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CHAP. III.

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY.

It will appear in the course of this reign, that an absolute supremacy over the consciences of men, lodged with a single person, may as well be prejudicial as serviceable to true religion: for if king Henry VIII. and his son king Edward VI. reformed some abuses by their supremacy, against the inclinations of the majority of the people, we shall find queen Mary making use of the same power to turn things back into their old channel, till she had restored the grossest and most idolatrous part of Popery. This was begun by proclamations and orders of council, till her majesty could procure a parliament that would repeal king Edward’s laws for religion, which she quickly found means to accomplish. It is strange indeed, that when there were but seven or eight peers that opposed the laws made in favour of the Reformation under king Edward, the same house of lords should almost all turn Papists in the reign of queen Mary; but as to the commons; it is less wonderful, because they are changeable, and the court took care to new- model the magistrates in the cities and corporations before the elections came on, so that not one almost was left that was not a Roman Catholic. Bribery and menaces were made use of in all places; and where they could not carry elec­tions by reason of the superiority of the reformed, the sheriffs made double returns.[[1]](#footnote-1) It is sad when the religion of a nation is under such a direction! But so it will be when the management of religion falls into the hands of a bigoted prince and ministry.

Queen Mary was a sad example of the truth of this ob­servation, whose reign was no better than one continued scene of calamity. It is the genuine picture of Popery, and should be remembered by all true Protestants with abhor­rence; the principles of that religion being such as no man can receive, till he has abjured his senses, renounced his understanding and reason, and put off all the tender com­passions of human nature.

King Edward VI. being far gone in a consumption, from a concern for preserving the Reformation, was persuaded to set aside the succession of his sisters Mary and Elizabeth, and of the queen of Scots, the first and last being Papists, and Elizabeth’s blood being tainted by act of parliament; and to settle the crown by will upon lady Jane Grey, eldest daughter of the duke of Suffolk, a lady of extraordinary qualities, zealous for the Reformation, and next in blood after the princesses above mentioned. One may guess the sad apprehensions the council were under for the Protestant religion, when they put the king, who was a minor, and not capable of making a will; upon this expedient, and set their hands to the validity of it. The king being dead, queen Jane was proclaimed with the usual solemnities, and an army raised to support her title; but the princess Mary, then at Norfolk, being informed of her brother’s death, sent a letter to the council, in which she claims the crown, and charges them, upon their allegiance, to proclaim her in the city of London and elsewhere. The council in return in­sisted upon her laying aside her claim, and submitting as a good subject to her new sovereign. But Mary, by the en­couragement of her friends in the north, resolved to main­tain her right; and to make her way more easy, she promised the Suffolk men to make no alteration in religion. This gained her an army, with which she marched towards London; but before she came thither, both the council and citizens of London declared for her: and on the 3d of August she made her public entry without the loss of a drop of blood, four weeks after the death of her brother.

Upon queen Mary’s entrance into the Tower she released Bonner, Gardiner, and others, whom she called her prisoners. August 12, her majesty declared in council, “that though her conscience was settled in matters of religion, yet she was resolved not to compel others, but by the preaching of the word. This was different from her promise to the Suffolk men: she assured them that religion should be left upon the same foot she found it at the death of king Edward, but now she insinuates, that the old religion is to be restored, but without compulsion. Next day there was a tumult at St. Paul’s, occasioned by Dr. Bourne, one of the canons of that church, preaching against the late reforma­tion: he spoke in commendation of Bonner, and was going on with severe reflections upon the late king Edward, when the whole audience was in an uproar; some called to pull down the preacher, others throwing stones, and one a dag­ger, which stuck in the timber of the pulpit. Mr. Rogers and Bradford, two popular preachers for the Reformation, hazarded their lives to save the doctor, and conveyed him in safety to a neighbouring house; for which act of charity they were soon after imprisoned, and then burnt for heresy.

To prevent the like tumults for the future the queen published an inhibition, August 18th, forbidding all preach­ing without special licence; declaring farther, that she would not compel her subjects to be of her religion, till public order should be taken in it by common assent. Here was another intimation of an approaching storm: “the subjects were not to be compelled till public order should be taken for it.” And to prevent farther tumults a procla­mation was published, for masters of families to oblige their apprentices and servants to frequent their own parish churches on Sundays and holidays, and to keep them at home at other times.

The shutting up all the Protestant pulpits at once awakened the Suffolk men, who, presuming upon their merits and the queen’s promise, sent a deputation to court to represent their grievances; but the queen checked them for their insolence: and one of their number, happening to mention her promise, was put in the pillory three days together, and had his ears cut off for defamation. On the 22d of August, Bonner of London, Gardiner of Winchester, Tonstal of Durham, Heath of Worcester, and Day of Chichester, were restored to their bishoprics. Some of the reformers, continuing to preach after the inhibition, were sent for into custody, among whom were Hooper bishop of Gloucester, Coverdale of Exeter, Dr. Taylor of Hadley, Rogers the protomartyr, and several others. Hooper was committed to the Fleet, September 1, no regard being had to his active zeal in asserting the queen’s right in his ser­mon against the title of lady Jane; but so sincerely did this good man follow the light of his conscience, when, he could not but see what sad consequences it was like to have. Coverdale of Exeter, being a foreigner, was ordered to keep his house till farther order. Burnet[[2]](#footnote-2) says he was a Dane, and had afterward leave to retire. But according to Fuller[[3]](#footnote-3) he was born in Yorkshire. Archbishop Cranmer was so silent at Lambeth, that it was thought he would have returned to the old religion; but he was preparing a pro­testation against it, which taking air, he was examined, and confessing the fact, he was sent to the Tower, with bishop Latimer, about the 13th of September. The be­ginning of next month Holgate archbishop of York was committed to the Tower, and Horn dean of Durham, was summoned before the council, but he fled beyond sea.

The storm gathering so thick upon the reformers, above eight hundred of them retired into foreign parts; among whom were five bishops, viz. Poynet of Winchester, who died in exile; Barlow of Bath and Wells, who was super­intendant of the congregation at Embden; Scory of Chiches­ter; Coverdale of Exon; and Bale of Ossory; five deans, viz. Dr. Cox, Haddon, Horn, Turner, and Sampson; four archdeacons, and above fifty doctors of divinity and eminent preachers, among whom were Grindal, Jewel, Sandys, Reynolds, Pilkington, Whitehead, Lever, Nowel, Knox, Rough, Wittingham, Fox, Parkhurst, and others, famous in the reign of queen Elizabeth: besides of noblemen, mer­chants, tradesmen, artificers, and plebeians, many hundreds. Some fled in disguise, or went over as the servants of foreign Protestants, who having come hither for shelter in king Edward’s time, were now required to leave the kingdom;[[4]](#footnote-4) among these were Peter Martyr and John a Lasco, with his congregation of Germans. But to prevent too many of the English embarking with them, an order of council was sent to all the ports, that none should be suffered to leave the kingdom without proper passports. The Roman Catho­lic party, out of their abundant zeal for their religion, outrun the laws, and celebrated mass in divers churches before it was restored by authority;[[5]](#footnote-5) while the people that favoured the Reformation continued their public de­votion with great seriousness and fervency, as foreseeing what was coming upon them; but the rude multitude came into the churches, insulted their ministers, and ridiculed their worship. The court not only winked at these things, but fined judge Hales (who alone refused to sign the act which transferred the crown to Jane Grey) a thousand pounds sterling, because in his circuit he ordered the justices of Kent to conform themselves to the laws of king Edward, not yet repealed; upon which that gentleman grew melan­choly and drowned himself.

The queen was crowned October 1, 1553, by Gardiner, at­tended by ten other bishops, all in their mitres, copes, and crosiers; and a parliament was summoned to meet the 10th. What methods were used in the elections have been related. On the 31st of October a bill was sent down to the commons for repealing king Edward’s laws about religion, which was argued six days, and at length carried. It repeals in gene­ral all the late statutes relating to religion, and enacts, “that after the 20th of December next, there should be no other form of divine service but what had been used in the last year of king Henry VIII.” Severe punishments were decreed against such as should interrupt the public service; as should abuse the holy sacrament, or break down altars, crucifixes, or crosses. It was made felony for any number of persons above twelve, to assemble together with an inten­tion to alter the religion established by law. November 3d, archbishop Cranmer, the lord Guilford, lady Jane, and two other sons of the duke of Northumberland, were brought to their trials for high treason, in levying war against the queen, and conspiring to set up another in her room.—They all con­fessed their indictments, but Cranmer appealed to his judges, how unwillingly he had set his hand to the exclusion of the queen: these judgments were confirmed by parliament; after which the queen’s intended marriage with Philip of Spain being discovered, the commons sent their speaker, and twenty of their members, humbly to entreat her majesty not to marry a stranger; with which she was so displeased, that upon the 6th of December she dissolved the parliament.

The convocation that sat with the parliament was equally devoted to the court. Care had been taken about their elec­tions. In the collection of public acts there are found about a hundred and fifty presentations to livings before the choice of representatives; so that the lower house of convocation was of a piece with the upper, from whence almost all the Protestant bishops were excluded by imprisonment, depriva­tion or otherwise. Bonner presided as the first bishop of the province of Canterbury. Harpsfield his chaplain preached the sermon on Acts xx. 28, Feed the flock; and Weston dean of Westminster was chosen prolocutor. On the 20th of October it was proposed to the members to subscribe to the doctrine of transubstantiation; which all complied with but the following six divines, who by their places had a right to sit in convocation; Philpot archdeacon of Winchester; Philips dean of Rochester; Haddon dean of Exeter; Cheyney archdeacon of Hereford; Aylmer archdeacon of Stow; and Young chanter of St. David’s: these disputed upon the argument for three days, but the disputation was ma­naged according to the fashion of the times, with reproaches and menaces on the stronger side; and the prolocutor end­ed it with saying, “You have the word, but we have the sword.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

This year [1554] began with Wyat’s rebellion, occasioned by a general dislike of the queen’s marriage with Philip of Spain: it was a raw unadvised attempt, and occasioned great mischiefs to the Protestants, though religion had no share in the conspiracy, Wyat himself being a Papist: this gentle­man got together four thousand men, with whom he marched directly to London; but coming into Southwark, February 2, he found the bridge so well fortified that he could not force it without cannon; so he marched about, and having crossed the Thames at Kingston, he came by Charing-cross to Ludgate next morning, in hopes the citizens would have opened their gates; but being disappointed, he yielded himself a prisoner at Temple-bar, and was afterward executed; as were the lady Jane Grey, lord Guilford her husband, and others; the lady Elizabeth herself hardly escaping. Wyat upon his trial accused her, in hopes of saving his life; upon which she was ordered into custody: but when Wyat saw he must die, he acquitted her on the scaffold; and upon the queen’s marriage this summer she obtained her pardon.

As soon as the nation was a little settled, her majesty, by virtue of the supremacy, gave instructions to her bishops to visit the clergy. The injunctions were drawn up by Gardi­ner, and contain an angry recital of all the innovations in­troduced into the church in the reign of king Edward; and a charge to the bishops, “to execute all the ecclesiasti­cal laws that had been in force in king Henry VIII.’s reign; but not to proceed in their courts in the queen’s name. She enjoins them not to enact the oath of suprema­cy any more, but to punish heretics and heresies, and to re­move all married clergymen from their wives; but for those that would renounce their wives they might put them into some other cures. All the ceremonies, holidays, and fasts, used in king Henry’s time were to be revived. Those cler­gymen who had been ordained by the late service-book were to be reordained, or have the defects of their ordination supplied; that is, the anointing, the giving the priestly vest­ments, with other rites of the Roman pontifical. And lastly, it was declared, that all people should be compelled to come to church.”[[7]](#footnote-7)—The archbishop of York, the bishops of St. David’s, Chester, and Bristol, were deprived for being mar­ried; and the bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Hereford, were deprived by the royal pleasure, as holding their bishoprics by such a patent. It was very arbitrary to turn out the married bishops, while there was a law subsisting to le­gitimate their marriages; and to deprive the other bishops without any manner of process, merely for the royal plea­sure. This was acting up to the height of the supremacy, which though the queen believed to be an unlawful power, yet she claimed and used it for the service of the Romish church. The vacant bishoprics were filled up the latter end of March, with men after the queen’s heart, to the num­ber of sixteen, in the room of so many deprived or dead.

The new bishops in their visitation, and particularly bishop Bonner, executed the queen’s injunctions with ri­gour. The mass was set up in all places, and the old Po­pish rites and ceremonies revived. The carvers and makers of statues had a quick trade for roods, and other images, that were to be set up again in churches. The most eminent preachers in London were under confinement; and all the married clergy throughout the kingdom were deprived. Dr. Parker reckons, that of sixteen thousand clergymen twelve thousand were turned out; which is not probable, for if we compute by the diocese of Norwich, which is almost an eighth part of England, and in which there were but three hundred and thirty-five deprived, the whole number will fall short of three thousand.[[8]](#footnote-8) Some were turned out without conviction, upon common fame: some were never cited, and yet turned out for not appearing. Those that quitted their wives, and did penance, were nevertheless deprived; which was grounded on the vow that (as was pretended) they had made. Such was the deplorable condition of the reformed this summer, and such the cruelty of their adversaries.

The queen’s second parliament met April 2d. The court had taken care of the elections by large promises of money from Spain. Their design was to persuade the parliament to approve of the Spanish match;[[9]](#footnote-9) which they accomplished, with this proviso, that the queen alone should have the go­vernment of the kingdom; after which the houses were presently dissolved. King Philip arrived in England[[10]](#footnote-10) July 20th, and was married to the queen on the 27th, at Winchester, he being then in the twenty-seventh year of his age, and the queen in her thirty-eighth. He brought with him a vast mass of wealth; twenty-seven chests of bullion, every chest being above a yard long; and ninety-nine horse-loads and two cart-loads of coined silver and gold.

The reformers complaining of their usage in the late dis­pute held in convocation, the court resolved to give them a fresh mortification, by appointing another at Oxford in pre­sence of the whole university; and because archbishop Cranmer, bishops Ridley and Latimer, were the most cele­brated divines of the Reformation, they were by warrant from the queen removed from the Tower to Oxford, to manage the dispute. The convocation sent their prolocu­tor and several of their members, who arriving on the 13th of April, being Friday, sent for the bishops on Saturday, and appointed them Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, every one his day, to defend their doctrine. The questions were, upon transubstantiation, and the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass. The particulars of the dispute are in Mr. Fox’s Book of Martyrs. The bishops behaved with great modesty and presence of mind; but their adversaries insulted and triumphed in the most barbarous manner. Bishop Ridley writes, “that there were perpetual shoutings, tauntings, reproaches, noise, and confusion.” Cranmer and old Lati­mer were hissed and laughed at;[[11]](#footnote-11) and Ridley was borne down with noise and clamour; “In all my life (says he) I never saw any thing carried more vainly and tumultuously; I could not have thought that there could have been found any Englishman honoured with degrees in learning, that could allow of such thrasonical ostentations, more fit for the stage than the schools.” On the 28th of April they were summoned again to St. Mary’s, and required by Wes­ton the prolocutor to subscribe, as having been vanquished in disputation; but they all refusing, were declared obsti­nate heretics, and no longer members of the Catholic church.

It was designed to expose the reformers by another dispu­tation at Cambridge; but the prisoners in London hearing of it published a paper, declaring “that they would not dispute but in writing, except it were before the queen and council, or before either house of parliament, because of the misreports and unfair usage they had every where met with.” At the same time they printed a summary of their faith, for which they were ready to offer up their lives to the halter or the fire, as God should appoint.[[12]](#footnote-12)

And here they declared, “that they believed the Scrip­tures to be the true word of God, and the judge of all con­troversies in matters of religion; and that the church is to be obeyed as long as she followed this word.

“That they adhered to the Apostles’ creed; and those creeds set out by the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; and by the first and fourth coun­cils of Toledo; and the symbols of Athanasius, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Damasus.

“They believed justification by faith alone; which faith was not only an opinion, but a certain persuasion wrought by the Holy Ghost, which did illuminate the mind, and supple the heart to submit itself unfeignedly to God.

“They acknowledged the necessity of an inherent righ­teousness; but that justification and pardon of sins came only by Christ’s righteousness imputed to them.

“They affirmed, that the worship of God ought to be performed in a tongue understood by the people.

“That Christ only, and not the saints, were to be prayed to.

“That immediately after death departed souls pass either into the state of the blessed, or of the damned, without any purgatory between.

“That baptism and the Lord’s supper are the sacra­ments of Christ, which ought to be administered according to his institutions; and therefore they condemned the deny­ing the cup to the people, transubstantiation, the adoration or sacrifice of the mass: and asserted the lawfulness of mar­riage to all ranks and orders of men.”

These truths they declare themselves ready to defend, as before; and in conclusion they charged all people to enter into no rebellion against the queen, but to obey her in all points, except where her commands are contrary to the law of God. This put an end to all farther triumphs of the Popish party for the present, and was a noble testimony to the chief and distinguishing doctrines of the Protestant faith.—But since the reformers were not to be run down by noise and clamour, therefore their steadfastness must undergo the fiery trial.

The queen’s third parliament met November II, 1554. In the writs of summons the title of Supreme Head of the Church was omitted, though it was still by law vested in the crown. The money brought from Spain had procured a house of commons devoted to the court. The first bill passed in the house was the repeal of cardinal Pole’s attainder. It had the royal assent November 22d, and the cardinal himself arrived in England two days after in quality of the pope’s legate, with a commission to receive the kingdom of England into the bosom of the Catholic church under the pope as their supreme pastor. On the 27th he made a speech in parlia­ment, inviting them to a reconciliation with the apostolic see. Two days after a committee of lords and commons was appointed to draw up a supplication to the king and queen, to intercede with the legate for a reconciliation; with a promise to repeal all acts made against the pope’s authority. This being presented by both houses on their knees to the king and queen, they made intercession with the cardinal, who thereupon made a long speech in the house, at the close of which he enjoined them for penance to repeal the laws above mentioned, and so in the pope’s name he granted them a full absolution, which they re­ceived on their knees; and then absolved the realm from all censures.

The act of repeal was not ready till the beginning of Ja­nuary, when it passed both houses, and received the royal assent. It enumerates and reverses all acts since the 20th of Henry VIII. against the holy see; but then it contains the following restrictions, which they pray, through the cardinal’s intercession, may be established by the pope’s authority:

1. “That all bishoprics, cathedrals, or colleges, now established, may be confirmed for ever. 2. That marriages within such degrees as are not contrary to the law of God, may be confirmed, and their issue legitimated. 3. That institutions into benefices may be confirmed. 4. That all judicial processes may be confirmed. 5. That all the set­tlements of the lands of any bishoprics, monasteries, or other religious houses, may continue as they were, without any trouble from the ecclesiastical courts.”

The cardinal admitted of these requests, but ended with a heavy denunciation of the judgments of God upon those who had the goods of the church in their hands, and did not restore them. And to make the clergy more easy, the sta­tutes of Mortmain were repealed for twenty years to come. But after all the pope refused to confirm the restrictions, alleging, that the legate had exceeded his powers; so that the possessors of church lands had but a precarious title to their estates under this reign; for even before the reconci­liation was fully concluded, the pope published a bull, by which he excommunicates all those persons who were in possession of the goods of the church or monasteries, and did not restore them.[[13]](#footnote-13) This alarmed the superstitious queen, who, apprehending herself near her time of child­birth, sent for her ministers of state, and surrendered up all the lands of the church that remained in the crown, to be disposed of as the pope or his legate should think fit.

But when a proposal of this kind was made to the commons in parliament, some of them boldly laid their hands upon their swords, and said, ‘they well knew how to defend their own properties.’ But the queen went on with acts of devotion to the church; she repaired several old monas­teries, and erected new ones; she ordered a strict inquiry to be made after those who had pillaged the churches and monasteries, and had been employed in the visitations of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. She commanded bishop Bonner to rase out of the public records all that had been done against the monks; and particularly the accounts of the visitations of monasteries; which has rendered the eccle­siastical history of this time defective.

The next act brought into the houses was for reviving the statutes of Richard II. and Henry IV. and V. for burning heretics; which passed both houses in six days, to the un­speakable joy of the Popish clergy. The houses having been informed of some heretical preachers, who had prayed in their conventicles, that God would turn the queen’s heart from idolatry to the true faith, or else shorten her days; they passed an act, “that all that prayed after this manner should be adjudged traitors.” After which, on the 16th of January 1555, the parliament was dissolved.

The kingdom being now reconciled to the church of Rome, and the penal laws against heretics revived, a council was held about the manner of dealing with the reformed. It is said, that cardinal Pole was for the gentler methods of in­struction and persuasion, which is somewhat doubtful;[[14]](#footnote-14) but Gardiner was certainly for rigour, imagining that a few ex­amples of severity upon the heads of the party, would ter­rify the rest into a compliance. The queen was of his mind, and commanded Gardiner, by a commission to himself and some other bishops, to make the experiment. He began with Mr. Rogers, Mr. Cardmaker, and bishop Hooper, who had been kept in prison eighteen months without law. These upon examination were asked whether they would abjure their heretical opinions about the sacrament, and submit to the church as then established; which they refusing, were declared obstinate heretics, and delivered over to the secu­lar power. Mr. Rogers was burnt in Smithfield, February 4, a pardon being offered him at the stake, which he refused, though he had a wife and ten small children unprovided for. Bishop Hooper was burnt at Gloucester, February 9. He was not suffered to speak to the people; and was used so barbarously in the fire, that his legs and thighs were roast­ed, and one of his hands dropped off before he expired: his last words were,“ Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” While he was in prison he wrote several excellent letters, full of de­votion and piety, to the foreign divines.[[15]](#footnote-15) In one to Bullin­ger, dated December 11, 1554, about two months before his martyrdom, are these expressions,—“With us the wound which antichrist had received is healed, and he is declared head of the church, who is not a member of it. We are still in the utmost peril, as we have been for a year and half. We are kept asunder in prison, and treated with all kinds of inhumanity and scorn. They threaten us every day with death, which we do not value. We resolutely despise fire and sword for the cause of Christ. We know in whom we have believed, and are sure we have committed our souls to him by well-doing. In the meantime, help us with your prayers, that he that has begun the good work in us would perform it to the end. We are the Lord’s, let him do with us as seemeth good in his sight.”

About the same time Mr. Saunders, another minister, was burnt at Coventry. When he came to the stake, he said, “Welcome the cross of Christ; welcome everlasting life.” Dr. Taylor, parson of Hadley, suffered next: Gardiner used him very roughly, and after condemning and degrading him sent him to his own parsonage to be burnt; which he underwent with great courage February 9, though he had barbarous usage in the fire, his brains being beat out with one of the halberts.

Gardiner seeing himself disappointed, meddled no fur­ther, but committed the prosecution of the bloody work to Bonner bishop of London. This clergyman behaved more like a cannibal than a Christian; he condemned without mercy all that came before him; ordering them to be kept in the most cruel durance till they were delivered over to the civil magistrate. He tore off the beard of Tomkins a weaver in Shoreditch, and held his hand in the flame of a candle till the sinews and veins shrunk and burst, and the blood spirted out in Harpsfield’s face, who was standing by. He put others in dungeons, and in the stocks, and fed them with bread and water; and when they were brought before him, insulted over their misery in a most brutish manner.

In the month of March were burnt, bishop Ferrars, at St, David’s; Mr. Lawrence, a priest, at Colchester; Mr. Tom­kins, a weaver, in Smithfield; Mr. Hunter, an apprentice of nineteen years of age, at Brentwood; Mr. Causton and Mr. Higden, gentlemen of good estates, in Essex; Mr. Wil­liam Pigot, at Braintree; Mr. Stephen Knight, at Malden; Mr. Rawlings White, a poor fisherman, at Cardiffe. In the next month, Mr. March, a priest, at Chester; and one Flower, a young man in St. Margaret’s churchyard, Westminster.

These burnings were disliked by the nation, which began to be astonished at the courage and constancy of the mar­tyrs; and to be startled at the unrelenting severity of the bishops, who, being reproached with their cruelties, threw the odium upon the king and queen. At the same time a petition was printed by the exiles beyond sea, and addressed to the queen, putting her in mind, “that the Turks tole­rated Christians, and Christians in the most places tolerated Jews. That no Papist had been put to death for religion in king Edward’s time. And then they beseech the nobility and common people, to intercede with her majesty, to put a stop to this issue of blood, and at least grant her subjects the same liberty she allowed strangers, of transporting themselves into foreign parts.” But it had no effect.—King Philip, being informed of the artifices of the bishops, caused his confessor Alphonsus to preach against these seve­rities, which he did in the face of the whole court; Bonner himself pretended to be sick of them; but after some little recess he went on. And though Philip pretended to be for milder measures, yet on the 24th of May he and the queen signed a letter to Bonner, to quicken him to his pastoral duty;[[16]](#footnote-16) whereupon he redoubled his fury, and in the month of June condemned nine Protestants at once to the stake in Essex; and the council wrote to the sheriffs, to gather the gentry together to countenance the burnings with their presence.

In the month of July Mr. John Bradford, late prebends ary of St. Paul’s, and a most celebrated preacher in king Edward’s days, suffered martyrdom. He was a most pious Christian, and is said to have done as much service to the Reformation by his letters from prison, as by his preaching in the pulpit. Endeavours were used to turn him, but to no purpose. He was brought to the stake with one John Lease, an apprentice of nineteen years old; he kissed the stake and the fagots; but being forbid to speak to the people, he only prayed with his fellow-sufferer, and quietly sub­mitted to the fire. His last words were, “Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leadeth unto eternal life, and few there be that find it.” From Smithfield the persecution spread all over the country; in the months of June and July eight men and one woman were burnt in several parts of Kent; and in the months of August and September, twenty-five more in Suffolk, Essex, and Surrey. But the greatest sacrifice to Popish cruelty was yet to come; for on the 16th of October the bishops Ridley and Latimer were burnt at one stake in Oxford. Latimer died presently; but Ridley was a long time in exquisite torments, his lower parts being burnt before the fire reached his body. His last words to his fellow-sufferer were, “Be of good heart, brother, for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or enable us to abide it.” Latimer replied, “Be of good comfort, for we shall this day light such a candle in England, as I trust by God’s grace shall never be put out.” The very same day Gardiner, their great persecutor, was struck with the illness of which he died; it was a suppression of urine, which held him in great agonies till the 12th of November, when he expired. He would not sit down to dinner till he had received the news from Oxford of the burning of the two bishops, which was not till four of the clock in the afternoon; and while he was at dinner he was seized with the distemper that put an end to his life.[[17]](#footnote-17) When bishop Day spoke to him of justification through the blood of Christ, he said, “If you open that gap to the people, then farewell all again.” He confessed he had sinned with Peter, but had not repented with him.

On the 18th of December Mr. archdeacon Philpott[[18]](#footnote-18) was burnt, and behaved at the stake with the courage and reso­lution of the primitive martyrs.

On the 21st of March following archbishop Cranmer suffered. He had been degraded by the bishops Thirlby and Bonner on February 14th. Bonner insulted him in an indecent manner, but Thirlby melted into tears. After this, by much persuasion, and in hopes of life, he set his hand to a paper, in which he renounced the errors of Luther and Zuinglius, and acknowledged his belief of the corporal pre­sence, the pope’s supremacy, purgatory, and invocation of saints, &c. This was quickly published to the world with great triumph among the Papists, and grief to the reformers. But the unmerciful queen was still resolved to have his life, and accordingly sent down a writ for his execution: she could never forgive the share he had in her mother’s divorce, and in driving the pope’s authority out of England.—Cranmer suspecting the design, prepared a true confession of his faith, and carried it in his bosom to St. Mary’s church on the day of his martyrdom, where he was raised on an eminence, that he might be seen by the people, and hear his own funeral sermon. Never was a more awful and me­lancholy spectacle; an archbishop, once the second man in the kingdom, now clothed in rags, and a gazing-stock to the world! Cole the preacher magnified his conversion as the immediate hand of God, and assured him of a great many masses to be said for his soul. After sermon he desired Cranmer to declare his own faith, which he did with tears, declaring his belief in the Holy Scriptures, and the apostles’ creed; and then came to that, which he said troubled his conscience more than anything he had done in his life, and that was his subscribing the above-mentioned paper out of fear of death and love of life; and therefore, when he came to the fire, he was resolved that hand that signed it should burn first. The assembly was all in confusion at this disap­pointment; and the broken-hearted archbishop, shedding abundance of tears, was led immediately to the stake; and being tied to it, he stretched out his right hand to the flame, never moving it but once to wipe his face, till it dropped off. He often cried out, That unworthy hand! which was con­sumed before the fire reached his body. His last words were. Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. He died in the sixty-seventh year of his age, and twenty-third of his archbishopric, and was succeeded by cardinal Pole.

It is not within the compass of my design to write a mar­tyrology of these times; nor to follow bishop Bonner and his brethren through the rivers of Protestant blood which they spilt. The whole year 1556 was one continued persecu­tion, in which Popery triumphed in all its false and bloody colours. Bonner, not content to burn heretics singly, sent them by companies to the flames. Such as were suspected of heresy were examined upon the articles of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, auricular confession, and the mass; and if they did not make satisfactory answers, they were without any farther proofs condemned to the fire. Women were not spared, nor infants in the womb. In the isle of Guernsey a woman with child being ordered to the fire, was delivered in the flames, and the infant being taken from her, was ordered by the magistrates to be thrown back into the fire. At length the butcherly work growing too much for the hands that were employed in it, the queen erected an extraordinary tribunal for trying of heresy, like the Spanish inquisition, consisting of thirty-one commission­ers, most of them laymen: and in the month of June 1555, she issued out a proclamation, that such as received hereti­cal books should be immediately put to death by martial law. She forbid prayers to be made for the sufferers, or even to say God bless them so far did her fiery zeal transport her.[[19]](#footnote-19) Upon the whole, the number of them that suffered death for the reformed religion in this reign, were no less then two hundred and seventy-seven persons,[[20]](#footnote-20) of whom were five bishops, twenty-one clergymen, eight gentlemen, eighty-four tradesmen, one hundred husbandmen, labourers, and servants, fifty-five women, and four children. Besides these, there were fifty-four more under prosecution, seven of whom were whipped, and sixteen perished in prison: the rest, who were making themselves ready for the fire, were delivered by the merciful interposure of Divine Providence in the queen’s death.

In a book corrected, if not written, by lord Burleigh in queen Elizabeth’s time, entitled, The Executions for Trea­son, it is said four hundred persons suffered publicly in queen Mary’s reign, besides those who were secretly murdered in prison; of these, twenty were bishops and dignified clergy­men; sixty were women, of whom some were big with child; and one was delivered of a child in the fire, which was burnt; and above forty men-children I might add,[[21]](#footnote-21) these merci­less Papists carried their fury against the reformed beyond the grave; for they caused the bones of Fagius and Bucer to be dug out of their graves, and having ridiculously cited them by their commissioners to appear, and give an account of their faith, they caused them to be burnt for nonappear­ance. Is it possible, after such a relation of things, for any Protestant to be in love with high commissions, with oaths *ex officio,* and laws to deprive men of their lives, liberties, and estates, for matters of mere conscience? And yet these very reformers, when the power returned into their hands, were too much inclined to these engines of cruelty.

The controversy about predestination[[22]](#footnote-22) and free-will ap­peared first among the reformers at this time. Some that were in the King’s Bench prison for the profession of the gospel, denied the doctrines of absolute predestination and original sin. They were men of strict and holy lives, but warm for their opinions, and unquiet in their behaviour. Mr. Bradford had frequent conferences with them, and gained over some to his own persuasion. The names of their teachers were, Harry Hart, Trew, and Abingdon; they ran their notions as high as the modern Arminians, or as Pelagius himself, despising learning, and utterly reject­ing the authorities of the fathers. Bradford was apprehen­sive that they would do a great deal of mischief in the church, and therefore, in concert with bishop Ferrar, Tay­lor, and Philpot, he wrote to Cranmer, Ridley, and Lati­mer, at Oxford, to take some cognizance of the matter, and consult together about remedying it. Upon this occasion Ridley wrote back a letter of God’s election and predesti­nation, and Bradford wrote another upon the same subject. But the free-willers treated him rudely; “They told him, he was a great slander to the word of God in respect of his doctrine, because he believed and affirmed the salvation of God’s people to be so certain, that they should assuredly enjoy the same.—They said, it hanged partly upon our perseverance to the end; but Bradford said it hanged upon God’s grace in Christ, and not upon our perseverance in any point, otherwise grace was no grace.” When this holy martyr saw he could not convince them, he desired they might pray one for another. “I love you (says he) my dear hearts, though you have taken it otherwise without cause: I am going before you to my God and your God; to my Father and your Father.; to my Christ and your Christ; to my home and your home.”

Mr. Careless, another eminent martyr, had much confer­ence with these men in the King’s Bench prison, of whose contentiousness he explained in a letter to Philpot. In answer to which Philpot writes, “that he was sorry to hear of the contentions that these schismatics raised, but that he should not cease to do his endeavours in defence of the truth, against these arrogant, self-willed, and blinded scatterers: that these sects were necessary for the trial of our faith.” He advised Mr. Careless to be modest and humble, that others seeing his grave conversation among those conten­tious babblers might glorify God in the truth. He then beseeches the brethren in the bowels of Christ, to keep the bond of peace, and not to let any root of bitterness spring up among them.

But this contention could not be laid asleep for some time, notwithstanding their common sufferings for the cause of religion. They wrote one against another in prison, and dispersed their writings abroad in the world. Mr. Careless wrote a confession of his faith; one article of which was for predestination, and against free-will. This confession he sent to the Protestant prisoners in Newgate, whereunto they generally subscribed, and particularly twelve that were under sentence of condemnation to be burnt. Hart, having got a copy of Careless’s confession, wrote his own in oppo­sition to it on the back-side; and would have persuaded the prisoners in Newgate to subscribe it, but could not prevail. I do not find any of these free-willers at the stake (says my author), or if any of them suffered, they made no mention of their distinguishing opinions when they came to die.—But these unhappy divisions among men that were under the cross, gave great advantage to the Papists, who took occasion from hence to scoff at the professors of the gospel, as disagreeing among themselves. They blazed abroad their infirmities, and said, they were suffering for they knew not what. Dr. Martin, a great Papist, exposed their weak­nesses; but when Martin came to visit the prisoners, Careless took the opportunity to protest openly against Hart’s doctrines, saying, “he had deceived many simple souls with his Pelagian opinions.”

Besides these free-willers, it seems there were some few in prison for the gospel that were Arians, and disbelieved the divinity of Jesus Christ. Two of them lay in the King’s Bench, and raised such unseemly and quarrelsome disputes, that the marshal was forced to separate the prisoners from one another; and in the year 1556, the noise of their con­tentions reached the ears of the council, who sent Dr. Mar­tin to the King’s Bench to examine into the affair.[[23]](#footnote-23)

I mention these disputes, to shew the frailty and corrup­tion of human nature,[[24]](#footnote-24) even under the cross, and to point the reader to the first beginnings of those debates which afterward occasioned unspeakable mischiefs to the church; for though the Pelagian doctrine was espoused but by a very few of the English reformers, and was buried in that prison where it began for almost fifty years, it revived in the latter end of queen Elizabeth, under the name of Arminianism, and within the compass of a few years supplanted the received doctrine of the Reformation.

Many of the clergy that were zealous professors of the gospel under king Edward VI. through fear of death re­canted and subscribed; some out of weakness, who, as soon as they were out of danger, revoked their subscriptions, and openly confessed their fall: of this sort were Scory and Barlow, bishops, the famous Mr. Jewel, and others. Among the common people some went to mass to preserve their lives, and yet frequented the assemblies of the Gospellers, holding it not unlawful to be present with their bodies at the service of the mass, as long as their spirits did not con­sent.[[25]](#footnote-25) Bradford and others wrote with great warmth against these temporizers, and advised their brethren not to trust or consort with them. They also published a treatise upon this argument, entitled, The Mischief and Hurt of the Mass; and recommended the reading it to all that had defiled themselves with that idolatrous service.

But though many complied with the times, and some con­cealed themselves in friends’ houses, shifting from one place to another, others resolved with the hazard of their lives to join together and worship God, according to the service ­book of king Edward. There were several of these con­gregations up and down the country, which met together in the night, and in secret places, to cover themselves from the notice of their persecutors. Great numbers in Suffolk and Essex constantly frequented the private assemblies of the Gospellers, and came not at all to the public service; but the most considerable congregation was in and about London. It was formed soon after queen Mary’s accession, and consisted of above two hundred members. They had divers preachers, as Mr. Scambier afterward bishop of Peterborough, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Rough a Scotsman, who was burnt; Mr. Bernher, and Mr. Bentham, who survived the persecution, and in the beginning of queen Elizabeth’s reign, was made bishop of Litchfield and Coventry; Mr. Cuthbert Simpson was deacon of the church, and kept a book with names of all that belonged to it: they met some­times about Aldgate, sometimes in Blackfriars, some­times in Thames-street, and sometimes on board of ships, when they had a master, for their purpose: sometimes they assembled in the villages about London, to cover themselves from the bishops’ officers and spies; and especially at Isling­ton; but here, by the treachery of a false brother, the con­gregation was at length discovered and broke up: Mr. Rough their minister, and Mr. Simpson their deacon, were apprehended and burnt, with many others. Indeed the whole church was in the utmost danger; for whereas Simpson the deacon used to carry the book wherein the names of the congregation were contained, to their private assemblies, he happened that day, through the good providence of God, to leave it with Mrs. Rough the minister’s wife. When he was in the Tower the recorder of London examined him strictly, and because he would neither discover the book or the names, he was put upon the rack three times in one day.[[26]](#footnote-26) He was then sent to Bonner, who said to the specta­tors, “You see what a personable man this is; and for his patience, if he was not a heretic, I should much commend him, for he has been thrice racked in one day, and in my house has endured some sorrow, and yet I never saw his patience moved.” But notwithstanding this Bonner condemned him, and ordered him first into the stocks in his coal-house, and from thence to Smithfield, where with Mr. Fox and Davenish, two others of the church taken at Isling­ton, he ended his life in the flames.

Many escaped the fury of the persecution, by withdrawing from the storm, and flying into foreign countries. Some went into France and Flanders, some to Geneva, and others into those parts of Germany and Switzerland where the Re­formation had taken place; as Basil, Frankfort, Embden, Strasburgh, Doesburgh, Arrow, and Zurich, where the magistrates received them with great humanity, and allow­ed them places for public worship. But the uncharitable­ness of the Lutherans on this occasion was very remark­able; they hated the exiles because they were Sacramentarians, and when any English came among them for shelter, they expelled them their cities; so that they found little hospitality in Saxony and other places of Germany where Lutheranism was professed. Philip Melancthon interceded with the senate on their behalf, but the clergy were so zealous for their consubstantiation, that they irritated the magistrates every where against them. The number of the refugees is computed at above eight hundred; the most con­siderable of whom have been mentioned, as the bishops of Winchester, Bath and Wells, Chichester, Exeter, and Ossory; the deans of Christ-church, Exeter, Durham, Wells, and Chichester; the archdeacons of Canterbury, Stowe, and Lincoln; with a great many other very learned divines.[[27]](#footnote-27) The laity of distinction were, the duchess of Suf­folk with her husband, sir Thomas Wroth, sir Richard Morison, sir Anthony Cook, sir John Cheeke, and others.

The exiles were most numerous at Frankfort, where that contest and division began which gave rise to the Puritans, and to that separation from the church of England which continues to this day. It will therefore be necessary to trace it from its original. On the 27th of June 1554, Mr. Whittingham, Williams, Sutton, and Wood, with their fami­lies and friends, came to settle at the city of Frankfort; and upon application to the magistrates were admitted to a partnership in the French church for a place of worship; the two congregations being to meet at different hours, as they should agree among themselves, but with this proviso, That before they entered they should subscribe the French confession of faith, and not quarrel about ceremonies, to which the English agreed; and after consultation among themselves they concluded, by universal consent of all pre­sent, not to answer aloud after the minister, nor to use the litany and surplice; but that the public service should begin with a general Confession of sins, then the people to sing a psalm in metre in a plain tune, after which the minister to pray for the assistance of God’s Holy Spirit, and so proceed to the sermon; after sermon, a general prayer for all es­tates, and particularly for England, at the end of which was joined the Lord’s prayer, and a rehearsal of the articles of belief; then the people were to sing another psalm, and the minister to dismiss them with a blessing. They took possession of their church July 29th, 1554, and having chosen a minister and deacons to serve for the present, they sent to their brethren that were dispersed, to invite them to come to Frankfort, where they might hear God’s word truly preached, the sacraments rightly ministered, and Scrip­ture discipline used, which in their own country could not be obtained.

The more learned clergymen, and some younger divines, settled at Strasburgh, Zurich, and Basil, for the benefit of the libraries of those places, and of the learned conversa­tion of the professors, as well as in hopes of some little em­ployment in the way of printing.[[28]](#footnote-28) The congregation at Frankfort sent letters to these places of the 2d of August 1554, beseeching the English divines to send some of their number, whom they might choose, to take the oversight of them. In their letter they commend their new settlement, as nearer the policy and order of Scripture than the service­book of king Edward. The Strasburgh divines demurring upon the affair, the congregation at Frankfort sent for Mr. Knox from Geneva, Mr. Haddon from Strasburgh, and Mr. Lever from Zurich, whom they elected for their ministers. At length the students at Zurich sent them word, that unless they might be assured, that they would use the same order of service concerning religion, as was set forth by king Edward, they would not come to them, for they were fully determined to admit and use no other. To this the Frank­fort congregation replied, that they would use the service­ book as far as God’s word commanded it; but as for the unprofitable ceremonies, though some of them were toler­able, yet being in a strange country they could not be suf­fered to use them; and indeed they thought it better that they should never be practised. “If any (say they) think that the not using the book in all points should weaken our godly fathers and brethren’s hands, or be a disgrace to the worthy laws of king Edward, let them consider, that they themselves have upon consideration and circumstances al­tered many things in it heretofore; and if God had not in these wicked days otherwise determined, would hereafter have altered more; and in our case we doubt not but they would have done as we do.” So they made use of part of the book, but omitted the litany and responses.

But this not giving satisfaction, Mr. Chambers and Mr. Grindal came with a letter from the learned men of Strasburgh, subscribed with sixteen hands, in which they exhort them in the most pressing language to a full conformity. They say, they make no question but the magistrates of Frankfort will consent to the use of the English service, and therefore they cannot doubt of the congregation’s good­will and ready endeavours to reduce their church to the exact pattern of king Edward’s book, as far as possible can be obtained: “should they deviate from it at this time, they apprehend they should seem to condemn those who were now sealing it with their blood, and give occasion to their adversaries to charge them with inconstancy.” The Frank­fort congregation, in their letter of December 3d, reply, that “they had omitted as few ceremonies as possible, so that there was no danger of their being charged with inconstancy. They apprehended that the martyrs in England were not dying in defence of ceremonies, which they allow may be al­tered; and as for doctrine there is no difference; therefore, if the learned divines of Strasbugh should come to Frankfort with no other views but to reduce the congregation to king Edward’s form, and to establish the Popish ceremonies, they give them to understand that they had better stay away.” This was signed by John Knox, now come from Geneva, John Bale, John Fox the Martyrologist, and fourteen more.

Things being in this uncertain posture at Frankfort; king Edward's book being used in part, but not wholly; and there being no prospect of an accommodation with their brethren at Strasburgh, they resolved to ask the advice of the famous Mr. Calvin, pastor of the church at Geneva; who having perused the English liturgy, took notice, “that there were many tolerable weaknesses in it, which, because at first they could not be amended, were to be suffered; but that it behoved the learned, grave, and godly ministers of Christ to enterprise farther, and to set up something more, filed from rust, and purer. If religion (says he) had flou­rished till this day in England, many of these things should have been corrected. But since the Reformation is over­thrown, and a church is to be set up in another place, where you are at liberty to establish what order is most for edifi­cation, I cannot tell what they mean, who are so fond of the leavings of Popish dregs.” Upon this letter the Frankfort congregation agreed not to submit to the Strasburgh divines, but to make use of so much of the service-book as they had done, till the end of April 1555; and if any new contention arose among them in the meantime, the matter was to be referred to Calvin, Musculus, Martyr, Bullinger, and Vyret.

But upon the 13th of March, Dr. Cox, who had been tu­tor to king Edward VI. a man of a high spirit, but of great credit with his countrymen, coming to Frankfort with some of his friends, broke through the agreement, and interrupt­ed the public service by answering aloud after the minis­ter; and the Sunday following one of his company, without the consent of the congregation, ascended the pulpit, and read the whole litany. Upon this Mr. Knox their minister taxed the authors of this disorder in his sermon with a breach of their agreement; and farther affirmed, that some things in the service-book were superstitious and impure.—The zealous Dr. Cox reproved him for his censoriousness; and being admitted with his company to vote in the congrega­tion, got the majority to forbid Mr. Knox to preach any more. But Knox’s friends applied to the magistrate, who commanded them to unite with the French church both in discipline and ceremonies, according to their first agreement. Dr. Cox and his friends, finding Knox’s interest among the magistrates too strong, had recourse to an unchristian me­thod to get rid of him. This divine, some years before when he was in England, had published an English book, called An Admonition to Christians; in which he had said, that the emperor was no less an enemy to Christ than Nero. For which, and some other expressions in the book, these gentlemen accused him of high treason against the empe­ror. The senate being tender of the emperor’s honour, and not willing to embroil themselves in a controversy of this nature, desired Mr. Knox in a respectful manner, to depart the city, which he did accordingly, March 25, 1555.

After this Cox’s party being strengthened by the addition of several English divines from other places, sixteen of them, viz. three doctors of divinity, and thirteen bachelors, peti­tioned the magistrates for the free use of king Edward’s ser­vice-book, which they were pleased to grant. Thus the old congregation was broke up by Dr. Cox and his friends, who now carried all before them. They chose new church-offi­cers, taking no notice of the old ones, and set up the service­book of king Edward without interruption. Knox’s friends would have left the matter to the arbitration of divines, which the others refused, but wrote to Mr. Calvin to coun­tenance their proceedings, which that great divine could not do; but after a modest excuse for intermeddling in their affairs, told them, that “in his opinion they were too much addicted to the English ceremonies; nor could he see to what purpose it was to burden the church with such hurt­ful and offensive things, when there was liberty to have a simple and more pure order. He blamed their conduct to Mr. Knox, which he said, was neither godly nor brotherly; and concludes with beseeching them to prevent divisions among themselves.” This pacific letter having no effect, the old congregation left their countrymen in possession of their church, and departed the city. Mr. Fox the martyrologist with a few more went to Basil; and the rest to Ge­neva, where they were received with great humanity, and having a church appointed there, they chose Mr. Knox and Goodman their pastors. Here they set up the Geneva dis­cipline, which they published in English, under the title of The Service, Discipline, and Form, of Common Prayers and Administration of Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva: with a dedication to their brethren in England and elsewhere. Dated from Geneva, February 10th, 1556. The liturgy is too long to be inserted in this place, but is agreeable to that of the French churches. In their dedication they say, “that their discipline is limited within the compass of God’s word, which is sufficient to govern all our actions. That the dilatory proceedings of the bishops in reforming church-discipline, and removing offen­sive ceremonies, is one cause of the heavy judgments of God upon the land. That the late service-book of king Edward being now set aside by parliament according to law, it was in no sense the established worship of the church of Eng­land, and consequently they were under no obligation to use it, any farther than it was consonant to the word of God. Being therefore at liberty, and in a strange land, they had set up such an order as, in the judgment of Mr. Calvin and other learned divines, was most agreeable to Scripture, and the best reformed churches.” Their reasons for laying aside the late rites and ceremonies were these; “because being invented by men, though upon a good occasion, yet they had since been abused to superstition, and made a necessary part of divine worship. Thus Hezekiah was commended for breaking in pieces the brazen serpent, after it had been erected eight hundred years, and the high places that had been abused to idolatry were commanded to be destroyed. In the New Testament, the washing the disciples’ feet, which was practised in the primitive church, was for wise reasons laid aside, as well as their love-feasts. Besides, these rites and ceremonies have occasioned great contentions in the church in every age. The Galatian Christians objected to St. Paul, that he did not observe the Jewish ceremonies as the other apostles did; and yet he observed them while there was any hope of gaining over weak brethren; for this rea­son he circumcised Timothy; but when he perceived that men would retain them as necessary things in the church, he called that, which before he made indifferent, wicked and impious, saying, that ‘whosoever was circumcised, Christ could nothing profit him.’ The like contentions have been between the Greek and Latin church in later ages. For which, and other reasons, they have thought fit to lay aside these human inventions which have done so much mischief; and have contented themselves with that wisdom that is contained in God’s book; which directs them to preach the word of God purely, to minister the sacraments sincerely, and use prayers and other orders thereby approved, to the edification of the church, and increase of God’s glory.”

The reader has now seen the first breach or schism be­tween the English exiles, on the account of the service-book of king Edward; which made way for the distinction, by which the two parties were afterward known, of Puritans and Conformists. It is evident that Dr. Cox and his friends were the aggressors, by breaking in upon the agreement of the congregation of Frankfort, which was in peace, and had consented to go on in their way of worship for a limited time, which time was not then expired. He artfully ejected Mr. Knox from his ministry among them, and brought in the service-book with a high hand; by which those who had been in possession of the church about nine months,[[29]](#footnote-29) were obliged to depart the city, and set up their worship in another place. The doctor and his friends discovered an ill spirit in this affair. They might have used their own forms without imposing them upon others, and breaking a congre­gation to pieces, that had settled upon a different founda­tion with the leave of the government under which they lived. But they insisted, that because the congregation of Frankfort was made up of Englishmen, they ought to have the form of an English church; that many of them had sub­scribed to the use of the service-book; and that the depart­ing from it at this time was pouring contempt on the martyrs who were sealing it with their blood. But the others re­plied, that the laws of their country relating to the service-­book were repealed; and as for their subscription, it could not bind them from making nearer approaches to the purity and simplicity of the Christian worship, especially when there was no established Protestant church of England, and they were in a strange country, where the vestments and ceremonies gave offence. Besides, it was allowed on all hands, that the book itself was imperfect; and it was cre­dibly reported, that the archbishop of Canterbury had drawn up a form of common prayer much more perfect, but that he could not make it take place, because of the corruption of the clergy. As for discipline, it was out of the question that it was imperfect, for the service-book itself laments the want of it; and therefore they apprehend, that if the mar­tyrs themselves were in their circumstances they would practise with the same latitude, and reform those imperfections in the English service-book, which they attempted, but could not obtain in their own country.

To return to Dr. Cox’s congregation at Frankfort. The doctor having settled Mr. Horn in the pastoral office, in the room of Mr. Whitehead who resigned, after some time left the place. But within six months a new division happened among them, occasioned by a private dispute between Mr. Horn the minister, and Mr. Ashby, one of the principal mem­bers. Mr. Horn summoned Ashby to appear at the vestry before the elders and officers of the church; Ashby appeal­ed from them as parties, to the whole church, who appoint­ed the cause to be brought before them; but Mr. Horn and the officers protested against it, and chose rather to lay down their ministry and service in the church, than submit to a popular decision. The congregation being assembled on this occasion, gave it as their opinion, that in all contro­versies among themselves, and especially in cases of appeals, the last resort should be in the church. It is hardly cre­dible what heats and divisions, factions and parties, these personal quarrels occasioned among a handful of strangers, to. the scandal of religion, and their own reproach with the people among whom they lived. At length the magistrate interposed, and advised them to bury all past offences in ob­livion, and to choose new church-officers in the room of those that had laid down; and since their discipline was defective as to the points of controversy that had been before them, they commanded them to appoint certain persons of their number to draw up a new form of discipline, or correct and amend the old one; and to do this before they chose their ecclesiastical officers, that, being all private persons, they might agree upon that which was most reasonable in itself, without respect of persons or parties. This precept was de­livered in writing, March 1st, 1557, and signed by Mr. John Glauburge. Hereupon fifteen persons were appointed to the work, which after some time was finished; and having been subscribed by the church, to the number of fifty-seven, was confirmed by the magistrate; and on the 21st of De­cember, twenty-eight more were added to the church and subscribed; but Mr. Horn and his party, to the number of twelve, dissented, and appealed to the magistrates, who had the patience to hear their objections, and the others’ reply. But Mr. Horn and his friends, not prevailing, left the con­gregation to their new discipline, and departed the city; from which time they continued in peace till the death of queen Mary.

During these troubles died Dr. Poynet, late bishop of Winchester, born in Kent, and educated in Queen’s college, Oxon, a very learned and pious divine, who was in such fa­vour with king Edward for his practical preaching, that he preferred him first to the bishopric of Rochester, and then to Winchester.[[30]](#footnote-30) Upon the accession of queen Mary he fled to Strasburgh, where he died August 2, 1556, before he was full forty years old, and was buried with great la­mentations of his countrymen.

To return to England. Both the universities were visited this year. At Cambridge they burnt the bodies of Bucer and Fagius, with their books and heretical writings. At Oxford the visitors went through all the colleges, and burnt all the English Bibles, and such heretical books as they could find. They took up the body of Peter Martyr’s wife out of one of the churches, and buried it in a dunghill, be­cause, having been once a nun, she broke her vow; but her body was afterward taken up again in queen Elizabeth’s time, and mixed with the bones of St. Fridiswide, that they might never more be disturbed by Papists. The persecu­tion of the reformed was carried on with all imaginable fury; and a design was set on foot to introduce the inquisition, by giving commissions to certain laymen to search for persons suspected of heresy, and present them to their ordinaries, as has been related. Cardinal Pole being thought too favour­able to heretics, because he had released several that were brought before him upon their giving ambiguous answers, had his legantine power taken from him, and was recalled; but upon his submission he was forgiven, and continued here till his death, but had little influence afterward either in the courts of Rome or England, being a clergyman of too much temper for the times he lived in.

Princess Elizabeth was in constant danger of her life throughout the whole course of this reign. Upon the break­ing out of Wyat’s conspiracy she was sent to the Tower, and led in by the Traitors’ gate; her own servants being put from her, and no person allowed to have access to her: the governor used her hardly, not suffering her to walk in the gallery, or upon the leads. Wyat and his confederates were examined about her, and some of them put to the rack; but they all cleared her except Wyat, who once accused her, in hopes to save his life, but declared upon the scaffold to all the people, that he only did it with that view. After some time she was sent to Woodstock in custody of sir Henry Benefield, who used her so ill, that she apprehended they designed to put her privately to death. Here she was under close confinement, being seldom allowed to walk in the gardens. The politic bishop Gardiner often moved the queen to think of putting her out of the way, saying, it was to no purpose to lop off the branches while the tree was left standing. But king Philip was her friend; who sent for her to court, where she fell upon her knees before the queen, and protested her innocence, as to all conspiracies and treasons against her majesty; but the queen still hated her: however, after that, her guards were discharged, and she was suffered to retire into the country, where she gave herself wholly to study, meddling in no sort of business, for she was always apprehensive of spies about her. The prin­cess complied outwardly with her sister’s religion, avoiding as much as she could all discourses with the bishops, who suspected her of an inclination to heresy from her education. The queen herself was apprehensive of the danger of the Popish religion if she died without issue; and was often urged by her clergy, especially when her health was visibly declining, to secure the Roman Catholic religion, by deliver­ing the kingdom from such a presumptive heir. Her majes­ty had no scruple of conscience about spilling human blood in. the cause of religion; the preservation of the princess was therefore little less than a miracle of Divine Provi­dence, and was owing, under God, to the protection of king Philip, who despairing of issue from his queen, was not with­out expectations from the princess.

But the hand of God was against queen Mary and her government, which was hardly attended with one prosper­ous event; for instead of having issue by her marriage, she had only a false conception, so that there was little or no hopes afterward of a child. This increased the sourness of her temper; and her husband being much younger than her­self, grew weary of her, slighted her company; and then left her to look to his hereditary dominions, after he had lived with her about fifteen months. There being a war be­tween Spain and France, the queen was obliged to take part with her husband; this exhausted the treasure of the na­tion, and was the occasion of the loss of all the English do­minions upon the continent. In the beginning of this year the strong town of Calais was taken, after it had been in the possession of the English two hundred and ten years: afterward the French took Guines and the rest of that ter­ritory; nothing being left but the isles of Jersey and Guernsey. The English, says a learned writer, had lost their hearts; the government at home being so unacceptable that they were not much concerned to support it, for they began to think that heaven itself was against it.

Indeed there were strange and unusual accidents in the heavens.[[31]](#footnote-31) Great mischief was done in many places by thun­der and lightning; by deluges; by excessive rains; and by stormy winds. There was a contagious distemper like the plague, that swept away great numbers of people; so that in many places there were not priests to bury the dead, nor men enough to reap the harvest. Many bishops died, which made way for the Protestant ones in the next reign.—The parliament was dissatisfied with king Philip’s demands of men and money for the recovery of Calais; and the queen herself grew melancholy upon the loss of that place, and the other misfortunes of the year. She had been declining in health ever since her pretended miscarriage, which was vastly increased by the absence of her husband, her despair of issue, and the cross accidents that attended her govern­ments. Her spirits were now decayed, and a dropsy coming violently upon her put an end to her unhappy life and reign, November 17, 1558, in the forty-third year of her age, and sixth of her reign; cardinal Pole, archbishop of Canterbu­ry, dying the same day.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Queen Mary was a princess of severe principles, constant at her prayers, and very little given to diversions. She did not mind any branch of government so much as the church, being entirely at the disposal of her clergy, and forward to give a sanction to all their cruelties. She had deep resent­ments of her own ill-usage in her father’s and brother’s reigns, which easily induced her to take revenge, though she coloured it over with a zeal against heresy. She was perfectly blind in matters of religion, her conscience being absolutely directed by the pope and her confessor, who en­couraged her in all the cruelties that were exercised against the Protestants, assuring her, that she was doing God and his church good service. There is but one instance of a pardon of any condemned for heresy during her whole reign. Her natural temper was melancholy; and her infirmities, together with the misfortunes of her government, made her so peevish, that her death was lamented by none but her Popish clergy. Her reign was in every respect calamitous to the nation, and “ought to be transmitted down to poste­rity in characters of blood.”

1. Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 252. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 221, 239. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Fuller’s Worthies, b. 3. p. 198. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Strype’s Life of Cran. p. 314. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Burnet’s Hist; Ref; vol. 3. p. 223. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
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Bishop Warburton, in his notes on Mr. Neal’s History (see a supplemental volume of his works, 8vo. 1788. p. 455.) with great anger impeaches the truth of this passage. “This is to lie (says his lordship) under the cover of truth. Can anybody in his senses believe that when the only contention between the two parties was, who had the word; that the more powerful would yield it up to their adversaries. Without all doubt, some Protestant member, in the heat of dispute, said, ‘We have the word upon which the prolocutor insultingly answers—‘But we have the sword without thinking any one would be so foolish as to join the two propositions into one, and then give it to the prolocutor.” In reply to these unhandsome reflections, it is sufficient to say, that Mr Neal spoke on the authority of bishop Burnet, whom he truly quotes: and whom it would have been more consistent with candour and the love of truth for bishop Warburton to have consulted the authority, before he insinuated his conjectures against the statement of a fact, and without authority pointed his charge of folly and falsehood: of which Mr. Neal, by quoting his author, stands perfectly clear; and which if well founded must fall, not on him but bishop Burnet,—whose remarks on the prolocutor’s speech is; that “by it he truly pointed out wherein the strength of both causes lay.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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9. “This,” observes Dr. Warner, “is the first instance to be met with in the English history of corrupting parliaments: but the precedent has been so well followed ever since, that if ever this nation should lose its liberties and be enslaved and ruined, it will be by means of parliament corrupted with bribes and places.” Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 341.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The view of Philip, in this match, was undoubtedly to make himself master of the kingdom. When afterward Mary was supposed to be pregnant, he applied to parliament to be appointed regent during the minority of the child, and offered security to resign the government on its coming of age. The motion was warmly debated in the house of peers, and nearly carried; when the lord Paget stood up and said, Pray who shall sue the king’s bond?” This laconic speech had its intended effect, and the debate was soon concluded in the negative. Granger’s Biogr. History of England, vol. 1. p. 161. note, 8vo. edition.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Strype’s Life of Cranmer, p. 338. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 285. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
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14. Strype’s Memoirs of Cranmer, p. 347. and Life of Whitgift, p. 6. Mr. Strype’s. words in the former place are as follows: “In these instructions (given to the clergy) there are several strictures that make it appear Pole was not so gentle towards the heretics as was reported, but rather the contrary, and that he went hand in hand with the bloody bishops of these days; for it is plain, that he put the bishops upon proceeding with them, (the Protestants) according to the sanguinary laws lately revived, and put in full force and virtue. What an invention was that of his, a kind of inquisition by him set up, wherein the names of all such were to be written, that in every place and parish in England were reconciled; and so whosoever were not found in those books, might be known to be no friend to the pope; and so to be proceeded against—.And indeed after Pole’s crafty and zealous management of this re-conciliation (with Rome), all that good opinion that men had before of him vanished, and they found themselves much mistaken in him, insomuch that people spoke against him as bad as of the pope himself, or the worst of his cardinals.—Indeed he had frequent conferences with the Protestants about justification by faith alone, &c. and would often wish the true doctrine might prevail; but now the mask was taken off, and he shewed himself what he was.”

In the place answering to the latter reference, Strype says, “He wholly Italianized, and returned into England endued with a nature foreign and fierce, and was the very butcher and scourge of the English church.” Author’s Review, p. 896.

Dr. Warner, whose character of cardinal Pole is a panegyric, yet says, “that he was very inconsistent in one particular; which was, that at the same time he was exclaiming against the persecution of the reformed, and would not himself take any part in that slaughter, he was giving commissions to others to proceed in it, and returned a certificate into the court of Chancery, of several who had been convicted of heresy before the commissaries of his appointing.” Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 402.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
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17. This is said on the authority of Fox, after whom most historians repeat it. Dr. Warner, however, gives no credit to the story. He observes “that the bishops were burnt on the 16th of October: on the 21st the parliament was opened by a speech from the lord-chancellor, and on the 23d he appeared again in the house of lords: and had he been seized with a retention of urine on the 16th, he would scarcely have been able to come abroad on those days, neither would he probably have held out till the 12th of November following, which was the day he died. And bishop Godwin, who takes no notice of this report, says he died of a dropsy.” Warner’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 382.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. It is not pleasing to dwell on the failings of good men, especially of those to whose zeal and integrity the cause of religion and truth is, in a great degree, indebted: yet the impartiality of an historian, and the instruction and warning of future times, require some notice of them. Mr. Neal, in this view, would not have done amiss, had he informed his readers, that this eminent Protestant divine and martyr incurred the blame of his friends, and discovered a very illiberal and intolerant spirit, by a highly insulting and passionate behaviour towards some of his fellow-prisoners, who denied the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Deity of Christ. It gave, even in those times, so much offence, that he judged it proper to attempt a vindication of himself in a little tract, entitled, “An apology of John Philpot, written for spitting upon an Arian; with au invective against the Arians, the very natural children of antichrist: with an admonition to all that be faithful in Christ, to beware of them, and of other late sprung heresies, as of the most enemies of the gospel!.” The title of this piece plainly indicates, that no calm investigation of the truth, or candid retracting of intemperate language and spirit, is to be expected in it. Mr. Lindsey has given it at length, in his History of Unitarian Worship,” with pertinent, judicious, and valuable remark. To which with pleasure we refer the reader, p. 84 to 194.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
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24. Mr. Neal’s language and sentiments are not here the most correct. Disputes, aris­ing from difference of opinion on points of speculation, may be proofs of the frailty of our nature; as they show, that all cannot attain to precise ideas, a clear discernment, and comprehensive views, on subjects that are attended with many difficulties. But how do they indicate the corruption of human nature? That betrays itself in the intemperate spirit and language with which they are managed, and should be imputed not to human nature, but to the want of self-government in those individuals who thus offend. It is not proper, indiscriminately, to condemn disputes, because such cen­sures operate as discouragements and bars to the investigation of the truth.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
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28. Hist. of the Troubles of Frankfort, printed 1575. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Mr. Neal has said, “almost two years;” here, by consulting his authority, “the troubles at Frankfort,” it appears that he is properly corrected by bishop Maddox. In other respects his lordship’s animadversions on this part of Mr, Neal’s History are not just or accurate; if Mr. Neal’s authority, to which he has faithfully adhered, deserves credit. This piece, when it was become scarce, was reprinted in the Phoenix, vol. 2. 1708, Mr. Strype refers to it, as giving authentic information.—ED. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
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32. During his residence in Italy, on the demise of Paul III. cardinal Pole had been elected pope, at midnight, by the conclave; and sent for to come and be admitted. He desired that this, as it was not a work of darkness, might be postponed the morning. Upon this message, the cardinals without any farther ceremony, proceeded to another election, and chose the cardinal De Monte; who, before he left the conclave, bestowed a hat upon a servant who looked after his monkey. Granger’s Biogr. History, 8vo. vol. 1, p. 158, note.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)