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 TIIE CHURCH, THEIR SUFFERINGS, AND THE LIVES AND CHARACTERS OF THEIR MOST CONSIDERABLE DIVINES.

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN’S EDITION;

WITH HIS LIFE OF THE AUTHOR AND ACCOUNT OF HIS WRITINGS.

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

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

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

1837.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE CALLING THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES AT WESTMINSTER TO THE OXFORD PARLIAMENT.

IT has been observed, that at the setting down of this parliament, the resolution of the leading members was to remove the grievances of the church as well as state, and for this purpose to address the king to call an assembly of divines to reform the liturgy and discipline. To forward this design the London ministers, in their petitions in the year 1641, prayed the houses to be mediators to his majesty for a free synod, and the commons accordingly mentioned it in their grand remonstrance of December 1, 1641. “We desire (say they) that there may be a general synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines of this island, assisted with some from foreign parts professing the same religion with us, who may consider of all things necessary for the peace and good government of the church, and to represent the result of their consultations to be allowed and confirmed, and to receive the stamp of authority.” In the treaty of Oxford a bill was presented to the same purpose and rejected: some time after Dr. Burges, at the head of the Puritan clergy, applied again to parliament, but the houses were unwilling to take this step without the king’s concurrence, till they were reduced to the necessity of calling in the Scots, who insisted, that “there should be a uniformity of doctrine and discipline between the two nations.” To make way for which the houses turned their bill into an ordinance, and convened the assembly by their own authority.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The ordinance bears date June 12, 1643, and is the very same with the Oxford bill, except in the point of lay-assessors, and of restraining the assembly from exercising any jurisdiction or authority ecclesiastical whatsoever. It is entitled,

“An ordinance of the lords and commons in parliament, for the calling of an assembly of learned and godly divines, and others, to be consulted with by the parliament, for settling the government and liturgy of the church of England, and for vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the said church, from false aspersions and interpretations.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

The preamble sets forth,

“That whereas amongst the infinite blessings of Almighty God upon this nation, none is or can be more dear to us than the purity of our religion; and forasmuch as many things as yet remain in the discipline, liturgy, and government, of the church, which necessarily require a more perfect reformation. And whereas it has been declared and resolved, by the lords and commons assembled in parliament, that the present church-government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending on the hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, and a great impediment to reformation, and growth of religion, and very prejudicial to the state and government of this kingdom, that therefore they are resolved, the same shall be taken away, and that such a government shall be settled in the church as may be agreeable to God’s holy word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the church at home, and nearer agreement with the church of Scotland, and other reformed churches abroad. And for the better effecting hereof, and for the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the church of England from all false calumnies and aspersions, it is thought fit to call an assembly of learned, godly, and judicious divines, to consult and advise of such matters and things touching the premises, as shall be proposed to them by both, or either houses of parliament; and to give their advice and counsel therein to both, or either of the said houses, when and as often as they shall be thereunto required.

 “Be it therefore ordained by the lords and commons in this present parliament assembled, that all and every the persons hereafter in this ordinance named [the ordinance here names the persons], and such other persons as shall be nominated by both houses of parliament, or so many of them as shall not be letted by sickness, or other necessary impediment, shall meet and assemble, and are hereby required and enjoined upon summons signed by the clerks of both houses of parliament left at their several respective dwellings, to meet and assemble at Westminster, in the chapel called King Henry the Seventh’s chapel, on the first of July 1643, and after the first meeting, being at least of the number of forty, shall from time to time sit, and be removed from place to place; and also, that the said assembly shall be dissolved in such manner as by both houses of parliament shall be directed. And the said assembly shall have power and authority, and are hereby enjoined from time to time, during this present parliament, or till farther order be taken by both the said houses, to confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things concerning the liturgy, discipline, and government, of the church of England, or the vindicating and clearing of the doctrine of the same from all false aspersions and misconstructions, as shall be proposed by either or both houses of parliament, and no other; and to deliver their advices and opinions touching the matters aforesaid, as shall be most agreeable to the word of God, to both or either houses from time to time, in such manner as shall be required, and not to divulge the same by printing, writing, or otherwise, without consent of parliament.”

If any difference of opinion arose, they were to represent it to parliament with their reasons, that the houses might give farther direction. Four shillings per day were allowed for each one during his attendance. Dr. William Twisse of Newbury was appointed prolocutor, and in case of his sickness or death the parliament reserved to themselves the choice of another. The ordinance concludes with the following proviso: “Provided always, that this ordinance shall not give them, nor shall they in this assembly assume or exercise, any jurisdiction, power, or authority ecclesiastical, whatsoever, or any other power than is herein particularly expressed.”

Then follow the names of thirty lay-assessors, viz. ten lords, and twenty commoners, and one hundred and twenty-one divines.

N. B. The lay-assessors had an equal liberty of debating and voting with the divines, and were these;

 *Peers.*

Algernon earl of Northumberland.

William earl of Bedford.

William earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.

William earl of Salisbury.

Henry earl of Holland.

Edward earl of Manchester.

William lord viscount Say and Seal.

Edward lord viscount Conway.

Philip lord Wharton.

Edward lord Howard of Escrick.

 *Commoners.*

John Belden, esq.

Francis Rouse, esq.

Edmund Prideaux, esq.

Sir Henry Vane, knight senior.

Sir Henry Vane, knight junior.

John Glynne, esq. recorder of London.

John White, esq.

Bulstrode Whitelocke, esq,

Humphry Salway, esq.

Oliver St. John, esq.

Sir Benjamin Rudyard, knight.

John Pym, esq.

Sir John Clotworthy, knight.

Sir Thomas Barrington, knight.

William Wheeler, esq.

William Pierpoint, esq.

Sir John Evelyn, knight.

John Maynard, esq.

Mr. Serjeant Wild.

Mr. Young.

Sir Matthew Hale, afterward lord-chief-justice of the King’s Bench [appeared, says Anthony Wood, among the lay-assessors].

 *Lay-assessors from Scotland.*

Lord Maitland, afterward duke Lauderdale.

Earl Lothian.

A. Johnston, called Warriston.

The divines were chosen out of such lists as the knights and burgesses brought in, of persons best qualified in their several counties, out of which the parliament agreed upon two; though according to Dr. Calamy some counties had only one.

A list of the assembly of divines at Westminster, in alphabetical order:—

Those with \*\* gave constant attendance; those with one \* sat in the assembly and took the protestation, but withdrew, or seldom appeared; those with no star did not appear at all.

To supply the vacancies that happened by death, secession, or otherwise, the parliament named others from time to time, who were called superadded divines.

\*\* The reverend Dr. William Twisse, of Newbury, was appointed by parliament, prolocutor.

\*\* The reverend Dr. Cornelius Burges of Watford. Mr. John White of Dorchester, A.M. *assessors.*

 \* The reverend Mr. Henry Roborough, Mr. Adoniram Byfield, A.M. *scribes,but had no votes.*

\*\* The Rev. John Arrowsmith, of Lynn, afterward D.D. and master of Peter-house, Cambridge.

 \* Mr. Simeon Ash, of St. Bride’s, or Basingshaw.

\*\* Mr. Theodore Backhurst, of Over-ton Waterville.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Bayly, B.D. of Manningford-Bruce.

\*\* Mr. John Bond, a superadded divine.

 \* Mr. Boulton, superadded.

\*\* M. Oliver Bowler, B.D. of Sutton.

\*\* Mr. William Bridge, A.M. of Yarmouth.

The right reverend Dr. Ralph Brownrigge, bishop of Exon.

Mr. Richard Buckley.

\*\* Mr. Antony Burges, A M. of Sutton-Colefield.

\*\* Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs, A.M, of Stepney.

\*\* Mr. Richard Byfield, A.M. superadded.

\*\* Edmund Calamy, B.D. Aldermanbury.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Case, Milk-street.

Mr. Richard Capel, of Pitchcoinbe, A.M.

\*\* Mr. Joseph Caryl, A.M. Lincoln’s-inn.

\*\* Mr. William Carter, of London.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Carter, of Oxon.

\*\* Mr. William Carter, of Dynton, Bucks.

\*\* Mr. John Cawdrey, A.M. St. Martin’s Fields.

\*\* Humphrey Chambers, D.D. of Cla-verton.

\*\* Francis Cheynel, D.D. of Petworth.

\*\* Mr. Peter Clarke, A.M. of Carnaby.

\*\* Mr. Richard Clayton, of Showel.

\*\* Mr. Francis Coke, of Yoxhall.

\*\* Mr.-Thomas Coleman, A.M. of Bli-ton.

\*\* John Conant, of Lymington, D.D. afterward archdeacon of Norwich, and prebendary of Worcester.

\*\* Mr. Edward Corbet, A.M. Merton-college, Oxon.

\*\* Robert Crosse, D.D. afterward Vicar of Chew, Somerset.

\*\* Mr. Philip Delme, superadded.

Mr. Thomas Dillingham, of Dean.

 \* Calibute Downing, D.D. of Hackney. Mr. William Dunning, of Godalston.

\*\* The reverend Mr. John Drury, superadded.

Mr. Edward Ellis, B.D. Gilfield.

Mr. John Erle, of Bishopstone.

\*\* Daniel Featley, D.D. of Lambeth.

\*\* Mr.Thomas Ford, A.M. superadded.

\*\* Mr. John Foxcroft, of Gotham.

Mr. Hamilton Gammon, A.M. of Cornwall.

\*\* Thomas Gataker, B.D. Rotherhithe.

\*\* Mr. Samuel Gibson, of Burleigh.

\*\* Mr. John Gibbon, of Waltham.

\*\* Mr. George Gippes, of Aylston.

\*\* Thomas Goodwin, D.D. of London, afterward president of Magdalen-college, Oxon.

\*\* Mr. William Goad, superadded.

\*\* Mr. Stanley Gower, of Brampton-Bryan.

\*\* William Gouge, D.D. of Blackfriars.

\*\* Mr. William Greenhill, of Stepney.

\*\* Mr. Green, of Pentecomb.

 John Hacket, D.D. of St. Andrew’s, Holborn, afterward bishop of Litchfield.

 Henry Hammond, D.D. of Penshurst, Kent.

\*\* Mr. Henry Hall, B.D. Norwich.

\*\* Mr. Humphrey Hardwicke, superadded.

 \* John Harris, D.D. prebendary of Winchester, warden of Wickham.

\*\* Robert Harris, D.D. of Hanwell, president of Trinity-college, Oxon.

\*\* Mr. Charles Herle, A.M. Winwick, afterward prolocutor.

\*\* Mr. Richard Heyrick, A.M. of Manchester.

\*\* Thomas Hill, D.D. of Tichmarsh, afterward master of Trinity-college, Cambridge.

 \* Samuel Hildersham, B.D. of Felton.

\*\* Mr. Jasper Hickes, A.M. of Lawrick.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Hodges, B.D. of Kensington.

 \* Richard Holdsworth, D.D. master of Emanuel-college, Cambridge.

\*\* Joshua Hoyle, D.D. of Dublin, Ireland.

Mr. Henry Hutton.

\*\* Mr. John Jackson, A.M. of Queen’s college, Cambridge.

 \* Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Lance, Harrow, Middlesex.

\*\* Mr. John Langley, of West Tuder-ley, prebendary, Gloucester.

\*\* Mr. John Ley, A.M. Great Budworth.

\*\* Thereverend John Lightfoot,D.D. of Ashby, master of Catharine-house.

 \* Richard Love, D.D. of Ekinton.

 \* Mr. Christopher Love, A.M. super, added.

Mr. William Lyford, A.M. Sherbourne.

 \* Mr. John de la March, minister of the French church.

\*\* Mr. Stephen Marshal, B.D. ofFinch-ingfield.

 \* Mr. William Massam, superadded.

Mr. John Maynard, A.M. superadded.

\*\* Mr. William Mew, B.D. of Essing-ton.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Micklethwait, Cheri-. burton.

George Morley, D.D. afterward bishop of Winchester.

Mr. William Moreton, Newcastle.

 \* Mr. Moore.

\*\* Mr. Matthew Newcomen, Dedham.

 \* Mr. William Newscore, superadded.

William Nicholson, D.D. afterward bishop of Gloucester.

Mr. Henry Nye, of Clapham.

\*\* Mr. Philip Nye, of Kimbolton.

Mr. Herbert Palmer, B.D. Ashwell, afterward assessor.

Mr. Henry Painter, of Exeter.

Mr. Christopher Parkly, of Hawarden.

\*\* Mr. Edward Peal, of Compton.

\*\* Mr. Andrew Pern, of Wilby, Northampton.

\*\* Mr. John Philips, Wrentham.

\*\* Mr. Benjamin Pickering, East-Il oatly.

\*\* Mr. Samuel de la Place, minister of the French church.

\*\* Mr. William Price, of St. Paul’s Covent-Garden.

John Prideaux, D.D. bishop of Worcester.

\*\* Nicholas Proffet, of Marlborough. Mr. John Pyne, of Bereferrars.

\*\* Mr. William Rathband, of Highgate.

\*\* Mr. William Reyner, B.D. Egham.

\*\* Edward Reynolds, of Brampton, D.D. afterward bishop of Norwich.

\*\* Mr. Arthur Salway, Severn Stoke.

Robert Saunderson, D.D. afterward bishop of Lincoln.

\*\* Mr. Henry Scudder, of Colingbourne.

\*\* Lazarus Seaman, B.D. of London, master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

\*\* Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick, B.D. Cog-gesliall.

Mr. Josias Shute, B.D. Lombardstreet.

\*\* The reverend Mr. Sydrach Sympson, London.

\*\* Peter Smith, D.D. of Barkway.

\*\* William Spurstow, D.D. of Hampden.

\*\* Edmund Staunton, D.D. of Kingston.

\*\* Mr. Peter Sterry, London.

\*\* Mr. John Strickland, B.D. New Sarum, superadded.

\*\* Matthew Styles, D.D. Eastcheap.

\*\* Mr. Strong, Westminster, superadded.

\*\* Mr. Francis Taylor, A.M. Yalding.

\*\* Thomas Temple, D.D. of Battersey.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Thoroughgood, Massingham.

\*\* Mr. Christopher Tisdale, Uphurst-bourne.

Mr. Henry Tozer, B.D. Oxon.

\*\* Anthony Tuckney, D.D. of Boston, afterward master of St. John’s college, Oxon, and Regius professor.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Valentine, B.D. Chal-fort, Saint Giles’s.

\*\* Mr. Rich. Vines, A.M. of Calcot, master of Pembroke-house, Cambridge.

The most reverend Dr. James Usher, archbishop of Armagh.

\*\* Mr. George Walker, B.D. St. John the Evangelist.

Samuel Ward, D.D. master of Sidney-college, Cambridge.

\*\* Mr. John Wallis, afterward D.D. and scribe.

\*\* Mr. John Ward, superadded. Mr. James Welby, Sylatten.

 \* Thomas Westfield, D.D. bishop of Bristol.

\*\* Mr. Jeremiah Whitaker, A. M. Stretton.

Mr. Francis Whiddon, Aloreton.

\*\* Henry Wilkinson, senior, D.D. Waddeson, afterward Margaret professor, Oxon.

\*\* Mr. Henry Wilkinson, junior, B.D. St. Dunstan’s.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Wilson, Otham.

 \* Thomas Wincop, D.D. Elesworth.

\*\* John Wincop, D.D. St. Martin’s in the Fields.

\*\* Mr. Francis Woodcock, proctor of the University of Cambridge.

\*\* Mr. Thomas Young, Stow-market.

*Ministers from Scotland.*

\*\* Mr. Alexander Henderson.

\*\* Mr. George Gillespie.

\*\* Mr. Samuel Rutherford.

\*\* Mr. Robert Bayly.

Before the assembly sat, the king, by his royal proclamation of June 22, forbade their meeting for the purposes therein mentioned; and declared, that no acts done by them ought to be received by his subjects: he also threatened to proceed against them with the utmost severity of the law;[[3]](#footnote-3) nevertheless, sixty-nine assembled in king Henry the Seventh’s chapel the first day, according to summons, not in their canonical habits, but chiefly in black coals and bands in imitation of the foreign Protestants. Few of the episcopal divines appeared, and those who did, after some time, withdrew for the following reasons.

Obj. 1. “Because the assembly was prohibited by the royal proclamation; which Dr. Twissc, in his sermon at the opening the assembly, lamented, but hoped in due time his majesty’s consent might be obtained.”

Answ. To which it was replied, “That the constitution at present was dissolved; that there were two sovereign contending powers in the nation; and if the war in which the parliament was engaged was just and necessary, they might assume this branch of the prerogative, till the nation was settled, as well as any other.”

Obj. 2. “Because the members of the assembly were not chosen by the clergy, and therefore could not appear as their representatives.”

Ans. To which it was answered, “That the assembly was not designed for a national synod, or representative body of the clergy, but only as a committee, or council to the parliament, to give their opinion touching such church-matters as the houses should lay before them; they had no power of themselves to make laws or canons, or determine controversies in matters of faith. They were to enter upon no business but what the parliament appointed, and when they had done they were to offer it to the two houses only as their humble advice: and surely the parliament might choose their own council, without being obliged to depend upon the nomination of the clergy.”

Obj. 3. “But as great an exception as any, was their dislike of the company, and of the business they were to transact; there was a mixture of laity with the clergy; the divines were for the most part of a Puritanical stamp, and enemies to the hierarchy: and their business (they apprehended) was to pull down that which they would uphold.”

Answ. “This being not designed for a legal convocation, but for a council to the parliament in the reformation of the church, they apprehended they had a power to join some of their own members with such a committee or council, without intrenching upon the rights of convocation.—The divines, except the Scots and French, were in episcopal orders, educated in our own universities, and most of them graduates; their business was only to advise about such points of doctrine and church-discipline as should be laid before them, in which the episcopal divines might have been of service, if they had continued with the assembly, to which they were most earnestly invited.”

I believe no set of clergy since the beginning of Christianity have suffered so much in their characters and reputations,[[4]](#footnote-4) as these, for their advices to the two houses of parliament. In his majesty’s proclamation of June 22, the far greater part of them are said to be men of no learning or reputation. Lord Clarendon admits,[[5]](#footnote-5) “about twenty of them were reverend and worthy persons, and episcopal in their judgments; but as to the remainder, they were but pretenders to divinity; some were infamous in their lives and conversations, and most of them of very mean parts and learning, if not of scandalous ignorance, and of no other reputation than of malice to the church of England.” His lordship would insinuate, that they understood not the original text, because the learned Mr. Selden sometimes corrected the English translation of their little pocket Bibles, and put them into confusion, by his uncommon acquaintance with Jewish antiquities; as if that great man would have treated a convocation with more decency or respect.[[6]](#footnote-6) But archbishop Laud’s account is still more extravagant, for though it is notorious the assembly would not allow a toleration to those whom they called sectaries, yet his grace says, “the greatest part of them were Brownists or Independents, or New-England ministers, if not worse, or at best enemies to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England;” whereas in truth there was not above six Independents in the assembly, and not one New-England minister that I know of. If the reader will carefully peruse the list, he will find in it some of the most considerable lawyers and ablest divines of the last age; and though they might have mistaken notions of church-discipline, and were no better acquainted with the rights of conscience and private judgment, than their predecessors the bishops, yet with all their faults, impartial posterity must acknowledge the far greater number were men of exemplary piety and devotion, who had a real zeal for the glory of God, and the purity of the Christian faith and practice. Mr. Echard confesses, that lord Clarendon had perhaps with too much severity said, that some of these divines were infamous in their lives and characters; but Mr. Baxter, who was better acquainted with them than his lordship, or any of his followers, affirms, “that they were men of eminent learning, godliness, ministerial abilities, and fidelity.”

The assembly was opened on Saturday July 1, 1643, with a sermon preached by Dr. Twisse in king Henry VII.’s chapel, both houses of parliament being present. The ordinance for their convention was then read, and the names of the members called over, after which they adjourned to Monday, and agreed on the following rules:

(1.) “That every session begin and end with a prayer.

(2.) “That after the first prayer, the names of the assembly be called over, and those that are absent marked; but if any member comes in afterward, he shall have liberty to give in his name to the scribes.

(3.) “That every member before his admission to sit and vote, do take the following vow or protestation:

“ I, A.B., do seriously and solemnly, in the presence of Almighty God, declare that, in this assembly whereof I am a member, I will not maintain any thing in matter of doctrine but what I believe in my conscience to be most agreeable to the word of God; or in point of discipline, but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the glory of God, and the good and peace of his church.”

And to refresh their memories this protestation was read in the assembly every Monday morning.

(4.) “That the appointed hour of meeting be ten in the morning; the afternoon to be reserved for committees.

(5.) “That three of the members of the assembly be appointed weekly as chaplains, one to the house of lords, another to the house of commons, and a third to the committee of both kingdoms.” The usual method was to take it by turns, and every Friday the chaplains were appointed for the following week.

(6.) “That all the members of the assembly have liberty to be covered, except the scribes;” who some time after had also this liberty indulged them.

Besides these, the parliament on the Thursday following sent them some farther regulations. As,

(1.) “That two assessors be joined with the prolocutor, to supply his place in case of absence or sickness, viz. Dr. Cornelius Burges, and the reverend Mr. John White of Dorchester.

(2.) “That scribes be appointed, who are not to vote in the assembly, viz. the reverend Mr. Roborough and Mr. Byfield.

(3.) “That every member at his first entrance into the assembly take the fore-mentioned protestation.

(4.) “That no resolution be given upon any question the same day wherein it was first proposed.

(5.) “What any man undertakes to prove as a necessary truth in religion, he shall make good from the Holy Scriptures.

(6.) “No man shall proceed in any dispute, after the prolocutor has enjoined him silence, unless the assembly desire he may go on.

(7.) “No man shall be denied the liberty of entering his dissent from the assembly, with his reasons for it, after the point has been debated; from whence it shall be transmitted to parliament, when either house shall require it.

(8.) “All things agreed upon and prepared for the parliament, shall be openly read, and allowed in the assembly, and then offered as their judgment, if the majority assent; provided, that the opinions of the persons dissenting, with their reasons, be annexed, if they desire it, and the solution of those reasons by the assembly.”

The proceedings being thus settled, the parliament sent the assembly an order to review the thirty-nine articles of the church; but before they entered upon business, viz. July 7, they petitioned the two houses for a fast, on a day when the Rev. Mr. Bowles and Matthew Newcomen preached before them. Upon which petition bishop Kennet passes the following severe censure, “Impartially speaking, it is stuffed with schism, sedition, and cruelty:” I will therefore set the substance of the petition before the reader in their own language, that he may form his own judgment upon it, and upon the state of the nation.

“To the right honourable the lords and commons assembled in parliament,—The humble petition of divers ministers of Christ, in the name of themselves, and sundry others, humbly sheweth,—

“That your petitioners, upon serious consideration, and deep sense of God’s heavy wrath lying upon us, and hanging over our heads, and the whole nation, manifested particularly by the two late sad and unexpected defeats of our forces in the north and in the west, do apprehend it to be our duty, as watchmen for the good of the church and kingdom, to present to your religious and prudent consideration these ensuing requests, in the name of Jesus Christ, your Lord and ours.

First, “That you will be pleased to command a public and extraordinary day of humiliation this week, throughout the cities of London, Westminster, the suburbs of both, and places adjacent within the weekly bills of mortality, that every one may bitterly bewail his own sins, and cry mightily to God, for Christ’s sake, to remove his wrath, and to heal the land; with professedly new resolution of more full performance of the late covenant, for the amendment of our ways.

Secondly, “That you would vouchsafe instantly to take into your most serious consideration, how you may more speedily set up Christ more gloriously in all his ordinances within this kingdom, and reform all things amiss throughout the land, wherein God is more specially and more immediately dishonoured, among which we humbly lay before you these particulars:—

1. “That the brutish ignorance and palpable darkness possessing the greatest part of the people in all places of the kingdom, may be remedied, by a speedy and strict charge to all ministers constantly to catechise all the youth and ignorant people within their parishes.

2. “That the grievous and heinous pollution of the Lord’s supper, by those who are grossly ignorant, and notoriously profane, may be henceforth, with all Christian care and due circumspection, prevented.

3. “That the bold venting of corrupt doctrines, directly contrary to the sacred law of God, may be speedily suppressed.

4. “That the profanation of any part of the Lord’s day, and the days of solemn fasting, by buying, selling, working, sporting, travelling, or neglecting of God’s ordinances, may be remedied, by appointing special officers in every place for the due execution of all good laws and ordinances against the same.

5. “That there may be a thorough and speedy proceeding against blind guides, and scandalous ministers; and that your wisdom would find out some way to admit into the ministry such godly and hopeful men as have prepared themselves, and are willing thereunto, without which there will suddenly be such a scarcity of able and faithful ministers, that it will be to little purpose to cast out such as are unable, idle, or scandalous.

6. “That the laws may be quickened against swearing and drunkenness, with which the land is filled and defiled, and under which it mourns.

7. “That some severe course be taken against fornication, adultery, and incest, which do greatly abound.

8. “That all monuments of idolatry and superstition, but more especially the whole body and practice of Popery, may be totally abolished.

9. “That justice maybe executed on all delinquents, according to your religious vow and protestation to that purpose.

10. “That all possible means may be used for the speedy relief and release of our miserable and extremely distressed brethren, who are prisoners in Oxford, York, and elsewhere, whose heavy sufferings cry aloud in the ears of our God; and it would lie very heavy on the kingdom should they miscarry, suffering as they do for the cause of God.

“That so God, who is now by the sword avenging the quarrel of his covenant, beholding your integrity and zeal, may turn from the fierceness of his wrath, hear our prayers, go forth with our armies, perfect the work of reformation, forgive our sins, and settle truth and peace throughout the kingdom.

“And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

Pursuant to this petition, Friday July 21[[8]](#footnote-8) was appointed for a fast, when the reverend Mr. Hill, Mr. Spurstow, and Mr. Vines, preached before both houses of parliament and the assembly together; and the fast was observed with great solemnity in all the churches within the limits above-mentioned.

Next day a committee of divines was appointed to consider what amendments were proper to be made in the doctrinal articles of the church of England, and report them to the assembly, who were ten weeks in debating upon the first fifteen, before the arrival of the Scots commissioners; the design was to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism. It is not necessary to trouble the reader with the theological debates; but the articles, as they were new modelled, being rarely to be met with, I have placed them in the appendix, with the original articles of the church, in opposite columns, that the reader, by comparing them, may judge whether the alterations are real improvements.[[9]](#footnote-9)

As the assembly were for strengthening the doctrines of the church against Arminianism, they were equally solicitous to guard against the opposite extreme of Antinomianism, for which purpose they appointed a committee to peruse the writings of Dr, Crisp, Eaton, Saltmarsh, and others; who having drawn out some of their most dangerous positions, reported them to the assembly, where they were not only condemned, but confuted in their public sermons and writings.

At this time the interest of the parliament was so reduced, they were obliged to call in the assistance of the Scots. The conservators of the peace of that kingdom had appointed a convention of the states June 22, under pretence of securing their country against the power of the royal army in the north:[[10]](#footnote-10) and a general assembly, August 2, to consider the state of religion. His majesty would have prevented their meeting, but that being impracticable, he gave orders to limit their consultations to the concerns of their own country; but the parliament of England sent the earl of Rutland, Sir William Armyn, Sir H. Vane, Mr. Hatcher, Mr. Darley, and two divines from Westminster, viz. Mr. Marshal and Mr. Nye, with letters to each of these assemblies, desiring their assistance in the war, and the assistance of some of their divines with those at Westminster, to settle a uniformity of religion and church-government between the two nations. To enforce these requests they delivered a letter from the assembly, “setting forth the deplorable condition of the kingdom of England, which was upon the edge of a most desperate precipice, ready to be swallowed up by Satan and his instruments; they represent the cruelty of their enemies against such as fall into their hands, being armed against them, not only as men, but as Christians, as Protestants, and as reformers, and that if they should be given up to their rage, they fear it will endanger the safety of all the Protestant churches. In a deeper sense of this danger (say they) than we can express, we address you in the bowels of Christ, for your most fervent prayers and advice, what farther to do for the making our own and the kingdom’s peace with God, and for the uniting the Protestant party more firmly, that we may all serve God with one consent, and stand up against antichrist as one man.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

The commissioners arrived at Edinburgh August 9, and were favourably received by the assembly, who proposed as a preliminary, that the two nations should enter into a perpetual covenant for themselves and their posterity, that all things might be done in God’s house according to his will; and having appointed some of their number to consult with the English commissioners about a proper form, they chose delegates for the Westminster-assembly, and unanimously advised the convention of states to assist the parliament in the war, for the following reasons:—

1. “Because they apprehend the war was for religion. 2. Because the Protestant faith was in danger. 3. Gratitude for former assistances at the time of the Scots reformation, required a suitable return. 4. Because the churches of Scotland and England being embarked in one bottom, if one be ruined the other cannot subsist. 5*.* The prospect of uniformity between the two kingdoms in discipline and worship, will strengthen the Protestant interest at home and abroad. 6. The present parliament had been friendly to the Scots, and might be so again. 7. Though the king had so lately established their religion according to their desires, yet they could not confide in his royal declarations, having so often found *facta verbis contraria.*[[12]](#footnote-12)

The instructions of the commissioners, sent to the assembly at Westminster, were to promote the extirpation of Popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, scepticism, and idolatry, and to endeavour a union between the two kingdoms in one confession of faith, one form of church-government, and one directory of worship.

The committee for drawing up the solemn league and covenant delivered it into the assembly August 17, where it was read and highly applauded by the ministers and lay-elders, none opposing it except the king’s commissioners; so that it passed both the assembly and convention in one day,[[13]](#footnote-13) and was despatched next morning to Westminster, with a letter to the two houses, wishing that it might be confirmed, and solemnly sworn and subscribed in both kingdoms, as the surest and strictest obligation to make them stand and fall together in the cause of religion and liberty.

Mr. Marshal and Nye, in the letter to the assembly of August 18, assure their brethren, the Scots clergy were entirely on the side of the parliament in this quarrel, against the Popish and episcopal faction; that there were between twenty and thirty of the prime nobility present, when the covenant passed the convention; and that even the king’s commissioners confessed, that in their private capacity they were for it, though as his majesty’s commissioners they were bound to oppose it. So that if the English parliament (say they) comply with the form of this covenant, we are persuaded the whole body of the Scots kingdom will live and die with them, and speedily come to their assistance.

When their commissioners arrived at London, they presented the covenant to the two houses, who referred it to the assembly of divines, where it met with some little opposition: Dr. Featly declared, he durst not abjure prelacy absolutely, because he had sworn to obey his bishop in all things lawful and honest, and therefore proposed to qualify the second article thus,—“I will endeavour the extirpation of Popery, and all antichristian, tyrannical, or independent prelacy;” but it was carried against him. Dr. Burges objected to several articles, and was not without some difficulty persuaded to subscribe, after he had been suspended. The prolocutor Mr. Gataker, and many others, declared for primitive episcopacy, or for one stated president with his presbyters to govern every church; and refused to subscribe till a parenthesis was inserted, declaring what sort of prelacy was to be abjured, viz. “[churchgovernment by archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending upon them.]”[[14]](#footnote-14) The Scots, who had been introduced into the assembly September 15, were for abjuring episcopacy as simply unlawful, but the English divines were generally against it.

Bishop Burnet says, our commissioners pressed chiefly for a civil league, but the Scots would have a religious one, to which the English were obliged to yield, taking care, at the same time, to leave a door open for a latitude of interpretation.[[15]](#footnote-15) Sir Henry Vane put the word “league” into the title, as thinking that might be broken sooner than a covenant; and in the first article he inserted that general phrase, of reforming “according to the word of God;” by which the English thought themselves secure from the inroads of presbytery; but the Scots relied upon the next words, “and according to the practice of the best reformed churches;” in which they were confident their discipline must be included. When Mr. Colman read the covenant before the house of lords, in order to their subscribing it, he declared, that by prelacy all sorts of episcopacy were not intended, but only the form therein described. Thus the wise men on both sides endeavoured to outwit each other in wording the articles; and with these slight amendments the covenant passed the assembly and both houses of parliament; and by an order dated September 21, was printed and published as follows:—

“A solemn league and covenant for reformation and defence of religion, the honour and happiness of the king, and the peace and safety of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

“We noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the gospel, and commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, by the providence of God, living under one king, and being of one reformed religion, having before our eyes the glory of God, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the honour and happiness of the king’s majesty, and his posterity, and the true public liberty, safety, and peace, of the kingdoms, wherein everyone’s private condition is included; and calling to mind the treacherous and bloody plots, conspiracies, attempts, and practices, of the enemies of God, against the true religion, and professors thereof in all places, especially in these three kingdoms, ever since the reformation of religion; and how much their rage, power, and presumption, are of late and at this time increased and exercised, whereof the deplorable estate of the church and kingdom of Ireland, the distressed estate of the church and kingdom of England, and the dangerous estate of the church and kingdom of Scotland, are present and public testimonies; we have (now at last) after other means of supplication, remonstrance, protestations, and sufferings, for the preservation of our lives and our religion, from utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of God’s people in other nations, after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn league and covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most high God, do swear: —

I.

“ That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion in the church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the word of God, and the example of the best reformed churches; and we shall endeavour to bring the church of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction, and uniformity in religion, confessing of faith, form of church government, directory for worship, and catechising, that we, and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.

II.

“That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy (that is, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men’s sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms.

III.

“We shall, with the same reality, sincerity, and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavour with our estates and lives, mutually to preserve the rights and privileges of the parliaments, and the liberties of the kingdoms, and to preserve and defend the king’s majesty’s person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms, that the world may bear witness with our consciences, of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminish his majesty’s just power and greatness.

IV.

“ We shall also, with all faithfulness, endeavour the discovery of all such as have been or shall be incendiaries, malignants, or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the king from his people, or one of the kingdoms from another, or making any factions or parties among the people, contrary to the league and covenant, that they may be brought to public trial, and receive condign punishment, as the degree of their offences shall require or deserve, or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, shall judge convenient.

V.

“And whereas the happiness of a blessed peace between these kingdoms, denied in former times to our progenitors, is by the good providence of God granted unto us, and has been lately concluded and settled by both parliaments, we shall, each one of us according to our places and interests, endeavour that we may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union to all posterity, and that justice may be done on all the wilful opposers thereof, in manner expressed in the precedent articles.

VI.

“We shall also, according to our places and callings, in this common cause of religion, liberty, and peace of the kingdom, assist and defend all those that enter into this league and covenant, in the maintaining and pursuing thereof; and shall not suffer ourselves, directly or indirectly, by whatsoever combination, persuasion, or terror, to be divided and withdrawn from this blessed union and conjunction, whether to make defection to the contrary part, or give ourselves to a detestable indifferency or neutrality in this cause, which so much concerneth the glory of God, the good of the kingdoms, and honour of the king; but shall all the days of our lives zealously and constantly continue therein against all opposition, and promote the same according to our power, against all lets and impediments whatsoever; and what we are not able ourselves to suppress or overcome, we shall reveal and make known, that it may be timely prevented or removed.

“And because these kingdoms are guilty of many sins and provocations against God, and his son Jesus Christ, as is too manifest by our present distresses and dangers, the fruits thereof, we profess and declare, before God and the world, our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins, and for the sins of these kingdoms; especially that we have not, as we ought, valued the inestimable benefit of the gospel: that we have not laboured for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not endeavoured to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of him in our lives, which are the cause of other sins and transgressions so much abounding amongst us; and our true and unfeigned purpose, desire, and endeavour, for ourselves and all others under our charge, both in public and private, in all duties we owe to God and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation, that the Lord may turn away his wrath and heavy indignation, and establish these churches and kingdoms in truth and peace. And this covenant we make in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that great day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed; most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by his Holy Spirit for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with such success as may be a deliverance and safety to his people, and encouragement to the Christian churches, groaning under, or in danger of, the yoke of antichristian tyranny, to join with the same or like attestation and covenant, to the glory of God, the enlargement of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the peace and tranquillity of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

Monday September 25, 1643, was appointed for subscribing this covenant, when both houses, with the Scots commissioners and assembly of divines, being met in the church of St. Margaret’s Westminster, the reverend Mr. White of Dorchester opened the solemnity with prayer; after him Mr. Henderson and Mr. Nye spoke in justification of taking the covenant from Scripture precedents, and displayed the advantage the church had received from such sacred combinations. Mr. Henderson spoke next, and declared that the states of Scotland had resolved to assist the parliament of England, in carrying on the ends and designs of this covenant; then Mr. Nye read it from the pulpit with an audible voice article by article, each person standing uncovered, with his right hand lifted up bare to heaven, worshipping the great name of God, and swearing to the performance it.[[17]](#footnote-17) Dr. Gouge concluded the solemnity with prayer, after which the house of commons went up into the chancel, and subscribed their names in one roll of parchment, and the assembly in another, in both which the covenant was fairly transcribed. Lord’s-day following it was tendered to all persons within the bills of mortality, being read in the several churches to their congregations as above.

October 15, it was taken by the house of lords, after a sermon preached by Dr. Temple, from Nehemiah x. 29, and an exhortation by Mr. Colman. October 29, it was ordered by the committee of states in Scotland to be sworn to, and subscribed all over that kingdom, on penalty of the confiscation of goods and rents, and such other punishment as his majesty and the parliament should inflict on the refusers.[[18]](#footnote-18) All the lords of the council were summoned to sign the covenant November 2, and those who did not, to appear again the 14th of the same month, under the severest penalties, when some of the king’s party not attending were declared enemies to religion, and to their king and country; November 18, their goods were ordered to be seized, and their persons apprehended; upon which they fled into England. Such was the unbounded zeal of that nation! February 2, following, the covenant was ordered to be taken throughout the kingdom of England, by all persons above the age of eighteen years; and the assembly were commanded to draw up an exhortation to dispose people to it, which being approved by both houses, was published under the title of

“An exhortation to the taking of the solemn league and covenant, for reformation and defence of religion, the honour and happiness of the king, and the peace and safety of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and for satisfying such scruples as may arise in the taking of it; assented to by the house, and ordered to be printed.”

“*Die Veneris,* February 9, 1643.

“If the power of religion, or solid reason; if loyalty to the king, and piety to their native country, or love to themselves, and natural affection to their posterity; if the example of men touched with a deep sense of all these; or extraordinary success from God thereupon, can awaken an embroiled bleeding remnant to embrace the sovereign and only means of their recovery, there can be no doubt but this solemn league and covenant will find, wheresoever it shall be tendered, a people ready to entertain it with all cheerfulness and duty.

“And were it not commended to the kingdom by the concurrent encouragement of the honourable houses of parliament, the assembly of divines, the renowned city of London, multitudes of other persons of eminent rank and quality of this nation, and the whole body of Scotland, who have all willingly sworn and subscribed it with rejoicing at the oath, so graciously seconded from heaven already, by blasting the counsels, and breaking the power, of the enemy more than ever, yet it goeth forth in its own strength with such convincing evidence of equity, truth, and righteousness, as may raise in all (not wilfully ignorant, or miserably seduced) inflamed affections to join with their brethren in this happy bond, for putting an end to the present miseries, and for saving both king and kingdom from utter ruin, now so strongly and openly laboured by the Popish faction, and such as have been bewitched and besotted by that viperous and bloody generation.”[[19]](#footnote-19)—

It then proceeds to answer objections against taking the covenant; as,

Obj. 1. That it obliges to the extirpation of prelacy, which stands as yet by the known laws of the land.

Answ. The life and soul of the hierarchy is already taken away; nothing of jurisdiction remaining; and since it is but a human constitution, if it be found a grievance, we may certainly endeavour its extirpation in a lawful way.

Obj. 2. It is said to be inconsistent with the oath of canonical obedience.

Answ. If men have sworn obedience to the laws of the land, may they not endeavour by lawful means the repealing those laws, if they are found inconvenient? or if any ministers have taken oaths not warranted by the laws of God and the land, ought they not to repent of them?

Obj. 3. But the covenant crosses the oaths of supremacy and allegiance.

Answ. This is false, for it binds to the preservation of the king’s person and authority, in the defence of the religion and liberties of the kingdom.

Obj. 4. But it is done without the king’s consent.

Answ. So was the protestation of May 5*,* which went through the whole kingdom, his majesty not excepting against it, though he was then at Whitehall. The same has been done by the united Netherlands under king Philip; and more lately in Scotland, his majesty himself declaring by act of parliament, that they had done nothing but what became loyal and obedient subjects.

Dr. Barwick says,[[20]](#footnote-20) that some persons in the university of Cambridge published an answer to this exhortation, which I have not seen; but if the reader will look forward to the year 1647, he will find the reasons of the university of Oxford against it, confirmed in convocation, the validity of which he will judge of for himself. It is certain most of the religious[[21]](#footnote-21) part of the nation, who apprehended the Protestant religion in danger, and were desirous of reducing the hierarchy of the church, were zealous for the covenant. Others took it only in obedience of the parliament, being sensible of the distressed circumstances of their affairs, and that the assistance of the Scots was to be obtained on no other terms.[[22]](#footnote-22) But as it was a test of a mixed nature, and contained some obligations upon conscience, which wise and honest men might reasonably scruple, who were otherwise well affected to the Protestant religion, and the liberties of their country, the imposing it as a test can never be justified, though it appears, most of the episcopal divines who made the greatest figure in the church after the Restoration, did not refuse it.

Together with the exhortation of the assembly, the following orders[[23]](#footnote-23) and instructions were dispersed over the kingdom.

Ordered, “That copies of the covenant be sent to all commanders-in-chief, and governors of towns, forts, garrisons, and soldiers, that it may be taken by all soldiers under their command.

“That copies be sent to the committees of parliament, in the several counties that are under the power of the parliament, and that the committees within six days disperse the said copies, and cause them to be delivered to the ministers, churchwardens, or constables, of the several parishes.

“That the several ministers be required to read the covenant to the people, the next Lord’s day after they have prepared the people to take it.

“That the committees of parliament take it themselves within seven days after they have received the copies; and then disperse themselves throughout their counties, so as three or four of them may be together at the several places appointed for the people to take it. That they summon all the ministers, churchwardens, constables, and other officers, to that place, and after a sermon preached by a minister whom they shall appoint, they shall cause the said minister to tender the covenant to all such ministers and other officers, to be taken and subscribed in the presence of the committee.

“The said ministers are then to be required to tender the covenant to all the rest of their parishioners next Lord’s day, and if any minister refuse or neglect to appear at the said summons, or refuse to take the said covenant, the committee shall appoint another minister to do it in his place.

“If any minister refuse to take or tender the covenant; or if any other person refuse to take it after a second tender, upon two Lord’s days, their names shall be returned to the committee, and by them to the house of commons; and all persons that absent themselves after notice given, shall be returned as refusers.”

The English in foreign parts were not exempted from this test; directions were sent to Mr. Strickland, the parliament’s agent at the Hague, to tender it to all the English in those countries, and to certify the names of such as refused.[[24]](#footnote-24) Here the elector palatine took it, and after some time came into England, and condescended to sit in the assembly of divines. December 20, 1643, it was ordered by the lords and commons, that no person should be capable of being elected a common-council-man of the city of London, or so much as a voice in such elections, who has not taken the covenant.[[25]](#footnote-25) On the 29th of January 1644, it was ordered by the commons, that the solemn league and covenant be, upon every day of fasting and public humiliation, publicly read in every church and congregation within the kingdom; and every congregation is enjoined to have one fairly printed in a large letter, in a table fitted to be hung up in a public place of the church or congregation, to be read by the people. All young ministers were required to take the covenant at their ordination; none of the laity were continued in any office of trust, either civil or military, who refused it. When the war was ended, all the noblemen, knights, gentlemen, and officers, who had opposed the parliament were obliged to submit to it, before they were admitted to composition. Notwithstanding all this severity, Dr. Calamy says, Mr. Baxter kept his people from taking the covenant, as fearing it might be a snare to their consciences; nay, he prevented its being much taken in the county he lived in, by keeping the ministers from offering it their people, except the city of Worcester, where he had no great interest.[[26]](#footnote-26)

The king could not be unacquainted with these proceedings, for the covenant lay before the parliament and assembly almost a month, during which time his majesty took no public notice of it; but a fortnight after it had been subscribed by both houses, and by all the clergy and laity within the bills of mortality, he issued out the following proclamation, dated from Oxford, October 9, in the nineteenth year of his reign.

“By the King.

“Whereas there is a printed paper, entitled, A solemn league and covenant, for reformation and defence of religion, &c., pretended to be printed by order of the house of commons, September 21, which covenant, though it seems to make specious expressions of piety and religion, is in truth nothing else but a traitorous and seditious combination against us and the established religion and laws of this kingdom, in pursuance of a traitorous design and endeavour to bring in foreign force to invade this kingdom; we do therefore straitly charge and command all our loving subjects, of what degree or quality soever, upon their allegiance, that they presume not to take the said seditious and traitorous covenant. And we do likewise hereby further inhibit and forbid all our subjects to impose, administer, or tender, the said covenant, as they, and every one of them, will answer the contrary at their utmost and extremest perils.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

His majesty sent the like declaration into Scotland, to which the states of that kingdom paid no farther regard, than to send him the reasons of their conduct, with their advice to his majesty to take the covenant himself.

Great complaints have been made, and not without reason, of the execution this test did upon the king’s clergy throughout the kingdom. It was a new weapon put into the hands of the committees, which enabled them with more ease and certainty to detect malignant or disaffected ministers; for instead of producing a number of witnesses, as had been the method hitherto, they now tendered the covenant, which the others refusing, gave occasion to the general report, that the clergy were turned out of their livings only for refusing the covenant, whereas their sequestration was grounded upon other causes: or at least the articles of immorality or disaffection to the parliament were almost always joined with it. When the covenant passed through the parliament-quarters, in some towns it was neglected, in others the incumbent avoided it, by withdrawing for a few weeks, and getting another to officiate. Some who refused were displaced, and the names of those who absented were returned to the parliament, but little or nothing came of it. The writer of the life of bishop Saunderson says, that in the associated counties of Cambridgeshire, &c. all were ejected who refused the covenant, that is, all to whom it was tendered; for though it was pressed pretty closely in some places notorious for disaffection, in others, that had been quiet, it was little regarded. The earl of Manchester had particular instructions to tender the covenant to the Cambridge scholars, and yet the commissioners imposed it only upon such who had adhered to the king, or of whose disaffection they had sufficient evidence, several who behaved peaceably being permitted to keep their places, who would certainly have refused it. It has been observed already, that Mr. Baxter prevented its being much taken in Worcestershire; and no doubt, there were men of moderation and influence who did the same in other counties. Those clergymen who had declared for the king were usually put to the trial; but reputed Calvinists, of sober lives, who had stood neuter, were frequently overlooked; so that the benefieed clergy suffered by the covenant, rather as parties in the war, than as friends of the hierarchy. However, it being a religious test, the imposing it was, in my opinion, unwarrantable, and a very great hardship, especially as it was for some time a door of entrance into ecclesiastical preferments, for such young divines as had no concern in the war. A test of a civil nature would have answered all the ends of civil government, without shackling the consciences of men, which ought always to be left free, and open to conviction. But if the Puritan powers bore hard upon the loyalists, in imposing the covenant, the king’s clergy were even with them at the Restoration, when they obliged them publicly to abjure it, or quit their preferments.

The necessity of the king’s affairs having obliged him to arm the Papists, and commission the duke of Ormond to agree to a cessation of arms with the Irish Catholics, in order to draw off his forces from thence, his majesty fell under the suspicion of favouring that religion, especially when it appeared that not only the Protestant soldiers, but the Irish rebels, were transported with them. Mr. Whitelocke[[28]](#footnote-28) says, several of their officers and soldiery came over with the king’s army; that a month or two after, eight hundred native Irish rebels landed at Weymouth, under the lord Inchequin, and another party at Beaumaris, which committed great spoils, destroying with fire what they could not carry off. Another party landed near Chester under the earl of Cork, and fifteen hundred were cast away at sea: these wretches brought hither the same savage disposition which they had discovered in their own country; they plundered and killed people in cold blood, observing neither the rules of honour, nor the law of arms.[[29]](#footnote-29) The Scotch forces in the north of Ireland, entered into a confederacy to stand by each other against the cessation; the parliament of England protested against it, and published a declaration informing the world, that his majesty had broke through his royal promise, of leaving the Irish war to them; they forbade all masters of ships to bring over any officers or soldiers, on penalty of the forfeiture of their vessels, and gave letters of marque to merchants and others, who would fit out ships at their own expense, empowering them to take to their own profit all such ships and goods as they should meet coming over with soldiers or warlike stores for the king. Next year an ordinance was published, that no quarter should be given to any Irish Papist taken in arms against the parliament; all officers were to except them out of their capitulations, and, upon making them prisoners, were immediately to put them to death.

This unhappy management of the king alienated the affections of great numbers of his friends who had the Protestant religion at heart; many who wished well to his person deserted him upon this occasion, and made their peace with the parliament, as the earls of Holland, Bedford, Clare, Carlisle, sir Edward Deering, and others; this last gentleman published the reasons of his conduct to the world, the principal of which were, the Irish cessation; his majesty preferring Popish officers to chief places of trust and honour; and the language of the Oxford clergy and others, that the king should come no other way to his palace but by conquest.[[30]](#footnote-30) There was certainly a very malignant spirit among those gentlemen at this time, as appears by their form of thanksgiving, or rather imprecation, for the taking of Bristol, and the success of the earl of Newcastle’s army in the north: “O Lord (say they), though our sins cry aloud, hear them not, but look to the righteousness of our cause: see the seamless coat of thy Son torn; the throne of thine Anointed trampled upon; thy church invaded by sacrilege, and thy people miserably deceived by lies; see it, O God, as see it thou dost, and vindicate what thou seest on the heads of those who lead these wretches.” Many of the earl of Newcastle’s soldiers in the north, upon news of the Irish cessation, threw down their arms, and offered a composition; and if we may believe the Parliamentary Chronicle,[[31]](#footnote-31) this single action lost the king all the northern counties. To put a stop to the clamours of the people, and prevent any farther desertions, his majesty resolved to support his own character as a Protestant, and accordingly made the following protestation in presence of the congregation at Christchurch, Oxford, immediately before his receiving the sacrament from the hands of archbishop Usher.

“My Lord.

“I espy here many resolved Protestants, who may declare to the world the declaration I do now make. I have, to the utmost of my power, prepared my soul to be a worthy receiver, and may I so receive comfort from the blessed sacrament, as I do intend the establishment of the true reformed Protestant religion, as it stood in its beauty in the happy days of queen Elizabeth, without any connivance at Popery. I bless God that, in the midst of these public distractions, I have still liberty to communicate. And may this sacrament be my damnation, if my heart do not join with my lips in this protestation.”[[32]](#footnote-32)

How consonant was this with his majesty’s actions, when within a few days he agreed to a cessation with the Irish Papists for a year, and a toleration of their religion! All men knew, that his majesty not only connived at Popery, but indulged it as far as was in his power; historians therefore are at a loss to reconcile this solemn appeal to heaven, with the king’s piety and sincerity. The parliament was so apprehensive of the consequences of bringing over the Irish Papists, that by an order of November 22, they desired the assembly of divines to write letters to the foreign churches of Holland, France, and Switzerland, and other places, to inform them of the artifices of his majesty’s agents; of the constant employment of Irish rebels, and other Papists, to be governors, commanders, and soldiers, in his armies; of the many evidences of their intentions to introduce Popery; to hinder the intended reformation, and to condemn other Protestant churches as unsound because not prelatical; and that the Scots commissioners be desired to join with them. In pursuance of this order, the assembly wrote the following letter, dated November 30, 1643:—

“To the Belgic, French, Helvetian, and other reformed churches.

“Right reverend and dearly beloved in our Lord Jesus Christ,

“We, the assembly of divines, and others, convened by the authority of both houses of parliament, with the commissioners from the general assembly of the church of Scotland, do heartily salute you in the Lord. We doubt not, but the sad reports of the miseries under which the church and kingdom of England do bleed, and wherewith we are ready to be swallowed up, is long since come to your ears; and it is probable, the same instruments of Satan and Antichrist have, by their emissaries, endeavoured to represent us as black as may be among yourselves.[[33]](#footnote-33)—And we sometimes doubt whether we have not been wanting to our own innocence, and your satisfaction, in being thus long silent; but pardon us, dear brethren, if this cup of trembling wherewith our spirits have been filled to amazement, and our wrestling with extreme difficulties ever since our meeting, has hindered from that which was our duty; and give us leave now a little to ease our grief, while we relate the desolation made by the antichristian faction, who are for hindering the work of reformation, and for introducing and cherishing Popery; and are now arrived to that strength, that if the Lord do not speedily help us, we shall be altogether laid waste by them.

“How great a hand they [the prelates] have had, in the miseries of other reformed churches, in the destruction of the Palatinate, in the loss of Rochelle, are so fully known and felt by you all, that we need not speak anything of them. And we suppose their inveterate hatred against you all is sufficiently manifest, in that multitudes of them have refused to acknowledge any of you for churches of Christ because you are not prelatical, and thereby, as they conceive, want a lawful vocation of ministers. Sure we are, that among ourselves, scarce one thing can be thought of which may be supposed an argument of their design to advance Popery, that has not been attempted. The laws against Popcry have been suspended; judges forbid to proceed against condemned priests; Jesuits set free; houses of superstition in Ireland and England have been set up and not discountenanced; notorious Papists harboured about the court and preferred; many released from legal penalties, and their prosecutors discountenanced; agents have been sent into Italy, and nuncios from Rome received, while the most zealous Protestants have been persecuted; many prelates and clergymen have publicly preached, and endeavoured to leaven the people with all points of' Popery, except the supremacy, and introduced adundance of corrupt innovations into the worship of God; for noncompliance with which many have been forced to fly for refuge to the remote parts of the world.

“They imposed upon the kingdom of Scotland a new Popish service-book and canons, to which, when that nation would not submit, they prevailed with his majesty to proclaim them rebels, and raise an army against them, to which all the Papists, and those who were popishly affected, contributed; and had not the Lord, by his blessing on the Scots, arms, and by the calling of this parliament, prevented it, the two nations had been imbruing their hands in each other’s blood.

“But though we hoped through the goodness of God, and his blessing upon this parliament, whose hearts were inclined to a more perfect reformation, that our winter had been past, yet, alas! we find it to be quite otherwise. We know our sins have deserved all, and if we die and perish, the Lord is righteous; to his hand we submit, and to him alone we look for healing. The same anti-christian faction not being discouraged, by their want of success in Scotland, have stirred up a bloody rebellion in Ireland, wherein above one hundred thousand Protestants have been destroyed in one province, within a few months. They have alienated the heart of his majesty from his parliament, and prevailed with him to withdraw and raise an army, which at first pretended only to be made up of Protestants—but soon after Papists were armed by commission from the king; many great Papists were put into places of public command, and the body of all the Papists have joined his majesty with all their might; they profess and exercise their religion publicly in several parts of the kingdom, and go up and down plundering, murdering, and spoiling of their goods, all such as adhere to the parliament, and to the cause of religion. Nor has the parliament been able, by their petitions and remonstrances, to recover his majesty out of their hands, or bring these men to deserved punishment, but the sword rages almost in every corner of this woeful land.

“And to complete our miseries, they have prevailed with his majesty so far to own the rebels in Ireland, as not only to call them his Roman-Catholic subjects now in arms, but to grant them a cessation of arms for a year, and to hold what they have gotten, with liberty to strengthen themselves with men, money, arms, ammunition, &c., whereby they are enabled not only to destroy the remnant of Protestants in Ireland, but to come over hither (as many of them are already) to act the same butchery upon us.

“In the midst of these troublesome times the two houses of parliament have called this assembly, to give them our best counsel for the reformation of the church, requiring us to make God’s word only our rule, and to endeavour the nearest conformity to the best reformed churches, and uniformity to all the churches of the three kingdoms.

“The church and kingdom of Scotland have made offer of their humble mediation to the king for a pacification, which being rejected both nations have entered into a mutual league and covenant; and the Scots have resolved to join in arms with their brethren in England, for their mutual preservation from the common enemy, and so far as in them lieth for the safety of their native king. They have also sent their commissioners hither, for uniformity of religion in the churches of both kingdoms.

“And we their commissioners do exceedingly rejoice, to behold the foundation of the house of God, not only in doctrine, but in church-government, laid before our eyes in a reverend assembly of so wise, learned, and godly divines. And we find ourselves bound in all Christian duty, as well as by our late covenant, to join in representing to the reformed churches abroad, the true condition of affairs here, against all mistakes and misinformations.

“And now, dear brethren, we beg of you, first, to judge aright of our innocence and integrity in this our just defence; if our enemies say, that we are risen up in rebellion to deprive the king of his just power and greatness, and to bring anarchy and confusion into the church of Christ, we doubt not but our solemn covenant (a copy of which we humbly present you herewith) will sufficiently clear us. Let the righteous Lord judge between us, whom we implore to help us no farther than we can plead these things in sincerity.

“Secondly, That you would sympathise with us as brethren, who suffer in and for the same cause wherein yourselves have been oppressed.

“Thirdly, That you would conceive of our condition as your own common cause, which, if it be lost with us, yourselves are not like long to escape, the quarrel being not so much against men’s persons, as against the power of godliness, and the purity of God’s word. The way and manner of your owning us we leave to yourselves, only we importunately crave your fervent prayers, both public and private, that God would bring salvation to us; that the blessings of truth and peace may rest upon us; that these three nations may be joined as one stick in the hands of the Lord; and that we ourselves, contemptible builders, called to repair the house of God, in a troublesome time, may see the pattern of this house, and commend such a platform to our Zerubbabels as may be most agreeable to his sacred word, nearest in conformity to the best reformed churches, and to establish uniformity among ourselves; that all mountains may become plains before them and us; that then all who now see the plummet in our hands, may also behold the top-stone set upon the head of the Lord’s house among us, and may help us with shouting to cry, Grace, grace, to it.

“Thus much we have been commanded to inform you of, re-

verend brethren (and by you all faithful Christians under your charge), by the honourable house of commons, in whose name, and in our own, we bid you heartily farewell in the Lord.

“Your most affectionately devoted brethren in Christ, William Twisse, *prolocutor.*

Cornelius Burges, John White, *assessors,*

Henry Roborough, Adoniram Byfield, *scribes,*

John Maitland, A. Johnston, Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Bailie, George Gillespie, *commissioners of the church of Scotland.*’'

The inscription was, “To the reverend and learned pastors and elders of the classes and churches of the province of Zealand, our much honoured brethren.”

Letters of the same import were sent to the several churches of the Seven Provinces; to the churches of Geneva; the Protestant cantons of Switzerland; the churches of Hesse, Hanau, and Hainault; and to the Protestant congregation at Paris; all which were received with respect, and answered by the several classes.[[34]](#footnote-34) But the churches of Bohemia, Transylvania, Poland, Silesia, and Austria, and other cities and principalities of Germany, were not written to. The answer from the French church at Paris was read in the assembly the beginning of March; from Switzerland June 12, 1644; and from Geneva[[35]](#footnote-35) at the same time; from the classes of Amsterdam and Guelderland June 29; and Mr. Whitelocke observes, that the Netherland divines expressed not only their approbation of the proceedings of the parliament and assembly touching the covenant, but desired to join with the two kingdoms therein.

The king, apprehending himself misrepresented to the foreign churches, in that part of the assembly’s letter which insinuates a design to introduce Popery, and being advised to vindicate his character from that imputation, caused a manifesto to be drawn up in Latin and English, to all foreign Protestants; which, though not published till the beginning of next year, may be properly inserted in this place.

“Charles by the special providence of Almighty God, king of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c., to all those who profess the true reformed Protestant religion, of what nation, degree, or condition, soever they be, to whom this present declaration shall come, greeting.

“Whereas we are given to understand, that many false rumours and scandalous letters are spread up and down among the reformed churches in foreign parts by the politic or rather the pernicious industry of some ill-affected persons, that we have an inclination to recede from that orthodox religion which we were born, baptized, and bred in, and which we have firmly professed and practised throughout the whole course of our life to this moment; and that we intend to give way to the introduction and public exercise of Popery again, in our dominions; which most detestable calumny being grounded upon no imaginable foundation, hath raised these horrid tumults, and more than barbarous wars, throughout this flourishing island, under pretence of a kind of reformation which is incompatible with the fundamental laws and government of this kingdom; we desire that the whole Christian world should rest assured, that we never entertained the least thought to attempt such a thing, or to depart a jot from that holy religion, which, when we received the crown and sceptre of this kingdom, we took a most solemn sacramental oath to profess and protect. Nor does our constant practice, and daily presence in the exercise of this religion, with so many asseverations at the head of our armies, and the public attestation of our barons, with the circumspection used in the education of our royal offspring, besides divers other undeniable arguments, only demonstrate this, but also that happy alliance of marriage we contracted between our eldest daughter and the illustrious prince of Orange, most closely confirms the reality of our intentions herein; by which it appears, that our endeavours are not only to make a profession thereof in our own dominions, but to strengthen it abroad as much as lieth in our power.[[36]](#footnote-36)

“This most holy religion of the Anglican church, ordained by so many convocations of learned divines, confirmed by so many acts of parliament, and strengthened by so many royal proclamations, together with the ecclesiastical discipline and liturgy, which the most eminent Protestant authors, as well as Germans, French, Danes and Swedes, Dutch and Bohemians, do with many eulogies, and not without a kind of envy, approve and applaud in their public writings, particularly in the transactions of the synod of Dort, wherein (besides others of our divines who were afterward prelates) one of our bishops assisted, to whose dignity all due respect and precedency were given; this religion, we say, which our royal father, of blessed memory, doth publicly assert in his famous confession addressed to all Christian princes, with the hierarchy and liturgy thereof, we solemnly protest, that by the help of God, we will endeavour to our utmost power, and last period of our life, to keep entire and inviolable; and will be careful according to our duty to heaven, and the tenor of our oath at our coronation, that all ecclesiastics, in their several degrees and incumbencies, shall preach and practise. Wherefore we command all our ministers of state beyond the seas, as well ambassadors as residents, agents, and messengers; and we desire all the rest of our loving subjects that sojourn in foreign parts, to communicate and assert this our solemn and sincere protestation, when opportunity of time and place shall be offered.

“Given in our university and city of Oxford, “May 14, 1644.”

This declaration did the king little service among foreign Protestants, for though it assured them his majesty would not turn Papist, it convinced them that no alteration in the English hierarchy was to be expected. His marrying his daughter to the prince of Orange was perhaps the only evidence of his charity for the Dutch reformation; but his appeal to the education of his children was trifling, when all the world knew they were under Popish instructors, in pursuance of a marriage-contract, till twelve or fourteen years of age, and had received impressions not to be easily effaced. His insinuating to the foreign churches, that their most learned divines preferred the English hierarchy to the government of their own countries, convinced them they ought to be more sparing of their compliments for the future, to persons who would draw such conclusions from them. As to the synod of Dort, no precedency was given to the bishop on account of his episcopal character, but as a baron of the English parliament.[[37]](#footnote-37) Nor is there anything in the declaration that might encourage the foreign clergy to hope his majesty would own their churches, ministers, or sacraments, or unite with them against the common enemy of the reformation, any more than before these unhappy troubles began.

All the episcopal divines left the assembly before the bringing in of the covenant, except Dr. Featly, who was expelled for holding correspondence with archbishop Usher at Oxford, and for revealing their proceedings, contrary to the express words of the ordinance, which obliges them “not to divulge by printing, or writing, or otherwise, their opinions or advices, touching the matters proposed to them by parliament, without the consent of both or either houses.” The doctor was a learned man, and a Calvinist, upon which account the assembly paid him a high regard, and indulged him in all his speeches in favour of episcopacy, and against the covenant, some of which were afterward published to the world. They appointed him to answer to a Popish pamphlet called the Safeguard; and he bore a part in the annotations on the Bible, which go under the name of the Assembly. Lord Clarendon says, the king sent him a letter forbidding him to sit any longer, but that the doctor excused it in a letter to archbishop Usher, which being intercepted, he was committed prisoner[[38]](#footnote-38) to lord Peter’s house in Aldersgate-street as a spy: the archbishop at the same time being declared incapable of sitting in the assembly for the like reason. And here was an end of all the public concern the episcopal party had in the government of the church till the Restoration.

From the time of taking the covenant, we may date the entire dissolution of the hierarchy, though it was not as yet abolished by an ordinance of parliament. There were no ecclesiastical courts, no visitations, no wearing the habits, no regard paid to the canons, or ceremonies, or even to the common prayer itself. The archbishop of Canterbury, by an ordinance of May 16, had been forbid to collate any benefices in his gift, but to persons nominated by parliament; for disobedience to which he was, by another ordinance of June 10, “suspended *ab officio et benejicio,* and from all archiepiscopal jurisdiction, till he should be acquitted, or convicted of the high treason of which he was impeached; and as to such livings, dignities, promotions, &c. in the said archbishop’s gift or collation, as are, or shall hereafter, become void, institution or induction shall henceforward be given by the archbishop’s vicar-general, or any other having authority on his behalf, upon the nomination and recommendation of both houses of parliament.” By this extraordinary method the reverend Mr. Corbet was inducted into the living of Chatham, “ratione suspensionis dom. Guil. archiepiscopi Cant, et sequestrationis temporalium archi-episcopatus in manibus supremæ curiae parliament, jam existentis,” “by reason of the suspension of the archbishop of Canterbury, and the sequestration of the temporalities of his archbishopric into the hands of the present high court of parliament, the same belonging to their gift.” But this ordinance was of no long continuance, for upon the sitting of the assembly of divines, church-business went through their hands; the parishes elected their ministers, the assembly examined and approved of them, and the parliament confirmed them in their benefices without any regard to the archbishop or his vicar. Thus the earl of Manchester filled the vacant pulpits in the associated counties; and when lord Fairfax was authorized to supply those in the north, by an ordinance of February 27, the preamble says, “The houses being credibly informed that many ministers in the county of York were not only of a scandalous life, but having left their churches and cures, had withdrawn themselves wilfully from the same, and joined such forces as had been raised against the parliament, and assisted them with men, money, horses, and arms; therefore it is ordained, that lord Fairfax be authorized to fill up their places, with such learned and godly divines as he shall think fit, with advice of the assembly.”[[39]](#footnote-39)

This created a great deal of business; for though the assembly had not a parliamentary authority to ordain, yet the examination and approbation of such clergymen already in orders, as petitioned for sequestered livings, being by express order of the two houses referred to them, they were obliged to choose a select committee for this work; their names were,

Reverends,

Dr. Gouge,

Dr. Stanton.

Dr. Lightfoot.

Dr. Smith.

Dr. Temple.

Dr. Tuckney.

Dr. Hoyle.

Dr. Burges.

Dr. Spurstow.

Mr. Ley.

Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. Conant.

Mr. Gower.

Mr. Cheynel.

The method of examination was this; the names of the ministers who petitioned for livings, or were recommended by either house of parliament, being published in the assembly two or three days before the examination, liberty was given in that time to make exceptions to their characters; if nothing was objected they were examined by the committee, or any five of them, who reported their qualifications to the house, upon which each candidate received a certificate from the assembly to the following effect:

“According to an order bearing date—from the committee of the house of commons for plundered ministers, to the committee of divines for the examination of A. B., concerning his fitness to be admitted to the benefit of the sequestration of the church of—, in the county of—, and so to officiate in the cure thereof, these are to certify the said committee of plundered ministers, that upon examination of the said A. B. and some trial of his gifts and abilities, we conceive him fit to officiate in the cure of—, in the county aforesaid. In witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names.”

The scribes of the assembly were ordered to keep a record of all orders and certificates concerning ministers recommended to sequestrators, and to enter them in a register-book. This continued for about a year, till the new directory and form of church-government took place.

Towards the latter end of this year died William Chillingworth, A. M. whom I mention not as a Puritan, but as a witness against some of those hardships the present dissenters complain of; he was born at Oxford 1602, and educated in Magdalen-college, of which he became fellow in June 1628. He afterward turned Roman Catholic, and went to the Jesuits’ college at St. Omer’s, where not being thoroughly satisfied in some of their principles he returned to England 1631, and having embraced the religion of the church of England, published an excellent treatise entitled, “The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation,” for which he was preferred to the chancellorship of the church of Sarum, and made master of Wygston-hospital in Leicester. He was inserted in the list with other loyalists to be created D. D. in the year 1642, but came not thither to receive that honour. It was the general opinion of the times that he was a Socinian, but in his last letter at the end of his works, he appears an Arian. It is very certain he refused to subscribe the thirty-nine articles, for some years after his conversion, (1.) Because he did not believe the morality of the fourth commandment. (2.) Because he did not agree to the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian creed, and therefore could not read the common prayer. He objected also to the twentieth article, of the church’s power to decree rites and ceremonies;” to the nineteenth article, “that works done before the grace of Christ, &c. are not pleasing to God;” and indeed, says the writer of his life, to the articles in general, as an imposition on men’s consciences, much like the authority which the church of Rome assumes.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Mr. Chillingworth blesses God, that when he had entertained some thoughts of subscription, two unexpected impediments diverted him from it; “for (says he) I profess since I entertained it I never enjoyed quiet day nor night, till now that I have rid myself of it again; and I plainly perceive, that if I had swallowed this pill, howsoever gilded over with glosses and reservations, and wrapped up in conserves of good intentions and purposes, yet it would never have agreed nor stayed with me, but I should have cast it up again, and with it whatsoever preferment I should have gained as the wages of unrighteousness; but now, I thank God, I am resolved, that I will never do that while I am living and in health, which I would not do if I was dying: and this I am sure I would not do, and therefore whenever I make such a preposterous choice, I will give you leave to believe, that I am out of my wits, or do not believe in God—.”[[41]](#footnote-41) Notwithstanding these resolutions, he was prevailed with to subscribe, by his godfather archbishop Laud, to qualify him for the above-mentioned preferments. How the pill was gilded over is not certain; the writer of his life says he subscribed as articles of peace not of belief. Mr. Chillingworth was a quick disputant, and of very high principles, for in one of his sermons before the king, he says, that “the most unjust and tyrannical violence of princes may not be rejected; this being unlawful, even though princes be most impious, tyrannical, and idolatrous.” But though his political principles were high, he was low enough with regard to the authority of councils, fathers, and convocations, in matters of faith: adhering steadfastly to that celebrated declaration, “that the Bible alone is the religion of a Protestant.” He was an excellent mathematician, and served as engineer in Arundel-castle in Sussex, in which he was taken prisoner, and when indisposed had the favour of being lodged in the bishop’s house at Chichester, where he died January 20, 1643-4. It is surprising, that lord Clarendon should say, “The parliament-clergy prosecuted him with all the inhumanity imaginable, so that by their barbarous usage he died within a few days;”[[42]](#footnote-42) when, as he himself acknowledged, he wanted for nothing; and by the interest of Dr. Cheynel, who attended him in his sickness, was courteously used.[[43]](#footnote-43) The doctor would have reasoned him out of some of his principles, but could not prevail, and therefore at his interment, after a reflecting speech upon his character, threw his book, entitled “The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation,” into the grave, saying, “Get thee gone, thou cursed book, which has seduced so many precious souls; earth to earth, dust to dust; get thee into the place of rottenness, that thou mayest rot with thy author, and see corruption.” A most unchristian and uncharitable imprecation!

Among the considerable statesmen who died this year, may be justly reckoned John Hampden, esq. of Buckinghamshire, a gentleman of good extraction, and one of the greatest patriots of his age, as appears by his standing trial with the king in the case of ship-money, which raised his reputation to a very great height throughout the kingdom. He was not a man of many words, but a very weighty speaker; his reputation for integrity universal, and his affections so publicly guided, that no corrupt or private ends could bias them. He was indeed a very wise man, of great parts and modesty, and possessed of the most absolute spirit of popularity, says lord Clarendon, I ever knew. He was one of the impeached members of the house of commons, and in the beginning of the war took the command of a regiment, and performed the duty of a colonel on all occasions punctually, being a man of great personal courage, not to be tired out by the most laborious, and of parts not to be imposed upon by the most subtle, but because he fought against the court, lord Clarendon says (if this be not an interpolation of the editors) that he had a head to contrive, a tongue to persuade, and a hand to execute, any mischief.[[44]](#footnote-44) Which is very unaccountable in one whom his lordship had commended as a person not only of cheerfulness and affability, but of extraordinary sobriety and strictness of life. Mr. Hampden was certainly in all respects one of the greatest and best men of his age, and the parliament sustained an irreparable less in his death, which happened June 24, about a week after his shoulder-bone had been broken by a musket-ball, in a skirmish with prince Rupert’s forces in Calgrave-field.

John Pym, esq. member for Tavistock in all the parliaments of king Charles I. was a man of the greatest experience in parliamentary affairs of any man of his time. He was an admirable speaker, and by the gravity of his countenance and graceful behaviour, could turn the house which way he pleased; he was a man of business and for moderate measures, according to lord Clarendon, till the king impeached him of high treason. In his private life he was eminent for true piety and exactness of manners; and though inclined to the Puritan party, not averse to the hierarchy with some emendations. He was one of the lay-members of the assembly of divines, and at the head of all public business, the fatigue of which wore out his constitution, and put an end to his life, December 8, 1643, in the sixtieth year of his age. The news of no man’s death was more welcome to the royalists than his, who spread a report, that he died of the *morbus pediculosus*;[[45]](#footnote-45) to confute which aspersion, his body was exposed to public view for many days, and at last interred in the most honourable manner in Westminster-abbey. A little before his death, he published his own vindication to the world, against the many slanders that went abroad concerning him, wherein “he declares himself a faithful son of the Protestant religion, and of the orthodox doctrine of the church of England. He confesses he had been for reforming abuses in the government of the church, when the bishops, instead of taking care of men’s souls, were banishing their bodies into the most desolate places; bringing in new canons, Arminian and Pelagian errors, and such a number of rites and ceremonies as the people were not able to bear.—When since that time they had, as much as in them lay, fomented the civil differences between the king and his parliament, abetting and encouraging malignants with large supplies of men and money, and stirring up the people to tumults by their seditious sermons. For these reasons (says he) I gave my opinion for abolishing their functions, which I conceive may as well be done as the dissolution of monasteries, monks, and friars, was in king Henry the Eighth’s time. He concludes with declaring, that he was not the author of the present distractions; with acknowledging the king for his lawful sovereign, but thinks, when he was proscribed for a traitor, merely for the service of his country, no man can blame him for taking care of his own safety, by flying for refuge to the protection of parliament, who were pleased to make his case their own.”

1. It is a just remark of Mr. Palmer, that the assembly of divines at Westminster, was not a convocation according to the diocesan way of government, nor was it called by the votes of the ministers according to the presbyterian way; but the parliament chose all the members themselves, merely with a view to have their opinion and advice for settling the government, liturgy, and doctrine, of the church of England. And they were confined in their debates to such things as the parliament proposed. Nonconformists’ Memorial, vol. 1. introduction, p. 7.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Rushworth, vol. 2. part 3. or vol. 5. p. 337. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Dr. Grey refers to the 25tb of Henry VIII. cap. 19, or the act of submission of the clergy, to prove this assembly illegal.—Ed. “And no set of clergy (says Dr. Grey) ever deserved it more:” and to show this, he quotes a virulent invective against them by Gregory Williams, bishop of Ossory—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. “And no set of clergy (says Dr. Grey) ever deserved it more:” and to show this, he quotes a virulent invective against them by Gregory Williams, bishop of Ossory—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 530. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Bishop Warburton has no doubt but Mr. Selden would have treated a convocation with more decency and respect. For his lordship adds, “he had infinitely more esteem for the learning of the episcopal clergy, though, perhaps, no more love for their persons.” In what estimation Mr. Selden held the learning of the episcopal clergy, has been shown vol. 2. p. 128, note. With what respect he was likely to speak of a convocation, the reader will judge from the following passage, in his Table Talk, p. 37, in the edition of 1777, under the word clergy. “The clergy and laity together are (says he) never like to do well; it is as if a man were to make an excellent feast, and should have his apothecary and his physician come into the kitchen: the cooks, if they were let alone, would make excellent meat, but then comes the apothecary, and he puts rhubarb into one sauce, and agaric into another sauce. Chain up the clergy on both sides.” That he had no high opinion of the power and authority of a convocation, may be concluded from his comparing it to “a court-leet, where they have a power to make by-laws as they call them; as that a man shall put so many cows or sheep in the common; but they can make nothing that is contrary to the laws of the kingdom.” Under the word convocation, p. 45.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 344. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. “July 7 (Dr. Grey says) was the day on which Mr. Bowles and Newcomen preached.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Appendix, No. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Yet these conservators issued out, in the king’s name, a proclamation for all persons, from sixteen to sixty years old, to appear in arms. “At which (says Rushworth) the king was much incensed.”—Dr. Grey. Who will not own, that he had great reason to resent his name being used against himself?—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 463. 466. 469. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 472, &c. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. “Wise observers (bishop Burnet adds) wondered to see a matter of that importance carried through upon so little deliberation or debate. It was thought strange to see all their consciences of such a size, so exactly to agree as the several wheels of a clock; which made all apprehend, there was some first mover that directed all those other motions: this by the one party was imputed to God’s extraordinary providence, but by others to the power and policy of the leaders and the simplicity and fear of the rest.” Memoirs of the Duke of Hamilton, p. 239. —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Calamy’s Abridgment, p. 81. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Duke of Hamilton’s Memoirs, p. 237. 210. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 478. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Ibid. p. 475. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Duke of Hamilton’s Memoirs, p. 240. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 475. Husband’s Collections, p. 424. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Life of Barwick, p. 35. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
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