

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.

## CHAP. VIII.

### FROM THE SPANISH INVASION TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

WHILE there were any hopes of compromising matters between the church and Puritans, the controversy was carried on with some decency; but when all hopes of accommodation were at an end, the contending parties loaded each other with the heaviest reproaches. The public printing presses being shut against the Puritans, some of them purchased a private one, and carried it from one country to another to prevent discovery: it was first set up at Molesey in Surrey, near Kingston-on-Thames; from thence it was conveyed to Fawsley in Northamptonshire; from thence to Norton, from thence to Coventry, from Coventry to Woolston in Warwickshire, and from thence to Manchester in Lancashire, where it was discovered. Sundry satirical pamphlets were printed by this press, and dispersed all over the kingdom; as,

“Martin Mar-Prelate;” written, as is supposed, by a club of separatists, for the authors were never discovered: it is a violent satire against the hierarchy and all its supporters; it calls the lord-bishops petty antichrists, petty popes, proud prelates, enemies to the gospel, and most covetous wretched priests.—It says, “that the Lord has given many of our bishops over to a reprobate sense, because they wilfully oppose and persecute the truth; and supposes them to have committed the unpardonable sin, because they have manifested in their public writings, &c. most blasphemous and damnable doctrines;” The author then addresses himself to the clergy who had subscribed, and who were for pressing subscription upon others, in such punning language as this, “right puissant and terrible priests, my clergy masters of the *confocation* or *conspiration* house, whether *fickters* [vicars], *paltripolitans*, or others of the holy league of subscription. Right poisoned, persecuting, and terrible priests; my horned masters, your government is antichristian, your cause is desperate, your grounds are ridiculous—Martin understands all your knavery; you are intolerable withstanders of reformation, enemies of the gospel, and most covetous, wretched, and Popish priests, &c.”<sup>1</sup> There are a great many sad truths in the book, but delivered in rude and unbecoming language, and with a bitter angry spirit.

The titles of the rest were,

“Theses Martinianæ; i.e. certain demonstrative conclusions set down and collected by Martin Mar-Prelate the Great, serving as a manifest and sufficient confutation of all that ever the college of cater-caps, with their whole band of clergy-priests, have or can bring for the defence of their ambitious and antichristian prelacy. Published by Martin junior, 1589, in octavo, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 290.

dedicated to John Kankerbury” [i. e. Canterbury]. The author of this tells the bishops, that he would plant young Martins in every diocese and parish, who should watch the behaviour of the clergy, that when anything was done amiss it might be made public.

“Protestation of Martin Mar-Prelate; wherein, notwithstanding the surprising of the printer, he maketh it known to the world, that he feareth neither proud priest, antichristian pope, tyrannous prelate, nor godless cater-cap, &c. Printed 1589.” Octavo.

“His appellation to the high court of parliament from the bad and injurious dealing of the archbishop of Canterbury, and other his colleagues of the high-commission, &c.<sup>2</sup> Printed 1589.” Octavo.

“Dialogue, wherein is plainly laid open the tyrannical dealings of the lords-bishops against God’s children. Printed 1589.” Quarto.

“A treatise, wherein is manifestly proved, that reformation, and those that sincerely favour the same, are unjustly charged to be enemies to her majesty, and the state. Printed 1590” Quarto.

“Ha’ ye any work for the Cooper?” This was written against Dr. Thomas Cooper, bishop of Winchester; and is said to be printed in Europe, not far from some of the bouncing priests, 1590.

“Epitome of the first book of Dr. John Bridges against the Puritans;” with this expression in the title-page, “Oh! read over Dr. John Bridges, for it is a worthy work. Printed over-sea in Europe, within two furlongs of a bouncing priest, at the cost and charges of Martin Mar-Prelate, gent, in quarto.”

“The cobbler’s book,<sup>3</sup> which denies the church of England to be a true church, and charges her with maintaining idolatry under the name of decency, in the habits, fonts, baptism by women, gang-days, saints’ eves, bishoping of children, organs, wafer-cakes, &c.

“Ha’ ye any more work for the Cooper?”<sup>4</sup> In printing of which the press was discovered and seized, with several pamphlets unfinished; as, Episto [Episco] Mastix, Paradoxes, Dialogues, Miscellanea, Variæ Lectiones, Martin’s Dream, The Lives and Doings of English Popes, Itinerarium or Visitations, Lambethisms.

The two last of these were imperfect; but to complete the Itinerarium, the author threatens to survey all the clergy of England, and note their intolerable pranks: and for his Lambethisms he would have a Martin at Lambeth. Other books were published of the same nature; as “A demonstration of discipline;” “The counter-poison,” &c.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ath. Oxon. vol. 1. p 259.

<sup>3</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 296.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 288.

The writers on the church-side came not behind their adversaries in buffoonery and ridicule, as appears by the following pamphlets printed at this time.

“Pappe with an hatchet, alias, A fig for my godson: or, Crack me this nut, that is, a sound box of the ear for the idiot Martin to hold his peace. Written by one that dares call a dog a dog. Imprinted by John Anoke, and are to be sold at the sign of the Crab-Tree Cudgel, in Thwack-Coat-Lane.”<sup>5</sup>

“Pasquil’s apology. In the first part whereof he renders a reason of his long silence, and gallops the field with the treatise of reformation. Printed where I was, and where I shall be ready, by the help of God and my muse, to send you a May-game of Martinism. Anno. 1593.” Quarto.

“An almond for a parrot: or, An alms for Martin Mar-Prelate, &c. By Cuthbert Curry-Knave.” Quarto.

“The return of the renowned Cavaliero Pasquil to England, and his meeting with Marforius at London, upon the Royal Exchange, London 1589, against Martin and Martinism.”

“A counter-cuff given to Martin junior, by the Pasquil of England, Cavaliero. 1589.” Octavo.

It is sad when a controversy about serious matters runs these dregs: ridicule and personal reflection may expose an adversary and make him ashamed, but will never convince or reconcile; it carries with it a contempt which sticks in the heart and is hardly ever to be removed, nor do I remember any cause that has been served by such methods. Dr. Bridges answered Martin in a ludicrous style; but Cooper bishop of Winchester did more service by his grave and sober reply, with the assistance of the archbishop of Canterbury, who, being miserably aspersed, furnished the bishop with replies to the particular charges brought against him. The book is entitled, “An advertisement to the people of England;” wherein the slanders of Martin Mar-Prelate the libeller are distinctly answered. But after all, it was impossible for the bishops to wipe off from themselves the charge of persecution and violation of the laws.

To put a stop to these pamphlets the queen sent a letter to the archbishop, commanding him to make diligent inquiry after the printing press, and issued out her royal proclamation, dated February 13th, 1589, “for the bringing in all seditious and schismatical books, whether printed or written, to the ordinary, or to one of the privy council, as tending to bring in a monstrous and dangerous innovation of all manner of ecclesiastical government now in use, and with a rash and malicious purpose to dissolve the state of the prelacy, being one of the three ancient estates of this realm under her highness, whereof her majesty mindeth to have a reverend regard; she therefore

---

<sup>5</sup> Ath. Oxon. 6. 280.

prohibits any of her subjects from keeping any books in their custody against the order of the church, or the rites and ceremonies of it, her majesty being minded to have the laws severely executed against the authors and abettors of them, as soon as they shall be apprehended.”<sup>6</sup>

As soon as the printing press was discovered, his grace wrote to the treasurer to prosecute the persons with whom it was found; but, like an able politician, wishes it might be done by the lords of the council, rather than by the ecclesiastical commissioners, because they had already suffered for supporting the government, which was wounded through their sides.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly sir Richard Knightly, sir — Wigston, who had entertained the press, together with the printer, and Humphrey Newman the disperser, were deeply fined in the star-chamber; and others were put to death.<sup>8</sup>

The archbishop being now in his visitation had framed twenty-two articles of inquiry, upon which the churchwardens of every parish were to be examined upon oath. By these articles they were to swear, that their minister was exactly conformable to the orders of the church, or else to impeach him; and to declare farther, whether they knew of any of their neighbours or fellow-parishioners, that were “common swearers, drunkards, usurers, witches, conjurers, heretics; any man that had two wives; or women that had two husbands; whether they knew any that went to conventicles or meetings for saying prayers in private houses; any that were of age, and did not receive the sacrament at church three times a year:”<sup>9</sup> with others, calculated to dissolve all friendship in country-towns, and set a whole diocese in a flame. When sir Francis Knollys had read the articles he sent them to the treasurer, calling them by their proper name, “articles of inquisition, highly prejudicial to the royal prerogative:” but there was no stopping his grace’s career.<sup>10</sup>

Among the divines that suffered death<sup>11</sup> for the libels above mentioned, were the reverend Mr. Udal, whose case being peculiarly hard, I shall give

---

<sup>6</sup> Life of Whitgift, in Rec. b. 3. no. 41.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 314. Toiler, b. 9. p. 194.

<sup>8</sup> Fuller adds, archbishop Whitgift improved his interest with the queen, till, though she was at first angry with his solicitations, they were delivered out of prison and eased of their fines. Bishop Maddox censures Mr. Neal for passing this over in silence: but he himself omits the construction put on this, apparently, kind conduct of the prelate; “which, while some highly commended, so others (says Fuller) imputed it to the declining of envy, gaining of applause and remorse of conscience for over-rigorous proceedings: it being no charity to cure the wound he had caused, and solicit the remitting those fines which he had procured to be imposed.”—Our author proceeds; “Thus impossible is it to please forward spirits, and to make them like the best deed, who dislike the doer.”—ED.

<sup>9</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 309. 311.

<sup>10</sup> Pierce’s Vindic. p. 129.

<sup>11</sup> Bishop Warburton is very severe in his censure of Mr. Neal for using this language; “which (he says), in common English, means, dying by the hand of the executioner;” whereas Mr. Udal died in prison. But, when he died quite heartbroken with sorrow and grief through imprisonment and the severe treatment he met with on account of the libels, his death was as much the consequence of the prosecution commenced against him, as if it had

the reader an abstract of it. He had been minister of Kingston-upon-Thames; where, having been silenced by the official Dr. Hone, he lay by for half a year, having no farther prospect of usefulness in the church. At length the people of Newcastle-upon-Tyne wanting a minister, prevailed with the earl of Huntingdon to send him to them; when he had been there about a year he was sent for up to London by the lord Hunsdon and the lord-chamberlain, in the name of the whole privy council: Mr. Udal set out December 29th, 1589, and on the 13th of January, 1590, appeared at lord Cobham's house before the commissioners, lord Cobham, lord Buckhurst, lord-chief-justice Anderson, Dr. John Young bishop of Rochester, Mr. Fortescue, Mr. Egerton the queen's solicitor, Dr. Aubrey, and Dr. Lewin. The bishop began the examination in this manner:—Bishop. Have you the allowance of the bishop of the diocese to preach at Newcastle?—Udal. There was neither bishop of the diocese, nor archbishop of York at that time.—Fortescue. By what law then did you preach at Newcastle, being silenced at Kingston?—Udal. I know no law against it, seeing I was silenced only by the official, whose authority reaches not beyond his archdeaconry.—L. C. J. Anderson. You are called to answer concerning certain books, thought to be of your writing.—Udal. If it be any of Martin's books, I have disowned them a year and a half ago at Lambeth.—L. C. J. Anderson. Who was the author of the Demonstration, or the Dialogue?—Udal. I shall not answer.—Anderson. Why will you clear yourself of Martin, and not of these?—Udal. Because I would not be thought to handle the cause of discipline as Martin did; but I think otherwise of the other books, and care not though they should be fathered upon me; I think the author did well, and therefore would not discover him if I knew him; but would hinder it all I could.—L. C. J. Anderson. Why dare you not confess if you be the author?—Udal. I have said I liked of the books, and the matter handled in them; but whether I made them or no I will not answer, for by the law I am not obliged to it.—Anderson. That is true, if it concerned the loss of your life [and yet the judges tried and condemned him for his life].—Udal. I pray your lordship, does not the law say. No man shall be put to answer without presentment before justices on matters of record, or by due proofs and writ original, &c. (A. 42 Edw. III. cap. 3.)—Anderson. That is law if it be not repealed.—Bishop of Rochester. Pray let me ask you a question concerning your book.—But Udal was upon his guard, and said, It is not yet proved to be mine.—Mr. Solicitor. I am sorry, Mr. Udal, you will not answer nor take an oath, which by law you ought to do; but he did not say by what law.—Udal. Sir, if I have a liberty by law, there is no reason why I should not challenge it: show me by what law I am obliged to accuse myself.—Dr.

---

been inflicted by the executioner. At most there was only an inaccuracy in the expression, which it was very unworthy the bishop to censure as "unworthy a candid historian, or an honest man."—ED.

Lewin. You have taken the oath heretofore, why should you not take it now?—Udal. I then voluntarily confessed certain things concerning my preaching of the points of discipline, which could never have been proved; and when my friends laboured to have me restored to my ministry, the archbishop answered, there was sufficient matter against me by my own confession why I should not be restored; whereupon I covenanted with my own heart never to be my own accuser again.

At length the bishop told him his sentence for that time was to be sent to the Gate-house; take it in his own words,. “I was carried to the Gate-house by a messenger, who delivered me with a warrant to be kept close prisoner, and not to be suffered to have pen, ink, or paper, or anybody to speak with me. Thus I remained half a year, in all which time my wife could not get leave to come to me, saying only that in the hearing of the keeper she might speak to me, and I to her, of such things as she should think meet.—All which time my chamber-fellows were seminary priests, traitors, and professed Papists. At the end of the half year I was removed to the White Lion in Southwark, and so carried to the assizes at Croydon.”

On the 23d of July Mr. Udal was brought to Croydon with fetters on his legs, and indicted upon the statute 23 Eliz. cap. 2. before baron Clarke, and Mr. sergeant Puckering, for writing a wicked, scandalous, and seditious libel, called, A demonstration of discipline,” dedicated to the supposed governors of the church of England,<sup>12</sup> in which is this passage; “Who can without blushing deny you [the bishops] to be the cause of all ungodliness? forasmuch as your government gives liberty for a man to be anything but a sound Christian; it is more free in these days to be a Papist or a wicked man, than what we should be; I could live twenty years as such in England, and it may be in a bishop’s house, and not be molested: so true is it, that you care for nothing but the maintenance of your dignities, be it to the damnation of your own souls, and infinite millions more.” These are the words of the indictment. To which Mr. Udal pleaded Not guilty, and put himself upon the trial of his country. In opening the cause, Mr. Daulton the queen’s council made a long invective against the new discipline, which he affirmed was not to be found in the word of God. To whom Udal replied, This being a controversy among learned divines, he thought Mr. Daulton might have suspended his judgment, since he had formerly showed some liking to the cause. Upon which the judge said, Sirrah! sirrah! answer to the matter. Mr. Daulton, go on to the proof of the points in the indictment, which were these three:

1. That Udal was the author of the book.
2. That he had a malicious intent in making it.

---

<sup>12</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 343.

3. That the matters in the indictment were felony by the statute 23 Eliz. cap. 2.

The first point was to prove Udal to be the author of the book; and here it is observable, that the witnesses were not brought into court, but only their examinations, which the registrar swore to. And, first, Stephen Chatfield's articles were produced, which contained a report of certain papers he had seen in Udal's study. Upon seeing them, he asked, whose writings they were. Udal answered, A friend's. Chatfield then desired him to rid his hands of them, for he doubted they concerned the state. He added, that Udal told him another time, that if they put him to silence, he would give the bishops such a blow as they never had.

Chatfield was called to witness these things, but appeared not. Daulton said he went out of the way on purpose. The judge said, Mr. Udal, you are glad of that. Mr. Udal answered, My lord, I wish heartily he were here; for as I am sure he could never say anything against me to prove this point; so I am able to prove it to be true, that he is very sorry that he ever made any complaint against me, confessing he did it in anger when Martin came first out, and by their suggestions, whom he had proved since to be very bad men. Mr. Udal added, that the book was published before this conversation with Chatfield.

The examination of Nicholas Tomkins before the commissioners was next produced. This Tomkins was now beyond sea, but the paper said, that Udal had told him he was the author. But Tomkins himself sent word, that he would not for 1000£. affirm any more, than that he had heard Udal say, that he would not doubt but set his name to the book if he had indifferent judges. And when Udal offered to produce his witnesses, the judge said, that because the witnesses were against the queen's majesty they could not be heard.

The confession of Henry Sharp of Northampton was then read, who upon oath before the lord-chancellor had declared, that he heard Mr. Penry say, that Mr. Udal was the author of the Demonstration.

This was the whole evidence of the fact upon which he was convicted, not a single living witness being produced in court; so that the prisoner had no opportunity to ask any questions, or refute the evidence. And what methods were used to extort these confessions may easily be imagined from the confessors flying their country, and then testifying their sorrow for what they had said.

To prove the sedition, and bring it within the statute, the council insisted upon his threatening the bishops, who being the queen's officers, it was construed a threatening of the queen herself. The prisoner desired liberty to explain the passage, and his council insisted, that an offence against the bishops was not sedition against the queen; but the judge gave it for law, that "they



who spake against the queen's government in causes ecclesiastical, or her laws, proceedings, and ecclesiastical officers, defamed the queen herself." Upon this the jury were directed to find him guilty of the fact, and the judges took upon them the point of law and condemned him as a felon. Mr. Fuller confesses,<sup>13</sup> that the proof against him was not pregnant, for it was generally believed he wrote not the book, but only the preface. They might as well have condemned him without the form of a trial, for the statute was undoubtedly strained beyond the intent of it, to reach his life. He behaved modestly and discreetly at the bar; and having said as much for himself as must have satisfied any equitable persons, he submitted to the judgment of the court.

Mr. Udal was convicted in the summer assizes 1590, but did not receive sentence till the Lent assize, in the meantime he was offered his pardon, if he would sign the following submission:—<sup>14</sup>

"I John Udal have been heretofore, by due course of law, convicted of felony, for penning or setting forth a certain book, called, 'The demonstration of discipline,' wherein false, slanderous, and seditious matters, are contained against her majesty's prerogative royal, her crown and dignity, and against the laws and government ecclesiastical and temporal by law established under her highness, and tending to the erecting a new form of government, contrary to her said laws; all which points I do now perceive, by the grace of God, to be very dangerous to the peace of this realm and church, seditious in the commonwealth, and infinitely offensive to the queen's most excellent majesty; so as thereby I, now seeing the grievousness of my offence, do most humbly on my knees, before, and in this presence, submit myself to the mercy of her highness, being most sorry that I have so deeply and worthily incurred her majesty's indignation against me; promising, if it shall please God to move her royal heart to have compassion on me a most sorrowful convicted person, that I will for ever hereafter forsake all such undutiful and dangerous courses, and demean myself dutifully and peaceably; for I do acknowledge her laws to be both lawful and godly, and to be obeyed by every subject. February 1590-1."

No arguments or threatenings of the judges could prevail with Udal to sign this submission; but the day before sentence was to be passed, he offered the following, drawn up by himself:—

"Concerning the book whereof I was by due course of law convicted, by referring myself to the trial of the law, and for that by the verdict of twelve men, I am found to be the author of it, for which cause an humble submission is worthily required and offered of me: although I cannot disavow the cause and substance of the doctrine debated in it, which I must needs acknowledge

---

<sup>13</sup> B. 9. p. 223.

<sup>14</sup> Strype's Ann, vol. ult. p. 26.

to be holy, and (so far as I conceive it) agreeable to the word of God; yet I confess, the manner of writing it is such in some part as may worthily be blamed, and might provoke her majesty's just indignation therein. Whereof the trial of the law imputing to me all such defaults as are in that book, and laying the punishment of the same in most grievous manner upon me; as my most humble suit to her most excellent majesty is, that her mercy and gracious pardon may free me from the guilt and offence which the said trial of the law hath cast upon me, and farther of her great clemency, to restore me to the comfort of my life and liberty, so do I promise, in all humble submission to God and her majesty, to carry myself in the whole course of my life, in such humble and dutiful obedience, as shall befit a minister of the gospel and dutiful subject, fervently and continually praying for a good preservation of her highness's precious life, and happy government, to the honour of God, and comfort of her loyal and dutiful subjects. February 19, 1590-1."

Mr. Udal had often, and with great earnestness, petitioned his judges for their mediation with the queen: in his letter of November 11th, he says, "I pray you call to mind my tedious state of imprisonment, whereby myself, my wife, and children, are reduced to beggary; pray call to mind by what course this misery is brought upon me, and if you find by due consideration, that I am worthy to receive the punishment from the sentence of upright justice, I pray you to hasten the execution of the same, for it were better for me to die than to live in this case; but if it appear to your consciences (as I hope it will) that no malice against her majesty can possibly be in me, then do I humbly and heartily desire you to be a means that I may be released; then I shall not only forget that hard opinion conceived of your courses against me, but pray heartily to God to bury the same, with the rest of your sins, in the grave of his Son Jesus Christ." Mr. Udal wrote again November 18 and 25, in most humble and dutiful language; but the court would do nothing till he had signed their submission.

At the close of the Lent assizes, being called to the bar with the rest of the felons, and asked what he had to say, why judgment should not be given against him according to the verdict, he gave in a paper consisting of nine reasons; of which these are the principal:

1. "Because the jury were directed only to find the fact, whether I was author of the book; and were expressly freed by your lordship from inquiring into the intent, without which there is no felony.

2. "The jury were not left to their own consciences, but were wrought upon partly by promises, assuring them it should be no farther danger to me but tend to my good; and partly by fear, as appears, in that it has been a grief to some of them ever since.

3. "The statute in the true meaning of it, is thought not to reach my case, there being nothing in the book spoken of her majesty's person but in duty

and honour; I beseech you therefore to consider, whether the drawing of it from her royal person to the bishops, as being part of her body politic, be not a violent depraving and wresting of the statute.

4. “But if the statute be taken as it is urged, the felony must consist in the malicious intent; wherein I appeal first to God, and then to all men who have known in the course of my life, and to your lordships’ own consciences, whether you can find me guilty of any act in all my life that savoured of any malice or malicious intent against her majesty; of which, if your consciences must clear me before God, I hope you will not proceed to judgment.

5. “By the laws of God, and I trust also by the laws of the land, the witnesses ought to be produced face to face against me; but I have none such, nor any other things, but papers and reports of depositions taken by ecclesiastical commissioners and others. This kind of evidence is not allowed in case of lands, and therefore much less ought it to be allowed in case of life.

6. “None of the depositions prove me directly to be the author of the book in question; and the author of the chief testimony is so grieved, that he is ashamed to come where he is known.

7. “Supposing me to be the author of the book, let it be considered that the said book for substance contains nothing but what is taught and believed by the best reformed churches in Europe, so that in condemning me you condemn all such nations and churches as hold the same doctrine. If the punishment be for the manner of writing, this may be thought by some worthy of an admonition, or fine, or some short imprisonment;<sup>15</sup> but death for an error of such a kind, as terms and words not altogether dutiful of certain bishops, cannot but be extreme cruelty, against one that has endeavoured to show himself a dutiful subject, and faithful minister of the gospel.

“If all this prevail not, yet my Redeemer liveth, to whom I commend myself, and say as sometime Jeremiah said in a case not much unlike, ‘Behold, I am in your hands to do with me whatsoever seemeth good unto you; but know you this, that if you put me to death you shall bring innocent blood upon your own heads, and upon the land.’ As the blood of Abel, so the blood of Udal, will cry to God with a loud voice, and the righteous Judge of the land will require it at the hands of all that shall be guilty of it.”

But nothing would avail, unless he would sign the submission the court had drawn up for him; which his conscience not suffering him to do, sentence of death was passed upon him February 20th, and execution openly awarded; but next morning the judges, by direction from court, gave ‘private orders to respite it till her majesty’s pleasure was farther known. The dean of St. Paul’s and Dr. Andrews were sent to persuade him to sign the submission; which

---

<sup>15</sup> Strype’s Ann. vol. 4. p. 23.

he peremptorily refused. But because the queen had been misinformed of his belief, he sent her majesty a short confession of his faith in these words:

“I believe, and have often preached, that the church of England is a part of the true visible church, the word and sacraments being truly dispensed; for which reason I have communicated with it several years at Kingston, and a year at Newcastle-on-Tyne; and do still desire to be a preacher in the same church; therefore I utterly renounce the schism and separation of the Brownists:—I do allow the articles of religion as far as they contain the doctrine of faith and sacraments, according to law:—I believe the queen’s majesty hath, and ought to have, supreme authority over all persons, in all causes ecclesiastical and civil.—And if the prince commands anything contrary to the word of God, it is not lawful for subjects to rebel or resist, but with patience and humility to bear the punishment laid upon them:—I believe the church rightly reformed ought to be governed ecclesiastically by ministers, assisted by elders, as in the foreign reformed churches:—I believe the censures of the church ought merely to concern the soul, and may not impeach any subject, much less any prince, in liberty of body, goods, dominion, or any earthly privilege; nor do I believe that a Christian prince ought otherwise to be subject to church-censures, than our gracious queen professes herself to be to the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments.”<sup>16</sup>

With this declaration of his faith he sent an humble request, that if her majesty would not graciously be pleased to pardon him, she would change his sentence into banishment, that the land might not be charged with his blood.<sup>17</sup> King James of Scotland wrote to the queen, requesting most earnestly, that, for the sake of his intercession, Udal might be relieved of his present strait, promising to do the like for her majesty in any matter she should recommend to him. The Turkey merchants also offered to send him as chaplain to one of their factories abroad, if he might have his life and liberty; which Udal consented to, as appears by his letter to the lord-treasurer, in which he says, “Lamentable is my case, having been three years in du-rance, which makes me humbly desire your lordship’s favour, that I may be released from my imprisonment, the Turkey merchants having my consent to go into Syria or Guinea, there to remain two years with their factors, if my liberty may be obtained.” The writer of archbishop Whitgift’s life says the archbishop yielded to this petition; that the lord-keeper promised to further it; and that the earl of Essex had a draught of a pardon ready prepared, with this condition annexed, that he should never return without the queen’s licence; but her majesty never signed it, and the Turkey ships going away without him, poor unhappy Udal died a few months after in the Marshalsea

---

<sup>16</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 376,

<sup>17</sup> Fuller, b. 9. p. 203.

prison, quite heartbroken with sorrow and grief, about the end of the year 1592. Mr. Fuller<sup>18</sup> says, he was a learned man, and of a blameless life, powerful in prayer, and no less profitable than painful in preaching. He was decently interred in the churchyard of St. George, Southwark, not far from the grave of bishop Bonner, being honoured with the attendance of great numbers of the London ministers, who visited him in prison and now wept over the remains of a man, who, after a long and severe trial of his faith and patience, died for the testimony of a good conscience, and stands upon record as a monument of the oppression and cruelty of the government under which he suffered.

Though the moderate Puritans publicly disowned the libels above mentioned, and condemned the spirit with which they were written, they were nevertheless brought into trouble for their associations. Among others, the reverend Mr. Cartwright, father of the Puritans, and master of the new hospital at Warwick, was suspended by his diocesan, and summoned before the high commissioners, who committed him to the Fleet with his brethren, Mr. Egerton, Fen, Wright, Farmer, Lord, Snape, King, Rushbrooke, Wiggins, Littleton, Field, Royde, Payne, Proudlove, and Jewel. At their first appearance the commissioners asked them, where they held their associations or assemblies, and how often? who were present, and what matters were treated of? who corrected or set forth the book of Discipline, and who had subscribed or submitted to it? whether in a Christian monarchy the king is supreme governor of the church? or, whether he is under the government of pastors, doctors, and such-like? whether it be lawful for a sovereign prince to ordain ceremonies, and make orders for the church? whether the ecclesiastical government established in England be lawful, and allowed by the word of God? whether the sacraments ministered according to the Book of Common Prayer, are godly and rightly ministered? &c.

Mr. Cartwright's answer to these interrogatories was said by the civilians to be sufficient; upon which they exhibited thirty-one articles against him September 1, 1590, and required him to answer them upon oath.<sup>19</sup> The first twenty-four articles charge him with renouncing his episcopal orders, by being reordained beyond sea, with interrupting the peace, and breaking, the orders, of the church since he came home; and with knowing the authors or printers of Martin Mar-Prelate.

Art. 25. Charges him with penning, or procuring to be penned, the book of Discipline; and with recommending the practice of it.

Art. 26. Charges him with being present at sundry pretended synods, classes or conferences of ministers in divers counties.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. p. 222.

<sup>19</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 373.

Art. 27. That at such synods they subscribed the book of Discipline, and promised to govern themselves by it as far as they could.

Art. 28. Charges him with setting up particular conferences in several shires, which were to receive the determinations of the general assembly, and put them in practice.

Art. 29, 30, and 31. Mention some rules and orders of their synods; as, that the members should bring testimonials from their several classes; that they should subscribe the book of Discipline; that no books should be printed but by consent; that they should be subject to the censures of the brethren both for doctrine and life; and that if any should be sent abroad upon public service at the meeting of parliament, their charges should be borne, &c.

Mr. Cartwright offered to clear himself of some of these articles upon oath, and to give his reasons for not answering the rest, but if this would not satisfy, he was determined to submit to the punishment the commissioners should award<sup>20</sup> [which was imprisonment in the Fleet]; praying the lord-treasurer to make some provision for the poor people of Warwick who had no minister. The rest of Cartwright's brethren refusing the oath for the same reasons, viz. because they would not accuse themselves, nor bring their friends into trouble, were committed to divers prisons. But the archbishop, by advice of the treasurer, was not present at the commitment of his old adversary.

On the 13th of May 1591, they were brought before the star chamber,<sup>21</sup> which was a court made up of certain noblemen, bishops, judges, and counsellors, of the queen's nomination, to the number of twenty or thirty, with her majesty at their head, who is the sole judge when present, the other members being only to give their opinion to their sovereign by way of advice, which he [or she] disallows at their pleasure; but in the absence of the sovereign the determination is by a majority, the lord-chancellor or keeper having a casting vote. The determinations of this court, says Mr. Rushworth, were not by the verdict of a jury, nor according to any statute-law of the land, but according to the king's [or queen's] royal will and pleasure, and yet they were made as binding to the subject as an act of parliament. In the reign of king Henry VII. the practice of that court was thought to intrench upon the common law, though it seldom did any business; but in the latter end of this, and during the two next reigns, the court sat constantly, and was so unmerciful in its censures and punishments, that the whole nation cried aloud against it as a mark of the vilest slavery. Lord Clarendon says,<sup>22</sup> "There were very few persons of quality in those times that had not suffered, or been perplexed, by the weight and fear of its censure and judgments; for having

---

<sup>20</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 338.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. p. 361.

<sup>22</sup> Hist. Gr. Rebellion, vol. 1. 8vo. p. 68, &c.

extended their jurisdiction from riots, perjuries, and the most notorious misdemeanours, to an asserting of all proclamations, and orders of state, to the vindicating illegal commissioners and grants of monopolies, no man could hope to be any longer free from the inquisition of that court, than he resolved to submit to those and the like extraordinary courses.”

When Cartwright and his brethren appeared before the court, Mr. Attorney-general inveighed bitterly against them for refusing the oath, and when Mr. Fuller, counsel for the prisoners, stood up to answer, he was commanded silence, and told, that far less crimes than theirs had been punished with the galleys or perpetual banishment, which latter he thought proper for them, provided it was in some remote place from whence they might not return.<sup>23</sup> From the starchamber they were remitted back to the high-commission, where Bancroft had a long argument with Cartwright about the oath; from thence they were returned again to the starchamber, and a bill was exhibited against them with twenty articles;<sup>24</sup> in answer to which they maintain, that their associations were very useful, and not forbidden by any law of the realm; that they exercised no jurisdiction, nor moved any sedition, nor transacted any affairs in them, but with a due regard to their duty to their prince, and to the peace of the church; that they had agreed upon some regulations to render their ministry more edifying, but all was voluntary, and in breach of no law; and as for the oath, they refused it, not in contempt of the court, but as contrary to the laws of God and nature.

But this answer not being satisfactory, they were remanded to prison, where they continued two years without any farther process, or being admitted to bail; in the meantime king James of Scotland interceded for them, in a letter to the queen, dated June 12, 1591, in which he requests her majesty to show favour to Mr. Cartwright and his brethren, because of their great learning and faithful travels in the gospel.<sup>25</sup> Cartwright himself petitioned for his liberty,<sup>26</sup> as being afflicted with excessive pains of the gout and sciatica, which were much increased by lying in a cold prison; he wrote a most humble and pious letter to the lady Russel, and another to the lord-treasurer, beseeching them to procure his enlargement with the queen, though it were upon bond, expressing a very great concern that her majesty should be so highly offended with him, since he had printed no books for thirteen years past, that could give the least uneasiness; since he had declared his dislike of Martin Mar-Prelate; and that he never had a finger in any of the books under the name, nor in any other satirical pamphlets; and farther, that in the course of his ministry for five years past at Warwick he had avoided all controversy.

---

<sup>23</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 360.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. b. 4. sec. 4.

<sup>25</sup> Life of Aylmer, p. 321.

<sup>26</sup> Fuller, b. 9. p. 203.

Dr. Goad, Dr. Whitaker, and two others of the university, wrote an excellent letter<sup>27</sup> to the treasurer in favour of the prisoners, beseeching his lordship that they might not be more hardly dealt with than Papists; but this not prevailing, after six months they petitioned the lords of the council [December 4, 1591] to be enlarged upon bail, and wrote to the treasurer to second it, assuring his lordship of their loyalty to the queen, and peaceable behaviour in the church. “We doubt not (say they) but your lordship is sensible, that a year’s imprisonment and more, which we have suffered, must strike deeper into our healths, considering our education, than a number of years to men of a different occupation. Your lordship knows that many Papists who deny the queen’s supremacy have been enlarged, whereas we have all sworn to it; and if the government require, are ready to take the oath again.” This was signed by

THO. CARTWRIGHT,  
HUMP. FEN,  
ANDREW KING,  
DAN. WIGHT,  
JOHN PAYNE,  
EDWARD LORD,  
EDMUND SNAPE,  
WM. PROUDLOVE,  
MELANCTHON JEWEL.

---

<sup>27</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 370.



They also applied to the archbishop, who refused to consent to their enlargement, unless they would under their hands declare the church of England to be a true church, and the whole order of public prayers, &c. consonant to the word of God, and renounce for the future all their assemblies, classes, and synods; which they declined. These applications proving ineffectual, they resolved at last to address the queen herself, for which purpose they drew up a declaration, containing a full answer to the several charges brought against them.<sup>28</sup>

It was not till some time after this that Mr. Cartwright was released,<sup>29</sup> upon promise of his quiet and peaceable behaviour, and restored to his hospital in Warwick, where he continued without farther disturbance the rest of his days; but many of his brethren continued under suspension while their families were starving, as the reverend Mr. Fenner of Cranbrook suspended seven years, Mr. Leverwood of Manchelsea seven years, Mr. Percival Wyburne of Rochester five years, Mr. Rockeray prebendary of Rochester four years, Mr. Barber of Bow-church, London, two years six months, Mr. Field of Aldermary, London, Mr. Smith lecturer of St. Clement's, whose printed sermons were a family book all over England many years;<sup>30</sup> Mr. Travers of the Temple, Mr. Colset of Easton-on-the-Hill, Mr. Settle of Buxstead, Suffolk, Mr. Gellibrand, Dyke, Flemming, Mr. Kendal, Mr. Hubbock of Oxford, with many others whose names are before me. Mr. Hubbock was an excellent divine, and was called before the commission for saying, that a great nobleman (meaning the archbishop) had kneeled down to her majesty for staying and hindering her intent to reform religion. But his grace not being willing to insist upon this, commanded him to subscribe, and in case of refusal to enter into bonds not to preach any more, nor to come within ten miles of Oxford; which Mr. Hubbock declined, saying, "he had rather go to prison than consent to be silent from preaching, unless he was convinced that he had taught false doctrine, or committed any fault worthy of bonds."<sup>31</sup>—Sir Francis Knollys and the treasurer interceded for him, but to no purpose; upon which sir Francia, wrote back to the treasurer in these words; "You know how greatly, yea, and tyrannously, the archbishop hath urged subscription to his own articles without law—and that he has claimed in the right of all the bishops a superiority over the inferior clergy from God's own ordinance, in prejudice to her majesty's supreme government, though at present he says he does not claim it, therefore in my opinion he ought openly to retract it."

---

<sup>28</sup> See the Appendix, no. 5.

<sup>29</sup> It should be observed here, that Mr. Cartwright was indebted for his liberty to the services of archbishop Whitgift, who had been his old acquaintance at Trinity college, and had a respect for his abilities, and it was also said, "feared the success in so tough a conflict." Fuller's Church History, b. 9. p. 204.

<sup>30</sup> MS. p. 584.

<sup>31</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 341, 342.

These high proceedings of the commissioners brought their powers under examination; most were of opinion that they exceeded the law, but some thought the very court itself was illegal, imagining the queen could not delegate her supremacy to others. Mr. Cawdery, late minister of Luffingham in Suffolk, had been suspended by the bishop of London for refusing the oath *ex officio*; but not acquiescing in his lordship's sentence, the bishop summoned him before the high commissioners, who deprived him for nonconformity and lack of learning, and gave away his living to another, though Mr. Cawdery was one of the most learned clergymen and best preachers in the country, and offered to give proof of his learning before his judges. When this would not be accepted he pleaded with tears his wife and eight poor children that had no maintenance; but the hearts of the commissioners not being mollified, Mr. Cawdery was advised to appeal to the court of exchequer, and proceed against the chaplain that had possession of his living; on this occasion the jurisdiction of the court was argued before all the judges in Hilary term, 1591.<sup>32</sup> Dr. Aubrey the civilian confessed, that their proceedings were not warrantable by the letter of the statute 1st Eliz. but were built upon the old canon law still in force; though it has been shown that their proceeding by way of inquisition was warranted by no law at all; but the judges confirmed the proceedings of the court, and left Mr. Cawdery with his large family to starve as a layman. The suit cost Mr. Cawdery's friends a round sum of money, besides two-and-twenty journeys which he made to London. But it was a brave stand for the rights of the subject, and staggered the archbishop so much, that he declined the business of the commission afterward, and sent most of his prisoners to the starchamber.

While these causes were depending, sundry books were written for and against the oath *ex officio*; among others Mr. Morrice, attorney of the court of wards, and member of parliament, published a learned treatise, to prove that no prelates, or ecclesiastical judges, have authority to compel any subject of the land to an oath, except in causes testamentary or matrimonial; and he gives these reasons for it, Because it is against the word of God:—It was never allowed by any general council for a thousand years after Christ:—It was forbidden by the Pagan emperors against the Christians:—It is against the pope's decretals, except in cases of heresy, and where there is danger to the accuser, and not otherwise:—It is against the laws of the realm;—and, Because it is against the queen's prerogative.<sup>33</sup> Morrice's book was answered by Dr. Cosins a civilian, in his "Apology for the ecclesiastical proceedings;" to which Morrice had prepared a reply, but the archbishop hearing of it, sent for him, and forbade the publication.—The attorney complained of this usage

---

<sup>32</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 318.

<sup>33</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 340.

to the treasurer in these words; “Cosins may write at his pleasure of ecclesiastical courts without check or controlment, though never so erroneously; but I, poor man, such is my ill hap, may not maintain the right cause of justice without some blot or blemish.” But this was his grace’s shortest way of ending controversies.

Though Mr. Cartwright and his brethren above mentioned had the resolution to lie in jail for two years, rather than take the oath *ex officio*, others out of weakness, or some other principle, yielded to it, and discovered their classes, with the names of those that were present at them:<sup>34</sup> among these were, Mr. Stone, rector of Warkton in Northamptonshire; Mr. Henry Alvey, fellow of St. John’s, Cambridge; Mr. Thomas Edmunds, Mr. William Perkins, Mr. Littleton, Johnson, Barber, Cleaveley, and Nutter. These divines confessed upon examination, that they had several meetings with their brethren in London, at the houses of Mr. Travers, Egerton, Gardner, and Barber; that there had been assemblies of ministers in Cambridge, Northamptonshire, and Warwickshire; that at these meetings there were usually between twelve and twenty ministers present; that they had a moderator; that they began and ended with prayer; and that their usual debates were, how far they might comply with the establishment rather than forego their ministry; here they revised their book of Discipline, and consulted of peaceable methods in subordination to the laws for promoting a reformation in the church, and how far they might exercise their own platform in the meantime: but the worst part of their confession was their discovering the names of the brethren that were present, which brought them into trouble. The reasons they gave for taking the oath were, Because it was administered by a lawful magistrate:—Because the magistrate had a right to search out the truth in matters relating to the public safety:—Because it was impossible to keep things any longer secret, many letters of the brethren having been intercepted:—Because there was nothing criminal in their assemblies, and the magistrate might suspect worse things of them than were true; and though their confessions might bring some into trouble, they might deliver others who were suspected. How far these reasons will justify the confessors, I leave with the reader; but it is certain they purchased their own liberties at the expense of their brethren’s; for they had the favour to be dismissed, and lived without disturbance afterward.

To render the Puritans odious to the public, all enthusiasts without distinction were ranked among them; even Racket and his two prophets, Arthington and Coppinger.<sup>35</sup> Racket was a blasphemous, ignorant wretch, who could not so much as read; he pretended to be King Jesus, and to set up

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. p. 371.

<sup>35</sup> Strype’s Ann. vol. ult p. 71.

his empire in the room of the queen's, who, he said, was no longer to be queen of England. He defaced her majesty's arms, and stabbed her picture through with his dagger, in the house where he lodged. Being apprehended and put upon the rack, he confessed every thing they would have him, and upon his trial pleaded Guilty, declaring he was moved thereunto by the Spirit; he was hanged July 18, and died raving like a madman. Coppinger starved himself in prison, but Arthington lived to recover his senses, and was pardoned. Dr. Nichols says, that by the solicitations of these men the Puritans stirred up the people to rebellion, their design being communicated to Cartwright, Egerton, and Wiggington;<sup>36</sup> whereas there was not a single Puritan concerned with them. Fuller<sup>37</sup> the historian speaks candidly of the matter; "This business of Hacket (says he) happened unseasonably for the Presbyterians; true it is, they as cordially detested his blasphemies as any of the episcopal party; and such of them as loved Hacket the Nonconformist, abhorred Hacket the heretic, after he had mounted to so high a pitch of impiety." However, Mr. Cartwright wrote an apology for himself and his brethren against the aspersions of Dr. Sutcliff, in which he declares, he had never seen Hacket nor Arthington, nor ever had any conference with them by letter or message. Had there been any ground for this vile charge, we should no doubt have found it among their articles of impeachment.

At the opening of the new parliament, February 19, the queen signified her pleasure to the house, that they might redress such popular grievances as were complained of in their several counties, but should leave all matters of state to herself and the council: and all matters relating to the church, to herself, and the bishops. What an insignificant thing is a representative body of the nation, that must not meddle with matters of church or state! But her majesty was resolved to let them see she would be obeyed, for when Mr. Wentworth and Bromley moved the house to address the queen to name her successor, she sent for them, together with Mr. Welsh and Stevens, and committed them to prison, where Wentworth remained many years.<sup>38</sup> When it was moved in the house to address the queen for the release of their members, it was answered by those privy counsellors that were of the house, "that her majesty had committed them for causes best known to herself; that the house must not call the queen to account for what she did of her royal authority; that the causes of their restraint might be high and dangerous; that her majesty did not like such questions, nor did it become the house to deal in such matters.

---

<sup>36</sup> Pierce's Vindic. p. 140.

<sup>37</sup> B. 9. p. 206.

<sup>38</sup> Heyl. Hist. Fresh p. 319.

After this it was a bold adventure of Mr. Attorney Morrice,<sup>39</sup> and for which he paid very dear, to move the house, to inquire into the proceedings of the bishops in their spiritual courts,<sup>40</sup> and how far they could justify their inquisition, their subscriptions, their binding the queen's subjects to their good behaviour contrary to the laws of God and of the realm; their compelling men to take oaths to accuse themselves; and upon their refusal to degrade, deprive, and imprison them at pleasure, and not to release them till they had complied. At the same time he offered two bills to the house; one against the oath *ex officio*, and the other against their illegal imprisonments; which last he prayed might be read presently. Sir Francis Knollys seconded the attorney, and said, "that in his opinion these abuses ought to be reformed; and that if the prelates had acted against law they were in a premunire."<sup>41</sup> He added, that after the reformation of king Henry VIII. no bishop practised superiority over his brethren; that in king Edward VI.'s time a statute was made, that bishops should keep their courts in the king's name; and that though this statute was repealed by queen Mary, and not since revived, yet it was doubtful what authority bishops had to keep courts in their own name, because it was manifestly against the prerogative that any subject should hold a court, without express warrant from the crown. If it was said, they kept their courts by prescription, or by the statute of king Henry VIII. which gives bishops the same rule under the king as they had under the pope, he answered, that there was a clause in the act which restrains them from offending against the king's prerogative, and the laws and customs of the realm; and according to the laws and customs of the realm, no subject can hold a court but by special warrant from the crown." Mr. Beal spoke upon the same side, and added, "that the bishops had incurred a premunire, because the statute of 13 Eliz. requires subscription to articles of faith only; that this limitation was made by the lords after the bill had passed the commons; and that no councils nor canons gave authority to the bishops to frame articles, and require subscription at their pleasure." For which speech the queen forbade him the court, and commanded him to absent himself from parliament.

These debates awakened the civilians in the house, and particularly Mr. Daulton, who opposed the reading of the bill, because the queen had often forbid them to meddle with the reformation of the church; which sir Robert Cecil, one of her majesty's secretaries, confirmed.

As soon as the queen was acquainted with the proceedings of the house she sent for the speaker Coke,<sup>42</sup> and commanded him to tell the house, "that

---

<sup>39</sup> This step of Mr. Attorney Morrice is described in more proper and happy language by Dr. Warner: who calls it, "a noble attempt in favour of religious liberty." —ED.

<sup>40</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 386, 387.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid. p. 388.

<sup>42</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 320.

it was wholly in her power to call, to determine, to assent or dissent, to any thing done in parliament; that the calling of this was only, that such as neglected the service of the church might be compelled to it with some sharp laws; and that the safety of her majesty's person and the realm might be provided for; that it was not meant that they should meddle with matters of state or causes ecclesiastical; that she wondered they should attempt a thing so contrary to her commandment; that she was highly offended at it; and that it was her royal pleasure, that no bill, touching any matters of state and causes ecclesiastical, should be there exhibited.<sup>43</sup> At the same time Mr. Attorney Morrice was seized on in the house by a serjeant at arms, discharged from his office in the court of the duchy of Lancaster, disabled from any practice in his profession as a barrister at law, and kept for some years prisoner in Tutbury-castle.

If there had been a just spirit of English liberty in the house of commons, they would not have submitted so tamely to the insults of an arbitrary court, which arrested their members for liberty of speech, and committed them to prison; which forbade their redressing the grievances of church or state, and sent for their bills out of the house and cancelled them. These were such acts of sovereign power as none of her majesty's predecessors had dared to assume, and which cost one of her successors his crown and life.

But this parliament, instead of asserting their own and the people's liberties, stands upon record for one of the severest acts of oppression and cruelty that ever was passed by the representatives of a Protestant nation, and a free people. It is entitled, "An act for the punishment of persons obstinately refusing to come to church, and persuading others to impugn the queen's authority in ecclesiastical causes." It is therein enacted, "that if any person above the age of sixteen shall obstinately refuse to repair to some church, chapel, or usual place of common prayer, to hear divine service, for the space of one month, without lawful cause; or shall at any time, forty days after the end of this session, by printing, writing, or express words, go about to persuade any of her majesty's subjects to deny, withstand, or impugn, her majesty's power or authority in causes ecclesiastical; or shall dissuade them from coming to church, to hear divine service, or receive the communion according as the law directs; or shall be present at any unlawful assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion; that every person so offending, and lawfully convicted, shall be committed to prison without bail, till they shall conform and yield themselves to come to church, and make the following declaration of their conformity:

---

<sup>43</sup> This, says Dr. Warner, "was the message of a queen to the house of commons, whose reign affords such subjects of panegyric to those who would be thought patriots, and patrons of liberty, in the present age." *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 3. p. 464. ED.—

“I A. B. do humbly confess and acknowledge, that I have grievously offended God, in contemning her majesty’s godly and lawful government and authority, by absenting myself from church, and from hearing divine service, contrary to the godly laws and statutes of the realm, and in frequenting disorderly and unlawful conventicles, under pretence and colour of exercise of religion; and I am heartily sorry for the same, and do acknowledge and testify in my conscience, that no other person has or ought to have any power or authority over her majesty. And I do promise and protest, without any dissimulation, or colour of dispensation, that from henceforth I will obey her majesty’s statutes and laws in repairing to church and hearing divine service; and to my utmost endeavour will maintain and defend the same.”

“But in case the offenders against this statute, being lawfully convicted, shall not submit and sign the declaration within three months, then they shall abjure the realm and go into perpetual banishment.<sup>44</sup> And if they do not depart within the time limited by the quarter-sessions, or justices of peace; or if they return at any time afterward without the queen’s licence, they shall suffer death without benefit of clergy.” So that, as the lord-chancellor King observed at the trial of Dr. Sacheverel, the case of the Nonconformists by this act was worse than that of felons at common law, for these were allowed the benefit of clergy, but the others were not.—This statute was levelled against the laity as well as the clergy; and the severe execution of it with that of the 23d of Eliz. in this and the following reigns,<sup>45</sup> brought infinite mischiefs upon the kingdom; many families being forced into banishment; some put to death, as in cases of treason; and others as the authors of seditious pamphlets.<sup>46</sup>

The moderate Puritans made a shift to evade the force of this law, by coming to church when common prayer was almost over, and by receiving the sacrament in some churches where it was administered with some

---

<sup>44</sup> It is remarkable, that there is a proviso in this statute, that no Popish recusant shall be compelled or bound to abjure by virtue of this act,—Such was her majesty’s tenderness for the Papists, while she was crushing Protestant dissenters. Neal’s Review.—ED.

<sup>45</sup> “These laws are still put in execution; and about three years ago in Cornwall, a poor fellow, a dissenter, was libelled in the spiritual court for not attending divine worship at his parish-church on Sunday. He had not taken the oaths required by the toleration-act; but it being a sufficient defence to take them at any time during the persecution, he applied to the magistrates of the county at their quarter-sessions, who illegally refused to administer them: the consequence was, that he was excommunicated.—Upon a representation of the committee in London for taking care of the civil concerns of the dissenters, the chairman of the sessions acknowledged the error of the justices, and the man took the oaths at the ensuing sessions, but it was then too late.” High Church Politics, p. 69.—ED.

<sup>46</sup> Dr. Warner remarks on this statute, “that thus in some measure were renewed the days of Henry VIII.; when it was a crime against the state to depart ever so little from the religion of the sovereign; but in some part of this act, she exceeded her father’s tyranny. For absolute as he was, he contented himself with punishing such as opposed the established religion by some overt act. But by this new statute, the subjects were obliged to make an open profession by a constant attendance on the established service.” Eccles. History, vol. 2. p. 465.—ED.

latitude; but the weight of it fell upon the separatists, who renounced all communion with the church in the word and sacraments as well as in the common prayer and ceremonies; these were called Brownists or Barrowists, from one Barrow a gentleman of the Temple, who was now at their head. We have given an account of their distinguishing principles in the year 1580, since which time their numbers were prodigiously increased, though the bishops pursued them, and shut them up in prison without bail, or troubling themselves to bring them to a trial. Sir Walter Raleigh declared in the parliament-house, that they were not less than twenty thousand, divided into several congregations in Norfolk, in Essex, and in the parts about London: there were several considerable men now at their head, as the reverend Mr. Smith, Mr. Jacob, the learned Mr. Ainsworth, the rabbi of his age, and others.

The congregation about London, being pretty numerous, formed themselves into a church, Mr. Francis Johnson being chosen pastor by the suffrage of the brotherhood, Mr. Greenhood doctor [or teacher], Mr. Bowman and Lee deacons, Mr. Studley and Kinaston elders, all in one day, at the house of Mr. Fox in Nicholas-lane in the year 1592,<sup>47</sup> seven persons were baptized at the same time without godfathers or godmothers, Mr. Johnson only washing their faces with water, and pronouncing the form, I baptize thee in the name, &c. The Lord's supper was also administered in this manner; five white loaves being set upon the table, the pastor blessed them by prayer, after which, having broken the bread, he delivered it to some, and the deacons to the rest, some standing and others sitting about the table, using the words of the apostle, 1 Cor. xi. 24. "Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Jesus, which was broken for you: this do in remembrance of him." In like manner he gave the cup, using the like words of the apostle, "This cup is the New Testament in his blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of him." In the close they sung a hymn, and made a collection for the poor. When any person came first into the church, he made this protestation or promise, that "he would walk with them so long as they did walk in the way of the Lord, and as far as might be warranted by the word of God."

The congregation being obliged to meet in different places to conceal themselves from the bishop's officers, was at length discovered on a Lord's day at Islington, in the very same place where the Protestant congregation met in queen Mary's reign; about fifty-six were taken prisoners, and sent two by two to the jails about London, where several of their friends had been confined for a considerable time.

At their examination they confessed, that for some years they had met in the fields in the summer-time at five o'clock in the morning of the Lord's

---

<sup>47</sup> Strype's Annals. vol. 4. p. 174.



day, and in the winter at private houses;<sup>48</sup> that they continued all day in prayer and expounding the Scriptures; that they dined together, and after dinner made a collection for their diet, and sent the remainder of the money to their brethren in prison; that they did not use the Lord's prayer, apprehending it not to be intended by our blessed Saviour to be used as a form after the sending down of the Spirit at Pentecost. Their adversaries charged them with several extravagances about baptism, marriage, lay-preaching, &c. from which they vindicated themselves in a very solid and judicious reply, showing how far they disowned, and with what limitations they acknowledged, the charge.<sup>49</sup>

But the bishops observing no measures with this people, they ventured to lay their case before the lords of the council in an humble petition.<sup>50</sup> But

---

<sup>48</sup> Strype's Ann. vol. 3. p. 579.

<sup>49</sup> MS. p. 850.

<sup>50</sup> In this petition they say, that "upon a careful examination of the Holy Scriptures, we find the English hierarchy to be dissonant from Christ's institution, and to be derived from antichrist, being the same the pope left in this land, to which we dare not subject ourselves.—We farther find, that God has commanded all that believe the gospel to walk in that holy faith and order which he has appointed in his church; wherefore in the reverend fear of his name we have joined ourselves together, and subjected our souls and bodies to those laws and ordinances; and have chosen to ourselves such a ministry of pastor, teacher, elders, and deacons, as Christ has given to his church on earth to the world's end, hoping for the promised assistance of his grace in our attendance upon him; notwithstanding any prohibition of men, or what by men can be done unto us.—We are ready to prove our church-order to be warranted by the word of God, allowable by her majesty's laws, and no ways prejudicial to her sovereign power; and to disprove the public hierarchy, worship, and government, by such evidence of Scripture, as our adversaries shall not be able to withstand; protesting, if we fail herein, not only willingly to sustain such deserved punishment as shall be inflicted upon us, but to become conformable for the future; if we overthrow not our adversaries, we will not say if our adversaries overcome us.

"But the prelates of this land have for a long time dealt most injuriously, unlawfully, and outrageously, with us, by the great power and high authority they have gotten in their hands, and usurped above all the public courts, judges, laws, and charters, of this land, persecuting, imprisoning, and detaining, at their pleasure our poor bodies, without any trial, release, or bail; and hitherto without any cause either for error or crime directly objected.—Some of us they have kept in close prison four or five years with miserable usage, as Henry Burrowe and John Greenwood now in the Fleet; others they have cast into Newgate, and laden with as many irons as they could bear; others into dangerous and loathsome jails, among the most facinorous [atrociously wicked] and vile persons, where it is lamentable to relate how many of these innocents have perished within these five years; aged widows, aged men, and young maidens, &c. where, so many as the infection hath spared, lie in woeful distress, like to follow their fellows, if speedy redress be not had; others of us have been grievously beaten with cudgels in Bridewell; and cast into a place called Little Ease, for refusing to come to their chapel-service; in which prison several have ended their lives; but upon none of our companions thus committed by them, and dying in their prison, is any search or inquest suffered to pass, as by law in like case is provided.

the privy council dropped the petition, being afraid to move in an affair that lay more immediately before the high-commission.

Mr. Smith, one of their ministers, after he had been in prison twelve months, was called before the commissioners, and being asked whether he would go to church, answered, that he should dissemble and play the hypocrite if he should do it to avoid trouble, for he thought it utterly unlawful; to which one of the commissioners answered, "Come to church and obey the queen's laws, and be a dissembler, be a hypocrite, or a devil, if thou wilt."<sup>51</sup> Upon his refusal he was remanded to the Clink, and his brethren to the Fleet, where by order of Mr. Justice Young, one of the commissioners, they were shut up in close rooms, not being allowed the liberty of the prison; here they died like rotten sheep, some of the disease of the prison, some for want, and others of infectious distempers. "These bloody men [the ecclesiastical commissioners] (says Mr. Barrowe) in his supplication, will allow us neither meat, drink, fire, lodging, nor suffer any whose hearts the Lord would stir up for our relief, to have an access to us, by which means seventeen or eighteen

---

"Their manner of pursuing and apprehending us is with no less violence and outrage; their pursuivants, with their assistants, break into our houses at all times of the night, where they break open, ransack, and rifle, at their pleasure, under pretence of searching for seditions and unlawful books. The husbands in the deep of the night they have plucked oat of their beds from their wives, and haled them to prison.—Some time since their pursuivants, late in the night, entered in the queen's name, into an honest citizen's house upon Ludgate-hill, where, after they had at their pleasure searched and ransacked all places, chests, &c. of the house, they apprehended two of our ministers, Mr. Francis Johnson and John Greenwood, without any warrant at all, both whom, between one and two of the clock after midnight, they with bills and staves led to the counter of Wood-street, taking assurance of Mr. Boys, the master of the house, to be prisoner in his house till next day; at which time the archbishop, with certain doctors his associates, committed them to close prison, two to the Clink, and the third to the Fleet, where they now remain in distress. Since this they have cast into prison Thomas Settle, Daniel Studley, and Nicholas Lane, taken upon a Lord's day in our assembly, and shut them up in the Gate-house; others of our friends they are in continual pursuit of; so that there is no safety for them in any one place.

"We therefore humbly pray, in the name of God, and our sovereign the queen, that we may have the benefit of the laws, and of the public charter of the land, namely, that we may be received to bail till we be by order of law convicted of some crime deserving bonds. We plight unto your honours our faith unto God, and our allegiance to her majesty, that we will not commit any thing unworthy the gospel of Christ, or to the disturbance of the common peace and good order of the land, and that we will be forthcoming at such reasonable warning as your lordships shall command. Oh! let us not perish before trial and judgment, especially imploring and crying out to you for the same.—However, we here take the Lord of heaven and earth, and his angels, together with your own consciences, and all persons in all ages, to whom this our supplication may come, to witness that we have here truly advertised your honours of our case and usage, and have in all humility offered our cause to Christian trial."

<sup>51</sup> *Strype's Ann.* vol. ult. p 134.

have perished in the noisome jails within these six years;<sup>52</sup> some of us had not one penny about us when we were sent to prison, nor any thing to procure a maintenance for ourselves and families but our handy labour and trades, by which means not only we ourselves, but our families and children, are undone and starved. Their unbridled slander; their lawless privy searches; their violent breaking open houses; their taking away whatever they think meet; and their barbarous usage of women, children, &c. we are forced to omit lest we be tedious. That which we crave for us all, is the liberty to die openly, or live openly in the land of our nativity; if we deserve death let us not be closely murdered, yea, starved to death with hunger and cold, and stifled in loathsome dungeons.”—Among those who perished in prison was one Mr. Roger Rippon, who dying in Newgate, his fellow-prisoners put this inscription upon his coffin: “This is the corpse of Roger Rippon, a servant of Christ, and her majesty’s faithful subject; who is the last of sixteen or seventeen which that great enemy of God, the archbishop of Canterbury, with his high commissioners, have murdered in Newgate within these five years, manifestly for the testimony of Jesus Christ; his soul is now with the Lord, and his blood cried for speedy vengeance against that great enemy of the saints, and against Mr. Richard Young [a justice of peace in London], who in this and many the like points hath abused his power for the upholding of the Romish antichrist, prelacy, and priesthood. He died A. D. 1592.”<sup>53</sup>

Many copies of this inscription were dispersed among friends, for which some were apprehended and confined.

The privy council taking no notice of the above-mentioned supplications, the prisoners in the several jails about London, joined in the petition<sup>54</sup> given below, to the lord-treasurer Burleigh, to which they subscribed their names.

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. vol. ult. p. 133.

<sup>53</sup> Strype’s Annals, vol. ult. p. 91.

<sup>54</sup> The humble petition of many poor Christians, imprisoned by the bishops in sundry prisons in and about London, to the lord-treasurer.

“We humbly beseech your honour, either to grant us a speedy trial together, or some free Christian conference, or else in the meanwhile, that we may be bailed according to law; or else put into Bridewell, or some other convenient place, where we may be together for our mutual help and comfort; or if your honour will not yourself alone grant this our request, that then it may please you to be a mean for our speedy relief, unto the rest of her majesty’s most honourable privy council.

“The Almighty God, that hath preserved your lordship unto these honourable years in so high service to our sovereign prince, and to the unspeakable comfort of this whole land, give your honourable heart so tender compassion and careful consideration in equity, of the poor afflicted servants of Christ, and that (before the Lord plead against this land for Abel’s innocent blood that is shed in the several prisons) your honour may open your mouth for the dumb in the cause of the children of [devoted to] destruction [that], you may open your mouth and judge righteously, and judge the cause of the afflicted; as the people of Israel when they went to war in first made peace with God, and removed all occasion whereby his

---

wrath might be incensed, lest he should fight against them in battle. For if this suppression of the truth, and oppression of Christ in his members, contrary to all law and justice, be without restraint prosecuted by the enemy in the land; then not only the persecuted shall daily cry from under the altar for redress, but God's wrath be so kindled for the shedding the innocent blood of men, even the blood of his own servants (of whom he has said, "Touch not mine anointed"), that if Noah, Daniel, and Job, should pray for this people, yet should they not deliver them.

"Pleaseth it then your lordship to understand, that we her majesty's loyal, dutiful, and true-hearted subjects, to the number of threescore persons and upwards, have, contrary to all law and equity, been imprisoned, separated from our trades, wives, children, and families; yea, shut up close prisoners from all comfort, many of us the space of two years and a half, upon the bishop's sole commandment, in great penury and noisomeness of the prisons; many ending their lives, never called to trial; some baled forth to the sessions; some cast in irons and dungeons; some in hanger and famine: all of us debarred from any lawful audience before our honourable governors and magistrates, and from all benefit and help of the laws; daily defamed and falsely accused by published pamphlets, by private suggestions, open preaching, slanders, and accusations of heresy, sedition, schism, and what not. And above all, which most utterly toucheth our salvation, they keep us from all spiritual comfort and edifying by doctrine, prayer, or mutual conference, &c.

"And seeing for our conscience only we are deprived of all comfort, we most humbly beseech your good lordship, that some more mitigate and peaceable course might be taken therein, that some free and Christian conference publicly or privately before your honour, or before whom it would please you, where our adversaries may not be our judges [might be had]; that our case, with the reason and proof on both sides, might be recorded by indifferent notaries and faithful witnesses: and if anything be found in us worthy of death or bonds, let us be made an example to all posterity; if not, we entreat for some compassion to be shown in equity according to law for our relief; [and] that in the meantime we may be bailed to do her majesty service, walk in our callings, to provide things needful for ourselves, our poor wives, disconsolate children, and families, lying upon us, or else that we might be prisoners together in Bridewell, or any other convenient place at your honour's appointment, where we might provide such relief by our diligence and labours as might preserve life, to the comfort both of our souls and bodies."

Signed by your supplicants in the following prisons:

Andrew Smith,

In the Gate-house.

John Gaulter, John Nicolas, John Barnes, John Crawford, Thomas Conadync, Thomas Reeve, William Dodshowe, Father Debnam, Edmund Thompson, Thomas Freeman.

In the Fleet.

Henry Barrowe, John Greenwoods Daniel Studley, Robert Badkyne, Walter Lane.

In Newgale.

William Deptford, Widow Borrough, Roger Watcrer.

In Bridewell.

William Broomal, James Forrester, Antony Claxton, Nicholas Lee, Jolin Francis, William Forester, John Clarke, John Fisher, John Bucer, Roger Rippon, Robert Andrews, Richard Skarlet, Luke Hayes, Richard Maltusse, Richard Lmberfield William Fowler, William Burl, William Hutton. William Black borrow, Thomas Lemare, Christopher Raper, . Quintin Smith.

In the White-Lion.

Thomas Legat, ' Edmund Marsh, Antony Johnes,— Cook,— Auger,

Among the names subscribed to this petition is Mr. Henry Barrowe, an ingenious and learned man, but of too warm a spirit, as appears by his book, entitled, “A brief discovery of false churches,” printed 1590, and reprinted 1707. This gentleman having been several years in prison, sent another supplication to the attorney-general and privy council for a conference with the bishops, or that their ministers might be conferred with in their hearing, without taunts or railings, for searching out the truth in love: “If it be objected [says Barrowe] that none of our side are worthy to be thus disputed with, we think we should prove the contrary, for there are three or four of them in the city of London; and more elsewhere, who have been zealous preachers in the parish-assemblies, and are not ignorant of the Latin; Greek, and Hebrew tongues, nor otherwise unlearned, and generally confessed to be of honest conversation. If this motion takes effect, the controversy will soon end with most of us, for by this means we poor wretches shall perceive, whether as simple souls we are led aside; or whether, as the dear children of God, we are first trusted with the view of, and standing up for, the cause of holiness and righteousness. But let us not perish secretly in prison, or openly by execution, for want of that help that lies in your power to afford; When we

---

In the Clink.

George Collier, John Sparrow, Edmund Nicolson, Christopher Browne, Thomas Mitchel,

Wood-street Compter

George Snells, Christopher Bowman, Robert Jackson,

Poultry Compter.

Rowlet Skipwith, George Kingston, Thomas Eyneworth, Richard Hayward, John Lancaster,

In all fifty-nine

Prisoners deceased:—

Out of the Poultry Compter.

John Chandler.

Out of Wood-street Compter.

George Dinghtie.

Out of the Clink:

Henry Thompson; Jerome Studley.

Out of Newgate:

Richard Jackson;

Widow Mainard,

Widow Row;

Nicholas Crane,

Thomas Stephens.

Out of Bridewell.

John Pardy

In all ten.

protest in the sight of God, we do not separate from the establishment out of pride or obstinacy, but from the constraints of conscience.”

But all these petitions were rejected by the bishops and privy council for the following reasons, if they deserve that name; “Because a disputation had been denied to Papists: To call the ministry of the church of England into question; is to call all other churches into question, against whom their exceptions extend.<sup>55</sup> The church of England has submitted to disputation three times in king Edward’s, queen Mary’s, and queen Elizabeth’s time: These men’s errors have been condemned by the writings of learned men: It is not reasonable that a religion established by parliament should be examined by an inferior authority: It is not reasonable to condemn those foreign churches that have acknowledged ours for a true church: Their principal errors have been confuted by St. Austin: This will strengthen the hands of the Papists: It has been the manner of heretics to require disputations with clamour and importunity: The cause has been already decided by written books which they may consult: They will not stand to the judgment of the civil magistrate: If the church should satisfy every sect that riseth, there would be no end of disputations.” Thus these pious and conscientious persons, after a long and illegal imprisonment, were abandoned to the severity of an unrighteous law; some of them being publicly executed as felons, and others proscribed and sent into banishment;

Among the former were, Mr. Barrowe, gent, of Gray’s Inn, Mr. Greenwood and Penry ministers; the two first had been in prison some years, and several times before the commissioners; their examinations, written by themselves, are now before me. Barrowe was apprehended at the Clink-prison in Southwark, where he went to visit his brother Greenwood; he was carried immediately to Lambeth, where the archbishop would have examined him upon the oath *ex officio*, but he refused to take it, or to swear at all upon the Bible; but, says he, by God’s grace I will answer nothing but the truth. So the archbishop took a paper of interrogatories into his hand, and asked him, 1. “Whether the Lord’s prayer might be used in the church?” He answered, that in his opinion it was rather a summary than a form, and not finding it used by the apostles, he thought it should not be constantly used by us. 2. Whether forms of prayer may be used in the church? He answered, that none such ought to be imposed. 3. Whether the common prayer be idolatrous or superstitious? He answered, that in his opinion it was so. 4. Whether the sacraments of the church are true sacraments and seals of the favour of God? He answered, he thought as they were publicly administered they were not. 5. Whether the laws of the church are good? He answered, that many of them were unlawful and antichristian. 6. Whether the church of England is a true

---

<sup>55</sup> Strype’s Annals, vol. ult, p. 172.

church? He answered, that as it was now formed it was not; yet that there are many excellent good Christians of it. 7. Whether the queen be supreme governor of the church, and may make laws for it? He answered, that the queen was supreme governor of the church, but might not make laws other than Christ had left in his word. 8. Whether a private person may reform if the prince neglects it? He answered, that no private persons might reform the state, but they are to abstain from any unlawful thing commanded by the prince; 9. Whether every particular church ought to have a presbytery? He answered in the affirmative. After this examination he was remanded to close prison, and denied a Copy of his answers, though he earnestly desired it;

His next examination was before the archbishop, the lord-Chancellor, lord-treasurer, lord Buckhurst, and the bishop of London, at Whitehall, where he found twelve of his brethren in the same circumstances with himself, but was not admitted to speak to them. Being called into another room, and kneeling down at the end of the table, the lord-treasurer spoke to him thus.—Treas. Why are you in prison?—Barrowe. Upon the statute against recusants.—Treasurer. Why will you not go to church?—Barrowe. Because I think the church of England as established by law not a church of Christ, nor their manner of worship lawful.—After a long debate on this head the treasurer said, You complain of injustice, where have you wrong?—Barrowe. In being kept in prison without due trial; and in the misery we suffer by a close imprisonment contrary to law.—The archbishop said, he had matter to call him before him for a heretic.—Barrowe replied, That you shall never do, I may err, but heretic by the grace of God I will never be.—It being observed that he did not pay such reverence to the archbishop and bishop of London as to the temporal lords, the chancellor asked him, if he did not know those two men, pointing to the bishops. To which he answered, that he had cause to know them, but did not own them for lord-bishops.—Being then asked by what name he would call the archbishop; he replied, that he was a monster, a persecutor, a compound of he knew not what, neither ecclesiastical nor civil, like the second beast spoken of in the Revelations; upon which the archbishop rose out of his place, and with a severe countenance said. My lords, will you suffer him?—So he was plucked off his knees, and carried away.

Mr. Greenwood the minister was examined after the same manner before the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of London and Winchester, the lords-chief-justices, the lord-chief-baron, and the master of the rolls: he had interrogatories put to him as Barrowe had, but refused to swear, and made much the same answer with the other. At length, on March 21, 1592, they, together with Saxio Bellot, gent. Daniel Studley, girdler, and Robert Bowlie, fishmonger, were indicted at the sessions-house in the Old Bailey, upon the statute of 23 Eliz. for writing and publishing sundry seditious books and

pamphlets, tending to the slander of the queen and government; when they had only written against the church; but this was the archbishop's artful contrivance, to throw off the odium of their death from himself to the civil magistrate; for, as the reverend and learned Mr. Hugh Broughton observes, "though Mr. Barrowe and Greenwood were condemned for disturbance of the state; yet this would have been pardoned, and their lives spared, if they would have promised to come to church."<sup>56</sup> Upon their trial they behaved with constancy and resolution, showing no token of recognition, says the attorney, nor prayer for mercy: they protested their inviolable loyalty to the queen, and obedience to her government; that they never wrote, nor so much as intended anything, against her highness, but only against the bishops and the hierarchy of the church; which was apparent enough. However, the jury brought them all in guilty.<sup>57</sup> Bellot desired a conference, and with tears confessing his sorrow for what he had done, was pardoned. Bowlle and Studley being looked upon only as accessories, though they continued firm, declaring their unshaken loyalty to the queen, and refusing to ask for mercy, were reprieved, and sent back to prison; but Barrowe and Greenwood were to be made examples. Sentence of death being passed upon them March 23, sundry divines were appointed to persuade them to recant; who not succeeding, they were brought in a cart to Tyburn on the last of March, and exposed under the gallows for some time to the people, to see if the terrors of death would affright them; but remaining constant, they were brought back to Newgate, and on the 6th of April, 1593, carried a second time to Tyburn and executed. At the place of execution they gave such testimonies of their unfeigned piety towards God, and loyalty to the queen, praying so earnestly for her long and prosperous reign, that when Dr. Reynolds, who attended them, reported their behaviour to her majesty, she repented that she had yielded to their death.

They had been in close prison ever since the year 1590, exposed to all the severities of cold, hunger, and nakedness, which Mr. Barrowe represented in a supplication to the queen, already mentioned, concluding with an earnest desire of deliverance from the present miseries, though it were by death; but the archbishop intercepted the paper, and endeavoured to prevent the knowledge of their condition from coming to the queen's ear: upon this Mr. Barrowe exposed his grace's behaviour towards miserable men, in a letter to one Mr. Fisher, wherein he charges him "with abusing the queen's clemency by false informations and suggestions; and with artful disingenuity, in committing so many innocent men to Bridewell, the Compter, Newgate, the White Lion, and the Fleet, and then posting them to the civil magistrate to take off the clamour of the people from himself. He says, that he

---

<sup>56</sup> Broughton's Works, p. 731.

<sup>57</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 323.



had destined himself and his brother Greenwood to death, and others to be kept in close prison; their poor wives and children to be cast out of the city, and their goods to be confiscated. Is not this a Christian bishop? (says he.) Are these the virtues of him who takes upon him the care and government of all the churches of the land, to tear and devour God's poor sheep, and to rend off the flesh and break their bones, and chop them in pieces as flesh to the cauldron?<sup>58</sup> Will he thus instruct and convince gainsayers? Surely he will persuade but few that fear God to his religion, by his dealing and evil. Does he consult his own credit, or the honour of his prince, by this tyrannous havoc? For our parts, our lives are not dear to us, so that we may finish our testimony with joy: we are always ready, through God's grace, to be offered up upon the testimony of the faith that we have made."

Thus fell these two unhappy gentlemen a sacrifice to the resentments of an angry prelate.

About six weeks after this, the reverend Mr. John Penry or Ap-Henry, a Welsh divine, was executed for the same crime, in a cruel and inhuman manner. He was a pious and learned man, well disposed to religion, says Mr. Strype, but mistaken in his principles, and hot in his temper; a zealous platformer, and a declared enemy of the archbishop. He was born in the county of Brecknock, and educated first at Cambridge, and afterward in St. Alban's hall, Oxford, where he became M. A. 1586, and entered into holy orders, being well acquainted with arts and languages. He preached in both universities with applause, and afterward travelling into Wales, was the first, as he said, that preached the gospel publicly to the Welsh, and sowed the good seed among his countrymen. In the year 1518, he published a "View of such public wants and disorders as are in her majesty's country of Wales, with an humble petition to the high court of parliament for their redress:" wherein is showed not only the necessity of reforming the state of religion among that people, but also the only way in regard of substance to bring that reformation to pass. He also published "An exhortation to the governors and people of her majesty's country of Wales, to labour earnestly to have the preaching of the gospel planted among them." Printed 1588.

When Martin Mar-Prelate, and the other satirical pamphlets against the bishops were published, a special warrant was issued from the privy council 1590, under several of their hands, whereof the archbishop's was one, to seize and apprehend Mr. Penry, as an enemy of the state; and that all the queen's good subjects should take him so to be. To avoid being taken he retired into Scotland, where he continued till the year 1593. Here he made many observations of things relating to religion, for his own private use; and

---

<sup>58</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 416.

at length prepared the heads of a petition,<sup>59</sup> or an address to the queen, to show her majesty the true state of religion, and how ignorant she was of many

---

<sup>59</sup> The heads of the petition, taken upon him, were as follow: “The last days of your reign are turned rather against Jesus Christ and his gospel, than to the maintenance of the same.

“I have great cause and complaint, madam; nay, the Lord and his church have Cause to complain of your government, because we your subjects, this day, are not permitted to serve our God under your government according to his word, but aro sold to be bondslaves, not only to our affections, to do what we will, so that wo keep ourselves within the compass of established civil laws, but also to be servants to the nan of sin [the pope] and bis ordinances.

“It is not the force that we seem to fear that will come upon us (for the Lord may destroy both you for denying, and us for slack seeking, of bis will) by strangers: I come unto you with it: if you will hear it, our cause may be eased; if not, that posterity may know that you have been dealt with, and that this age may know that there is no expectation [hope] to be looked for at your hands.

“Among the rest of the princes under the gospel, that have been drawn to oppose it, you must think yourself to' be one; for until you see this, madam, you see not yourself, and they are but 'sycophants and flatterers whoever tell you otherwise: your standing is and has been by the gospel. It is little beholden to you for any tiling that appears. The practice of your government shews, that if you could have ruled without the gospel, it would have been doubtful whether the gospel should be established or not; for now that you are established in your throne by the gospel, yon suffer it to reach no farther than the end of your sceptre limiteth unto it.

“If we had had queen Mary's days, I think that we should have had as flourishing a church this day as ever any; for it is well known that there was then in London, under the burden, and elsewhere in exile, more flourishing churches than any now tolerated by your authority. .

“ Now whereas we should have your help, both to join ourselves with the true church, and reject the false, and all the ordinances thereof; we are in your kingdom permitted to do nothing, but accounted seditious if we affirm either the one or the other of the former points; and therefore, madam, you are not so much an adversary to us poor men, as unto Christ Jesus and the wealth of his kingdom.

“ If we cannot have your favour, but by omitting our duty to God, we are unworthy of it, and by God's grace we mean not to purchase it so dear.

“ But, madam, thus much we must needs say, that in al! likelihood, if the days of your sister queen Mary, and her persecution, bad continued unto this day, that the church of God in England had been far more flourishing than at this day it is; for then, madam, the church of God within this land, and elsewhere, being strangers enjoyed the ordinances of God's holy word, as far as then they saw.

“But since your majesty came unto your crown, we have had whole Christ Jesus, God and man; but we must serve him only in heart.

“And if those days had continued to this time, and those lights risen therein, which by the mercy of God have since shined in England, it is not to be doubted but the church of England, even in England, had far surpassed all the reformed churches in the world.

“Then, madam, any of our brethren durst not have been seen within the tents of antichrist; now they are ready to defend them to be the Lord's, and that he has no other tabernacle upon earth but them. Our brethren then durst not temporize in the cause of God, because the Lord himself ruled in his church, by his own law s, in a good measure; but now, behold! they may do what they will, for any sword that the church has to draw against them, if they contain themselves within your laws.

abuses in the church of England, especially in the management of ecclesiastical matters; and likewise to intercede for so much favour, that he might, by her authority, have liberty to go into Wales, his native country, to preach the gospel.<sup>60</sup> With the petition he came from Scotland, resolving to finish and deliver it with his own hand, as he should find opportunity; but upon his arrival he was seized with his papers in Stepney- parish, by the information of the vicar, in the month of May, and arraigned, condemned, and executed, hastily, the very same month.

It appears by this petition, as well as by his letter sent to the congregation of Separatists in London, that Mr. Penry was a Brownist. His book of observations was also seized, out of which were drawn articles of accusation against him. He was indicted upon the statute of the 23d of Eliz. chap. 2. for seditious words and rumours uttered against the queen's most excellent majesty, tending to the stirring up of rebellion among her subjects; and was convicted of felony, May 21, in the King's bench, before the lord-chief-justice Popham. He received sentence of death May 25, and was executed on the 29th of the same month. It was designed to indict him for the books published in his name; but by the advice of counsel, Mr. Penry drew up a paper, entitled, "Mr. Penry's declaration, May 16, 1593, that he is not in danger of the law for the books published in his name."<sup>61</sup> Here he observes, that the statute was not intended against such as wrote only against the hierarchy of the church; for then it must condemn many of the most learned Protestants both at home, and abroad; but relates to such as defame her majesty's royal person: whereas he had always written most dutifully of her person and

---

"This peace, under these conditions, we cannot enjoy; and therefore, for any thing I can see, queen Mary's days will be set up again, or we must needs temporize. The whole truth we must not speak; the whole truth we must not profess. Your state must have a stroke above the truth of God.

"Now, madam, your majesty may consider what good the church of God hath taken at your hands, even outward peace with the absence of Jesus Christ in his ordinance; otherwise as great troubles are likely to come as ever were in the days of your sister.

"As for the council and clergy, if we bring any such suit unto them, we have no other answer but that, which Pharaoh gives to the Lord's messengers, touching the state of the church under his government.

"For when any are called for this cause before your council, or the judges of the land, they must take this for granted, once for all, that the uprightness of their cause will profit them nothing, if the law of the land be against them; for your council and judges have so well profited in religion, that they will not stick to say, that they come not to consult whether the matter be with. or against the word or not, but their purpose is to lake the penalty of the transgressions against your laws if your council were wise, they would not kindle your wrath against us; but, madam, if you give ear to their words, no marvel though you have no better counsellors."

<sup>60</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 409.

<sup>61</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 412.

government, having never encouraged sedition or insurrection against her majesty, but the contrary; nor had he ever been at any assembly or conventicle, where any, under or above the number of twelve, were assembled with force of arms, or otherwise, to alter any thing established by law: nor was it his opinion that private persons should of their own authority, attempt any such thing; for he had always written and spoken to the contrary. But however, if all this had been true, he ought to have been accused within one month of the crime, upon the oath of two witnesses, and have been indicted within one year; otherwise the statute itself clears him in express words.

The court apprehending this declaration might occasion an argument at law, set aside his printed books, and convicted him upon the petition and private observations above, mentioned, which was still harder, as he represented it himself in the following letter to the lord-treasurer, with a protestation enclosed, immediately after his condemnation.—

“Vouchsafe, I beseech your lordship (right honourable), to read the enclosed writing. My days, I see, are drawing to an end, and I thank God an undeserved end, except the Lord stir up your honour to acquaint her majesty with my guiltless state.

“The cause is most lamentable, that the private observations of any student being in a foreign land, and wishing well to his prince and country, should bring his life with blood to a violent end; especially seeing they are most private and so imperfect, as they have no coherence at all in them, and in most places carry no true English—

“Though my innocence may stand me in no stead before an earthly tribunal, yet I know that I shall have the reward thereof before the judgment-seat of the great King; and the merciful Lord, who relieves the widow and fatherless, will reward my desolate orphans and friendless widow that I leave behind me, and even hear their cry, for he is merciful.

“Being like to trouble your lordship with no more letters, I do with thankfulness acknowledge your honour’s favour in receiving the writings I have presumed to send to you from time to time; and in this my last, I protest I have written nothing but the truth from time to time.

“Thus preparing myself, not so much for an unjust verdict, and an undeserved doom in this life, as unto that blessed crown of glory, which of the great mercy of my God is ready for me in heaven, I humbly betake your lordship unto the hands of the just Lord. May 22, 1593. Your lordship’s most humble in the Lord,

“JOHN PENRY.”

In the protestation enclosed in this letter he declares, that he wrote his observations in Scotland; that they were the sum of certain objections made by people in those parts against her majesty and her government, which he intended to examine, but had not so much as looked into them for fourteen

or fifteen months past; that even in these writings so imperfect, unfinished, and enclosed within his private study, he had shown his dutifulness to the queen, nor had he ever a secret wandering thought of the least disloyalty to her majesty: “I thank the Lord (says he) I remember not, that that day has passed over my head, since under her government I came to the knowledge of the truth, wherein I have not commended her estate unto God. Well, I may be indicted and condemned, and end my days as a felon or a traitor against my natural sovereign, but heaven and earth shall not be able to convict me thereof. Whensoever an end of my days comes (as I look not to live this week to an end) I shall die queen Elizabeth’s most faithful subject, even in the consciences of mine enemies, if they will be beholders thereof.”<sup>62</sup>

“I never took myself for a rebuker, much less for a reformer of states and kingdoms; far was that from me; yet in the discharge of my conscience all the world must bear with me, if I prefer my testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ before the favour of any creature. An enemy, to good order and policy either in the church or Commonwealth was I never. I never did anything in this cause (Lord! thou art witness) for contention, vain-glory, or to draw disciples after me.—Great things in this life I never sought for; sufficiency I have had with great outward trouble; but most content I was with my lot; and content I am and shall be with my untimely death, though I leave behind me a friendless widow and four infants, the eldest of which is not above four years old. I do from my heart forgive all that seek my life; and if my death can procure any quietness to the church of God or the state, I shall rejoice. May my prince have many such subjects, but may none of them meet with such a reward! my earnest request is, that her majesty may be acquainted with these things before my death, or at least after my departure.

“Subscribed with the heart and hand that never devised or wrote anything to the discredit or defamation of my sovereign queen Elizabeth: I take it on my death, as I hope to have a life after this, by me,

“JOHN PENRY.”

It was never known before this time, that a minister and a scholar was condemned to death for private papers found in his study; nor do I remember more than once since that time, in whose case it was given for law, that *scribere cst agere*, that to write has been construed an overt act; but Penry must die right or wrong; the archbishop was the first man who signed the warrant for his execution, and after him Puckering and Popham. The warrant was sent immediately to the sheriff, who the very same day erected a gallows at St. Thomas Waterings; and while the prisoner was at dinner sent his officers to bid him make ready, for he must die that afternoon; accordingly he was carried in a cart to the place of execution; when he came thither the sheriff

---

<sup>62</sup> Life of Whitgift, in Rec. p. 176.

would not suffer him to speak to the people, nor make any profession of his faith towards God, or his loyalty to the queen, but ordered him to be turned off in a hurry about five of the clock in the evening, May 29, 1593, in the thirtyfourth year of his age.

The court being struck with this behaviour of the Brownists, began to be ashamed of hanging men for sedition against the state, who died with such strong professions of loyalty to the queen and government, and therefore could suffer only for the cause of religion. This raised an odium against the bishops and the high commissioners, who, all men knew, were at the bottom of these proceedings. It is said the queen herself was displeased with them when she heard of the devotion and loyalty of the sufferers. It was therefore resolved to proceed for the future on the late statute of the 31st Eliz. to retain the queen's subjects in their obedience; and instead of putting the Brownists to death, to send them into banishment. Upon this statute, Mr. Johnston, pastor of the Brownist church, was convicted, and all the jails were cleared for the present; though the commissioners took care within the compass of another year to fill them again.

The Papists were distressed by this statute, and that of 23 Eliz. as much as the Brownists, though they met with much more favour from the ecclesiastical courts; the queen either loved or feared them, and would often say, she would never ransack their consciences if they would be quiet; but they were always libelling her majesty, and in continual plots against her government. While the queen of Scots was alive, they supported her pretensions to the crown, and after her death they maintained in print the title of the Infanta of Spain: they were concerned with the Spaniards in the invasion of 1588, which obliged the queen to confine some of their chiefs in Wisbeach castle, and other places of safety, but she was tender of their lives. In the first eleven years of her reign, not one Roman Catholic was prosecuted capitally for religion; in the next ten years, when the pope had excommunicated the queen and the whole kingdom, and there had been dangerous rebellions in the north, there were only twelve priests executed, and most of them for matters against the state. In the ten following years, when swarms of priests and Jesuits came over from foreign seminaries, to invite the Catholics to join with the Spaniards, the laws were girt closer upon them, fifty priests being executed, and fifty-five banished; but as soon as the danger was over, the laws were relaxed, and by reason of the ignorance and laziness of the beneficed clergy, the missionaries gained over such numbers of proselytes in the latter end of this reign, as endangered the whole government and reformation in the beginning of the next,

The last and finishing hand was put to the Presbyterian discipline in Scotland this year [1544]. That kingdom had been governed by different factions during the minority of king James, which prevented a full settlement of

religion. The general assembly in the year 1566, had approved of the Geneva discipline; but the parliament did not confirm the votes of the assembly, nor formally deprive the bishops of their power, though all church-affairs from that time were managed by presbyteries and general assemblies. In the year 1574, they voted the bishops to be only pastors of one Parish; and to show their power, they deposed the bishop of Dunkeld, and delated the bishop of Glasgow. In the year 1577, they ordained that all bishops be called by their own names; and the next year voted the very name of a bishop a grievance. In the year 1580, the general assembly with one voice declared diocesan episcopacy to be unscriptural and unlawful. The same year king James with his family, and the whole nation, subscribed a confession of faith, with a solemn league and covenant annexed, obliging themselves to maintain and defend the Protestant doctrine and the Presbyterian government. After this, in the year 1584, the bishops were restored by parliament to some parts of their ancient dignity;<sup>63</sup> and it was made treason for any man to procure the innovation or diminution of the power and authority of any of the three estates; but when this act was proclaimed, the ministers protested against it, as not having been agreed to by the kirk. In the year 1587, things took another turn, and his majesty being at the full age of twenty-one, consented to an act to take away bishops' lands and annex them to the crown. In the year 1593, it was ordained by the general assembly, that all that bore office in the kirk, or should hereafter do so, should subscribe to the book of Discipline. In the year 1592, all acts of parliament whatsoever, made by the king's highness or any of his predecessors, in favour of Popery or episcopacy, were annulled; and in particular, the act of May 22, 1584, "for granting commissions to bishops, or other ecclesiastical judges, to receive presentations to benefices, and give collation thereupon;" and it was ordained, that for the future "all presentations to benefices shall be directed to the particular presbyteries, with full power to give collation thereupon; and to order all matters and causes ecclesiastical within their bounds, according to the discipline of the kirk."<sup>64</sup>

"Farther, the act ratifies and confirms all former acts of parliament in favour of kirk-discipline, and declares, that it shall be lawful for the kirk and ministers to hold general assemblies once a year, or oftener if necessity require, the king's commissioner being present if his majesty pleases. It ratifies and approves of provincial and synodal assemblies twice a year within every province; and of presbyteries and particular sessions appointed by the kirk, with the whole discipline and jurisdiction of the same. Provincial assemblies have power to redress all things omitted or done amiss in the particular

---

<sup>63</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb, p. 231.

<sup>64</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 294.

assemblies, to depose the office-bearer of the province, and generally they have the power of the particular elderships whereof they are collected.

“The power of presbyteries is declared to consist in keeping the kirks within their bounds in good order; to inquire after and endeavour to reform vicious persons. It belongs to the elderships to see that the word of God be duly preached, and the sacraments rightly administered, and discipline entertained; they are to cause the ordinances made by the provincial, national, and general assemblies, to be put in execution; to make or abolish constitutions which concern decent order in their kirks, provided they alter no rules made by the superior assemblies; and communicate their constitutions to the provincial assembly; they have power to excommunicate the obstinate after due process. Concerning particular kirks, if they are lawfully ruled by sufficient ministers and session, they have power and jurisdiction in their own congregation in matters ecclesiastical.”

This act, for the greater solemnity, was confirmed again in the year 1593, and again this present year 1594, so that from this time, to the year 1612, presbytery was undoubtedly the legal establishment of the kirk of Scotland, as it had been in fact ever since the reformation.

To return to England. Several champions appeared about this time for the cause of episcopacy, as, Dr. Bilson, Bancroft, Bridges, Cosins, Soam, and Dr. Adrian Sararia, a Spaniard, but beneficed in the church of England: this last was answered by Beza; Bridges was answered by Fenner, Cosins by Morrice, and Bilson by Bradshaw, though the press was shut against the Puritans.

But the most celebrated performance, and of greatest note, was Mr. Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, in eight books; the four first of which were published this year; the fifth in the year 1597, and the three last not till many years after his death, for which reason some have suspected them to be interpolated, though they were deposited in the hands of archbishop Abbot, from whose copy they were printed; about the beginning of the civil wars.<sup>65</sup> This is esteemed the most learned defence of the church of England, wherein all that would be acquainted with its constitution, says a learned prelate, may see upon what foundation it is built. Mr. Hooker begun his work while master of the Temple, but meeting with some trouble, and many interruptions in that place, the archbishop, at his request, removed him to Boscum in the diocese of Salisbury, and gave him a minor prebend in that church; here he finished his four first books; from thence he was removed to the parsonage of Bishops-born in Kent, about three miles from Canterbury, where he finished his work and his life in the year 1660, and in the forty-seventh year of his age.

The chief principles upon which this learned author proceeds, are,

---

<sup>65</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 421.



“That though the Holy Scriptures are a perfect standard of doctrine, they are not a rule of discipline or government: nor is the practice of the apostles an invariable rule or law to the church in succeeding ages, because they acted according to the circumstances of the church in its infant and persecuted state: neither are the Scriptures a rule of human actions, so far as that whatsoever we do in matters of religion without their express direction or warrant is sin, but many things are left indifferent: the church is a society like others, invested with powers to make what laws she apprehends reasonable, decent, or necessary, for her well-being and government, provided they do not interfere with, or contradict the laws and commandments of, Holy Scripture: where the Scripture is silent, human authority may interpose; we must then have recourse to the reason of things and the rights of society: it follows from hence, that the church is at liberty to appoint ceremonies, and establish order within the limits above mentioned; and her authority ought to determine what is fit and convenient: all who are born within the confines of an established church, and are baptized into it, are bound to submit to its ecclesiastical laws; they may not disgrace, revile, or reject, them at pleasure: the church is their mother, and has more than a maternal power over them: the positive laws of the church not being of a moral nature, are mutable, and may be changed or reversed by the same powers that made them; but while they are in force they are to be submitted to, under such penalties as the church in her wisdom shall direct.”

The fourth and fifth propositions are the main pillars of Mr. Hooker’s fabric, and the foundation of all human establishments, viz. “that the church, like other societies, is invested with power to make laws for its well-being; and that where the Scripture is silent, human authority may interpose.” All men allows that human societies may form themselves after any model, and make what laws they please for their well-being; and that the Christian church has some things in common with all societies as such, as the appointing time and place, and the order of public worship, &c. but it must be remembered, that the Christian church is not a mere voluntary society, but a community formed and constituted by Christ the sole king and lawgiver of it, who has made sufficient provision for its well-being to the end of the world. It does not appear in the New Testament, that the church is empowered to mend or alter the constitution of Christ, by creating new officers, or making new laws, though the Christian world has ventured upon it. Christ gave his church, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, for the perfecting the saints, and edifying his body; but the successors of the apostles in the government of the church, apprehending these not sufficient, have added patriarchs, cardinals, deans, archdeacons, canons, and other officials. The church is represented in Scripture as a spiritual body; her ordinances, privileges, and censures, being purely such; but later ages have wrought the civil

powers into her constitution, and kept men within her pale, by all the terrors of this world, as, fines, imprisonments, banishments, fire, and sword. It is the peculiar excellence of the gospel-worship to be plain and simple, free from the yoke of Jewish ceremonies; but the antichristian powers, thinking this a defect, have loaded it with numberless ceremonies of their own invention; and though there are laws in Scripture sufficient for the direction of the church, as constituted by Christ and his apostles, they have thought fit to add so many volumes of ecclesiastical laws, canons, and injunctions, as have confounded, if not subverted, the laws of Christ.

Whereas if men considered the church as a spiritual body, constituted by Christ its sole lawgiver for spiritual purposes, they would then see that it had no concern with their Civil rights, properties, and estates, nor any power to force men to be of its Communion, by the pains and penalties of this world. The laws of the New Testament would appear sufficient for the well-being of such a society; and in cases where there are no particular rules or injunctions, that it is the will of Christ and his apostles, there should be liberty and mutual forbearance; there would then be no occasion for Christian courts, as they are called, nor for the interposition of human authority, any farther than to keep the peace. Upon the whole, as far as any church is governed by the laws and precepts of the New Testament, so far is it a church of Christ; but when it sets up its own by-laws as terms of communion, or works the policy of the civil magistrate into its constitution, it is so far a creature of the state.

Mr. Hooker's two last propositions are inconsistent with the first principles of the Reformation, viz. that all that are born within the confines of an established church, and are baptized into it, are bound to submit to its ecclesiastical laws under such penalties as the church in her wisdom shall direct. Must I then be of the religion of the country where I am born? that is, at Rome a Papist, in Saxony a Lutheran, in Scotland a Presbyterian, and in England a diocesan prelatist; and this under such penalties as the church in her wisdom shall think fit? Must I believe as the church believes, and submit to her laws right or wrong? Have I no right, as a man and a Christian, to judge and act for myself, as long as I continue a loyal and faithful subject to my prince? Surely religious principles and church-communion should be the effect of examination and a deliberate choice, or they lose their name, and degenerate into hypocrisy or atheism.

From general principles Mr. Hooker proceeds to vindicate the particular rites and ceremonies of the church, and to clear them from the exceptions of the Puritans; which may easily be done when he has proved, that the church has a discretionary power to appoint what ceremonies and establish what order she thinks fit; he may then vindicate not only the ceremonies of the church of England, but all those of Rome, for no doubt that church alleges

all their ceremonies conducive to her well-being, and not inconsistent with the laws of Christ.<sup>66</sup>

This year died Dr. John Aylmer, bishop of London, whose character has been sufficiently drawn in this history; he was born in Norfolk, educated in Cambridge, and in queen Mary's reign an exile for religion; he was such a little man, that Fuller<sup>67</sup> says, when the searchers were clearing the ship in which he made his escape, the merchant put him into a great wine-butt that had a partition in the middle, so that Mr. Aylmer sat enclosed in the hinder part, while the searchers drank of the wine which they saw drawn out of the head on the other part; he was of an active, busy spirit, quick in his language, and, after his advancement, of a stout and imperious behaviour: in his younger days he was inclined to Puritanism, but when he was made a bishop he became a resolute champion of the hierarchy, and a bitter persecutor of his former friends. In his latter days he was very covetous, and a little too lax in his morals: he usually played at bowls on Sundays in the afternoons; and used such language at his game, as justly exposed his character to reproach; but with all these blemishes, the writer of his life, Mr. Strype, will have him a learned, pious, and humble bishop. He died at Fulham, June 3, 1594, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.<sup>68</sup>

Aylmer was succeeded by Dr. Fletcher bishop of Worcester, who in his primary visitation gave out twenty-seven articles of inquiry to the

---

<sup>66</sup> To Mr. Neal's remarks on the principles of the Ecclesiastical Polity, it may be added, that how just and conclusive soever those principles are in themselves, they do not, they cannot apply, to the vindication of our religious establishment, till it be proved that its ceremonies and laws were fixed by the church. In whatever sense the word church is used; this is not the fact. Whether you understand by it, "a congregation of faithful men," or "all ecclesiastical persons," or "an order of men who are set apart by Christianity, and dedicated to this very purpose of public instruction,"—in neither sense were the forms and opinions of our established religion settled by the church. They originated with royal pleasure: they have changed as the will of our princes hath changed; they have been settled by acts of parliaments, formed illegally, corrupted by pensions, and overawed by prerogative, and they constitute part of the statute law of the land. See my Letters to the Rev. Dr. Sturges, 1782, p. 15—28.—ED.

<sup>67</sup> Fuller's Worthies, b. 2. p. 248.

<sup>68</sup> This prelate had been preceptor to lady Jane Gray. During his residence in Switzerland, he assisted John Fox, in translating his Martyrology into Latin. It was usual with him, when he observed his audience to be inattentive, to take a Hebrew Bible out of his pocket and read them a few verses, and then resume his discourse. It is related, as an instance of his courage, that he had a tooth drawn to encourage the queen to submit to the like operation. But it is more to the honour of his judgment and patriotism, that notwithstanding his rigour and cruelty in ecclesiastical matters, he had and avowed just sentiments concerning the constitution of the English government, and the power of parliaments: of whom he said, that "if they used their privileges the king can do nothing without them: if he do, it is his fault in usurping it, and their folly in permitting it. Wherefore, in my judgment, those that in king Henry's days would not grant him that proclamation should have the force of a statute, were good fathers of the country, and worthy of commendation in defending their liberty." Strype as quoted in British Biogr. vol. 3. p. 240, 241, and Granger's Biogr. History, vol. 1. p. 208, 209.

churchwardens concerning their preachers; as, whether they prayed for the queen as supreme head over all persons and causes within her dominions, ecclesiastical and temporal?—whether they were learned —or frequented conventicles—or taught innovations—or commended the new discipline—or spoke in derogation of any part of the common prayer—or did not administer the sacrament in their own persons at certain times of the year? &c. By these, and such-like inquiries, the prisons, which had been lately cleared, were filled again; for by an account, sent to the queen from the ecclesiastical commissioners towards the close of this year, it appears that in the Marshalsea, Newgate, the Gate-house, Bridewell, the Fleet, the compters, the White-lion, and the King's-bench, there were eighty-nine prisoners for religion; some of them were Popish recusants, and the rest Protestant Nonconformists; of whom twenty-four had been committed by the ecclesiastical commission, and the rest by the council and the bishops' courts. But his lordship's proceedings were quickly interrupted, by his falling under her majesty's displeasure a few months after his translation, for marrying a second wife, which the queen looked upon as indecent in an elderly clergyman; for this she banished him the court, and commanded the archbishop to suspend him from his bishopric; but after six months, her majesty being a little pacified, ordered his suspension to be taken off, though she would never admit him into her presence, which had such an influence upon his great spirit, as was thought to hasten his death, which happened the next year, as he was sitting in his chair smoking a pipe of tobacco. The year following he was succeeded by Dr. Bancroft, the great adversary of the Puritans.

These violent proceedings of the bishops drove great numbers of the Brownists into Holland, where their leaders, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Smith, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Jacob, and others, were gone beforehand, and with the leave of the states were erecting churches after their own model at Amsterdam, Arnheim, Middleburgh, Leyden, and other places. The church at Amsterdam had like to have been torn in pieces at first by intestine divisions, but it afterward flourished under a succession of pastors for above a hundred years. Mr. Robinson, pastor of the church at Leyden, first struck out the congregational or independent form of church-government, and at length part of this church transplanting themselves into America, laid the foundation of the noble colony of New England, as will be seen hereafter.

Hitherto the controversy between the church and Puritans had been chiefly about habits and ceremonies, and church-discipline, but now it began to open upon points of doctrine; for this year Dr. Bound published his treatise of the sabbath, wherein he maintains the morality of a seventh part of time for the worship of God; that Christians are bound to rest on the Lord's day as much as the Jews on the Mosaical sabbath, the commandment of rest being moral and perpetual; that therefore it was not lawful to follow our studies or

worldly business on that day; nor to use such recreations and pleasures as were lawful on other days, as shooting, fencing, and bowling, &c. This book had a wonderful spread among the people, and wrought a mighty reformation; so that the Lord's day, which used to be profaned by interludes, May-games, morrice-dances, and other sports and recreations, began to be kept more precisely, especially in corporations. All the Puritans fell in with this doctrine, and distinguished themselves by spending that part of sacred time in public, family, and private, acts of devotion.<sup>69</sup> But the governing clergy exclaimed against it, as a restraint of Christian liberty; as putting an unequal lustre on the Sunday, and tending to eclipse the authority of the church in appointing other festivals. Mr. Rogers, author of a commentary on the thirty-nine articles, writes in his preface, "that it was the comfort of his soul, and would be to his dying day, that he had been the man, and the means that the Sabbatarian errors were brought to the light and knowledge of the state." But I should have thought this clergyman might have had as much comfort upon a dying bed, if he had spent his zeal in recommending the religious observation of that sacred day. Dr. Bound might carry his doctrine too high if he advanced it to a level with the Jewish rigours; but it was certainly unworthy the character of divines to encourage men in shooting, fencing, and other diversions, on the Lord's day, which they are forward enough to give way to, without the countenance and example of their spiritual guides. Archbishop Whitgift called in all the copies of Dr. Bound's book by his letters and officers at synods and visitations, and forbade it to be reprinted; and the lord-chief-justice Popham did the same; both of them declaring, that the sabbath doctrine agreed neither with the doctrine of our church, nor with the laws and orders of this kingdom;<sup>70</sup> that it disturbed the peace of the commonwealth and church, and tended to schism in the one, and sedition in the other; but notwithstanding all this caution, the book was read privately more than ever. "The more liberty people were offered (says Mr. Fuller) the less they used, refusing to take the freedom authority tendered them, as being jealous of a design to blow up their civil liberties." The archbishop's head was no sooner laid, but Dr. Bound prepared his book for the press a second time and published it with large additions in 1606; and such was its reputation, that scarce any comment or catechism was published by the stricter divines for many years, in which the morality of the sabbath was not strongly recommended and urged: but this controversy will return again in the next reign.

All the Protestant divines in the church, whether Puritans or others, seemed of one mind hitherto about the doctrines of faith; but now there arose a party which were first for softening, and then for overthrowing, the

---

<sup>69</sup> Fuller, b. 9. p. 257.

<sup>70</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 531.

received opinions about predestination, perseverance, free-will, effectual grace, and the extent of our Saviour's redemption. The articles of the church of England were thought by all men hitherto to favour the explication of Calvin; but these divines would make them stand neuter, and leave a latitude for the subscriber to take either side of the question. All the Puritans to a man maintained the articles of the church to be Calvinistical, and inconsistent with any other interpretation, and so did far the greatest number of the conforming clergy; but as the new explications of Arminius grew into repute, the Calvinists were reckoned old-fashioned divines,<sup>71</sup> and at length branded with the character of Doctrinal Puritans.

The debate began in the university of Cambridge, where one Mr. Barret, fellow of Gonville and Caius-college, in his sermon *ad clerum*, declared himself against Calvin's doctrine about predestination and falling from grace; reflecting with some sharpness upon that great divine, and advising his hearers not to read him. For this he was summoned before the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges, and obliged to retract in St. Mary's church, according to a form prescribed by his superiors; which he read after a manner that showed he did it only to save his place in the university. This was so offensive to the scholars, that forty or fifty graduates of the several colleges signed a petition, dated May 26, 1595, desiring some farther course might be taken with him, that the great names which he had reproached, as P. Martyr, Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, &c. might receive some reparation.<sup>72</sup> Both parties appealed to the archbishop, who blamed the university for their too-hasty proceedings, and seemed to take part with Barret; but the heads of colleges in a second letter vindicated their proceedings, desiring his grace not to encourage such a bold, corrupt, and unlearned young fellow, and insisted on the rights and prerogatives of the university. At length Mr. Barret was sent for to Lambeth, and having been examined before the archbishop and some other divines, they agreed that he had maintained some errors, and enjoined him in an humble manner to confess his ignorance and mistake, and not to teach the like doctrines for the future; but he chose rather to quit the university.<sup>73</sup> This Barret was a conceited youth, who did not treat his superiors with decency: in one of his letters he calls the grave and learned Mr. Perkins, *homuncio quidam*, a little contemptible fellow: but at last he turned Papist. The fire was no sooner kindled, than it was observed that Barret and his friends were countenanced by the high Conformists and Roman Catholics, and that his adversaries took part with the Puritans, which was like to produce a new division in the church.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> While they in return looked on the others as little better than novelists. Warner.—ED.

<sup>72</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 437.

<sup>73</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 343.

<sup>74</sup> Hickman's Quinq. Hist, against Heylin, p. 210.

To put an end to these disputes, the heads of the university sent Dr. Whitaker and Dr. Tyndal to Lambeth, to consult with the archbishop, and some other learned divines, upon these points; who at length, November 20, concluded upon the following nine propositions, commonly called the Lambeth articles, which the scholars in the university were strictly enjoined to conform their judgments unto, and not to vary from. The articles were as follow:

“That God from eternity has predestinated some persons to life, and reprobated others to death:—The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life, is not foreseen faith, or good works, or any other commendable quality in the persons predestinated, but the good will and pleasure of God:—The number of the predestinate is fixed, and cannot be lessened or increased:—They who are not predestinated to salvation, shall be necessarily condemned for their sins:—A true, lively, and justifying faith, and the sanctifying influence of the Spirit, is not extinguished, nor does it fail, or go off either finally or totally:—A justified person has a full assurance and certainty of the remission of his sins, and his everlasting salvation by Christ:—Saving grace is not communicated to all men; neither have all men such a measure of divine assistance, that they may be saved if they will:—No person can come to Christ unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to Christ:—It is not in everyone’s will and power to be saved.”

These high propositions were drawn up, and consented to by archbishop Whitgift, Dr. Fletcher bishop of London, Dr. Vaughan elect of Bangor, and some others; they were sent to Dr. Hutton archbishop of York, and Dr. Young of Rochester, who subscribed them, only wishing that the word *necessarily* in the fourth article, and those words in the seventh article, *if they will*, might be omitted. The archbishop in his letter which he sent to the university with the articles, says they are to look upon them not as new laws and decrees, but only as an explication of certain points which they apprehend to be true, and corresponding to the doctrine professed in the church of England, and already established by the laws of the land. But forasmuch as they had not the queen’s sanction, he desires they may not become a public act, but used privately and with discretion.<sup>75</sup> He adds, that her majesty was fully persuaded of the truth of them; which is strange, when she commanded sir Robert Cecil to signify to the archbishop by letter, “that she misliked much that any allowance had been given by his grace and his brethren for any such points to be disputed, being a matter tender and dangerous to weak, ignorant minds: and thereupon commanded him to suspend the urging them publicly, or suffering them to be debated in the pulpit.”

---

<sup>75</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 462, 463.

The queen's design was to stifle the controversy in its birth; for if she was dissatisfied with the archbishop's private determinations, she was downright angry with Dr. Baro a Frenchman, and one of the divinity-professors at Cambridge, for continuing the debate. She said, that being an alien, and humanely harboured and enfranchised, both himself and family, he ought to have carried himself more quietly and peaceably. His case was this; in his sermon before the university, preached January 12, he asserted, "that God created all men according to his own likeness in Adam, and consequently to eternal life, from which he rejects no man but on the account of his sins:—That Christ died for all mankind, and was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, original and actual; the remedy provided by him being as extensive as the ruins of the fall:—That the promises of eternal life made to us in Christ, are to be generally and universally taken and understood, being made as much to Judas as to Peter." For these propositions he was summoned before the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges, who examined him by several interrogatories, and commanded him peremptorily to abstain from those controversies in his lectures and sermons for the future.

They acquainted secretary Cecil by letter with their proceedings, in which they call all doctrines Popish, and say, that for fourteen or fifteen years he has taught in his lectures, and preached in his sermons, divers points of doctrine contrary to those which have been taught and read ever since her majesty's reign, and agreeable to the errors of Popery, by which means they fear the whole body of that religion will break in upon them; they therefore pray his lordship's assistance for the suppressing them. Cambridge, March 8th, 1595.<sup>76</sup>

On the other hand Baro wrote to the archbishop to keep him in his place, promising obedience to his grace's commands, and to keep the peace of the university by dropping the controversy in silence,<sup>77</sup> He also wrote to secretary Cecil to put a stop to the proceedings of the vice-chancellor, which he together with the archbishop accomplished; but the university not being satisfied with him, he was obliged next year to quit his professorship and retire to London, where he died two or three years after, having been lady Margaret's professor at Cambridge about twenty-five years.<sup>78</sup> He left a large family

---

<sup>76</sup> Signed by Roger Goad, *pro-can.* R. Some, Tlio. Legge, John Jegon, Tho. Nevyle, Tho. Preston, Hump. Tyndal, James Montague, Edm. Barrel, Lawr. Cbadderton.

<sup>77</sup> Strype's Ann, vol. ult. p. 230.

<sup>78</sup> "Hence (remarks an able writer) it appears what little latitude was then allowed to the freedom of thinking and debate, on subjects the most innocent, and with regard to doctrines the truth of which is now generally maintained by the clergy, and especially by those of them who stand the highest in dignity, reputation, and learning. We must be sensible how narrow was the spirit, and how confined the true theological knowledge of the times, when the dogmas of Calvinism were maintained with such pertinacity by the governors of the church, and to call them in question was looked upon as a crime." History of Knowledge in the New Annual Register for 1789, p. 9.



behind him, and was buried in St. Olave's, Hart-street, his pall being supported by six doctors of divinity, by order from the bishop of London. The chancellor in his letter to the university was very angry, because they sifted Baro with interrogatories, "as if (says he) he was a thief; this seems done of stomach among you."<sup>79</sup> How sad then was the case of the Puritans!

The divines of Oxford, and indeed all the first reformers, were in the same sentiments with those of Cambridge about the disputed points; Calvin's Institutions being read publicly in the schools by appointment of the convocation, though perhaps they might not go the full length of the Lambeth articles, nor express themselves with the exactness of those who lived afterward, when those doctrines were publicly opposed by Arminius and his followers.

The article of our Saviour's local descent into hell began to be questioned at this time. It had been the received doctrine of the church of England, that the soul of Christ, being separated from his body, descended locally into hell, that he might there triumph over Satan, as before he had over death and sin.<sup>80</sup> But the learned Mr. Hugh Broughton, the rabbi of his age, whom king James would have courted into Scotland, convinced the world that the word *hades*, used by the Greek fathers for the place into which Christ went after his crucifixion, did not mean hell, or the place of the damned, but only the state of the dead, or the invisible world. It was farther debated, whether Christ underwent in his soul the wrath of God, and the pains of hell, and finished all his sufferings upon the cross before he died.<sup>81</sup>—This was Calvin's sentiment, and with him agreed all the Puritan divines, who preached it in their sermons, and inserted it in their catechisms. On the other hand, bishop Bilson in his sermons at Paul's-cross maintained, that no text of Scripture asserted the death of Christ's soul, or the pains of the damned, to be requisite in the person of Christ before he could be our ransom, and the Saviour of the world.<sup>82</sup> But still he maintained the local descent of Christ into hell, or the territory of the damned; and that by the course of the creed the article must refer not to Christ living upon the cross, but to Christ dead; and that he went thither not to suffer, but to wrest the keys of hell and death out of the hands of the devil.<sup>83</sup> When these sermons were printed, they were presently answered by Mr. Henry Jacob, a learned Brownist. Bilson, by the queen's command, defended his sermons, in a treatise entitled, "A survey of Christ's sufferings," which

---

<sup>79</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 473.

<sup>80</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 349.

<sup>81</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 482.

<sup>82</sup> Heyl. Hist. Presb. p. 350. .

<sup>83</sup> This controversy gave a celebrity, beyond his own time, to the name of bishop Bilson; he was an eminent divine, and the author of some doctrinal and practical works; as well as of some Latin poems and orations never published. In the reign of James I. he was one of the two final correctors of the English translation of the Bible; for which office his easy and harmonious style particularly qualified him. History of Knowledge in the New Annual Register for 1789, p. 17.—ED.

did not appear in the world till 1604. The controversy was warmly debated in both universities; but when the learned combatants had spent their artillery it dropped in silence, without any determination from authority, though it was one of the articles usually objected to the Puritans, for which they were suspended their ministry. [And the rational sentiment, that the word *hades* signifies only the state of the dead, or the invisible world, silently and universally took place.]

Among other reproaches cast upon their clergy, one was, that they deluded the people by claiming a power to exorcise the devil. “Some of their ministers (says Mr. Strype) pretended to cast out devils, that so the amazed multitude having a great veneration for these exercisers of devils, by the power of their prayers and fastings, might the more readily and awfully submit to their opinions and ways; a practice borrowed from the then Papists to make their priests revered, and to confirm the laity in their superstitions.” One would think here was a plot of some cunning, designing men, to conjure the people into the belief of discipline; but all vanishes in the peculiar principles of a weak, and (as Mr. Strype confesses) honest man, whose name was Darrel, a bachelor of arts and minister of Nottingham. This divine was of opinion, that by the power of prayer the devil might be cast out of persons possessed;<sup>84</sup> and having tried the experiment upon one Darling of Burton, a boy of about fourteen years old, with supposed success, and upon some others, he was importuned by one of the ministers, and several inhabitants of the town of Nottingham, to visit one William Somers, a boy that had such convulsive agonies, as were thought to be preternatural, insomuch that when Mr. Darrel had seen them, he concluded, with the rest of the spectators that he was possessed, and advised his friends to desire the help of godly and learned ministers to endeavour his recovery, but excused himself from being concerned, lest if the devil should be dispossessed, the common people should attribute to him some special gift of casting out devils; but upon a second request from the mayor of Nottingham, he agreed with Mr. Aldridge and two other ministers, with about one hundred and fifty neighbouring Christians, to set apart a day for fasting and prayer, to entreat the Lord to cast out Satan, and deliver the young man from his torments; and after some time the Lord, they say, was entreated, and they blessed God for the same; this was November 1597. A few days after, the mayor and some of the aldermen began to suspect that Somers was a cheat; and to make him confess, they took him from his parents, and committed him to the custody of two men, who with threatenings prevailed with him to acknowledge, that he had dissembled and counterfeited all he did. Upon this he was carried before the commission, where at first he owned himself a counterfeit, and then presently denied it

---

<sup>84</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 492. 491. 495.

again; but being thoroughly frightened, he fell into fits before the commissioners, which put an end to his examination for the present. After some time, being still in custody, he returned to his confessing, and charged Mr. Darrel with training him up in the art for four years. Upon this Mr. Darrel was summoned before the commissioners, and brought witnesses with him to prove, that Somers had declared in a very solemn manner that he had not dissembled; upon which he was dismissed, and the commission dissolved; but the affair making a great noise in the country, Mr. Darrel was sent for to Lambeth, and after a long hearing before the archbishop, and others of the high commission, he was deposed from his ministry, and committed close prisoner to the Gatehouse, for being accessory to a vile imposture, where he continued many years.

While Mr. Darrel was in the prison, he wrote an apology, to show that people in these latter days may be possessed with devils; and that by prayer and fasting the unclean spirit may be cast out. In the end of which he makes this protestation; "If what I am accused of be true (viz. that I have been accessory to a vile imposture, with a design to impose on mankind), let me be registered to my perpetual infamy, not only for a notorious deceiver, but such a hypocrite as never trod on the earth before; yea, Lord! for to thee I convert my speech, who knowest all things, if I have confederated more or less with Somers, Darling, or any of the rest; if ever I set eye on them before they were possessed, then let me not only be made a laughing-stock, and a byword to all men, but rase my name also out of the book of life, and let me have my portion with hypocrites."

It has been observed, that the bishops had now wisely transferred the prosecution of the Puritans from themselves to the temporal courts, so that, instead of being summoned before the high-commission, they were indicted at the assizes and tried at common law; this being thought more advisable, to take off the odium from the church. Judge Anderson discovered his zeal against them this summer in an extraordinary manner, for in his charge to the jury at Lincoln he told them, that the country was infested with Brownists, with disciplinarians and erectors of presbyteries, which he spoke with so much wrath, with so many oaths, and such reviling language, as offended the gentlemen upon the bench. He called the preachers knaves, saying, that they would start up into the pulpit and speak against everybody.<sup>85</sup> He was for extending the statute of recusancy to such who went at any time to hear sermons from their own parish-churches, though they usually attended in their places, and heard divine service dutifully. When lord Clinton, and the deputy-lieutenants and justices of those parts, obtained the bishop's allowance for a day

---

<sup>85</sup> trype's Ann. vol. ult. p. 261.

of fasting and prayer at Lowth, upon an extraordinary occasion, his lordship urged the jury to find a bill against them, upon the statute of conventicles.

Mr. Allen, minister of that parish, being indicted by means of a revengeful justice of peace, for not reading all the prayers at once (he using sometimes to omit part of them for the sermon), was obliged to hold up his hand at the bar, when judge Anderson standing up, spoke to him with a fierce countenance, and having insinuated some grievous faults against the man (though he named none), called him oftentimes knave, rebellious knave, with more such opprobrious language, though it was known all over the country that Mr. Allen was a good preacher; that he had subscribed; was esteemed by the bishop; was conformable in his affections; and behaved upon this occasion with all humility and submission. But his lordship had said in his charge, that he would hunt all the Puritans out of his circuit. One thing was remarkable in Mr. Allen's arraignment, that when upon some point wherein judgment in divinity was required, Mr. Allen referred himself to the bishop (his ordinary then sitting upon the bench), the judge took him up with marvellous indignation, and said, he was both his ordinary and bishop in that place.<sup>86</sup>

Thus the Puritan clergy were put upon a level with rogues and felons, and made to hold up their hands at the bar among the vilest criminals; there was hardly an assize in any county in England, but one or more ministers, through the resentments of some of their parishioners, appeared in this condition, to the disgrace of their order, and the loss of their reputation and usefulness; besides being exposed to the insults of the rude multitude. "But I would to God (says my author) that they which judge in religious causes, though in the name of civil affairs, would either get some more knowledge in religion and God's word than my lord Anderson hath, or call in the assistance of those that have."<sup>87</sup>

Archbishop Whitgift was busy this summer about elections for the ensuing parliament, which was to meet Oct. 24, 1597. Mr. Strype says, his grace took what care he could to prevent such as were disaffected to the constitution of the church, that is, all Puritans, from coming into the house; but some thought it a little out of character for an archbishop to appear so publicly in the choice of the people's representatives.<sup>88</sup> The house being thus modelled, did not meddle with the foundations of discipline, or form of public worship; but several bills were brought in to regulate abuses in spiritual courts, as against licences to marry without bands, against excessive fees, frivolous

---

<sup>86</sup> Strype's Ann. vol. nit. p. 267.

<sup>87</sup> These are not the words of Mr. Strype himself, as they may appear by the manner of quotation, but are part of a letter "from a person unknown of the clergy to a person of quality" on judge Anderson's proceedings.—ED.

<sup>88</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 508.

citations *ex officio*, and excommunications for little matters, as twopence or threepence. These and all other bills of this nature were, according to custom, quashed by a message from the queen, forbidding them to touch her prerogative; and assuring them, that she would take the aforesaid grievances into her princely consideration. Accordingly her majesty referred these matters to the convocation; it being her steady maxim, not to proceed in matters of the church by statutes, which the parliament alone could repeal, but rather by canons, which she could confirm or dispense with at pleasure. The convocation drew up some regulations upon these and other heads, relating to ecclesiastical courts, which the queen confirmed by her letters patent January 18, in the fortieth year of her reign. They were printed the same year by her authority, and may be seen in bishop Sparrow's collection of articles, injunctions, &c.

But still the ecclesiastical courts were an insufferable grievance: the oppressions which people underwent from the bottomless deep of the canon law, put them upon removing their causes into Westminster-hall, by getting prohibitions to stay proceedings in the bishops' courts, or in the high-commission. This awakened the archbishop, who, in order to support the civilians, drew up certain queries to be considered by the lords and judges of the land touching prohibitions; of which this was the principal, "that seeing ecclesiastical authority is as truly vested in the crown as temporal, whether the queen's temporal authority should any more restrain her ecclesiastical, than her ecclesiastical should her temporal? And seeing so many and so great personages with some others, are trusted to do her majesty service in her ecclesiastical commission, whether it be convenient, that an offender, ready to be censured, should obtain, and publicly throw into court, a prohibition, to the delay of justice, and to the disgrace and disparagement of those who serve freely, without all fee therein." The archbishop caused a list to be made of divers cases, wherein the Christian court, as he called it, had been interrupted by the temporal jurisdiction; and of many causes that had been taken out of the hands of the bishops' courts, the high-commission, and the court of delegates; the former authorized by immediate commission from the queen, and the latter by a special commission upon an appeal to her court of chancery.<sup>89</sup> But notwithstanding all these efforts of Whitgift and his successor Bancroft, the number of prohibitions increased every year; the nobility, gentry, and judges, being too wise to subject their estates and liberties to a number of artful civilians, versed in a codex or body of laws, of most uncertain authority, and strangers to the common and statute law, without the check of prohibition; when it was notorious, that the canon law had been always since the reformation controlled by the laws and statutes of the realm. Thus the

---

<sup>89</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 537.

civilians sunk in their business under the two next archbishops, till Laud governed the church, who terrifying the judges from granting prohibitions, the spiritual courts, star-chamber, council-table, and high commissioners, rode triumphant, fining, imprisoning, and banishing, men at their pleasure, till they became as terrible as the Spanish inquisition, and brought upon the nation all the confusions and desolations of a civil war.

From this time to the queen's death, there was a kind of cessation of arms between the church and Puritans; the combatants were out of breath, or willing to wait for better times. Some apprehended that the Puritans were vanquished, and their numbers lessened by the severe execution of the penal laws; whereas it will appear, by a survey in the beginning of the next reign, that the nonconforming clergy were about fifteen hundred. But the true reason was this, the queen was advanced in years, and could not live long in a course of nature, and the next heir to the crown being a Presbyterian, the bishops were cautious of acting against a party for whom his majesty had declared, not knowing what revenge he might take, when he was fixed on the throne; and the Puritans were quiet, in hopes of great matters to be done for them upon the expected change.

Notwithstanding all former repulses from court, the queen's last parliament, which sat in the year 1601, renewed their attacks upon the ecclesiastical courts; a bill being brought in to examine into bishops' leases, and to disable them from taking fines; another against pluralities and nonresidents; and another against commissaries and archdeacons' courts. Multitudes of complaints came to the house against the proceedings of the ordinaries *ex mero officio*, without due presentments preceding, and against the frequent keeping their courts, so that the churchwardens were sometimes cited to two or three spiritual courts at once;<sup>90</sup> complaint was made of their charging the country with quarterly bills; of the great number of apparitors, and petty summoners, who seized upon people for trifling offences; of the admission of curates by officials and commissaries, without the bishop's knowledge, and without testimonials of their conversation; of scandalous commutations of penance, and divers abuses of the like kind; but the queen would not suffer the house to debate them, referring them to the archbishop, who wrote to his brethren the bishops, to endeavour as much as possible to reform the above-mentioned grievances, which, says he,<sup>91</sup> have produced multitudes of complaints in parliament; and had they not been prevented by great circumspection, and promise of careful reformation, there might perhaps have ensued the taking away of the whole, or most of those courts. "So prudently diligent was the archbishop (says Mr. Strype) to keep up the jurisdiction of the

---

<sup>90</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 516, 547.

<sup>91</sup> Life of Whitgift, p. 547. 549.

bishops' courts, and the wealthy estate of the clergy by preserving nonresidences to them."

There was another bill brought into the house, to punish voluntary absence from church; the forfeiture was to be twelvepence each Sunday, to be levied by distress, by a warrant from a justice of peace; but the bill was opposed, because there was a severe law already against recusants,<sup>5</sup> of 20£. per month; and because, if this bill should pass, a justice of peace's house would, like a quarter-sessions, be crowded with a multitude of informers: it was likewise against Magna Charta, which entitles every man to be tried by his peers, whereas by this act, two witnesses before a justice of peace were sufficient.<sup>92</sup> The bill however was engrossed, and being put to the question, the noes carried it by a single voice; upon which the yeas said the speaker was with them, which made the number even. The question was then put whether the speaker had a voice, which being carried in the negative, the bill miscarried.

The convocation did nothing but give the queen four subsidies to be collected in four years, and receive an exhortation from the archbishop to observe the canons passed in the last convocation. They met October the 18th, and were dissolved with the parliament December the 19th following.

This year [1602] died the reverend and learned Mr. Wm. Perkins, born at Marston in Warwickshire in the first year of queen Elizabeth, and educated in Christ's college, Cambridge, of which he was fellow: he was one of the most famous practical writers and preachers of his age; and being a strict Calvinist, he published several treatises in favour of those doctrines, which involved him in a controversy with Arminius, then professor of divinity at Leyden, that continued to his death. He was a Puritan Nonconformist, and a favourer of the discipline, for which he was once or twice brought before the high-commission; but his peaceable behaviour, and great fame in the learned world, procured him a dispensation from the persecutions of his brethren. Mr. Perkins was a little man, and wrote with his left hand, being lame of his right. His Works, which were printed in three volumes folio, show him to have been a most pious, holy, and industrious divine, considering he lived only forty-four years.<sup>93</sup>

To sum up the state of religion throughout this long reign. It is evident that the parliament, the people, and great numbers of the inferior clergy, were for carrying the Reformation farther than the present establishment. The first bishops came into it with this view; they declared against the Popish habits

---

<sup>92</sup> Collyer's Ecol. Hist. p. 667.

<sup>93</sup> Many of his works were translated into Dutch, Spanish, French, and Italian, and are still in estimation in Germany. Mr. Orton, who by his mother's side descended in a direct line from Mr. Perkins's elder brother, speaks of him as an excellent writer, clear and judicious; and recommends his works to all ministers, especially young ones, as affording large materials for composition. Orton's Letters to a Young Clergyman, p. 39, 40.—Ed.

and ceremonies, and promised to use all their interest with the queen for their removal; but how soon they forgot themselves, when they were warm in their chairs, the foregoing History has discovered.<sup>94</sup> Most of the first reformers were of Erastian principles, looking upon the church as a mere creature of the state: they gave up everything to the crown, and yielded to the supreme magistrate the absolute direction of the consciences, or at least of the religious profession, of all his subjects. They acknowledged only two orders of divine institution, viz. bishops or priests, and deacons. They admitted the ordinations of foreign churches by mere presbyters, till towards the middle of this reign, when their validity began to be disputed and denied, Whitgift was the first who defended the hierarchy, from the practice of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, when the Roman empire became Christian; but Bancroft divided off the bishops from the priesthood, and advanced them into a superior order by divine right, with the sole power of ordination, and the keys of discipline; so that from his time there were reckoned three orders of clergy in the English hierarchy, viz. bishops, priests, and deacons. Thus the church advanced in her claims, and removed by degrees to a greater distance from the foreign Protestants.

The controversy with the Puritans had only a small beginning, viz. the imposing of the Popish habits and a few indifferent ceremonies; but it opened by degrees into a reformation of discipline, which all confessed was wanting; and at last the doctrinal articles were debated. The queen and the later bishops would not part with a pin out of the hierarchy, nor leave a latitude in the most trifling ceremonies, but insisted upon an exact uniformity both in doctrine and ceremonies, that all might unite in the public standard. The Puritans, in their writings and conferences, attempted to show the defects of the establishment from Scripture, and from the earliest ages of the church; and what they suffered for it has been in part related; the suspensions and deprivations of this long reign amounting to several thousands; but when it appeared that nothing would be abated, and that penal laws were multiplied and rigorously executed, they endeavoured to erect a sort of voluntary discipline within the church, for the ease and satisfaction of their own consciences, being unwilling to separate; till at length the violence of persecution drove some of them into the extremes of Brownism, which divided the Puritans, and gave rise to a new controversy, concerning the necessity of a separation from the established church, of which we shall hear more hereafter; but under all their hardships their loyalty to the queen was untainted, and their behaviour peaceable; they addressed the queen and parliament and bishops for relief, at sundry

---

<sup>94</sup> Bishop Warburton informs us, from Selden de Synedriis, that Erastus's famous book *De Excommunicatione* was purchased by Whitgift of Erastus's widow in Germany, and put by him to the press in London, under fictitious names of the place and printer. Supplemental Volume to Warburton's Works, p. 473.—Ed.



times; and remonstrated against the arbitrary proceedings of the spiritual courts, making use of no other weapons but prayers and tears, attended with Scripture and argument.

The chief principles of the Puritans have been already related: they were no enemies to the name or function of a bishop, provided he was no more than *προεστως*, or a stated president of the college of presbyters in his diocese, and managed the affairs of it with their concurrence and assistance. They did not object against prescribed forms of prayer, provided a latitude was indulged the minister to alter or vary some expressions; and to make use of a prayer of his own conception before and after sermon: nor had they an aversion to any decent and distinct habits for the clergy that were not derived from Popery. But upon the whole they were the most resolute Protestants in the nation, zealous Calvinists, warm and affectionate preachers, and determined enemies to Popery, and to everything that had a tendency towards it.

It is not pretended, that the Puritans were without their failings; no, they were men of like passions and infirmities with their adversaries; and while they endeavoured to avoid one extreme, they might fall into another; their zeal for their platform of discipline would, I fear, have betrayed them into the imposition of it upon others, if it had been established by law. Their notions of the civil and religious rights of mankind were narrow and confused, and derived too much from the theocracy of the Jews, which was now at an end. Their behaviour was severe and rigid, far removed from the fashionable freedoms and vices of the age; and possibly they might be too censorious, in not making those distinctions between youth and age, grandeur and mere decency, as the nature and circumstances of things would admit; but with all their faults, they were the most pious and devout people in the land; men of prayer, both in secret and public, as well as in their families; their manner of devotion was fervent and solemn, depending on the assistance of the divine Spirit, not only to teach them how to pray, but what to pray for as they ought. They had a profound reverence for the holy name of God, and were great enemies not only to profane swearing, but to “foolish talking and jesting, which are not convenient;” they were strict observers of the Christian sabbath or Lord’s day, spending the whole of it in acts of public and private devotion and charity. It was the distinguishing mark of a Puritan in these times, to see him going to church twice a day with his Bible under his arm: and while others were at plays and interludes, at revels, or walking in the fields, or at the diversions of bowling, fencing, &c. on the evening of the sabbath, these with their families were employed in reading the Scriptures, singing psalms, catechising their children, repeating sermons, and prayer: nor was this only the work of the Lord’s day, but they had their hours of family devotion on the week-days, esteeming it their duty to take care of the souls as well as the bodies of their servants. They were circumspect as to all the excesses of

eating, drinking, apparel, and lawful diversions, being frugal in housekeeping, industrious in their particular callings, honest and exact in their dealings, and solicitous to give to every one his own. These were the people who were branded with the name of Precisians, Puritans, Schismatics, enemies to God and their country, and throughout the course of this reign underwent cruel mockings, bonds, and imprisonment.

Sir Francis Walsingham has given a summary account of the queen's policy towards them, in a letter to Monsieur Cretoy, which I shall transcribe in his own words.<sup>95</sup>

“—I find (says sir Francis) that the queen's proceedings, both against Papists and Puritans, are grounded upon these two principles:<sup>96</sup>

“The one, that consciences are not to be forced but to be won, and reduced by force of truth, with the aid of time and use of all good means of instruction and persuasion.

“The other, that causes of conscience, when they exceed their bounds, and grow to be matter of faction, lose their nature; and that sovereign princes ought distinctly to punish their practices and contempt, though coloured with the pretence of conscience and religion.

“According to these principles her majesty behaved towards the Papists with great mildness, not liking to make a window into their hearts, except the abundance of them overflowed into overt acts of disobedience, in impugning her supremacy. When the pope excommunicated her, she only defended herself against his bulls; but when she was threatened with an invasion, and the Papists were altered from being Papists in conscience to being Papists in faction, she was then obliged to provide severer laws for the security of her people.

“For the other party which have been offensive to the state, though in another degree, and which call themselves reformers, and we commonly call Puritans, this hath been by the proceeding towards them: a great while, when they inveighed against such abuses in the church, as pluralities, nonresidents, and the like, their zeal was not condemned, only their violence was sometimes censured. When they refused the use of some ceremonies and rites as superstitious, they were tolerated with much connivance and gentleness; yea, when they called in question the superiority of bishops, and pretended to a democracy in the church, their propositions were considered, and by contrary

---

<sup>95</sup> Mr. Neal, in his Review, observes, that sir Francis wrote this letter as secretary of state and as the queen's servant, endeavouring to vindicate her behaviour towards Nonconformists to a foreign court; he must be allowed therefore to put the most favourable construction on his royal mistress's conduct, and acquit her in the best manner he is able. It also deserves to be remarked, that sir Francis, dying April 1590, did not see the severities of the last thirteen years of queen Elizabeth's reign, which were by much the sharpest and most cruel. Neal's Review, 4to edition, p. 875.—ED.

<sup>96</sup> Barnett's Hist. Ref. vol. 3. p. 419.

writings debated and discussed; yet all this while it was perceived that their course was dangerous and very popular; as because Papistry was odious, therefore it was ever in their mouths, that they sought to purge the church from the relics of Papistry, a thing acceptable to the people, who love ever to run from one extreme to another.

“Because multitudes of rogues and poverty was an eyesore, and a dislike to every man, therefore they put into people’s heads, that if discipline were planted, there would be no vagabonds, no beggars, a thing very plausible; and in like manner they promised the people many of the impossible wonders of their discipline; besides, they opened to the people a way to government by their consistories and presbyteries, a thing though in consequence no less prejudicial to the liberties of private men than to the sovereignty of princes, yet in first show very popular; nevertheless this, except it were in some few that entered into extreme contempt, was borne with, because they pretended in dutiful manner to make propositions, and to leave it to the providence of God and the authority of the magistrate.

“But now of late years, when there issued from them [some], that affirmed the consent of the magistrate was not to be attended; when under pretence of a confession to avoid slander and imputations, they combined themselves by classes and subscriptions; when they descended into that vile and base means of defacing of the church by ridiculous pasquils; when they began to make many subjects in doubt to take oaths, which is one of the fundamental parts of justice in this land, and in all places; when they began both to vaunt of their strength, and number of their partisans and followers, and to use comminations, that their cause “would prevail through uproar and violence, then it appeared to be no more zeal, no more conscience, but mere faction and division; and therefore, though the state were compelled to hold somewhat a harder hand to restrain them than before, yet was it with as great moderation as the peace of the state or church could permit. Thus her majesty has always observed the two rules before mentioned, in dealing tenderly with consciences, and yet in discovering faction from conscience, and softness from singularity.”

The false colourings of this letter are easily discerned: it admits that the consciences of men ought not to be forced but when they grow into faction; that is, to an inconsistency with the peace and safety of the civil government; and was there anything like this in the petitions, addresses, and submissive behaviour, of the Puritans? but they did not attend the consent of the magistrate. Let the reader judge by the foregoing history, whether they did not attend and apply for it several years; and if, after all, the consent of the magistrate must be waited for, before we follow the dictates of our consciences, it is easy to see there would have been no reformation in the Protestant world. But the queen’s worst maxim was, that while she pretended not to force the

consciences of her subjects, she obliged them under the severest penalties to come to church, and make an outward profession of that way of worship which they inwardly disallowed. This was to establish hypocrisy by a law, and to force men to deal falsely with God. and their own consciences, in matters of the most solemn importance.

Practical religion was during all this reign at a very low ebb; the greatest part of the clergy being barely capable of reading prayers and a homily. In the remoter countries and villages, the people were either Papists, or no better than Heathens. "If any among the clergy or laity were remarkably pious, strict observers of the sabbath, and declared enemies of profaneness and Popery (says Mr. Osburn), they were either real Puritans, or branded with that invidious name; and great numbers of the inferior clergy and people in cities and corporations, were of this number:" the conforming clergy lost ground; and the order of bishops, by spending their zeal more about the external forms of worship, than in painful preaching and encouraging practical religion, grew into contempt. Popery gained ground in the country, by the diligence of the missionaries, and the ignorance and laziness of the established clergy; whilst Puritanism prevailed in cities and corporations: so that, as archbishop Parker observed, the queen was the only friend of the church; and supported it by a vigorous execution of the penal laws, and by resolving to admit of no motion for reformation, but what should arise from herself.

Thus things continued to the queen's death: her majesty was grown old and infirm, and under a visible decay of natural spirits, some say for the loss of the earl of Essex, whom she had lately beheaded; but others, from a just indignation to see herself neglected by those who were too ready to worship the rising sun. This threw her into a melancholy state, attended with a drowsiness and heaviness in all her limbs; which was followed with a loss of appetite, and all the marks of an approaching dissolution: upon this she retired to Richmond; and having caused her inauguration ring, which was grown into the flesh, and become painful, to be filed off, she languished till the 24th of March, and then died in the seventieth year of her age, and forty-fifth of her reign.

Queen Elizabeth was a great and successful princess at home, and the support of the Protestant interest abroad, while it was in its infancy; for without her assistance, neither the Huguenots in France nor the Dutch reformers could have stood their ground: she assisted the Protestants of Scotland against their Popish queen, and the princes of Germany against the emperor; whilst at the same time she demanded an absolute submission from her own subjects; and would not tolerate that religion at home, which she countenanced and supported abroad. As to her own religion, she affected a middle way between Popery and Puritanism, though her majesty was more inclined to the former; disliking the secular pretensions of the court of Rome over

foreign states, though she was in love with the pomp and splendour of their worship: on the other hand, she approved of the doctrines of the foreign reformed churches, but thought they had stripped religion too much of its ornaments, and made it look with an unfriendly aspect upon the sovereign power of princes. She understood not the rights of conscience in matters of religion; and is therefore justly chargeable with persecuting principles. More sanguinary laws were made in her reign, than in any of her predecessors: her hands were stained with the blood of Papists and Puritans; the former were executed for denying her supremacy, and the latter for sedition or nonconformity. Her greatest admirers blame her for plundering the church of its revenues, and for keeping several sees vacant many years together for the sake of their profits; as the bishoprics of Ely, Oxford, and others; which last was without a bishop for twenty-two years. The queen was devout at prayers, yet seldom or never heard sermons except in Lent; and would often say, that two or three preachers in a county were sufficient. She had high notions of the sovereign authority of princes, and of her own absolute supremacy in church-affairs: and being of opinion that methods of severity were lawful to bring her subjects to an outward uniformity, she countenanced all the engines of persecution, such as spiritual courts, high-commission, and star-chamber, and stretched her prerogative to support them beyond the laws, and against the sense of the nation.<sup>97</sup> However, notwithstanding all these blemishes, queen Elizabeth stands upon record as a wise and politic princess, for delivering the kingdom from the difficulties in which it was involved at her accession; for preserving the Protestant Reformation against the potent attempts of the pope, the emperor, and the king of Spain abroad, and the queen of Scots and her Popish subjects at home; and for advancing the renown of the English nation beyond any of her predecessors. Her majesty held the balance of power in Europe, and was in high esteem with all foreign princes, the greatest part of her reign; and though her Protestant subjects were divided about church-affairs, they all discovered a high veneration for her royal person and government; on which accounts she was the glory of the age in which she lived, and will be the admiration of posterity.

Considering the complexion of that series of events, through which Mr. Neal's history conducts the reader, he must be allowed to have drawn the character of queen Elizabeth with great fairness and candour. A later ecclesiastical historian, a learned writer of our establishment, has described the leading features of her reign and principles in stronger and bolder terms of reprobation. With Mr. Neal, he has allowed to her the merit of "being a wise and politic princess, for delivering the kingdom from the difficulties in which

---

<sup>97</sup> Fuller's Worthies, b, 2. p. 313.

it was involved at her accession, for preserving the Protestant reformation against the potent enemies which attempted to destroy it, and for advancing the renown of the English nation beyond any of her predecessors:" yet he taxes her with many flagrant instances of weakness and misrule; in which her ministers had no share, and which they had neither power nor interest enough to prevent. Having enumerated these, to them he observes must be added "the severity with which she treated her Protestant subjects by her high-commission court, against law, against liberty, and against the rights of human nature. If these are not (says he) flagrant instances of weakness and misrule to which her ministers never encouraged, but oft-times dissuaded her as far as they durst and which were not owing to sudden starts of passion, but to her own tyrannical disposition, then all arbitrary power may be defended as just and lawful. The passion of Elizabeth was to preserve her crown and her prerogative: and every measure which she herself directed, or approved when projected by her ministers, was subservient to these two purposes." To this account "we are to place all the measures, which she directed and she alone, against the disturbers of the uniformity which was established. To her alone it was owing at first and not to her bishops, that no concession or indulgence was granted to tender consciences. She understood her prerogative, which was as dear to her as her crown and life: but she understood nothing of the rights of conscience in matters of religion; and like the absurd king her father, she would have no opinion in religion, acknowledged at least, but her own. She restored the Reformation, it is true, and I believe, restored it upon principle: she was, likewise, at the head of the Protestant religion abroad, in assisting those who professed it in France, and the Netherlands, as well as Scotland, and it was her interest to do so; but where her interest called upon her to neglect the reformed religion, she did it without scruple. She differed from her sister in this, that she would not part with her supremacy upon any terms: and, as she had much greater abilities for governing, so she applied herself more to promote the strength and glory of her dominion, than Mary did: but she had as much of the bigot and tyrant in her as her sister, though the object of that bigotry was prerogative and not religion."<sup>98</sup>

If facts have any meaning and force, those which we have now reviewed abundantly confirm this representation of the spirit and principles of queen Elizabeth. Yet a celebrated modern writer<sup>99</sup> has resolved her conduct to her Puritan subjects into "her good taste, which gave her a sense of order and decorum, and her sound judgment, which taught her to abhor innovations." What! Can the severest acts of oppression and cruelty, can a series of arbitrary and unfeeling outrages committed against the property, lives, and rights

---

<sup>98</sup> Warner's Ecclesiastical History of England vol. 2. p. 474, 475.

<sup>99</sup> Mr. Hume.

of men, take shelter under the sanction of good taste and a sound judgment? “Nature and religion reclaim.” “If (says an accurate and judicious writer) it be once laid down as a maxim, that a sound judgment will teach a monarch to abhor innovations, and if his power be but little subject to control, one does not know to what lengths it might proceed, so as to be exerted not only in matters of church-government; but likewise, perhaps, against those who would introduce ‘enlarged’ or rather libertine ‘sentiments’ about religion. Such persons, I doubt, would soon give up the wisdom and equity of this maxim concerning innovations, if they were in danger of having the concluding section of the 35th of Elizabeth, cap. 1. put in execution against them.”<sup>100</sup>

Another writer has thrown the blame of the separation from the church of England, and of the evils of which it was productive, on the Puritans. “It was more owing to the weakness and want of judgment in the Puritans, who could think such things were sinful about which the Scriptures were wholly silent, and who desired a great majority to give way to the humour of a few, than to the superstition and want of temper in the queen and the archbishop, who could press such indifferent rites with that severity, before the minds of men had time to be reconciled to them.”<sup>101</sup> To this representation it may be replied, Was it anything unreasonable, that the few should desire the majority not to oppress and bind their consciences in matters about which, it was allowed, the Scriptures were silent, and of course where Christ had left them free? Or could it be deemed weakness and want of judgment, that they requested only to be permitted to stand fast in this liberty? Need a Protestant divine be reminded, that to add to the religion of Christ is sinful: and to enforce these additions, and by severe penalties, is to exercise a forbidden jurisdiction in his church? Can it be deemed weakness and want of judgment to see this criminality, and to resist this yoke? But if to scruple the use of the habits indicated weakness and want of judgment, yet a conscientious adherence to the dictates of their own minds, the integrity which would not allow them to adopt habits or ceremonies, that they thought or suspected to be sinful, should not be reproached, but applauded. An apostle would on such an occasion have said, that “Whatever is not of faith is sin;” and “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.” Why should the rejection, or even a hesitation about the use of habits, which had no divine authority, but a Popish original, and by the mystical signification affixed to them led to superstition, be resolved into weakness and want of judgment? It argued rather a true discernment, a just estimate of things, and a comprehensive view of the tendency and progress of superstition, when once admitted.

---

<sup>100</sup> Letters on Mr. Hume's History of Great Britain, printed at Edinburgh, 1756, page 226.

<sup>101</sup> Warner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 3. p. 431.

The weakness, I should conceive, lay on the other side, where these things were held in such high account, and deemed of such essential importance, as to be the ground of the severest laws to enforce the use of them. The cruelty of the imposition aside, the very imposition itself was folly. For a mighty prince, a convocation of the clergy, a bench of bishops, and the legislature of the nation, to give all their attention to support the reputation of the wearing of a hood and a surplice: to employ all the earnestness of their minds, the weight of their character, and the dignity of their rank, about such little things, this is a ridiculous transaction: it betrays the thoughts and passions of a child. But when to this impotence of judgment oppression and tyranny are added, our indignation is raised!

It is an argument of the rationality and good sense of the general principles, by which the Puritans professed to be governed, that “these very principles (as a late writer observes) were the same which rightly influenced the conduct of the reformers in other instances; for example, in their removing the altars out of the churches and setting up tables in the place of them.<sup>102</sup> Namely, that the retaining altars would serve only to nourish in the people’s minds the superstitious opinion of a propitiatory mass, and would administer an occasion of offence and division.” A like argument in relation to the ancient habits was argued by bishop Hooper, so early as the year 1550:<sup>103</sup> and it was thought of weight in 1562 by one half of the house of convocation.<sup>104</sup>

The conduct of the Puritans, it appears from hence, was wisely adapted to the times in which they lived: in which the habits had a tendency and influence that rendered the contest about them far from being such a frivolous affair, as many are now disposed to consider it. For then a mystical signification was affixed to them by the church of Rome: and there was a prevailing notion of their necessity and efficacy in the administration of the clergy. It is also evident, that they gave the queen and her courtiers a handle to establish and exercise a despotic power: they were the instruments by which the court of high-commission endeavoured to rivet on the people the chains of tyranny. The opposition of the Puritans, therefore, may be vindicated on the largest principles. It was a bold and vigorous stand against arbitrary power, which justly calls for resistance in its first outset and its most trivial demands, if men would not give it room to place its foot and erect its banner. It is a pertinent and very sensible remark of a great author, “that our ancestors, the old Puritans, had the same merit in opposing the imposition of the surplice, that Hampden had in opposing the levying of ship-money. In neither case was the thing itself objected to, so much as the authority that enjoined it, and the danger of the precedent. And it appears to us, that the man, who is as

---

<sup>102</sup> See our author, p. 54, 55. of this volume.

<sup>103</sup> See the same, p. 150.

<sup>104</sup> Letters on Mr. Hume’s History, p. 212, 213.



tenacious of his religious as he is of his civil liberty, will oppose them both with equal firmness.”<sup>105</sup>

The reign of queen Elizabeth affords many instances of the connexion between civil and religious liberty: and furnishes striking documents of her disposition and endeavours to violate both. In this view the behaviour of the Puritans was eventually attended with the most important effects.—Mr. Hume; who treats their principles as frivolous and their conduct as ridiculous, has bestowed on them, at the same time, the highest eulogium his pen could well dictate. “So absolute (says he) was the authority of the crown, that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled, and was preserved, by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution.”<sup>106</sup>

While it is not asserted, that all the Puritans acted upon such enlarged views of things; while it is granted, that “the notions” of numbers, probably of the majority, of them concerning “the civil and religious rights of mankind, were dark and confused;” yet it should be allowed that some of them, for instance Fox the martyrologist, acted upon liberal principles: and all of them felt the oppression of the day, so as, by their own experience of its iniquity and evils, to be instigated to oppose them; though they did not apply the principles, which were thus generated in the mind, to their full extent.

The charge brought against the Puritans, for satirical pamphlets, libels, and abusive language, was in some instances well founded. But it by no means, justly, lay against the whole party. “The moderate Puritans publicly disowned the libels for which they were accused, yet they were brought before the star-chamber. The determinations of this court were not according to any statute law of the land, but according to the queen's will and pleasure: yet they were as binding upon the subject as an act of parliament, which the whole nation exclaimed against, as a mark of the vilest slavery.”<sup>107</sup>

Such oppression, such violent outrages against the security, the conscience, and the lives of men, were sufficient to irritate their minds, and to provoke them to reviling and abusive language. Much allowance should be made for men, who were galled and inflamed by severe sufferings. But, independently of this consideration, we should judge of the strain and spirit of their writings, not by the more polite manners and liberal spirit of the present age, but by the times in which they lived; when, on all subjects, a coarse and rough and even abusive style was common from authors of learning and rank. Bishop Aylmer, in a sermon at court, speaking of the fair sex, said, “Women are of two sorts, some of them are wiser, better learned, discreeter, and more

---

<sup>105</sup> Dr. Priestley's *View of the Principles and Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters*, page 66.

<sup>106</sup> Hume's *History of England*, vol. 5. p 189. 8vo. ed 1763.

<sup>107</sup> Warner's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 2. p. 463.

constant, than a number of men; but another and a worse sort of them, and the most part, are fond, foolish, wanton flibbergibs, tattlers, triflers, wavering, witless, without counsel, feeble, careless, rash, proud, dainty, nice, tale-bearers, evesdroppers, rumour-raisers, evil-tongued, worse-minded, and in every wise doltified with the dregs of the devil's dunghill."<sup>108</sup> If a bishop, when preaching before the queen, could clothe his sentiment in such words, on a subject where this age would study peculiar politeness of style; can we wonder that reviling language should proceed, in the warmth of controversy, from those who were suffering under the rod of oppression?

The other side, who had not the same provocations, did not come behind the most abusive of the Puritan writers, in this kind of oratory. In a tract, ascribed to archbishop Parker, the Nonconformists are described and condemned, as "schismatics, bellie-gods, deceivers, flatterers, fools, such as have been unlearnedlie brought up in profane occupations; puffed up in arrogancie of themselves, chargeable to vanities of assertions: of whom it is feared that they make posthast to be Anabaptists and libertines, gone out from us, but belike never of us; differing not much from Donatists, shrinking and refusing ministers of London; disturbers; factious, wilful entanglers, and encumberers of the consciences of their herers, girdirs, nippers, scoffers, biters, snappers at superiors, having the spirit of irony, like to Audiani, smelling of Donatistrie, or of Papistrie, Rogatianes, Circumcellians, and Pelagians."<sup>109</sup>

END OF VOL. I.

Printed by J. F. Dove, St. John's Square.

---

<sup>108</sup> British Biography, vol. 3. p. 239.

<sup>109</sup> Pierce's Vindication of the Dissenters, p. 62.