

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.

PART III.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE BATTLE OF EDGEHILL TO THE CALLING THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES AT WESTMINSTER.

THE king having recruited his army at Oxford, after the battle of Edgehill, by the assistance of the university, who now gave his majesty all their money, as they had before done their plate, resolved to pursue his march to London, in order to break up the parliament, and surprise the city; while the earl of Essex, imagining the campaign was ended, lay quiet about Warwick, till being informed of the king's designs, he posted to London, and ordered his forces to follow with all expedition. The earl arrived November 7, 1742, and was honourably received by both houses of parliament, who presented him with a gratuity of £5,000. and to strengthen his army passed an ordinance, that such apprentices as would list in their service should be entitled to a freedom of the city at the expiration of their apprenticeship, equally with those who continued with their masters. In the beginning of November, the king took possession of Reading without the least resistance, the parliament-garrison having abandoned it, which alarmed both houses, and made them send an express to desire a safe conduct for a committee of lords and commons, to attend his majesty with a petition for peace;¹ the committee waited on his majesty at Colnbrook, fifteen miles from London, and having received a favourable answer,² reported it to the two houses,

¹ Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 58.

² "He seemed to receive the petition with great willingness; and called God to witness, in many protestations, that he was tenderly compassionate of his bleeding people, and more desirous of nothing than a speedy peace." May's Parliamentary History, b. 3. p. 33.—The immediate subsequent conduct of the king was, certainly, not consistent with such professions: yet Dr. Grey is displeased with Mr. Neal, for insinuating that it was a breach of promise, and accuses him of not giving the fairest account of this action, which, he says, the king sufficiently justified. But, when the doctor passed this censure, it seems that he had not looked forward to the next paragraph, where the motives of the king's behaviour are stated. The committee, deputed by the parliament to Colnbrook, consisted of the earls of Northumberland and Pembroke, lord Wainman, Mr. Pierpoint, sir John Ipsley, and sir John Evelyn: when the king refused to admit the last gentleman, because he had named him a traitor the day before, the parliament, though extremely displeased with the exception, so as to vote it a breach of privilege, yet, from their ardent desire of accommodation, permitted the petition to be presented without sir John Evelyn. May, b. 3. p. 32.—This yielding conduct leaves the king more inexcusable, as it serves to show the sincerity of the parliament in their overtures: and lord Clarendon says, that it was believed by many, that had the king retired to Reading, and waited there for the answer of parliament, they would immediately have withdrawn their garrison from Windsor, and delivered that castle to his majesty for his accommodation to have carried on the treaty he had proposed. History, vol. 2. p. 73.—The motives, on which the king acted, in the action at Brentford, which Mr. Neal has compressed into one paragraph, Dr. Grey, by large quotations on different

who immediately gave orders to forbear all acts of hostility, and sent a messenger to the king, to desire the like forbearance on his part; but the committee had no sooner left Colnbrook, than his majesty, taking the advantage of a thick mist, advanced to Brentford about seven miles from London,¹ which he attacked with his whole army, November 13, and after a fierce and bloody rencounter with the parliament-garrison, wherein considerable numbers were driven into the Thames and slain, he got possession of the town, and took a great many prisoners. The consternation of the citizens on this occasion was inexpressible, imagining the king would be the next morning at their gates; upon which the lord-mayor ordered the trained bands immediately to join the earl of Essex's forces, which were just arrived at Turnham-green, under the command of major-general Skippon; and there being no farther thoughts of peace, every one spirited up his neighbour, and all resolved as one man to live and die together. Major Skippon went from regiment to regiment, and encouraged his troops with such short soldier-like speeches as these; "Come, my boys! my brave boys! I will run the same hazards with you; remember, the cause is for God and the defence of yourselves, your wives and children. Come, my honest brave boys! let us pray heartily, and fight heartily, and God will bless us." When they were drawn up, they made a body of about twenty-four thousand men eager for battle; but their orders were only to be on the defensive, and prevent the king's breaking through to the city. The two armies having faced each other all day, his majesty retreated in the night to Kingston, and from thence to Reading, where having left a garrison, he returned to Oxford about the beginning of December with his Brentford prisoners, the chief of whom were condemned to die,² and had been executed for high treason, if the two houses had not threatened to make reprisals.³ The parliament, to

authorities, has extended through four pages, which affords a parade of confuting Mr. Neal.—ED.

¹ Whitelocke, p. 62.

² Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 93.

The persons named by Rushworth, whom Mr. Neal quotes, were, Clifton Catesby, John Lilburne, and Robert Vivers. Dr. Grey says, that "it does not appear that these three were taken prisoners at Brentford." He should have added, from this place in Rushworth, to which the reference is here made. For in p. 83, Rushworth informs his readers, with respect to Lilburne in particular, that he owned that he was at Brentford: and by the others being included in the same sentence, it is probable, that they were involved in the same charge of acting against the king at Brentford.

³ On the authority of lord Clarendon and Mr. Echard, Dr. Grey charges the chaplains of the parliament-army, Dr. Downing and Mr. Marshal, with publicly avowing "that the soldiers lately taken at Brentford, and discharged by the king upon their oaths that they would never again bear arms against him, were not obliged by that oath," and with absolving them from it. The doctor is also displeased with Mr. Oldmixon for treating this account as a falsehood. But he suppresses the grounds of Mr. Oldmixon's censure of it, which are these; in the first place, that there was no occasion to use these arts, when the prisoners amounted to but one hundred and fifty men, which could not be wanted when the city of

prevent a like surprise of the city for the future, empowered the lord-mayor to cause lines of circumvallation to be drawn around it, and all the avenues fortified.

It was not without reason that the two houses complained of the king's extraordinary conduct on this occasion, which was owing to the violent counsels of prince Rupert and lord Digby, animated by some of his majesty's friends in the city, who imagined, that if the royal army appeared in the neighbourhood of London, the parliament would accept of his majesty's pardon and break up; or else the confusions would be so great, that he might enter and carry all before him; but the project having failed, his majesty endeavoured to excuse it in the best manner he could: he alleged, that there being no cessation of arms agreed upon, he might justly take all advantages against his enemies. He insisted farther upon his fears of being hemmed in by the parliament's forces about Colnbrook, to prevent which, it seems, he marched seven miles nearer the city. Lord Clarendon says,¹ prince Rupert having advanced to Hounslow without order, his majesty at the desire of the prince marched forward, to disengage him from the danger of the forces quartered in that neighbourhood; which is so very improbable, that, in the opinion of Mr. Rapin, it is needless to refute it.² Upon the whole, it is extremely probable, the king came from Oxford with a design of surprising the city of London before the earl of Essex's army could arrive; but having missed his aim, he framed the best pretences to persuade the people, that his marching to Brentford was only in his own defence.

Though his majesty took all occasions to make offers of peace to his parliament, in hopes the nation would compel them to an agreement, by leaving him in possession of all his prerogatives, it is sufficiently evident he had no intentions to yield anything to obtain it,³ for in his letter to duke

London was pouring out recruits:—and then priestly absolution was not the practice, nor the power of it the claim, of Puritan divines. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 59. Oldmixon's History of the Stuarts, p. 214.—ED.

¹ History, p. 74.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 465. fol.

³ Without controverting Mr. Neal's authority. Dr. Grey calls this a bold assertion, and appeals to various messages for an accommodation, which the king sent to the parliament. But of what avail, to prove a yielding and accommodating temper, are speeches without actions; or softening overtures, unless they be followed up by mild and pacific measures, adopted with sincerity, and adhered to with firmness? Did Charles I. act with this consistency? Let them who are acquainted with the history of his reign answer the question. Even lord Clarendon owns his belief, that in matters of great moment, an opinion that the violence and force used in procuring bills rendered them absolutely void, influenced the king to confirm them. History, vol. 1. p. 430.—What confidence could be placed in the professions and sincerity of a man who could be displeased with the earl of Northumberland, because he would not perjure himself for lord-lieutenant Strafford? Sydney's State Papers, quoted by Dr. Harris; Life of Charles I. p. 79, who has fully stated the evidence of Charles's dissimulation and want of faith. See also An Essay towards a true Idea of the Character and Reign of Charles I. p. 93, &c.—ED.

Hamilton, dated December 2, 1642, he says, “he had set up his rest upon the justice of his cause, being resolved that no extremity or misfortune should make him yield, for (says his majesty) I will be either a glorious king or a patient martyr; and as yet not being the first, nor at this present apprehending the other, I think it no unfit time to express this my resolution to you.”¹ The justice of the cause upon which his majesty had set up his rest, was his declaration and promise to govern for the future according to the laws of the land; but the point was, to know whether this might be relied upon. The two houses admitted the laws of the land to be the rule of government,² and that the executive power in the time of peace was with the king;³ but his majesty had so often dispensed with the laws by the advice of a corrupt ministry, after repeated assurances to the contrary thereof, that they durst not confide in his royal word, and insisted upon some additional security for themselves, and for the constitution.⁴ On the other hand, his majesty averred the constitution was in no danger from him, but from themselves, who were acting every day in defiance of it. To which it was answered, that it was impossible the laws should have their due course in time of war as in the height of peace, because this must effectually tie up their hands. Neither party by law could raise money upon the subject, without each other’s consent; the king could not do it without consent of parliament, nor the parliament without the royal assent, and yet both had practised it since the opening of the war. To have recourse, therefore, to the laws of a well-settled government in times of general confusion, was weak and impracticable. Besides, his majesty refused to give up any of his late ministers to the justice of parliament; for in his letter to duke Hamilton, he says, that “his abandoning the earl of Strafford had gone so near him, that he was resolved no consideration should make him do the like again.” Upon these resolutions, he declined the mediation of the Scots commissioners, which gave the several parties engaged against him, a fair opportunity of uniting their interests with that nation.

¹ Duke of Hamilton’s Memoirs, b. 4. p. 203.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 466.

³ “Our laws have no where, that I know of, distinguished (says Dr. Grey) between times of peace or war, with regard to the king’s executive power.” This is true; but it was the infelicity of the times, of which Mr. Neal writes, that there arose new questions out of the present emergency for which the standing laws had made no provision; and difficulties to which they did not apply.—ED.

⁴ “Mr. Neal (says Dr. Grey) has not produced one single proof in support of this assertion, and I challenge him to instance in particulars.” This may appear a bold challenge from a writer, who professed to be conversant in the history of those times. But as the doctor has thrown it out, we will produce an instance of the king’s violation of his word. He gave his assent to the petition of right, a kind of second magna charta: which he immediately violated, and continued to do for twelve years together. *Essay towards a True Idea, &c.* p. 94.—ED.

This was a nice and curious affair: the friends of the parliament, who were agreed in the cause of civil liberty, were far from being of one mind in points of church discipline; the major part were for episcopacy, and desired no more than to secure the constitution, and reform a few exorbitances of the bishops; some were Erastians, and would be content with any form of government the magistrate should appoint; the real Presbyterians, who were for an entire change of the hierarchy upon the foot of divine right, were as yet but few, and could carry nothing in the house; it was necessary therefore in treating with the Scots, who contended earnestly for their kirk-government, to deliver themselves in such general expressions, that each party might interpret them as they were inclined, or as should be expedient. This contented the Scots for the present, and left the parliament at full liberty, till they saw what terms they could make with the king. Nor could the churchmen be dissatisfied, because they knew if they could put a period to the war without the Scots, the two houses would not call in their assistance, much less submit to a kirk-discipline with which they had no manner of acquaintance; and therefore lord Clarendon was of opinion,¹ that even at the treaty of Uxbridge, if the parliament could have obtained an act of oblivion for what was past, and good security for the king's government by law, the affair of religion might easily have been compromised; but it required all the prudence and sagacity the two houses were masters of, to keep so many different interests in point of religion united in one common cause of liberty and the constitution, at a time when great numbers of the king's friends, in the very city of London, were forming conspiracies to restore him without any terms at all.

The king's affairs had a promising aspect this winter; his forces in the north under the earl of Newcastle were superior to those of lord Ferdinando Fairfax. In the western and midland counties there were several sieges and rencounters with various success, but nothing decisive. Divers counties entered into associations for their mutual defence on both sides.² The four northern counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, and Durham, associated for the king;³ after which the two houses encouraged the like in those that owned their authority, and appointed generals to command their troops; the chief of which was the eastern association of Essex, Cambridgeshire, the isle of Ely, Hertford, Norfolk, Suffolk, and the

¹ Dr. Grey asks, "Where does lord Clarendon discover this opinion? As he (i. e. Mr. Neal) is faulty even when he quotes his authorities, I am unwilling to take his word, when he makes no reference at all." What will the reader think of the candour of this insinuation, when he is told, that the passages to which Mr. Neal refers are to be found in p. 581 and 594 of the second volume of lord Clarendon's History; and that they are expressly quoted, and the references are pointed out in Mr. Neal's account of the treaty at Uxbridge?—Ed.

² Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 66.

³ Ibid. p. 64.

city of Norwich, whose militia were trained and ready to march where necessity should require within their several limits. In some parts of England the inhabitants resolved to stand neuter, and not be concerned on either side; but the parliament condemned and disannulled all such agreements.

As the two houses depended upon the assistance of the Scots, his majesty had expectations of foreign aids from the queen, who had endeavoured, by the influence of her son-in-law the prince of Orange, to engage the states of Holland in the king's interest, but they wisely declared for a neutrality; however, they connived at her private negotiations, and gave her a general passport, by virtue whereof she transported a very large quantity of arms and ammunition to Burlington-bay, and conveyed them to the king at York. His majesty also, in order to bring over the Irish forces under the command of the duke of Ormond, consented to a truce with the Irish rebels [signed September 15, 1643], in which he allowed the Catholics to remain in possession of what they had conquered since the Rebellion, to the great grief of the Protestants, who by this means were legally dispossessed of their estates: a most unpopular action, in favour of a people who, by their late massacre, were become the very reproach and infamy of human nature!¹ Thus the whole kingdom was marshalled into parties, with their drawn swords eager to plunge them into each other's breasts.²

The parliament's cause having a dark and threatening aspect, the lords and commons were not forgetful to implore the divine blessing upon their counsels and arms; for which purpose they published an ordinance, February 15, 1642-3, exhorting to the duty of repentance, as the only remedy to prevent public calamities. It was drawn up by some of the Puritan divines; and because bishop Kennet has branded it with the reproachful characters of cant, broad hypocrisy, and a libel against the church, I will transcribe the substance of it in their own words.

“That flourishing kingdoms have been ruined, by impenitent going on in a course of sin, the sacred story plainly tells us; and how near to ruin our sinful nation now is, the present lamentable face of it does too plainly

¹ To wipe off the reflections which this transaction brings on the character of Charles I. Dr. Grey is large in producing authorities to show, that the situation of the Protestants and of the army in Ireland, through the length of the war and the failure of supplies from England, required a cessation of arms. But, if the reader would see a full investigation of this business, he should consult Mrs. Macaulay's History, vol. 4. 8vo. p. 63–90. Two circumstances will afford a clue into the policy and design of this truce. To prevent opposition to it in the Irish council, the members who were suspected of an attachment to the parliament of England, were committed close prisoners to the castle. And the king derived from it, as the price of granting it, £38,000. to assist him to carry on the war against his Protestant subjects in England. I will only add, that the main point aimed at by the rebels, and which the king encouraged them to expect, was a new parliament; which, as the kingdom was circumstanced, would have put the whole power of government into their hands. Mrs. Macaulay, p. 845.—ED.

² Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 537—539. 548.

show. And though we should feel the heavy stroke of God's judgments yet seven times more, it is our duty to accept the punishment of our iniquities, and to say, Righteous art thou, O Lord, and just are thy judgments. Yet, because the Lord, who is just, is also merciful, and in his infinite mercy has left the excellent and successful remedy of repentance to nations brought near the gates of destruction and despair. O! let not England be negligent in the application of it. Humble addresses of a penitent people to a merciful God have prevailed with him: they have prevailed for Nineveh when sentence seemed to be gone out against her; and may also prevail for England.

"It is therefore thought necessary, by the lords and commons in parliament assembled, that all his majesty's subjects be stirred up to lay hold of this only and unfailing remedy of repentance, freely acknowledging, and heartily bewailing with deepest humiliation, both their own personal sins, and those of the nation; a confession of national sins being most agreeable to the national judgments under which the land groans, and most likely to be effectual for the removing of them.

"Among the national sins are to be reckoned, the contempt of God's ordinances, and of holiness itself; gross ignorance, and unfruitfulness under the means of grace; multitudes of oaths, blasphemies, profanation of the sabbath by sports and games; luxury, pride, prodigality in apparel, oppression, fraud, violence, &c. a connivance, and almost a toleration of the idolatry of Popery, the massacre of Ireland, and the bloodshed of the martyrs in queen Mary's time, which, having been a national sin, still calls for a national confession.

"Now, that all the sin and misery of this polluted and afflicted nation may be bitterly sorrowed for, with such grief of heart, and preparedness for a thorough reformation, as God may be pleased graciously to accept, it is ordained that all preachers of God's word do earnestly inculcate these duties on their hearers, that at length we may obtain a firm and happy peace, both with God and man; that glory may dwell in our land; and the prosperity of the gospel, with all the privileges accompanying it, may crown this nation unto all succeeding ages."¹

The reverend prelate above mentioned makes the following remark upon this ordinance. "When once the two houses could descend to have such fulsome penitential forms put upon them, to adopt and to obtrude in their name upon the nation, it was a sure sign, that all that was sound and decent in faith and worship was now to be commanded into enthusiasm and endless schisms." I leave the reader to examine, whether he can find any ground for so severe a censure.

¹ Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 141.

Though the king had rejected the Scots' mediation, and set up his rest upon the justice of his cause, he was pleased before the beginning of the campaign to admit of a treaty with his two houses, for which purpose he sent a safe conduct to six lords, and as many commoners, with their attendants, to repair to him at Oxford, who, being admitted to an audience in one of the colleges, produced the following proposals, which were read by the earl of Northumberland:—

1. "That the armies may be disbanded on both sides, and the king return to his parliament.

2. "That delinquents may submit to a legal trial, and judgment of parliament.

3. "That all Papists be disbanded and disarmed.

4. "That his majesty will please to give his consent to the five bills hereafter mentioned.

5. "That an oath may be established by act of parliament, wherein the Papists shall abjure and renounce the pope's supremacy, transubstantiation, purgatory, worshipping the consecrated host, crucifixes and images; and the refusing such oath lawfully tendered shall be a sufficient conviction of recusancy.—That your majesty will graciously please to consent to a bill for the education of Papists in the Protestant religion.—And to another bill for the better putting the laws in execution against them.

6. "That the earl of Bristol, and lord Herbert, may be removed from your majesty's counsels, and from the court.

7. "That the militia may be settled in such manner as shall be agreed upon by both houses.

8. "That the chief justices and judges of the several courts of law may hold their place *quam diuse bene gesserint*.

9. "That such persons as have been put out of the commissions of the peace since April 1, 1642, may be restored, and that those whom the parliament shall except against be removed.

10. "That your majesty will please to pass the bill now presented, to secure the privileges of parliament from the ill consequences of the late proceedings against the lord Kimbolton and the five members.

11. "That an act may be passed for satisfying such public debts as the parliament has engaged the public faith for.

12. "That your majesty will please to enter into alliances with foreign Protestant powers, for the defence of the Protestant religion, and recovering the Palatinate.

13. "That in the general pardon, all offences committed before the 10th of January 1641, which have been or shall be questioned in the house of commons before the 10th of January 1643, be excepted.—That all persons

concerned in the Irish rebellion be excepted; as likewise William earl of Newcastle, and George lord Digby.

14. “That such members of parliament as have been turned out of their places since the beginning of this parliament may be restored, and may have some reparation, upon the petition of both house.”¹

These things being granted and performed, we shall be enabled say they, to make it our hopeful endeavour, that your majesty and your people may enjoy the blessings of peace, truth, and justice.

The bills mentioned in the fourth proposition were these:

The first is entitled, “An act for the suppression of divers innovations in churches and chapels in and about the worship of God; and for the due observation of the Lord’s day, and the better advancement of preaching God’s holy word in all parts of this kingdom.”

It enacts, “That all altars and rails be taken away out of churches and chapels before April 18, 1643, and that the communion-table be fixed in some convenient place in the body of the church. That all tapers, candlesticks, basins, crucifixes, crosses, images, pictures of saints, and superstitious inscriptions in churches or churchyards, be taken away or defaced.

“That all damages done to the churches, or windows of churches, by the removal of any of the aforesaid innovations, be repaired by the proper officers of the parish or chapel.

“This act is not to extend to any image, picture, or monument for the dead.”

It enacts farther, “That all bowing towards the altar, or at the name of Jesus, shall be forborne; and for the better observation of the sabbath, that all dancing, gaming, sports, and pastimes, shall be laid aside. That every minister that has cure of souls shall preach, or expound the Scriptures, or procure some other able divine to preach to his congregation every Lord’s day in the forenoon; and it shall be lawful for the parishioners to provide for a sermon in the afternoon, and a lecture on the week-day, where there is no other lecture or preaching at the same time; and if any person oppose or hinder them, he shall forfeit 40s. to the poor.”²

The second, entitled “An act for the utter abolishing and taking away of all archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, and commissaries,” &c. has been already inserted in the former part of this history.³

The third is entitled, “An act for punishing scandalous clergymen, and others.”

“It ordains, “That the lord-chancellor, or lord-keeper, for the time being, shall award commissions under the great seal, to persons of worth and

¹ Rushworth, vol, 5. p. 165, 166.

² Husband’s Collections, fol. 119,

³ Vol. 2. p. 498, 499.

credit in every county of England and Wales; which commissioners, or any three or more of them, shall have power to inquire by the oaths of twelve lawful men of the said county of the following offences in the clergy, viz. not preaching six times at least in a year, by any ecclesiastical persons having cure of souls under the age of sixty, and not hindered by sickness or imprisonment; of blasphemy, perjury, or subornation of perjury, fornication, adultery, common alehouse or tavern haunting, drunkenness, profane swearing or cursing, done or committed within three years past, by any parson or vicar, or other person having cure of souls, or by any lecturer, curate, stipendiary, schoolmaster or usher of any school. The commissioners shall take information by articles in writing; the party complaining to be bound in a recognizance of £10 to prosecute at a time appointed: the articles of complaint being first delivered to the party complained of twenty days before the trial, that he may prepare for his defence. Upon conviction, by the verdict of twelve men, the party complained of shall be deprived of his spiritual promotions, and be adjudged a disabled person in law, to have and enjoy the same incumbency or ecclesiastical promotion. This act to continue till November 1, 1645, and no longer.”¹

The fourth is entitled, “An act against the enjoying pluralities of benefices by spiritual persons, and nonresidence.”

It enacts, “That all persons, that have two or more benefices with cure of souls, of what yearly value soever they be, shall resign them all but one, before April 1, 1643, any licence, toleration, faculty, or dispensation, to the contrary notwithstanding.

“That if any spiritual person, having cure of souls, shall be absent from his cure above ten Sundays, or eighty days in a year, except in case of sickness, imprisonment, or except he be a reader in either university, or be summoned to convocation; and be thereof lawfully convicted in any court of justice, that his living shall be deemed void, and the patron have power to nominate another person, as if the former incumbent was dead.”

The fifth, for calling an assembly of learned and godly divines to be consulted with by the parliament, for the settling of the government and liturgy of the church, and for the vindication and clearing of the doctrine of the church of England from false aspersions and interpretations, will be inserted at large, when we come to the sitting of the assembly.

To the forementioned propositions and bills, his majesty, after a sharp reply² to the preamble, returned the following answer; That though many of them were destructive of his just power and prerogative, yet because they might be mollified and explained upon debates, he is pleased to agree that a

¹ Husband’s Collections, fol. 140.

² Dr. Grey disputes the propriety of this epithet, applied to the king’s reply. The reader may judge of it by referring to lord Clarendon’s History, vol. 2. p. 123, &c.—ED.

time and place be appointed for the meeting of commissioners on both sides to discuss them, and to consider the following proposals of his own:¹

1. “That his majesty’s revenues, magazines, towns, forts, and ships, may be forthwith restored.

2. “That whatsoever has been done or published, contrary to the known laws of the land, and his majesty’s legal rights, may be renounced and recalled.

3. “That whatever illegal power over his majesty’s subjects has been exercised by either, or both houses, or any committee, may be disclaimed, and all persons that have been imprisoned by virtue thereof be forthwith discharged.

4. “That a good bill may be framed, for the better preserving the Book of Common Prayer from the scorn and violence of Brownists, Anabaptists, and other sectaries, with such clauses for the ease of tender consciences as his majesty has formerly offered.²

5. “That all persons to be excepted out of the general pardon shall be tried *per pares*, according to common course of law, and that it be left to that, to acquit or condemn them.

6. “That in the meantime there be a cessation of arms, and free trade for all his majesty’s subjects for twenty days.”

His majesty desired the last article might be first settled, by which he proposed not only to gain time, but to provide himself with several necessaries from London, and to convoy safely to Oxford the ammunition and other stores the queen had lately landed at Burlington-bay;³ but the parliament were too sensible of his designs to consent to it. They therefore empowered their commissioners to begin with the first proposition, concerning restoring the revenues of the crown, and the delivery of his majesty’s magazines, towns, forts, and ships, &c. All which they were authorized to agree to, on condition the persons with whom he would intrust them were such as they could confide in. To which the king replied, that the oaths of the officers were a sufficient security, and if they abused their trust he would leave them to the law. The commissioners then went upon the other articles, and spun out the treaty till the 12th of April, without concluding one single point. The king would be restored to the condition he was in before the war, upon a bare promise, that he would govern for the future according to law; but the parliament were resolved not to trust themselves nor the constitution in his hands, without the redress of some grievances, and a better security. Mr. Whitelocke says, that the commissioners (of which he was one) having been with the king one evening till midnight, gave his majesty such

¹ Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 169.

² The king had never made any offer of this kind but in general terms. Mrs. Macaulay—ED.

³ Rapin, vol. 2, p. 476, folio.

reasons to consent to a very material point, which would have much conduced to a happy issue and success of the treaty, that he told them, he was fully satisfied, and promised to let them have his answer in writing, according to their desire, next morning.¹ But when the commissioners were withdrawn, some of the king's bed-chamber, and they went higher, fearing the king's concessions would tend to peace, never left persuading him, till he had altered his resolution, and gave orders for the following answer to be drawn up, directly contrary to what he had promised the commissioners.²

“As soon as his majesty is satisfied concerning his own revenue, magazines, ships, and forts, in which he desires nothing, but that the just known legal rights of his majesty, devolved to him from his progenitors, and of the persons trusted by him, which have violently been taken from both, be restored to him and them—

“As soon as all the members of both houses shall be restored to the same capacity of sitting and voting in parliament as they had on the 1st of January 1641, the same right belonging unto them by their birthrights, and the free elections of those that sent them; and having been voted from them for adhering to his majesty in these distractions; his majesty not intending that this should extend either to the bishops, whose votes have been taken away by bill; or to such in whose places, upon new writs, new elections have been made.

“As soon as his majesty and both houses may be secured from such tumultuous assemblies, as to the great breach of the privileges, and the high dishonour of parliaments, have formerly assembled about both houses, and awed the members of the same; and occasioned two several complaints from the house of lords, and two several desires of that house to the house of commons, to join in a declaration against them, the complying with which desire might have prevented all the miserable distractions which have ensued; which security his majesty conceives can be only settled by adjourning the parliament to some other place, at the least twenty miles from London, the choice of which his majesty leaves to both houses.

“His majesty, will then most cheerfully and readily consent, that both armies be immediately disbanded, and give a present meeting to both his

¹ Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 65.

² Dr. Grey censures Mr. Neal, for not giving his reader Mr. Whitelocke's account of the king's great civility to the parliament-commissioners. We will supply the omission. “The commissioners were allowed by his majesty a very free debate with him, and had access to him at all times. He used them with great favour and civility; and his general Ruthen and divers of his lords and officers came frequently to their table. The king himself did them the honour sometimes to accept of part of their wine and provisions, which the earl (viz. of Northumberland) sent to him when they had anything extraordinary.” Whitelocke adds; “In this treaty the king manifested his great parts and abilities, strength of reason, and quickness of apprehension, with much patience in hearing what was objected against him: wherein he allowed all freedom.” Memorials, p. 65.—ED.-

houses of parliament, at the same time and place, at and to which the parliament shall agree to be adjourned.

“His majesty, being confident that the law will then recover its due credit and estimation, and that upon a free debate, in a full and peaceable convention of parliament, such provisions will be made against seditious preaching and printing against his majesty, and the established laws, which hath been one of the chief causes of the present distractions; and such care will be taken concerning the legal and known rights of his majesty, and the property and liberty of his subjects, that whatsoever hath been published or done in, or by colour of, any illegal declarations, ordinances, or order of one or both houses, or any committee of either of them, and particularly the power to raise arms without his majesty’s consent, will be in such manner recalled, disclaimed, and provided against, that no seed will remain for the like to spring out of for the future, to disturb the peace of the kingdom, and to endanger the very being of it.”¹

This resolute answer broke off the treaty, and left the quarrel to be decided by the sword; upon which bishop Kennet makes the following remark: it is to be lamented, that some of the king’s most intimate friends were against his concluding a peace, and others were against his obtaining an absolute victory. They were afraid he should comply, lest his prerogative might not be great enough to protect him; and yet afraid he should conquer, lest he might be tempted to assume an arbitrary power.”² It is plain from hence, that by peace the king meant nothing but being restored to all the prerogatives of his crown as before the war, without any additional security; and that there was no room for a treaty till the previous question was determined, “Whether there was just reason to confide in the king, and restore him to his rights upon his bare promise of government by law for the future?” For all the propositions necessarily led to this point, and till this was decided it was in vain to lose time upon the others.

Thus ended the year 1642, in which died the famous Tobias Crisp, D.D. third son of Ellis Crisp, of London, esq. He was born in Bread-street, London, 1600, educated at Eton-school, and having taken the degree of bachelor of arts at Cambridge retired to Oxford, and was incorporated into Baliol-college in the beginning of February 1626. In the year 1627 he became rector of Brinkworth in Wiltshire, and a few years after proceeded D.D. At Brinkworth he was much followed for his edifying manner of preaching, and for his great hospitality. Upon the breaking out of the war he was obliged to fly to London, to avoid the insolences of the king’s soldiers; where his peculiar sentiments about the doctrines of grace being discov-

¹ Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 259, 260.

² Compl. Hist. p. 135.

ered, he met with a vigorous opposition from the city divines. The doctor in his younger years had been a favourer of Arminianism, but changing his opinions, he ran into the contrary extreme of Antinomianism. He was certainly a learned and religious person, modest and humble in his behaviour, fervent and laborious in his ministerial work, and exact in his morals. Mr. Lancaster, the publisher of his works, says, "that his life was so innocent and harmless from all evil, so zealous and fervent in all good, that it seemed to be designed as a practical confutation of the slander of those who would insinuate that his doctrine tended to licentiousness." The doctor was possessed of a very large estate, with which he did a great deal of good; but being engaged in a grand dispute against several opponents (if we may believe Mr. Wood) he overheated himself, and fell sick of the small pox, of which he died February 27, 1642, and was buried in the family-vault in Bread-street, London.¹ In his last sickness he was in a most comfortable and resigned frame of mind, and declared to them that stood by, his firm adherence to the doctrines he had preached; that as he had lived in the belief of the free grace of God through Christ, so he did now with confidence and great joy, even as much as his present condition was capable of, resign his life and soul into the hands of his heavenly Father. He published nothing in his lifetime, but after his death his sermons were published in three volumes from his own notes, which, with some additions, were reprinted by his son, in one volume quarto, about the year 1689, and gave occasion to some intemperate heats among the Nonconformist ministers of those times.

Towards the end of this year died Robert lord Brooke, a virtuous and religious gentleman, a good scholar, and an eminent patriot, but a determined enemy of the hierarchy. In the beginning of the war he took part with the parliament, and being made lord-lieutenant of the counties of Warwick and Stafford, put himself at the head of twelve hundred men, and marched against the earl of Chesterfield at Litchfield, whom he dislodged from the town, March 1, but next day, as he was looking out of a window with his beaver up, and giving direction to his soldiers to assault St. Chad's church, adjoining to the close where the earl of Chesterfield's forces lay, a musket-ball struck him near the left eye, of which he instantly died. The Parliamentary Chronicle² calls him "the most noble, and ever-to-be-honoured and renowned pious lord Brooke, whose most illustrious name and memory, both for his piety, prudence, incomparable magnanimity, and heroic martial spirit, for his loyalty to the king, and fidelity to his country, deserves to remain deeply engraven in letters of gold on high-erected pillars of marble."³ On

¹ Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 12, 13.

² P. 272.

³ Parliamentary Chronicle, p. 272.

the other hand archbishop Laud, in his Diary,¹ has some very remarkable observations upon his death, which show the superstition of that prelate. "First (says his grace,) I observe, that this great and known enemy to cathedral churches died thus fearfully, in the assault of a cathedral; a fearful manner of death in such a quarrel! Secondly, That this happened upon St. Chad's day, of which saint the cathedral bears the name. Thirdly, That this lord coming from dinner about two years since from the lord Herbert's house in Lambeth, upon some discourse of St. Paul's church then in their eye upon the water, said to some young lords that were with him, that he hoped to live to see that one stone of that building should not be left upon another; but that church stands yet, and that eye is put out, that hoped to see the ruins of it."²

While the treaty of Oxford was depending, his majesty's friends in the city were contriving to bring him to London, and deliver the parliament into his hands.³ Mr. Tomkins, Chaloner, and Waller a member of the house of commons, in conjunction with some others, were to carry off the king's children, to secure the most active members of the house of commons, as Mr. Pym, Hampden, Strode, &c. to seize the Tower and the gates of the city, with the magazines, and to let in a party of the royal forces, who were to be at hand; for all which they had the king's commission, dated March 16, 1643. The day of rising was to be the last Wednesday in May: but the plot being discovered by a servant of Tomkins's before it was ripe for execution, the conspirators were apprehended and tried; Tomkins and Chaloner confessed the facts, and were executed; but Waller purchased his life for £10,000. and was banished.⁴

Upon this discovery both houses resolved to strengthen themselves by a new covenant or vow, which was tendered first to their own members, then to the army, and such of the people as were willing to take it.⁵ In it they declare their abhorrence of the late plot, and engage not to lay down their arms as long as the Papists were protected from justice, but to assist the parliament according to their abilities in the just defence of the Protestant religion, and the liberties of the subject, against the forces raised by the king without their consent. Nevertheless the king's friends were not disheartened from entering into several other combinations against the parlia-

¹ P. 211.

² It was the opinion of some of the royalists, and especially of the Roman Catholics, that the bullet was directed by St. Chad. It is observable, that the same man who was by one party looked upon as a monument of divine vengeance (see South's Sermons, serm. 1. p. 270.) was by the other revered as a saint. Baxter has placed him in heaven (Saints' Everlasting Rest, p. 82, 83. edit. 1649) together with White, Pym, and Hampden." Granger's History of England, vol. 2. p. 144. 8vo. See also Mrs. Macaulay's History, vol. 3. p. 417, 418, note, 8vo.—ED.

³ Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 322. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 487, folio,

⁴ Ibid. p. 326,327.

⁵ Ibid. p. 325.

ment; one was discovered in August, and another towards the latter end of the year; even the lower sort of women, to the number of two or three thousand, with white silk ribands in their hats, went in a body to Westminster with a petition for peace upon the king's terms, and could not be dispersed without the military arm;¹ all which was occasioned by the correspondence the king held in London, notwithstanding the ordinance the parliament had published in April last, to prevent spies and intelligences from Oxford or the royal army, coming to any part of the parliament's quarters.

The king having failed in his designs of surprising the city, resolved at last to starve the citizens into their duty, for which purpose he issued a proclamation, July 17, prohibiting all intercourse of trade and commerce with them, and expressly forbidding all persons to travel to London, or to carry any goods, merchandise, or provisions, thither, without special licence from himself.² By another proclamation [Oct. 17] his majesty forbids his subjects of Scotland, and all foreign kingdoms and states in amity with him, to bring any ammunition, provision, goods, or merchandise, of any sort, to London, or any other town or city in rebellion against him. The prohibiting foreign merchandises had very little influence upon the trade of the city, because the parliament were masters of the seas; but the town of Newcastle being garrisoned by the king, the Londoners were distressed the following winter for coals, which obliged them to have recourse to the digging turf, and cutting down all fell wood on the estates of delinquents within sixty miles of London. By another proclamation his majesty forbade all his subjects, upon pain of high treason, to obey the orders of parliament; and all tenants to pay their rents to such landlords as adhered to the rebellion, but to reserve them for his majesty's use.

After this account of things, it is reasonable to suppose that very extraordinary burdens must be laid upon the people on both sides to support the expenses of the war. The parliament at Westminster excised everything, even the necessaries of life; all butchers' meat paid one shilling in twenty; every rabbit a halfpenny; and pigeons one penny in the dozen. The king's parliament at Oxford did the like in his majesty's quarters; and by an ordinance of March 26 following, all persons within the cities of London and Westminster, and the bills of mortality, were to pay the weekly value of one meal a week, on every Tuesday, for the public service, which they were supposed to abate in their families.³ Such were the hardships of the times!

The king's affairs this summer were very prosperous, and threatened the ruin of his enemies; for besides his army, which had been recruiting in

¹ Ibid. p. 357.

² Husband's Collections, folio, 237. 366.

³ For a more minute detail of the ways by which the parliament raised money, see Dr. Grey, vol. 2. p. 42, &c. and Historical Account of all Taxes, p. 296, 297.

the winter, the queen furnished him with foreign money, and with two thousand foot, a thousand horse, a hundred waggons laden with ammunition of all sorts, six pieces of cannon, and two mortars; upon which the house of commons impeached her of high treason, for levying forces without consent of parliament. In the month of April the earl of Essex besieged and took the town of Reading, from whence he marched within ten miles of Oxford, where prince Rupert with a party of horse beat up his quarters, and killed the famous Mr. Hampden in Chalgrave-field; after which Essex retired, and put his sickly forces into quarters of refreshment. In the north the king's armies had a train of successes. Lord Fairfax was defeated by the earl of Newcastle at Atherston-moor, June 30, and sir William Waller at the battles of Lansdown and Round-away-down, July 5 and 13, which was followed with the loss of Weymouth, Dorchester, Portland-castle, Exeter, and almost all the west.¹ About the latter end of July prince Rupert besieged and took the city of Bristol, and the king himself sat down before Gloucester [August 10], which so alarmed the two houses, that the shops in London were ordered to be shut till the siege was raised, and a strong body of the trained bands dispatched to join the earl of Essex's broken troops, who, by this means, were in a condition in fifteen days to march to the relief of that important city; upon the earl's approach the king raised the siege, and Essex entered the town, when reduced to the last extremity; and having supplied it with necessaries, after three days returned towards London. The king being joined by prince Rupert with five thousand horse, got before him to Newbury, where both armies engaged with pretty equal success, till night parted them, when his majesty retired to Oxford, and left the way open for the earl to pursue his march.² In this battle the city trained bands, by their undaunted bravery, are said to have gained immortal honour. But it is the opinion of most historians, that if, instead of sitting down before Gloucester, the king had marched his victorious army directly to London after the taking of Bristol, he might have put an end to the war, the parliament being in no readiness to oppose him; however, it is certain, that about this time the royal cause was in the height of its prosperity, and the parliament's at so low an ebb, that they were obliged to throw themselves into the hands of the Scots. It is no part of my design to give a particular description of sieges and battles, or a recital of the military exploits of the heroes of these times, any farther than to inform the reader of the true situation of affairs, and to enable him to form a just idea of the grounds and reasons of those extraordinary measures that each party took for the support of their cause. Let us now, therefore, attend the affairs of the church.

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 477, folio.

² Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 293, 294.

The clergy on both sides had a deep share in the calamities of the times, being plundered, harassed, imprisoned, and their livings sequestered, as they fell into the hands of the enemy. The king's party were greatly incensed against the Puritan clergy, as the chief incendiaries of the people and trumpeters of rebellion. Such as refused to read the king's proclamations and orders against the parliament were apprehended, and shut up in the common jails of York, and other places within his majesty's quarters. When any parties of the royal army got possession of a town that adhered to the parliament, they inquired presently for the minister's house, which was rifled and plundered of everything that was valuable, and himself imprisoned, if he could be found; but the incumbents usually took care to avoid the danger, by flying to the next parliament-garrison. Above thirty Puritan ministers took shelter in the city of Coventry after the fight of Edgehill. Great numbers came to London with their families in a naked and starving condition leaving their books, and everything they could not bring away, to the mercy of the king's soldiers. The prisoners underwent uncommon hardships, and would have been executed as rebels, if the parliament had not threatened reprisals.

On the other hand, the episcopal clergy were no less harassed by the parliament-soldiers; these being in possession of the best livings in the church, were liable to suffer the greatest damage; multitudes of them left their cures, and took sanctuary in the king's armies or garrisons, having disposed of their goods and chattels in the best manner they could. Others, who had rendered themselves obnoxious by their sermons, or declarations for the king, were put under confinement in Lambeth, Winchester, Ely, and most of the bishops' houses about London; and for want of room, about twenty, according to Dr. Walker, were imprisoned on board of ships in the river Thames, and shut down under decks, no friend being suffered to come to them.¹ The same writer observes, that about one hundred and ten of the London clergy were turned out of their livings in the years 1642 and 1643, and that as many more fled to prevent imprisonment; yet it ought to be remembered, that none were turned out or imprisoned, for their adhering to the doctrine or discipline of the church of England, till after the imposing of the Scots covenant, but for immorality, false doctrine, nonresidence, or for taking part with the king against the parliament. However, it is to be lamented that several pious and worthy bishops, and other clergymen, who withdrew from the world, and were desirous to live peaceably without joining either side, suffered afterward in common with the rest of their brethren; their estates and livings being sequestered, their houses and goods plundered by ungovernable soldiers, and themselves reduced to live upon

¹ Walker's Suffering Clergy, part 2. p. 180.

the fifths, or a small pension from the parliament, either because they could not take the covenant, or comply with the new directory for public worship. Among these we may reckon the most reverend archbishop Usher, bishop Morton, Hall, and many others. When the bishops' lands were seized for the service of the war, which was called *Bellum Episcopale*, or the Bishops' War, it was not possible to show favour to any under that character: and though the two houses voted very considerable pensions to some of the bishops, in lieu of their lands that were sequestered, due care was not taken of the payment; nor would several of their lordships so far countenance the votes of the houses as to apply for it.

In order to account for these things, it will be necessary to set before the reader the proceedings of the several committees of religion from the beginning of the present parliament. It has been remembered, that a grand committee, consisting of the whole house of commons, was appointed November 6, 1640, to inquire into the scandalous immoralities of the clergy,¹ of which the famous Mr. White, member of parliament for Southwark, a good lawyer, and, according to Mr. Whitelocke, an honest, a learned, and faithful servant of the public, was chairman. Great numbers of petitions, with articles of misbehaviour, were brought before them, relating to superstition, heresy, or the immorality of their ministers, insomuch that the house was forced to branch the committee into several subdivisions, for the quicker dispatch of business. November 19, 1640, a sub-committee was appointed "to consider how there may be preaching ministers set up where there are none; how they may be maintained where there is no maintenance, and all other things of that nature; also to inquire into the true grounds and causes of the scarcity of preaching ministers throughout the kingdom, and to consider of some way of removing scandalous ministers, and putting others in their places." For which purposes the knights of shires and burgesses of the several corporations were ordered to bring informations within six weeks, of the state of religion in their respective counties. The sub-committee consisted of sixty-one members, together with the knights and burgesses of Northumberland, Wales, Lancashire, Cumberland, and the burgesses of Canterbury. Mr. White was chairman of this, as well as of the grand committee; they had their regular meetings in the court of wards, and from the powers above mentioned, were sometimes called the committee for preaching ministers, but more usually for scandalous ministers. They had the inspection of all hospitals and free-schools, and were authorised to consider of the expediency of sending commissions into the several counties, to examine such clergymen as were accused, and could not with convenience be brought up to London.

¹ Walker's Attempt, p. 63.

But presentments against the clergy came in so fast, that for the dispatch of business they were obliged to divide again into several smaller committees, which, from the names of the gentlemen in the respective chairs, were called Mr. White's, Corbet's, Sir Robert Harlow's, and Sir Edward Deering's committees, &c.¹ Within a short space above two thousand petitions were brought before them, of which Mr. Corbet's committee had no less than nine hundred. Great complaints have been made of their severity, by those who will not believe the clergy were so corrupt as really they were; nor remember the political principles for which most of them suffered. The forms of proceeding in the committee were certainly unexceptionable, for they were obliged to give proper notice to the party accused to make his appearance; the witnesses were usually examined upon oath in his presence; a copy of the articles was given him if desired, and a reasonable time assigned to prepare for his defence.² The articles of inquiry on which they proceeded were, 1. Scandalous immoralities of life, as, drunkenness, swearing, incontinency, and sometimes blasphemy and sodomy. 2. False or scandalous doctrine, i. e. Popish and Arminian, these being understood to be inconsistent with the articles of the church of England. 3. Profanation of the sabbath, by reading and countenancing the book of sports. 4. Practising and pressing the late innovations, after they had been censured by the parliament as illegal. 5. Neglect of their cures, by not preaching according to their duty. 6. Malignancy and disaffection to the parliament, discovered by their assisting his majesty with money, and persuading others to do so; by reading the king's declarations, and refusing to read the parliament's: by not observing the parliament's fasts, but calling them rebels, traitors, and wishing the curse of God upon them and their cause. These were apprehended reasonable matters of inquiry, and just grounds of exception, as matters stood between the king and the two houses. And after all, the final determination was not with the committee; their opinion, with the evidence, was first laid before the grand committee, then it was reported to the whole house, and finally referred to the house of lords before it was decisive. One would think, here should be little room for complaint, and yet there was too much passion and prejudice on both sides, which was owing to the confusion of the times, and the violent resentments of each party. The commissioners were too forward in exposing the failings of the clergy, and encouraging witnesses of slender credit; on the other hand, the clergy were insufferably rude to the committee, defaming their witnesses, and threatening revenge, for being obliged to plead their cause before laymen. However, few clergymen were sequestered by the commit-

¹ Walker's Attempt, p. 65.

² Ibid. p. 8.

tee for scandalous ministers before it was joined with that for plundered ministers; an account of which I shall lay before the reader, after I have given two or three examples of the proceedings of the present committee, from the relations of those clergymen who have left behind them an account of their sufferings.

The first is Mr. Symmonds, of Rayne in Essex, who acknowledges, that he was sequestered for preaching and publishing, that “the king being the supreme magistrate hath immediate dependence on God, to whom alone he is accountable.—That authority is a sacred thing, and essential to the king’s person.—That resistance is against the way of God, destructive to the whole law of God, inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel, the perpetual practice of Christianity, the calling of ministers, common prudence, the rule of humanity, nature itself, reason, the oath of allegiance, and even the late protestation.”¹ Besides, he had notoriously defamed the parliament, and pressed his auditors to believe the king’s declarations, “because a divine sentence was in his mouth, and he cannot err. And that if David’s heart smote him for cutting off Saul’s garment, what would it have done if he had kept him from his castles, towns, and ships?” For which reasons the lords and commons in parliament assembled, ordered [March 3, 1642] his living to be sequestered into the hands of Robert Atkins, M.A. who was appointed to preach every Lord’s day till farther order. Mr. Symmonds endeavoured to discredit the evidence, but so far from disowning the charge, that he afterward vindicated it in a pamphlet entitled, “The loyal Subject’s Belief.”

A second gentleman, who has left an account of his sufferings, is the reverend Mr. Squire of Shoreditch; he was articled against for “practising and pressing the late innovations, for saying the Papists were the king’s best subjects, because of their loyalty and liberality; for declaring that none should come to the sacrament, unless they were as well affected to the king as the Papists; for comparing his majesty to the man that fell among thieves, being wounded in his honour, and robbed of his castles, and the hearts of his people; that the priest passing by, was the Protestant; the forward professor the Levite, but the Papist was the good Samaritan; and for affirming, that the king’s subjects, and all that they had, were at his command.”² Mr. Squire denied some of these articles, and extenuated others; he procured a certificate from several of his parishioners of his diligence in preaching, in catechising, and in beating down Popery, for thirty years past, all which might be true; but Dr. Walker admits,³ that from the beginning of the war he was a most strenuous champion for allegiance; that is, for pas-

¹ Walker’s Suffering Clergy, p. 67.

² Walker’s Suffering Clergy, p. 67.

³ Ibid. p. 176.

sive obedience and nonresistance, and most earnestly exhorted his people to the practice of it, which, as the times then were, might be a sufficient reason for the parliament to silence him.

The other clergyman is Mr. Finch of Christ-church, who was articled against for extortion, superstition, nonresidence, and neglect of his cure, and for being a common swearer, tavernhunter, and drunkard, which was proved by very substantial evidence. Dr. Walker's defence of this gentleman is very remarkable: "Common charity (says he) will oblige every one to give more credit to the bare word of a clergyman, though in his own vindication, than to that of his known and professed enemies."¹ And yet, in the next page,² he owns he was not satisfied in Mr. Finch's character, nor in some parts of his defence, in which he thinks he does by no means acquit himself from having been a man of an ill life. His case was reported by the grand committee to the house of commons, and by them to the lords, who all agreed he was unfit to hold any ecclesiastical living.

It must be left with the impartial world to judge, whether the parliament had reason to sequester these clergymen, in their own defence. The last was a man of an immoral life, and the two former, allowing them to be otherwise good men, were certainly incendiaries against the two houses, and preached up those doctrines which were inconsistent with the constitution and freedom of this country, as most of the parochial clergy at that time did.

The committee for plundered ministers took its rise from those Puritan clergymen, who, being driven from their cures in the country by the king's soldiers, fled to London with their families, leaving their substance and household-furniture to the mercy of the enemy; these being reduced to very great exigencies, applied to the parliament for relief; the commons first ordered a charitable collection for them at their monthly fast, and four days after viz. December 31, 1642, appointed a committee to consider of the fittest way "for the relief of such godly and well-affected ministers as have been plundered; and what malignant clergymen have benefices in and about the town, whose benefices being sequestered may be supplied by others who may receive their profits." The committee consisted of Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Martyn, sir Gilbert Gerrard, sir William Armyn, Mr. Prideaux, Mr. Holland, Mr. Rouse, Mr. Case, Mr. Knightly, sir William Hayman, Mr. Wentworth, Mr. Ruthen, Mr. Wheeler, and Mr. Spurstow, to whom were afterwards added some others; among whom Dr. Walker supposes was the famous Mr. White, who sat in the chair of this committee March 2, 1642-3. The commissioners were upon their oath; any four had a

¹ Walker's Attempt, p. 71.

² Ibid. p. 72.

power to act; they were distinguished by the name of the “committee for plundered ministers;” but the royalists, by way of reproach, calling them the “committee for *plundering* ministers.” They began their meetings in the court of exchequer, Jan. 2, in the afternoon; two days after they were ordered to examine the complaints against Dr. Soam, minister of Twittenham and Stains, to send for parties and witnesses, to consider of proper persons to supply the cures, to apply the revenues to their use if they found it necessary, and to report the proceedings to the house. July 27, 1643, they were empowered to consider of informations against scandalous ministers, though there were no malignancy proved against them, and to put out such whose scandal was sufficiently proved; from which time the committee for scandalous and plundered ministers were in a sort united, and so continued to the end of the long parliament.¹

In order to silence the clamours of the royalists, and justify the severe proceedings of these committees, it was resolved to print the cases of those whom they ejected, and submit their conduct to the public censure; accordingly, towards the latter end of the year, Mr. White the chairman published a pamphlet, entitled, “The first century of scandalous malignant priests, made and admitted into benefices by the prelate, in whose hands the ordination of ministers and government of the church had been; or, a narration of the causes for which the parliament has ordered the sequestration of the benefices of several ministers complained of before them, for viciousness of life, errors in doctrine, contrary to the articles of our religion, and for practising and pressing superstitious innovations against law, and for malignancy against the parliament.” The author in his preface says, the reason of his appearing in print was, “that the parliament might appear just in their doings, that the mouth of iniquity might be stopped; that all the world might see, that the tongues of them that speak evil of the parliament are set on fire of hell; that they hide themselves under falsehood, and make lies their refuge.” And then adds, “that the grossest faults which were charged on the clergy were proved by many witnesses, seldom less than six.” The whole century were convicted of malignity, or disaffection to the parliament: and about eighty of them of scandalous immoralities in their lives. Dr. Walker has endeavoured to recover the reputation of seven or eight, and would insinuate that the rest were convicted upon too slender evidence, the witnesses not being always upon oath, nor in his opinion of sufficient credit to impeach a clergyman; that some of the crimes were capital, and therefore if they had been proved, must have touched not only the livings but the lives of the criminals; and that the parliament who set up for precise morals, accepted the mere verbal evidence of the most infamous people. How-

¹ Walker’s Attempt, p. 73.

ever, the doctor himself has admitted and confirmed the centurist's account of many of the scandalous ministers, by the inquiries he has made into their characters in the places from whence they were ejected. Mr. Fuller confesses, "that several of the offences of the clergy were so foul, that it is a shame to report them, crying to justice for punishment." But then adds, in favour of others, "that witnesses against them were seldom examined on oath. That many of the complainers were factious people. That some of the clergy were convicted for delivering doctrines that were disputable, and others only for their loyalty."¹ Bishop Kennet says, that several of them were vicious to a scandal. And Mr. Archdeacon Echard is of the same mind. But Mr. Baxter's testimony is more particular and decisive, who says, "that in all the countries where he was acquainted, six to one at least, if not many more, that were sequestered by the committees, were by the oaths of witnesses proved insufficient or scandalous, or especially guilty of drunkenness and swearing, This I know (says the reverend author) will displease the party, but I am sure that this is true."²

It is impossible to account for the particular proceedings of all the committees, of which great outcries have been made by the friends of the sufferers. "If the meanest and most vicious parishioners could be brought to prefer a petition against their parson to the house of commons, how falsely soever (says lord Clarendon,) he was sure to be prosecuted for a scandalous minister."³ His lordship adds, "that the committees accepted of the evidence not only of mean people, but of them who were professed enemies of the discipline of the church; that they baited the clergy with rude and uncivil language; that they obliged them to a long and tedious attendance, and were very partial in voting them out of their livings, right or wrong." In another place he says, "that these complaints were frequently exhibited by a few of the meanest of the people against the judgment of the parish." The like representation is made by most of the royalists; but the writers on the side of the parliament deny the charge, and complain as loudly of the contemptuous behaviour of the king's clergy to the commissioners, treating them as a combination of illiterate laymen who had nothing to do with the church; nay, as rebels and traitors. Some refused to obey their summons, and others who appeared, took their time in examining the spelling of words, the propriety of grammar, and other little evasions, foreign to the purpose. They declared roundly, they did not own the tribunal before which they stood; they insulted the witnesses, and threatened reprisals out of court, when things should revert to their former channel; and upon the whole behaved as if they had engrossed all the law, learning, and good

¹ Church History, b. 11. p. 207.

² Baxter's Life, p. 74.

³ Sufferings of the Clergy, p. 65.

sense of the nation to themselves. The commissioners, provoked with this usage, were obliged to behave with some sharpness, in order to support their own authority; they would not indulge them the peculiar privilege they claimed as clergymen, nor allow them as scholars to debate the truth of those doctrines of which they were accused, but confined them to matters of fact. When they excepted against the witnesses as ignorant mechanics, factious, schismatical, enemies to the church, &c. they overruled their exceptions, as long as there were no legal objections to their competency or credibility.

With regard to the country committees, the commissioners were chosen out of the deputy-lieutenants, and the best country gentlemen in the parliament interest. Most of the crimes for which the clergy were sequestered were confessed by themselves; superstition or false doctrine were hardly ever objected, far the greatest part being cast out for malignity; and yet the proceedings of the sequestrators were not always justifiable; for whereas a court of judicature should rather be counsel for the prisoner than the prosecutor, the commissioners considered the king's clergy as their most dangerous enemies, and were ready to lay hold of all opportunities to discharge them their pulpits.

But whatever might be the excesses or partiality of particular committees, no reasonable blame can be laid upon the two houses, whose instructions were, in my opinion, unexceptionable; the words of the ordinance are these:—"And to the end that those who will appear before the committee may have the witnesses examined in their presence, it is farther ordained, that summonses, with sufficient warning of the time and place when and where the charge against them shall be proved, be either given to their persons, or left at their houses; and if they desire it, they shall have a copy of the articles against them, with a convenient time to give in their answer under their hands, which together with their charge, and the proofs upon every particular of it, the said deputy-lieutenants, and committees of parliament, shall send up to the committee of this house, appointed to provide for plundered ministers; which committee shall from time to time transmit them to this house."¹ And further to prevent all abuses, it is ordained, in the ordinance for sequestration, "that if any person or persons find themselves aggrieved with any acts done by the sequestrators, their agents or deputies, and shall not therein be relieved by the sequestrators, upon complaint made to them, or any two or more of them; then upon information given to both houses of parliament, or to the committee of lords and commons aforementioned, such farther order shall be taken therein as shall be agreeable to jus-

¹ Husband's Collections, p. 311.

tice.”¹ Here was an appeal from a lower to a higher court; and to prevent a scrutiny into the lives and manners of the clergy, when their witnesses might be dead, they were limited to such crimes, as had been committed within three years before the beginning of the present parliament; so that if the committees observed their orders there could be little cause of complaint; yet, as no one will undertake to vindicate all their proceedings, we must not, on the other hand, give ear to the petulant and angry complaints of every discontented clergyman.² I shall only observe farther, that these country committees hardly began to sit till the latter end of the year 1643, or the beginning of 1644; that they exercised their power very sparingly while the war was in suspense, but when the royal forces had been beat out of the field, and victory declared on their side, they proceeded with more freedom, especially against those who had made themselves parties in the war.

Very different accounts are given of the numbers and quality of the ejected clergy by their several friends. Lord Clarendon says, that all the learned and orthodox divines of England were deemed scandalous. And Dr. Walker has taken a great deal of pains to increase their numbers, and vindicate their characters. By this account one would think most of them were of the first rank and character; but Mr. Baxter,³ who was much better acquainted with them, says, “that when the parliament purged the ministry, they cast out the grosser sort of insufficient and scandalous ones, and also some few civil men who had assisted in the wars against the parliament, or set up bowing to altars, and such innovations, but they left in near one half of the ministers that were not good enough to do much service, nor had enough to be utterly intolerable. These were a company of poor weak preachers, who had no great skill in divinity, nor zeal for godliness, but preached weekly that that was true, and were free from notorious sins.” This seems a pretty fair relation of the matter; however, we shall have occasion to consider it more fully hereafter.

Besides the sequestration of benefices, the parliament considered the king’s clergy as parties in the war, and seized their estates both real and personal under that character, towards defraying the expenses of it; for this purpose they passed the following ordinance, April 1, 1643, the preamble to which sets forth,⁴ “that it is most agreeable to common justice, that the estates of such notorious delinquents as have been the causes or instruments of the public calamities, which have hitherto been employed to the

¹ Ibid. p. 15.

² *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 81.

³ *Life*, p. 95.

⁴ *Husband’s Collections*, fol. 13.

fomenting and nourishing of this miserable distraction, should be converted and applied towards the support of the commonwealth.

“Be it therefore enacted, that the estates, as well real as personal, of all such bishops, deans, deans and chapters, prebends, archdeacons, and of all other persons ecclesiastical or temporal, who have or shall raise arms against the parliament; or have been, or shall be, in actual war against the same; or who have, or shall voluntarily contribute, money, horse, plate, arms, ammunition, or other aid or assistance, towards the maintenance of any force raised against the parliament, or for the plundering the king’s subjects, who have willingly contributed, or yielded obedience, to the commands of both houses of parliament, and of all such who have joined or shall join in any oath or association against the parliament, &c. shall be seized into the hands of sequestrators, to be named by both houses of parliament, which sequestrators, or their deputies, are to seize into their hands, as well all the money, goods, chattels, debts, and personal estates, and all the manors, lands, tenements, hereditaments, rents, revenues, and profits, of all the said delinquents before specified; and also two parts of all the personal and real estates of every Papist, and to let, set, and demise, the same from year to year, as the respective landlords or owners thereof might have done. And the authority of both houses is engaged to save them harmless from paying any rents to their landlords being delinquents: and all the monies, rents, and revenues, that shall arise from this ordinance, shall be applied to the maintenance of the army and forces raised by the parliament, and such other uses as shall be directed by both houses of parliament for the benefit of the commonwealth.”

August 19, 1643, this ordinance was farther explained, as including in the number of delinquents, such as absented from their usual places of abode, or betook themselves to the king’s forces, such as should embezzle or conceal any of their effects, to avoid payment of taxes, and assessments to the parliament; or who kept out of the way, so that no tax could be levied upon them; or who concealed or harboured the goods or persons of delinquents; or who should seize or molest any persons for obeying or executing any of the parliament’s orders.¹ A clause was then added to the ordinance, empowering the commissioners to allow to the wives and children of such delinquents, for their maintenance, any portion of their goods, provided it did not exceed one fifth part. This clause was construed to extend to the wives and children of all clergymen who were ejected their livings, on any account whatsoever. The commissioners were also to seize two thirds of the estates of Papists, both real and personal, and for the discovering of them, were to tender to such as they suspected, the following oath:—

¹ Scobel’s Collections, p. 49.

“ I A. B. do abjure and renounce the pope’s supremacy and authority over the Catholic church in general, and over myself in particular. And I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, or in the elements of bread and wine after consecration thereof by any person whatsoever. And I do also believe that there is not any purgatory, or that the consecrated host, crucifixes, or images, ought to be worshipped; or that any worship is due to any of them. And I also believe, that salvation cannot be merited by works; and all doctrines in affirmation of the said points, I do abjure, and renounce, without any equivocation, mental reservation, or secret evasion whatsoever, taking the words by me spoken according to the common meaning of them.

“So help me God.”

Divers clergymen of considerable learning, and blameless lives, sound Protestants, and good preachers, lost their estates and livelihoods by falling within the compass of this ordinance. How far such severities are justifiable by the law of arms, in a time of civil war and confusion, I shall not determine. It had been well, if those who would have given security for their peaceable behaviour, could have been distinguished. But what could the parliament do in their circumstances with men who were always dealing in politics, privately sending the king money, preaching publicly that he was above law, and stirring up the people to sedition and disaffection to those powers by whom they were protected? If others suffered in this manner it was a very hard measure; their estates might have been double taxed, as those of Papists and nonjurors have since been; but to take away their whole property, and reduce them to a fifth, and this at the mercy of sequestrators, was extremely rigorous and severe.

However, his majesty pursued the same measures, and gave directions to seize the lands and goods of the parliamentarians, as appears by his proclamation of April 7, and May 8, wherein he forbids all his subjects to submit to their orders; and by another dated May 15, 1643, complains, “that divers of his clergy, eminent for piety and learning, because they publish his royal and just commands and declarations, and will not (against the known laws of the land, and their own consciences) submit to contributions, nor publicly pray against us and our assistants, but conform to the Book of Common Prayer established by law, and preach God’s word according to the purity of it, and in their sermons, will not teach sedition, nor publish illegal commands and orders for fomenting the unnatural war levied against us, are some of them driven from their cures and habitations, others silenced and discharged from their cures, and persecuted, and their curates, if orthodox, displaced, in whose places factious and seditious persons are introduced.— His majesty therefore forbids all his subjects to hinder any of his clergy from exercising their functions, or to displace them;

and if any transgress this command his majesty declares them assistants of the rebellion, and will proceed against them according to law, as soon as he can apprehend them, and in the meantime will give direction for taking their lands and goods into safe custody.”¹ Such were the extremities on both sides!

The silencing so many clergymen at once made it very difficult to find persons qualified to fill the vacant pulpits. This was an inconvenience that attended the reformation of queen Elizabeth, and was the case of the established church again in the year 1662, when near two thousand ministers were ejected on account of their nonconformity. Lord Clarendon, with his usual candour, says, “that from the beginning of this parliament he is confident not one learned or orthodox man was recommended by them to any church in England;” and yet some of the greatest ornaments of the church for learning and good sense, in the reign of king Charles II. were of their promotion, as bishop Reynolds, bishop Wilkins, Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Cudworth, Dr. Wallis, and others. Mr. Baxter, who was a more competent judge in this respect, says,² “that though now and then an unworthy person, by sinister means, crept into the places of the ejected ministers, yet commonly those whom they put in were such as set themselves laboriously to seek the saving of souls. Indeed the one half of them were very young, but that could not be helped, because there were no others to be had; the parliament could not make men learned or godly, but only put in the learnedest and ablest they could have; and though it had been to be wished, that they might have had leisure to ripen in the universities, yet many of them did, as Ambrose, teach and learn at once so successfully, as that they much increased in learning themselves whilst they profited others, and proportionably more than many in the universities do.” Those clergymen who had been silenced and imprisoned by archbishop Laud were set at liberty and promoted; some who had fled to Holland and New-England on the account of nonconformity returned home, and were preferred to considerable lectures in the city, or to livings that had been sequestered. The parliament entertained and promoted several Scots divines, and yet, after all, wanted a supply for several vacant benefices, which obliged them to admit of some unlearned persons, and pluralists, not of choice, but through necessity; for when things were more settled, the assembly of divines declared against both; and it deserves to be remembered that the parliament, instead of giving their divines an absolute and full possession of the sequestered livings, reserved to themselves a right in their warrants to displace them if they saw occasion, which shows their great prudence and caution; for by this means

¹ Husband’s Collections, p. 177.

² Hist. of Life and Times, p. 74.

it was in their power, upon the conclusion of a peace, to restore those who had been ejected merely for their attachment to the king, without any injustice to the present possessor. To put some stop to the clamours of the royalists at Oxford, who gave out, that the parliament admitted butchers, cobblers, bricklayers, and those who had no call from God or man, they ordained, July 27, 1643, “that the committees should not nominate any person to vacant benefices, but such as should be examined and approved by the assembly of divines then sitting at Westminster.” Upon the whole it is evident, that the two houses did the best they could in their present circumstances, and perhaps better than the royalists did at the Restoration 1660, when, according to Dr. Walker, all the sequestered clergy who survived were restored to their livings, even those who had been convicted of the most scandalous immoralities, without any marks of repentance or amendment.

The parliament’s affairs being low, and their counsels divided, they not only applied to Heaven by extraordinary fastings and prayers, but went on vigorously with their intended reformation. They began with the sabbath, and on March 22, 1642–3, sent to the lord-mayor of the city of London, to desire him to put in execution the statutes for the due observation of the Lord’s day; his lordship accordingly issued his precept the very next day to the aldermen,¹ requiring them to give strict charge to the churchwardens and constables within their several wards, that from henceforth “they do not permit or suffer any person or persons, in time of divine service, or at any time on the Lord’s day, to be tipping in any tavern, inn, tobacco-shop, alehouse, or other victualling-house whatsoever; nor suffer any fruiterers or herbwomen to stand with fruit, herbs, or other victuals or wares, in any streets, lanes, or alleys, or any other ways to put things to sale, at any time of that day, or in the evening of it; or any milk-woman to cry milk; nor to suffer any persons to unlade any vessels of fruit, or other goods, and carry them on shore; or to use any unlawful exercises or pastimes; and to give express charge to all inn-keepers, taverns, cook-shops, alehouses, &c. within their wards, not to entertain any guests to tipple, eat, drink, or take tobacco, in their houses on the Lord’s day, except inn-keepers, who may receive their ordinary guests or travellers, who come for the dispatch of their necessary business; and if any persons offend in the premises, they are to be brought before the lord-mayor, or one of his majesty’s justices of the peace, to be punished as the law directs.” This order had a very considerable influence upon the city, which began to wear a different face of religion to what it had formerly done.² May 5, the book tolerating sports upon the

¹ Husband’s Collections, p. 7.

² Ibid. p. 159.

Lord's day was ordered to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman in Cheapside, and other usual places; and all persons having any copies in their hands were required to deliver them to one of the sheriffs of London to be burnt.

Next to the Lord's day they had a particular regard to their monthly fast: April 24, all constables, or their deputies, were ordered to repair to every house within their respective liberties, the day before every public fast, and charge all persons strictly to observe it according to the said ordinances. And upon the day of the public fast, they were enjoined to walk through their said liberties, to search for persons who either by following the work of their calling, or sitting in taverns, victualling, or alehouses, or any other ways should not duly observe the same; and to return their names to the committee for examination, that they might be proceeded against for contempt. The fast was observed the last Wednesday in every month, the public devotions continued with little or no intermission from nine in the morning till four in the afternoon,¹ and (as has been already observed) with uncommon strictness and rigour.

Besides the stated fasts, it was usual upon extraordinary emergencies to appoint occasional ones; as when the army was going upon any hazardous enterprise, or were within sight of the enemy, or under very disadvantageous circumstances. When the earl of Essex was shut up in Cornwall, the two houses appointed a day of fasting and prayer in six churches within the lines of communication, and in such other churches where it should be desired; and the crowds of serious attentive hearers on such occasions was almost incredible.

The king apprehending the parliament's monthly fast was perverted from its original design, and turned into a nursery of rebellion, was pleased to dissolve it, and appoint another for the reasons contained in the following proclamation from Oxford, dated October 5, 1643. "When a general fast was first propounded to us in contemplation of the miseries of our kingdom of Ireland, we readily consented to it.—But when we observe what ill use has been made of these public meetings, in pulpits, in prayers, and in the sermons of many seditious lecturers, to stir up and continue the rebellion raised against us within this kingdom;—we thought fit to command that such a hypocritical fast, to the dishonour of God, and slander of true religion, be no longer continued and countenanced by our authority.—

¹ These services were protracted, undoubtedly, to a tiresome and unreasonable length; and became the subject of ridicule to the royal party. Of which this proposal, in a pamphlet entitled "New orders New," is a proof: viz. "that every year there shall be the Round-heads' feast celebrated, a well-lunged, long-breathed cobbler shall preach a sermon six hours, and his prayers two hours long, and at every mess in this feast shall be presented a godly dish of turnips, because it is very agreeable to our natures: for a turnip hath a round head, and the anagram of a Puritan is a turnip." Dr. Grey, p. 76, note.—ED.

And yet we being desirous to express our own humiliation and the humiliation of our people, for our own sins, and the sins of the nation, are resolved to continue a monthly fast, but not on the day formerly appointed.—We do therefore hereby command, that from henceforth no fast be held on the last Wednesday in the month, as for many months it has been; nor on any other day than is hereby appointed by us. But we do expressly charge and command, that in all churches and chapels, &c. there be a solemn fast religiously observed on the second Friday in every month, with public prayers and preaching where it may be had, that as one man we may pour out our prayers to God, for the continuance of his gracious presence and blessing upon us, and for establishing a happy peace; for which purpose we have caused devout forms of prayer to be composed and printed, and intend to disperse them, that they may be used in all parts of our kingdom.”¹ Agreeably to this proclamation, the king’s friends in the counties of Cornwall and Devonshire took an oath, and entered into an association upon sundry articles, of which this was one, That if any minister shall refuse, or wilfully neglect, to observe the fast appointed by his majesty, or shall not read the service and prayers appointed for that fast, and being carried before a justice of peace shall not promise and protest for their future conformity, he shall be forthwith secured, and his estates sequestered; the like course to be taken with such ministers as absent themselves that day, unless upon sickness, or other cause allowed by two justices of peace; and with those that will not read such books as shall be appointed to be read by his majesty; and the constables are to certify their defaults to the next justice of the peace.² This was a new hardship upon clergy and people, for the parliament having enjoined the continuance of the fast on Wednesday, the royalists were obliged to an open separation, by changing it to Friday. Thus the devotions of the kingdom were divided, and Almighty God called into the quarrel on both sides.

The next thing the parliament undertook, was the removal of those monuments of superstition out of churches, &c. which had been voted down the last year, but without any considerable effect, because of the dissent of the house of lords. In the beginning of May, sir Robert Harlow, by order of the two houses, took down the crosses in Cheapside, Charing-cross, and St. Paul’s cross,³ which was a pulpit of wood covered with lead,

¹ Husband’s Collections, p. 353.

² Rushworth, vol. 2. p. 381, 382.

³ The zeal showed for pulling down the crosses gave occasion for the publication of a humorous piece, entitled “A Dialogue betwixt the Cross in Cheap and Charing-cross, comforting each other, as fearing their fall in these uncertain times.” It was also bantered in a pamphlet, with this title, “New orders New, agreed upon by the parliament of Roundheads, confirmed by the brethren of the new separation, assembled at Roundheads’-hall without Cripplegate, with the great discretion of master Long-breath, an upright, new inspired cobbler, speaker of the house. Avowed by Ananias Dulman, alias Prick Ears.” Of

in form of a cross, and mounted on several steps of stone about the middle of St. Paul's churchyard, where the first reformers used to preach frequently to the people; and upon a farther representation of the assembly of divines, they passed the following-ordinance,—“That before the 1st of November all altars and tables of stone shall be utterly taken away and demolished; and all communion-tables removed from the east end of every church, chapel, or place of public worship, and be set in some other fit and convenient place or places of the body of the church or chapel; and all rails whatsoever which have been erected near to, or before, or about, any altar or communion-table, in any of the said churches or chapels, shall before the said day be taken away, and the chancel-ground of every such church, or chapel, or other place of public prayer, which has been within these twenty years raised for any altar or communion-table to stand upon, shall before the said day be laid down and levelled as it was before; and all tapers, candlesticks, and basins, shall before the said day be removed and taken away from the communion-table in every church, chapel, or place of public prayer, and not to be used again afterward. And all crucifixes, crosses, images, and pictures, of any one or more persons of the Trinity, or of the Virgin Mary; and all other images, and pictures of saints, or superstitious inscriptions in or upon any of the said churches, church-yards, or other places belonging to the said churches or church-yards, or in any other open place, shall, before the said 1st of November, be taken away and defaced by the proper officers that have the care of such churches. And it is farther ordained, that the walls, windows, grounds, and other places that shall be broken, impaired, or altered, by any the means aforesaid, shall be made up and repaired in good and sufficient manner, in all and every the said parish-churches, chapels, or places of public prayer belonging to the parish, by the churchwardens for the time being, and in any cathedral or collegiate church or chapel by the deans or sub-deans; and in the inns of court, by the benchers and readers of the same, at the cost and charge of all and every such person or persons, bodies politic, or corporations, to whom the charge of repair does usually belong, upon penalty of 4s. to the use of the poor, for the space of twenty days after such default; and if default be made after December 1, the justice of peace of the county or city shall have power to perform it. Provided that this ordinance shall not extend to any image, pic-

the strain of this piece the following passage is a specimen: “that we have no crosses, for they are mere Popery, and tend to the confusion and opposition of Scripture: especially let the sight of Cheapside-cross be a detestation unto you all, and let these streets that are called Crosses, as Red-Cross-Street, and White-Cross-Street, &c. be turned otherwise and called after the name of some of our own family, as Green, Spencer, &c. and call it rather Green-street, than Red-Cross-street, &c. That thus all profaneness being rooted and extirpated from our conventions, nothing but holiness may remain amongst us.” Dr. Grey, vol. 2. p. 80, 81, note.—Ed.

ture, or coat of arms, in glass, stone, or otherwise, in any church, chapel, or church-yard, set up by, or engraven for a monument of, any king, prince, nobleman, or other dead person, which has not been commonly reputed or taken for a saint.”¹

This ordinance is of the same tenor with the bill against innovations, presented to the king at the treaty of Oxford, and does not much differ from queen Elizabeth’s injunctions at the Reformation; there were some disorders and tumults in putting it in execution, and great neglect of repairs; but if the reader will look back to the superstitious decorations and ornaments of the cathedrals, mentioned in the former volume of this work, he will see there was some need of a reformation. December 14, the commissioners cleared the cathedral of Canterbury of all the images, and paintings in the windows. Heylin says, the rabble violated the monuments of the dead, spoiled the organs, took down the rails, &c. and affronted the statue of our blessed Saviour.² December 30, they removed the pictures, images, and crucifixes, in Henry VII.’s chapel; and about Lady-day the paintings about the walls and windows were defaced, and the organs taken down in the presence of the committee of the house. The cathedral of St. Paul’s was stripped about the same time, the candlesticks, crucifixes, and plate, being sold for the service of the war; and within a few months most of the cathedrals throughout England underwent the same fate.³ If the parliament, instead of leaving this work to the officers of every parish, had put it into the hands of some discreet persons, to give directions what might remain, and what was fit to be removed, all the mischiefs that have been complained of might have been prevented; the monuments of the dead might have remained entire, and a great many fine paintings been preserved. Dr. Heylin charges the officers with sacrilege, and fixes the divine vengeance upon them as a terror to others, one of them being killed in pulling down the cross in Cheapside, and another hanged soon after he had pulled down the rich cross in Abingdon. But without remarking on the doctor’s prognostications, it might be very proper to remove these images and crosses, because of the superstitious resort of great numbers of people to them; though it ought to have been done in a peaceable manner, without any damage to the truly venerable remains of antiquity.

The paper combat between the two parties at Oxford and London, was carried on with no less fury than the war itself; numberless pamphlets were scattered up and down the kingdom, big with disaffection and scandal

¹ Husband’s Collections, fol. 307.

² Hist. Presbytery, p. 450.

³ Dr. Grey gives various examples of the rude violence and indiscriminate destruction with which this was done. His authorities are, bishop Hall, Heylin, Dugdale, and a work entitled, Mercurius Rusticus—ED.

against the two houses; to put a stop to which, the commons, by an order of March 6, 1642–3, had empowered the committee of examinations to search for printing presses, in such places where they had cause to suspect they were employed against the parliament, and to break them in pieces, and destroy the materials. They were also to seize the pamphlets, and to commit the printer and vender to prison. But this order not being effectual, another was published June 14, 1643, the preamble to which sets forth, “that the former orders of parliament to prevent the printing and dispersing scandalous pamphlets having been ineffectual, it is ordained, that no person or persons shall print any book or pamphlet without licence under the hands of such persons as shall be appointed by parliament, nor shall any book be reprinted without the licence and consent of the owner, and the printer to put his name to it; the company of stationers and the committee of examinations, are required to make strict inquiry after private presses, and to search all suspected shops and warehouses for unlicensed books and pamphlets, and to commit the offenders against this order to prison, to be punished as the parliament shall direct.”¹ The names of the licensers appointed by this ordinance were these:—

For books of divinity.

The Rev. Mr. Thomas Gataker.

The Rev. Mr. J. Downham.

The Rev. Mr. Callicut Downing.

The Rev. Dr. Thomas Temple.

The Rev. Mr. Joseph Caryl.

The Rev. Mr. Edmund Calamy.

The Rev. Mr. Carter of Yorkshire.

The Rev. Mr. Charles Herle.

The Rev. Mr. Janies Crauford.

The Rev. Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick.

The Rev. Mr. Batchelor.

The Rev. Mr. John Ellis, jun.

For law-books.

Sir John Brampton.

Mr. Serj. Phesant.

Mr. Serj. Rolls.

Mr. Serj. Jermyn.

For physic and surgery.—The president and four censors of the college of physicians, for the time being.

¹ Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 335.

For civil and canon law.— Sir Nath. Brent, or any three doctors of the civil law.

For heraldry, titles of honour, and aims.—One of the three kings at arms.

For philosophy, history, poetry, morality, and arts.—Sir Nath. Brent, Mr. Langley, and Mr. Farnaby, schoolmasters of St. Paul's.

For small pamphlets, pictures, &c.—The clerk of the company of stationers for the time being; and

For mathematics, almanacks, and prognostications.—The reader of Gresham-college for the time being.

But neither this nor any other regulation of the press, could restrain the Oxonians from dispersing their mercuries and diurnals over the whole kingdom, as long as the university was in the king's hands.