

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. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

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

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

1837.

## CHAPTER IX.

### FROM THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE EARL OF STRAFFORD, TO THE RECESS OF THE PARLIAMENT UPON THE KING'S PROGRESS IN SCOTLAND.

IT is impossible to account for the prodigious changes of this and the years immediately succeeding, without taking a short view of some civil occurrences that paved the way for them. In pursuance of the design of bringing corrupt ministers to justice, the parliament began with Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, an able statesman, but a most dangerous enemy of the laws and liberties of his country, whom they impeached of high treason November 11, 1640, and brought to his trial the 22nd of March following. The grand article of his impeachment<sup>1</sup> was, "for endeavouring to subvert the fundamental laws of England and Ireland, and to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government." This was subdivided into several branches, supported by a multiplicity of facts, none of which were directly treason by law, but being put together were construed to be such by accumulation. The earl's reply to the facts consisted partly in excuses and evasions; with a humble acknowledgment that in some things he had been mistaken; but his principal defence rested upon a point of law, "Whether an endeavour to subvert the fundamental form of government, and the laws of the land, was high treason at common law, or by any statute in force?" Mr. Lane the counsel for the prisoner maintained, (1.) That all treasons were to be reduced to the particulars specified in the 25th Edw. III. cap. 2. (2.) That nothing else was or could be treason; and that it was so enacted by the 1st Henry IV. cap. 10. (3.) That there had been no precedent to the contrary since that time. And (4.) That by 1 Mary, cap. 12, an endeavour to subvert the fundamental laws of the land is declared to be no more than felony.

The commons felt the weight of these arguments; and not being willing to enter into debate with a private barrister, changed their impeachment into a bill of attainder, which they had a right to do by virtue of a clause in the 25th Edw. III. cap. 2,<sup>2</sup> which refers the decision of what is treason in all

---

<sup>1</sup> When the earl of Strafford was impeached, the king came into the house of lords, and desired that the articles against him might be read; which the lord-keeper ordered to be done, while many lords cried out, Privilege! privilege! When the king was departed, the house ordered that no entry should be made of the king's demand of hearing the articles read, or of the keeper's compliance with it.—A MS. memorandum of Dr. Birch in the British Museum, and quoted in *Curiosities of Literature*, vol. 2. p. 186.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> The words of the statute are,

"And because that many other like cases of treason may happen in time to come, which a man cannot think or declare at this present time, it is accorded that if any other case, supposed treason, which is not above specified, doth happen before any justice, the justices shall tarry without any going to judgment of the treason till the cause be shewed and declared before the king and his parliament, whether it ought to be judged treason or felony."

doubtful cases to the king and parliament.<sup>1</sup> The attainder passed the commons April 19, yeas two hundred and four, noes fifty-nine; but it is thought would have been lost in the house of lords had it not been for the following accident, which put it out of the power of the earl's friends to save him.

The king, being weary of his parliament and desirous to protect his servant, consented to a project of some persons in the greatest trust about the court, to bring the army that was raised against the Scots up to London, in order to awe the two houses, to rescue the earl, and to take possession of the city of London. Lord Clarendon says,<sup>2</sup> the last motion was rejected with abhorrence, and that the gentleman who made it was the person that discovered the whole plot. The conspirators met in the queen's lodgings at Whitehall, where a petition was drawn up for the officers of the army to sign, and to present to his majesty; with a tender of their readiness to wait upon him in defence of his prerogative against the turbulent spirits of the house of commons; the draught was shown to the king, and signed, "in testimony of his majesty's approbation, C. R." but the plot being discovered to the earl of Bedford, to the lords Say and Kimbolton, and to Mr. Pym, with the names of the conspirators; all of them absconded, and some fled immediately into France.

Mr. Pym opened the conspiracy to the house of commons May 2, 1641,<sup>3</sup> and acquainted them, that among other branches of the plot, one was to seize the Tower, to put the earl of Strafford at the head of the Irish army of Papists who were to be transported into England, and to secure the important town of Portsmouth, in order to receive succours from France; sir William Balfour, lieutenant of the Tower, confessed that the king had sent him express orders to receive a hundred men into that garrison under the command of captain Billingsly, to favour the earl's escape; and that the earl himself offered him £20,000. in money, and to advance his son in marriage to one of the best fortunes in the kingdom. Lord Clarendon has used all his rhetoric to cover over this conspiracy, and to make posterity believe it was

---

<sup>1</sup> The bill of attainder against the earl of Strafford being formed on this principle and authority, there was a great propriety in the following clause of it: viz. "That no judge or judges, justice or justices whatsoever, shall adjudge or interpret any act or thing to be treason, nor hear or determine treason, in any other manner than he or they should or ought to have done before the passing of this act." This clause has been considered as a reflection on the bill itself, and as an acknowledgment, that the case was too hard and the proceedings too irregular to be drawn into a precedent. But this is a misconstruction of the clause, which did not intimate any consciousness of wrong in those who passed it; but was meant to preserve to parliament the right, in future, which is exercised in this instance, of determining what is treason in all doubtful cases; and was intended to restrain the operation of the bill to this single case. It showed, observes Mrs. Macaulay, a very laudable attention to the preservation of public liberty. Macaulay's History, vol. 2. 8vo, p. 444, note (f), and Dr. Harris's Life of Charles I. p. 324, 325.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 248.

<sup>3</sup> Rapin, vol. 2. p. 369. folio.

little more than the idle chat of some officers at a tavern; but they who will compare the depositions in Rushworth, with his lordship's account of that matter, says bishop Burnet, will find, that there is a great deal more in the one, than the other is willing to believe.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Echard confesses that the plot was not wholly without foundation. The court would have disowned it, but their keeping the conspirators in their places, made the parliament believe that there was a great deal more in it than was yet discovered; they therefore sent orders immediately to secure the town and haven of Portsmouth, and to disband the Irish army; they voted that all Papists should be removed from about the court; and directed letters to sir Jacob Ashley, to induce the army to a dutiful behaviour, and to assure them of their full pay.

The consequences of this plot were infinitely prejudicial to the king's affairs; the court lost its reputation; the reverence due to the king and queen was lessened; and the house of commons began to be esteemed the only barrier of the people's liberties; for which purpose they entered into a solemn protestation to stand by each other with their lives and fortunes; the Scots army was continued for their security; a bill for the continuance of the present parliament was brought in and urged with great advantage; and last of all, by the discovery of this plot the fate of the earl of Strafford was determined; great numbers of people crowded in a tumultuous manner to Westminster, crying, Justice! justice! and threatening violence to those members of the house of commons who had voted against his attainder. In this situation of affairs, and in the absence of the bench of bishops (as being a case of blood), the bill passed with the dissent only of eleven peers. The king had some scruples about giving it the royal assent, because, though he was convinced the earl had been guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanours," he did not apprehend that an "endeavour to subvert the fundamental form of government, and to introduce an arbitrary power, was high treason;" his majesty consulted his bishops and judges, but was not satisfied till he received a letter from the earl himself, beseeching his majesty to sign the bill, in order to make way for a happy agreement between him and his subjects. Mr. Whitelocke insinuates,<sup>2</sup> that this letter was but a feint of the earl's; for when secretary Carlton acquainted him with what the king had done, and with the motive, which was his own consent, he rose up in a great surprise, and lifting up his eyes to heaven, said, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation" [Psalm 146.] Two days after this [May 12,] he was executed upon Tower-hill, and submitted to the axe with a Roman bravery and courage; but at the restoration of king Charles II. his attainder was reversed, and the articles of accu-

---

<sup>1</sup> May's Hist. p. 97–99. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 291.

<sup>2</sup> Memorials, p. 44.

mulative treason declared null, because what is not treason in the several parts cannot amount to treason in the whole.<sup>1</sup>

This was the unhappy fate of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, once an eminent patriot and assertor of the liberties of his country, but after he was called to court one of the most arbitrary ministers that this nation ever produced. He was certainly a gentleman of distinguished abilities, as appears by the incomparable defence he made on his trial, which gained him more reputation and esteem with the people, than all the latter actions of his life put together; but still he was a public enemy of his country, and had as great a share in those fatal counsels that brought on the civil war as any man then living. “The earl (says Mr. Echard) was of a severe countenance, insufferably proud and haughty, having a sovereign contempt of the people, whom he never studied to gratify in anything; the ancient nobility looked upon his sudden rise, and universal influence in public affairs, with envy; so that he had but few friends, and a great many enemies.”

Lord Digby, in his famous speech against the bill of attainder, wherein he washes his hands of the blood of the earl of Strafford, has nevertheless these expressions; “I confidently believe him the most dangerous minister, and the most insupportable to free subjects, that can be charactered. I believe his practices in themselves have been as high and tyrannical as any subject ever ventured upon; and the malignity of them is greatly aggravated by those abilities of his, whereof God has given him the use, but the devil the application. In a word, I believe him still that grand apostate to the commonwealth, who must not expect to be pardoned in this world, till he be dispatched to the other.”

Lord Falkland says, “that he committed so many mighty and so manifest enormities and oppressions in the kingdom of Ireland, that the like have not been committed by any governor in any government since Verres left Sicily; and after his lordship was called over from being deputy of Ireland, to be in a manner deputy of England, he and the junctillo gave such counsels and pursued such courses as it is hard to say, whether they were more unwise, more unjust, or more unfortunate.”

Lord Clarendon says,<sup>2</sup> “that he had been compelled, for reasons of state, to exercise many acts of power, and had indulged some to his own appetite and passion, as in the case of the lord-chancellor of Ireland, and the lord Mount Norris, the former of which was *satis pro imperio*, but the latter, the most extravagant piece of sovereignty that in a time of peace had been executed by any subject.” From whence the reader may conclude, that whatev-

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collections, vol. 2. p. 203.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 1. p. 250.

er encomiums the earl might deserve as a gentleman and a soldier, yet as a statesman he deserved the fate he underwent.

The execution of this great personage struck terror into all the king's late ministers; some of them resigned their places, and others retired into France; among the latter was the lord-keeper Finch and secretary Windbank. Six of the judges were impeached of high crimes and misdemeanours, for "interpreting away the laws of their country;" but the parliament had too much business upon their hands to attend to their prosecution at present. Thus this unhappy prince was deprived of those counsellors who were in his own arbitrary sentiments, and left as in a manner to himself, and the powerful influence of his bigoted queen and her cabal of Papists; for the new ministers who succeeded, were such in whom the king would place no confidence. So that most men expected that these vigorous proceedings would induce him to put a speedy end to the session.

But that which prevented it, was the want of money to pay off the armies in the north; his majesty pressed the houses to dispatch this affair, and relieve the country from the burden of contribution; on the other hand, the commons looked upon the Scots as their security, and that if they were sent home, they should again be at the mercy of the prerogative, supported by a standing army. However, they had begun to borrow money of the city of London towards the expense; but when the plot to dissolve the parliament broke out, the citizens declared they would lend nothing upon parliamentary security, because their sitting was so very precarious. This gave rise to a motion for the continuance of the present parliament, till they should dissolve themselves, which was presently turned into a short bill, and passed both houses with very little opposition, as the only expedient that could be thought of to support the public credit: it enacts, "that this present parliament shall not be adjourned, prorogued, or dissolved, without their own consent:" and was signed by commission with the bill of attainder against the earl of Strafford.

All men stood amazed at the king's weakness on this occasion; for by this hasty and unadvised measure he concurred in a change of the whole constitution, giving the two houses a co-ordinate power in the legislature with himself, for as long time as they pleased: if his majesty had fixed their continuance to a limited time, it might have satisfied the people, and saved the prerogative; but by making them perpetual, he parted with the sceptre out of his own bands, and put it into the hands of his parliament. "This (says Mr. Echard) has made some writers doubt, whether those who afterward took up arms against the king could be legally termed rebels. For by passing this act his majesty made the two houses so far independent upon himself, that they immediately acquired an uncommon authority, and a sort

of natural right to inspect and censure his actions, and to provide for the safety of the kingdom.”

While the commons were alarmed with the discovery of the plot, and the flight of the conspirators, Mr. Pym moved that both houses might join in some band of defence for the security of their liberties, and of the Protestant religion; accordingly the following protestation was drawn up, and subscribed the very next day by the whole house [May 3],

“I, A. B., do in the presence of Almighty God vow and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may, with my life, power, and estate, the true reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the church of England, against all Popery and Popish innovations in this realm, contrary to the said doctrine; and according to the duty of my allegiance, I will maintain and defend his majesty’s royal person, honour, and estate; also the power and privilege of parliament, the lawful rights and liberties of the subject, and of every person who shall make this protestation in whatsoever he shall do, in the lawful pursuance of the same. And to my power, as far as lawfully I may, I will oppose, and by all good ways and means endeavour to bring to condign punishment, all such who shall by force, practice, counsel, plot, conspiracy, or otherwise, do anything to the contrary in this protestation contained. And farther, that I shall in all just and honourable ways endeavour to preserve the union and peace between the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and neither for hope, fear, or any other respect, shall relinquish this promise, vow, and protestation.”<sup>1</sup>

May 4, this protestation was made by all the peers present in parliament, except the earl of Southampton and lord Roberts;<sup>2</sup> even by the bishops themselves, though (as lord Clarendon<sup>3</sup> observes) it comes little short of the Scots covenant. Their lordships, indeed, would have interpreted those words, “the true reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the church of England,” to have included the government or hierarchy of the church; but it was resolved and declared by the house,<sup>4</sup> that by those words was and is meant,—only the public doctrine professed in the said church, so far as it is opposite to Popery and Popish innovations; and that the said words are not to extend to the maintenance of any form of

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 251, &c.

<sup>2</sup> “Alleging, that there was no law that enjoined it: and that the consequence of such voluntary engagements might produce effects, that were not intended.” Lord Clarendon as quoted by Dr. Grey.—ED.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. 1. p. 253.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Neal, according to lord Clarendon, has misrepresented this matter. For he says, that this explanation was procured in the house of commons, without ever advising with the house of peers. The peers had previously taken the protestation. *Hist. of the Rebellion*, vol. 2. p. 252. Mr. Neal’s properly corrected here by Dr. Grey.—ED.

worship, discipline, or government, nor of rites and ceremonies.<sup>1</sup>—Within two days the protestation was taken by eighty temporal lords, seventeen bishops, nine judges, and four hundred and thirty-eight of the house of commons. Next day it was printed, and sent to the sheriffs and justices of peace in the several counties of England, to be taken by the whole nation, with the following directions.

“—That it be taken in the afternoon of some Lord’s day after sermon, before the congregation be dismissed, by all masters of families, their sons that are of a proper age, and men-servants, in the manner following. First, That notice be given to the minister by the churchwardens of the intention.—Secondly, That the minister acquaint the people in his sermon of the nature of the protestation.—Thirdly, That the minister first take it himself, reading it distinctly with an audible voice, that all present may hear it; then the assembly shall take the writing in their hands, saying with a distinct and audible voice, ‘I, A. B., do in the presence of Almighty God vow and protest the same, which the leading person that reads it did,’ naming the person—Fourthly, The names of all that take it shall be subscribed in a register; and the names of those that refuse shall be entered.”

The cities of London and Westminster observed these directions, but the remoter counties were complained of for neglect; upon which the house of commons passed a bill to oblige all persons to take it throughout the kingdom; which was lost in the house of lords, the whole bench of bishops opposing it; whereupon the commons came to this resolution, that “whosoever would not take the protestation was unfit to bear offices in the church or commonwealth.”

This was carrying matters to a very extraordinary length.—There had been a parliamentary association in the reign of queen Elizabeth, which her majesty confirmed, and a solemn league and covenant in Scotland, which the king had complied with; but the enforcing a protestation or vow upon his majesty’s subjects without his consent, was assuming a power, which even this dangerous crisis of affairs, and the uncommon authority with which this parliament was invested by the late act of continuance, can by no means support or justify. The odium of putting a stop to the protestation fell upon the bench of bishops, who were already sinking under their own weight: and his majesty’s not interposing in this affair at all, was afterward made use of as a precedent for imposing the solemn league and covenant upon the whole kingdom without his concurrence.<sup>2</sup>

The Puritans had also objected to the lordly titles and dignities of the bishops; but their votes in the house of peers were now esteemed a very

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Nalson's Col. vol. 2. p. 414.



great grievance, and an effectual bar to the proceedings of parliament. It was remembered that they had been always averse to reformation; that they had voted unanimously against the supremacy in king Henry VIII.'s reign; and against the act of uniformity in queen Elizabeth's. It was now observed that they were the creatures of the court, and a dead weight against all reformation in church or state; twenty-six votes being sufficient at any time to turn the scale in that house, whose full number was not above a hundred; it was therefore moved, that a bill might be brought in to take away their seats in parliament, which was readily agreed to. The bill, says lord Clarendon,<sup>1</sup> was drawn up with great deliberation, and was entitled, "An act for restraining bishops, and others of the clergy holy orders, from intermeddling in secular affairs." It consisted of several branches, as, "that no bishop should have a vote in parliament, nor any judicial power in the star-chamber, nor be a privy-councillor, nor a judge in any temporal courts; nor should any clergyman be in the commission of peace." To make way for the passing of this bill, it was alleged, that if this were granted the commons would be satisfied, and little or nothing further attempted to the prejudice of the church. It therefore passed the house of commons without opposition, and was sent up to the house of peers May 1, 1641. Mr. Fuller says,<sup>2</sup> that lord Kimbolton would have persuaded the bishops to resign their votes in parliament, adding, that then the temporal lords would be obliged in honour to preserve their jurisdiction and revenues. The earl of Essex also employed somebody to treat privately with the bishops on the same head; but they rejected all overtures of accommodation, resolving to make their utmost efforts, and to keep possession of their seats till a superior strength should dispossess them; accordingly the bill met with a vigorous opposition in the upper house, and after a second reading was thrown out, without so much as being committed (a countenance frequently given to bills they never intend to pass); but the whole bench of bishops voting for themselves, it is no wonder it was lost by a considerable majority. Mr. Fuller says it would have been thrown out if the bishops had not voted at all; for though the temporal lords were content to exclude them from all secular offices and employments in the state, they were in no disposition to take away their suffrages in the house of peers.

Many learned speeches were made in both houses upon this occasion; the reasons of the commons for passing the bill were these: (1.) Because their attendance on secular affairs, not relating to the church, is a great hinderance to their spiritual function.<sup>3</sup> "No man that warreth (saith St. Paul to Timothy) entangleth himself with the affairs of this life." (2.) Because it is

---

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1. p. 234.

<sup>2</sup> Book. 9. p. 185.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, p. 281. Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 260.

contrary to their ordination-vow; for when they enter into holy orders they promise to give themselves wholly to that vocation. (3.) Because councils and canons in several ages have forbid their meddling in secular affairs. (4.) Because the twenty-four bishops depend on the two archbishops, and take an oath of canonical obedience to them. (5.) Because their peerage is not of the same nature with the temporal lords, being but for life. (6.) Because they depend on the crown for translation to greater bishoprics. (7.) Because it is not fit that twenty-six of them should sit as judges upon complaints brought against themselves and their order.<sup>1</sup>

Bishop Williams published an answer to these reasons, entitled the Abstract, to which there presently came out a reply. The chief speakers on behalf of the bishops, in the house of peers, were, the lord-viscount Newark, afterward earl of Kingston, Dr. Williams, lord-bishop of Lincoln, afterward archbishop of York, the marquis of Hereford, the earls of Southampton, Bath, and Bristol. But instead of transcribing their speeches, I will give the reader a summary of their arguments, and of their adversaries' reply.

First, It was argued, that "bishops had voted in parliament almost ever since the Conquest, according to Matthew Paris, sir Henry Spelman, and others." To which it was replied,<sup>2</sup> that time and usage ought to be of no weight with lawmakers, on the behalf of things which are allowed to be inconvenient: abbots had voted as anciently in parliament as bishops, and yet their votes were taken away.

Secondly, It was said that "the bishops voting was no considerable hinderance in their spiritual function; for parliaments were to sit but once in three years, and then but for a month or two together; but though no clergyman should entangle himself with the affairs of this life, the apostle does not exclude him from intermeddling." To which it was answered, that the episcopal function, if well discharged, was enough for all their time and thoughts; and that their dioceses were large enough to employ all their labours, in visitation, confirmation, preaching, &c. The design of the apostle Paul was certainly to exhort Timothy to withdraw himself as much as possible from the affairs of this life, that his thoughts might be more entire for his evangelical work; and therefore, in another place, he exhorts him to give himself wholly to these things.

---

<sup>1</sup> On these reasons, Dr. Harris observes, "that, whatever might have been thought of them at that time, we are to suppose that they have long been of no force. The zeal for the constitution in church and state, the abhorrence of all ministerial measures inconsistent therewith, the opposition to everything contrary to liberty and the public good; and above all, the self-denial, and contempt of the world, humility, and constant discharge of episcopal duties, required in the New Testament: I say, all these things show how much the bishops since the Reformation are altered, and how much those are mistaken who represent them as a dead weight in the house of lords, and a useless expense to the public." *Life of Charles I.* p. 330, 331.

<sup>2</sup> *Nelson's Collections*, vol. 2. p. 251, &c.

Thirdly, it was said, that “clergymen had always been in the commission of the peace, from the first planting of Christianity, and that they were best qualified for it.” To which it was answered, that they were most unfit for this employment, because it had a direct tendency to hinder their usefulness in their pulpits; and to the fact it was replied, that the first clergymen that were made justices of the peace, or had power in temporal jurisdiction, were the bishops of Durham and York, 34 Edw. III. That before the act of conformity, 1 Edw. VI. the clergy were not put in commission for the peace; and that the reason of their being then admitted was, that they might persuade the people to conformity; but if in conscience they held it not consistent with their spiritual calling, they might refuse.

It was farther said, that the taking away one whole bench out of the house of peers was an ill precedent, and might encourage the commons one time or other to cut off the barons, or some other degree of the nobility. To which it was replied, that the peerage of the bishops did not stand upon the same footing with the rest of the nobility, because their honour does not descend to their posterity, and because they have no right to vote in cases of blood; if they had the same right of peerage with the temporal lords, no canon of the church could deprive them of it; for it was never known, that the canons of the church pretended to deprive the barons of England of any part of their inherent jurisdiction.

It was argued further, that if the bench of bishops were deprived of their votes, they would be left under very great disadvantages; for whereas the meanest commoner is represented in the lower house, the bishops will be thrown out of this common benefit; and if they have no share in consenting to the laws, neither in their persons nor representatives, what justice can oblige them to keep those laws?

To which it was replied, that they have the same share in the legislature with the rest of the freeholders of England; nor is there any more reason that the bishops, as bishops, should be a part of the legislature, than the judges or the lawyers, as such, or any other incorporated profession of learned men.

But the principal argument that was urged in favour of bishops was, that “they were one of the three estates in parliament; that as such they were the representatives of the whole body of the clergy, and therefore to turn them out would be to alter the constitution, and to take away one whole branch of the legislature: the parliament would not then be the complete representative body of the nation, nor would the laws which were enacted in their absence be valid. To support this assertion it was said, (1.) That the clergy in all other Christian kingdoms of these northern parts, make up a third estate, as in Germany, France, Spain, Poland, Denmark, Scotland; and therefore why not in England? (2.) When king Henry V. was

buried, it is said, the three estates assembled, and declared his son Henry VI. his successor. The petition to Richard duke of Gloucester, to accept the crown, runs in the name of the three estates; and in his parliament it is said expressly, that at the request of the three estates (i. e. the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons in parliament assembled,) he was declared undoubted king of these realms; to which may be added, the statute of 1 Eliz. cap. 8, where the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, are said to represent the three estates of this realm.

It was replied to this, that the bishops did not sit in the house as a third estate, nor as bishops, but only in the right of their baronies annexed to their bishoprics, 5 Will. I. All the bishops have baronies except the bishop of Man, who is as much a bishop, to all intents and purposes of jurisdiction and ordination, as the others, but has no place in parliament, because he does not hold *per integram baroniam*. It must be admitted, that in ancient times the lords spiritual are sometimes mentioned as a third estate of the realm, but it could not be intended by this, that the clergy, much less the bishops, were an essential part of the legislature; for if so, it would then follow, that no act of parliament could be valid without their consent; whereas divers acts are now in force, from which the whole bench of bishops have dissented, as the act of conformity, 1 Edw. VI. and the act of supremacy, 1 Eliz.<sup>1</sup> If the major part of the barons agree, and the house of commons concur, any bill may pass into an act with the consent of the king, though all the bishops dissent, because their votes are overruled by the major part of the peers. In the parliament of Northampton under Henry II. when the bishops challenged their peerage,<sup>2</sup> they said, “Non sedemus hic episcopi sed barones,” We sit not here as bishops, but as barons;—we are barons, and you are barons, here therefore we are peers. Nor did king Charles himself apprehend the bishops to be one of the three estates, for in his declaration of June 16, 1642, he calls himself one, and the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, the other two. In ancient times the prelates were sometimes excluded the parliament, as in 25 king Edw. I. when they would not agree to grant an aid to his majesty in the parliament at Carlisle; and before that time several acts had passed against the oppressions of the clergy, in which the entry in the records stands thus, “the king having consulted with the earls, barons, and the other nobles; or by the assent of the earls, barons, and other lay people;” which shows the bishops did not consent, for if they had, they would have been first named, the order of the nobility in all ancient records being prelates, earls, and barons.<sup>3</sup> When the convocation had cited Dr. Standish before them, for speaking words against their power and privi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collections, vol. 2. p. 502, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller’s Appeal.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 396.

lege, in the 7th Henry VIII. it was determined by all the judges of the land, in presence of the king, that his majesty might hold his parliament without calling the bishops at all. It appears therefore from hence, that the bishops never were accounted a third estate of the realm, in such a sense as to make them an essential branch of the legislature; nor are they the representatives of the clergy, because then the clergy would be twice represented, for as many of them as are freeholders are represented with their fellow-subjects in the house of commons; and as clergymen they are represented in convocation, the writ of election to convocation being to send two clerks *ad consentiendum*, &c. Besides, none can properly be called representatives of others, but such as are chosen by them; the bishops therefore, not being chosen for this purpose, cannot properly be the representatives of the clergy in parliament; they sit there not in their spiritual character, but by virtue of the baronies annexed to their bishoprics; and if the king, with consent of parliament, should annex baronies to the courts of justice in Westminster-hall, or to the supreme magistracy of the city of London, the judges and the lord-mayor for the time being would have the same right of peerage. But none of these arguments were deemed of sufficient weight with the lords to deprive them of their seats in parliament.

The loss of this bill, with the resolute behaviour of the bishops, who were determined to part with nothing they were in possession of, inflamed the commons, and made them conclude, that there was no hope of reformation while they were a branch of the legislature. It was observed that the bishops were unusually diligent in giving their attendance upon the house at this time, and always voted with the court. Some of the leading members therefore, in the warmth of their resentments, brought in a bill in pursuance of the root and branch petition, which had been laid aside for some time, for the utter extirpation of all bishops, deans, and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, with all chancellors, officials, and officers belonging to them; and for the disposing of their lands, manors, &c. as the parliament shall appoint.<sup>1</sup> A rash and inconsiderate attempt! For could they expect that the bishops should abolish themselves? Or that the temporal lords should consent to the utter extirpating an order of churchmen, when they would not so much as give up one branch of their privilege? The bill being drawn up by Mr. St. John, was delivered to the speaker by sir Edward Deering with a short speech, in which he took notice of the moderation of the house in the late bill, hoping that, by pruning and taking off a few unnecessary branches from the bishops, the tree might prosper the better! but that this soft method having proved ineffectual, by reason of their incorrigible obstinacy, it was now necessary to put the “axe to the root of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collections, vol. 2. p. 248. 295. 300

tree.”<sup>1</sup> “I never was for ruin (says he) as long as there was any hope of reforming; and now I profess, that if those hopes revive and prosper, I will divide my sense upon this bill, and yield my shoulders to underprop the primitive, lawful, and just episcopacy.” He concluded with a sentence in Ovid.

Cuncta prius tentanda, sed immedicabile vulnus  
Ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.<sup>2</sup>

The reading of this bill was very much opposed, because it was brought in contrary to the usage of parliament without first asking leave; however, it was once read, and then adjourned for almost two months: a little before the king went to Scotland it was carried by a majority of thirty-one voices to read it a second time, and commit it to a committee of the whole house, of which Mr. Hyde [lord Clarendon] was chairman, who made use of so much art and industry to embarrass the affair, that after twenty days the bill was dropped.

Sir Edward Deering’s speech in the committee will give light into the sentiments of the Puritans of these times;<sup>3</sup> “The ambition of some prelates (says he) will not let them see how inconsistent two contrary functions are in one and the same person, and therefore there is left neither root nor branch of that so good and necessary a bill which we lately sent up, and consequently no hope of such a reformation as we all aim at; what hopes then can we have, that this bill, which strikes at root and branch, both of their seats of justice, and of their episcopal chairs in the church, will pass as it is, and without a tender of some other government in lieu of this, since the voices are still the same which threw out your former bill.”<sup>4</sup>—Sir Edward therefore proposed another form of government, if the house should think fit to abolish the present, which was in a manner the same with archbishop Usher’s hereafter mentioned; as, “First, That every shire should be a distinct diocese or church. Secondly, That in every shire or church twelve or more able divines should be appointed, in the nature of an old primitive constant presbytery. Thirdly, That over every presbytery there should be a president, let him be called bishop, or overseer, or moderate, or superintendent, or by what other name you please, provided there be one in every

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 237. Nalson, ut ante, p. 248.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Clarendon represents sir Edward Deering as a man of levity and vanity, easily flattered by being commended; and says, “that the application of the above lines was his greatest motive to deliver the speech which they close. Dr. Harris (Life of Charles I. p. 327) says, he could not be actuated by so mean a motive; and that he was a man of sense, virtue, and learning, perhaps not inferior to his lordship, and of a family vastly superior.”—ED.

<sup>3</sup> Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 295, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

shire, for the government and direction of the presbytery, in the nature of the speaker of the house of commons, or chairman of a committee.” Accordingly it was resolved, July 10, “That ecclesiastical power for the government of the church be exercised by commissioners.” July 31, resolved, “That the members for every county bring in the names of nine persons to be ecclesiastical commissioners, on whom the power of churchgovernment shall be devolved; but that no clergyman be of the commission.” This was designed as a temporary provision, and shows that the Puritans of these times did not intend the presbyterian government, but only a reduction of episcopacy to what they apprehended a more primitive standard; and if the bishops would have relinquished some part of their jurisdiction, the mischiefs that befell them afterward might have been prevented; however, for the present, the prosecution of it was laid aside.

But the house went more readily into the debate for abolishing deans and chapters, and applying their revenues to better purposes.<sup>1</sup> This alarmed the cathedral-men, and put them upon consulting how to ward off the danger that threatened them; for this purpose one divine was deputed from every cathedral in England, to solicit their friends in the houses on behalf of their several foundations; and it must be owned, they did all that men could do, leaving no stone unturned that might be for their advantage. Addresses were presented from both universities in their favour:<sup>2</sup> the address from Oxford prays “for the continuance of the present form of church-government, as the most ancient and apostolical; and for the continuance of cathedral churches, with their lands and revenues, as dedicated to the service of God, soon after the first plantation of Christianity here; as foundations thought fit to be preserved, when the nurseries of superstition were demolished at the Reformation; as confirmed by the laws of the land; as nurseries of students and learned men in divinity; as the upholders of divers schools, hospitals, highways, bridges, and other pious works; as beneficial to those cities where they are situate, by hospitality, by relief of the poor, and by occasioning the resort of many strangers, to the benefit of the tradesmen and inhabitants of the places where they are built; as the chief support of many thousand families of the laity, who enjoy estates from them in a free way; and as yielding an ample revenue to the crown, and a maintenance to many learned professors in the university.” The address from the university of Cambridge was to the same purpose, and therefore prays, “that the religious bounty of their ancestors, for the advancement of learning, and of learned men, may be preserved from ruin and alienation; but withal, to take order, that they may be reduced to the due observation of their statutes, and that

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuller’s Church History, b. 11. p. 176.

<sup>2</sup> Nalson’s Coll. vol. 2. p. 305, 306.

all innovations and abuses may be reformed.” The deputies from the several cathedrals drew up a petition to the lords and commons to be heard by their counsel; but being informed that the house would not allow them that benefit, and that if they had anything to offer they must appear and plead their own cause; they made choice of Dr. John Hacket, prebendary of St. Paul’s and archdeacon of Bedford, as their advocate, who being admitted to the bar of the house, May 12, after the petitions from the two universities had been read, made a laboured speech in their behalf, insisting chiefly on the topics of the Oxford address.

He recommended cathedrals, “as fit to supply the defects of private prayer;” the public performance whereof should be in some place of distinction.<sup>1</sup> And whereas the exquisiteness of the music gave offence to some ears, as hindering their devotion, he requested, in the name of his brethren, that it might be moderated to edification, and reduced to the form that Athanasius recommends, “ut legentibus sint quam cantantibus similiores.”

He alleged, that “at the Reformation preaching began in cathedrals;” and whereas some have said, that lecture-preachers were an upstart corporation; the doctor observed, that the local statutes of all the cathedrals required lectures on the week-days; and he requested, in the name of his brethren, that the godly and profitable performance of preaching might be more exacted.

He urged, that “cathedrals were serviceable for the advancement of learning, and training up persons for the defence of the church;” and that the taking them away would disserve the cause of religion, and be a pleasure to their adversaries.

He added, that “the ancient and genuine use of deans and chapters was a *senatus episcopi*,” to assist the bishop in his jurisdiction; and whereas some of his reverend brethren had complained, that bishops had for many years usurped the sole government to themselves and their consistories; the continuing of chapters rightly used would bring it to a plurality of assistants.

He then put them in mind of “the antiquity of the structures, and the number of persons maintained by them,” amounting to many thousands; he instanced their tenants, who by their leases enjoyed six parts in seven pure gain, and had therefore petitioned for their landlords; and showed, that the cities in which cathedrals were built, were enriched by the hospitality of the clergy, and the resort of strangers.

He enlarged farther, “upon their endowments, as encouragements to industry and virtue:” that several famous Protestants of foreign parts had been maintained by being installed prebendaries, as, Casaubon, Saravia, Dr. Pe-

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuller, b. 11. p. 177.



ter du Moulin, Vossius, and others; that the crown had great benefit from these foundations, paying greater sums into the exchequer for first-fruits and tenths, according to proportion, than other corporations.

And lastly, he puts them in mind, that “these structures and estates were consecrated to divine service, and barred all alienation with the most dreadful imprecations.”

In the afternoon Dr. Cornelius Burges appeared on the other side of the question, and made a long speech concerning the unprofitableness of those corporations; he complained of the “debauchery of singing-men,” and of their vicious conversation; he spoke against “music in churches” as useless and hurtful. He made a distinct answer to the particulars of Dr. Hacket’s speech; and in conclusion said, “though he apprehended it necessary to apply these foundations to better purposes, it was by no means lawful to alienate them from public and pious uses, or to convert them to any private persons’ profit.”

The farther debate of this bill was adjourned for a week, and then committed to a committee of the whole house, when the two following remarkable speeches were made against these foundations.<sup>1</sup>

The first by Mr. Serjeant Thomas, who admits, “that there were deans in St. Austin’s time, but that they were not officers of the church until some centuries after. St. Austin gives this account of their original; that the monks, for their more convenient retirement and contemplation, appointed officers, whom they called deans, ‘eo quod denis sunt præpositi;’ because every man had the care of ten monks, and was to provide them all necessaries of life, that their devotions might not be interrupted with worldly cares. In the following ages of darkness and superstition, princes and others bestowed large revenues upon these monks, from the opinion they had of the austerity and sanctity of their lives; and as the monks grew rich, the office of the dean, who was the ‘præpositus’ or steward, grew more considerable, till in St. Bernard’s time it was ordained, that none but a presbyter should be a dean: ‘ne sit decanus nisi presbyter.’ At the reformation of religion, when many other religious foundations were broke up, these were preserved, and in the constitutions of King Henry VIII. and Edward VI. it is ordained, that all deans should be presbyters, men of gravity, learning, and prudence, that they should govern the cathedral churches according to their statutes; that they should preserve discipline, and see that the holy rites be performed in a grave and decent manner; that they be assistants to the bishops within their several cathedrals, as the archdeacons are abroad, for which reason they should not be absent from their cathedrals without the most urgent necessity, to be allowed by the bishop, but one or other of them

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 285. Nalson’s Coll. vol. 2. p. 282.

is to preach in their cathedrals every Lord's day." The Serjeant then observed how unlike our present deans were to their predecessors; how little they observed the statutes of their institution, and gave it as his opinion, that it was not reasonable that such vast revenues should be allowed to persons who were of so little use to the church or commonwealth.

Mr. Pury, alderman of Gloucester, pursued the same argument; he produced a copy of the statutes of the dean and chapter of Gloucester, with their original grant about the time of the Reformation. "We have erected (says the king) cathedrals and colleges in the place of monasteries, that where ignorance and superstition reigned, the sincere worship of God might flourish, and the gospel of Christ Jesus be purely preached; and farther, that the increase of the Christian faith and piety, the instruction of youth in good learning, and the sustentation of the poor, may be for ever kept, maintained, and continued."<sup>1</sup> He then produced the statutes, which ordained, "that the said deans, prebends, and canons, shall always reside and dwell in the houses of the said cathedrals, and there keep a family, with good hospitality to feed the poor, and to distribute alms. That they should 'preach the word in season and out of season,' especially in the cathedral-church, and have youth profitably taught there. To this end they are to have a common table in the common-hall of the cathedral, where the canons, scholars, choristers, and officers, are to eat together. The said dean and chapter are to give yearly £20 to the poor, besides what is given to their own poor alms-men, and £20 more to the repairing bridges and highways thereabouts. For the performance of the said statutes and premises, the deans, prebendaries, canons, and other ministers of the cathedral, are obliged to take an oath, and every one of them doth swear, that to the utmost of his power, he will observe them inviolably."

The alderman observes from hence, "that not one of the abovementioned statutes are, or have been kept, or the matters in any of them contained, performed by any of the deans or prebendaries of the said cathedral in his memory. That they come once a year, to receive the rents and profits of the lands, but do not distribute to the poor their proportion; nor do they mend the highways and bridges; nor do they keep any common table; and instead of preaching 'in season and out of season,' they neither practise it themselves, nor encourage it in others. Infinite are the pressures that many cities near unto deans and chapters have endured by them, and their procurement; so far have they been from a common benefit. Since then the said deans and chapters are but trustees, and the profits of the said lands have been so ill employed, contrary to the trust in them reposed, the alderman was of opinion, that by a legislative power in parliament it was fit to

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 289.

take them away, and put them into the hands of feoffees, to be disposed of to such pious and charitable uses as they were first intended for; by which means the preaching of the gospel might be effectually encouraged, smaller livings augmented, and the necessities of the poor better supplied.”

These speeches made such an impression upon the house, that after a long debate they came to these resolutions, “that all deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, chanters, canons, and petty canons, and their officers, shall be utterly abolished and taken away out of the church; and that all the lands taken by this bill from deans and chapters shall be put into the hands of feoffees, to be employed for the support of a fit number of preaching ministers for the service of every church, and for the reparation of the said churches, provision being made, that his majesty be no loser in his rents, first-fruits, and other duties; and that a competent maintenance shall be made to the several persons concerned, if they appear not delinquents to this house.” But none of these votes passed into a law; nor was there the least prospect of their being confirmed by the lords, as long as the bishops were in that house, who stood together like a wall against every attempt of the commons for alterations in the church, till, by an unexpected providence, they were broken in pieces, and made way for their own ruin.

The firmness of the bishops against all abatements or relaxations in favour of the Puritans, exasperated the people, and put an end to all prospect of agreement. A committee of accommodation had been appointed by the house of lords, March 12, to consider of such innovations in religion as were proper to be taken away, which by the plot of the court to bring up the army, and the loss of the late bills for reformation of the hierarchy, was now broken up.<sup>1</sup> It consisted of ten earls, ten bishops, and ten barons. “This committee (says archbishop Laud in his diary) will meddle with doctrine as well as ceremony, and will call some divines to them to consider of the business, as appears by a letter hereunto annexed, sent by the lord-bishop of Lincoln to some divines to attend this service. Upon the whole, I believe this committee will prove the national synod of England, to the great dishonour of the church, and what else may follow upon it God knows.” At their first meeting they appointed a sub-committee of bishops, and divines of different persuasions, to prepare matters for their debate; the bishop of Lincoln was chairman of both, and was ordered to call together the sub-committee with all convenient speed; which he did by a letter directed to each of them in the following words:

“I am commanded by the lords of the committee for the innovations in matters of religion, to let you know, that their said lordships have assigned and appointed you to attend them, as assistants in that committee; and to let

---

<sup>1</sup> Laud’s Diary, p. 61. History of his Troubles, p. 174.

you know in general, that their lordships intend to examine all innovations in doctrine and discipline introduced into the church without law, since the Reformation; and (if their lordships shall find it behoveful for the good of the church and state) to examine after that, the degrees and perfection of the Reformation itself, which I am directed to intimate to you, that you may prepare your thoughts, studies, and meditations, accordingly, expecting their lordships' pleasure for the particular points, as they shall arise. Dated March 12, 1640–1.”

    Their names were these:—

Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Usher, archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Morton, bishop of Durham, Dr. Hall, bishop of Exeter, Dr. Samuel Ward, Dr. John Prideaux,

Dr. Sanderson, Dr. Featly, Dr. Brownrigge, Dr. Holdsworth, Dr. Hacket, Dr. Twisse, Dr. Burges, Mr. White, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Hill.

Some others were named, but these were all who appeared: they consulted together six several days in the Jerusalem-chamber at Westminster, the dean entertaining them all the while at his table. The result of their conferences was drawn up for the debate of the committee, in certain propositions and queries under the following heads:

1.—*Innovations in Doctrine.*

1. “Quære, Whether in the twentieth article these words are not inserted, ‘the church has authority in controversies of faith’?”

2. “Several false doctrines have been preached, even all the doctrines of the council of Trent, abating only such points of state Popery against the king’s supremacy, as were made treason by the statute; for example, some have preached justification by works; others, that works of penance are satisfactory before God; that private confession is necessary to salvation, *necessitate medii*; that absolution of a priest is more than declaratory; that the Lord’s supper is a true and proper sacrifice. Some have defended prayer for the dead, and the lawfulness of monastic vows; some have denied the morality of the sabbath; some have preached, that subjects are bound to pay taxes, contrary to the laws of the realm; some have defended the whole substance of Arminianism; and others have given just occasion of being suspected of Socinianism.

3. “Several dangerous and reprobable books have been printed,” which are mentioned in the copy of their proceedings, now<sup>7</sup> before me.

2.—*Innovations in Discipline.*

As, 1. “Turning the holy table into an altar.

2. “Bowling towards it, or to the east many times, with three congees, at access or recess in the church.

3. “Placing candlesticks on altars in parochial churches in the day-time, and making canopies over them, with curtains, in imitation of the vail of the temple; advancing crucifixes and images upon the parafront or altar-cloth, and compelling all communicants to come up before the rails.

4. “Reading the litany in the body of the church, and some part of the morning-prayer at the altar, when there is no communion; and the minis-

ter's turning his face to the east when he pronounces the creed, or reads prayers.

5. "Offering bread and wine by the hands of the churchwardens, or others, before the consecration of the elements. Having a *credentia*, or side-table for the Lord's supper. Introducing an offertory before the communion, besides the giving alms to the poor afterward.

6. "Prohibiting ministers to expound the catechism; suppressing lectures on the week-day, and sermons on Sunday afternoon. Prohibiting a direct prayer before sermon; and bidding of prayer.

7. "Singing Te Deum in prose in parish-churches. Standing up at the hymns of the church; and always at Gloria Patri. Carrying children from baptism to the altar, to offer them to God; and prohibiting the building galleries in churches, where the parishes are very populous.

8. "Introducing Latin service in the communion at Oxford; and into morning and evening prayer in Cambridge.

9. "Pretending for their innovations the injunctions and advertisements of queen Elizabeth, which are not in force, but appertain to the liturgy, printed in the second and third of Edw. VI. which the parliament had reformed and laid aside."

#### *Memorandum for Reformation.*

1. "That in all cathedral and collegiate churches two sermons be preached every Sunday, and likewise every holiday; and one lecture at least on working days every week in the year.

2. "That the music used in cathedral and collegiate churches be framed with less curiosity; and that no hymns or anthems be used where ditties are framed by private men, but such as are contained in the Holy Scriptures, or in our liturgy or prayers, or have public allowance.

3. "That the reading desk be placed in the church, where divine service may be best heard of the people."

#### *3.—Considerations upon the Book of Common Prayer.*

1. "Whether the names of some departed saints should not be struck out of the calendar?"

2. "Whether the rubric should not be mended, where all those vestments are commanded which were used in the second year of Edward VI?"

3. "Whether lessons of canonical Scripture should not be inserted into the calendar instead of Apocrypha?"

4. "In the rubric for the Lord's supper, whether it should not be inserted, that such as intend to communicate shall signify their names to the curate over night, or in the morning before prayers?"

5. “The next rubric to be explained, how far a minister may repulse a scandalous and notorious sinner from the communion?”

6. “Whether it be not fit to insert a rubric, touching: kneeling at the communion, that it is to comply in all humility with the prayer which the minister makes, when he delivers the elements?”

7. “Whether there should not be a rubric to takeaway all offence from the cross in baptism? Or, whether it be more expedient that it be wholly disused? And, whether this reason shall be published, that in ancient liturgies no cross was signed, upon the party but where oil also was used, and therefore oil being now omitted, so may that which was concomitant with it, the sign of the cross?”

8. “Whether the catechism may not receive a little more enlargement?”

9. “Whether the times prohibited for marriages are quite to be taken away? Whether those words in the office, “With my body I thee worship,” should not be thus altered,— I give thee power over my body? And, whether that part of the rubric which obliges the new-married persons to receive the communion the same day of their marriage, might not be changed for the next Sunday when the communion is celebrated?”

10. “Whether in the absolution for the sick it were not better to say, I pronounce thee absolved? And in the office for the dead, instead of those words, ‘in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life,’ whether it were not better to say,—knowing assuredly, that the dead shall rise again.”

Some other amendments of smaller moment were proposed, but these were the chief. No mention was made of a reformation of episcopacy, because their chairman the bishop of Lincoln had undertaken that province, and accordingly presented the house of lords with a reconciling scheme, which was dropped after the first reading. It consisted of ten articles.

1. “That every bishop, being within his diocese, and not disabled by ill heath, shall preach once every Lord’s day, or pay £5 to the poor, to be levied by the next justice of the peace.

2. “That no bishop shall be justice of the peace, except the dean of Westminster in Westminster and St. Martin’s. [This seems to be a proviso for himself.]

3. “That every bishop shall have twelve assistants besides the dean and chapter; four to be chosen by the king, four by the lords, and four by the commons, for jurisdiction and ordination.

4. “That in all vacancies, these assistants, with the dean and chapter, shall present to the king, three of the ablest divines in the diocess, who shall choose one to be bishop.

5. “That deans and prebendaries shall not be nonresidents at their cathedrals above sixty days.

6. “That sermons shall be preached in the cathedrals twice every Lord’s day, once every holiday, and a lecture on Wednesdays, with a salary of one hundred marks per annum.

7. “That all archbishops, bishops, and collegiate churches &c. shall be obliged to give a fourth part of their fines, and improved rents, to buy in impropriations.

8. “That all double beneficed men shall pay the value of half their living to the curate.

9. “No appeal shall be made to the court of arches, or court of audience.

10. “It is proposed, that canons and ecclesiastical constitutions shall be drawn up, and suited to the laws of the realm, by sixteen learned persons, six to be nominated by the king, five by the lords, and five by the commons.”

Archbishop Usher offered another scheme, for the reduction of episcopacy into the form of synodical government, received in the ancient church; in which his grace supposes, that of the many elders that ruled the church of Ephesus, there was one stated president whom our Saviour calls the angel; and whom Ignatius, in one of his epistles, calls the bishop, to whom, in conjunction with the elders or presbyters, the whole government of the church, both as to doctrine and discipline, was committed. He therefore proposes, that these be continued; and for a regulation of their jurisdiction, that suffragans should be appointed to hold monthly synods of presbyters, from whom there should be an appeal to diocesan, provincial, and national ones; and more particularly,

1. “That the rector of every parish, with the churchwardens, should admonish and reprove such as live scandalously, according to the quality of their offence: and if by this means they are not reclaimed, to present them to the next monthly synod, and in the meantime debar them the Lord’s table.

2. “Whereas by a statute of 26 Henry VIII. suffragans are appointed to be erected in twenty-six several places of this kingdom, the number of them may be conformed to the number of the several rural deaneries, into which every diocess is subdivided; which being done, the suffragan may every month assemble a synod of the several rectors or incumbent pastors within the precinct, and according to the major part of their votes conclude all matters that should be brought into debate before them.

3. “A diocesan synod might be held once or twice a year, wherein all the suffragans, and the rest of the rectors and incumbent pastors, or a certain select number out of every deanery, within that diocess, might meet, with whose consent all things might be concluded by the bishop or superintendent; or in his absence by one of his suffragans, whom he should appoint



as moderator in his room; and here the transactions of the monthly synods may be revised and reformed.

4. “The provincial synod may consist of all the bishops and suffragans, and such of the clergy as should be elected out of every diocese within the province; the primate of either province might be moderator, or in his room, one of the bishops appointed by him. This synod might be held every third year, and if the parliament be sitting, both the primates and provincial synods might join together, and make up one national synod, wherein all appeals from inferior synods might be received, all their acts examined, and all ecclesiastical affairs relating to the state of the church in general established.”

Several other proposals were made to the house of commons by those Puritans who were for revising and altering some things in the church, but not for root and branch:<sup>1</sup> as that his majesty should be moved to call a national synod, or a select number of divines of the three nations under his majesty’s government; with an intimation to all reformed churches to send their deputies, to settle a uniform model of government for the church of England, to be confirmed by parliament, leaving to other nations a Christian liberty in those forms of discipline which are most agreeable to their civil government.

Others proposed, “that the present liturgy might be continued, but that the Apocryphal lessons be entirely omitted; that all sentences of Holy Scripture be according to the last translation; that the word minister be used instead of priest; with some other amendments.—That, with regard to episcopal government, bishops be obliged to constant preaching in their metropolitan or parochial churches;—that they never ordain without consent of three or four presbyters at least;—that they do not suspend by their sole authority, but with consent of presbyters, and that for weighty causes;—that none may be excommunicated but by the bishop himself, with consent of the pastor in whose parish the delinquent dwells; and that for heinous and very scandalous crimes only.—That the fees of ecclesiastical courts be regulated, and that bishops, chancellors, and their officials, may be subject to the censure of provincial synods and convocations.”

But all these attempts for accommodation were blasted by the stiffness of the bishops, and by the discovery of the plot to bring the army to London to dissolve the parliament; this put the nation into a ferment, and widened the distance between the king and the two houses, upon which the committee broke up about the middle of May, without bringing anything to perfection. Mr. Fuller has observed very justly, “that the moderation and mutual compliance of these divines might have saved the body of episcopacy and

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 203.

prevented the civil war; but the court-bishops expected no good from them, suspecting the Doctrinal Puritans, (as they nicknamed those bishops and episcopal divines) joined with the disciplinary Puritans, would betray the church between them. Some hot spirits would abate nothing of episcopal power or profit, but maintained, that the yielding anything was granting the day to the opposite party." It is the observation of another learned writer, upon the committee's agreeing to have the psalms in the liturgy printed according to the new translation; to expunge all Apocryphal lessons: to alter certain passages in the book of Common Prayer; and some other things, with which divers of the Presbyterians said they were satisfied, "that if the episcopal men had made these concessions when they were in full power, they had prevented the mischiefs that were coming upon them; but as things were at present, neither side appeared very well satisfied."

There were deep resentments in the breasts of both parties; the bishops were incensed at the bold attacks of the house of commons upon their peerage and spiritual jurisdiction; and the Puritans had a quick sense of their former sufferings, which made them restless till they had abridged their power. It is very remarkable, and looks like an appearance of divine displeasure against the spirit of these times, that archbishop Usher's scheme, for the reduction of episcopacy, which at this time would have satisfied the chief body of the Puritans, could not be obtained from the king and the bishops; that afterward, when the king offered this very scheme at the treaty of the Isle of Wight, the parliament and Puritan divines would not accept it, for fear of breaking with their Scots brethren. Again, when the Presbyterian ministers at the restoration of king Charles II. presented it to his majesty as a model with which they were satisfied, and which would comprehend in a manner their whole body, both the king and bishops rejected it with contempt, and would not suffer it to be debated.

It may not be improper in this place, to make a few remarks upon this part of Mr. Rapin's accurate and judicious history of England, who, in his account of these times, seems to represent the body of the Puritans to be presbyterians, and as having formed a conspiracy against the whole fabric of the church, from the very beginning of this parliament; whereas the state of the controversy between the church and the Puritans was now changed. In the reigns of queen Elizabeth and king James I. the Puritans were for the most part presbyterians, though even then there were many episcopalians among them; but from the time that Arminianism prevailed in the church, and the whole body of the Calvinists came to be distinguished by the name of Doctrinal Puritans, both parties seemed to unite in a moderate episcopacy, there being little or no mention of the old book of discipline for twenty years before the commencement of the civil war, and all the controversy turning upon points of Calvinism; upon a reduction of the exorbitant power

of the bishops; or upon innovations, as they were called, and ceremonies. There were few either among the clergy or laity, who had a zeal for presbytery, or desired any more than to be rid of their oppressions. Mr. Rapin, however, is of opinion,<sup>1</sup> that “among the members of parliament there were real presbyterians, who thought no doubt, of altering the whole government of the church. These are represented as deep politicians, as working underground, and making use of all kinds of artifices to accomplish their designs, which they took care not to discover.” He owns, indeed, that “the presbyterians were not very numerous in the house, but that they were supported by a pretty great party in the kingdom, and particularly by the Scots;” which assertion seems to me to require stronger evidence than he has thought fit to produce. I have shown from lord Clarendon, that both houses of parliament, at their first sitting down, were almost to a man for the constitution of the church; that they aimed at no more than a redress of grievances; and that there were not above two or three in both houses that were for root and branch. That all the members received the communion according to the usage of the church of England, at their first sitting down, and brought a certificate of their having so done. That the petition of the Puritan ministers was not for setting up presbytery, but only for reforming the grievances of the hierarchy; the controversy between bishop Hall and the Smectymnuan divines, proceeded on the same footing, as did the committee of accommodation. In short, when the parliament was obliged to fly to the Scots for assistance in the war, and to receive their covenant; and when afterward they found it necessary to pay the utmost deference to their advices, lest they should withdraw their army, and leave them to the mercy of an enraged king, they could never, in the worst of times, be induced to establish their discipline in the church of England, without a reserve of the ecclesiastical power to themselves. And as to the ministers who composed the assembly of divines at Westminster, though in a course of time they carried things very high, yet I am of opinion with Mr. Fuller,<sup>2</sup> that at first “they rather favoured the presbyterian discipline, or were brought over to embrace it by the Scots,” than that they came thither possessed with sentiments of its divine authority. However, it is certain, that at the Restoration these very divines offered to give it up for archbishop Usher’s model of primitive episcopacy.

It must be confessed, that soon after the beginning of the parliament there were many among the common people who were enemies to the whole ecclesiastical constitution, being supported by the Scots commissioners, who had conceived an implacable antipathy against the order of

---

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 2. p. 359. 447. folio edition.

<sup>2</sup> Book 11 p. 198.

bishops, which they had voted contrary to the word of God. But this was not the case of the Puritan clergy, who wanted only to get rid of the tyranny of the bishops, and were willing to leave the parliament to model the government of the church as they pleased. And although as the influence of the Scots over the two houses increased, presbytery prevailed; and when the parliament were at their mercy, and forced to submit to what conditions they would impose upon them for their assistance, the kirk-discipline gained the ascendant, and at length advanced into a divine right in the assembly of divines; yet the parliament would never come into it, and when the Scots were gone home it dwindled by degrees, till it was almost totally eclipsed by the rising greatness of the Independents.

It appears therefore to me, that there was no formed design as yet, either in the house of commons or among the Puritan clergy, to subvert the hierarchy, and erect the presbyterian government upon its ruins; there were no considerable number of presbyterian ministers in the nation; and the leading members in both houses were known to be of another stamp. “We are confident (says the king, in his letter to the council of Scotland, August 26) that the most considerable persons in both houses of parliament, and those who make the fairest pretensions to you of uniformity in church-government, will no sooner embrace a presbyterial than you an episcopal.”<sup>1</sup> And bishop Burnet speaks the same language. So that what was done in the house of commons afterward, was the result of the situation of their affairs, and not of any formed design: as that changed, so did their councils and measures. The contrary to this ought not to be supposed, but proved by incontestable matters of fact, which neither Mr. Rapin, nor any other historian whom I have read, has yet done. And I will venture to say, that if there were such invisible presbyterians behind the curtain, who planned the subversion of the hierarchy, and blew it up as it were without hands, they must have been abler statesman, and masters of much more worldly politics, than their posterity have ever been remarkable for.

To return to the parliament: There were two bills which affected the prerogative now ready for the royal assent; one to abolish the court of high-commission, and regulate the privy-council; the other to take away the star-chamber. To induce the king to pass them more readily, the commons sent up a money-bill with them; but when the king came to the house [July 3, 1641] he passed the money-bill, and told the houses, he must take some time to consider of the others; which disgusted the commons so much, that they returned to their house and immediately adjourned. At their next meeting they fell into new heats, which his majesty being informed of, came to the house of peers, and having sent for the commons, reprimanded them for

---

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton's Memoirs, book 4. p. 197.

their jealousies, and then passed the bills; he also put them in mind what he had done this session; “that he had yielded, that the judges should hold their places *quamdiu se bene gesserint*; that he had given away his right to ship-money; granted a law for triennial parliaments, and for securing the money borrowed for disbanding the armies; in a word, that he had hitherto given way to everything, and therefore they should not wonder, if in some things he began now to refuse.”<sup>1</sup> Lord Clarendon insinuates, that the king passed these bills with reluctance; from whence another ingenious writer concludes, that if ever the ministry had regained their power, it was likely they would advise his majesty to declare them void, as being extorted from him by force and violence.

The act for abolishing the high-commission court repeals that branch of the statute 1 Eliz. cap. 1, upon which this court was founded, and then enacts, “that no archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, chancellor, or official, nor commissary, of any archbishop, bishop, or vicar-general, or any other spiritual or ecclesiastical officer, shall by any grant, licence, or commission, from the king, his heirs or successors, after the 1st of August 1641, award, impose, or inflict, any pain, penalty, fine, amercement, imprisonment, or other corporal punishment, upon any of the king’s subjects, for any contempt, misdemeanour, crime, matter, or thing whatsoever, belonging to spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or shall *ex officio* tender or administer to any person, any corporal oath, to make any presentment of any crime, or to confess or accuse himself of any crime, offence, delinquency, or misdemeanour, whereby he or she may be liable to any punishment whatsoever, under penalty of treble charges, and £100 to him or them who shall first demand or sue for the same. And it is farther enacted, that after the said 1st of August 1641, no new court shall be erected, or deemed, or appointed, that shall have the like power, jurisdiction, or authority, as the high-commission court had, or pretended to have, but all such commissions, letters patent, &c. from the king, or his successors: and all acts, sentences, and decrees, made by virtue thereof, shall be utterly void.”

By the passing this act, all coercive power of church-consistories was taken away, and the spiritual sword, that had done such terrible execution in the hands of some bishops, was put into the scabbard. It was very extraordinary that the bishops, who were then in the house of lords, should so supinely suffer themselves to be surprised out of their power. Some were ready to observe a hand of justice, says Mr. Fuller,<sup>2</sup> that seeing many simple souls, by captious interrogatories, had been circumvented by the high-commission court into a self-accusation, an unsuspected clause in this stat-

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collection, vol. 1. p. 327.

<sup>2</sup> Book 11. p. 181.

ute should abolish all their lawful authority: for there is no proviso in the act to confine it only to the high-commission, but it extends to all archbishops, bishops, and all spiritual or ecclesiastical officers in any of their courts. Lord Clarendon says,<sup>1</sup> that the king was apprehensive that the body of the bill exceeded the title, and therefore made a pause in consenting to pass it, but that some bishops prevailed with his majesty to sign it, to take off the odium from that bench, of their being enemies to all reformation; for it was insinuated, says the noble historian, that since they opposed a due regulation of their power, there would be no way but to cut them off root and branch.

The act for taking away the star-chamber, and regulating the privy-council, dissolves the said court from the 1st of August 1641, “and repeals all those acts, or clauses of acts of parliament, by which any jurisdiction, power, or authority, is given to the said court, or to any of the officers or ministers thereof. And it ordains farther, that neither his majesty, nor his privy-council, have, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, or authority, by English bill, petition, articles, libel, or other arbitrary way, to examine or draw in question, determine or dispose of, the lands, tenements, hereditaments, goods, or chattels, of any of the subjects of this kingdom.”

Thus fell the two chief engines of the late arbitrary proceedings in church and state, which had the liberties and estates of many worthy and pious families to answer for. By the proviso in the act for abolishing the high-commission, that “no new court shall be erected with like powers for the future,” it appears how odious their proceedings were in the eyes of the nation. Lord Clarendon admits,<sup>2</sup> that the taking away the star-chamber at this time was very popular; but is of opinion that it would be no less politic in the crown to revive it when the present distempers are expired; however, I rely on the wisdom of a British parliament, that they will never consent to it.

When the king had signed the two bills, he desired the advice of his parliament, concerning a manifesto which he intended to send to the diet of Ratisbon in favour of the Palatine family, wherein he declares, that he will not abandon the interests of his sister and nephews, but will employ all his force and power in their behalf until they are restored. This was highly acceptable to the Puritans, who had always the interest of that house at heart. The manifesto was read July 7,<sup>3</sup> when the commons declared their approbation of it, and resolved to give his majesty such assistance therein as shall stand with the honour of his majesty, and the interest and affections of his kingdom, if the present treaty does not succeed. The peers concurred in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 284.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 1. p. 285.

<sup>3</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 310.

same vote, and both houses desired the king to recommend it to the parliament of Scotland: which his majesty promised. Many warm speeches were made on this occasion in favour of the queen of Bohemia, by sir Simon D'Ewes, Mr. Denzil Hollis, and sir Benjamin Rudyard.<sup>1</sup> "The restoring the prince to his electorate (says sir Benjamin) will restore the Protestant religion there; it will strengthen and increase it in Germany, which is of great and vast consequence. It will likewise refresh and comfort the heart of that most noble, virtuous, and magnanimously-suffering, queen of Bohemia his majesty's sister, and his highness's mother, who is ever to be highly and tenderly regarded by this house, and by this kingdom."—Mr. Denzil Hollis said, "The house of commons looks upon those distressed princes of so glorious an extraction, with an eye of tenderness, wishing every drop of that princely blood may ever be illustrated with honour and happiness.—To hear that these princes should have their patrimony taken from them, and suffer things so unworthy their birth and relation, is a thing that makes our ears to tingle, and our hearts to rise within us.—But there is another motive which has an irresistible operation with us, which is the advancement of Protestant religion—The Protestant religion and this kingdom must live and die together; and it is madness to suppose the Protestant religion can continue here, if we suffer it to be destroyed and eradicated out of the neighbouring countries.—Religion is the heart of England, and England is the heart of the Protestant religion in all the other parts of Christendom; let us therefore, likewise men, that foresee the evil afar off, rather meet it at a distance, than stay till the Austrian ambition and Popish power come to our door."<sup>2</sup> These were the sentiments of the Puritans in this parliament, with respect to the ancestors of his present majesty, and the Protestant religion. The queen of Bohemia was so sensible of their particular regards for her family, that she returned them her thanks; but the manifesto ended in nothing.<sup>3</sup>

The commons not being able to come at their intended alterations in the church, while the bench of bishops remained united in the house of peers, formed several schemes to divide them: it was first proposed to set large fines upon both houses of convocation for compiling the late canons, and a bill was brought in for that purpose; but upon better consideration it was thought more effectual for the present, to make examples of those bishops only, who had been the principal movers in that affair; agreeably to this resolution a committee was appointed July 31, to draw up an impeachment against one half of the bench, viz. Dr. Laud archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Curie bishop of Winchester, Dr. Wright bishop of Coventry and Litchfield,

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson's Collection, p. 326–328. 378.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, p. 316.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 357.

Dr. Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Hall bishop of Exeter, Dr. Owen bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. Pierse bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Wren bishop of Ely, Dr. Roberts bishop of Bangor, Dr. Skinner bishop of Bristol, Dr. Warner bishop of Rochester, Dr. Towers bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Owen bishop of Landaff.<sup>1</sup> The impeachment was of high crimes and misdemeanours, “for making and publishing the late canons, contrary to the king’s prerogative, to the fundamental laws of the realm, to the rights of parliament, and to the property and liberty of the subject; and containing matters tending to sedition, and of dangerous consequence; and for granting a benevolence or contribution to his majesty, to be paid by the clergy of that province, contrary to law.” It was carried up to the lords August 4, by serjeant Wild, who demanded, in the name of all the commons of England, that the bishops might be forthwith put to answer the crimes and misdemeanours above mentioned, in the presence of the house of commons; and that such farther proceedings might be had against them as to law and justice appertained. The commons were in hopes, that the bishops would have quitted their votes in parliament to be discharged of the premunire; but they resolved to abide by their right, and therefore only desired time to prepare their answer, and counsel for their assistance; accordingly they were allowed three months<sup>1</sup> time to put in their answer, and counsel of their own nomination, viz. serjeant Jermin, Mr. Chute, Mr. Herne, and Mr. Hales.<sup>2</sup>

From this time the bishops fell under a general disregard; the cry of the populace was against them, as the chief impediments of all reformation in church and state; and even the temporal peers treated them with neglect, expressing their dislike at the bishop of London being styled Right Honourable. Besides, the lords spiritual were not distinctly mentioned in the bills that passed this session, according to ancient usage; the clerk of the parliament, in reading the bills to the house, turned his back upon the bench of bishops; and when the houses went in a body to church on a fast-day, the temporal barons gave themselves precedence of the bishops. These were the preludes to their downfall, which happened about six months forward, though from this time they were little better than ciphers in the house.

These resolute proceedings against the bishops, put the court upon forming new projects to break up the parliament. It was observed that the strength and courage of the house of commons rose from their confederacy with the Scots, whose army in the north was entirely in their interest; it was therefore resolved in council to detach that nation, if possible, from the parliament, and to bring them over to the king, by yielding everything they should desire; for this purpose his majesty declared his resolution to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, part 3. vol. 1. p. 359.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller’s Church History, book 11. p. 183.



two houses, to visit his native country in person within fourteen days, and desired them to finish the bills which were before them by that time. The commons being aware of the design, and apprehensive of danger, if the king should put himself at the head of the English army in the north, sent away the earl of Holland immediately with money to pay them off, which was done without mutiny or disturbance; but the business of the houses being very urgent, and the time short, they voted, that in this case of great necessity, concerning the peace of the kingdom, they would sit the next day, being Sunday, by six o'clock in the morning; which they did, and having heard a sermon, returned to the house about nine, and sat all day long on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday [August 8, 1641]. But lest this might be misconstrued as a profanation, or be drawn into example, they published the following declaration:<sup>1</sup>—

“Whereas both houses of parliament found it fit to sit in parliament upon the 8th of August, being Lord's day, for many urgent occasions, being straitened in time, by his majesty's resolution to go within a day or two to Scotland, they think fit to declare, that they would not have done this but upon inevitable necessity; the peace and safety of both church and state being so deeply concerned, which they do hereby declare, to this end, that neither any other inferior court or council, or any other person, may draw this into example, or make use of it for their encouragement, in neglecting the due observation of the Lord's day.”

The same vote passed the house of lords *nemine contradicente*, and was ordered to be printed.

August 10, his majesty came to the house and gave his assent to a bill concerning knighthood; against the oppressions of the stannary courts; for regulating the clerks of markets; and for confirming and ratifying the peace [or pacification] with the Scots. This last being an affair of great consequence, I shall give the reader an abstract of the treaty, which had been depending ever since November 23, 1640, between the commissioners of both nations, who agreed to the following conclusions [August 7], which the king ratified and confirmed the very day he set out for Scotland.

“That the acts of parliament held at Edinburgh June 2, be published by his majesty's authority, and have in all time to come the full strength of laws.

“That the castle of Edinburgh, and other forts of Scotland, should be furnished and used for the defence of the kingdom, with the advice of the states of parliament.

“That all those who in England or Ireland have been imprisoned, or otherwise censured for subscribing the covenant, and for refusing to take

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, p. 362. Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 436.

the oath contrary to the same, shall be released and freed from such censures; and for the time to come, the subjects of Scotland living in Scotland, shall not be obliged to any oaths contrary to the laws or religion of that kingdom; but if they come to reside in England or Ireland, they shall be subject to the laws as others are.

“That all his majesty’s courts of justice shall be free and open against all evil counsellors and delinquents; that the parliament of Scotland shall have liberty to proceed against such; and that his majesty will not employ any person, in any office or place, who shall be judged incapable by sentence of parliament; nor make use of their service, nor grant them access to his royal person, without consent of parliament.

“That all ships and goods on both sides be restored, and that £300,000. be given to the Scots by the English, for their friendly assistance and relief.

“That all declarations, proclamations, &c. that have been published against the loyalty and dutifulness of his majesty’s subjects of Scotland be recalled and suppressed; and that at the close of the treaty of peace, the loyalty of his majesty’s said subjects shall be made known at the time of public thanksgiving in all places, and particularly in all parish-churches, of his majesty’s dominions.

“That the garrisons of Berwick and Carlisle be removed, and all things be reduced to the state they were in before the late troubles.

“Whereas unity in religion, and uniformity in church-government, have been desired by the Scots, as a special means for preserving the peace between both kingdoms, his majesty, with the advice of both houses of parliament, doth approve of the affection of his subjects in Scotland, in their desire of having a conformity of church-government between the two nations. And as the parliament hath already taken into consideration the reformation of church-government, so they will proceed therein in due time, as shall best conduce to the glory of God, the peace of the church, and both kingdoms.

“That the prince of Wales shall be permitted to repair into Scotland, and reside there, as there shall be occasion.

“That his majesty will give ear to the informations of parliament, and when that is not sitting, to the council and college of justice, so far as to make choice of someone of such, as they, by common consent, shall recommend to places of trust in the council, the session, and other judicatures. Or if his majesty shall think any other person fit, he shall acquaint his parliament, to the intent, that if by their information any just exception shall be made to the said person, his majesty may nominate another.

“That some noblemen, &c. of the Scots nation, shall be placed about the king; and that his majesty will endeavour to give just satisfaction to his

people, with regard to his placing none but persons of the reformed religion about his own and the prince's person."

Then follows an act of oblivion, with exception to the Scots prelates, and four others; and in the close the ratification of the whole in these words:—

"Be it enacted by his majesty, with the assent of the lords and commons in this present parliament assembled, that the said treaty, and all the articles thereof, be and stand for ever ratified and established, and have the force, vigour, strength, and authority, of a law, statute, and act of parliament.—And his majesty for himself and his successors promises, in *verbo principis*, never to come in the contrair of this statute and sanction, nor anything therein contained, but to hold the same in all points firm and stable, and cause it to be truly observed, according to the tenor and intent thereof, now and for ever.—And the parliaments of both kingdoms respectively give full assurance, and make public faith, for the true and faithful observation of this treaty, &c. *hinc inde*, in all times to come."

Bishop Burnet very justly observes a collusion in the king's approving the desire of his Scots subjects for uniformity of church-government. His majesty wished it as much as they, but with a very different view; the king was for bringing them to the English standard, whereas the Scots intended to bring the English to theirs. However, his majesty was resolved to contradict them in nothing, that he might break the confederacy between the two nations; for lord Saville had now informed him of the correspondence of some of the English nobility with the Scots, which encouraged them to raise an army and march to the borders. He had shown him a copy of the letter, with the forged names of Essex, Bedford, Mandeville, and others, exciting them to assert the liberties of their church and nation, and promising all the assistance they could give with safety to themselves. His majesty therefore resolved to gain over the Scots, that he might be at liberty to prosecute the inviters, and recover his prerogative in England, which he knew he could accomplish by the assistance of the Irish, if the English Puritans were left to themselves. The parliament were aware of the design, and therefore appointed one lord and two commoners to follow his majesty to Scotland, in order to keep up a good correspondence with the parliament of that nation, and to exhort them, since they had gained their own liberties by the assistance of the English parliament, not to desert them till the English also had recovered theirs.

The king set out post August 11, 1641, and arrived at Edinburgh in three or four days. The parliament met August 19, when his majesty acquainted them in a most gracious speech, that the end of his coming into his native country, was to quiet the distractions of the kingdom, "and this I mind (says his majesty) fully and cheerfully to perform, for I assure you, I

can do nothing with more cheerfulness than to give my people general satisfaction; wherefore not offering to endear myself to you in words, which is not my way, I desire in the first place to settle that which concerns religion, and the just liberties of this my native country, before I proceed to any other act.”<sup>1</sup> Accordingly his majesty allowed of their late proceedings in opposing the English liturgy, and erecting tables in defence of their liberties; he confirmed the acts of their assembly at Glasgow, which declared, that “the government of the church by archbishops and bishops was contrary to the word of God, and was therefore abolished.” The reverend Mr. Henderson waited on the king as his chaplain, and was appointed to provide preachers for him while he was in that country, his majesty having declared, that he would conform to their manner of worship while he was among them. Mr. Henderson had the rent of the royal chapel; Mr. Gillespie had a pension, and the professors of the several universities had their provisions augmented, by the revenues formerly belonging to the bishops. His majesty conferred titles of honour upon many of their gentry; and all parties were so well pleased, that it was said, when his majesty left the kingdom, that he departed a contented king from a contented people.

No sooner was the king returned but the English bishops reproached his majesty with his concessions, especially for admitting “the English hierarchy to be contrary to the word of God.” They told him he had unravelled the web which his father and himself had been weaving in that country for above forty years, and instead of making the Scots his friends, he had only created a new thirst in the English parliament to follow their example. These remonstrances had such an influence upon the unhappy king, that he repented heartily of what he had done, and told Dr. Saunderson, afterward bishop of Lincoln, when he was in the Isle of Wight, that two errors did much afflict him, his consenting to the earl of Strafford’s death, and his abolishing episcopacy in Scotland; and that if God should ever restore him to the peaceable possession of his crown, he would demonstrate his repentance by a public confession and a voluntary penance (I think says the doctor) by going barefoot from the Tower of London, or Whitehall, to St. Paul’s, and desiring the people to intercede with God for him. This shows how much superstition still remained in his majesty’s make and constitution, when he could imagine, the going barefoot through the streets could atone for his mistakes; and how little dependence was to be had upon his promises and declarations; that even in the year 1648, when the necessity of his affairs obliged him to consent to a uniformity of presbyterian government in both nations, he could declare in private to his chaplain, that “if he was ever restored to his throne, he would do public penance for abolishing

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 382.

episcopacy in Scotland.” Upon the whole, the king’s journey into his native country did him no service; for though the Scots were pleased with his majesty’s concessions, they durst not depend upon them as long as he was under the direction of the queen and the English bishops, and they continued to think themselves obliged from gratitude, affection, and interest, to cultivate a good understanding with the English parliament, and to assist them in recovering their religion and liberties.

Upon the day of thanksgiving for the pacification between the two nations [September 7], bishop Williams, dean of Westminster, without any direction from his superiors, composed a form of prayer for the service of the day, with which the house of commons were offended, and came to this resolution, “that the bishop of Lincoln had no power to set forth any prayer to be read on the public thanksgiving; and that no minister is obliged to read the said prayer; and the house is of opinion and doth order, that the said prayer be not read in the liberties of Westminster, or elsewhere.”<sup>1</sup> Dr. Burges and Mr. Marshall preached before the commons, and read the following order, appointed by both houses to be published in all the churches throughout England, with his majesty’s consent.

“Whereas according to the act of this present parliament, for confirmation of the treaty of pacification, it was desired by the commissioners of Scotland, that the loyalty and faithfulness of his majesty’s subjects [of Scotland] might be made known at the time of thanksgiving, in all places, and particularly in all parish-churches of his majesty’s dominions; which request was graciously condescended to by his majesty, and confirmed by the said act: it is now ordered and commanded by both houses of parliament, that the same be effectually done in all parish-churches throughout this kingdom, on Tuesday, September 7, at the time of the public thanksgiving, by the respective ministers of each parish, or their curates, who are hereby required to read this present order in the church.”

The order being read, the ministers declared, that notwithstanding all which had passed in the late commotions, the Scots nation were still his majesty’s faithful and loyal subjects. Thus as the calling and continuance of an English parliament, after twelve years’ interval, was owing to the marching of the Scots army into the north of England, it was by the powerful support and assistance of that parliament, and the expense of a million of money, that the Scots obtained the present pacification, with the full recovery of their kirk discipline and civil liberties.

In the midst of this ferment of the spirits of men, the workings of opposite counsels, and the taking the sword out of the hands of the spiritual courts, it is not to be wondered that the state of religion was unsettled, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 476, 477.

that men began to practise with some latitude in points of ceremony and forms of worship. It has been observed, that in the beginning of the year, the house of commons had ordered commissioners to be sent into all the counties of England, for removing the late innovations. June 28, it was further ordered, "that neither university should do reverence to the communion-table." And August 31, "that the churchwardens of the several parishes shall forthwith remove the communion-table from the east end of the churches where they stand altarwise, and take away the rails and level the chancels, as before the late innovations." Upon complaint of the want of sermons, and that the incumbents in many places would not admit preachers into their pulpits, though the parish maintained them, it was ordered, June, 14, "that the deans and chapters of all cathedrals be required, and enjoined, to suffer the inhabitants to have free liberty to have a sermon preached in their cathedrals every Sunday in the afternoon." July 12, ordered, "that in all parochial churches where there is no preaching in the afternoon, if the parishioners will not maintain a conformable lecturer at their own charge, the parson or vicar shall give way to it, unless he will preach himself." September 6, ordered, "that it be lawful for the parishioners of any parish to set up a lecture, and to maintain an orthodox minister at their own charge, to preach every Lord's day where there is no preaching, and to preach one day every week where there is no weekly lecture."<sup>1</sup> But notwithstanding these votes, some bishops inhibited preaching on Sundays in the afternoon; and in particular Dr. Montague, bishop of Norwich, upon which the commons voted, "that his lordship's inhibition of the reverend Mr. Carter to preach in his own parish-church, was void; and that every minister may preach in his own parish-church as often as he pleases."

Many petitions being sent from divers counties for preaching ministers, a committee of forty members of the house, called the committee for preaching ministers, was appointed to send ministers where there were vacancies, and to provide for their maintenance.<sup>2</sup> These gentlemen recommended many of the late silenced ministers, as, the reverend Mr. Case, Mr. Marshall, Sedgwick, Burroughs, whom some of the vicars refused to admit into their pulpits, or at least dissuaded their parishioners from hearing them, upon which some of them were required to attend the committee; and because great complaints were made to the house, of the idleness and viciousness of the country clergy, another committee was appointed to examine into such complaints, and was called the committee for scandalous ministers.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 288. 383.457.

<sup>2</sup> Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 295.

<sup>3</sup> "By 'scandalous ministers' (says Dr. Grey) no more was meant than the being truly orthodox, truly conformable to the rules and orders of the church, and faithful and obedient

The day before the recess of the parliament [September 8, 1641], it was resolved by the commons, “that the Lord’s day should be duly observed and sanctified; that all dancing, or other sports either before or after divine service, be forborne and restrained; and that the preaching God’s word be promoted in the afternoon, in the several churches and chapels of this kingdom; and that ministers and preachers be encouraged thereunto. The chancellors of the two universities, the heads of colleges, all patrons, vicars, and churchwardens, are to make certificate of the performance of these orders; and all defaulters to be returned to parliament before the 30th of October next.—Ordered farther, that all crucifixes, scandalous pictures of any one or more persons of the Trinity, and all images of the Virgin Mary, shall be taken away and abolished; and that all tapers, candlesticks, and basins, be removed from the communion-table.—That all corporal reverences at the name of Jesus, or towards the east end of the church, chapel, or chancel, or towards the communion-table, be forborne.”<sup>1</sup> These orders to be observed in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, in the two universities, by the respective officers and ministers of these places, and by the readers and benchers of the inns of court.<sup>2</sup>

The house of lords consented to some of these resolutions, but not to all. They agreed in their committee, “that no rails should be placed about the communion-table, where there were none already, but not to the pulling down all that were set up; and that all chancels raised within fifteen years past should be levelled; that images of the Trinity should be abolished, without limitation of time; and all images of the Virgin Mary erected within twenty years past.”<sup>3</sup> But as for bowing at the name of Jesus, they insisted

---

subjects to his majesty.” It is sufficient to oppose to this round assertion of Dr. Grey, an authority not to be controverted, that of Fuller, *Church History*, b. 11. p. 207. He informs us, that some of the clergy were outed for their affection to the king’s cause merely, and many were charged with delivering false doctrines, whose positions were found at the least disputable: and urges, that many of the complainers were factious people, and the witnesses against the clergy seldom deposed on oath; yet, after these deductions, he allows that many outed for their misdemeanours; and adds, “some of their offences were so foul, it is a shame to report them, crying to justice for punishment.” He appears indeed, to have his doubts, whether their crimes were sufficiently proved; for if the proof were perfect, the persons ought to have lost their lives, and not their livings only. This is, however, a proof against Dr. Grey’s unlimited assertion, that in many instances the imputation of scandalous crimes, supported by considerable evidence at least, was the ground of proceeding. Mr. Baxter tells us, that it was no sooner understood, that the committee was formed, than multitudes in all counties came up with petitions against their ministers. Two hundred of the names of scandalous ministers, their places, and articles proved against them, were published by Mr. White, the chairman of the committee: and moderate men were grieved to see so much ignorance, and such gross immoralities exposed to the derision of the world. And yet Dr. Grey could say, that scandalous ministers meant no more than the loyal and orthodox. *Baxter’s Life*, part 1. p. 19, folio.—ED.

<sup>1</sup> Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 482.

<sup>2</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 386.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 482, 483.

that it should be left indifferent. So that when the question was put, to agree or not agree with the resolutions of the commons, it passed in the negative, eleven against nine. The commons therefore published their resolutions apart, and desired the people to wait patiently for the intended reformation, without any disturbance of the worship of God, and of the peace of the kingdom. Upon which the lords in a heat appointed their order of Jan. 19, 1640–1, already mentioned, to be reprinted,<sup>1</sup> “that divine service should be performed as it is appointed by act of parliament; and that all who disturb that wholesome order shall be severely punished according to law. That all parsons, vicars, and curates, in their several parishes, do forbear to introduce any rites or ceremonies that may give offence, otherwise than those that are established by the laws of the land.” This was voted by twelve of the lords present, the other six entering their protest;<sup>2</sup> after which both houses adjourned for six weeks. Mr. Rapin observes,<sup>3</sup> that there seems no necessity for the lords to renew this order; and that it was done out of spleen and revenge, because the commons had made a declaration against innovations, and it was not doubted but the bishops were the chief authors of it.

Lord Clarendon represents the putting these orders of the house of commons in execution, as a transcendent presumption, and a breach of the privilege of the house of lords; and though in one place his lordship acknowledges, that little or nothing of moment was done in pursuance of the orders of the two houses, yet upon this occasion he says,<sup>4</sup> “that seditious and factious persons caused the windows to be broken down in churches, tore away the rails, removed the communion-tables, and committed many insolent and scandalous disorders, and that if any opposed them they were sent for before the committee.” But the fairest account of this matter may be gathered from Mr. Pym’s report to the house at their first meeting after the recess.

“The committee of religion (says he) have sent down divers of your declarations into the country, and have found that in some places where there were good ministers they were retained, and in other places neglected. We cannot say there have been any great tumults, though the execution of the orders of the house has occasioned something tending that way. In some parishes they came to blows, and in others they would have done the like, if care had not been taken to prevent it. At St. Giles’s Cripplegate, the parishioners were almost at daggers drawing about the rails of the communion-table, which they would not suffer to be removed. The like opposition

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 387. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 485.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. 2. p. 382, folio.

<sup>4</sup> Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 29.



was made to the orders of the house at St. George's Southwark, St. Mary's Woolnoth, St. Botolph Aldersgate and a few other places; but in most places they were quiet."

If the innovations complained of were according to law, neither lords nor commons had authority to remove them, for in a time of public peace and tranquillity a vote of parliament cannot suspend or set aside the laws; but if they were apparently contrary to law, I do not see why either house of parliament, or even the parishioners themselves, by a vote of their vestry, might not order them to be taken away. Remarkable are the words of sir Edward Deering to this purpose; "The orders of the house (says he) are, doubtless, powerful, if grounded upon the laws of the land; upon this warrant we may, by an order, enforce anything that is undoubtedly so grounded; and by the same rule we may abrogate whatsoever is introduced contrary to the undoubted foundation of your laws; but we may not rule and govern by arbitrary and disputable orders, especially in matters of religion."<sup>1</sup>

The lords disapproved of the tumultuous attempts of private persons, and punished them severely. Complaint being made by the inhabitants of St. Saviour's Southwark, of certain persons who had pulled down the rails of the communion-table in an insolent and riotous manner, they were sent into custody, and having been heard by their counsel at the bar of the house, the churchwardens of the parish were ordered to set up new rails, at the costs and charges of the offenders, in the manner they had stood for fifty years.<sup>2</sup> The rioters also were enjoined to make a public confession of their fault in the body of the church on a sabbath-day when the congregation should be present, and to stand committed to the Fleet, during the pleasure of the house.<sup>3</sup> Upon another complaint of the parishioners of St. Olave's Southwark, against others that had made a tumult in their church, and used irreverent speeches during the administration of the sacrament; the delinquents were sent into custody, and after hearing they were committed to the King's-bench for six months, without bail or mainprize; and ordered to stand upon a high stool in Cheapside and in Southwark, for two hours on a market day, and to acknowledge their fault publicly: They were also fined £20. and to find sureties for their good behaviour; but when they had been imprisoned about a month, upon their humble petition, and acknowledgment of their misdemeanours, they were released.<sup>4</sup>

If we may give credit to the petition from Canterbury, things were every where in great confusion; for it says, "that the religion and government by

---

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, vol. 1. part 3. p. 391.

<sup>2</sup> Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 271. 322.

<sup>3</sup> Nalson's Collection, vol. 2. p. 291, 292.

<sup>4</sup> Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 395.

law established, has been of late most miserably distracted by ill-affected persons, by whose means the houses of God are profaned, and in part defaced; the ministers of Christ are contemned and despised; the ornaments, and many utensils of the church are abused; the liturgy and Book of Common Prayer depraved and neglected; that absolute model of prayer, the Lord's prayer, vilified; the sacraments of the gospel, in some places, rudely administered, in other places omitted; solemn days of fasting observed, and appointed by private persons; marriages illegally solemnised; burials uncharitably performed; and the very fundamentals of religion subverted by the publication of a new creed, and teaching the abrogation of the moral law; many offensive sermons are preached, and many impious pamphlets printed." Lord Clarendon says,<sup>1</sup> that the pulpits were supplied with seditious and schismatical preachers. That in order to poison the hearts of the king's subjects, care was taken to place such ministers and lecturers in the most populous towns and parishes, as abhorred the present government and temperature of the church and state;" and then adds, "I am confident there was not from the beginning of this parliament, one orthodox or learned man recommended by them to any church in England." Strange! when scarce one was recommended who had not been educated in our universities, and subscribed all the doctrinal articles of the church of England! But his majesty's language is more severe in his declaration of August 12, 1642. "Under pretence of encouraging preaching (says he) they have erected lectures in several parishes, and commended such lecturers as were men of no learning nor conscience, but furious promoters of the most dangerous innovations; many have taken no orders, yet were recommended by members of either house to parishes: and when mechanic persons have been brought before them for preaching in churches, and have confessed the same, they have been dismissed without punishment, and hardly with reprehension. All persons of learning and eminency in preaching, and of sober and virtuous conversation; of great examples in their lives, and even such as among these men had been of greatest estimation, and suffered somewhat for them, were discountenanced, and such men cherished who boldly preached against the government of the church, against the Book of Common Prayer, against our kingly lawful power, and against our person. Farther, a licence even to treason is admitted in pulpits, and persons ignorant in learning and understanding, turbulent and seditious in disposition, scandalous in life, and unconfirmable in opinion to the laws of the land, are imposed upon parishes, to infect and poison the minds of our people."—

What character the parliament-divines had for learning, for orthodoxy of doctrine, and sobriety of manners, will appear hereafter. The commons

---

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1. p. 295.

in their reply to his majesty's declaration, denied the whole of this charge, and averred, "that they were careful in their inquiries into the learning and morality of those whom they recommended; that they were not for encouraging faction and schism, but for preferring those who were for a parliamentary, reformation in the church and state. That they had shown their resentments against mobs and tumults, and against the preaching of laymen;"<sup>1</sup> for when they were informed that Mr. Robinson, Spencer, Banks, Durant, and Green, being mere laymen, had presumed to preach publicly, they sent for them [June 7], and reprimanded them by their speaker in these words; "The house has a great distaste of your proceedings; and if you offend at any time in the like kind again, this house will take care you shall be severely punished.

Far be it from me to apologise for the furious preachers of these times; though it will appear hereafter, that the complaints of the royalists are very much exaggerated. It was certainly a great disadvantage to the parliament's cause, that they could not get a good supply of learned and able preachers, the keys of admission into holy orders being at this time in the hands of the bishops, who were very strict in their examination into the political principles of those they ordained; this reduced the committee to the necessity of admitting some few who came well recommended from New England or Scotland, and had been only ordained by presbyters; and such young students, who, producing their testimonials from the universities, were allowed to preach for some time as candidates. They were under the like disadvantages as to presentations or inductions, most of them being in the hands of the king and the bishops.

The archbishop of Canterbury continued to ordain clergymen of his own principles in the Tower; whereupon the house of lords ordered [October 28], that his jurisdiction should be sequestered, and administered by his inferior officers, till he should be acquitted of the charge of high treason that was against him. His grace often admitted such clergymen to livings as were obnoxious to the two houses, insomuch that the lords found it necessary to enjoin him to acquaint their house with the names of such persons as he nominated to any ecclesiastical benefice, promotion, or dignity, within his disposal, to be approved of first by the house, before they were collated or instituted. On the other hand, when a minister was chosen by the parishioners, and recommended to his grace for admission, if he did not like his principles and character, he would either except against him, or suffer the living to lapse to the crown. This created him new enemies, and kept alive the resentments of the commons. At length the archbishop acquainted the king with his case, who sent him a peremptory letter, requiring him

---

<sup>1</sup> Nalson's Coll. vol. 2. p. 265. 270.

“that as often as any benefice, or other spiritual promotion, should become void within his gift, to dispose of it only to such persons as his majesty should nominate; and that if either or both houses should command him otherwise, he should then let it fall in lapse to the crown.” As soon as the houses were acquainted with this, they published an order of their own, requiring the archbishop to dispose of no benefice or spiritual promotion that should become void at any time before his trial, without the leave and order of the two houses at Westminster. Such was the struggle between the king and parliament for the pulpits! It being thought of great consequence on both sides, to fill them with men of their own principles, who would be zealous in the cause in which they were severally engaged.

All the bishops were under a cloud, and in no degree of favour either with the parliament or people, except the bishop of Lincoln, who, having some years been in prison, had no share in the late innovations. This prelate, in the recess of parliament, visited his diocese; and exhorted the people in his sermons to keep to their lawful minister, and not go after tub-preachers in conventicles. He acquainted them with the laws, and told them that no power could protect them from the penalty of statutes unrepealed. “Look back (says his lordship) from the beginning of queen Elizabeth. Can the gospel stand better against the church of Rome, than it has done under the bishops, liturgy, and canons? Therefore don’t abandon the good old way, for another which you do not know how much evil may be in it.” But his rhetoric had very little effect; nor did the parliament approve of his conduct, at a time when his majesty was out of the kingdom, and when it was resolved to attempt some considerable alterations in the hierarchy.

The distractions in the state were no less threatening than those of the church. The plague was in the city of London, which dispersed the members, so that they could hardly make a house. The disbanding the army infested the roads with highwaymen, insomuch that it was hardly safe to travel from one town to another. The officers (many of whom were Papists) crowded to London, and took lodgings about Covent-garden and Whitehall, under pretence of receiving the remainder of their pay; these behaved with unusual insolence, and struck terror into the minds of the people. The mob was frequently up in one part of the town or another; one while they threatened the pope’s nuncio, and another while the queen-mother, upon which they retired out of the kingdom; but the queen herself stood by her friends; she had a convent of capuchins in her court, and protected great numbers of the king's subjects and others, from the sentence of the laws. The lord-mayor was commanded to bring in a list of Popish recusants about London; and all the Papists in the several counties were ordered to be disarmed;

“which though it had little or no effect (says lord Clarendon<sup>1</sup>), served to keep up fears and apprehensions in the people of dangers and designs;” which will appear presently not to have been groundless. This was the melancholy state of the nation, when on a sudden it was thunderstruck with the surprising news of one of the most barbarous massacres of the Protestants in Ireland, that the records of any age or nation can produce.

Lord Clarendon is of opinion, that the parliament, instead of adjourning, should now have broken up and returned home, since the principal grievance of church and state had been redressed, and the constitution secured by the act for triennial parliaments. But not to trouble the reader with affairs of state; what religious grievances were actually redressed? except the shortening the power of the spiritual courts, by the acts for abolishing the court of high-commission and star-chamber? not one of the late innovations was abolished by law; nor was there any alteration in the liturgy, or form of church-government. The sole power of the bishops in ordination and jurisdiction remained to be regulated; nor was there any reformation of deans and chapters; all which the puritans hoped for and expected. In short, the whole government of the church remained entire, notwithstanding the fierce attacks of the commons against it. The act for triennial parliaments will appear not to have been a sufficient security to the constitution, if we consider how many acts of parliament the king and his arbitrary ministers had broke through the last fifteen years; that his majesty had still the same principles, and was likely to be in the same hands upon the dissolution of this parliament. Besides, it was said that these laws had been extorted from him by force, and therefore were not binding; and if a parliament should be called after three years, that it was dissolvable at pleasure; so that in all probability things would have returned to the old channel if the parliament had now dissolved themselves. Supposing therefore, but not admitting, that the principal grievances of church and state had been redressed, I leave it with the reader, whether in the present situation of affairs, a mere redress of past grievances was sufficient without some security against the return of the like in time to come.

Among the remarkable divines who died about this time was Dr. John Davenant bishop of Salisbury, born in London, and educated a fellow-commoner in Queen’s college, Cambridge, of which he was afterward master, and lady Margaret professor in the same university. He was a celebrated Calvinist, and one of those divines appointed by king James to represent the church of England at the synod of Dort, where he behaved with great prudence and moderation; and upon his return to England was preferred to the bishopric of Salisbury; but in the beginning of the reign of king Charles

---

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1. p. 290.

he became obnoxious to the court, for venturing to preach on the doctrine of predestination, contrary to his majesty's declaration, and was forced to make his submission before the privy-council. He was a quiet and peaceable prelate, humble and charitable, a strict observer of the sabbath, an enemy to the pomp and luxury of the clergy, and one who lamented the high proceedings of the court. He had a great reputation in foreign parts for profound learning, and an unblemished life; and after he had enjoyed his bishopric about twenty years, ended his days in peace and honour, April 20, 1641, a little before the beginning of the troubles that afterward came upon the church and kingdom.<sup>1</sup> He died of a consumption, and a few hours before his death prayed pathetically for a quarter of an hour, "blessing God for his fatherly correction, forasmuch as his whole life having been full of mercy, he had been ready to doubt, whether he was a true child of God till this last sickness."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Richard Montague, bishop of Norwich, was a divine of a different character; he was born in Westminster, educated in Eaton-college, and afterward fellow of King's college. Mr. Fuller says he was a celebrated Grecian, and church antiquary, well read in the fathers, but a superstitious admirer of church-ceremonies.<sup>3</sup> He was a thorough Arminian, a creature of archbishop Laud's, and an ill instrument between the king and parliament in the late times, and therefore voted unfit for any church-preferment; but when the king resolved to govern without parliaments, his majesty preferred him first to the bishopric of Chichester, and then to Norwich, where he showed his zeal for the church, by a vigorous and illegal prosecution of the Puritans. He was accused by the present parliament, for superstitious innovations; and would no doubt have felt their resentments, if he had not gone, as Mr. Fuller expresses it,<sup>4</sup> a more compendious way, to answer for all his proceedings in the high court of heaven. He died April 12, 1641.

The Rev. Mr. John Eaton, M.A. and vicar of Wickham-Market, was born in Kent 1575, and of a peculiar mould, says Mr. Echard,<sup>5</sup> very paradoxical in his opinions, and reckoned a great Antinomian, and one of the founders of that sect, for which he more than once suffered imprisonment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuller's Worthies, b. 2. p. 207; and Church History, b. 11. 176.

<sup>2</sup> This eminent and worthy prelate was a benefactor to Queen's college in Cambridge; giving to it the perpetual advowsons of the rectories of Cheverel-Magna and Newton-Tony in Wiltshire, and a rent-charge of £31. 10s. per annum for the founding of two Bible clerks, and buying books for the library in the same college. Biogr. Britan, vol. 4. second edit. p. 631.—ED.

<sup>3</sup> Fuller's words, as Dr. Grey observes, are, "but all his diocese being not so well skilled in antiquity as himself, some charged him with superstitious urging of ceremonies." He is allowed to have urged ceremonies; but according to Fuller and Dr. Grey, that is not superstition, though they may be unauthorized by Scripture, if they be sanctioned by antiquity.—ED.

<sup>4</sup> Book 11. p. 194.

<sup>5</sup> Ath. Ox. vol. 2. p. 1-6.

His chief performance was a book entitled, "The honeycomb of free justification by Christ alone;" for which he was imprisoned in the Gate-house at Westminster. Mr. Echard admits, that by means of his zeal, his exemplary patience, and piety, he was exceedingly admired in the neighbourhood where he lived, and strangely valued for many years after his death. In truth, though he committed some mistakes in his assertions about the doctrine of grace, he was nevertheless, says Mr. Archdeacon, a pattern of faith, holiness, and cheerfulness, in his sufferings, to succeeding generations. He died in the sixty-seventh year of his age.