

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 VI.

### FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE COMMOTIONS IN SCOTLAND, TO THE LONG PARLIAMENT IN THE YEAR 1640.

WE are now entering upon a scene of calamity which opened in the north, and in a few years, like a rising tempest, overspread both kingdoms, and involved them in all the miseries of a civil war. If archbishop Laud could have been content with being metropolitan of the church of England alone, he might have gone to his grave in peace; but grasping at the jurisdiction of another church founded upon different principles, he pulled both down upon his head and was buried in the ruins.

We have mentioned the preposterous publishing the Scots book of canons a year before their liturgy, which was not finished till the month of October 1636. His majesty's reasons for compiling it were, that "his royal father had intended it, and made a considerable progress in the work, in order to curb such of his subjects in Scotland as were inclined to Puritanism; that his present majesty resolved to pursue the same design, and therefore consented to the publication of this book, which was in substance the same with the English liturgy, that the Roman party might not upbraid us with any material differences, and yet it was so far distinct, that it might be truly reputed a book of that church's composing, and established by his royal authority as king of Scotland."<sup>1</sup>

The compilers of this liturgy were chiefly Dr. Wederburne, a Scots divine, beneficed in England, but now bishop of Dunblain; and Dr. Maxwell, bishop of Ross. Their instructions from England were to keep such Catholic saints in their calendar as were in the English, and that such new saints as were added should be the most approved, but in no case to omit St. George and St. Patrick; that in the book of orders, those words in the English book be not changed, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" and that sundry lessons out of the Apocrypha be inserted; besides these, the word presbyter be inserted instead of priest; and the water in the font for baptism was to be consecrated. There was a benediction or thanksgiving for departed saints; some passages in the communion were altered in favour of the real presence; the rubrics contained instructions to the people, when to stand and when to sit or kneel: to all which the Scots had hitherto been strangers. The main parts of the liturgy were the same with the English, that there might be an appearance of uniformity; it was revised, corrected, and altered, by archbishop Laud and bishop Wren, as appeared by the original found in the archbishop's chamber in the Tower, in which the alterations were inserted with his own hand.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p 386.

The liturgy, thus modelled, was sent into Scotland, with a royal proclamation, dated December 20, 1636, commanding all his majesty's loving subjects of that kingdom to receive it with reverence, as the only form his majesty thinks fit to be used in that kirk, without so much as laying it before a convocation, synod, general assembly, or parliament, of that nation. It was appointed to be read first on Easter Sunday, 1637, against which time all parishes were to be provided with two books at least; but the outcries of the people against it were so vehement, that it was thought advisable to delay it to the 23rd of July, that the lords of the session [or judges] might see the success of it before the end of the term, which always ends the 1st of August, in order to report in their several counties the peaceable receiving the book at Edinburgh and parts adjacent. The archbishop of St. Andrews, with some of his more prudent brethren, foreseeing the disorders that would arise, advised the deferring it yet longer: but archbishop Laud was so sanguine of success, that he procured a warrant from the king, commanding the Scots bishops to go forward at all events, threatening that if they moved heavily, or threw in unnecessary delays, the king would remove them, and fill their sees with churchmen of more zeal and resolution.<sup>1</sup>

In obedience therefore to the royal command, notice having been given in all the pulpits of Edinburgh, that the Sunday following [July 23, 1637] the new service-book would be read in all the churches, there was a vast concourse of people at St. Giles's, or the great church, where both the archbishops and divers bishops, together with the lords of the session, the magistrates of Edinburgh, and many of the council, were assembled; but as soon as the dean began to read, the service was interrupted by clapping of hands, and a hideous noise among the meaner sort of people at the lower end of the church; which the bishop of Edinburgh observing, stepped into the pulpit, and endeavoured to quiet them, but the disturbance increasing, a stool was thrown towards the desk; upon which the provost and bailiffs of the city came from their places, and with much difficulty thrust out the populace, and shut the church-doors; yet such were the clamours from without, rapping at the doors, and throwing stones at the windows, that it was with much difficulty the dean went through the service: and when he

---

<sup>1</sup> "This (says Dr. Grey) is not very likely, and as he [*i.e.* Mr. Neal] produces no vouchers for what he says, he cannot reasonably take it amiss, if we do not readily assent to it." To this it is sufficient to reply, that the fact is stated by Collyer in his Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 770, whose words Mr. Neal uses. The eagerness of Laud to carry this point was stimulated by the earl of Traquair, who carried a letter to him from some of the lately-preferred Scotch bishops, who had an over-balance of heat and spirits, urging execution and dispatch in the business. In this instance the archbishop was the dupe of the insidious policy of the earl of Traquair, whose aim was, by pushing things to extremity, to ruin the older Scotch bishops; who, as he thought, stood in the way of his ambitious views, and "might grow too big for his interest."—ED.

and the bishop came out of church in their habits, they were in danger of being torn in pieces by the mob, who followed them, crying out, "Pull them down, a pape, a pape, antichrist," &c.

Between the two sermons the magistrates took proper measures for keeping the peace in the afternoon, but after evening prayer the tumult was greater than in the morning; for the earl of Roxburgh returning to his lodgings with the bishop in his coach, was so pelted with stones, and pressed upon by the multitude, that both were in danger of their lives. The clergy who read the liturgy in the other churches met with the like usage, insomuch that the whole city was in an uproar, though it did not yet appear that any besides the meaner people were concerned in it;<sup>1</sup> however, the lords of the council thought proper to dispense with reading the service next Sunday, till their express returned from England with further instructions, which Land dispatched with all expedition, telling them, it was the king's firm resolution that they should go on with their work; and blaming them highly for suspending it.

Among the ministers who opposed reading the liturgy were, the Reverend Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Rollock, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Hamilton, and Mr. Bruce, who were charged with letters of horning for their disobedience. But they stood by what they had done, and in their petition to the council gave the following reasons for their conduct; "(1.) Because the service-book had not been warranted by a general assembly, which is the representative body of the kirk, nor by any act of parliament. (2.) Because the liberties of the Scots kirk, and the form of worship received at the Reformation, and universally practised, stood still warranted by acts of the general assembly, and acts of parliament. (3.) Because the kirk of Scotland is a free and independent kirk, and therefore her own pastors are the proper judges what is most for her benefit. (4.) Some of the ceremonies contained in this book have occasioned great divisions in the kirk, forasmuch as they are inconsistent with the form of worship practised in it, and symbolize with the kirk of Rome, which is antichristian. (5.) Because the people, having been otherwise taught, are unwilling to receive the new book till they are better convinced." These reasons were of weight with the council, but they durst not show favour to the prisoners without allowance from England, which could not be obtained; the zealous archbishop stopping his cars against all gentle methods of accommodation, hoping to bear down all opposition with the royal authority.

While the country people were busy at harvest, things were pretty quiet, but when that was over they came to Edinburgh in great numbers, and raised new disturbances, upon which the council issued out three

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth's Collection, vol. 2. p. 388.

proclamations; one for the people that came out of the country to return home; a second for removing the session or term from Edinburgh to Linlithgow; and a third, for calling in and burning a seditious pamphlet, called a “Discourse against the English Popish ceremonies, obtruded on the kirk of Scotland;”<sup>1</sup> all dated October 17, 1637. These proclamations inflamed the people to such a degree, that the very next day, the bishop of Galloway would have been torn in pieces by the mob, as he was going to the council-house, if he had not been rescued by Mr. Steward; but missing of his lordship they beset the council-house, and threatened to break open the door; insomuch that the lords who were assembled, were obliged to send for some of the popular nobility in town to their relief; however, the people would not disperse, till the council had promised to join with the other lords in petitioning the king against the service-book, and to restore the silenced ministers.

Soon after this, two petitions were presented to the lord-chancellor and council against the liturgy and canons; one in the name of all the men, women, children, and servants, of Edinburgh; and the other in the name of the noblemen, barons, gentry, ministers, and burgesses. Their objections against them were the same with those already mentioned. The petitions were transmitted to the king, who, instead of returning a soft answer, ordered a proclamation to be published from Stirling [Feb. 19, 1637], against the late disorderly tumults, in which, after having declared his abhorrence of all superstition and Popery, he expressed his displeasure against the petitioners; and, to prevent any farther riots, his majesty ordered the term or session to be removed from Linlithgow to Stirling,<sup>2</sup> twenty-four miles from Edinburgh, with a strict injunction that no stranger should resort thither without special licence. His majesty also forbade all assemblies or convocations of people to frame or sign petitions upon pain of high-treason,<sup>3</sup> and yet declared at the same time that he would not shut his ears

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 400.

<sup>2</sup> “There is no order given in this proclamation (I will take upon me to say, having perused it carefully) for the removal of the session or term from Linlithgow to Stirling, as Mr. Neal affirms,” says Dr. Grey. This is true: and Mr. Neal’s inaccuracy here lieth in representing the removal of the session from Linlithgow to Stirling as directed by this proclamation; whereas it was the act of the council, after the earl of Roxburgh arrived in Scotland with certain instructions from the king to the council, who were to meet at Dalkeith, to consider of the disordered affairs of the kingdom. It should seem, that this removal was in consequence of those instructions; especially as the proclamation expressly inhibited the resort of the people to Stirling, “where (says his majesty) our council sits,” without a warrant. Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 7.30. Guthry, as quoted by Dr. Harris, expressly says, that the king’s proclamation ordained that the council and sessions should remove from Edinburgh, first to Lithgow, and afterward to Stirling. Life, &c. of Charles I. p, 282.—ED.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, vol. 2. part 2. p. 731, 732.

against them, if neither the form nor matter were prejudicial to his royal authority.

Upon publishing this proclamation sundry noblemen, barons, ministers, and burghers, met together, and signed the following-protest: “1. That it is the undoubted right of the subjects of Scotland, to have immediate recourse to the king by petition. 2. That archbishops and bishops ought not to sit in any judicatory in this kingdom, civil or ecclesiastical, till they have purged themselves of those crimes which are ready to be proved against them. 3. That no proclamation of council, in presence of the archbishops or bishops, shall be prejudicial to any of our proceedings. 4. That neither we nor any that adhere to us shall incur any damages for not observing the liturgy or book of canons, as long as it is not established by general assembly or act of parliament. 5. That if any inconvenience fall out (which God prevent) upon pressing the late innovations, we declare the same is not to be imputed to us. 6. That all our proceedings in this affair have no other tendency but the preservation of the true reformed religion, and the laws and liberties of the kingdom.”

The council, being apprehensive of danger from these large assemblies and combinations of people, agreed, that if they would return peaceably to their houses, they might appoint some of their number of all ranks and orders to represent the rest, till his majesty’s pleasure concerning their protest should be farther known.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly four tables, as they were called, were erected at Edinburgh; one of the nobility, another of the gentry, a third of the burroughs, and a fourth of the ministers. These prepared and digested matters for the general table, formed of commissioners from the other four, where the last and binding resolutions were taken.

One of the first things concluded upon by the tables, was the renewing their confession of faith, and the solemn league and covenant, subscribed by king James and his royal household, March 2, 1580–1, and by the whole Scots nation in the year 1590, with a general band for maintenance of true religion and the king’s person. To this covenant was now added a narrative of sundry acts of parliament, by which the reformed religion had been ratified since that time, with an admonition, wherein the late innovations were renounced, and a band of defence for adhering to each other in the present cause.<sup>2</sup>

In their covenant they declare in the most solemn manner, “that they believe with their hearts, confess with their mouths, and subscribe with their hands, that the confession of faith then established by act of parliament, is the true Christian faith and religion, and the only ground of

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. vol. I. part 2. p. 734.

<sup>2</sup> Nalson’s Collection, p. 20.

their salvation.—They farther declare their abhorrence of all kinds of Papistry in general, and then enumerate sundry particulars of Popish doctrine, discipline, and ceremonies, as the pope’s pretended primacy over the Christian church; his five bastard sacraments, the doctrine of transubstantiation,—the mass, purgatory,—prayers for the dead, and in an unknown language,—justification by works,—auricular confession,—crosses, images, altars, dedicating of kirks, with all other rites, signs, and traditions, brought into the kirk without or contrary to the word of God. All which they promise to oppose to the utmost of their power, and to defend the ancient doctrine and discipline of their kirk all the days of their lives, under the pains contained in the law, and danger both of body and soul, in the day of God’s fearful judgment, protesting and calling the Searcher of all hearts to witness, that their minds and hearts do fully agree with this their confession, promises, oath, and subscriptions. They protest and promise, under the same oath, hand-writing, and pains, to defend the king’s royal person and authority with their goods, bodies, and lives, in defence of Christ’s gospel, the liberties of their country, the administration of justice, the punishment of iniquity, against all his enemies within the realm and without; and this they do from their very hearts, as they hope God will be their defence in the day of death, and the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. To whom with the Father and Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory eternally.”

Then follows a recital of the acts of parliament, by which the reformed religion was established among them. But instead of the band of defence annexed to the covenant of 1580, they framed a new one, suited to the present time, in which, after reciting the king’s coronation-oath, they declare, “that as they will defend the king’s royal person and authority, they will also support the authority of parliaments, upon which the security of the lands, livings, rights, and properties, depend, and without which neither any law nor lawful judicatory can be established. They declare the late innovations brought into the kirk to be contrary to the doctrine and discipline of it, and contrary to the covenant above mentioned, and therefore they will forbear the practice of them till they are tried, and allowed in a free assembly, and in parliament; and not only so, but they promise and swear, by the great name of God, to resist all these errors and corruptions to the utmost of their power, all the days of their lives. They then promise and swear over again, to defend the king’s person and authority in the preservation of the aforesaid true religion, laws, and liberties, of the kingdom, and to assist and stand by one another at all adventures, without suffering themselves to be divided by any allurements or terror from this blessed and loyal conjunction, and without being afraid of the odious aspersions of rebellion or combination, which their

adversaries may cast upon them. And they conclude with calling the Searcher of hearts to witness to their sincerity, as they shall answer it to Christ in the day of account, and under pain of the loss of all honours and respect in this world, and God's everlasting wrath in the next." All this was sworn to and subscribed with great seriousness and devotion, first at Edinburgh, in the month of February 1637–8, and afterward in the several counties and shires, where it was received by the common people, as a sacred oracle, and subscribed by all such as were thought to have any zeal for the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country. The privy-counsellors, the judges, the bishops, and the friends of arbitrary power, were the principal persons who refused. The universities of St. Andrews and Aberdeen were said to oppose it, and those of Glasgow did not subscribe without some limitations.

There cannot be a more solemn and awful engagement to God, and each other, than this! what the reasons were that induced king James, and the whole Scots nation, to enter into it in the years 1580 and 1590, are not necessary to be determined; but certainly such a combination of subjects, without the consent of their sovereign, in a well-settled government, is unwarrantable, especially when it is confirmed with an oath, as no oath ought to be administered but by commission from the chief magistrate. The only foundation therefore upon which this covenant can be vindicated is, that the Scots apprehended their legal church-establishment had been broken in pieces by the king's assuming the supremacy, by his erecting a high-commission, and by his imposing upon them a book of canons and liturgy, without consent of parliament, or general assembly.

The council sent advice of the proceedings of the covenanters from time to time, and acquainted his majesty, that the cause of all the commotions was the fear of innovations in the doctrine and discipline of the kirk, by introducing the liturgy, canons, and high-commission; that it was therefore their humble opinion, that the reading the service-book should not be urged at present.

Upon this the king sent the marquis of Hamilton, his high-commissioner, into Scotland, with instructions to consent to the suspending the use of the service-book for the present, but at the same time to dissolve the tables, and to require the covenant to be delivered up within six weeks. His majesty adds, "that if there be not sufficient strength in the kingdom to oblige the covenanters to return to their duty, he will come in person from England at the head of a sufficient power to force them;" and in the meantime, the marquis is empowered to use all hostile acts against them as a rebellious people.

Upon the marquis's arrival at Holyrood-house, he was welcomed by great numbers of the covenanters of all ranks and qualities, in hopes that he



would call a general assembly and a free parliament; but when he told them this was not in his instructions, they went home full of resentments. The people nailed up the organ-loft in the church, and admonished the marquis not to read the liturgy. The ministers cautioned their hearers against consenting to ensnaring propositions; and a letter was sent to the marquis and council, exhorting them to subscribe the covenant. His lordship sent advice of these things to court, and moved his majesty either to yield to the people, or hasten his royal arms. The king replied that he would rather die than yield to their impertinent and damnable demands; but admitted of the marquis's flattering them to gain time,<sup>1</sup> provided he did not consent to the calling a general assembly or parliament, till they had disavowed or given up the covenant.<sup>2</sup> When this was known, both ministers and people declared with one voice, that they would as soon renounce their baptism as their covenant; but withal avowed their duty and allegiance to the king, and their resolutions to stand by his majesty, in defence of the true religion, laws, and liberties of the kingdom. The marquis, not being able to make any impression on the covenanters, returned to England with an account of the melancholy state of affairs in that kingdom, which surprised the English court, and reflected some disgrace upon the archbishop, for as his grace was going to council, Archibald, the king's jester, said to him, "Whae's feule now? Does not your grace hear the news from Striveling about the liturgy?"<sup>3</sup> His grace complaining of this usage to the council, Archibald Armstrong, the king's fool, was ordered to have his coat pulled over his ears, to be discharged the king's service, and banished the court.

After some time Hamilton was sent back with instructions (if necessity required) to revoke the liturgy, the canons, the high-commission, and the five articles of Perth; and with authority to subscribe the confession of faith of 1580, with the band thereunto annexed, and to take orders that all his majesty's subjects subscribed the same.<sup>4</sup> He might also promise the calling a general assembly and parliament within a competent time, but was to endeavour to exclude the laity from the assembly. The design of subscribing the band of the old covenant of 1580, was to secure the continuance of episcopacy, because that band obliges them to maintain the religion at that time professed, which the king would interpret of prelatial

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Grey would supply from the original, "by all the honest means you can, without forsaking your ground."—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 752. 762.

<sup>3</sup> On the stool being thrown at the dean's head, who first read it in the cathedral at Edinburgh, Archy said, it was "the stool of repentance." He had a particular spleen against bishop Laud, and the gravity of history will be relieved by another stroke of his humour pointed at this prelate. Once, when the bishop was present, he asked leave to say grace, which being granted him, he said, "Great praise be given to God, and little Laud to the devil." Granger's Biog. History, vol. 2. p. 400.—ED.

<sup>4</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 767, &c.

government, as being not then legally discharged by parliament, and because it contained no promise of mutual defence and assistance against all persons whatsoever, which might include the king himself. However, the covenanters did not think fit to subscribe over again, and therefore only thanked the king for discharging the liturgy, the canons, and high-commission.

At length the marquis published a proclamation for a general assembly to meet at Glasgow, November 21 [1638]. The choice of members went everywhere in favour of the covenanters, the reverend Mr. Henderson, one of the silenced ministers, was chosen moderator, and Mr. Johnston, clerk-registrar;<sup>1</sup> but the bishops presented a declinator, “declaring the assembly to be unlawful, and the members of it not qualified to represent the clergy of the nation, (1.) Because they were chosen before the presbyteries had received the royal mandate to make election. (2.) Because most of them had not subscribed the articles of religion, nor sworn to the king’s supremacy in presence of the bishops, for neglect of which they were *ipso facto* deprived. (3.) Because they had excluded the bishops, who, by the act of assembly at Glasgow 1610, were to be perpetual moderators. (4.) Because there were lay-elders among them who had no right to be there, nor had ordinarily sat in presbyteries for above forty years. (5.) Because they apprehended it absurd, as well as contrary to the practice of the Christian church, that archbishops and bishops should be judged by a mixed assembly of clergy and laics.” Signed by the archbishop of St. Andrews, the bishops of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Galloway, Ross, and Brechin.

The force of these objections, how strong soever in themselves, was taken off by the king’s owning the assembly, and sitting in it by his commissioner seven days; though at the dissolution he declared their proceedings to be utterly destructive of the name and nature of a free assembly.

The bishops’ declinator being read, was unanimously rejected, and a committee appointed to draw up an answer. In the meantime the assembly was busy in examining elections, in which the covenanters carried everything before them; the marquis therefore, despairing of any good issue, determined, according to his instructions, to dissolve them; and accordingly went to the great church where they sat, and read over his majesty’s concessions; as, (1.) “That his majesty was willing to discharge the service-book, and the book of canons. (2.) To dissolve the high-commission. (3.) That the articles of Perth should not be urged. (4.) That no oath should be required of any minister at his entrance into the ministry, but what is required by act of parliament. (5.) That for the future there should

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, p. 865–867.

be general assemblies as often as the affairs of the kirk shall require; and that the bishops should be censurable by the assembly, according to their merits. (6.) That the confession of faith of 1580, should be subscribed by all his majesty's subjects of Scotland." These, although very considerable abatements, did not reach the requirements of the covenanters, which were, the dissolution of the order of the bishops, and of the above-mentioned grievances by a statute law. The marquis went on, and in a long speech declaimed against lay-elders, "an office (as he said) unknown in the church for fifteen hundred years, such persons being very unfit to judge of the high mysteries of predestination, effectual grace, ante and post-lapsarian doctrines, or to pass sentence upon their superiors in learning and office." He therefore advised them to break up and choose another assembly of all clergymen; but his motion striking at the very being and lawfulness of their present constitution, was unanimously rejected; whereupon the marquis dissolved them, after they had sat only seven days: forbidding them to continue their sessions upon pain of high treason; and next morning the dissolution was published by proclamation at the market-cross.

But the assembly, instead of submitting to the royal command, continued sitting, and the very next day [November 29] published a protestation to justify their proceedings, wherein they affirm, "1. That ruling elders have constantly sat in their assemblies before the late times of corruption. 2. That his majesty's presence in their assemblies, either in his own person or by his commissioners, is not for voting, but as princes and emperors of old, in a princely manner, to countenance their meetings, and preside in them for external order. 3. That it is clear, by the doctrine and discipline of the kirk, contained in the book of policy, and registered in the book of the assembly, and subscribed by the presbyteries of this kirk, that it is unlawful in itself, and prejudicial to the privileges that Christ has left his church, for the king to dissolve or break up the assembly of this kirk, or to stay their proceedings; for then it would follow, that religion and church-government should depend absolutely upon the pleasure of the prince. 4. That there is no pretence by act of assembly, or parliament, or any preceding practice, whereby the king's majesty, or his commissioner, may lawfully dissolve the general assembly of the church of Scotland, without their consent. 5. That the assemblies of the kirk have continued sitting, notwithstanding any contramand, as it is evident by all the records thereof; and in particular, by the general assembly of 1582. And, lastly, to dissolve the assembly before any grievances are redressed, is to throw back the whole nation into confusion, and to make every man despair hereafter ever to see innovations removed, the subjects' complaints regarded, or offenders punished. For these reasons they declare it lawful and necessary to continue the present assembly, till they have tried and censured all the bygone evils

and the introductors of them, and have provided a solid course for continuing God's truth in this land with purity and liberty; they declare farther, that the said assembly is and shall be esteemed and obeyed as a most lawful, full, and free general assembly of this kingdom, and that the acts, sentences, censures, and proceedings of it, shall be obeyed and observed by all the subjects of this kingdom."<sup>1</sup>

Archbishop Laud was vexed at these bold and desperate proceedings of the assembly, and thought of nothing but dispersing them by arms. "I will be bold to say (says his grace), never were there more gross absurdities, nor half so many, in so short a time committed in any public meeting; and for a national assembly, never did the church of Christ see the like." "—I am as sorry as your grace [the marquis of Hamilton] can be, that the king's preparations can make no more haste; I hope you think I have called upon his majesty, and by his command upon some others, to hasten all that may be, and more than this I cannot do;—I have done, and do daily call upon his majesty for his preparations; he protests he makes all the haste he can, and I believe him, but the jealousies of giving the covenanters umbrage too soon have made preparations here so late."

The assembly, according to their resolution, continued sitting several weeks, till they had passed the following acts; an act for disannulling six late assemblies therein mentioned, held in the years 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, 1618, with the reasons; an act for abjuring and abolishing episcopacy; an act for condemning the five articles of Perth; an act for condemning the servicebook, book of canons, book of ordination, and the high-commission; an act for condemning archdeacons, chapters, and preaching deacons; an act for restoring presbyteries, provincial and national assemblies, to their constitution of ministers and elders, and to their power and jurisdiction contained in the book of policy;<sup>2</sup> with many others of the like nature. They then pronounced sentence of deposition against the bishops; eight of whom were excommunicated, four excluded from the ministerial function, and two only allowed to officiate as pastors or presbyters. Upon this Dr. Spotswood, bishop of St. Andrews, and lord-high-chancellor of Scotland, retired to London, where he died the next year. Most of his brethren the bishops took the same method; only four remained in the country, three of whom renounced their episcopal orders, viz. Alexander Ramsey bishop of Dunkeld, George Graham bishop of Orkney, and James Fairby bishop of Argyle; but the fourth, George Guthrey, bishop of Murray, kept his ground and weathered the storm. At the close of the session the assembly drew up a letter to the king, complaining of his

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 863–865.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 873.

majesty's commissioner, who had proclaimed them traitors, and forbade the people to pay any regard to their acts; and praying the king to look upon them still as his good and faithful subjects. They also published another declaration to the good people of England, in vindication of their proceedings, which his majesty took care to suppress, and issued out a proclamation against the seditious behaviour of the covenanters, which he commanded to be read in all the churches in England.<sup>1</sup>

It was easy to foresee that these warm proceedings must issue in a war, especially when it is remembered that his majesty consulted with none but the declared enemies of their kirk, viz. Laud, Hamilton, and Wentworth. On the 26th of January the king published his resolution to go in person against the Scots covenanters at the head of an army; for this purpose the nobility were summoned to attend his majesty, and all the wheels of the prerogative were put in motion to raise men and money.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pierce, bishop of Bath and Wells, in his letter to his clergy, calls it "bellum episcopale," a war for the support of episcopacy, that they should therefore stir up their clergy to a liberal contribution after the rate of three shillings and tenpence in the pound, according to the valuation of their livings in the king's books. The archbishop also wrote to his commissary, Sir John Lamb, for a contribution in the civil courts of Doctors'-commons, requiring him to send the names of such as refused to himself at Lambeth. The queen and her friends undertook for the Roman Catholics; the courtiers and the country gentlemen were applied to, to lend money upon this occasion, which the former readily complied with, but of the latter forty only contributed together about £1,400. With these and some other assistances, the king fitted out a fleet of sixteen men-of-war, and raised a splendid army of twenty-one thousand horse and foot.

The Scots, being informed of the preparations that were making against them in England, secured the important castles of Edinburgh, Dumbritton, and Frith; and raised an army of such volunteers as had the cause of the kirk at heart, and were determined to sacrifice their lives in defence of it; they sent for their old general Lesley from Germany, who upon this occasion quitted the emperor's service, and brought over with him several experienced officers. But their greatest distress was the want of fire-arms, ammunition, and money, there not being above three thousand arms to be found in the whole kingdom; and having no money, their soldiers made such a ragged appearance, that when the king saw them, he said, "they would certainly fight the English if it were only to get their fine clothes." But the success of this war will fall within the compass of the next year.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 876.

<sup>2</sup> Prynne's Introd. p. 177, 178. 196. Rushworth, vol. 1. part 2. p. 791.

To return to England, the star-chamber and high-commission went on with their oppressions, as if they were under no apprehensions from the storm that was gathering in the north. Many ministers were suspended and shut up in prison, as, Mr. Henry Wilkinson, B.D., of Magdalen-college, Oxford; Mr. George Walker, Mr. Smith, Mr. Small, Mr. Cooper; Mr. Brewer, a Baptist preacher, who lay in prison fourteen years; Mr. Foxley, of St. Martin's in the Fields, who was confined in a chamber in the Gate-house, not four yards square, for twenty months, without pen, ink, or paper, or the access of any friends, even in his extreme sickness: and all this without knowing his crime or so much as guessing at it, unless it was for speaking in favour of the feoffees.<sup>1</sup>

Great numbers of Puritans continued to flock into New England, notwithstanding the prohibition of the council last year, insomuch that the Massachusetts-bay began to be too strait for them; in the latter end of the year 1636, about one hundred families travelled farther into the country, and settled on the banks of the river Connecticut, with the reverend Mr. Hooker at their head; another detachment went from Dorchester; a third from Water-Town; and a fourth from Roxbury; and built the towns of Hertford, Windsor, Wethersfield, and Springfield, in that colony. Next year [1637] the passengers from England were so numerous that they projected a new settlement on the south-west part of Connecticut-river, in a large bay near the confines of New York; the leaders of this colony were Theophilus Eaton, esq. and the reverend Mr. Davenport, who came from England with a large retinue of acquaintance and followers; they spread along the coast, and first built the town of Newhaven, which gives name to the colony; and after some time the towns of Guilford, Milford, Stamford, Brentford, &c. Notwithstanding these detachments, the Massachusetts-bay had such frequent recruits from England, that they were continually building new towns or enlarging their settlements in the neighbourhood.

Among the divines who went over this summer, was the reverend Mr. Ezekiel Rogers, M. A., some time chaplain in the family of sir Francis Barrington of Hatfield Broad-oak in Essex, and afterward vicar of Rowley in Yorkshire, where he continued a successful preacher to a numerous congregation almost twenty years.<sup>2</sup> The archbishop of that diocess [Dr. Matthews] being a moderate divine, permitted the use of those lectures or prophesyings which queen Elizabeth had put down; the ministers within certain districts had their monthly exercises, in which one or two preached and others prayed before a numerous and attentive audience. One of the hearers, that bore an ill-will to the exercises, told the archbishop that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Prynne, p. 388.

<sup>2</sup> Mather's History of New England, b. 3. p. 101.

ministers prayed against him; but his grace, instead of giving credit to the informer, answered with a smile, that he could hardly believe him, because “those good men know (says he) that if I were gone to heaven, their exercises would soon be put down;” which came to pass accordingly, for no sooner was his successor [Mr. Neile] in his chair, but he put a period to them, and urged subscription with so much severity, that many of the clergy were suspended and silenced; among whom was Mr. Rogers, who, having no farther prospect of usefulness in his own country, embarked with several of his Yorkshire friends for New England, where he arrived in the summer of the year 1638, and settled at a place which he called Rowley. Here he spent the remainder of his days, amidst a variety of afflictions and sorrows till the year 1660, when he died in the seventieth year of his age.

Mr. Samuel Newman, author of that concordance of the Bible that bears his name, was born at Banbury, educated at Oxford, and having finished his studies, entered into holy orders, and became minister of a small living in that county: but the severe prosecutions of the spiritual courts obliged him to no less than seven removals, till at length he resolved to get out of their reach and remove with his friends to New England, where he arrived this summer, and settled at Rehoboth in the colony of New Plymouth, where he spent the remainder of his days to the year 1663, when he died in the sixty-third year of his age.<sup>1</sup> He was a hard student, a lively preacher, and of a heavenly conversation.

Mr. Charles Chauncey,<sup>2</sup> B. D., educated in Cambridge, and Greek lecturer of his own college in that university. He was afterward settled at Ware, and was an admired and useful preacher, till he was driven from thence, as has been related. When the book of sports was published, and the drums beat about the town to summon the people to their dances and revels

---

<sup>1</sup> Mather’s Hist. p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> He received his grammar education at Westminster-school; and was at school at the time the gunpowder plot was to have taken effect; and must have perished, if it had succeeded. He was an accurate Hebreian and Grecian, and admirably skilled in all the learned languages. Latin and Greek verses of his appeared in the collections of poetical compliments of condolence or congratulation, offered by the university on different occasions to the courts of James I. and Charles I. He was at Boston in order to take passage for England, in consequence of an invitation to settle again with his old people at Ware; when the importunities of the overseers of Harvard-college prevailed with him to accept the presidentship of that seminary, in which place he continued highly honoured for his learning and piety. A grandson of his son Isaac, also named Charles, minister of the first church in Boston, died 10th of February 1787, in the eighty-third year of his age; having been an ornament to his profession, distinguished by his extensive benevolence and invincible integrity, a warm and virtuous patriot; for nearly sixty years the able faithful instructor and friend of his flock, and the author of many works, which remain monuments of his abilities, application, and excellent temper. The most valuable and laboured were, “The Salvation of all Men,” a treatise; “Five Dissertations on the Fall and its Consequences;” and a tract on the “Benevolence of the Deity;” all published in London. See Dr. Grey, and Clarke’s funeral sermon for Dr. Charles Chauncey, 1787.—ED.

on the Lord's day evening, he preached against it, for which he was suspended, and soon after totally silenced.<sup>1</sup> Few suffered more for nonconformity, says my author, by fines, by imprisonment, and by necessities, than Mr. Chauncey: at length he determined to remove to New England, where he arrived in the year 1638, and became president of Harvard-college in Cambridge. Here he continued a most learned, laborious, and useful governor, till the year 1671, when he died in the eighty-second year of his age; he left behind him six sons, the eldest of which was Dr. Isaac Chauncey, well known heretofore among the Nonconformist ministers of London.

I pass over the lives of many other divines and substantial gentlemen, who deserted their native country, for the peace of their consciences; but it deserves a particular notice that there were eight sail of ships at once this spring in the river Thames bound for New England, and filled with Puritan families, among whom (if we may believe Dr. George Bates and Mr. Dugdale, two famous royalists) were, Oliver Cromwell, afterward protector of the commonwealth of England, John Hampden, esq., and Mr. Arthur Haselrigge, who, seeing no end of the oppressions of their native country, determined to spend the remainder of their days in America; but the council, being informed of their design, issued out an order dated May 1, 1638, to make stay of those ships and to put on shore all the provisions intended for the voyage. And to prevent the like for the future, his majesty prohibited all masters and owners of ships, to set forth any ships for New England with passengers, without special licence from the privy-council; and gives this remarkable reason for it, "Because the people of New England were factious and unworthy of any support from hence, in regard of the great disorders and want of government among them, whereby many that have been well affected to the church of England have been prejudiced in their estates by them."<sup>2</sup>

When the Puritans might not transport themselves to New England, they removed with their families into the Low Countries; among the divines who went thither about this time, were Dr. Thomas Goodwin, educated in Cambridge, and a great admirer of Dr. Preston. In the year 1628, he was chosen to preach the lecture in Trinity-church, and held it till the year 1634, when he left the university and all his preferments, through dissatisfaction with the terms of conformity: having lived in retirement till this time, he withdrew with some select friends to Holland, and settled at Arnheim in Gelderland, where he continued till the beginning of the long parliament.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mather's History of New England, p. 134.

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



Philip Nye, M.A., educated in Magdalen-hall, Oxon, and a popular preacher at St. Bartholomew Exchange, London.

Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, a most candid and moderate divine, educated in Cambridge, and afterward a famous preacher to two of the largest congregations about London, viz. Stepney and Cripplegate.

Mr. William Bridge, M.A., and fellow of Emanuel-college, Cambridge; he was first minister in Essex, and afterward settled in the city of Norwich, in the parish of St. George Tombland; where he continued till he was silenced for nonconformity by bishop Wren, in the year 1637, and excommunicated.

Mr. Sydrach Sympson, educated in Cambridge, and afterward a celebrated preacher in London. These were afterward the five pillars of the Independent or congregational party, and were distinguished by the name of the Dissenting Brethren in the assembly of divines.

Several gentlemen and merchants of figure disposed of their effects, and went after them into exile, as, sir Matthew Poynton, sir William Constable, sir Richard Saltington, Mr. Lawrence, afterward lord-president of the council, Mr. James, Mr. White, and others. The States received them with great humanity, granting them the use of their churches at different hours of the day, with the liberty of ringing a bell for public worship, though they did not approve of the Dutch discipline, or join in communion with their churches.

Great was the damage the nation sustained by these removals: Heylin observes,<sup>1</sup> “The severe pressing of the ceremonies made the people in many trading towns tremble at a visitation, but when they found their striving in vain, and that they had lost the comfort of the lecturers, who were turned out for not reading the second service at the communion-table in their hoods and surplices, and for using other prayers besides that of the fifty-fifth canon, it was no hard matter for those ministers to persuade them to transport themselves into foreign parts; “The sun (said they) shines as comfortably in other places, and the Sun of righteousness much brighter; it is better to go and dwell in Goshen, find it where we can, than tarry in the midst of such Egyptian bondage as is among us; the sinful corruptions of the church are now grown so general, that there is no place free from the contagion; therefore, ‘go out of her, my people, and be not partakers of her sins.’” And hereunto they were encouraged by the Dutch, who chose rather to carry their manufactures home, than be obliged to resort to their parish-churches, as by the archbishop’s injunctions they were obliged.

The eyes of all England were now towards the north, whither the king went March 27, to put himself at the head of his army raised against the

---

<sup>1</sup> Life of Laud, p. 367.

Scots; the earls of Arundel, Essex, and Holland, being the chief commanding officers under his majesty. The Scots, under the command of general Lesley, received them upon the borders; but when the two armies had faced each other for some time, the king, perceiving that his Protestant nobility and soldiers were not hearty in his cause, gave way to a treaty at the petition of the Scots, which ended in a pacification June 17, by which all points of difference were referred to a general assembly to be held at Edinburgh, August 12, and to a parliament which was to meet about a fortnight after. In the meantime both armies were to be disbanded,<sup>1</sup> the tables to be broken up, and no meetings held except such as are warranted by act of parliament. Accordingly the king dismissed his army, but with very disobliging circumstances, not giving the nobility and gentry so much as thanks for their affection, loyalty, and personal attendance, which they resented so highly, that few or none of them appeared upon the next summons; the Scots delivered back the king's forts and castles into his majesty's hands, and disbanded the soldiery, wisely keeping their officers in pay till they saw the effect of the pacification.<sup>2</sup>

The general assembly met at Edinburgh according to the treaty, but being of the same constitution with the last, the bishops presented another declinator to his majesty's commissioner [the earl of Traquair], and were excused giving their attendance by express letter from the king, his majesty in his instructions to his commissioner having yielded them the point of lay-elders. The assembly, therefore, without any opposition, confirmed the proceedings of that at Glasgow, which was of very dubious authority. They appointed the covenant to be taken throughout the kingdom, and explained the bond of mutual defence to a consistency with their late conduct. They voted away the new service-book, the book of canons, the five articles of Perth, the high-commission, and with one consent determined, that diocesan episcopacy was unlawful, and not to be allowed in their kirk.<sup>3</sup> This the earl of Traquair did not apprehend inconsistent with his private instructions from the king, which were these: "We allow episcopacy to be

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Grey quotes lord Clarendon, as stating "that the king's army, by the very words of the agreement, was not to be disbanded, until all should be executed on the part of the Scots." But not to say, that the accounts of this treaty in the *Memoirs of the Marquis of Hamilton*, p. 142, and in Guthry, as quoted by Dr. Harris, p. 288, mention no such limitation; lord Clarendon himself undermines his own authority on this matter, by telling his reader, that "no two who were present at the treaty agreed in the same relation of what was said or done; and, which was worse, not in the same interpretation of the meaning of what was comprehended in writing." Clarendon's *History*, vol. 1. p. 123.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Macaulay, in her detail of this treaty, mentions as a memorable circumstance, unnoticed by historians, and very expressive of the pacific disposition of the Scots, that they told the king, that if he would give them leave to enjoy their religion and their laws, they would, at their own expense, transport their army to assist the recovery of the Palatinate. *History of England*, vol. 2. p. 283, note, 8vo. edit. —ED.

<sup>3</sup> Nalson's *Collection*, p. 246, 247.

abolished for the reasons contained in the articles, and that the covenant of 1580, for satisfaction of our people, be subscribed.—Again, if they require episcopacy to be abjured, as contrary to the constitution of the church of Scotland, you are to give way to it, but not as a point of Popery, or as contrary to God’s law, or the Protestant religion.—Again, in giving way to the abolishing episcopacy, be careful that it be done without the appearing of any warrant from the bishops in prejudice of episcopacy as unlawful; but only in satisfaction to the people for settling the present disorders, and such other reasons of state; but herein you must be careful that our intentions appear not to any.” It is evident from hence, that his majesty’s usage of the Scots was neither frank nor sincere; he had no design to abolish episcopacy, and only consented to suspend it, because he was told that the bishops being one of the three estates of parliament, no law made in their absence could be of force, much less an act for abolishing their whole order, after they had entered their protest in form. When his majesty gave way to the subscribing the covenant, it was with another reserve, “as far as may stand with our future intentions well known to you. For though we have discharged the service-book and canons, we will never consent that they be condemned as Popish and superstitious,<sup>1</sup>—nor will we acknowledge that the high-commission was without law, nor that the five articles of Perth be condemned as contrary to the confession of faith; it is enough that they be laid aside.” His majesty’s instructions conclude, “that if anything be yielded in the present assembly prejudicial to his majesty’s service, his commissioner shall protest, that his majesty may be heard for redress thereof in his own time and place.”

The Scots parliament met Aug. 31 [1639], and having first subscribed the solemn league and covenant with the king’s consent, they confirmed all the acts of the general assembly, concluding with the utter extirpation of episcopacy as unlawful.<sup>2</sup> But the king having by letter to his commissioner forbidden him to consent to the word unlawful, lest it should be interpreted absolutely, though it seems to have a reference only to the kirk of Scotland, his lordship prorogued the parliament, first for fourteen days, and then, by the king’s express command,<sup>3</sup> for nine months, without ratifying any of their acts. The earl of Dunfermlin and lord Loudon were dispatched to London, to beseech his majesty to consent to their ratification; but they were sent back with a reprimand for their misbehaviour, being hardly admitted into the king’s presence. It seems too apparent, that his majesty meant little or nothing by his concessions but to gain time; for in his

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson's Collection, p. 254, 255.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 256.

<sup>3</sup> The term of prorogation, as Dr. Grey points it out, is expressed in Nalson thus—“till the next spring.”—ED.

declaration before the next war, about six months forward, he says, “Concerning our promise of a free parliament, no man can imagine we intended it should be so free as not to be limited by the enjoyment of their religion and liberties, according to the ecclesiastical and civil laws of that kingdom; but if they pass these bounds, we are disobliged, and they left at liberty to fly at our monarchical government without control, to wrest the sceptre out of our hands, and to rob the crown of the fairest flower belonging to it.”<sup>1</sup> The king, therefore, did not really intend the alteration of any of the civil or ecclesiastical laws of that kingdom, and by his majesty’s not ratifying any of their acts, it was evident, that the English court had resumed their courage, and were determined once more to try the fortune of war.

In the meantime, to balance the declaration of the Scots assembly, bishop Hall, at the request of Laud, composed a treatise of the “Divine Right of Episcopacy,” which the archbishop revised. The propositions which he advances are these: (1.) That form of government which is of apostolical institution ought to be esteemed of divine right. (2.) That form which was practised and recommended by the apostles, though not expressly commanded, is of apostolical institution. (3.) The government set up by the apostles was designed for perpetuity. (4.) The universal practice of the primitive church is the best rule to judge of the apostolical practice. (5.) We ought not to suppose the primitive fathers would change the form of government they had received from the apostles. (6.) The accession of privilege and honourable titles does not affect the substance of the episcopal function. (7.) The Presbyterian government, though challenging the glorious title of Christ’s kingdom and ordinance, has no foundation in Scripture, or in the practice of the church for fifteen hundred years, and is altogether incongruous and unjustifiable.

The bishop’s book was altered in many places, contrary to his own inclinations, by the archbishop, and particularly in those wherein he had called the pope antichrist, or spoke too favourably of the morality of the sabbath; and said that presbytery was of use, where episcopacy could not be obtained. His grace disapproved of his lordship’s waiving the question, whether episcopacy was a distinct order, or only a higher degree of the same order; and of his advancing the divine right of episcopacy no higher than the apostles, whereas he would have it derived from Christ himself. Upon the whole, his lordship’s book was so modelled by his metropolitan, that in the debate hereafter mentioned, he could hardly go the lengths of his own performance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collection, p. 273.

The bishops still kept a strict hand over the Puritans: not a sermon was to be heard on the distinguishing points of Calvinism all over England. In some diocesses great complaints were made of Puritan justices of peace, for being too strict in putting the laws in execution against profaneness. At Ashford in Kent the archbishop said, he must have recourse to the statutes of abjuration, and call in the assistance of the temporal courts to reduce the separatists, the censures of the church not being sufficient. Upon the whole, there was no abatement of the height of conformity, even to the end of this year, though the flames that were kindling in Scotland began to disturb the tranquillity of the church.

Mr. Bagshaw, a lawyer of some standing in the Middle Temple, being chosen reader in that house for the Lent vacation, began to attack the power of the bishops. In his lectures on the 25th Edw. III. cap. 7, he maintained that acts of parliament were valid without the assent of the lords spiritual. 2. That no beneficed clerk was capable of temporal jurisdiction at the making that law. And, 3. That no bishop, without calling a synod, had power as a diocesan to convict a heretic. Laud, being informed of these positions, told the king that Bagshaw had justified the Scots covenanters in decrying the temporal jurisdiction of churchmen, and the undoubted right of the bishops to their seats in parliament; upon which he was immediately interdicted all farther reading on those points; and though Bagshaw humbly petitioned the lordkeeper and the archbishop for liberty to proceed, he could get no other answer, after long attendance, than that it had been better for him not to have meddled with that argument, which should stick closer to him than he was aware of.<sup>1</sup> Whereupon he retired into the country.

The resolution of the English court to renew the war with Scotland, was owing to the lord-deputy Wentworth, whom archbishop Laud had sent for from Ireland for this purpose. This nobleman, from being an eminent patriot, was become a petty tyrant, and had governed Ireland in a most arbitrary and sovereign manner for about seven years, discountenancing the Protestants, because they were Calvinists, and inclined to Puritanism, and giving all imaginable encouragement to the Roman Catholics as friends to the prerogative, whereby he suffered the balance of power in that kingdom to fall into the hands of the Papists. Wentworth, being come to court, was immediately created earl of Strafford and knight of the garter, and in concert with Laud advised the king to set aside the pacification, and to push the Scots war with vigour, offering his majesty eight thousand Irish, and a large sum of money for his assistance; but this not being sufficient, the war was thought so reasonable and necessary to the king's honour, that it might be ventured with an English parliament, which being laid before the

---

<sup>1</sup> Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 407.

council, was cheerfully agreed to, and, after twelve years<sup>1</sup> interval, a parliament was summoned to meet April 13, 1640.

The Scots foreseeing the impending storm, consulted where to fly for succour; some were for throwing themselves into the hands of the French, and accordingly wrote a very submissive letter to that monarch, signed by the hands of seven Scots peers, but never sent; for upon application to their friends at London, they were assured by a letter drawn up by lord Saville, and signed by himself, with the names of Bedford, Essex, Brook, Warwick, Say and Seal, and Mandeville (who agreed to the letter, though they were so cautious as not to write their own names), “that the hearts of the people of England were with them; that they were convinced, the liberties of both nations were at stake, and therefore they might depend upon their assistance as soon as a fair opportunity offered.” Upon this encouragement the Scots laid aside their design of applying to France, and resolved to raise another army from among themselves, and march into England.

“The parliament that met at Westminster (says the noble historian<sup>1</sup>) was made up of sober and dispassionate men, exceedingly disposed to do the king service,” and yet his majesty would not condescend to speak to them from the throne,<sup>2</sup> ordering the lord-keeper Finch to acquaint them with the undutiful behaviour of the Scots, whom he was determined to reduce, and therefore would not admit of the mediation of the two houses, but expected their immediate assistance, after which he would give them time to consider of any just grievance to be redressed. But the commons, instead of beginning with the supply, appointed committees for religion and grievances, which disobliged the king so much, that, after several fruitless attempts to persuade them to begin with the subsidy-bill, he dissolved them in anger, without passing a single act, after they had sat about three weeks. The blame of this hasty dissolution was by some cast upon Laud, by others on Sir Harry Vane, while the king laid it on the misbehaviour of the house

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon’s Hist. vol. 1. p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Clarendon says, “After the king had shortly mentioned his desire to be again acquainted with parliaments after so long an intermission,” &c. he referred the cause to be enlarged on by the speaker. “It is plain from hence (Dr. Grey adds) that his majesty did condescend to speak to them from the throne.” This is observed to impeach Mr. Neal’s veracity. But when the reader has laid before him the short speech delivered from the throne, he will judge whether Mr. Neal stands charged with more than an inaccuracy. It is given us by Nalson, vol. 1. p. 306.

“My lords and gentlemen,

“There never was a king that had a more great and weighty cause to call his people together than myself; I will not trouble you with the particulars; I have informed my lord-keeper, and command him to speak, and to desire your attention.” This was not properly a speech from the throne, but, as Mrs. Macaulay calls it, “a short preface-’ to the lord-keeper’s speech.—ED.

of commons, who would not take his royal word for redress of grievances, after they had voted the necessary supplies; he therefore sent the leading members of the house into custody, and committed them prisoners to the Fleet and other prisons.

His majesty having failed of a parliamentary supply at the time he demanded it, was told by lord Strafford and others of the council, that he was now absolved from all rules of government, and might take what his necessities required, and his power could obtain. This indeed was no more than his majesty had been doing for twelve years before; but some people drew an unhappy conclusion from this maxim, viz. that if the king was absolved from all rules of government, the people were absolved from all rules of obedience.

However, all the engines of arbitrary power were set at work to raise money for the war, as loans, benevolences, ship-money, coat and conduct money, knighthood, monopolies, and other springs of the prerogative, some of which, says lord Clarendon, were ridiculous, and others scandalous, but all very grievous to the subject. Those who refused payment, were fined and imprisoned by the star-chamber or council-table, among whom were some of the aldermen of London, and sheriffs of several of the counties. The courtiers advanced £300,000. in three weeks, the clergy in convocation gave six subsidies, the Papists were very generous; Strafford went over to Ireland, and obtained four subsidies of the parliament of that kingdom; soldiers were pressed into the service in all counties, few listing themselves voluntarily except Papists, many of whom had commissions in the army, which gave rise to a common saying among the people, that the queen's army of Papists were going to establish the Protestant religion in Scotland.

The people groaned under these oppressions, the odium whereof fell upon Laud and Strafford, who were libelled and threatened with the fury of the populace. May 9, 1640, a paper was fixed upon the old Exchange, animating the apprentices to pull the archbishop out of his palace at Lambeth; upon this the trained bands were ordered into St. George's Fields; nevertheless, the mob rose and broke his windows, for which one of them being apprehended suffered death as a traitor, though he could not be guilty of more than a breach of the peace. From Lambeth the mob went to the house of the pope's agent, where they were dispersed by the king's guards, and some of them sent to the Whitelion prison; but the following week [May 15], they rose again and rescued their friends. The country was in the same mutinous posture, there being frequent skirmishes between them and the new-raised soldiers, even to bloodshed. The city train-bands were in arms all the summer, but the campaign proving unsuccessful, there was no keeping the people within bounds afterward; for while the high-commission was sitting at St. Paul's, October 22, near two thousand

Brownists, as the archbishop calls them, raised a disturbance, and broke up the court, crying out, "No bishops, no high commission." Such were the distempers of the times.

The convocation that sat with this parliament was opened April 14, with more splendour and magnificence than the situation of affairs required. The sermon was preached by Dr. Turner, canon residentiary of St. Paul's, from St. Matt. xvi. 16, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep among wolves." After which they adjourned to the chapter-house, where the king's writ of summons being read, the archbishop, in a Latin speech, recommended to the lower house the choosing a prolocutor, to be presented to himself or his commissary in the of chapel Henry VII. on Friday following, to which time and place the convocation was adjourned.

On the 17th of April after divine service, Dr. Steward, dean of Chichester and clerk of the closet, was presented to the archbishop as prolocutor in the chapel of Henry VII., whom his grace approved, and then produced his majesty's commission under the great seal, authorizing them "to make and ordain certain canons and constitutions, for the establishing true religion, and the profit of the state of the church of England."<sup>1</sup> The commission was to remain in force during the present session of parliament, and no longer; and by a remarkable clause, "nothing was to be concluded without the archbishop's being a party in the consultation." It was intended also to draw up an English pontifical, which was to contain.—The form and manner of royal coronations.—A form for consecrating churches, churchyards, and chapels.—A form for reconciling penitents and apostates.—A book of articles to be used by all bishops at their visitation.—And a short form of prayer for before sermon, comprehending the substance of the fifty-fifth canon. But most of these projects were interrupted by the sudden dissolution of the parliament.

The convocation, according to ancient custom, should have broken up at the same time, but one of the lower house having acquainted the archbishop with a precedent in the 27th year of queen Elizabeth, of the clergy's granting a subsidy or benevolence, of two shillings in the pound, to be raised upon all the clergy, after the parliament was risen, and levying it by their own synodical act only, under the penalty of ecclesiastical censures, it was concluded from thence that the convocation might sit independent of the parliament, and therefore, instead of dissolving, they only adjourned for a few days to take further advice.<sup>2</sup>

The zealous archbishop, relying upon this single precedent, applied to the king for a commission to continue the convocation during his majesty's

---

<sup>1</sup> Collyer's Eccles. Hist. p. 793. Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 423.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller's Appeal, p. 67. 69.



pleasure, in order to finish the canons and constitutions, and to grant the subsidies already voted. The case being referred to the judges, the majority gave it as their opinion, “that the convocation being called by the king’s writ under the great seal, doth continue till it be dissolved by writ or commission under the great seal, notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved.”

Signed May 14, 1640, by John Finch, Custos, M. S.

H. Manchester, Ralph Whitfield, Edw. Littleton, John Bramston, Rob. Heath, John Banks.

Upon this a commission under the great seal was granted, and the convocation reassembled; however, notwithstanding the opinion of these gentlemen of the long robe, Dr. Hacket, Brownriggc, Holdisworth, and others, to the number of thirty-six, protested earnestly against it, though, because the session was warranted by so many considerable persons, they did not withdraw, nor enter their protest in form of law, as they ought to have done.<sup>1</sup> They were farther so influenced by his majesty’s message sent by sir H. Vane, secretary of state, to acquaint them, “that it was his royal pleasure, that none of the prelates or clergy should withdraw from the synod or convocation, till the affairs they had in command from the king were perfected and finished.”

Upon this dubious foundation the convocation was continued, and a committee of twenty-six appointed to prepare matters for the debate of the house; but the mob being so inflamed as to threaten to pull down the convocation-house, the king appointed them a guard of the militia of Middlesex, commanded by Endymion Porter, groom of the bedchamber, a Papist, under whose protection the synod was continued till the canons were perfected, and six subsidies granted by way of supply for the exigence of his majesty’s affairs, to be collected in six years, after the rate of four shillings in the pound, amounting to about £120,000, after which it was dissolved [May 29], by a special mandate or writ from his majesty, after it had continued twenty-five sessions. The canons, having been approved by the privy-council, were subscribed by as many of both houses of convocation as were present, and then transmitted to the provincial synod of York, by whom they were subscribed at once, without so much as debating either matter or form. Dr. John Williams, bishop of Lincoln, was in the Tower, and had no concern with the canons. Dr. Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, a concealed Papist, was the only prelate who declined the subscription; till the archbishop threatened him with deprivation, and the rest of his brethren pressing him to comply, he was persuaded to put his name to the book; but several of the members of the lower house avoided

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuller’s Church History, b. 9. p. 168.

the test, by withdrawing before the day of subscription; for out of above one hundred and sixty, of which both houses of convocation consisted, there were not many more than one hundred names to the book.

The unreasonableness of continuing the synod after the dissolution of parliament appears from hence, that the convocation consisting of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and clerks, the three former act in their personal capacities only, and may give for themselves what subsidies they please; but the clerks being chosen for their respective cathedrals and diocesses, legally to sit as long as the parliament continues, desist from being public persons as soon as it is dissolved, and lose the character of representatives; they are then no more than private clergymen, who, though they may give the king what sums of money they please for themselves, cannot vote away the estates of their brethren, unless they are reelected. Besides, it was contrary to all law and custom, both before and since the act of submission of the clergy to king Henry VIII. except in the single instance of queen Elizabeth.

The canons of this synod, consisting of seventeen articles, were published June 30, and entitled, “Constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, presidents of the convocation for their respective provinces, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of those provinces, and agreed upon with the king’s majesty’s licence, in their several synods begun at London and York 1640.”<sup>1</sup>

CANON 1.— *Concerning the Regal Power.*

“We ordain and decree, that every parson, vicar, curate, or preacher, upon one Sunday in every quarter of the year, in the place where he serves, shall read the following explanation of the regal power.

“That the most high and sacred order of kings is of divine right, being the ordinance of God himself, founded in the prime laws of nature and revelation, by which the supreme power over all persons civil and ecclesiastical is given to them.

“That they have the care of God’s church, and the power of calling and dissolving councils, both national and provincial.

“That for any persons to set up in the king’s realms any independent coercive power, either Papal or popular, is treasonable against God and the king. And for subjects to bear arms against their king, either offensive or defensive, upon any pretence whatsoever, is at least to resist the powers ordained of God; and though they do not invade, but only resist, St. Paul says, they shall receive damnation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collection, p. 545.

“And though tribute and custom, aid and subsidy, be due to the king by the law of God, nature, and nations, yet subjects have a right and property in their goods and estates; and these two are so far from crossing one another, that they mutually go together for the honourable and comfortable support of both.

“If any clergyman shall voluntarily and carelessly neglect to publish these explications, he shall be suspended; or if in any sermon, or public lecture, he shall maintain any position contrary hereunto, he shall be forthwith excommunicated and suspended for two years; and if he offend a second time he shall be deprived.”

CANON 2.—*For the better observing the Day of his Majesty's Inauguration.*

“The synod decrees and ordains, that all persons shall come to church the morning of the said day, and continue there till prayers and preaching are ended, upon pain of such punishment as the law inflicts on those who wilfully absent themselves from church on holy days.”

CANON 3.—*For suppressing the Growth of Popery.*

“All ecclesiastical persons within their several parishes or jurisdictions, shall confer privately with Popish recusants, but if private conference prevail not, the church must and shall come to her censures; and to make way for them, such persons shall be presented at the next visitation, who come not to church, and refuse to receive the holy eucharist; or who either say or hear mass; and if they remain obstinate after citation, they shall be excommunicated.

“But if neither conference nor censures prevail, the church shall then complain of them to the civil power; and this sacred synod does earnestly entreat the reverend justices of assize, to be careful in executing the laws, as they will answer it to God. And every bishop shall once a year send into the court of chancery, a *significavit* of the names of those who have stood excommunicated beyond the time limited by law, and shall desire, that a writ *de excommunicato capiendo* may be at once sent out against them all.

“Care is likewise to be taken, that, no person be admitted to teach school, but who has subscribed to the church as the law directs; and that no excommunicate person be absolved by any appeal, unless he first take the oath *de parendo juri et stando mandatis ecclesie*.”

CANON 4.—*Against Socinianism.*

“It is decreed, that no persons shall import, print, or disperse, any of their books, on pain of excommunication, and of being farther punished in

the star-chamber. No minister shall preach any such doctrines in his sermons, nor student have any such books in his study, except he be a graduate in divinity;<sup>1</sup> and if any layman embrace their opinions he shall be excommunicated, and not absolved without repentance and abjuration.”

[N. B. None of the doctrines of Socinus, nor any of his peculiar sentiments, are mentioned in this canon.]

CANON 5.—*Against Sectaries.*

“The synod decrees, that the canon above mentioned against Papists shall be in full force against all Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, and other sectaries, as far as they are applicable; and farther, the clause against the books of Socinians above mentioned, shall be in force against all books written against the discipline and government of the church of England.

“It is also ordained, that such persons who resort to their parish-churches to hear the sermon, but do not join in the public prayers, shall be subject to the same penalties with other sectaries and recusants.”

CANON 6.—*An oath for preventing Innovations in Doctrine and Government.*

“The synod decrees, that all archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, shall, before the 2nd of November next, take the following oath, which shall be tendered by the bishop in person, or some grave divine deputed by him, and shall be taken in presence of a public notary.”

THE OATH

“I, A. B., do swear, that I do approve the doctrine, discipline, or government, established in the church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any Popish<sup>2</sup> doctrine, contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c. as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand, nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the see of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Grey supplies here from Nalson—“or such as have episcopal or archidiaconal ordination, or any doctor of laws in order as is aforesaid.”—ED.

<sup>2</sup> In his majesty's duplicate of this canon, sent by the archbishop to the bishop of Ely, the word Popish is omitted, as it is in the duplicate sent to the vice-chancellor of Cambridge, and several others.

reservation, whatsoever; and this I do heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God in Jesus Christ.”

“If any beneficed person in the church shall refuse this oath, he shall after one month<sup>1</sup> be suspended *ab officio*; after a second month he shall be suspended *ab officio et beneficio*; and after a third month,<sup>2</sup> if he continue to refuse, he shall be deprived.

“It is likewise ordained, that all that are incorporated in either of the universities, or take any degree, whether lawyers, divines, or physicians, shall take the same oath<sup>3</sup>: and all governors of halls and colleges in the university; all schoolmasters, and in general, all that enter into holy orders, or have licence to preach.”

CANON 7.—*A Declaration concerning some Rites and Ceremonies.*

“The synod declares, that the standing of the communion-table sideways, under the east window of the chancel or chapel, is in its own nature indifferent; but forasmuch as queen Elizabeth’s injunctions order it to be placed where the altar was, we therefore judge it proper, that all churches and chapels do conform themselves to the cathedral or mother-churches. And we declare, that the situation of the holy table does not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon Christ is again sacrificed; but it may be called an altar in the sense of the primitive church; and because it has been observed that some people in time of divine service have irreverently leaned, cast their hats, or sat, upon or under the communion-table, therefore the synod thinks meet that the table be railed round.

“It is farther recommended to all good people, that they do reverence at their entering in and going out of the church; and that all communicants do approach the holy table to receive the communion at the rails,<sup>4</sup> which has heretofore been unfitly carried up and down by the minister, unless the bishop shall dispense with it.”

CANON 8.—*Of preaching for Conformity.*

“All public preachers shall twice a year preach positively and plainly, that the rites and ceremonies of the church of England are lawful, and that it is the duty of all people to conform to them.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Allowed “to inform himself.”

<sup>2</sup> “For his better information.”

<sup>3</sup> The sons of noblemen are expressly excepted.—Dr. Grey.

<sup>4</sup> “At the rails” is not in the original; but appears to be implied by the order to rail round the communion-table.—ED.

CANON 9.—*A book of Articles for Parochial Visitation.*

“No other book of articles of inquiry shall be used in parochial visitation, but that which is drawn up by the synod.”

CANON 10.—*Of the Conversation of the Clergy.*

“The clergy are enjoined to avoid all excesses and disorders, and by their Christian conversation to adorn their holy profession.”

CANON 11.—*Chancellors’ Patents.*

“No bishop shall grant any patent to any chancellor, or official, for any longer term than the life of the grantees, and the bishop shall keep in his own hands the power of instituting to benefices, and of licensing to preach.”

CANON 12.—*Chancellors’ Censures.*

“No Chancellor, commissary, or official, not being in holy orders, shall inflict any censure on the clergy in criminal causes, other than for neglect of appearing; but all such causes shall be heard by the bishop, or some dignified clergyman with the chancellor.”

CANON 13.—*Excommunication and Absolution.*

“No sentence of excommunication or absolution shall be pronounced but by a priest, and in open consistory, or at least in the church or chapel, having first received it under the seal of an ecclesiastical judge, from whom it comes.”

CANON 14.—*Of Commutations.*

“No commutation of penance to be admitted without consent of the bishop, and the money to be disposed of to charitable uses.”

CANON 15.—*Of Jurisdictions.*

“No executor shall be cited into any court or office, for the space of ten days after the death of the testator, though the executor may prove the will within such time.”

CANON 16.—*Of Licences to marry.*

“No licence to marry shall be granted to any party, unless one of the parties have been *commorant* in the jurisdiction of the ordinary to whom he applies, for the space of one month before the said licence be desired. The archiepiscopal prerogative is excepted.”

CANON 17.—*Against vexatious Citations.*

“No citation into any ecclesiastical court shall be issued out but under the hand and seal of one of the judges of those courts, and within thirty days after committing the crime; and unless the party be convicted by two witnesses, he shall be allowed to purge himself by oath, without paying any fee; provided that this canon extend not to any grievous crime, as schism, incontinence, misbehaviour in the church in the time of divine service, obstinate inconformity, or the like.”

When these canons were made public, they were generally disliked; several pamphlets were printed against them, and dispersed among the people; as, “England’s Complaint to Jesus Christ against the Bishops<sup>1</sup> Canons; wherein the nakedness of them is exposed in a solemn application to Jesus Christ as the Saviour of his church.” “Queries relating to the several Articles and Determinations of the late Synod,” &c. All who loved the old English constitution were dissatisfied with the first canon, because it declares for the absolute power of kings, and for the unlawfulness of defensive arms on any pretence whatsoever. The Puritans disapproved the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth canons; but the whole body of the clergy were nearly concerned in the sixth, being obliged by the 2d of November to take the oath therein mentioned, on pain of suspension and deprivation. The London clergy among whom were Dr. Westfield, Downham, Burges, Mr. Calamy, Jackson, John Goodwin, Offspring, and others, drew up a petition against it to the privy-council; and to give it the more weight procured a great many hands. The ministers, schoolmasters, and physicians, in Kent, Devonshire, Dorsetshire, Northamptonshire, and in most counties of England, took the same method; some objecting to the oath, as contrary to the oath of supremacy: some complaining of the *et cetera* in the middle. Others objected to the power of the synod to impose an oath, and many confessed, that they wished some things in the discipline of the church might be altered, and therefore could not swear never to attempt it in a proper way. Some of the bishops endeavoured to satisfy their clergy by giving the most favourable interpretation to the oath. Bishop Hall told them that it meant no more than this, “That I do so far approve of the discipline and doctrine of this church, as that I do believe there is nothing in any other pretended discipline or doctrine necessary to salvation, besides that which

is contained in the doctrine and discipline of the church of England. And as I do allow the government by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, so I will not, upon the suggestion of any factious persons, go about to alter the same as it now stands, and as by due right (being so established) it ought to stand in the church of England.”<sup>1</sup> But most of the bishops pressed the oath absolutely on their clergy; and to my certain knowledge, says Mr. Fuller,<sup>2</sup> obliged them to take it kneeling, a ceremony never required in taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; to such extravagance of power did these prelates aspire upon the wing of the prerogative!

The archbishop was advised of these difficulties by Dr. Sanderson, afterward bishop of Lincoln, who assured his grace by letter,<sup>3</sup> “that multitudes of churchmen, not only of the preciser sort, but of such as were regular and conformable, would utterly refuse to take the oath, or be brought to it with much difficulty and reluctance; so that unless by his majesty’s special direction, the pressing the oath may be forborne for a time; or that a short explanation of some passages in it most liable to exception, be sent to the several persons, who are to administer the same, to be publicly read before the tender of the said oath,—the peace of this church is apparently in danger to be more disquieted by this one occasion, than by anything that has happened within our memories.” However, this resolute prelate, as if he had been determined to ruin his own and his majesty’s affairs, would relax nothing to the times, but would have broken the king’s interest among the conformable clergy’s if the nobility and gentry with the king at York, had not prevailed with his majesty to lay him under a restraint by the following letter under the hand of the principal secretary of state:—

“May it please your grace,

“I am by his majesty’s command to let you know, that upon several petitions presented by divers churchmen, as well in the diocess of Canterbury as York, to which many hands are subscribed, as the mode of petitions now are, against the oath in the canons made in the last synod, his majesty’s pleasure is, that as he took order before his coming into these parts, that the execution of neither should be pressed on those that were already beneficed in the church, which was ordered at the council-board in your grace’s presence, but that it should be administered to those who were to receive orders and to be admitted; it is his majesty’s pleasure, that those should be dispensed with also, and that there be no prosecution thereof till the meeting of the convocation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson's Collection, p. 196 498.

<sup>2</sup> Book 11. p 171.

<sup>3</sup> Nalson, p. 497.



“York, September 30, 1640. H. VANE.”<sup>1</sup>

We have mentioned the secret correspondence between the English and Scots nobility to recover the liberties of both kingdoms, which encouraged the Scots to march a second time to their border, where the king met them with his army commanded by the earls of Northumberland and Strafford; but it soon appeared that the English nobility were not for conquering the Scots; nor had the Protestant soldiers any zeal in his majesty’s cause, so that after a small skirmish the Scots army passed the Tweed, August 21, and on the 30th took possession of the important town of Newcastle, the royal army retreating before them as far as York, and leaving them masters of the three northern counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Durham, where they subsisted their army, and raised what contributions they pleased. As soon as the Scots entered Newcastle, they sent an express to the lord-mayor and aldermen of London, to assure them they would not interrupt the trade between that town and the city of London, but would cultivate all manner of friendship and brotherly correspondence. They also sent messengers to the king, with a humble petition, that his majesty would please “to confirm their late acts of parliament, restore their ships and merchandise, recall his proclamation which styles them rebels, and call an English parliament to settle the peace between both kingdoms.” This was followed by another signed by twelve peers with his majesty at York, and by a third from the city of London. The king, finding it impossible to carry on the war, appointed commissioners to treat with the Scots at Rippon, who agreed to a cessation of arms for two months, from the 26th of October, the Scots to have £850. a day for maintenance of their army; and the treaty to be adjourned to London, where a free parliament was immediately to be convened. The calling an English parliament was the grand affair that had been concerted with the Scots before their coming into England; and it was high time; because to all appearance this was the last crisis for saving the constitution. If the Irish and English armies were raised to reduce Scotland, under the arbitrary power of the prerogative (as lord Clarendon confesses,) what could be expected, but that afterward they should march back into England, and establish the same despotic power here, with a standing army, beyond all recovery ?

Sad and melancholy was the condition of the prime-ministers, when they saw themselves reduced to the necessity of submitting their conduct to the examination of an English parliament, supported by an army from Scotland, and the general discontents of the people! Several of the courtiers began to shift for themselves; some withdrew from the storm, and others, having been concerned in various illegal projects, deserted their masters,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 500.

and made their peace by discovering the king's counsels to the leading members of Parliament, which disabled the junto from making any considerable efforts for their safety. All men had a veneration for the person of the king, though his majesty had lost ground in their affections by his ill-usage of parliaments, and by taking the faults of his ministers upon himself. But the queen was in no manner of esteem with any who had the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country at heart. The bishops had sunk their character by their behaviour in the spiritual courts, so that they had nothing to expect but that their wings should be clipped. And the judges were despised and hated, for betraying the laws of their country and giving a sanction to the illegal proceedings of the council and star-chamber. As his majesty had few friends of credit or interest among the people at home, so he had nothing to expect from abroad; France and Spain were pleased with his distress; the foreign Protestants wished well to the oppressed people of England; they published their resentments against the bishops, for their hard usage of the Dutch and French congregations, and gave it as their opinion, that a Protestant king who countenanced Papists, and at the same time drove his Protestant subjects out of the kingdom, was not worthy the assistance of the reformed churches, especially after he had renounced communion with them and declared openly, that the religion of the church of England was not the same with that of the foreign Protestants.

Three considerable divines of a very different character died about this time; Mr. John Ball, educated in Brazen-nose college, Oxon, and afterward minister of Whitmore, a small village near Newcastle in Staffordshire, where he lived upon £20. a year, and the profits of a little school. He was a learned and pious man, deserving as high esteem, says Mr. Baxter, as the best bishop in England, though he was content with a poor house, a mean habit, and a small maintenance. Being dissatisfied with the terms of conformity, it was some time before he could meet with an opportunity to be ordained without subscription, but at last he obtained it from the hands of an Irish bishop, then occasionally in London; though he lived and died a Nonconformist, he was an enemy to a separation, and wrote against Mr. Can and Mr. Robinson upon that head. His last work, entitled, "A Stay against Straying," was subscribed by five most noted Presbyterian divines, who all testified that he died abundantly satisfied in the cause of Nonconformity, which he distinguished from separation. His other works were very numerous, and of great reputation in those times. He died October 20, 1640, in the fifty-sixth year of his age.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Lawrence Chadderton, born in Lancashire 1546, of Popish parents, who, when they heard their son had changed his religion, disinherited him;

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarke's Lives annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 147.

he was first fellow of Christ's college, and afterward minister of Emanuel-college, Cambridge. King James nominated him one of the four representatives of the Puritans in the Hampton-court conference: and afterward one of the translators of the Bible.<sup>1</sup> He commenced D.D. 1612, and governed his college with great reputation many years, being remarkable for gravity, learning, and piety; he had a plain but effectual way of preaching, says Fuller,<sup>2</sup> having a strict regard for the sabbath, and a great aversion to Arminianism. He was a fine grey-headed old gentleman, and could read without spectacles to his death, which happened in the hundred and third year of his age. Being advanced in years, and afraid of being succeeded by an Arminian divine, he resigned his mastership to Dr. Preston, whom he survived; and saw Dr. Sancroft, and after him Dr. Holdisworth succeed him, which last attended his funeral at St. Andrew's church, and gave him a large and deserved commendation in a funeral sermon.

Dr. Richard Neile, archbishop of York, born in King-street, Westminster, of mean parents, his father being a tallow-chandler. He was educated in St. John's college, Cambridge, and passed through all the degrees and orders of preferment in the church of England, having been a schoolmaster, curate, vicar, parson, chaplain, master of the Savoy, dean of Westminster, clerk of the closet to two kings, bishop of Rochester, Litchfield, Lincoln, Durham, Winchester; and lastly, archbishop of York. The Oxford historian says, he was an affectionate subject to his prince, an indulgent father to his clergy, a bountiful patron to his chaplains, and a true friend to all that relied upon him. Dr. Heylin confesses, that he was not very eminent either for parts or learning; Mr. Prynne says, he was a Popish Arminian prelate, and a persecutor of all orthodox and godly ministers. It is certain he had few or none of the qualifications of a primitive bishop; he hardly preached a sermon in twelve years, and gained his preferments by flattery and servile court-compliances. He was a zealous advocate for pompous innovations in the church, and oppressive projects in the state, for which he would have felt the resentments of the house of commons, had he lived a little longer; but he died very seasonably for himself in an advanced age, October 31, 1640, three days before the meeting of the long parliament.

[To the divines to whose memory Mr. Neal pays the just tribute of respect in this chapter, may be added the great Mr. Joseph Mede. He was descended from a good family, and born in October 1586, at Berden in

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 116.

<sup>2</sup> Book 2. p. 118.

Essex. He received his grammar learning first at Hoddesdon, in Hertfordshire, and finished it at Weathersfield in Essex. While he was at this last school, he bought Bellarmine's Hebrew grammar, and without the assistance of a master, attained considerable skill in the Hebrew tongue. In 1602 he was sent to Christ's college in Cambridge. In 1612 he took the degree of master of arts; and 1618, that of bachelor in divinity; but his modesty and humility restrained him from taking the degree of doctor. After taking the first degree, by the influence of bishop Andrews he was chosen fellow of his college: having been passed over at several elections, as one suspected of favouring Puritanical principles. In 1627, at the recommendation of archbishop Usher, he was elected provost of Trinity-college, Dublin, but declined accepting this preferment; as he did also when it was offered him a second time in 1630. On the small income of his fellowship and a college-lecture he was extremely generous and charitable; and constantly appropriated a tenth of it to charitable uses. Temperance, frugality, and a care to avoid unnecessary expenses, enabled him to do this. His thoughts were much employed on the generous design of effecting a universal pacification amongst Protestants. It was a favourite saying with him, "that he never found himself prone to change his hearty affections to any one, for mere difference in opinion." He was a friend to free inquiry: "I cannot believe (said he) that truth can be prejudiced by the discovery of truth; but I fear that the maintenance thereof by fallacy or falsehood may not end with a blessing." He was an eminent and faithful tutor. It was his custom to require the attendance of his pupils in the evening, to examine them on the studies of the day; the first question he then proposed to every one in his order was, "Quid dubitas?" What doubts have you met with in your studies today? For he supposed that to doubt nothing, and to understand nothing, was nearly the same thing. Before he dismissed them to their lodgings, after having solved their questions, he commended them and their studies to God's protection and blessing by prayer. He was anxious and laborious in his study of history and antiquities, and diligently applied every branch of knowledge to increase his skill in the sacred writings. He led the way in showing that Papal Rome was one principal object of the Apocalyptic visions; and was the first who suggested the sentiments since espoused and defended by the pens of Lardner, Sykes, and Farmer, that the demoniacs in the New Testament were not real possessions, but persons afflicted with a lunacy and epilepsy. His days were spent in studious retirement. He died on the 1st of October 1638, in the fifty-second year his age. In 1677, a complete edition of his works was published in folio by Dr. Worthington. *British Biography*, vol. 4. p. 446–452, and his life prefixed to his works.—ED.]

END OF VOL. I.