores upon his back, ear, nose, and face, being not yet cured, he was whipped again at the pillory in Cheapside, and had the remainder of his sentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, slitting the other side of his nose, and branding the other cheek.”¹ He was then carried back to prison, where he continued in close confinement for ten years, till he was released by the long parliament.² The doctor was between forty and fifty years of age, of a low stature, a fair complexion, and well known for his learning and other abilities: but his long and close confinement had so impaired his health, that when he was released he could hardly walk, see, or hear. The sufferings of this learned man moved the people’s compassion; and, I believe, the records of the inquisition can hardly furnish an example of equal severity.

To make the distance between the church and the Puritans yet wider, and the terms of conformity more difficult, bishop Laud introduced sundry pompous innovations in imitation of Popery, that had no foundation in the laws of the realm, or the canons of the church. These were enforced both upon clergy and laity, with all the terrors of the high commission, to the ruin of many families, and the raising very great disturbances in all parts of the kingdom.

St. Katherine Creed church in the city of London, having been lately repaired, was suspended from all divine service till it was again consecrated; the formality of which being very extraordinary, may give us an idea of the superstition of this prelate. On Sunday, January 16, 1630, bishop Laud came thither about nine in the morning, attended with several of the high commission, and some civilians.³ At his approach to the west door of the church, which was shut and guarded by halberdiers, some who were appointed for that purpose, cried with a loud voice, “Open, open, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in;” and presently the doors being opened, the bishop with some doctors and principal men entered. As soon as they were come within the place, his lordship fell down upon his knees, and with eyes lifted up, and his arms spread abroad, said, “This place is holy; the ground is holy: in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy.” Then walking up the middle aisle towards the chancel, he took up some of the dust, and threw it into the air several times. When he approached near the rail of the communion-table, he bowed towards it five or six times, and returning, went round the church with his attendants in procession, saying first the hundredth, and then the

¹ Rushworth’s Collections, vol. 1. p. 57, 58.

² Pierce, p. 179–181.

³ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 77.

nineteenth psalm, as prescribed by the Roman pontificale. He then read several collects, in one of which he prays God to accept of that beautiful building, and concludes thus: “We consecrate this church, and separate it unto thee as holy ground, not to be profaned any more to common use.” In another he prays, “that all that should hereafter be buried within the circuit of this holy and sacred place, may rest in their sepulchres in peace, till Christ’s coming to judgment, and may then rise to eternal life and happiness.”¹ After this, the bishop, sitting under a cloth of state in the aisle of the chancel, near the communion table, took a written book in his band, and pronounced curses upon those who should thereafter profane that holy place by musters of soldiers, or keeping profane law-courts, or carrying burdens through it, and at the end of every curse he bowed to the east, and said, “Let all the people say, Amen.” When the curses were ended, which were about twenty, he pronounced a like number of blessings upon all who had any hand in framing and building of that sacred and beautiful edifice, and on those who had given or should hereafter give, any chalices, plate, ornaments, or other utensils; and at the end of every blessing he bowed to the east, and said, “Let all the people say, Amen.” After this followed the sermon, and then the sacrament, which the bishop consecrated, and administered after the following manner:—

As he approached the altar, he made five or six low bows, and coming up to the side of it, where the bread and wine were covered, he bowed seven times; then, after reading many prayers, he came near the bread, and gently lifting up the corner of the napkin, beheld it, and immediately letting fall the napkin, retreated hastily a step or two, and made three low obeisances. His lordship then advanced, and having uncovered the bread bowed three times as before; then laid his hand on the cup, which was full of wine, with a cover upon it, which having let go, he stepped back, and bowed three times towards it; then came near again, and lifting up the cover of the cup, looked into it, and seeing the wine, he let fall the cover again, retired back, and bowed as before: after which the elements were consecrated, and the bishop, having first received, gave it to some principal men in their surplices, hoods, and tippetts; towards the conclusion, many prayers being said, the solemnity of the consecration ended.

He consecrated St. Giles’s church in the same manner, which had been repaired, and part of it new built in his predecessor’s (bishop Mountain) time.² Divine service had been performed, and the sacrament administered in it for three or four years since that time without exception: but as soon as Laud was advanced to the bishopric of London, he interdicted the church,

¹ Prynne’s Complete History, p. 114.

² Prynne Cant. Doom. p. 117.

and prohibited divine service therein, till it should be reconsecrated, which is more than even the canon law requires. Sundry other chapels and churches, which had been built long since, were, by the bishop's direction, likewise shut up till they were consecrated in this manner; as Immanuel-chapel in Cambridge, built 1584, Sidney-college chapel, built 1596, and several others.

This method of consecrating churches was new to the people of England, and in the opinion of the first reformers superstitious and absurd; for though it is reasonable there should be public buildings reserved and set apart for public worship, and that at the first opening of them, prayers should be offered for a divine blessing on the ordinances of Christ, that may at any time be administered in them; yet have we not the least ground to believe that bishops, or any other dignitaries of the church, can, by their declaration or forms of prayer, hallow the building, or make the ground holy, or introduce a divine presence or glory into the place, as was in the temple of old: where is their commission? or what example have we of this kind in the New Testament? The synagogues of the Jews were not consecrated in this manner; nor was the temple of Solomon consecrated by a priest, but by a king. Our Saviour tells his disciples, "that wheresoever two or three of them should be gathered together in his name, he would be in the midst of them;" and the woman of Samaria, "that the hour was coming, when neither at that mountain, nor at Jerusalem, they should worship the Father." Besides, the changes made by time and various accidents in towns and cities, render it impossible to prevent the alienation or profanation of holy ground; for to look no farther than the city of London, would it not be very hard if all the curses that bishop Laud pronounced in Creed-church, should rest upon those who live in houses built by act of parliament, in places where there were consecrated churches or churchyards before the fire of London? Archbishop Parker, therefore, in his "*Antiquitates Ecclesiae Britan.*" p. 85, 86, condemns this practice as superstitious; nor was there any form for it in the public offices of the church. But this being objected to archbishop Laud at his trial, as an evidence of his inclinations to Popery; we shall there see his grace's defence, with the learned reply of the house of commons, concerning the antiquity of consecrating churches.

A proclamation had been published last year, "commanding the archbishops and bishops to take special care that the parish-churches in their several dioceses, being places consecrated to the worship of God, be kept in decent repair, and to make use of the power of the ecclesiastical court to oblige the parishioners to this part of their duty."¹ The judges were

¹ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 28.

also required not to interrupt this good work, by too easily granting prohibitions from the spiritual courts. It seems, sundry churches since the reformation were fallen to decay; and some that had been defaced by the pulling down of images, and other Popish relics, had not been decently repaired, the expense being too heavy for the poorer country parishes; it was therefore thought necessary to oblige them to their duty; and under colour of this proclamation, Laud introduced many of the trappings and decorations of Popery, and punished those ministers in the high-commission court, that ventured to write or preach against them.

His lordship began with his own cathedral of St. Paul's, for repairing and beautifying of which a subscription and contribution were appointed over the whole kingdom. Several houses and shops adjoining to the cathedral were, by injunction of council, ordered to be pulled down, and the owners to accept of a reasonable satisfaction: but if they would not comply, the sheriff of London was required to see them demolished. The church of St. Gregory was pulled down, and the inhabitants assigned to Christ-church, where they were to assemble for the future. The bishop's heart was in this work, and to support the expense, he gave way to many oppressions and unjustifiable methods of raising money, by compositions with recusants, commutations of penance exorbitant fines in the star-chamber and high-commission, insomuch that it became a proverb, that St. Paul's was repaired with the sins of the people. Before the year 1640, above £113,000. was expended thereon, with which the body of the church was finished, and the steeple scaffolded. There was also a stately portico built at the west end, supported with pillars of the Corinthian order, and embellished with the statues of king James and king Charles; but the rebuilding the spire and the inside decorations miscarried by the breaking out of the civil war.¹

What these decorations and ornaments of paintings, carvings, altars, crucifixes, candlesticks, images, vestments, &c. would have been, can only be guessed by the fashion of the times, and by the scheme that was now formed to recover and repair the broken relics of superstition and idolatry which the Reformation had left, or to set up others in imitation of them; for though the reformation of queen Elizabeth had destroyed a great many monuments of this kind; yet some were left entire, and others very little defaced.² In the cathedral of Canterbury over the door of the choir, remained thirteen images, or statues of stone; twelve of them representing the twelve apostles, and the thirteenth in the middle of them our Saviour Christ. Over these were twelve other images of Popish saints. In the several

¹ Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 751.

² Pari. Chron. p. 101.

windows of the cathedral were painted, the picture of St. Austin the monk, the first bishop of that see, and seven large pictures of the Virgin Mary, with angels lifting her up to heaven, with this inscription, "Gaude Maria, sponsa Dei." Under the Virgin Mary's feet, were, the sun, moon, and stars, and in the bottom of the window this inscription, "In laudem & honorem beatissimæ Virginis." Besides these, were many pictures of God the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, and of our Saviour lying in a manger, and a large image of Thomas Becket, and others; all which were taken away by the long-parliament.

In the Cathedral of Durham, there was an altar of marble stone set upon columns decorated with cherubim, pictures, and images, which cost above £2,000. There were three statues of stone in the church; one standing in the midst, representing Christ with a golden beard, a blue cap, and sun-rays upon his head, as the record of parliament says; though Dr. Cosins, in his vindication, says it was mistaken for the top of bishop Hatfield's tomb. There was also an image of God the Father, and many other carved images, pictures, &c. which the present dignitaries of the cathedral held in profound admiration; and to keep up the pomp, they bought copes of mass priests, with crucifixes and images of the Trinity embroidered upon them. They had consecrated knives to cut the sacramental bread, and great numbers of lighted candles upon the altars on Sundays and saints' days. On Candlemas-day there were no less than two hundred, whereof sixty were upon and about the altar; all which were reckoned among the beauties of the sanctuary. "But these fopperies (says bishop Kennet) did not perhaps gain over one Papist, but lost both the king and bishops the hearts and affections of the Protestant part of the nation, and were, (as his lordship observes) contrary to queen Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559, which appoint, that all candlesticks, trentals, rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, &c. be removed out of churches."¹

However, bishop Laud was mightily enamoured with them, and as soon as he was translated to Lambeth, repaired the paintings in the windows of that chapel; in one pane of which had been the picture of Christ crucified, with a skull and dead men's bones under it; a basket full of tools and nails, with the high-priest and his officers on horseback and the two thieves on foot. In the next were the two thieves on crosses;—Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and the brazen serpent on a pole.—In other panes were the pictures of Christ rising out of the grave, and ascending up into heaven, with his disciples kneeling about him.—The descent of the Holy Ghost on the apostles in the shape of cloven tongues.—God, giving the law upon mount Sinai;—his coming down from heaven at the prayer of Elisha;—

¹ Cant. Doom. p. 59–61.

Christ and his twelve apostles sitting in judgment on the world.—In other parts of the church were painted, the Virgin Mary, with the babe Christ sucking at her breast;—The wise men from the east coming to adore him;—The history of the Annunciation, with the picture of the Virgin Mary, and of the Holy Ghost overshadowing her, together with the birth of Christ. All which having been defaced at the Reformation, were now restored, according to the Roman missal, and beautified at the archbishop's cost. The like reparations of paintings, pictures, and crucifixes, were made in the king's chapel at Whitehall, Westminster-abbey, and both the universities, as was objected to the archbishop at his trial, where the reader will meet with his grace's defence of their lawfulness and antiquity. The Puritans apprehended these decorations of churches tended to image-worship, and were directly contrary to the homily of the peril of idolatry; their ministers therefore preached and wrote against them, and in some places removed them; for which they were severely handled in the high-commission.

Bishop Laud had been chosen chancellor of Oxford last year (April 12th, 1630), where the Puritans soon gave him some disturbance. Mr. Hill of Hart-hall, Mr. Ford of Magdalen-hall, Mr. Giles Thorne of Balliol-college, and Mr. Giles Hodges of Exeter-college, were charged with preaching against Arminianism and the new ceremonies in their sermons at St. Mary's. Hill made a public recantation, and was quickly released; but the very texts of the others, says Mr. Fuller,¹ gave offence: one preached on Numbers xiv. 4, "Let us make us a captain, and let us return into Egypt:" and another on 1 Kings xiii. 2, "And he cried against the altar in the word of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar," &c. These divines being convened before the vice-chancellor Dr. Smith, as offenders against the king's instructions, appealed from the vice-chancellor to the proctors, who received their appeal. Upon this the chancellor complained to the king, and procured the cause to be heard before his majesty at Woodstock, August 23, when the following sentence was passed upon them: "that Mr. Ford, Thorne, and Hodges, be expelled the university; that both the proctors be deprived of their places for accepting the appeal; and that Dr. Prideaux rector of Exeter college, and Dr. Wilkinson principal of Magdalen hall, receive a sharp admonition for their misbehaviour in this business."² Mr. Thorne and Hodges, after a year's deprivation, desiring to be restored, preached a recantation sermon, and read a written submission in the convocation-house on their bended knees, before the doctors and regents;³ but Mr. Ford, making no address to be restored, returned to his friends in

¹ Church Hist. b. 11. p. 141.

² Rushworth, vol. I. part 2. p. 110,

³ Prynne, Cant. Doom. p. 175.

Devonshire; and being like to be chosen lecturer or vicar of Plymouth, the inhabitants were required not to choose him, upon pain of his majesty's high displeasure; and in case he was chosen, the bishop of Exeter was commanded not to admit him.

Mr. Crowder, vicar of Vell near Nonsuch, was about this time committed close prisoner to Newgate for sixteen weeks, and then deprived by the high-commission, without any articles exhibited against him, or any proof of a crime. It was pretended that matters against him were so foul, that they were not fit to be read in court; but then they ought to have been certified to him, that he might have had an opportunity to disprove or confess them, which could not be obtained. Mr. Crowder was a pious man, and preached twice a day, which was an unpardonable crime so near the court.

Sundry eminent divines removed to New England this year; and among others the famous Dr. Elliot, the apostle of the Indians, who, not being allowed to teach school in his native country, retired to America, and spent a long and useful life in converting the natives, and with indefatigable pains translated the Bible into the Indian language.

Two very considerable Puritan divines were also removed into the other world by death, viz. Mr. Arthur Hildersham, born at Stechworth, Cambridgeshire, October 6th, 1563, and educated in Christ's-college, Cambridge, of an ancient and honourable family; his mother Anne Poole being niece to the cardinal of that name. His father educated him in the Popish religion; and because he would not go to Rome at fourteen or fifteen years of age, disinherited him: but the Earl of Huntingdon, his near kinsman, provided for him, sending him to Cambridge, where he proceeded M. A. and entered into holy orders. In the year 1587, he was placed by his honourable kinsman above mentioned, at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire, and inducted into that living soon after.¹ But here he was silenced for nonconformity, as in the year 1590, in the year 1605, and again in the year 1611, under which last suspension he continued many years. In the year 1613 he was enjoined by the high-commission not to preach, or exercise any part of the ministerial function, till he should be restored. In the year 1615, he was committed to the Fleet by the high-commission, for refusing the oath *ex officio*, where he continued three months, and was then released upon bond. In November 1616, the high-commission proceeded against him, and pronounced him refractory and disobedient to the orders, rites and ceremonies, of the church; and because he refused to conform, declared him a schismatic, fined him £2,000, excommunicated him and ordered him to be attached and committed to prison that he might be

¹ Clarke's Life of Hildersham, annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 114.

degraded of his ministry: but Mr. Hildersham wisely absconded, and kept out of the way. In the year 1625, he was restored to his living; but when Laud had the ascendant, he was silenced again for not reading divine service in the surplice and hood, and was not restored till a few months before his death. Though he was a Nonconformist in principle, as appears by his last will and testament, yet he was a person of great temper and moderation:¹ he loved and respected all good men, and opposed the separation of the Brownists, and the semi-separation of Mr. Jacob. His lectures on the fifty-first psalm, and his other printed works, as well as the encomiums of Dr. Willet and Dr. Preston, show him to have been a most excellent divine: what a pity was it that his usefulness in the church should be so long interrupted! He died March 4, 1631, in the sixty ninth year of his age, having been minister of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, as the times would suffer him, above forty three years.

Mr. Robert Bolton, was born at Blackburn in Lancashire, 1572, educated first in Lincoln-college, and afterward in Brazenose-college, Oxford, of which he was fellow. Here he became famous for his lectures in moral and natural philosophy, being an excellent Grecian,² and well versed in school divinity, while he continued a profane wicked man. During his residence at college, he contracted an acquaintance with one Anderton, a Popish priest, who, taking advantage of his mean circumstances, would have persuaded him to reconcile himself to the church of Rome, and go over to one of the English seminaries in Flanders. Mr. Bolton accepted the motion, and appointed a place of meeting to conclude the affair: but Anderton disappointing him, he returned to the college, and fell under strong convictions for his former misspent life; so that he could neither eat nor sleep, or enjoy any peace of mind, for several months; till at length, by prayer and humiliation, he received comfort. Upon this, he resolved to enter upon the ministry, in the thirty fifth year of his age. About two years after he was presented to the living of Broughton in Northamptonshire, where he continued till his death. He was a most awakening and authoritative preacher, having the most strong masculine and oratorical style of any of the age in which he lived. He preached twice every Lord's day, besides catechising. Upon every holy day, and every Friday, before the sacrament, he expounded a chapter: his constant course was to pray six times a day, twice in secret, twice with his family, and twice with his wife, besides many days of private humiliation that he observed for the Protestant

¹ "He dissented not from the church in any article of faith, but only about wearing the surplice, baptizing with the cross, and kneeling at the sacrament." Granger's History of England, vol. 1. p. 371. 8vo—ED.

² The Greek language was so familiar to him, that he could speak it with almost as much facility as his mother-tongue.—ED.

churches in Germany. He was of comely grave presence, which commanded respect in all companies; zealous in the cause of religion, and yet so prudent as to escape being called in question all the time he lived in Northamptonshire. At length he was seized with a tertian ague, which after fifteen weeks, put a period to his valuable and useful life, December 17, 1631, in the sixtieth year of his age. He made a most devout and exemplary end, praying heartily for all his friends that came to see him; bidding them make sure of heaven, and bear in mind what he had formerly told them in his ministry, protesting that what he had preached to them for twenty years, was the truth of God, as he should answer it at the tribunal of Christ. He then retired within himself, and said, Hold out faith and patience, your work will speedily be at an end. The Oxford historian¹ calls him a most religious and learned Puritan, a painful and constant preacher, a person of great zeal towards God, charitable and bountiful: but above all, an excellent casuist for afflicted consciences: his eloquent and excellent writings will recommend his memory to the latest posterity.²

About the year 1627, there was a scheme formed by several gentlemen and ministers to promote preaching in the country, by setting up lecturers in the several market towns of England; and to defray the expense a sum of money was raised by voluntary contribution, for the purchasing such impropriations as were in the hands of the laity, the profits of which were to be parcelled out into salaries of £40 or £50. per annum for the subsistence of their lecturers; the money was deposited in the hands of the following ministers and gentlemen, in trust for the abovesaid purposes, under the name and character of feoffees, viz. Dr. William Gouge, Dr. Sibbs, Dr. Offspring, and Mr. Davenport, of the clergy; Ralph Eyre and Simon Brown, esqrs. of Lincoln's inn, and C. Sherman, of Gray's inn, and John White, of the Middle-Temple, esqrs. lawyers; Mr. John Gearing, Mr. Richard Davis, Mr. G. Harwood, and Mr. Francis Bridges, citizens of London. There were at this time three thousand eight hundred and forty-five parish-churches appropriated to cathedrals, or to colleges, or impropriated as lay fees to private persons, having formerly belonged to abbeys. The gentlemen above mentioned dealt only in the latter, and had already bought in thirteen impropriations, which cost between 5 and £6,000. Most people thought this a very laudable design, and wished the feoffees good success; but bishop Laud looked on them with an evil eye, and represented them to the king as in a conspiracy against the church,

¹ Athenæ Oxon, vol. 1. p. 479; see also Fuller's *Abel Redivivus*, p. 586.

² When he lay at the point of death, one of his friends, taking him by the hand, asked him if he was not in great pain: "Truly (said he) the greatest pain I feel is your cold hand;" and presently expired. His book "On Happiness" was the most celebrated of his works, and has gone through many editions.—Granger's *History of England*, vol. 1. p. 365. 8vo.; and Fuller's *Abel Redivivus*, p. 591.—ED.

because, instead of restoring the impropriations they purchased to the several livings, they kept them in their own hands for the encouragement of factious and seditious lecturers, who were to depend upon their patrons, as being liable to be turned out if they neglected their duty.¹ He added farther, that the feoffees preferred chiefly Nonconformist ministers, and placed them in the most popular market-towns, where they did a great deal of mischief to the hierarchy. For these reasons an information was brought against them in the exchequer by Mr. attorney-general Noy, as an illicit society, formed into a body corporate, without a grant from the king, for the purchasing rectories, tithes, prebendaries, &c. which were registered in a book, and the profits not employed according to law.

The defendants appeared, and in their answer declared, that they apprehended impropriations in the hands of laymen, and not employed for the maintenance of preachers, were a damage to the church; that the purchasing of them for the purposes of religion was a pious work, and not contrary to law, it being notorious, that impropriations are frequently bought and sold by private persons; that the donors of this money gave it for this and such other good uses as the defendants should think meet, and not for the endowment of perpetual vicars; that they had not converted any of the money to their own use, nor erected themselves into a body corporate; and that to their knowledge they had never presented any to a church, or place an their disposal, who was not conformable to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, and approved of by the ordinary of the place. But notwithstanding all they could say, the court was of opinion, that their proceedings were contrary to law, and decreed that their feoffment should be cancelled; that the impropriations they had purchased should be confiscated to the king, and the feoffees themselves fined in the star-chamber; however, the prosecution was dropped as too invidious, it appearing in court by the receipts and disbursements, that the feoffees were out of pocket already above £1000. The odium of this prosecution fell upon Laud, whose chancellor told him upon this occasion, that he was miserably censured by the Separatists; upon which he made this reflection in his diary, "Pray God give me patience, and forgive them."

But his lordship had very little patience with those who opposed his proceedings. We have seen his zeal for pictures and paintings in churches, which some of the Puritans venturing to censure in their sermons and writings, were exposed to the severest punishments: among these was the reverend Mr. John Hayden of Devonshire, who being forced to abscond, was apprehended in the diocese of Norwich by bishop Harsnet, who, after

¹ Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 136. Appeal, p. 13. Prynne, p. 379. 385. Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 150.

he had taken from him his horse and money, and all his papers, caused him to be shut up in close prison for thirteen weeks;¹ after which, when the justices would have admitted him to bail at the quartersessions, his lordship sent him up to the high-commission, who deprived him of his ministry and orders, and set a fine upon him for preaching against decorations and images in churches. In the year 1634, Mr. Hayden venturing to preach occasionally, without being restored, was apprehended again and sent to the Gatehouse by archbishop Laud, and from thence to Bridewell, where he was whipped and kept to hard labour; here he was confined in a cold dark dungeon during a whole winter, being chained to a post in the middle of the room, with irons on his hands and feet, having no other food but bread and water, and a pad of straw to lie on. Before his release, he was obliged to take an oath, and give bond, that he would preach no more, but depart the kingdom in a month, and not return. Bishop Harsnet did not live to see the execution of this part of the sentence,² though for his zeal against the Puritans he was promoted to the archbishopric of York, and made a privy-councillor. Some time before his decease he not only persecuted the Nonconformists, but complained of the conformable Puritans, as he called them, because they complied out of policy and not in judgment. How hard is the case, when men shall be punished for not conforming, and be complained of if they conform! Queen Elizabeth used to say, she would never trouble herself about the consciences of her subjects, if they did but outwardly comply with the laws: whereas this prelate would ransack the very heart.

Henry Sherfield, esq. a bencher of Lincoln's inn, and recorder of the city of Sarum, was tried in the star-chamber, May 20, 1632,³ for taking down some painted glass out of one of the windows of St. Edmund's Church in Salisbury, in which were seven pictures of God the Father in form of a little old man in a blue and red coat, with a pouch by his side: one represents him creating the sun and moon with a pair of compasses, others as working on the business of the six days' creation, and at last he sits in an elbow-chair at rest.⁴ Many simple people, at their going in and out of church, did reverence to this window (as they say), because the Lord their God was there. This gave such offence to the recorder, who was also a justice of peace, that he moved the parish at a vestry for leave to take it down, and set up a new window of white glass in the place, which was accordingly granted, six justices of the peace being present. Some time after Mr. Sherfield broke with his staff the pictures of God the Father, in

¹ Usurpation of Prelates, p. 161, 162.

² Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 144.

³ Rushworth, part. 2. vol 1. p. 153-156.

⁴ Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 102.

order to new glaze the window; an account of which being transmitted to London, an information was exhibited against him in the star-chamber, February 8, 1632–3. The information sets forth, “that being evil affected to the discipline of the church, he, with certain confederates, without consent of the bishops, had defaced and pulled down a fair and costly window in the church, containing the history of the creation, which had stood there some hundred years, and was a great ornament to it; which profane act might give encouragement to other schismatical persons to commit the like outrages.”

Mr. Sherfield in his defence says, that the church of St. Edmund’s was a lay fee, and exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese; and the defendant, with the rest of the parishioners, had lawful power to take down the glass; and that it was agreed by a vestry that the glass should be changed, and the window made new; and that accordingly he took down a quarry or two in a quiet and peaceable manner; but he avers, that the true history of the creation was not contained in that window, but a false and impious one: God the Father was painted like an old man with a blue coat, and a pair of compasses, to signify his compassing the heavens and earth. In the fourth day’s work there were fowls of the air flying up from God their maker, which should have been the fifth day. In the fifth day’s work a naked man is lying upon the earth asleep, with so much of a naked woman as from the knees upward growing out of his side, which should have been the sixth day; so that the history is false.

Farther, this defendant holds it to be impious, to make an image or picture of God the Father, which he undertakes to prove from Scripture, from canons and councils, from the mandates and decrees of sundry emperors, from the opinions of ancient doctors of the church, and of our most judicious divines since the Reformation. He adds, that his belief is agreeable to the doctrine of the church of England, and to the homilies, which say, that pictures of God are monuments of superstition, and ought to be destroyed; and to queen Elizabeth’s injunctions, which command, that all pictures and monuments of idolatry should be removed out of churches, that no memory of them might remain in walls, glass-windows, or elsewhere: which injunction is confirmed by the canons of the 13th of Elizabeth. Mr. Sherfield concludes his defence with denying, that he was disaffected to the discipline of the church of England, or had encouraged any to oppose the government of it under the reverend bishops.

Though it is hard to make a tolerable reply to this defence, yet bishop Laud stood up and spake in excuse of the painter, saying, God the Father was called in Scripture the Ancient of Days; adding, however, that for his own part, he did not so well approve of pictures of things invisible; but be the paintings better or worse, he insisted strongly, that Mr. Sherfield had

taken them down in contempt of the episcopal authority, for which he moved, that he might be fined £1,000, and removed from his recordership of the city of Sarum; that he be committed close prisoner to the Fleet till he pay his fine, and then be bound to his good behaviour. To all which the court agreed, except to the fine, which was mitigated to £500.

The reverend Mr. John Workman, lecturer of St. Stephen's church, Gloucester, in one of his sermons, asserted, that pictures or images were no ornaments to churches; that it was unlawful to set up images of Christ or saints in our houses, because it tended to idolatry, according to the homily.¹ For this he was suspended by the high-commission, excommunicated, and obliged to an open recantation in the court at Lambeth, in the cathedral of Gloucester, and in the church of St. Michael's; he was also condemned in costs of suit and imprisoned. Mr. Workman was a man of great piety, wisdom, and moderation, and had served the church of St. Stephen's fifteen years; in consideration whereof, and of his numerous family, the city of Gloucester had given him an annuity of £20. per annum, under their common seal, a little before his troubles; but for this act of charity, the mayor, town-clerk, and several of the aidemen, were cited before the high-commission, and put to £100 charges, and the annuity was cancelled. After this Mr. Workman set up a little school, of which archbishop Laud being informed, inhibited him, as he would answer the contrary at his peril. He then fell upon the practice of physic, which the archbishop likewise absolutely forbid; so that, being deprived of all methods of subsistence, he fell into a melancholy disorder and died.

Our bishop was no less watchful over the press than the pulpit, commanding his chaplains to expunge out of all books that came to be licensed, such passages as disallowed of paintings, carvings, drawings, gildings; erecting, bowing, or praying before images and pictures; as appeared by the evidence of Dr. Featly and others at his trial.

This great prelate would have stretched out his arm not only against the Puritans in England, but even to reach the factories beyond sea, had it been in his power. The English church at Hamburgh managed their affairs according to the Geneva discipline, by elders and deacons. In Holland they conformed to the discipline of the States, and met them in their synods and assemblies, with the consent of king James, and of his present majesty, till secretary Widebank, at the instance of this prelate, offered some proposals to the privy-council for their better regulation:² the proposals consisted of ten articles: "1. That all chaplains of English regiments in the Low Countries shall be exactly conformable to the church of England. 2. That

¹ Prynne, p. 107. 109.

² Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 752, 753. Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 389.

the merchants residing there shall admit of no minister to preach among them, but one qualified as before. 3. That if any one after his settlement among them prove a Nonconformist, he shall be discharged in three months. 4. That the Scots factories shall be obliged to the same conformity. 5. That no minister abroad shall speak, preach, or print, anything to the disadvantage of the English discipline and ceremonies. 6. That no Conformist minister shall substitute a Nonconformist to preach for him in the factories. 7. That the king's agents shall see the service of the church of England exactly performed in the factories.—The last articles forbid the English ministers in Holland to hold any classical assemblies, and especially not to ordain ministers, because by so doing they would maintain a standing nursery for Nonconformity and schism.” These proposals were dispatched to the factories, and the bishop wrote in particular to Delft, that it was his majesty's express command, that their ministers should conform themselves in all things to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, and to all the orders prescribed in the canons, rubric, and liturgy; and that the names of such as were refractory should be sent over to him. But it was not possible to succeed in the attempt, because most of the English congregations, being supported by the States, must by so doing have run the hazard of losing their maintenance, and of being dissolved, as was represented to the king by a petition in the name of all the English ministers in the Low Countries. However, though the bishop could not accomplish his designs abroad, we shall find him hereafter retaliating his disappointment upon the French and Dutch churches at home.

His lordship met with better success in Scotland for the present, as being part of his majesty's own dominions. He had possessed the king with vast notions of glory in bringing the kirk of Scotland to an exact conformity with England; a work which his father had attempted, but left imperfect. The king readily fell in with the bishop's motion, and determined to run all hazards for accomplishing this important design, having no less veneration for the ceremonies of the church of England than the bishop himself. There had been bishops in Scotland for some years, but they had little more than the name, being subject to an assembly that was purely presbyterian. To advance their jurisdiction, the king had already renewed the high-commission, and abolished all general assemblies of the kirk, not one having been held in his reign; yet still, says the noble historian,¹ there was no form of religion, no liturgy, nor the least appearance of any beauty of holiness. To redress these grievances, as well as to show the Scots nation the pomp and grandeur of the English hierarchy, his majesty resolves upon a progress into his native country to be crowned, and accordingly set out

¹ Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 81.

from London, May 13, attended by several noblemen and persons of quality; and among others by bishop Laud. June 18 [1633,] his majesty was crowned at Edinburgh, the ceremony being managed by the direction of his favourite bishop, who thrust away the bishop of Glasgow from his place, because he appeared without the coat of his order, which being an embroidered one, he scrupled to wear, being a moderate churchman.¹

On the 20th of June the parliament met, and voted the king a large sum of money. After which his majesty proposed to them two acts relating to religion; one was concerning his royal prerogative, and the apparel of kirkmen; the other, a bill for the ratification of former acts touching religion. It being the custom in Scotland for king, lords, and commons, to sit in one house, when the question was put for the first bill, his majesty took a paper out of his pocket, and said, "Gentlemen, I have all your names here, and I will know who will do me service, and who will not, this day." Nevertheless it was carried in the negative; thirteen lords, and the majority of the commons, voting against it. The lords said, they agreed to the act so far as related to his majesty's prerogative, but dissented from that part of it which referred to the apparel of kirkmen, fearing that under that cover the surplice might be introduced. But his majesty said, he would have no distinction, and commanded them to say yes, or no, to the whole bill. The king marked every man's vote, and upon casting them up the clerk declared it was carried in the affirmative: which some of the members denying, his majesty said, the clerk's declaration must stand, unless any would go to the bar and accuse him of falsifying the record of parliament, at the peril of his life.²

This manner of treating the whole representative body of the nation, disgusted all ranks and orders of his subjects. A writing was immediately dispersed abroad, setting forth how grievous it was for a king to overawe and threaten his parliament in that manner; and that the same was a breach of privilege; that parliaments were a mere pageantry, if the clerk might declare the votes as he pleased, and no scrutiny be allowed. Lord Balmerino, in whose custody this libel was found, was condemned to lose his head for it, but was afterward pardoned.

After eight days the parliament was dissolved, but the king would not look upon the dissenting lords, or admit them to kiss his hand. The act concerning the apparel of ministers, says, that "Whereas it was agreed in the parliament of 1606, that what order soever his majesty's father, of blessed memory, should prescribe for the apparel of kirkmen, and send in writ to his clerk of register, should be a sufficient warrant for inserting the

¹ Rushworth, part 2. vol. 1. p. 182.

² Rushworth, p. 183.

same in the books of parliament, to have the strength of any act thereof; the present parliament agrees, that the same power shall remain with our sovereign lord that now is, and his successors.” The bill touching religion ratifies and approves all acts and statutes made before, about the liberty and freedom of the true kirk of God, and the religion at present professed within this kingdom, and ordains the same to stand in full force as if they were particularly mentioned.

The king left his native country July 16, having lost a great deal of ground in the affections of his people,¹ by the contempt he poured upon the Scots clergy, and his high behaviour in favour of the English ceremonies. His majesty was attended throughout his whole progress by Laud bishop of London, which service his lordship was not obliged to, and no doubt would have been excused from, if the design of introducing the English liturgy into Scotland had not been in view.² He preached before the king in the royal chapel at Edinburgh, which scarce any Englishman had ever done before, and insisted principally upon the benefit of the ceremonies of the church, which he himself observed to the height. It went against him to own the Scots presbyters for ministers of Christ; taking all occasions to affront their character, which created a high disgust in that nation, and laid the foundation of those resentments that they expressed against him under his sufferings.

When the king left Scotland, he erected a new bishopric at Edinburgh; and about two months after, Laud, being then newly advanced to the province of Canterbury, framed articles for the reformation of his majesty’s royal chapel in that city, which were sent into Scotland under his majesty’s own hand, with a declaration, that they were intended as a pattern for all

¹ Dr. Grey confronts Mr. Neal here with a passage from lord Clarendon to show that his account of the king’s reception in Scotland differs widely from this of our author. “The great civility of that people (says his lordship) being so notorious and universal, that they would not appear unconformable to his majesty’s wish in any particular.” But this quotation has little or no force against Mr. Neal, who is not representing the reception the king met with, but the impressions left on the minds of the people by the time of his departure. The king’s entry and coronation, bishop Burnet says, was managed with such magnificence, that all was entertainmeut and show, yet, he adds, “that the king left Scotland much discontented.” The proceeding on the bill concerning the royal prerogative, &c. show, that every proposal from the court was not pleasing. Whitelocke (Memoirs, p. 18) tells us, that though the king was crowned with all show of affection and duty, and gratified many with new honours; yet, before he left Scotland, some began to murmur and afterward to mutiny; and he was in some danger passing over Dumfrith. And such in particular was the effect of the prosecution of lord Balmerino on the public mind, that the ruin of the king’s affairs in Scotland was in a great measure owing to it. Dr. Grey refers to the preambles to some acts passed in the Scotch parliament, as proving the high degree of esteem the king was then in amongst them; as if an argument were to be drawn from formularies drawn up according to the routine of the occasion, and composed, probably, by a court lawyer: as if such formularies were proof against matter of fact. Burnet’s History of his Own Times, vol. 1. p. 24—31. 12mo.—ED.

² Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 81. 82.

cathedrals, chapels, and parish-churches, in that kingdom.¹ The articles appoint, “that prayers be read twice a day in the choir, according to the English liturgy, till some course be taken to make one that may fit the custom and constitution of that church. That all that receive the sacrament in the chapel do it kneeling. That the dean of the chapel always come to church in his whites, and preach in them. That the copes which are consecrated to our use be carefully kept, and used at the celebration of the sacrament; and that all his majesty’s officers and ministers of state be obliged, at least once a year, to receive the sacrament at the royal chapel, kneeling, for an example to the rest of the people.” Thus were the liberties of the kirk of Scotland invaded by an English bishop, under the wing of the supremacy, without consent of parliament or general assembly. The Scots ministers in their pulpits preached against the English hierarchy, and warned the people against surrendering up the liberties of their kirk into the hands of a neighbouring nation, that was undermining their discipline; so that when the new liturgy came to be introduced about four years after, all the people as one man rose up against it.

The king was no sooner returned from Scotland than Dr. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, died. He was born at Guildford in Surrey 1562, and educated in Baliol-college, Oxford, where he was a celebrated preacher. In the year 1597, he proceeded doctor in divinity, and was elected master of University-college: two years after he was made dean of Winchester, and was one of those divines appointed by king James to translate the New Testament into English. In the year 1609, he was consecrated bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, from thence he was translated to London, and upon the death of archbishop Bancroft, to Canterbury, April 9, 1611, having never been rector, vicar, or incumbent, in any parish-church in England. Lord Clarendon² has lessened the character of this excellent prelate, contrary to almost all other historians, by saying that “he was a man of very morose manners, and of a very sour aspect, which in that time was called gravity; that he neither understood nor regarded the constitution of the church; that he knew very little of ancient divinity, but adhered stiffly to the doctrine of Calvin, and did not think so ill of his discipline as he ought to have done; but if men prudently forbore a public reviling and railing at the hierarchy, let their private practice be as it would, he would give them no disturbance; that his house was a sanctuary to disaffected persons, and that he licensed their writings, by which means his successor [Laud] had a very difficult task to reduce things to order.”

¹ Rushworth, part 2. vol. 2. p. 205, 206.

² Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 88, 89.

The Oxford historian,¹ who was no friend to our archbishop's principles, confesses that he was a pious grave person, exemplary in his life and conversation, a plausible preacher, and that the many things he has written show him to be a man of parts, learning, and vigilance; an able statesman, and of unwearied study, though overwhelmed with business. Fuller² says he was an excellent preacher, and that his severity towards the clergy was only to prevent their being punished by lay judges, to their greater shame. Mr. Coke and Dr. Welwood³ add, that he was a prelate of primitive sanctity, who followed the true interests of his country, and of the reformed churches at home and abroad; that he was a divine of good learning, great hospitality, and wonderful moderation, showing upon all occasions an unwillingness to stretch the king's prerogative or the act of uniformity, beyond what was consistent with law, or necessary for the peace of the church; this brought him into all his troubles, and has provoked the writers for the prerogative, to leave a blot upon his memory, which on this account will be revered by all true lovers of the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country; and if the court had followed his wise and prudent counsels, the mischiefs that befell the crown and church some years after his death, would have been prevented. We have mentioned his casual homicide in the year 1621, which occasioned his keeping an annual fast as long as he lived, and maintaining the widow. Notwithstanding this misfortune, if he would have betrayed the Protestant religion, and been the dupe of the prerogative, he might have continued in high favour with his prince; but for his steady opposition to the arbitrary measures of Buckingham and Laud, and for not licensing Sibthorp's sermon, he was suspended from his archiepiscopal jurisdiction, [1628⁴], whereupon he retired to Croydon, having no more interest at court, or influence in the government of the church: here he died in his archiepiscopal palace, August 4, 1633, aged seventy-one, and was buried in Trinity-church in Guilford, the place of his nativity, where he had erected and endowed a hospital for men and women. There is a fine monument over his grave, with his effigies in full proportion, supported by six pillars of the Doric order of black marble, standing on six pedestals of piled books, with a large inscription thereon to his memory.⁵

¹ Athene Oxon. vol. 1. p. 499

² Church History, b. 11. p. 123.

³ Welwood's Memoirs, p. 36. edit. 1718.

⁴ Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 435.

⁵ In addition to our author's character of archbishop Abbot, it may be observed that Dr. Warner has entered largely into the description of it, "not only (he says) in conformity to the rule he prescribed to himself in his work, but (he adds) to rescue the memory of this prelate from the injury done to it by Lord Clarendon, with so notorious a partiality as does no honour to his history." The doctor sums up his view of archbishop Abbot's character, by saying, "that he was a man of good parts and learning as a divine; that he was a prelate of a very pious exemplary conversation; and an archbishop who understood the

constitution of his country in church and state, to which he steadfastly adhered, without any regard to the favour or the frowns of princes." The learned translator of Mosheim also censures lord Clarendon's account of this eminent prelate as most unjust and partial: and in a long note, ably and judiciously appreciates the archbishop's merit, and excellence. It was, he shows, by the zeal and dexterity of Abbot, that things were put into such a situation in Scotland as afterward produced the entire establishment of the episcopal order in that nation. It was by the mild and prudent counsels of Abbot, when he was chaplain to the lord-high-treasurer Dunbar, that there was passed a famous act of the general assembly of Scotland, which gave the king the authority of calling all general assemblies, and investing the bishops, or their deputies, with various powers of interference and influence over the Scotch ministers. These facts confute the charge of his disregarding the constitution of the church. It deserves to be mentioned, that this prelate had a considerable hand in the translation of the New Testament now in use. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 4. p. 513, and note (f.) 1763. Warner's Eccles. History, vol. 2. p. 522-524. Granger's Biogr. History of England, vol. 1. p. 341. 8vo.—ED.