

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 V.

### FROM THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP ABBOT TO THE BEGINNING OF THE COMMOTIONS IN SCOTLAND, IN THE YEAR 1637.

DR. LAUD was now at the pinnacle of preferment, being translated to the see of Canterbury two days after archbishop Abbot's death. His grace was likewise chancellor of the universities of Oxford and Dublin, privy-councillor for England and Scotland, first commissioner of the exchequer, and one of the committee for trade, and for the king's revenues: he was also offered a cardinal's cap [August 17], which he declined, as he says, because there was something dwelt within him which would not suffer it, till Rome was otherwise than it was. We are now to see how he moved in this high sphere. Lord Clarendon admits, "that the archbishop had all his life eminently opposed Calvin's doctrine, for which reason he was called a Papist; and it may be (says his lordship) the Puritans found the more severe and rigorous usage for propagating the calumny. He also intended, that the discipline of the church should be felt as well as spoken of." The truth of this observation has appeared in part already, and will receive stronger evidence from the seven ensuing years of his government.

The archbishop's antipathy to Calvinism, and zeal for the external beauty of the church, carried him to some very imprudent and unjustifiable extremes: for if the Puritans were too strict in keeping holy the sabbath, his grace was too lax in his indulgence, by encouraging revels, may-games, and sports, on that sacred day.

Complaint having been made to the lord-chief-justice Richardson, and baron Denham, in their western circuit, of great inconveniences arising from revels, church-ales, and clerk-ales, on the Lord's day, the two judges made an order at the assizes for suppressing them, and appointed the clerk to leave copies of the order with every parish-minister, who was to give a note under his hand, to publish it in his church yearly, the first Sunday in February, and the two Sundays before Easter.<sup>1</sup> Upon the return of the circuit the judges required an account of the execution of their order, and punished some persons for the breach of it; whereupon the archbishop complained to the king of their invading the episcopal jurisdiction, and prevailed with his majesty to summon them before the council. When they appeared, Richardson pleaded that the order was made at the request of the justices of the peace, and with the unanimous consent of the whole bench, and justified it from the following precedents: September 10, Eliz. 38th, the justices assembled at Bridgewater ordered, that no church-ale, clerk-ale, or

---

<sup>1</sup> Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 153.

bid-ale, be suffered; signed by Popham, lord-chief-justice, and ten others. The same order was repeated 1599, and 41st of Eliz. and again at Exeter, 1615, and 13th of Jac. and even in the present king's reign, 1627, with an order for the minister of every parish-church to publish it yearly. But notwithstanding all the chief justice could allege, he received a sharp reprimand, and a peremptory injunction to revoke his order at the next assizes; which he did in such a manner as lost him his credit at court for the future; for he then declared to the justices, "that he thought he had done God, the king, and his country, good service, by that good order that he and his brother Denham had made, for suppressing unruly wakes and revels, but that it had been misreported to his majesty, who had expressly charged him to reverse it; accordingly (says he) I do, as much as in me lies, reverse it, declaring the same to be null and void, and that all persons may use their recreations at such meetings as before." This reprimand and injunction almost broke the judge's heart, for when he came out of the council-chamber he told the earl of Dorset with tears in his eyes, that he had been miserably shaken by the archbishop, and was like to be choked with his lawn-sleeves.

Laud having thus humbled the judge, and recovered his episcopal authority from neglect, took the affair into his own hand, and wrote to the bishop of Bath and Wells October 4 [1663] for fuller information. In his letter he takes notice that there had been of late some noise in Somersetshire about the wakes; that the judges had prohibited them under pretence of some disorders, by which argument, says he, anything that is abused may be quite taken away; but that his majesty was displeased with Richardson's behaviour at the two last assizes, and especially the last; being of opinion, that the feasts ought to be kept for the recreation of the people, of which he would not have them debarred under any frivolous pretences, to the gratifying of the humourists, who were very numerous in those parts, and united in crying down the feasts; his grace therefore requires the bishop to give him a speedy account how these feasts had been ordered.

Pierce bishop of Bath and Wells, in answer to this letter, acquaints the archbishop, "that the late suppression of the revels was very unacceptable, and that the restitution of them would be very grateful to the gentry, clergy, and common people;\* for proof of which he had procured the hands of seventy-two of his clergy, in whose parishes these feasts are kept; and he believes that if he had sent for a hundred more he should have had the same answer from them all; but these seventy-two (says his lordship) are like the seventy-two interpreters that agreed so soon in the translation of the Old Testament in the Greek." He then proceeds to explain the nature of these

feasts: “There are (says he) in Somersetshire, not only feasts of dedication [or revel-days], but also church-ales, clerk-ales, and bid-ales.”<sup>1</sup>

“The feasts of Dedication are in memory of the dedication of the several churches; those churches dedicated to the holy Trinity have their feasts on Trinity-Sunday; and so all the feasts are kept upon the Sunday before or after the saint’s day to whom the churches are dedicated, because the people have not leisure to observe them on the week-days; this (says his lordship) is acceptable to the people, who otherwise go into tippling-houses, or else to conventicles.

“Church-ales are, when the people go from afternoon prayers on Sunday to their lawful sports and pastimes in the churchyard, or in the neighbourhood, in some public-house, where they drink and make merry. By the benevolence of the people at these pastimes, many poor parishes have cast their bells, and beautified their churches, and raised stocks for the poor; and there had not been observed so much disorder at them as is commonly at fairs or markets.

“Clerk-ales [or lesser church-ales] are so called, because they were for the better maintenance of the parish-clerk; and there is great reason for them (says his lordship), for in poor country parishes, where the wages of the clerk are but small, the people, thinking it unfit that the clerk should duly attend at church and gain by his office, send him in provision, and then come on Sundays and feast with him, by which means he sells more ale, and tastes more of the liberality of the people, than their quarterly payment would amount to in many years; and since these have been put down, many ministers have complained to me (says his lordship) that they are afraid they shall have no parish-clerks.

“A bid-ale is, when a poor man, decayed in his substance, is set up again by the liberal benevolence and contribution of his friends at a Sunday’s feast.”

The people were fond of these recreations, and the bishop recommends them, as bringing the people more willingly to church; as tending to civilize them, and to compose differences among them; and as serving to increase love and unity, forasmuch as they were in the nature of feasts of charity, the richer sort keeping in a manner open house; for which and some other reasons his lordship thinks them fit to be retained.

But the justices of peace were of another mind, and signed an humble petition to the king, in which they declare that these revels had not only introduced a great profanation of the Lord’s day, but riotous tippling, contempt of authority, quarrels, murders, &c. and were very prejudicial to the peace, plenty, and good government of the country, and therefore they pray

---

<sup>1</sup> Cant. Doom. p. 142.

that they be suppressed. Here we observe the laity petitioning for the religious observation of the Lord's day, and the bishop with his clergy pleading for the profanation of it.

To encourage these disorderly assemblies more effectually, archbishop Laud put the king upon republishing his father's declaration of the year 1618, concerning lawful sports to be used on Sundays after divine service; which was done accordingly, October 18, with this remarkable addition. After a recital of the words of king James's declaration, his majesty adds, "Out of a like pious care for the service of God, and for suppressing of those humours that oppose truth, and for the ease, comfort, and recreation of his majesty's well-deserving people, he doth ratify his blessed father's declaration, the rather, because of late in some counties of the kingdom his majesty finds, that, under pretence of taking away an abuse, there hath been a general forbidding, not only of ordinary meetings, but of the feasts of the dedication of churches, commonly called wakes; it is therefore his will and pleasure, that these feasts with others shall be observed, and that all neighbourhood and freedom with manlike and lawful exercises be used; and the justices of the peace are commanded not to molest any in their recreations, having first done their duty to God, and continued in obedience to his majesty's laws." And he does farther will, "that publication of this his command he made by order from the bishops, through all the parish-churches of their several dioceses respectively."

This declaration revived the controversy of the morality of the sabbath, which had slept for many years; Mr. Theophilus Bradbourne, a Suffolk minister, had published, in the year 1628, "A defence of the most ancient and sacred ordinance of God, the sabbath-day," and dedicated it to the king. But Mr. Fuller<sup>1</sup> observes, "that the poor man fell into the ambush of the high-commission, whose well-tempered severity so prevailed with him, that he became a convert, and conformed quietly to the church of England." Francis White, bishop of Ely, was commanded by the king to confute Bradbourne; and after him appeared Dr. Pocklington, with his "Sunday no sabbath;" and after him Heylin the archbishop's chaplain, and others. These divines, instead of softening some rigours in Bradbourne's Sabbatarian strictness, ran into the contrary extreme, denying all manner of divine right or moral obligation to the observance of the whole or any part of the Lord's day, making it depend entirely upon ecclesiastical authority, and to oblige no further than to the few hours of public service; and that in the intervals, not only walking (which the Sabbatarians admitted) but mixed dancing, masks, interludes, revels, &c. were lawful and expedient.

---

<sup>1</sup> Book 11. p.144.

Instead of convincing the sober part of the nation, it struck them with a kind of horror, to see themselves invited, by the authority of the king and church, to that which looked so like a contradiction to the command of God. It was certainly out of character for bishops and clergymen, who should be the supports of religion, to draw men off from exercises of devotion in their families and closets, by enticing them to public recreations. People are forward enough of themselves to indulge these liberties, and need a check rather than a spur; but the wisdom of these times was different. The court had their balls, masquerades, and plays, on the Sunday evenings, while the youth of the country were at their morrice-dances, may-games, church and clerk ales, and all such kinds of revelling.<sup>1</sup>

The revival of this declaration was charged upon archbishop Laud at his trial, but his grace would not admit the charge, though he confessed his judgment was in favour of it. It was to be published in all parish-churches, either by the minister or any other person, at the discretion of the bishop, and therefore the putting this hardship on the clergy was their act and deed; but Laud knew it would distress the Puritans, and purge the church of a set of men, for whom he had a perfect aversion. The reason given for obliging them to this service was, because the two judges had enjoined the ministers to read their order against revels in the churches; and therefore it was proper to have it reversed by the same persons and in the same place.<sup>2</sup>

The severe pressing this declaration made sad havoc among the Puritans for seven years. Many poor clergymen strained their consciences in submission to their superiors. Some after publishing it, immediately read the fourth commandment to the people, "Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy;" adding, "This is the law of God; the other the injunction of man." Some put it upon their curates, whilst great numbers refused to comply upon any terms whatsoever. Fuller<sup>3</sup> says, "that the archbishop's moderation in his own diocese was remarkable, silencing but three, in whom also was a concurrence of other nonconformities; but that his adversaries imputed it not to his charity but policy, fox-like, preying farthest from his own den, and instigating other bishops to do more than he would appear in himself." Sir Nath. Brent, his grace's vicar-general, attested upon oath at the archbishop's trial, that he gave him a special charge to convene all ministers before him who would not read the book of sports on the Lord's day, and to suspend them for it; and that he gave particular order to suspend the three following Kentish ministers by name, viz. Mr. Player, Mr. Hieron, and Mr. Culmer.<sup>4</sup> Whereupon he did, against his judgment, suspend them

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Warner adopts these remarks.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 149.

all *ab officio et beneficio*, though the king's declaration, as has been observed, does not oblige the minister to read it, nor authorize the bishops to inflict any punishment on the refusers. When the suspended ministers repaired to Lambeth, and petitioned to be restored, the archbishop told them, if they did not know how to obey, he did not know how to grant their petition. So their suspension continued till the beginning of the commotions in Scotland, to the ruin of their poor families; Mr. Culmer having a wife and seven children to provide for.<sup>1</sup>

Several clergymen of other dioceses were also silenced, and deprived on the same account; as, Mr. Thomas Wilson of Otham, who being sent for to Lambeth, and asked whether he had read the book of sports in his church, answered No; whereupon the archbishop replied immediately, "I suspend you for ever from your office and benefice till you read it;" and so he continued four years, being cited into the high-commission, and articted against for the same crime. Mr. Wrath and Mr. Erbery were brought up from Wales, Mr. William Jones from Gloucestershire, with divers others, and censured by the high-commission (of which the archbishop was chief) for not reading the declaration, and not bowing his body at the blessed name of Jesus, &c.<sup>2</sup> To these may be added, Mr. Whitfield of Ockley, Mr Garth of Woversh, Mr. Ward of Pepper-Harrow, Mr. Farrol of Purbright, and Mr. Pegges of Wexford, to whom the archbishop said, that he suspended him *ex mine prout ex tunc*, in case he did not read the king's declaration for sports, on the Sunday se'nnight following.

The reverend and learned Mr. Lawrence Snelling, rector of Paul's-Cray, was not only suspended by the high-commission at Lambeth for four years, but deprived and excommunicated, for not reading the declaration, &c.<sup>3</sup> He

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Grey introduces here a long quotation from Anthony Wood, and refers to a bad character of Mr. Culmer drawn by Mr. Lewis in Dr. Calamy's continuation of ejected ministers, to show what small reason Mr. Neal had to defend him. It should seem, from those authorities, that he was a man of a warm and violent temper, and some heavy charges are brought against him. But not to say that prejudice appears to have drawn his picture, admitting the truth of everything alleged against him, it is irrelevant to the vindication of archbishop Laud, whose severity against Mr. Culmer had not for its object his general deportment, or any immorality, but his not reading the book of sports; i. e. a royal invitation to men to give themselves up to dissipating, riotous, and intemperate diversions on a day sacred to sobriety. See on Mr. Culmer's character, Palmer's Nonconformist's Memorial, vol. 2. p. 77.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Grey, to impeach the fairness of Mr. Neal, quotes here Rushworth, to shew that sentence was passed on Mr. Snelling for omitting to "read the litany and wear the surplice, and for not bowing, or making any corporal obeisance at hearing or reading the name of Jesus." It is true, that on these premises also the sentence of deprivation was passed; but it appears from Rushworth, that he had been previously suspended *ab officio et beneficio*, and excommunicated, solely on the ground of refusing to read the book of sports; and that this offence was the primary cause of the deprivation. Rushworth's Collections, vol. 2. part 2. p. 460, 461.—ED

pleaded in his own defence the laws of God and of the realm, and the authority of councils and fathers; he added, that the king's declaration did not enjoin ministers to read it, nor authorize the bishops or high-commissioners to suspend or punish ministers for not reading it; that it being merely a civil, not an ecclesiastical declaration enjoined by any canons or authority of the church, no ecclesiastical court could take cognizance of it. All which Mr. Snelling offered to the commissioners in waiting, but the archbishop would not admit it, saying, in open court, that "whosoever should make such a defence, it should be burnt before his face, and he laid by the heels." Upon this he was personally and judicially admonished to read the declaration within three weeks, which he refusing, was suspended *ab officio et beneficio*. About four months after he was judicially admonished again, and refusing to comply, was excommunicated, and told, that unless he conformed before the second day of next term, he should be deprived; which was accordingly done, and he continued under the sentence many years, to his unspeakable damage.

"It were endless to go into more particulars; how many hundred godly ministers in this and other dioceses (says Mr. Prynne<sup>1</sup>) have been suspended from their ministry, sequestered, driven from their livings, excommunicated, prosecuted in the high-commission, and forced to leave the kingdom for not publishing this declaration, is experimentally known to all men." Dr. Wren, bishop of Norwich, says, that great numbers in his diocese had declined it, and were suspended; that some had since complied, but that still there were thirty who peremptorily refused and were excommunicated. This the bishop thinks a small number, although if there were as many in other dioceses, the whole would amount to near eight hundred.

To render the Common Prayer-book more unexceptionable to the Papists, and more distant from Puritanism, the archbishop made sundry alterations<sup>2</sup> in the later editions, without the sanction of convocation or parliament. In the collect for the royal family, the princess Elizabeth and her children were left out, and these words were expunged, "O God, who art the father of thine elect, and of their seed;" as tending towards particular election or predestination.<sup>3</sup> In the prayer for the 5th of November were these words, "Root out that antichristian and Babylonish sect which say of Jerusalem, Down with it even to the ground. Cut off those workers of iniquity, whose religion is rebellion, whose faith is faction, whose practice is murdering both soul and body;" which in the last edition are thus changed,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cant. Doom p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Grey says, that the archbishop fully cleared himself in this particular, by informing us [Troubles and Trial, p. 357], "that the alterations were made either by the king himself, or some other about him, when he was not at court."—ED.

<sup>3</sup> Cant. Doom. p. 111, 112.



“Root out the anti-christian and Babylonish sect of them, which say of Jerusalem, Down with it.—Cut off those workers of iniquity, who turn religion into rebellion,” &c. The design of which alteration was to relieve the Papists, and to turn the prayer against the Puritans, upon whom the Popish plot was to have been fathered. In the epistle for Palm-Sunday, instead of “*in the name of Jesus,*” as it was heretofore, it is now according to the last translation, “*at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow.*” But it was certainly very high presumption, for a single clergyman, or any number of them, to alter a service-book established by act of parliament, and impose those alterations upon the whole body of the clergy.

The Puritans always excepted against bowing at the name of Jesus; it appeared to them very superstitious, as if worship was to be paid to a name, or to the name of Jesus, more than to that of Christ or Immanuel. Nevertheless it was enjoined by the eighteenth canon, and in compliance with that injunction, our last translators inserted it into their text, by rendering *εν τω ονοματι*, “in the name of Jesus,” as it was before both in the Bible and Common Prayer-book, “at the name of Jesus,” as it now stands; however, no penalty was annexed to the neglect of this ceremony, nor did any suffer for it, till bishop Laud was at the head of the church, who pressed it equally with the rest, and caused above twenty ministers to be fined, censured, and put by their livings, for not bowing at the name of Jesus, or for preaching against it.<sup>1</sup>

On the 3rd of November was debated, before his majesty in council, the question about removing the communion-table at St. Gregory’s church near St. Paul’s, from the middle of the chancel to the upper end of it, and placing it there in form of an altar. This being enjoined upon the churchwardens by the dean and chapter of St. Paul’s, without the consent of the parishioners, they opposed it, and appealed to the court of arches, alleging that the book of Common-Prayer, and eighty-second canon, gave liberty to place the communion-table where it might stand with most convenience. His majesty being informed of the appeal, and acquainted by the archbishop, that it would be a leading case all over England, was pleased to order it to be debated before himself in council, and after hearing the arguments on both sides, declared that the liberty given by the eighty-second canon was not to be understood so, as if it were to be left to the discretion of the parish, much less to the fancies of a few humorous persons, but to the judgment of the ordinary [or bishop], to whose place it properly belonged to determine these points; he therefore confirmed the act of the ordinary, and gave commandment, that if the parishioners went on with their appeal, the dean of the arches, who was then attending at the hearing of the cause, should con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Usurpation of Prelates, p. 165.

firm the order of the dean and chapter.<sup>1</sup> This was a sovereign manner of putting an end to a controversy, very agreeable to the archbishop.

When the sacrament was administered in parish-churches the communion-table was usually placed in the middle of the chancel, and the people received round it, or in their several places thereabouts; but now all communion-tables were ordered to be fixed under the east wall of the chancel with the ends north and south in form of an altar; they were to be raised two or three steps above the floor, and encompassed with rails. Archbishop Laud ordered his vicar-general to see this alteration made in all the churches and chapels of his province; to accomplish which, it was necessary to take down the galleries in some churches, and to remove ancient monuments. This was resented by some considerable families, and complained of as an injury to the dead, and such an expense to the living, as some country parishes could not bear; yet those who refused to pay the rates imposed by the archbishop for this purpose, were fined in the spiritual courts contrary to law.<sup>2</sup> It is almost incredible, what a ferment the making this alteration at once, raised among the common people all over England. Many ministers and churchwardens were excommunicated, fined, and obliged to do penance, for neglecting the bishop's injunctions. Great numbers refused to come up to the rails and receive the sacrament, for which some were fined, and others excommunicated, to the number of some hundreds, say the committee of the house of commons at the archbishop's trial.

Books were written for and against this new practice, with the same earnestness and contention for victory, as if the life of religion had been at stake. Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, published two treatises against it, one entitled, "A letter to the vicar of Grantham:" the other, "The holy table, name, and thing;" filled with so much learning, and that learning so closely and solidly applied, says lord Clarendon, as showed he had spent his time in his retirement with his books very profitably. Dr. Heylin, who answered the bishop, argued from the words of queen Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559; from the orders and advertisements of 1562 and 1565; from the practice of the king's chapels and cathedrals; and finally, from the present king's declaration, recommending a conformity of the parish-churches to their cathedrals. The bishop, and with him all the Puritans, insisted upon the practice of primitive antiquity, and upon the eighty-second canon of 1603, which says, "We appoint, that the table for the celebration of the holy communion shall be covered with a fair linen cloth at the time of administration, and shall then be placed in so good sort within the church or chancel, as thereby the minister may more conveniently be heard of the communicants in his

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> Prynne's Cant. Doom. p. 100, 101.

prayer, and the communicants may more conveniently and in more numbers communicate.” They urged the rubric in the Common Prayer-book; that altars in churches were a Popish invention, of no greater antiquity in the Christian church than the sacrifice of the mass; and insisted strenuously on the discontinuance of them since the Reformation. But the archbishop, being determined to carry his point, prosecuted the affair with unjustifiable rigour over all the kingdom, punishing those who opposed him, without regard to the laws of the land. This occasioned a sort of schism among the bishops, and a great deal of uncharitableness among the inferior clergy; for those bishops who had not been beholden to Laud for their preferments, nor had any farther expectations, were very cool in the affair, while the archbishop’s creatures, in many places, took upon them to make these alterations by their own authority, without the injunctions or directions of their diocesans, which laid the foundation of many lawsuits. Those who opposed the alterations were called Doctrinal Puritans, and the promoters of them Doctrinal Papists.

The court-clergy were of the latter sort, and were vehemently suspected of an inclination to Popery, because of their superstitious bowing to the altar, not only in time of divine service, but at their going in and out of church. This was a practice unknown to the laity of the church of England before this time, but archbishop Laud introduced it into the royal chapel at Whitehall, and recommended it to all the clergy by his example; for when he went in and out of chapel, a lane was always made for him to see the altar, and do reverence towards it. All his majesty’s chaplains, and even the common people, were enjoined the same practice. In the new body of statutes for the cathedral of Canterbury, drawn up by his grace, and confirmed under the great-seal, the dean and prebendaries are obliged by oath, to bow to the altar at coming in and going out of the church; which could arise from no principle but a belief of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament or altar; or from a superstitious imitation of the Pagans worshipping towards the east.<sup>1</sup>

To make the adoration more significant, the altars in cathedrals were adorned with the most pompous furniture, and all the vessels underwent a solemn consecration. The cathedral of Canterbury was furnished, according to bishop Andrew’s model, who took it from the Roman missal, with two candlesticks and tapers, a basin for oblations, a cushion for the service-book, a silver gilt canister for the wafers, like a wicker-basket lined with cambric lace, the tonne on a cradle; a chalice with the image of Christ and the lost sheep, and of the wise men and star, engraven on the sides and on the cover. The chalice was covered with a linen napkin, called the aire, em-

---

<sup>1</sup> Collyer’s Eccles. Hist. p. 762.

broidered with coloured silk; two patins, the tricanale being a round ball with a screw cover, out of which issued three pipes, for the water of mixture; a credentia or side-table, with a basin and ewer on napkins, and a towel to wash before the consecration; three kneeling stools covered and stuffed, the foot-pace with three ascents, covered with a turkey carpet; three chairs used at ordinations, and the septum or rail with two ascents. Upon some altars, there was a pot called the incense-pot, and a knife to cut the sacramental bread.

The consecration of this furniture was after this manner; the archbishop in his cope, attended by two chaplains in their surplices, having bowed several times towards the altar, read a portion of Scripture; then the vessels to be consecrated were delivered into the hands of the archbishop, who, after he had placed them upon the altar, read a form of prayer, desiring God to bless and accept of these vessels, which he severally touched and elevated, offering them up to God, after which they were not to be put to common use. We have seen already the manner of his grace's consecrating the sacramental elements at Creed-church; there was a little more ceremony in cathedrals, where the wafers and wine, being first placed with great solemnity on the credentia or side-table, were to be removed from thence by one of the archbishop's chaplains, who, as soon as he turns about his face to the altar with the elements in his hands, bows three times, and again, when he comes to the foot of it, where he presents them upon his knees, and lays them upon the altar for consecration. How far the bringing these inventions of men into the worship of God, is chargeable with superstition, and with a departing from the simplicity of the Christian institution, I leave with the reader; but surely the imposing them upon others under severe penalties, without the sanction of convocation, parliament, or royal mandate, was not to be justified.

The lecturers or afternoon preachers, giving his grace some disturbance, notwithstanding the attempts already made to suppress them, the king sent the following injunctions to the bishops of his province:<sup>1</sup> 1. "That they ordain no clergyman without a presentation to some living. Or, 2. Without a certificate that he is provided of some void church. Or, 3. Without some place in a cathedral or collegiate church. Or, 4. Unless he be a fellow of some college. Or, 5. A master of arts of five years' standing, living at his own charge. Or, 6. Without the intention of the bishop to provide for him."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Grey truly observes, that none of these injunctions were new; but only an enforcement of the thirty-third canon of 1603. He refers the reader to bishop Gibson's Codex, p. 162, and might have referred to his own work, entitled, "A system of English ecclesiastical law," extracted from the Codex, p. 43, 44. But though these injunctions were not formed for the occasion, the application of them at that time was particularly directed against the lecturers, who are pointed at, in the king's letter which accompanied the injunc-

By virtue of these injunctions no chaplainship to a nobleman's family, or any invitation to a lecture, could qualify a person for ordination without a living.

In the annual account the archbishop gave the king of the state of his province this year, we may observe how much the suppressing of these popular preachers lay upon his mind. "The bishop of Bath and Wells (says his grace) has taken a great deal of pains in his late visitation, to have all the king's instructions observed, and particularly he has put down several lecturers in market-towns, who were beneficed in other dioceses, because he found, when they had preached factious sermons, they retired without the reach of his jurisdiction.

"And whereas his majesty's instructions require, that lecturers should turn their afternoon sermons into catechisings, some parsons or vicars object against their being included, because lecturers are only mentioned; but the bishops will take care to clear their doubts, and settle their practice.

"The bishop of Peterborough<sup>1</sup> had suppressed a seditious lecture at Repon, and put down several monthly lectures kept with a fast, and managed by a moderator. He had also suppressed a meeting called the running lecture, because the lecture went from village to village.

"The bishop of St. Asaph says, that his diocese is, without exception, abating the increase of Romish recusants in some places, by their superstitious concourse to St. Winifred's well.

"The bishop of Landaff certifies, that he has not one stubborn Nonconformist, or schismatical minister, within his diocese, and but two lecturers.

"All the bishops declare, that they take special care of that branch of his majesty's instructions relating to Calvinism, or preaching upon the predestinarian points; and the archbishop prays his majesty, that no layman whatsoever, and least of all the companies of the city of London, or corporations, should under any pretence have power to put in, or turn out, any lecturer, or other minister."

In this account the reader will observe very little complaint of the growth of Popery, which we shall see presently was at a prodigious height; but all the archbishop's artillery is pointed against the Puritan clergy, who were the most determined and resolved Protestants in the nation.

Towards the close of this year came on the famous trial of William Prynne, esq. barrister at law, and member of Lincoln's inn, for his Histri-

---

tions, as persons "wandering up and down to the scandal of their calling, and to get a maintenance falling upon such courses as were most unfit for them, both by humouring their auditors, and other ways altogether unsufferable." It is easy to perceive what dictated this representation. "By reason of these strict rules (says Rushworth), no lecture whatsoever was admitted to be a canonical title."—ED.

<sup>1</sup> It should be of Lichfield and Coventry, says Dr. Grey, from Laud's Trials and Troubles, p. 527.—Ed.

omastix,<sup>1</sup> a book written against plays, masks, dancing, &c. The information sets forth, that though the author knew that the queen and lords of the council were frequently present at those diversions, yet he had railed against these and several others, as may-poles, Christmas-keeping, dressing houses with ivy, festivals, &c. that he had aspersed the queen, and commended factious persons; which things are of dangerous consequence to the realm and state.<sup>2</sup> The cause was heard in the star-chamber, February 7, 1633. The counsel for Mr. Prynne were, Mr. Atkyns, afterward a judge of the common-pleas, Mr. Jenkins, Holbourne, Herne, and Lightfoot. For the king was Mr. attorney-general Noy. The counsel for the defendant pleaded, that he had handled the argument of stage-plays in a learned manner, without designing to reflect on his superiors;<sup>3</sup> that the book had been licensed according to law; and that if any passages may be construed to reflect on

---

<sup>1</sup> This book is a thick quarto, containing one thousand and six pages. It abounded with learning, and had some curious quotations, but it was a very tedious and heavy performance; so that it was not calculated to invite many to read it. This circumstance exposes the weakness, as the severity of the sentence against him does the wickedness, of those who pursued the author with such barbarity. He was a man of sour and austere principles, of great reading, and most assiduous application to study. It was supposed, that, from the time of his arrival at man's estate, he wrote a sheet for every day of his life. "His custom (Mr. Wood informs us) was, when he studied, to put on a long quilted cap, which came an inch over his eyes, serving as an umbrella to defend them from too much light; and seldom eating a dinner, would every three hours or more be munching a roll of bread, and now and then refresh his exhausted spirits with ale." To this Butler seems to allude in his address to his muse:

Thou that with ale or viler liquors.  
Didst inspire Withers, Prynne, and Vicars;  
And teach them, though it were in spite  
Of nature and their stars, to write.

His works amounted to forty volumes folio and quarto. The most valuable, and a very useful performance, is his "Collection of Records" in four large volumes. Harris's *Life of Charles I.* p. 226. 227. Wood's *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. 2. p. 315; and Granger's *Biog. Hist.* vol. 2. p. 230, 8vo. The prosecution of Mr. Prynne originated with archbishop Laud, who on a Sunday morning went to Noy, the attorney-general, with the charges against him. Prynne had instigated the resentment of Laud and other prelates by his writing against Arminianism and the jurisdiction of the bishops, and by some prohibitions he had moved and got to the high-commission court.----"Tantæne animis coelestibus iræ." Whitlocke's *Memoirs*, p. 18.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 221.

<sup>3</sup> A passage quoted by Dr. Grey from lord Cottington's speech, at the trial of Mr. Prynne, will afford a specimen of the spirit and style of the *Histriomastix*: "Our English ladies (he writes), shorn and frizzled madams, have lost their modesty; that the devil is only honoured in dancing; that they that frequent plays are damned; and so are all that do not concur with him, in his opinion, whores, panders, foul incarnate devils, Judases to their Lord and Master." But this way of speaking was in the taste of the times: and the speech of lord Dorset, given above, shows that a nobleman did not come behind him in severe and foul language.—ED.

his majesty, or any branch of his government, he humbly begs pardon. But Mr. Attorney aggravated the charge in very severe language, and pronounced it a malicious and dangerous libel. After a full hearing he was sentenced to have his book burnt by the hands of the common hangman, to be put from the bar, and to be for ever incapable of his profession, to be turned out of the society of Lincoln's inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, to lose both his ears, one in each place, to pay a fine of £5,000. and to suffer perpetual imprisonment. Remarkable was the speech of the earl of Dorset on this occasion: "Mr. Prynne (says he), I declare you to be a schism-maker in the church, a sedition-sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, *omnium malorum nequissimus*. I shall fine him £10,000. which is more than he is worth, yet less than he deserves. I will not set him at liberty, no more than a plagued man or a mad dog, who though he can't bite will foam: he is so far from being a social soul, that he is not a rational soul. He is fit to live in dens with such beasts of prey, as wolves and tigers, like himself; therefore I condemn him to perpetual imprisonment; and for corporal punishment I would have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off."<sup>1</sup> A speech more fit for an American savage than an English nobleman!

A few months after, Dr. Bastwick, a physician at Colchester, having published a book entitled "Elenchus religionis Papisticæ," with an appendix called "Flagellum pontificis et episcoporum Latialium, which gave offence to the English bishops, because it denied the divine right of the order of bishops above presbyters, was cited before the high-commission, who discarded him from his profession [1634], excommunicated him, fined him £1,000. and imprisoned him till he recanted.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Burton, B. D. minister of Friday-street, having published two exceptionable sermons, from Prov. xxiv. 21, 22, entitled, "For God and the king," against the late innovations, had his house and study broken open by a serjeant-at-arms, and himself committed close prisoner to the Gate-house, where he was confined several years.

These terrible proceedings<sup>3</sup> of the commissioners made many conscientious Nonconformists retire with their families to Holland and New Eng-

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 233. 240.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Grey's remark here, as doing credit to himself, deserves to be quoted: "The severity of the sentence (says the doctor) I am far from justifying."—ED.

<sup>3</sup> "The punishment of these men, who were of three great professions (says Mr. Granger) was ignominious and severe: though they were never objects of esteem they soon became objects of pity. The indignity and severity of their punishment gave general offence; and they were no longer regarded as criminals, but confessors." While these prosecutions were carried on with unrelenting severity, Chowney, a fierce Papist, who wrote a book in defence of the Popish religion, and of the church of Rome, averring it to be the

land, for fear of falling into the hands of men, whose tender mercies were cruelty.

Among others who went over this year, was the reverend and learned Mr. John Cotton, B. D. fellow of Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and minister of Boston in Lincolnshire, where he was in such repute, that Dr. Preston and others from Cambridge frequently visited him; he was an admired preacher, and of a most meek and gentle disposition; he became a Nonconformist upon this principle, That no church had power to impose indifferent ceremonies, not commanded by Christ, on the consciences of men.<sup>1</sup> He therefore omitted some of the ceremonies, and administered the sacrament to such as desired it without kneeling; for which he was informed against in the high-commission; and Laud being now at the head of affairs, the bishop of Lincoln his diocesan could not protect him. Mr. Cotton applied to the earl of Dorset for his interest with the archbishop, but the earl sent him word, that “if he had been guilty of drunkenness, uncleanness, or any such lesser fault, he could have got his pardon, but the sin of Puritanism and nonconformity (says his lordship) is unpardonable, and therefore you must fly for your safety.” Upon this he travelled to London in disguise, and took passage for New England, where he arrived September 3, 1633, and spent the remainder of his days, to the year 1652.

Mr. John Davenport, B. D. and vicar of Coleman-street, London, resigned his living, and retired to Holland this summer, 1633.<sup>2</sup> He had fallen under the resentments of his diocesan bishop Laud, for being concerned in the feoffments, which, together with some notices he received of being prosecuted for nonconformity, induced him to embark for Amsterdam, where he continued about three years, and then returning to England, he shipped himself with some other families for New England, where he began the settlement of Newhaven in the year 1637. He was a good scholar, and an admired preacher, but underwent great hardships in the infant colony, with whom he continued till about the year 1670, when he died.

The reverend Mr. Thomas Hooker, fellow of Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and lecturer of Chelmsford in Essex, after four years’ exercise of his ministry, was obliged to lay it down for nonconformity, though forty-seven conformable ministers in the neighbourhood subscribed a petition to the bishop [Laud], in which they declare, that Mr. Hooker was, for doctrine orthodox, for life and conversation honest, for disposition peaceable, and in

---

true church, was not only not punished, or even questioned for his performance; but was permitted to dedicate it to the archbishop, and it was favoured with his patronage. Granger’s Biogr. Hist. vol. 2. p. 192; and Whitelocke’s Memoirs, p. 211.—ED.

<sup>1</sup> Mather’s Hist. N. E. b. 3. p. 18, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. b. 3. p. 52.



no wise turbulent or factious.<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding which he was silenced by the spiritual court, 1630, and bound in a recognizance of £50, to appear before the high-commission; but by the advice of his friends, he forfeited his recognizance and fled to Holland; here he continued about two years fellow-labourer with old Mr. Forbes, a Scotsman at Delft, from whence he was called to assist Dr. Ames at Rotterdam, upon whose death he returned to England, and being pursued by the bishop's officers from place to place, he embarked this summer for New England, and settled with his friends upon the banks of the Connecticut-river, where he died in the year 1647. He was an awakening preacher, and a considerable practical writer, as appears by his books of Preparation for Christ, Contrition, Humiliation, &c.

The reverend and learned Dr. William Ames, educated at Cambridge, under the famous Mr. Perkins, fled from the persecution of archbishop Bancroft, and became minister of the English church at the Hague, from whence he was invited by the states of Friesland to the divinity-chair in the university of Franeker, which he filled with universal reputation for twelve years. He was in the synod of Dort, and informed king James's ambassador at the Hague, from time to time, of the debates of that venerable assembly. He wrote several treatises in Latin against the Arminians, which, for their conciseness and perspicuity, were not equalled by any of his time. His other works are, *Manuductio Logica*, *Medulla Theologiæ*, *Cases of Conscience*, *Analysis on the book of Psalms*, *Notes on the First and Second Epistles of Peter*, and upon the *Catechistical Heads*. After twelve years Dr. Ames resigned his professorship, and accepted of an invitation to the English congregation at Rotterdam, the air of Franeker being too sharp for him, he being troubled with such a difficulty of breathing, that he concluded every winter would be his last; besides, he had a desire to be employed in the delightful work of preaching to his own countrymen, which he had disused for many years. Upon his removal to Rotterdam he wrote his "Fresh Suit against Ceremonies;" but his constitution was so shattered, that the air of Holland did him no service; upon which he determined to remove to New England, but his asthma returning at the beginning of the winter before he sailed, put an end to his life at Rotterdam, where he was buried November 14, N. S. 1633. Next spring his wife and children embarked for New England, and carried with them his valuable library of books, which was a rich treasure to the country at that time. The doctor was a very learned divine, a strict Calvinist in doctrine, and of the persuasion of the Independents, with regard to the subordination and power of classes and synods.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Mather's Hist. N. E. b. 3. p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> He filled the divinity-chair with admirable abilities. His fame was so great, that many came from remote nations to be educated under him. In "An historical and critical account of Hugh Peters," London, 1751, is a quotation from a piece of his in these words: "Learned

Archbishop Laud being now chancellor of the university of Dublin, and having a new vice-chancellor [Wentworth] disposed to serve the purposes of the prerogative, turned his thoughts against the Calvinists of that kingdom, resolving to bring the church of Ireland to adopt the articles of the church of England. Archbishop Usher, and some of his brethren, being informed of the design, moved in convocation, that their own articles, ratified by king James in the year 1615, might be confirmed; but the motion was rejected, because it was said, they were already fortified with all the authority the church could give them, and that a farther confirmation would imply a defect. It was then moved on the other side, that for silencing the Popish objections of a disagreement among Protestants, a canon should be passed for approving the articles of the church of England, which was done only with one dissenting voice; one Calvinist, says Mr. Collyer, having looked deeper into the matter than the rest.

The canon was in these words: “For the manifestation of our agreement with the church of England, in the confession of the same Christian faith and doctrine of the sacrament, we do receive and approve the book of articles of religion, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops, &c. in the year 1562, for the avoiding diversity of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion; and therefore if any hereafter shall affirm, that any of these articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated.”<sup>1</sup>

The Irish bishops thought they had lost nothing by this canon, because they had saved their own articles, but Laud took advantage of it during the time of his chancellorship; for hereby the church of Ireland denounced the sentence of excommunication against all that affirmed any of the thirty-nine articles to be superstitious or erroneous, that is, against the whole body of the Puritans; and Fuller<sup>2</sup> adds, that their own articles, which condemned Arminianism, and maintained the morality of the sabbath, were utterly excluded.

This summer the reverend Mr. Thomas Sheppard, M. A. fled to New England. He had been lecturer at Earl’s-Coln in Essex several years, but when Laud became bishop of London his lecture was put down, and himself silenced; he then retired into the family of a private gentleman, but the bishop’s officers following him thither, he travelled into Yorkshire, where

---

Amesius breathed his last breath into my bosom, who left his professorship in Friesland to live with me, because of my church's independency at Rotterdam. He was my colleague, and chosen brother to the church, where I was an unworthy pastor.” Granger’s History of England, vol. 2. p. 198, 199. 8vo.—ED.

<sup>1</sup> Bib. Reg. §. 13. no. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Church Hist. b. 11. p. 149.

Neile archbishop of that province commanded him to subscribe or depart the country; upon this he went to Hedon in Northumberland, where his labours were prospered to the conversion of some souls; but the bishop of Durham, by the direction of archbishop Laud, forbade his preaching in any part of his diocese, which obliged him to take shipping at Yarmouth for New England; where he continued pastor of the church at Cambridge till his death, which happened August 25, 1649, in the forty-fourth year of his age.<sup>1</sup> He was a hard student, an exemplary Christian, and an eminent practical writer, as appears by his *Sincere Convert*, and other practical works that go under his name.

The reverend Mr. John Norton went over in the same ship with Mr. Sheppard,<sup>2</sup> being driven out of Hertfordshire by the severity of the times. He settled at Ipswich in New England, and was afterward removed to Boston, where he died in the year 1665. Mr. Fuller says, he was a divine of no less learning than modesty, as appears sufficiently by his numerous writings.

His grace of Canterbury, having made some powerful efforts to bring the churches of Scotland and Ireland to a uniformity with England, resolved in his metropolitane visitation this summer, to reduce the Dutch and French churches (which were ten in number, having between five and six thousand communicants) to the same conformity; for this purpose he tendered them these three articles of inquiry.

1. "Whether do you use the Dutch or French liturgy?"
2. "Of how many descents are you since you came into England?"
3. "Do such as are born here in England conform to the English ceremonies?"

The ministers and elders demurred upon these questions, and insisted upon their charter of privileges granted by king Edward VI. and confirmed no less than five times in the reign of king James, and twice by king Charles himself, by virtue of which they had been exempt from all archiepiscopal and episcopal jurisdiction till this time: yet Laud, without any regard to their charter, sent them the two following injunctions by his vicar-general.

1. "That all that were born in England of the Dutch and Walloon congregations, should repair to their parish-churches.
2. "That those who were not natives, but came from abroad, while they remained strangers, might use their own discipline as formerly."

In this emergency the Dutch and Walloon churches petitioned for a toleration, and showed the inconveniences that would arise from the archbish-

---

<sup>1</sup> Mather's *Hist. New England*, b. 3, p. 86, &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 34.

op's injunctions; as, that if all their children born in England were taken from their communion, their churches must break up and return home; for as they came into England for the liberty of their consciences, they would not continue here after it was taken from them.<sup>1</sup> They desired therefore it might be considered what damages would arise to the kingdom by driving away the foreigners with their manufactures, and discouraging others from settling in their room. The mayor and corporation of Canterbury assured his grace, that above twelve hundred of their poor were maintained by the foreigners, and others interceded with the king in their favour; but his majesty answered, "We must believe our archbishop of Canterbury," who used their deputies very roughly, calling them a nest of schismatics, and telling them it were better to have no foreign churches, than to indulge their nonconformity. In conclusion he assured them, by a letter dated August 19, 1635, that his majesty was resolved his injunctions should be observed, viz. That all their children of the second descent born in England, should resort to their parish-churches,<sup>2</sup> "and (says his grace) I do expect all obedience and conformity from you, and if you refuse, I shall proceed against the natives according to the laws and canons ecclesiastical." Accordingly some of their churches were interdicted, others shut up, and the assemblies dissolved; their ministers being suspended, many of their people left the kingdom, especially in the diocese of Norwich, where bishop Wren drove away three thousand manufacturers in wool, cloth, &c. some of whom employed a hundred poor people at work; to the unspeakable damage of the kingdom.

As a farther mark of disregard to the foreign Protestants, the king's ambassador in France was forbidden to frequent their religious assemblies. "It had been customary (says Lord Clarendon) for the ambassadors employed in any parts where the reformed religion was exercised, to frequent their churches, and to hold correspondence with the most powerful persons of that religion, particularly the English ambassadors at Paris constantly frequented the church at Charenton; but the contrary to this was now practised, and some advertisements, if not instructions, given to the ambassador, to forbear any commerce with the men of that religion. Lord Scudamore, who was the last ambassador before the beginning of the long parliament, instead of going to Charenton, furnished his chapel after the new fashion, with candles upon the altar, &c. and took care to publish, upon all occasions, that the church of England looked not on the Huguenots as a part of their communion; which was likewise industriously discoursed at home.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is said that Richelieu made the following speech on this exacted conformity: "If a king of England, who is a Protestant, will not permit two disciplines in his kingdom, why should a king of France, who is a Papist, admit two religions?" Mrs. Macaulay's History of England, vol. 2. p. 145. note 8vo.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, vol 2. part 2. p. 273.

This made a great many foreign Protestants leave the kingdom, and transport themselves into foreign parts.” The church of England by this means lost the esteem of the reformed churches abroad, who could hardly pity her, when a few years after she sunk down into the deepest distress.

To give another instance of the archbishop’s disaffection to the foreign Protestants, the queen of Bohemia, the king’s sister, solicited the king, in the most pressing manner, to admit of a public collection over England for the poor persecuted ministers of the Palatinate, who were banished their country for their religion. Accordingly the king granted them a brief to go through the kingdom; but when it was brought to the archbishop he excepted against the following clause:<sup>1</sup> “Whose cases are the more to be deplored, because this extremity has fallen upon them for their sincerity and constancy in the true religion, which we together with them professed, and which we are all bound in conscience to maintain to the utmost of our powers. Whereas these religious and godly persons, being involved among others their countrymen, might have enjoyed their estates and fortunes, if with other backsliders in the times of trial they would have submitted themselves to the antichristian yoke, and have renounced or dissembled the profession of their religion.” His grace had two exceptions to this passage: 1. The religion of the Palatine churches is affirmed to be the same with ours, which he denied, because they were Calvinists, and because their ministers had not episcopal ordination. 2. He objected to the church of Rome’s being called an antichristian yoke, because it would then follow, that she was in no capacity to convey sacerdotal power in ordinations, and consequently the benefit of the priesthood, and the force of holy ministrations, would be lost in the English church, forasmuch as she has no orders but what she derives from the church of Rome. Laud having acquainted the king with his exceptions, they were expunged in another draught. But the collection not succeeding in this way, Dr. Sibbes, Gouge, and other divines of the Puritan party, signed a private recommendatory letter, desiring their friends to enlarge their charity, as to men of the same faith and profession with themselves, and promising to see to the right distribution of the money; but as soon as Laud heard of it, he cited the divines before the high commission, and put a stop to the collection.

This year [1634] put an end to the life of the reverend Mr. Hugh Clarke, born at Burton-upon-Trent 1563, and educated partly at Cambridge and partly at Oxford. He was first minister of Oundle in Northamptonshire, and then of Woolston in Warwickshire, from whence he was suspended, and afterwards excommunicated, for expounding upon the catechism. At length

---

<sup>1</sup> Cyp. Ang. Collyer, vol. 2. p. 764, 765.

he was indicted for high treason, because he had prayed, “that God would forgive the queen [Elizabeth] her sins,”<sup>1</sup> but was ac

quitted. He was an awakening preacher, of a warm spirit, and a robust constitution, which he wore out with preaching twice every Lord’s day, and frequently on the week-days. His ministry met with great success even to his death, which happened, November 6, 1634, in the seventy second year of his age.<sup>2</sup>

About the same time died the reverend and pious Mr. John Carter, a man that feared God from his youth, and was always employed in acts of devotion and charity. He was born in Kent 1554, and educated in Clare hall, Cambridge. He was first minister of Bramford in Suffolk for thirty-four years, and then rector of Bedstead in the same county; and though often in trouble for his nonconformity, he made a shift, by the assistance of friends, to maintain his liberty without any sinful compliance. He was mighty in prayer, frequent and fervent in preaching, and a resolute champion against Popery, Arminianism, and the new ceremonies. He lived to a good old age, and died suddenly, as he was lying down to sleep, in the eightieth year of his age, greatly lamented by all who had a taste for practical religion and undissembled piety.<sup>3</sup> His funeral sermon was preached before a vast concourse of people, from these words, “My father, my father, the chariots of Israel, and the horsemen thereof!”

Conformity to the new ceremonies and the king’s injunctions was now pressed with the utmost rigour. The reverend Mr. Crook of Brazen-nose college, and Mr. Hobbes of Trinity college, Oxford, were enjoined a public recantation for reflecting upon the Arminians.

Mr Samuel Ward, of Ipswich, having preached against the book of sports, and bowing at the name of Jesus, added, that the church of England was ready to ring changes in religion; and that the gospel stood a tiptoe,

---

<sup>1</sup> Here bishop Warburton censures Mr. Neal as guilty of “an unfair representation.” His lordship adds, “that they were the sins of persecuting the holy discipline which he prayed for the remission of; and that, reflecting on her administration was the thing which gave offence.” The bishop is certainly right in this construction of Mr. Clarke’s prayer; but there is no occasion, methinks, for the charge he brings against Mr. Neal, who does not refer the expression, or insinuate that it was to be referred, to the personal vices of the queen; but rather the contrary; for he speaks of it as the ground on which Mr. Clarke was indicted for high treason. He might well suppose, that his reader would understand the language as pointing to the oppressions of her government, and the severities which the Puritans suffered under it. This would have been perfectly clear, had Mr. Neal added from his author, that this prayer, though in modest expressions, was offered up, when the persecution of the Nonconformists was becoming hot.—Ed.-

<sup>2</sup> Clarke’s Lives annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 127.

<sup>3</sup> Ut supra, p. 132.

ready to be gone to America;<sup>1</sup> for which he was suspended, and enjoined a public recantation. Another underwent the same censure, for saying, it was suspicious that the night was approaching, because the shadows were so much longer than the body, and ceremonies more enforced than the power of godliness.

The reverend Mr. Chauncey, late minister of Ware, but now of Mars-ton-Lawrence, in the diocess of Peterborough, was imprisoned, condemned in costs of suit, and obliged to read the following recantation, for opposing the railing in the communion-table:

“Whereas I, Charles Chauncey, clerk, late vicar of Ware, stand convicted for opposing the setting up a rail round the communion-table, and for saying it was an innovation, a snare to men’s consciences, a breach of the second commandment, an addition to God’s worship, and that which drove me from the place, I do now, before this honourable court, acknowledge my great offence, and protest I am ready to declare upon oath, that I am now persuaded in my conscience, that kneeling at the communion is a lawful and commendable gesture; that the rail is a decent and convenient ornament, and that I was much to blame for opposing it; and do promise from henceforth, never by word or deed to oppose that, or any other laudable rites and ceremonies used in the church of England.”<sup>2</sup>

After this he was judicially admonished and discharged; but the recantation went so much against his conscience, that he could enjoy no peace till he had quitted the church of England, and retired to New England, where he made an open acknowledgment of his sin.

The churchwardens of Beckington in Somersetshire were excommunicated by the bishop of Bath and Wells, for refusing to remove the communion-table from the middle of the chancel to the east end, and not pulling down the seats to make room for it. They produced a certificate, that their communion-table had stood time out of mind in the midst of the chancel; that the ground on which it was placed was raised a foot, and enclosed with a decent wainscot border, and that none went within it but the minister, and such as he required. This not availing, they appealed to the arches, and at last to the king; but their appeal was rejected. After they had remained excommunicated for a year, they were cast into the common jail, where they continued till the year 1637, and were then obliged to do public penance in the parish-church of Beckington, and two others, the shame of which broke their hearts; one of them declaring upon his death-bed soon after, that the penance and submission, so much against his conscience, had sunk his spirits, and was one principal cause of his death.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 285. Prynne, p. 285.

<sup>2</sup> Prynne, p. 95. 97. 100. Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 301. 316.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 300.

In the archbishop's metropolitanical visitation this summer, Mr. Lee, one of the prebendaries of Litchfield, was suspended, for churching refractory women in private, for being averse to the good orders of the church, and for ordering the bellman to give notice in open market of a sermon.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Randal, of Teddington near Hampton-court, Middlesex, was suspended for preaching a sermon above an hour long on Sunday in the afternoon, though it was a farewell sermon to the exercise of catechising. His grace's account of his province this year gives a further relation of the bufferings of the Puritans:<sup>2</sup> he acquaints his majesty, that the French and Dutch churches had not as yet thoroughly complied with his injunctions.—That in the diocess of London, Dr. Houghton rector of Aldermanbury, Mr. Simpson curate and lecturer of St. Margaret Fish-street, Mr. John Goodwin vicar of Coleman-street, and Mr. Viner of St. Lawrence Old-Jewry, had been convened for breach of canons, and had submitted; to whom his grace might have added, Dr. Sibbes, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Gouge, Mr. White of Dorsetshire, and about twenty more; some of whom fled into Holland, and others retired into New England. The bishop of Bath and Wells certified, that he had not one single lecture in any corporation-town, and that all afternoon sermons were turned into eatechisings in all parishes.—In the diocess of Norwich were many Puritans, but that Mr. Ward of Yarmouth was in the high-commission. From the diocess of Llandaff, Mr. Wroth and Mr. Erbury, two noted schismatics, were brought before the high commission.—And that in the diocess of Gloucester, were several popular and factious ministers.

It must be confessed, that the zeal of the Puritans was not always well regulated; nor were their ministers so much on their guard in the pulpit or conversation as they ought, considering the number of informers that entered all their churches, that insinuated themselves into all public conversation, and, like so many locusts, covered the land. These were so numerous and corrupt, that the king was obliged to bring them under certain regulations; for no man was safe in public company, nor even in conversing with his friends and neighbours. Many broke up housekeeping, that they might breathe in a freer air; which the council being informed of, a proclamation was published [July 21, 1635], forbidding all persons, except soldiers, mariners, merchants, and their factors, to depart the kingdom without his majesty's licence.

But notwithstanding this prohibition, numbers went to New England this summer; and among others the reverend Mr. Peter Bulkley, B.D., and fellow of St. John's college, Cambridge. He was son of Dr. Edward Bulkley, of Bedfordshire, and succeeded him at Woodhill, or Odel, in that

---

<sup>1</sup> Prynne, p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> Collyer's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 763.



county. Here he continued above twenty years, the bishop of Lincoln con-  
niving at his nonconformity: but when Dr. Laud was at the helm of the  
church, and the bishop of Lincoln in disgrace, Bulkley was silenced by the  
vicar-general sir Nathaniel Brent; upon which he sold a very plentiful es-  
tate, and transported himself and his effects to New England, where he died  
in the year 1658–9, and the seventyseventh of his age. He was a thundering  
preacher, and a judicious divine, as appears by his treatise “Of the cove-  
nant,” which passed through several editions, and was one of the first books  
published in that country.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Richard Mather, educated in Brazen-nose-college, Oxon, and min-  
ister of Toxteth near Liverpool for about fifteen years, a diligent and suc-  
cessful preacher, was suspended for nonconformity in the year 1633, but by  
the intercession of friends, after six months he was restored. Next summer  
the archbishop of York sending his visitors into Lancashire, this good man  
was again suspended by Dr. Cosins, upon an information that he had not  
worn the surplice for fifteen years. After this, no intercession could obtain  
the liberty of his ministry; upon which he took shipping at Bristol, and ar-  
rived at Boston in New England, August 17, 1635. He settled at Dorchester,  
and continued with his people, a plain and profitable preacher to the year  
1669, when he died. This was the grandfather of the famous Dr. Cotton  
Mather.

In Scotland the fire was kindling apace, which in three years’ time set  
both kingdoms in a flame. The restoring episcopacy by the violent methods  
already mentioned, did not sit easy upon the people; the new Scots bishops  
were of bishop Laud’s principles; they spoke very favourably of Popery in  
their sermons, and cast some invidious reflections on the reformers; they  
declared openly for the doctrines of Arminius; for sports on the sabbath;  
and for the liturgy of the English church; which was imagined to be little  
better than the mass.<sup>2</sup> This lost them their esteem with the people, who had  
been trained up in the doctrines and discipline of Calvin, and in the strict  
observation of the Lord’s day. But the king, to support them, cherished  
them with expressions of the greatest respect and confidence; he made  
eleven of them privy-counsellors; the archbishop of St. Andrews was lord-  
chancellor, and the bishop of Ross was in nomination to be lord-high-  
treasurer; divers of them were of the exchequer, and had engrossed the best  
secular preferments, which made them the envy of the nobility and gentry  
of that nation. The bishops were so sensible of this, that they advised the  
king not to trust the intended alterations in religion to parliaments or gen-  
eral assemblies, but to introduce them by his regal authority.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rapin, vol. 2. p. 394, folio edit.

<sup>2</sup> Burnet’s Memoirs of D. Hamilton, p. 29, 30.

When the king was last in Scotland, it was taken notice of as a great blemish in the kirk, that it had no liturgy or book of canons. To supply this defect the king gave orders to the new bishops, to prepare draughts of both, and remit them to London, to be revised by the bishops Laud, Juxon, and Wren. The book of canons being first finished, was presented to the king, and by him delivered to Laud and Juxon to examine, alter, and reform, at pleasure, and to bring it as near as possible to a conformity with the English canons. The bishops having executed their commission, and prepared it for press, the king confirmed it under the great seal by letters patent, dated at Greenwich, May 23, 1635. The instrument sets forth, “that his majesty, by his royal and supreme authority in causes ecclesiastical, ratifies and confirms the said canons, orders, and constitutions, and all and everything in them contained, and strictly commands all archbishops, bishops, and others exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to see them punctually observed.”

To give the reader a specimen of these canons, which were subversive of the whole Scots constitution both in kirk and state:

1. “The first canon excommunicates all those who affirm the power and prerogative of the king not to be equal with the Jewish kings, that is, absolute and unlimited.

2. “The second excommunicates those who shall affirm, the worship contained in the Book of Common Prayer, [which was not yet published], or the government of the kirk, by archbishops, bishops, &c. to be corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful.

3. “The third restrains ordinations to the *quatuor tempora*; that is, the first weeks of March, June, September, and December.

5. “The fifth obliges all presbyters to read, or cause to be read, divine service, according to the form of the Book of the Scottish Common Prayer, and to conform to all the offices, parts, and rubrics, of it [though not yet published].

The book decrees further, “that no assembly of the clergy shall be called but by the king.

“That none shall receive the sacrament but upon their knees.

“That every ecclesiastical person, dying without children, shall give part of his estate to the church.

“That the clergy shall have no private meetings for expounding Scripture.

“That no clergyman shall conceive prayer, but pray only by the printed form, to be prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.

“That no man shall teach school without a licence from the bishop; nor any censures of the church be pronounced, but by the approbation of the bishop. .

“That no presbyter shall reveal any thing in confession, except his own life should by the concealment be forfeited.”

After sundry other canons of this nature, as appointing fonts for baptism, church-ornaments, communion-tables, or altars, &c. the book decrees, that no person shall be admitted to holy orders, or to preach or administer the sacraments, without first subscribing the forementioned canons.

This book was no sooner published, than the Scots presbyters declared peremptorily against it;<sup>1</sup> their objections were of two sorts; they disliked the matter of the canons, as inconsistent with their kirk government, and severer in some particulars than those of the church of England: they protested also against the manner of imposing them, without consent of parliament or general assembly. It was thought intolerable vassalage, by a people who had asserted the independent power of the church, to convene assemblies of the clergy, and who had maintained that their decrees were binding, without the confirmation of the crown; to have the king and a few foreign bishops dictate canons to them, without so much as asking their advice and consent. Such a high display of the supremacy could not fail of being highly resented by a church, that had never yielded it to the king in the latitude in which it had been claimed and exercised in England. Besides, it was very preposterous to publish the book of canons before the book of common prayer, and to require submission and subscription to things that had no existence; for who could foretell what might be inserted in the common prayer-book? or what kind of service might be imposed upon the kirk? This looked too much like pinning the faith of a whole nation on the lawn-sleeves.

To return to England: Towards the end of this year it pleased God to remove out of this world the reverend Dr. Richard Sibbes, one of the most celebrated preachers of his time. He was born at Sudbury 1579, and educated in St. John’s college, Cambridge, where he went through all the degrees. Having entered into the ministry, he was first chosen lecturer of Trinity-church in Cambridge, where his ministry was very successful to the conversion and reformation of his hearers. About the year 1618, he was appointed preacher to the honourable society of Gray’s inn, London, in which station he became so famous, that besides the lawyers of the house, many of the nobility and gentry frequented his sermons. In the year 1625, he was chosen master of Katherine-hall, in the university of Cambridge, the government of which he made a shift to continue to his death, though he was turned out of his fellowship and lecture in the university for nonconformity, and often cited before the high-commission. He was a divine of good learning, thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures, a burning and shining light,

---

<sup>1</sup> Collyer’s Ecclcs. Hist. p. 764.

and of a most humble and charitable disposition; but all these talents could not screen him from the fury of the times. His works<sup>1</sup> discover him to have been of a heavenly evangelical spirit, the comforts of which he enjoyed at his death, which happened the latter end of this summer, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.<sup>2</sup>

To aggrandize the church yet farther, the archbishop resolved to bring part of the business of Westminster-hall into the ecclesiastical courts. The civilians had boldly and unwarrantably opposed and protested against prohibitions, and other proceedings at law, in restraint of their spiritual courts, and had procured some privileges and orders from the king in favour of the ecclesiastical courts, which had greatly offended the gentlemen of the law. But the archbishop now went a step farther, and prevailed with the king to direct that half the masters in chancery should always be civil lawyers; and to declare that no others, of what condition soever, should serve him as masters of request: these were more akin to the church than the common lawyers; their places being in the bishop's disposal, (as chancellors, commissaries, &c.) and therefore it was supposed their persons would be so too; but this was false policy, says the noble historian,<sup>3</sup> because it disgusted a whole learned profession, who were more capable of disserving the church in their estates, inheritances, and stewardships, than the church could hurt them in their practice. Besides, it was wrong in itself, for I have never yet spoken with one clergyman, says his lordship, who hath had experience of both litigations, that has not ingenuously confessed, that he had rather, in respect of his trouble, charge, and satisfaction to his understanding, have three suits depending in Westminster-hall, than one in the arches, or any ecclesiastical court.

As a farther step towards the sovereign power of the church, his grace prevailed with the king to allow the bishops to hold their ecclesiastical courts in their own names, and by their own seals, without the king's letters patent under the great seal; the judges having given it as their opinion, that a patent under the great seal was not necessary for examinations, suspensions, and other church-censures. This was undoubtedly contrary to law, for by the statute 1 Edw. VI. cap. 2, it is declared, "that all ecclesiastical jurisdiction is immediately from the crown; and that all persons exercising such jurisdiction shall have in their seal the king's arms, and shall use no other seal of jurisdiction on pain of imprisonment."<sup>4</sup> This statute being repealed 1

---

<sup>1</sup> Of these the most noted was his Bruised Reed; to which, Mr. Baxter tells us, he in a great measure owed his conversion. This circumstance alone, observes Mr. Granger, would have rendered his name memorable. *History of England*, vol. 2. p. 176. 8vo.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Clarke's Lives, annexed to his *General Martyrology*, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> Clarendon, vol. 2. p. 305, 306.

<sup>4</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 150.

Mariæ, cap. 2, was again revived by 1 Jac. cap. 25, as has been observed.<sup>1</sup> Hereupon, in the parliaments of the 3rd and 7th of king James I. the bishops were proceeded against, and two of them in a manner attainted in a premunire by the house of commons, for making citations and processes in their own names, and using their own seals, contrary to this statute, and to the common law, and in derogation of the prerogative. So that by this concession, the king dispensed with the laws, and yielded away the ancient and undoubted right of his crown; and the bishops were brought under a premunire, for exercising spiritual jurisdiction without any special commission, patent, or grant, from, by, or under, his majesty: whereas all jurisdiction of this kind ought to have been exercised in the king's name, and by virtue of his authority only, signified by letters patent under his majesty's seal.

The archbishop was no less intent upon enlarging his own jurisdiction, claiming a right to visit the two universities *jure metropolitico*, which being referred to the king and council, his majesty was pleased to give judgment against himself. As chancellor of Oxford his grace caused a new body of statutes to be drawn up for that university, with a preface, in which are some severe reflections on good king Edward and his government; it says, that the discipline of the university was discomposed, and troubled by that king's injunctions, and the flattering novelty of the age. It then commends the reign of his sister the bloody queen Mary, and says, that the discipline of the church revived and flourished again in her days, under cardinal Pool, when by the much-desired felicity of those times an inbred candour supplied the defect of statutes.<sup>2</sup> Was this spoken like a Protestant prelate, whose predecessors in the sees of London and Canterbury were burnt at Oxford by queen Mary, in a most barbarous manner? Or rather like one, who was aiming at the return of those happy times?

The last and most extravagant stretch of episcopal power that I shall mention, was the bishops framing new articles of visitation in their own names, without the king's seal and authority; and administering on oath of inquiry to the churchwardens concerning them.<sup>3</sup> This was an outrage upon the laws, contrary to the act of submission, 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 25, and even to the twelfth canon of 1603, which says, "that whosoever shall affirm it

---

<sup>1</sup> Usurpation of Prelates, p. 92. 115.

<sup>2</sup> An answer to Mr. Neal, it is urged by Dr. Grey, may be supplied from Frankland's Annals of King Charles I. according to whom what is applied above to queen Mary's time only, relates to all former times, as well as hers, during which the uncertainty of the statutes lasted and put the university to an inconvenience; and who asserts, that the preface, mentioned by Mr. Neal, was written by Dr. Peter Turner, of Merton-college, a doctor of civil law. The reader, however, will probably apprehend, that it expressed the sentiments of archbishop Laud, and was virtually his. — ED.

<sup>3</sup> Usurpation of Prelates, p. 229. 210.

lawful, for any sort of ministers, or lay-persons, to assemble together, and make rules, orders, and constitutions, in causes ecclesiastical, without the king's authority, and shall submit themselves to be ruled and governed by them, let him be excommunicated:" which includes the framers of the orders, as well as those who act under them. The administering an oath to churchwardens, without a royal commission, had no foundation in law; for by the common law, no ecclesiastical judge can administer an oath (except in cases of matrimony and testaments) without letters patent, or a special commission under the great seal. It was also declared contrary to the laws and statutes of the land, by sir Edward Coke and the rest of the judges, 3 James, in the case of Mr. Wharton, who, being churchwarden of Blackfriars, London, was excommunicated and imprisoned on a *capias excommunicatum*, for refusing to take an oath, to present upon visitation-articles; but bringing his *habeas corpus*, he was discharged by the whole court, both from his imprisonment and excommunication, for this reason, because the oath and articles were against the laws and statutes of this realm, and so might and ought to be refused. Upon the whole, the making the mitre thus independent of the crown, and not subject to a prohibition from the courts of Westminster-hall, was setting up *imperium in imperio*, and going a great way toward re-establishing one of the heaviest grievances of the Papacy; but the bishops presumed upon the felicity of the times, and the indulgence of the crown, which at another time might have involved them in a premature.

The articles of visitation differed in the several diocesses; the churchwardens' oath was generally the same, viz.

"You shall swear, that you, and every of you, shall duly consider and diligently inquire of all and every of these articles given you in charge; and that all affection, favour, hope of reward and gain, or fear of displeasure, or malice set aside, you shall present all and every such person that now is, or of late was, within your parish, or hath committed any offence, or made any default mentioned in any of these articles, or which are vehemently suspected, or defamed of any such offence or default, wherein you shall deal uprightly and fully, neither presenting nor daring to present any contrary to truth, having in this action God before your eyes, with an earnest zeal to maintain truth, and to suppress vice. So help you God, and the holy contents of this book."

By virtue of this oath, some out of conscience thought themselves obliged to present their ministers, their neighbours, and their near relations, not for immorality or neglect of the worship of God, but for omitting some superstitious injunctions. Others acted from revenge, having an opportunity put into their hands to ruin their conscientious neighbours. Many churchwardens refused to take the oath, and were imprisoned, and forced to do

penance. But to prevent this for the future, it was declared, “that if any man affirmed, it was not lawful to take the oath of a churchwarden; or that it was not lawfully administered; or that the oath did not bind; or that the church-wardens need not inquire; or after inquiry need not answer, or might leave out part of their answers;”<sup>1</sup> such persons should be presented and punished.

Several of the bishops published their primary articles of visitation about this time; as, the archbishop of York, the bishops of Winchester, and Bath and Wells; but the most remarkable and curious were Dr. Wren’s bishop of Norwich, entitled, “Articles to be inquired of within the diocess of Norwich, in the first visitation of Matthew lord bishop of Norwich.”<sup>2</sup> The book contains one hundred and thirty-nine articles, in which are eight hundred and ninety-seven questions, some very insignificant, others highly superstitious, and several impossible to be answered. To give the reader a specimen of them:—Have you the book of constitutions or canons ecclesiastical, and a parchment register book, book of common prayer, and a book of homilies?—Is your communion-table so placed within the chancel as the canon directs?—Doth your minister read the canons once every year?—Doth he pray for the king with his whole title?—Doth he pray for the archbishops and bishops?—Doth he observe all the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and administering the sacrament?—Doth he receive the sacrament kneeling himself, and administer to none but such as kneel?—Doth he admit to the sacrament any notorious offenders or schismatics?—Do the strangers of other parishes come often, or frequently, to your church?—Doth your minister baptize with the sign of the cross?—Is your minister licensed, and by whom?—Doth he wear the surplice while he is reading prayers and administering the sacrament?—Doth he catechise and instruct the youth in the ten commandments?—Doth he solemnize marriage without the banns?—Doth he in Rogation-days use the perambulation round the parish?—Doth he every six months denounce in the parish [or publicly declare the names of] all such as persevere in the sentence of excommunication, not seeking to be absolved?—Doth he admit any excommunicate persons into the church .without a certificate of absolution?—Is your minister a favourer of recusants?—Is he noted to be an incontinent person; a frequenter of taverns, alehouses; a common gamester, or a player at dice?—Hath your minister read the book of sports in his church or chapel?—Doth he read the second service at the communion-table?—Doth he use conceived prayers before or after sermon?—With regard to churchyards, are they consecrated?—Are the graves dug east and

---

<sup>1</sup> Visit. Art. chap. 6. §. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 186, 187. Prynne, p. 374. Rapin, vol 2. p. 289, 290, folio edit.

west, and the bodies buried with their heads to the west?—Do your parishioners, at going in and out of the church, do reverence towards the chancel?—Do they kneel at confession, stand up at the creed, and bow at the glorious name of Jesus?<sup>1</sup> &c. with divers articles of the like nature.<sup>2</sup>

The weight of these inquiries fell chiefly upon the Puritans, for within the compass of two years and four months, no less than fifty able and pious ministers were suspended, silenced, and otherwise censured, to the ruin of their poor families, for not obeying one or other of these articles; among whom were, the reverend Mr. John Allen, Mr. John Ward, Mr. William Powel, Mr. John Carter, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Wm. Bridges, Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, Mr. Greenhill, Mr. Edmund Calamy, Mr. Hudson, Peck, Raymond, Green, Mott, Kent, Allen, Scott, Beard, Moth, Manning, Warren, Kirrington, and others, in the diocese of Norwich. In other dioceses were, Mr. Jonathan Burre, Mr. William Leigh, Mr. Matthew Brownrigge, Mr. G. Huntley, Vicars, Proud, Workman, Crowder, Snelling, &c. some of whom spent their days in silence; others departed their country into parts beyond sea; and none were released without a promise to conform to the bishops' injunctions *editis et edendis*, i. e. already published, or hereafter to be published.

Bishop Montague, who succeeded Wren in the diocese of Norwich 1638, imitated his successor in his visitation-articles; it being now fashionable for every new bishop to frame separate articles of inquiry, for the visitation of his own diocese. Montague pointed his inquiries against the Puritan lecturers, of which he observes three sorts.<sup>3</sup>

1. "Such as were superinducted into another man's cure; concerning which he enjoins his visitors to inquire, Whether the lecturer's sermons in the afternoons are popular or catechetical? Whether he be admitted with consent of the incumbent and bishop? Whether he read prayers in his surplice and hood? Of what length his sermons are, and upon what subject? Whether he bids prayer, according to the fifty-fifth canon.

2. "The second sort of lecturers are those of combination, when the neighbouring ministers agreed to preach by turns at an adjoining market-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cant. Doom. p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> One article, which Mr. Neal has omitted, required, "that the church-wardens in every parish of his diocese should inquire, whether any persons presumed to talk of religion at their tables and in their families? "Not to say the gross ignorance which this restraint would cause, it showed the extreme of jealousy and intolerance; was subversive of the influence and endearments of domestic life, and converted each private house into a court of inquisition. Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy shaken, 1768. vol. 3. p. 307, 308.—Ed.

<sup>3</sup> Prynne, p. 376.



town on market-days; inquire who the combiners are, and whether they conform as above?

3. A third sort are running lecturers, when neighbouring Christians agree upon such a day to meet at a certain church in some country town or village, and after sermon and dinner to meet at the house of one of their disciples to repeat, censure, and explain the sermon; then to discourse of some points proposed at a foregoing meeting by the moderator of the assembly, derogatory to the doctrine or discipline of the church; and in conclusion to appoint another place for their next meeting. If you have any such lecturers, present them.

Dr. Pierse, bishop of Bath and Wells, suppressed all lecturers in market-towns, and elsewhere throughout his diocese, alleging, that he saw no such need of preaching now, as was in the apostles' days. He suspended Mr. Devenish, minister of Bridgewater, for preaching a lecture in his own church on a market-day, which had continued ever since the days of queen Elizabeth; and afterward, when he absolved him upon his promise to preach it no more, he said to him, "Go thy way, sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee."<sup>1</sup> His lordship put down all afternoon sermons on Lord's days; and suspended Mr. Cornish for preaching a funeral sermon in the evening. And whereas some ministers used to explain the questions and answers in the catechism, and make a short prayer before and after, the bishop reprov'd them sharply for it, saying, that was as bad as preaching, and charged them to ask no questions, nor receive any answers but such as were in the Book of Common Prayer: and for not complying with this injunction, Mr. Barret, rector of Berwick, and some others, were enjoined public penance. The bishop of Peterborough, and all the new bishops, went in the same track; and some of them upon this sad principle, That afternoon sermons on Sundays were an impediment to the revels in the evening.

The church was now in the height of its triumphs, and grasped not only at all spiritual jurisdiction, but at the capital preferments of state. This year Dr. Juxon, bishop of London, was declared lord-high-treasurer of England, which is the first office of profit and power in the kingdom, and has precedence next to the archbishop. Juxon's name had hardly been known at court above two years;<sup>2</sup> till then he was no more than a private chaplain to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 377.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Juxon, having been elected to the see of Hereford, before he was consecrated, was translated on the 19th of September 1633, to that of London. His first preferment was, in 1627, to the deanery of Worcester: but his constant connexion with the court was not formed till the 10th of July 1632, when he was, at the suit of archbishop Laud, sworn clerk of his majesty's closet, two years and eight months before he was declared lord-high-treasurer. So that Mr. Neal's expression, that his name had hardly been known at court above two years, at which Dr. Grey carps, does not greatly deviate from the exact fact. The doctor quotes also many testimonies to the amiable temper and virtues of bishop Juxon. But though they justly reflect honour on his memory, the personal virtues of the bishop did

king, and head of a poor college at Oxford. Besides, no churchman had held this post since the darkest times of Popery, in the reign of king Henry VII., but Laud valued himself upon this nomination; “Now [says he in his diary] if the church will not hold up themselves, under God, I can do no more.”<sup>1</sup> When the staff of treasurer was put into the hands of Juxon, lord Clarendon observes, “that the nobility were inflamed, and began to look upon the church as a gulf ready to swallow all the great offices of state, there being other churchmen in view who were ambitious enough to expect the rest. The inferior clergy took advantage of this situation of their affairs, and did not live towards their neighbours of quality, or patrons, with that civility and good manners as they used to do, which disposed others to withdraw their countenance and good neighbourhood from them, especially after they were put into the commissions of peace in most counties of England.” One of the members of the house of commons said, “that the clergy were so exalted, that a gentleman might not come near the tail of their mules; and that one of them had declared openly, that he hoped to see the day, when a clergyman should be as good a man as any upstart Jack gentleman in the kingdom.” It is certain, the favourable aspect of the court had very much exalted their behaviour, and their new notions had made them conceive themselves an order of men above the rank of the laity, forasmuch as they had the keys of the kingdom of heaven at their girdle, and upon their priestly character depended the efficacy of all gospel institutions. This made some of them remarkably negligent of their cures up and down the country; others lost the little learning they had acquired at the university, and many became very scandalous in their lives; though lord Clarendon<sup>2</sup> says, that there was not one churchman in any degree of favour or acceptance [at court] of a scandalous insufficiency in learning, or of a more scandalous condition of life; but on the contrary, most of them of confessed eminent parts in knowledge, and of virtuous and unblemished lives.

---

not render the investing a clergyman with the high office to which he was exalted, a measure more politic in itself, or less obnoxious to the people. And the shorter was the time, during which he had been known at court, the fewer opportunities he had enjoyed to display his virtues, and the more probable it was that he owed his dignity, not to the excellence of his own character, but to the influence and views of Laud. This circumstance, together with the vast power connected with the office, and the exaltation supposed to be thus given to the clerical order, created jealousy and gave offence. In this light Mr. Neal places the matter, without impeaching the merit of bishop Juxon.—ED.

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Warburton’s remarks here deserve attention: “Had he been content (says his lordship) to do nothing, the church had stood. Suppose him to have been an honest man and sincere, which I think must be granted, it would follow that he knew nothing of the constitution either of civil or religious society; and was as poor a churchman as he was a politician.”—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 1. p. 77.

Great numbers of the most useful and laborious preachers in all parts of the country were buried in silence, and forced to abscond from the fury of the high-commission; among whom were, the famous Mr. John Dod, Mr. Whatley, Dr. Harris, Mr. Capel, and Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, one of the most awakening preachers of his age, of whom bishop Brownrigge used to say, "that he did more good with his wild notes, than we [the bishops] with our set music." Yet his great usefulness could not screen him from those suspensions and deprivations which were the portion of the Puritans in these times. His resolutions about subscribing I will relate in his own words: "If I come into trouble for nonconformity, I resolve, by God's assistance, to come away with a clear conscience; for though the liberty of my ministry be dear to me, I dare not buy it at such a rate. I am troubled at my former subscription, but I saw men of good gifts, and of good hearts (as I thought), go before me; and I could not prove that there was anything contrary to the word of God, though I disliked the ceremonies, and knew them to be unprofitable burdens to the church of God; but if I am urged again I will never yield; it was my weakness before, as I now conceive, which I beseech God to pardon.—Written in the year 1627." But after this the good man was overtaken again, and yielded, which almost broke his heart; he adds, "—For this I smarted, 1631. If I had read over this [my former resolution] it may be I had not done what I did." How severe are such trials to a poor man with a numerous family of children! And how sore the distresses of a wounded conscience!

Others continued to leave their country, according to our blessed Saviour's advice, Matt. x. 23, "When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another." Among these were Mr. Nathaniel Rogers, son of Mr. John Rogers of Dedham, educated in Emanucl-college, Cambridge, and settled at Assington in Suffolk, where he continued five years; but seeing the storm that had driven his neighbours from their anchor, and being fearful of his own steadfastness in the hour of temptation, he resigned his living into the hands of his patron, and forsaking the neighbourhood of his father, and all prospects of worldly advantage, cast himself and his young family upon the providence of God, and embarked for New England, where he arrived about the middle of November 1636, and settled with Mr. Norton, at Ipswich, with whom he continued to his death, which happened in the year 1655.

About the same time went over Mr. Lambert Whiteing, M.A., a Lincolnshire divine, who continued at Shirbeck near Boston unmolested, till bishop Williams's disgrace, after which he was silenced by the spiritual courts, and forced into New England, where he arrived with his family this summer, and continued a useful preacher to a little flock at Lynn till the year 1679, when he died in the eighty-third year of his age.

The star-chamber and high-commission exceeded all the bounds not only of law and equity, but even of humanity itself.<sup>1</sup> We have related the sufferings of Mr. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, in the year 1633. These gentlemen, being shut up in prison, were supposed to employ their time in writing against the bishops and their spiritual courts; Bastwick was charged with a book published 1636, entitled, “Apologeticus ad præsules Anglicanos;” and with a pamphlet called “The new litany:” the others, with two anonymous books, one entitled, “A divine tragedy, containing a catalogue of God’s judgments against sabbath-breakers;” the other, “News from Ipswich;” which last was a satire upon the severe proceedings of Dr. Wren bishop of that diocese. For these they were cited a second time into the star-chamber, by virtue of an information laid against them by the attorney-general, for writing and publishing seditious, schismatical, and libellous books against the hierarchy of the church, and to the scandal of the government. When the defendants had prepared their answers, they could not get counsel to sign them; upon which they petitioned the court to receive them from themselves, which would not be admitted; however, Prynne and Bastwick, having no other remedy, left their answers at the office, signed with their own hands, but were nevertheless proceeded against *pro confesso*. Burton prevailed with Mr. Holt, a bencher of Gray’s inn, to sign his answer; but the court ordered the two chief justices to expunge what they thought unfit to be brought into court, and they struck out the whole answer, except six lines at the beginning, and three or four at the end; and because Mr. Burton would not acknowledge it thus purged, he was also taken *pro confesso*.

In Bastwick’s answer the prelates are called “invaders of the king’s prerogative, contemners and despisers of the Holy Scriptures, advancers of Popery, superstition, idolatry, and profaneness; they are charged with oppressing the king’s loyal subjects, and with great cruelty, tyranny, and injustice.” Mr. Prynne’s answer reflected upon the hierarchy, though in more moderate and cautious terms. All the defendants offered to maintain their several answers at the peril of their lives; but the court finding them not filed upon record, would not receive them. The prisoners at the bar cried aloud for justice, and that their answers might be read; but it was peremptorily denied, and the following sentence passed upon them; that “Mr. Burton be deprived of his living, and degraded from his ministry, as Prynne and Bastwick had been from their professions of law and physic; that each of them be fined £5,000; that they stand in the pillory at Westminster, and have their ears cut off; and because Mr. Prynne had already lost his ears by sentence of the court 1633, it was ordered that the remainder of his stumps

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 380, &c.

should be cut off, and that he should be stigmatized on both cheeks with the letters S. L., and then all three were to suffer perpetual imprisonment in the remotest prisons of the kingdom.” This sentence was executed upon them June 30, 1637, the hangman rather sawing the remainder of Prynne’s ears than cutting them off; after which they were sent under a strong guard, one to the castle of Launceston in Cornwall, another to the castle of Lancaster, and a third to Carnarvon-castle in Wales;<sup>1</sup> but these prisons not being thought distant enough, they were afterward removed to the islands of Scilly, Guernsey, and Jersey, where they were kept without the use of pen, ink, or paper, or the access of friends, till they were released by the long parliament.

At passing this sentence archbishop Laud made a laboured speech, to clear himself from the charge of innovations, with which the Puritans loaded him. He begins with retorting the crime upon the Puritans, who were for setting aside the order of bishops, whereas in all ages since the apostles’ time the church had been governed by bishops, whose calling and order, in his grace’s opinion, was by divine right, the office of lay-elders having never been heard of before Calvin. He then vindicates the particular innovations complained of; as, 1. Bowing towards the altar, or at coming into the church. This he says was the practice in Jewish times; Psal. xcvi. 6, “O come let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our maker;” and yet the government is so moderate, that no man is forced to it, but only religiously called upon. “For my own part (says his grace) I shall always think myself bound to worship with my body as well as soul, in what consecrated place soever I come to pray. You, my honoured lords of the garter, do reverence towards the altar, as the greatest place of God’s residence upon earth; greater than the pulpit, for there is only the word of God, but upon the altar is his body; and a greater reverence is due to the body than to the word of the Lord; and this is no innovation, for you are bound to it by your order, which is no new thing.”

His grace proceeds to consider the alterations in the collects and prayers, which he says the archbishops and bishops, to whom the ordering of the fast-book was committed, had power under the king to make, provided nothing was inserted contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the church of England; he then justifies the several amendments, and concludes most of

---

<sup>1</sup> The archbishop’s revenge, not glutted by the severe sentence obtained against Mr. Prynne, pursued those who, at Chester and other places, as he was carrying to prison, showed him civilities. For, though his keepers were not forbidden to let any visit him, some were fined £500., some £300., and others £250. Rushworth Abridged, vol. 2. p. 295, &c. as quoted in the Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy, vol. 3. p. 272. And the servant of Mr. Prynne was proceeded against in the high-commission, and sent from prison to prison, only for refusing to accuse his master. Id. p. 273. Neither fidelity nor humanity had merit with this prelate.—ED.

his articles with showing that there is no connexion between the charge and the popular clamour raised against him, of an intent to bring in Popery. But the several innovations here mentioned being objected to the archbishop at his trial, we shall defer our remarks to that place.

His grace concludes with a protestation, that he had no design to alter the religion established by law; but that his care to reduce the church to order, to uphold the external decency of it, and to settle it to the rules of the first reformation, had brought upon him and his brethren, all that malicious storm that had loured so black over their heads. He then thanks the court for their just and honourable censure of these men, and for their defence of the church; but because the business had some reference to himself, he forbears to censure them, leaving them to God's mercy and the king's justice.

Notwithstanding this plausible speech, which the king ordered to be printed, the barbarous sentence passed upon these gentlemen moved the compassion of the whole nation. The three learned faculties of law, physic, and divinity, took it to heart, as thinking their educations and professions might have secured them from such infamous punishment,<sup>1</sup> proper enough for the poorest and most mechanic malefactors, who could make no other satisfaction to the public for their offences; but very improper for persons of education, degrees, or quality. Nay, the report of this censure, and the smart execution of it, flew into Scotland, and the discourse was there, that they must also expect a star-chamber to strengthen the hands of their bishops, as well as a high-commission: "No doubt (says archbishop Laud) but there is a concurrence between them and the Puritan party in England, to destroy me in the king's opinion."<sup>2</sup>

Cruel as this sentence was, Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, and the reverend Mr. Osbaldeston, chief master of Westminster school, met with no less hardship.<sup>3</sup> The bishop had been Laud's very good friend, in persuading king James to advance him to a bishopric; but upon the accession of king Charles he turned upon his benefactor, and got him removed from all his preferments at court; upon which bishop Williams retired to his diocese,<sup>4</sup> and spent his time in reading and the good government of his diocese; here he became popular, entertaining the clergy at his table, and discoursing

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon. vol. 1. p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, p. 385.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. vol. 2. part 2. p. 81.

<sup>4</sup> The remarks of bishop Warburton on the proceedings against Dr. Williams are just, though severe, and by their impartiality and spirit, do honour to his lordship. "This prosecution (says he) must needs give every one a bad idea of Laud's heart and temper. You might resolve his high acts of power in the state, into reverence and gratitude to his master; his tyranny in the church, to his zeal for and love of what he called religion; but the outrageous prosecution of these two men can be resolved into nothing but envy and revenge: and actions like these they were which occasioned all that bitter, but indeed just, exclamation against the bishops in the speeches of lord Falkland and lord Digby."—ED.

freely about affairs of church and state.<sup>1</sup> He spoke with some smartness against the new ceremonies; and said once in conversation, “that the Puritans were the king’s best subjects, and he was sure would carry all at last; and that the king had told him, that he would treat the Puritans more mildly for the future.” Laud, being informed of this expression, caused an information to be lodged against him in the star-chamber, for revealing the king’s secrets; but the charge not being well supported, a new bill was exhibited against him, for tampering with the king’s witnesses; and though there was very little ground for the charge, his lordship was suspended in the high-commission-court from all his offices and benefices; he was fined £10,000 to the king; £1,000 to Sir John Mounson, and to be imprisoned in the Tower during the king’s pleasure. The bishop was accordingly sent from the bar to the Tower;<sup>2</sup> all his rich goods and chattels, to an immense value, were plundered and sold to pay the fine; his library seized, and all his papers and letters examined. Among his papers were found two or three letters written to him by Mr. Osbaldeston about five years before, in which were some dark and obscure expressions, which the jealous archbishop interpreted against himself and the lord-treasurer Weston. Upon the foot of these letters a new bill was exhibited against the bishop for divulging scandalous libels against the king’s privy-councillors. His lordship replied, that he did not remember his having received the letters, and was sure he had never divulged them, because they were still among his private papers; but notwithstanding all he could say, he was condemned in a fine of £8,000; £5,000. to the king, and £3,000. to the archbishop; for the nonpayment of which he was kept close prisoner in the Tower till the meeting of the long parliament.

The reverend Mr. Osbaldeston was charged with plotting with the bishop of Lincoln to divulge false news, and to breed a difference between the lord-treasurer Weston and the archbishop of Canterbury, as long ago as the year 1634.<sup>3</sup> The information was grounded upon the two letters already mentioned, in which he reports a misunderstanding between the great leviathan and the little urchin. And though the counsel for the defendant absolutely denied any reference to the archbishop, and named the persons meant in the letter, yet “the court fined him £5,000. to the king, and £5,000. to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, p. 417.

<sup>2</sup> Here he was kept in close imprisonment about four years. During his confinement, in order to deprive him of his bishopric, he was examined upon a book of articles of twenty-four sheets. Amongst which were such frivolous charges as these: viz. that he had called a book, entitled “A coal from the altar,” a pamphlet: that he had said, that all flesh in England had corrupted their ways; that he had wickedly jested on St. Martin’s hood. What must be thought of the temper of those who could think of depriving a bishop of his see on such grounds? The bishop was, however, so wary in his answers, that they could take no advantage against him. Fuller’s Church Hist. b. 11. p. 157.—ED.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 803–817.

archbishop; to be deprived of all his spiritual dignities and promotions, to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure, and to stand in the pillory in the dean's yard before his own school, and have his ears nailed to it." Mr. Osbaldeston being among the crowd in the court when this sentence was pronounced, immediately went home to his study at Westminster-school, and having burnt some papers, absconded, leaving a note upon his desk with these words, "If the archbishop inquire after me, tell him I am gone beyond Canterbury." The messengers were soon at his house, and finding this note, sent immediately to the seaports to apprehend him; but he lay hid in a private house in Drury-lane till the search was over, and then concealed himself till the meeting of the long parliament; however, all his goods and chattels were seized and confiscated. This Mr. Osbaldeston was M.A. of Christ-church college, Oxford, and prebendary of Westminster; he was an admirable master, and had eighty doctors in the two universities that had been his scholars, before the year 1640;<sup>1</sup> he was afterward restored by the long parliament, but when he apprehended they went beyond the bounds of their duty and allegiance, he laid down his school and favoured the royal cause.

Mr. Lilburne, afterward a colonel in the army, for refusing to take an oath to answer all interrogatories concerning his importing and publishing seditious libels, was fined £500. and to be whipped through the streets from the Fleet to the pillory before Westminster-hall gate, April 8, 1638. While he was in the pillory he uttered many bold and passionate speeches against the tyranny of the bishops; whereupon the court of star-chamber, then sitting, ordered him to be gagged, which was done accordingly; and that, when he was carried back to prison, he should be laid alone with irons on his hands and legs in the wards of the Fleet, where the basest of the prisoners used to be put, and that no person should be admitted to see him. Here he continued in a most forlorn and miserable condition till the meeting of the long parliament.

In the midst of all these dangers the Puritan clergy spoke freely against their oppressors.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Cornelius Burges, in a Latin sermon before the clergy of London, preached against the severities of the bishops, and refusing to give his diocesan a copy of his sermon, was put into the high-commission. Mr. Wharton of Essex preached with the same freedom at Chelmsford, for which, it is said, he made his submission. Several pamphlets were dispersed against the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts, which the bishop of London declared he had reason to believe were written or countenanced by the clergy of his own diocese. Many private gentlemen in Suffolk main-

---

<sup>1</sup> Athenæ Oxon, vol. 1. p. 833.

<sup>2</sup> Wood's Athena: Oxon. vol. 2. p. 235.



tained lecturers at their own expense, without consulting the bishop, who complained that they were factious, and did not govern themselves according to the canons; but says his lordship [Wren], “What shall I do with such scholars, some in orders and others not, which gentlemen of figure entertain in their houses under pretence of teaching their children? and with those beneficed divines who take shelter in the houses of the rich laity, and do not live upon their cures?”<sup>1</sup> Here was the Puritans<sup>1</sup> last retreat; those who were not willing to go abroad found entertainment in gentlemen’s families, and from thence annoyed the enemy with their pamphlets. Even the populace, who were not capable of writing, expressed their resentments against the archbishop by dispersing libels about the town, in which they threatened his destruction. His grace has entered some of them in his diary.

“Wednesday, August 23. My lord-mayor sent me a libel found by the watch at the south-gate of St. Paul’s, that the devil had left that house to me.

“Aug. 25. Another libel was brought me by an officer of the high-commission, fastened to the north-gate of St. Paul’s, that the government of the church of England is a candle in a snuff, going out in a stench.

“The same night the lord-mayor sent me another libel, hanged upon the standard in Chchside, which was my speech in the star-chamber set in the pillory.

“A few days after, another short libel was sent me in verse.” Yet none of these things abated his zeal, or relaxed his rigour against those who censured his arbitrary proceedings.

It was impossible to debate things fairly in public, because the press was absolutely at his grace's disposal, according to a new decree of the star-chamber made this summer, which ordains, that “no book be printed unless it be first licensed with all its titles, epistles, and prefaces, by the archbishop, or bishop of London for the time being, or by their appointment; and within the limits of the university, by the chancellor or vice-chancellor, on pain of the printer’s being disabled from his profession for the future, and to suffer such other punishment as the high-commission shall think fit. That before any books imported from abroad be sold, a catalogue of them shall be delivered to the archbishop, or bishop of London, to be perused by themselves, or their chaplains. And if there be any schismatical or offensive books, they shall be delivered up to the bishop, or to the high-commission, that the offenders may be punished. It was farther ordained, that no person shall print beyond sea any English book or books, whereof the greatest part is English, whether formerly printed or not; nor shall any book be reprinted, though formerly licensed, without a new licence. And finally, if any person

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, p. 467.

that is not an allowed printer, shall set up a printing-press, he shall be set in the pillory, and be whipped through the streets of London.”

These terrible proceedings, instead of serving the interests of the church or state, awakened the resentments of all ranks and professions of men, against those in power: the laity were as uneasy as the clergy, many of whom sold their effects, and removed with their families and trades into Holland or New England. This alarmed the king and council, who issued out a proclamation, April 30th, 1637, to the following purpose:<sup>1</sup> “—The king being informed, that great numbers of his subjects were yearly transported into New England with their families and whole estates, that they might be out of the reach of ecclesiastical authority; his majesty therefore commands, that his officers of the several ports should suffer none to pass without licence from the commissioners of the plantations, and a testimonial from their minister of their conformity to the orders and discipline of the church.” And to bar the ministers, the following order of council was published;

“Whereas it is observed, that such ministers who are not conformable to the discipline and ceremonies of the church, do frequently transport themselves to the plantations, where they take liberty to nourish their factious and schismatical humours, to the hinderance of the good conformity and unity of the church; we therefore expressly command you, in his majesty’s name, to suffer no clergyman to transport himself without a testimonial from the archbishop of Canterbury and bishop of London.”<sup>2</sup>

This was a degree of severity hardly to be paralleled in the Christian world. When the edict of Nantz was revoked the French king allowed his Protestant subjects a convenient time to dispose of their effects, and depart the kingdom; but our Protestant archbishop will neither let the Puritans live peaceably at home, nor take sanctuary in foreign countries; a conduct hardly consistent with the laws of humanity, much less with the character of a Christian bishop; but while his grace was running things to these extremities, the people (as has been observed) took a general disgust, and almost all England became Puritan.

The bishops and courtiers being not insensible of the number and weight of their enemies among the more resolved Protestants, determined to balance their power by joining the Papists; for which purpose the differences between the two churches were said to be trifling, and the peculiar doctrines of Popery printed and preached up, as proper to be received by the church of England. Bishop Montague, speaking of the points of faith and morality, affirmed, that none of these are controverted between us, but

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 409.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 410.

that “the points in dispute were of a lesser nature, of which a man might be ignorant without any danger of salvation.”<sup>1</sup> Franciscos de Clara, an eminent Franciscan friar, published a book, wherein he endeavoured to accommodate the articles of the church of England to the sense of the church of Rome, so that both parties might subscribe them. The book was dedicated to the king, and the friar admitted to an acquaintance with the archbishop.<sup>2</sup>

Great stress was laid upon the uninterrupted succession of the episcopal character through the church of Rome; for “miserable were we (says Dr. Pocklington) if he that now sits archbishop of Canterbury could not derive his succession from St. Austin, St. Austin from St. Gregory, and St. Gregory from St. Peter.” Dr. Heylin, in his moderate answer to Mr. Burton, has these words; “That my lord of Canterbury that now is, is lineally descended from St. Peter in a most fair and constant tenor of succession, you shall easily find if you consult the learned labours of Mason ‘De Ministerio Anglicano.’”

Bishop Montague published a treatise, “Of the Invocation of Saints,” in which he says, that “departed saints have not only a memory, but a more peculiar charge of their friends; and that some saints have a peculiar patronage, custody, protection, and power, as angels have also, over certain persons and countries by special deputation; and that it is not impiety so to believe.”<sup>3</sup> Dr. Cosins says, in one of his sermons, that “when our reformers took away the mass, they marred all religion; but that the mass was not taken away inasmuch as the real presence of Christ remained still, otherwise it were not a reformed, but a deformed religion.” And in order to persuade a Papist to come to church, he told him, that the body of Christ was substantially and really in the sacrament.<sup>4</sup> This divine printed a collection of private devotions, in imitation of the Roman Horary. The frontispiece had three capital letters, J. H. S., upon these there was a cross encircled with the sun, supported by two angels, with two devout women praying towards it. The book contains the Apostles’ creed, the Lord’s prayer divided into seven petitions, the precepts of charity, the seven sacraments, the three theological virtues, the eight beatitudes, the seven deadly sins; with forms of prayer

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, part 1. p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> Grey quotes a passage from the trial of Laud, by which it appears that he denied having given any encouragement to the publication of this book, and had absolutely prohibited its being printed in England; that Clara was never with him till the book was ready for the press, nor afterward above twice or thrice at most, when he made great friends to obtain the archbishop’s sanction to his printing another book, to prove that bishops are by divine right; and his request was again refused. For the archbishop replied, “that he did not like the way which the church of Rome went in the case of episcopacy; would never consent to the printing of any such book here from the pen of a Romanist, and that the bishops of England were able to defend their own cause, without calling in the aid of the church of Rome, and would in due time.”—Ed.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. p. 214.

<sup>4</sup> Collyer’s Eccles. Hist. p. 742.

for the first, third, sixth, and ninth hours, and for the vespers and compline, formerly called the canonical hours; then followed the litany, with prayers for the sacrament, in time of sickness, and at the approach of death. This book was licensed by the bishop of London, and publicly sold when the books of the most resolved Protestants were suppressed.

Mr. Adams, in a sermon at St. Mary's in Cambridge, asserted the expedience of auricular confession, saying, it was as necessary to salvation as meat is to the body.<sup>1</sup> Others preached up the doctrine of penance, and of authoritative priestly absolution from sin. Some maintained the proper merit of good works, in opposition to the received doctrine of justification by faith alone. Others, that in the sacrament of the Lord's supper there was a full and proper sacrifice for sin. Some declared for images, crucifixes, and pictures in churches, for purgatory, and for preserving, reverencing, and even praying to, the relics of saints. The author of the English Pope, printed 1643, says, that Sparrow paved the way for auricular confession, Watts for penance, Heylin for altar worship, Montague for saint worship, and Laud for the mass.

It was a very just observation of a Venetian gentleman in his travels to England about this time,<sup>2</sup> "that the universities, bishops, and divines, of England, daily embraced Catholic doctrines, though they professed them not with open mouth: they held that the church of Rome was a true church; that the pope was superior to all bishops; that to him it pertained to call general councils; that it was lawful to pray for souls departed; and that altars ought to be erected in all churches; in sum, they believed all that was taught by the church of Rome, but not by the court of Rome." Remarkable are the words of Heylin to the same purpose:<sup>3</sup> "The greatest part of the controversy between us and the church of Rome (says he), not being in fundamentals, or in any essential points of the Christian religion, I cannot otherwise look upon it but as a most Christian and pious work, to endeavour an agreement in the superstructure; as to the lawfulness of it, I could never see any reason produced against it: against the impossibility of it, it has been objected, that the church of Rome will yield nothing; if therefore there be an agreement, it must not be their meeting us, but our going to them; but that all in the church of Rome are not so stiff, appears from the testimony of the archbishop of Spalato, who acknowledged that the articles of the church of England were not heretical, and by the treatise of Franciscos de Clara.<sup>4</sup> Now if, without prejudice to truth, the controversies might be com-

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, p. 137. Prynne, p. 195, &c.

<sup>2</sup> May's Hist, of Pari. p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Fuller's Appeal, part 3. p. 63. 65.

<sup>4</sup> His real name was Christopher Davenport. He was the son of an alderman of Coventry, and with his brother John was sent to Merton-college in Oxford, in the year 1613. John

posed, it is most probable that other Protestant churches would have sued to be included in the peace; if not, the church of England will lose nothing by it, as being hated by the Calvinists, and not loved by the Lutherans." This was the ridiculous court scheme which archbishop Laud used all his interest to accomplish; and it is no impertinent story to our present purpose, because it is well attested, that a certain countess (whose husband's father the archbishop had married, and thereby brought himself into trouble) having turned Papist, was asked by the archbishop the cause of her changing, to whom she replied, it was because she always hated to go in a crowd. Being asked again the reason of that expression, she answered, that she perceived his grace and many others were making haste to Rome, and therefore to prevent going in a press she had gone before them.<sup>1</sup>

It is certain the Papists were in high reputation at court; the king counted them his best subjects, and relaxed the penal laws, on pretence that hereby foreign Catholic princes might be induced to show favour to their subjects of the reformed religion. Within the compass of four years, seventy-four letters of grace were signed by the king's own hand; sixty-four priests were dismissed from the Gate-house, and twenty-nine by warrant from the secretary of state, at the instance of the queen, the queen mother, or some foreign ambassador. Protections were frequently granted, to put a stop to the proceedings of the courts of justice against them.<sup>2</sup> I have before me a list of Popish recusants, convicted in the twenty nine English counties of the southern division, from the first of king Charles to the sixteenth, which amounts to no less than eleven thousand nine hundred and seventy<sup>3</sup> (as the account was brought into the long parliament by Mr. John Pulford, employed in their prosecution by the king himself), all of whom were released and pardoned. And if their numbers were so great in the south, how must they abound in the northern and Welsh counties, where they are computed three to one!

---

became afterward a noted Puritan, and then an Independent. Christopher, by the invitation of some Romish priests living in or near Oxford, went to study at Doway in 1616. He afterward spent some time in the university of Salamanca, from whence he returned to Doway, and read first philosophy, and then divinity there. At length he became a missionary into England, and a chaplain to queen Henrietta Maria, under the name of Franciscus a Sancta Clara. Amongst many learned works, of which he was the author, was "An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles in the most favourable Sense." "But (says bishop Warburton) it pleased neither party." The Spanish inquisition put it into the Index Expurgatorius; and it would have been condemned at Rome, had not the king and archbishop Laud pressed Penzani, the pope's agent at London, to stop the prosecution. He died the 31st of May, 1680. Warburton's supplemental volume, p. 483; and Wood's *Athente Oxon.* vol. 2. p. 415, &c.—ED.

<sup>1</sup> Fuller's Appeal, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 284.

<sup>3</sup> Foxes and Firebrands, part 3. p. 75.

Many of them were promoted to places of the highest honour and trust; sir Richard Weston was lord-high-treasurer, sir Francis Windebank secretary of state, lord Cottington was chancellor of the exchequer, and Mr. Porter of the bed chamber; besides these, there were, lord Conway, sir Kenelm Digby, sir Toby Mathews, Mr. Montague, jun., the duchess of Montague, the countess of Newport, and many others, all Papists, who were in high favour,<sup>1</sup> and had the king and queen's ear whensoever they pleased. The pope had a nuncio in England, and the queen an agent at Rome; cardinal Barberini was made protector of the English nation, and a society was erected under the title of "The congregation for propagating the faith."<sup>2</sup> Richard Smith, titular bishop of Chalcedon, exercised episcopal jurisdiction over the English Catholics by commission from the pope; he conferred orders, and appeared in Lancashire with his mitre and crosier;<sup>3</sup> seignior Con or Cunæus, the pope's legate gained over several of the gentry, and attempted the king himself by presents of little Popish toys and pictures, with which his majesty was wonderfully delighted.<sup>4</sup> The Papists had a common purse<sup>5</sup>, with which they purchased several monopolies, and bestowed the profits upon their best friends; several of their military men were put into commission, and great numbers were listed in his majesty's armies against the Scots.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Collyer's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 780.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller's Church History, b. 11. p. 137. Prynne, p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> Foxes and Firebrands, part 3. p. 124.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Neal here goes beyond his author, who says, "which yet could prevail nothing with the king." But then he remarks in the margin, that it "was strange that the king did not send Cunæus packing, when he thus tempted and assaulted him." On the truth and force of this remark, it may be presumed, that Mr. Neal grounded his representation of the king's being delighted with the legate's presents. For instead of dismissing him, he often received him at Hampton-court, and solicited his services for the Palatinate; which certainly indicated no displeasure at his gifts. —ED.

<sup>5</sup> Foxes and Firebrands, part 3. p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Grey properly observes, that the place in Collyer to which Mr. Neal here refers, mentions not one syllable of this. The truth is, that Collyer is alleged only to prove the influence which the Papists had at court. I have, therefore, annexed the reference to a preceding sentence. The doctor adds, "nor do I believe, that he (*i.e.* Mr. Neal) can produce the least authority for his assertion, that great numbers of Papists were listed in his majesty's armies against the Scots." It is to be wished, that Mr. Neal had referred here exactly to his authority. But to supply this omission, it may be observed, that the queen employed sir Kenelm Digby and Mr. Walter Montague to raise liberal contributions for the war from the Papists, whose clergy vied with the English on this occasion; on this ground, some styled the forces raised, the Popish army. The circumstance renders it, to say the least, exceedingly probable that Papists were enlisted. It was afterward charged on the king, that he employed them in his armies; the earl of Newcastle did not deny it; and the parliament produced lists of Popish officers in the king's service, with their names, quality, and employs. It was also urged against the parliament, that there were great numbers of Papists, both commanders and others, in their army. Dr. Grey quotes Dugdale to prove this. Rapin observes on this charge, that not a single Catholic was named by those who brought the charge, nor were the musterrolls, to which the appeal was made, ever published. Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 31. Mrs. Macauley's History, vol. 2. p. 270. 8vo. Rapin, vol. 2.

But let the reader form his judgment of the number and strength of the Roman Catholics from lord Clarendon<sup>1</sup>, who says, “The Papists had for many years enjoyed a great calm, being on the matter absolved from the severest parts of the law, and dispensed with for the gentlest. They were grown to be a part of the revenue, without any probable danger of being made a sacrifice to the law. They were looked upon as good subjects at court, and good neighbours in the country; all the restraints and reproaches of former times being forgotten: but they were not prudent managers of their prosperity, being elated with the connivance and protection they received; and though I am persuaded their numbers increased not, their pomp and boldness did to that degree, that, as if they affected to be thought dangerous to the state, they appeared more publicly, entertained and urged conferences more avowedly, than had before been known. They resorted at common hours to mass to Somerset-house, and returned thence in great multitudes with the same barefacedness as others come from the Savoy, or other neighbouring churches. They attempted, and sometimes gained, proselytes, of weak uninformed ladies, with such circumstances as provoked the rage, and destroyed the charity, of great and powerful families, which longed for their suppression; they grew not only secret contrivers, but public professed promoters of, and ministers in, the most odious and most grievous projects, as in that of soap, formed, framed, and executed, by almost a corporation of that religion, which under that licence and notion might be, and were suspected to be, qualified for other agitations. The priests and such as were in orders (orders that in themselves were punishable with death) were departed from their former modesty and fear, and were as willing to be known as to be hearkened to; insomuch that a Jesuit at Paris, who was coming for England, had the boldness to visit the ambassador there, who knew him to be such, and offering him his service, acquainted him with his journey, as if there had been no laws there for his reception; and for the most invidious protection and countenance of that whole party, a public agent from Rome (first Mr. Con a Scottish man, and after him the count of Rosetti an Italian) resided in London in great pomp, publicly visited the court, and was avowedly resorted to by the Catholics of all conditions, over whom he assumed a particular jurisdiction, and was caressed and presented magnificently by the ladies of honour who inclined to that profession. They had likewise, with more noise and vanity than prudence would have admitted, made public collections of money to a considerable sum, upon some recommendations from the queen, and to be by her majesty presented, as a free-will-offering from his Roman-Catholic subjects to

---

p. 462. 468. folio. *An Essay towards a true Idea of the Character and Reign of Charles I.* p. 69; and Dugdale's *Short View of the Troubles, &c.* p. 105. 564—ED.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1. p. 118.

the king, for the carrying on the war against the Scots; which drew upon them the rage of that nation, with little devotion and reverence to the queen herself, as if she desired to suppress the Protestant religion in one kingdom as well as the other, by the arms of the Roman Catholics.”

From this account, compared with the foregoing relation, it is evident there never was a stronger combination in favour of Popery, nor was the Protestant religion at any time in a more dangerous crisis, being deserted by its pretended friends, while it was secretly undermining by its most powerful enemies.

The case was the same with the civil liberties and properties of the people; no man had anything that he could call his own any longer than the king pleased; for in the famous trial of Mr. Hampden of Buckinghamshire, in the case of ship-money, all the judges of England, except Crook and Hutton,<sup>1</sup> gave it for law, “that the king might levy taxes on the subject by writ under the great seal, without grant of parliament, in cases of necessity; or when the kingdom was in danger; of which danger and necessity his majesty was the sole and final judge; and that by law his majesty might compel the doing thereof in case of refusal or refractoriness.” This determination was entered in all the courts of Westminster-hall; and the judges were commanded to declare it in their circuits throughout the kingdom, to the end that no man might plead ignorance. “The damage and mischief cannot be expressed (says lord Clarendon)<sup>2</sup> that the crown sustained by the deserved reproach and infamy that attended this behaviour of the judges, who out of their courtship submitted the grand questions of law to be measured by what they call the standard of general reason and necessity.” While these extraordinary methods of raising money were built only upon the prerogative, people were more patient, hoping that some time or other the law would recover its power; but when they were declared by all the judges to be the very law itself, and a rule for determining suits between the king and subject, they were struck with despair, and concluded very justly that magna charta and the old English constitution were at an end.

Let the reader now recollect himself, and then judge of the candour of the noble historian, who, notwithstanding the cruel persecutions and oppressions already mentioned, celebrates the felicity of these times in the following words: “Now, after all this, I must be so just as to say, that from the dissolution of the parliament in the fourth year of the king, to the beginning of the long parliament, which was about twelve years, this kingdom and all his majesty’s dominions enjoyed the greatest calm, and the fullest measure of felicity, that any people, in any age, for so long time to-

---

<sup>1</sup> Rapin, vol. 2. p. 295, 296. folio edit.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 1. p. 70.



gether, have been blessed with, to the wonder and envy of all other parts of Christendom:—the court was in great plenty, or rather excess and luxury, the country rich and full, enjoying the pleasure of its own wealth; the church flourished with learned and extraordinary men; and the Protestant religion was more advanced against the church of Rome, by the writings of archbishop Laud and Chillingworth, than it had been since the reformation.—Trade increased to that degree, that we were the exchange of Christendom; foreign merchants looking upon nothing so much their own as what they had laid up in the warehouses of this kingdom.—The reputation of the greatness and power of the king with foreign princes was much more than any of his progenitors. And lastly, for a complement of all these blessings, they were enjoyed under the protection of a king of the most harmless disposition, the most exemplary piety, and the greatest sobriety, chastity, and mercy, that any prince had been endowed with, and who might have said that which Pericles was proud of upon his death-bed, concerning his citizens, ‘that no Englishman had worn a mourning-gown through his occasion.’ In a word, many wise men thought it a time wherein those two adjuncts, *imperium* and *libertas*, were as well reconciled as possible.”<sup>1</sup>

Not a line of this panegyric will bear examination. When his lordship says, “that no people in any age had been blessed with so great a calm, and such a full measure of felicity for so long a time together [twelve years],” he seems to have undervalued the long and pacific reign of his majesty’s royal father, king James, who was distinguished by the title of Blessed. But where was the liberty or safety of the subject, when magna charta and the petition of right, which the king had signed in full parliament, were swallowed up in the gulf of arbitrary power? and the statute laws of the land were exchanged for a rule of government depending upon the sovereign will and pleasure of the crown? If the court was in excess and luxury, it was with the plunder of the people, arising from loans, benevolences, ship-money, monopolies, and other illegal taxes on merchandise. The country was so far from growing rich and wealthy, that it was every year draining-off its inhabitants and substance, as appears not only by the loss of the foreign manufacturers, but by his majesty’s proclamations, forbidding any of his subjects to transport themselves and their effects to New England without his special licence. Was it possible that trade could flourish, when almost every branch of it was engrossed, and sold by the crown for large sums of money, and when the property of the subject was so precarious, that the king might call for it upon any occasion, and in case of refusal ruin the proprietor by exorbitant fines and imprisonment? Did no Englishman

---

<sup>1</sup> Lord Clarendon’s Representation of the Times, vol. I. p. 71. 76.

wear a mourning-gown in these times, when the Seldens, the Hollises, the Elliots, the Strouds, the Hobarts, the Valentines, the Coritons, and other patriots, were taken out of the parliament-house, and shut up for many years in close prisons, where some of them perished? How many of the nobility and gentry were punished with exorbitant fines in the star-chamber? how many hundred ministers and others were ruined in the high-commission, or forced from their native country into banishment, contrary to law? The jails in the several counties were never free from state or church prisoners during the past twelve years of his majesty's reign, and yet it seems no Englishman wore a mourning-gown through his occasion? Is it possible to believe, that the reputation of the greatness and power of king Charles I. with foreign princes (however harmless, pious, sober, chaste, and merciful, he might be) was equal to that of queen Elizabeth or king Henry VIII? What service did he do by his arms or counsels for the Protestant religion, or for the liberties or tranquillity of Europe? When his majesty's affairs were in the greatest distress, what credit had he abroad? or where was the foreign prince (except his own son-in-law) that would lend him either men or money? If the Protestant religion was advanced in speculation by the writings of archbishop Laud and Chillingworth; is it not sufficiently evident that the Roman Catholics were prodigiously increased in numbers, reputation, and influence? Upon the whole, the people of England were so far from enjoying a full measure of felicity, that they groaned under a yoke of the heaviest oppression, and were prepared to lay hold of any opportunity to assert their liberties; so that to make his lordship's representation of the times consistent with truth, or with his own behaviour at the beginning of the long parliament, one is almost tempted to suspect it must have received some amendments or colourings from the hands of his editors. This was the state of affairs at the end of the pacific part of this reign, and forwards to the beginning of the long parliament.