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CHAPTER III.

THE OXFORD PARLIAMENT. PROGRESS OF THE WAR. VISITATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE BY THE EARL OF MANCHESTER. COMMITTEES FOR PLUNDERED, SEQUESTERED, AND SCANDALOUS MINISTERS.

The campaign being ended without any prospect of peace, both parties endeavoured to strengthen themselves by new and sovereign acts of power. The parliament experiencing the want of a great seal, for many purposes, gave orders that one should be made.[[1]](#footnote-1) They continued to list soldiers, to levy taxes, and to use every method to support their cause,[[2]](#footnote-2) which their policy suggested, and their necessity urged. On the other hand, the king raised contributions without form of law;[[3]](#footnote-3) ordered the removal of the courts of justice from Westminster; and that he might seem to act in a parliamentary way, summoned the members who had been expelled the houses, and all others willing to withdraw from the rebellious city of London, to meet him at Oxford,[[4]](#footnote-4) January 22, 1643‒4, which was, in effect, disannulling the act for continuing of the present parliament. In obedience to the proclamation, there appeared forty-nine peers, and one hundred and forty-one of the house of commons, not reckoning those employed in his majesty’s service, or absent with leave. Lord Clarendon says,[[5]](#footnote-5) the appearance of both houses with the king was superior in number, as well as quality, to those at Westminster; which must be a mistake; for though the majority of peers were on that side, Mr. Whitelocke[[6]](#footnote-6) assures us, that upon a call of the house of commons, the very day the others were to meet at Oxford, there were present two hundred and eighty members, not reckoning one hundred more, who were engaged in their service in the several counties. This is a very considerable majority; though if there had been only forty, the king could not have prorogued or dissolved them, without their own consent. However, the Oxford members styled themselves the parliament, lord Littleton being speaker for the peers, and serjeant Evers for the commons.[[7]](#footnote-7) Their first step was to satisfy the world they desired peace, such a peace, to use the king’s own words,[[8]](#footnote-8) “wherein God’s true religion may be secured from the danger of Popery, sectaries, and innovations: the crown may possess those just prerogatives, which may enable me to govern my people according to law, and the subjects be confirmed in those rights which I have granted them in parliament, to which I shall be ready to add such new graces as I shall find may most conduce to their happiness.” They laid an excise upon tobacco, wine, strong waters, ale, cider, grocery and mercery wares, soap, salt, and butcher’s meat, and subscribed considerable sums of money for support of the war; they declared the Scots then entering England with an army, traitors—and the lords and commons at Westminster, guilty of high treason, for inviting them, as well as for counterfeiting the great seal. On the other hand, the parliament at Westminster would not acknowledge the Oxford members, or receive a message from them under the character of a parliament, but expelled them their house, except they returned to their seats within a limited time.[[9]](#footnote-9) April 16, 1644, the king prorogued his Oxford members to November following, when they fell under his displeasure, for advising to pacific measures at the treaty of Uxbridge, which was then upon the carpet, and in a fair way of producing an accommodation. This was so disagreeable to the queen and her Roman-Catholic counsellors, that they never left off teazing the unhappy king, till he had dismissed them, and broke off the treaty; an account of which he sent her in the following letter, which seems to breathe an air of too great satisfaction.

“Dear heart,

“What I told thee last week, concerning a good parting with our lords and commons here, was on Monday last handsomely performed: now if I do any thing unhandsome, or disadvantageous to myself or friends, in order to a treaty, it will be merely my own fault.—Now I promise thee, if the treaty be renewed (which I believe it will not) without some eminent good success on my side, it shall be to my honour and advantage, I being now as well free from the place of base and mutinous motion[[10]](#footnote-10) (that is to say, our mongrel parliament here) as of the chief causers, for whom I may justly expect to be chidden by thee, for having suffered thee to be vexed by them—.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

Mr. Whitelocke says, this assembly sat again at Oxford in the year 1645, and voted against the directory, and for the common prayer; but the king’s cause being grown desperate, they soon after shifted for themselves, and made their peace at Westminster, upon the best terms they could obtain.

On the 19th of January 1643‒4, the Scots army, consisting of twenty-one thousand men, under the command of general Leven, crossed the Tweed at Berwick, and entered England. The two houses sent a committee to meet them, which being joined by another of that nation, was called the committee of both kingdoms,[[12]](#footnote-12) and were a sort of camp parliament, to direct the motions of the army, which after some time united with the lord Fairfax’s forces, and with those under the command of the earl of Manchester, and lieutenant-general Cromwell, from the associated counties. The united armies laid siege to the city of York, which prince Rupert having relieved, occasioned the battle of Marston-moor, wherein the prince was routed, with the loss of three thousand men and his whole train of artillery; and thereupon the marquis of Newcastle, leaving the royal army, embarked with divers lords and gentlemen for Hamburgh, prince Rupert retiring towards Chester, and deserting all the northern garrisons to the mercy of the enemy, which falling into their hands next summer, concluded the war in those parts.

His majesty however had better success in the west, where being strengthened by prince Maurice, he followed the earl of Essex, and shut up his army within the narrow parts of Cornwall, so that he could neither engage nor retreat.[[13]](#footnote-13) Here the king invited the earl to make his peace, but he choosing rather to retire in a boat to Plymouth, left his men to the fortune of war. As soon as the general was gone, the horse under the command of sir William Balfour bravely forced their way through the royal quarters by night; but the foot, under the command of major-general Skippon, were obliged to surrender their arms, artillery, ammunition, and baggage, consisting of forty brass cannon, two hundred barrels of powder, match and ball proportionable, seven hundred carriages, and between eight and nine hundred arms, and to swear not to bear arms against the king, till they came into Hampshire. This was the greatest disgrace the parliament’s forces underwent in the course of the war, the foot being forced to travel in a naked and starving condition to Portsmouth, where they were supplied with new clothes and arms. And now again, the king made offers of such a peace as, he says, he had been labouring for, that is, to be restored to his prerogatives as before the war; but the houses would not submit.

Upon the defeat of the earl of Essex, his majesty resolved to march directly for London, and upon the road issued a proclamation, September 30, 1644, requiring all his loving subjects to appear in arms, and accompany him in his present expedition.[[14]](#footnote-14) This gave rise to a combination of men, distinguished by the name of Club-men, who associated in Worcestershire and Dorsetshire, agreeing to defend themselves against the orders both of king and parliament. Their increase was owing to the prodigious ravages of the king’s forces in their march. Prince Rupert was a fiery youth, and with his flying squadrons of horse, burnt towns and villages, destroying the countries where he came, and indulging his soldiers in plunder and blood. In Wales he drove away the people’s cattle, rifled their houses, and spoiled their standing corn. Aged and unarmed people were stripped naked, some murdered in cold blood, and others half hanged, and burnt, and yet suffered to live.[[15]](#footnote-15) “Lord Goring, the king’s general of the horse, was one of the most finished debauchees of the age, and wanted nothing but industry to make him as eminent and successful in the highest attempts of wickedness as ever any man was. Wilmot, the lieutenant-general, was as great a debauchee as the other, and had no more regard to his promises, or any rules of honour and integrity.”[[16]](#footnote-16) Sir Richard Grenville, who commanded the army before Plymouth, is represented by the noble historian, as having been exceeding barbarous and cruel in Ireland, hanging up old men and women of quality, even though they were bed-rid, if he did not find the plunder he expected; when he came into the west, he exercised all kinds of cruelty, and would sometimes make one of the company hang all the rest, contrary to the law of arms.[[17]](#footnote-17)

The licentiousness of the king’s soldiers was not inferior to that of their officers: for having no regular pay, they committed rapines and plunders, without distinction of friends or foes; and were infamous for the most execrable oaths, and all kinds of impiety. “Lord Goring’s horse (says the noble historian) committed horrid outrages and barbarities in Hampshire, and infested the borders of Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, and Devon, with unheard-of rapines, so that the people who were well devoted to the king, wished for the accession of any force to redeem them.”[[18]](#footnote-18) They raised vast contributions in several counties, without any other pretence but the king’s sovereign pleasure. In Cornwall they levied £700 a week; in Devonshire £2,200 a week, and proportionable in other parts.[[19]](#footnote-19) As the army marched along the country, they seized the farmers’ horses, and carried them away without any consideration. At Barnstable they plundered the town and hanged the mayor, though it was surrendered upon articles. At Evesham the king sent the mayor and aldermen prisoners to Oxford. At Woodhouse in Devonshire, they seized fourteen substantial west country clothiers, who were not in arms, and hanged them, by way of reprisal for some Irish rebels, that had been executed according to the ordinance of parliament. In short, wherever they came they lived at free-quarter, and took but everything they could, and therefore no wonder the Clubmen united in their own defence.

The king thought to have reached London before the parliament could recruit their army, but the two houses sent immediately six thousand arms, and a train of artillery to Portsmouth, with new clothing for the Cornish soldiers. They ordered sir William Waller and the earl of Manchester to join them, and dispatched thither five thousand of the city train-bands, under the command of sir James Harington, by which accession they were enabled to face his majesty’s army at Newbury, October 27; and having forced the town, which the king had fortified, after a smart engagement they took nine of his cannon and several colours; but under covert of the night, his majesty secured the rest of his artillery in Dennington-castle, and retreated with his broken army to Oxford. The parliament-generals left a body of troops to block up the castle, being assured it must surrender in the winter for want of provision; when on a sudden a party of the king’s horse raised the blockade, and carried off the artillery to Oxford. This occasioned great murmuring at London, and quarrels among the generals, Essex, Manchester, and Cromwell, which ended in the new-modelling of the army, as will be seen under the next year.

While the royal army was little better than a company of banditti, or public robbers, the parliament’s were kept under the strictest discipline, and grew up, for the most part, into great diligence and sobriety, which, says lord Clarendon, begot courage and resolution in them, and notable dexterity in achievements and exercises.[[20]](#footnote-20) Most of their officers were men of religion;[[21]](#footnote-21) their soldiers possessed with a belief, that their cause was the cause of God,[[22]](#footnote-22) and that they fought for the Protestant religion, and magna charta; however, there were among them men of dissolute lives, who fought only for pay and plunder; strange complaints being sent up from Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Sussex, of the disorders of the common soldiers, the parliament appointed a committee to inquire into the facts, and make examples of the offenders, which put an effectual stop to the growing mischief. And as the parliament were enabled, by the inexhaustible treasure of the city of London, to give their soldiers regular pay, they had them under such strict government, that they were little or no burden to the towns and villages where they were quartered.[[23]](#footnote-23)

Upon the whole, the parliament-affairs were low at the end of this year, and their counsels divided by reason of the length of the war, and the king’s were much worse; for though he had triumphed over the earl of Essex in Cornwall, and was master of the open country in the west, he had no accession of real strength, nor had taken any considerable garrisons; the entrance of the Scots broke his army in the north, and lost him that part of the kingdom, whereby the parliament were enabled to draw off their forces to the west; and the worst circumstance of all was, that his majesty, having exhausted his treasure, had no way of raising a supply, which obliged him to connive at his soldiers living at free-quarter; his officers being poor, quarrelled in the royal presence, and carried their resentments to such a height, that the king himself could not reconcile them, which had a very ill aspect on the succeeding campaign.[[24]](#footnote-24) The parliament-generals also were censuring each other’s conduct in the house, on occasion of the escape of the king’s artillery from Dennington-castle. The earl of Essex’s party were charged with a design of protracting the war, in order to an accommodation, while others being weary, were for putting it to a decisive issue. In short, both parties were in confusion and distress; they were divided among themselves, some being for peace, and others for carrying on the war to the last extremity. All property was in a manner lost, the farmers paying no rent to their landlords; nor could any man be secure of what he possessed, except he buried it under ground. The spirits of the contending parties were as much exasperated as ever, and there was no seeing to the end of their troubles.

To return to the church. The state of the controversy about ecclesiastical discipline was now changed; for whereas before the entrance of the Scots, the parliament insisted only upon a reformation of the hierarchy, now they were engaged to attempt the total extirpation of it, and to establish another scheme for both kingdoms in its room: though it was a considerable time before this could be perfected. In the meanwhile, they resolved to purge the university of Cambridge, which was the head-quarters of their forces, that they might have a succession of clergymen training up in the principles they had espoused.

The town of Cambridge was in the interest of the parliament, but the colleges were so many little garrisons for the king, and sanctuaries of disaffection; the university-press was at his majesty’s disposal, and their sermons filled with invectives against the two houses. Frequent quarrels happened between the townsmen and scholars, which would have ended in the ruin of the university, had not the parliament forbid the offering any violence to the colleges, chapels, libraries, and schools, under severe penalties.[[25]](#footnote-25) Indeed the committee enjoined the proper officers of the parish, to put in execution the ordinance for destroying the relics of superstition, whereby the paintings in windows, images of the Deity, and a great deal of carved work, were demolished; at which the masters and fellows were so incensed, that when they were ordered to repair the damages, they peremptorily refused, and were fined 40s. a college, as the ordinance directed.[[26]](#footnote-26)

The heads of the university raised a great clamour at this pretended invasion of their rights, as if the parliament intended to seize all their revenues, and destroy the very fountains of learning; whereupon the houses published the following ordinance, January 6, 1643‒4, declaring “that none of the estates, rents, and revenues, of the university, or of the colleges and halls respectively, shall be sequestered or seized upon, or in any wise disposed of, by virtue of the ordinance for sequestering the estates, rents, and revenues, of delinquents, but shall remain to the university, and the respective halls and colleges, to all intents and purposes as if the said ordinance had not been made; and the rents and revenues, &c. are ordered to be approved of by the earl of Manchester, and to be applied to their proper uses as heretofore. But if any of the heads, fellows, scholars, or other officers, were convicted of delinquency, the receiver was to pay their dividend into the hands of the committee of sequestrations.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

This committee was founded upon an ordinance of January 22, for regulating the university of Cambridge, and for removing scandalous ministers in the seven associated counties: the preamble sets forth, “that the service of the parliament was retarded, the people’s souls starved, by the idle, ill-affected, and scandalous clergy of the university of Cambridge, and the associated counties; and that many who were willing to give evidence against them, not being able to bear the charges of a journey to London, the earl of Manchester was therefore empowered to appoint committees in all the associated counties, to consist of ten persons, being deputy-lieutenants, or such as had been nominated to committees, by some former ordinance of parliament; five of these were a quorum, and they were empowered to call before them all provosts, masters, and fellows, of colleges, all students and members of the university, all ministers in any of the counties of the association, all schoolmasters that were scandalous in their lives, or ill-affected to the parliament, or fomenters of this unnatural war, or that shall wilfully refuse obedience to the orders of parliament, or that have deserted their ordinary places of residence, not being employed in the service of the king and parliament. The said committee were also empowered to send for witnesses, and to examine any complaints against the forementioned delinquents upon oath, and to certify the names of the persons accused to the earl of Manchester, with charge and proof, who shall have power to eject such as he shall judge unfit for their places; to sequester their estates, means, and revenues, and to dispose of them as he shall think fit, and place others in their room, being first approved by the assembly of divines sitting at Westminster. He had also power to order the covenant to be administered where he thought fit, and to assign the fifths of sequestered estates for the benefit of their wives and children.”[[28]](#footnote-28) The ordinance makes no mention of the doctrine or discipline of the church, seeming to be levelled only against those who took part with the king in the war.

The earl of Manchester, who was at the head of these sequestrations, was styled, in the lifetime of his father, lord Kimbolton, and was one of the impeached members of the house of commons: lord Clarendon observes,[[29]](#footnote-29) that “he was of a genteel and generous nature; that his natural civility and good manners flowed to all men, and that he was never guilty of any rudeness, even to those whom he was obliged to oppress; that he long and heartily wished for the restoration, and never forfeited that grace and favour to which his majesty received him after his return.” The earl repaired in person to Cambridge, about the middle of February, with his two chaplains, Mr. Ashe and Mr. Good, and by his warrant of the 24th instant, required the heads of the several colleges and halls to send him their statutes, with the names of all their members, and to certify who were present, and who absent, with the express time of their discontinuance.[[30]](#footnote-30) Two days after, the officers of each college and hall were ordered to give speedy advertisement to the masters, fellows, scholars, &c. to repair to Cambridge by the 10th of March, in order to answer such inquiries as should be made by himself or his commissioners. But the earl being informed, that this notice was too short, the time was prolonged to the 3rd of April, when the earl summoned Mr. Tunstal and Mr. Palgrave, fellows of Corpus-Christi college, to appear before the commissioners at the Bear-inn in Cambridge, on penalty of ejectment. Warrants of the same nature were sent to several of the fellows of Caius, St. John’s, Queen’s, Peterhouse, Sidney, Trinity, Christ’s, Magdalen, and Jesus colleges; and to Pembroke and Clare hall; who, not appearing according to the summons, were, by a warrant of April 8, ejected, to the number of sixty-five. The reasons assigned for their expulsion were, nonresidence, and not returning upon due summons, and several other political misdemeanours.[[31]](#footnote-31) If the parties ejected returned after this, they were required not to continue in the university above three days, on pain of imprisonment, and confiscation of their goods; their names were put out of the butteries, and the profits of their places reserved for their successors. Not one fellow or student in Trinity-hall, or Katherine-hall, was turned out, but all Queen’s college was evacuated.

The covenant which was read March 18, 1644, in the churches and chapels of the town and university, and tendered to the inhabitants and soldiers, was not offered to the whole university, but only to such of whose disaffection they had sufficient evidence. Archbishop Tillotson says, the greatest part of the fellows of King’s college were exempted, by the interest of Dr. Whichcote; and no doubt others who had behaved peaceably, obtained the same favour.[[32]](#footnote-32) Dr. Barwick, author of the Querela Cantabrigiensis, a famous loyalist, mentions an oath of discovery for the university, like that of the oath *ex officio;* but Mr. Fuller the historian, about the year 1653, having requested an account of this oath from Mr. Ashe the earl’s chaplain, he returned for answer, that he remembered no such thing. Mr. Fuller adds, that he is upon just grounds daily confirmed in his confidence, that neither the earl of Manchester, nor any other under him by his command or consent, enforced such an oath.[[33]](#footnote-33)

The whole number of graduates expelled the university in this and the following years, by the earl of Manchester and his commissioners, including masters and fellows of colleges, were, according to Dr. Walker, near two hundred, besides inferior scholars, which were something more than one half;[[34]](#footnote-34) for the same author tells us in another place,[[35]](#footnote-35) there were about three hundred and fifty-five fellowships in the several houses of the university; above one hundred and fifty kept their places, and far the greatest part of the rest had deserted their stations, and fled to the king. There were six heads of colleges out of sixteen that complied, viz. Dr. Bainbrigge of Christ’s college, Dr. Eden of Trinity-hall, Dr. Richard Love of Ben’et-eollege, Dr. Brownrigge of Katherine-hall, ejected in the year 1645, Dr. Bacheroft of Caius-college, and Dr. Rainbow of Magdalen-college. The ten who were ejected by the earl of Manchester March 13, or some little time after, with the names of their successors, are contained in the following table:—

*Masters turned out.           Colleges.               Succeeded by*

Dr. John Cosins, Peter-house, Dr. Lazarus Seaman.

Dr. Thomas Pask, Clare-hall, Dr. Ralph Cudworth.

Dr. Benjamin Laney, Pembroke-hall, Mr. Richard Vines.

Dr. Samuel Collins, King’s college,        Dr. Benjamin Whichcote.

Dr. Edward Martin, Queen’s college,      Mr. Herb. Palmer.

Dr. Richard Stern, Jesus-college,         Dr. T. Young.

Dr. William Beale, St. John’s-college,     Dr. J. Arrowsmith.

Dr. Thomas Comber,  Trinity-hall,           Dr. Thomas Hill.

Dr. R. Holdsworth, Emanuel-college,      Dr. Ant. Tuckney.

Dr. Samuel Ward, Sidney-college,        Dr. Richard Minshull.

*Anno* 1645.

Dr. Ralph Brownrigge, Katherine-hall,  Dr. W. Spurstow, and afterward Dr. Lightfoot

It has been objected to the proceedings of the commissioners, that they were not according to the statutes of the university; to which it was replied, that the nation was in a state of war; that these gentlemen were declared enemies to the proceedings of parliament; that they instilled into their pupils the unlawfulness of resisting the king upon any pretence whatsoever, and preached upon these subjects to the people. It was therefore necessary to take the education of the youth out of their hands, which could not be done any other way at present; but in all future elections they returned to the statutes.—It has been said farther, that it was a great loss to learning, because those who succeeded were not equal to those who were ejected.[[36]](#footnote-36) Had this been true, it is no sufficient reason for keeping them in their places, in a time of war, if they were enemies to the constitution and liberties of their country. But the best way of determining the question as to their learning, is by comparing their respective characters.

Dr. Cosins had been sequestered by the parliament in the year 1640, for his high principles, and was retired to France, where he continued till the Restoration, and was then preferred to the rich bishopric of Durham: he was a learned man, of an open, frank, and generous temper, and well versed in the canons, councils, and fathers.[[37]](#footnote-37)

Dr. Paske lived peaceably and cheerfully under the parliament, and was reinstated in all his livings at the Restoration, except the mastership of his college, which he quitted to his son. The Querela Cantab, says, he was eminent for learning; but I do not remember that he has given any specimens of it to the world.[[38]](#footnote-38)

Dr. Laney was first chaplain to Dr. Neil, and afterward prebendary of Westminster; he was one of the king’s divines at the treaty of Uxbridge, and attended upon king Charles II. in his exile; after the Restoration he was successively bishop of Peterborough, Lincoln, and Ely, and was more favourable to the Nonconformists than some of his brethren. He has some sermons extant, and a small treatise against Hobbes.

Dr. Collins was regius professor, provost of King’s college, and rector of Fenny-Ditton; of which last he was deprived by the earl of Manchester, for his steady adherence to the royal cause. He kept his provostship till the year 1645, and his professorship much longer. He died in the year 1651, and had the reputation of a great scholar, says Dr. Barwick, and his name was famous in foreign universities, though he has transmitted very little down to posterity.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Dr. Martin was one of archbishop Laud’s chaplains, and one of Mr. White’s scandalous ministers; he was accused not only of practising the late innovations, and of being in the scheme of reconciling the church of England with Rome; but of stealing wheat-sheaves out of the field in harvest on the sabbath-day, and in laying them to his tithe stock. He was very high in his principles, and was imprisoned for sending the university-plate to the king. After his enlargement, he retired to France, and at the Restoration was preferred to the deanery of Ely. Lloyd says he was a godly man, and excellently well skilled in the canon, civil, and common law; but Mr. Prynne gives him a very indifferent character; and bishop Kennet acknowledges his principles were rigid, and his temper sour.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Dr. Stern was another of archbishop Laud’s chaplains, and imprisoned for the same reason as the former. He afterward assisted the archbishop on the scaffold, and lived retired till the Restoration, when he was made bishop of Carlisle, and in 1664 archbishop of York.[[41]](#footnote-41) He had a sober, honest, mortified aspect, but was of very arbitrary principles, and a very uncharitable temper; for when Mr. Baxter, at the Savoy conference, was entreating the bishops not to cast out so many ministers in the nation, he made this mean remark to his brethren, that Mr. Baxter would not use the word kingdom lest he should own a king.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Dr. Beale was also imprisoned for sending the university-plate to the king; after his enlargement he retired to Oxford, and was one of the preachers before the court, but upon the declining of the king’s cause, he retired to Madrid, where he died about the year 1651. He was a man of very high principles; though, if we may believe the Querela, a person of such worth, as rendered him above the reach of commendation.

Dr. Comber was another of the king’s chaplains, though imprisoned and deprived, for sending the university-plate to the king; after his enlargement he lived privately till the year 1654, when he died; he was a learned man, and of great piety and charity.

Dr. Holdsworth had been a celebrated preacher in the city of London, and divinity-professor in Gresham-college; he was afterward chosen master of Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and was a zealous advocate for the king, for which he was some time under confinement. He attended his majesty at Hampton court and the Isle of Wight, and soon after died with grief. He was a pious and charitable man, but high in his principles, and of a hasty passionate temper. He published one sermon in his lifetime, and after his death his friends published his Prelectiones, and a volume of sermons.

Dr. Ward was one of the English divines at the synod of Dort, and nominated of the committee of divines that sat in the Jerusalem-chamber, and of the assembly at Westminster, though he never sat; he was a very learned man, and died soon after his ejectment.

Dr. Brownrigge was installed bishop of Exeter 1642, and deprived of his mastership in the year 1645, for some expressions in his sermon upon the king’s inauguration. He was an excellent man, and of a peaceable and quiet disposition; after the war he was allowed the liberty of the pulpit, and was chosen master of the Temple, where he died about the year 1659.

Far be it from me to detract from the personal merit of any of these sufferers, or from their rank in the commonwealth of learning; but their political principles, like those of archbishop Laud, were certainly inconsistent with the constitution and liberties of England, and exposed them very naturally to the resentments of the parliament in these boisterous times.

Those who succeeded the ejected masters, having been first examined and approved by the assembly of divines at Westminster, were these:

Dr. Lazarus Seaman, a very considerable divine, according to Mr. Wood, a complete master of the oriental languages, an excellent casuist, and a judicious moving preacher. He was well versed in the controversy of church-government, which made the parliament send him with their commissioners to the Isle of Wight, where his majesty was pleased to take particular notice of his abilities.[[43]](#footnote-43) He was ejected out of his mastership of Peter-house in 1662, and died in 1675.[[44]](#footnote-44) He printed several sermons, and “A Vindication of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches concerning Ordination.”

Dr. Ralph Cudworth is so universally known in the learned world, for his great learning, which he discovered in his Intellectual System,[[45]](#footnote-45) that I shall only observe, he conformed at the Restoration, and a little before resigned his mastership of Clare-hall into the hands of Dr. Dillingham, who continued in it to his death.

Mr. Richard Vines was a very learned and excellent divine, a popular and laborious preacher, one of the parliament-divines at the treaty of the Isle of Wight, and a most industrious and useful man in his college. He was turned out of his mastership for refusing the engagement, and died before the Restoration.

Dr. Benjamin Whichcote was fellow of Emanuel-college, and upon the ejectment of Dr. Collins preferred to the mastership of King’s college, in which he continued till the Restoration, and then conformed. The account archbishop Tillotson gives of him is this; “that he was an excellent tutor and instructor of youth, and bred up many persons of quality and others, who afterward proved useful and eminent; that he contributed more to the forming the students to a sober sense of religion than any man of that age. He never took the covenant, and by his particular friendship and interest with some of the chief visitors, prevailed to have the greatest part of the fellows of his college exempted from -that imposition.”[[46]](#footnote-46)

Mr. Herbert Palmer, B. D., was one of the university-preachers in 1632, and clerk in convocation for the diocess of Lincoln, at the beginning of this parliament; he was one of the assessors of the assembly of divines at Westminster, and on April 11, 1644, constituted master of Queen’s college by the earl of Manchester.[[47]](#footnote-47) He was very careful to appoint such persons for tutors of youth as were eminent for learning and piety; and being possessed of a good paternal estate, was unbounded in his liberality. He was a polite gentleman, a complete master of the French language, in which he could preach as well as in English; but his constitution being infirm, he died in the year 1647, when he was only fortyseven years of age.[[48]](#footnote-48)

Dr. T. Young was an eminent member of the assembly of divines, says Mr. Clarke,[[49]](#footnote-49) a man of great learning, of much prudence and piety, and of great ability arid fidelity in the work of the ministry. He was a preacher at Duke’s place in London, from whence he was preferred to the mastership of Jesus-college, where he behaved with great prudence and piety, till he was turned out for refusing the engagement. He was one of the authors of the pamphlet called Smectymnuus.

Dr. John Arrowsmith was fellow of Katherine-hall, and of an unexceptionable character for learning and piety. He was an acute disputant, and a judicious divine, as appears by his Tactica Sacra, a book of great reputation in those times. He died before the Restoration.

Dr. Thomas Hill was fellow of Emanuel-college, and one of the assembly of divines at Westminster. He was first constituted master of Emanuel, and afterward removed to Trinity-college, where he employed all his zeal in the advancement of knowledge and virtue, and in keeping up the college exercises. He was twice vice-chancellor, and as solicitous to preserve the honour and privilege of the university as any of his predecessors. He was a zealous Calvinist, and after about ten years’ government of his college died in the year 1653.[[50]](#footnote-50)

Dr. Anthony Tuckney had been vicar of Boston in Lincolnshire, from whence he was called up to sit in the assembly of divines at Westminster. In the year 1645, he was constituted master of Emanuel-college.[[51]](#footnote-51) In 1653, he was chosen master of St. John’s, and upon the death of Dr. Arrowsmith, regius professor of Oxford, which place he enjoyed till the Restoration; when king Charles II., by letter under the hand of secretary Nicholas, ordered him to resign, promising him, in consideration of his great pains and diligence in discharge of his duty, £100 per annum, which was paid by his successor till his death, in the year 1671. He left behind him the character of a pious and learned man, an indefatigable student, a candid disputant, and a zealous promoter of truth and piety. He published some practical treatises in his life; and his Prelectiones Theologicae, with a volume of sermons, were printed after his death.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Dr. Richard Minshull was fellow of Sidney-college, and upon the death of Dr. Ward chosen regularly, according to the statutes, into the vacant mastership, and continued therein till the Restoration, when he conformed, and was confirmed in his place, which he filled with reputation till his death.

Dr. William Spurstow, one of the assembly of divines, and one of the commissioners at the Savoy in the year 1662,[[53]](#footnote-53) was a person of good learning, of a peaceable and quiet disposition, and of great humility and charity. He was turned out of his mastership of Katherine-hall for refusing the engagement, and was succeeded by the famous Dr. Lightfoot, the most complete master of oriental learning of his age; the doctor enjoyed this mastership, with the sequestered living of Muchmunden, given him by the assembly of divines, till the Restoration, when he would have resigned it back into the hands of Dr. Spurstow, but he declining it Lightfoot conformed, and upon his application to the king was confirmed in both his preferments till his death. His works were published by Mr. Strype in two volumes folio.

If it should be granted, that the new professors were not at first so expert in the learning of the schools as their predecessors, that defect was abundantly supplied by their application and diligence in their places, and by their observing a very strict and severe discipline; the tutors were constant in reading lectures not only in term-time, but out of it; the proctors and other officers had a strict eye over the students to keep them within bounds, and oblige them to be present at morning and evening prayer. The Lord’s day was observed with uncommon rigour; there were sermons and prayers in all the churches and chapels both morning and afternoon. Vice and profaneness were banished, insomuch that an oath was not to be heard within the walls of the university; and if it may be said without offence, the colleges never appeared more like nurseries of religion and virtue than at this period.[[54]](#footnote-54) The noble historian confesses, the university of Oxford flourished as much in learning and learned men at the Restoration, as before the civil wars, which is equally true of Cambridge. And it ought to be remembered, that most of the considerable divines and philosophers who flourished in the reigns of king Charles II. and king William III. owed their education to the tutors of those times, for whom they always retained a great veneration.

Though the form of inducting the new masters was not according to the statutes (as has been observed), because of the distraction of the times, it is evident this was not designed to be a precedent for their successors, as appears by the manner of their investiture, which was this: Mr. Lazarus Seaman having been examined and approved by the assembly of divines at Westminster, the earl of Manchester came in person into the chapel of Peter-house, April 11, and did there declare and publish Mr. Lazarus Seaman to be constituted master of the said Peter-house, in the room of Dr. Cosins, late master, who had been justly and lawfully ejected; requiring Mr. Seaman to take upon him that office, putting him into the master’s seat, and delivering to him the statutes of the college in token of his investiture, straitly charging the fellows, &c. to acknowledge and yield obedience to him, “notwithstanding he was not elected, nor admitted according to the ordinary course prescribed by the said statutes in this time of distraction and war, there being a necessity of reforming, as well the statutes themselves, as the members of the said house.”[[55]](#footnote-55) The earl then gave him an instrument under his hand and seal to the same effect, and administered him an oath or protestation, which he took in the following words:

“I do solemnly and seriously promise, in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, that during the time of my continuance in this charge, I shall faithfully labour to promote learning and piety in myself, the fellows, scholars, and students, that do or shall belong to the said college, agreeably to the late solemn national league and covenant, by me sworn and subscribed, with respect to all the good and wholesome statutes of the said college and of the university, correspondent to the said covenant: and by all means to procure the good, welfare, and perfect reformation, both of the college and university, so far as to me appertaineth.”

The other masters were introduced into their several chairs after the same solemn manner, their warrants bearing date the 11th, 12th, or 13th, of April, 1644; but the clause of the covenant was omitted by those who did not take it, as in the case of Dr. Whichcote, and others.

The vacant fellowships being more numerous were not so quickly filled, though the earl took the most prudent method in that affair; April 10, he directed a paper to the several colleges, declaring that “his purpose was forthwith to supply the vacant fellowships, and desiring that if there were any in the respective colleges, who in regard of degree, learning, and piety, should be found fit for such preferment, they would, upon receipt of that paper, return him their names, in order to their being examined by the assembly, and invested in them.” The persons thus examined and presented, were constituted fellows by warrant under the hand and seal of the earl of Manchester, to the heads of the several colleges, in the following form:

“Whereas A. B. has been ejected out of his fellowship in this college; and whereas C. D. has been examined and approved by the assembly of divines, these are therefore to require you to receive the said C. D. as fellow in the room of A. B. and to give him place according to his seniority in the university, in preference to all those that are, or shall hereafter be, put in by me.”[[56]](#footnote-56)

I have before me the names of fifty-five persons,[[57]](#footnote-57) who, after they had been examined by the assembly, were presented to the vacant fellowships, in the compass of the year 1644; and within six months more all the vacancies were in a manner supplied, with men of approved learning and piety.

From this time the university of Cambridge enjoyed a happy tranquillity; learning flourished, religion and good manners were promoted, at a time when the rest of the nation was in blood and confusion. And though this alteration was effected by a mixture of the civil and military power, yet in a little time things reverted to their former channel, and the statutes of the university were as regularly observed as ever. Let the reader now judge the candour and impartiality of the famous Dr. Barwick, author of the Querela Cantabrigiensis, whose words are these: “Thus the knipper-dolings of the age reduced a glorious and renowned university almost to a mere Munster, and did more in less than three years, than the apostate Julian could effect in his reign, viz. broke the heartstrings of learning, and all learned men, and thereby luxated all the joints of Christianity in this kingdom. We are not afraid to appeal to any impartial judge, whether if the Goths and Vandals, or even the Turks themselves, had overrun this nation, they would have more inhumanly abused a flourishing university, than these pretended advancers of religion have done? Having thrust out one of the eyes of this kingdom, made eloquence dumb, philosophy sottish; widowed the arts, drove the muses from their ancient habitation, plucked the reverend and orthodox professors out of the chairs, and silenced them in prison or their graves; turned religion into rebellion; changed the apostolical chair into a desk for blasphemy; tore the garland from off the head of learning to place it on the dull brows of disloyal ignorance, and unhived those numerous swarms of labouring bees, which used to drop honey-dews over all this kingdom, to place in their room swarms of senseless drones.”[[58]](#footnote-58) Such was the rant of this reverend clergyman; and such the language and the spirit of the ejected loyalists ‘

While the earl was securing the university to the parliament, he appointed commissioners for removing scandalous ministers in the seven associated counties, empowering them to act by the following warrant:

“March 15, 1644.

“By virtue of an ordinance of both houses of parliament, bearing date January 22, 1643-4, I do authorize and appoint you, — , or any five of you, to call before you all ministers or schoolmasters within the counties of —, that are scandalous in their lives, or ill-affected to the parliament, or fomenters of this unnatural war; or that shall wilfully refuse obedience to the ordinances of parliament; or that have deserted their ordinary places of residence, not being employed in the service of the king and parliament, with full power and liberty to send for any witnesses, and to examine complaints upon oath. And you are to certify the names of ministers, with the charge and proof against them, to me.”[[59]](#footnote-59)

It is to be observed, that the warrant is pointed only against those who are immoral, or disaffected to the parliament, or had deserted their cures; and was accompanied with instructions, and a letter, exhorting them to the faithful and effectual discharge of the trust. The instructions were to this effect:—

First, “That they should be speedy and effectual in executing the ordinances, and sit in such places within the county that all parties, by the easiness of access, may be encouraged to address themselves to them with their complaints.

Secondly, “That they should issue their warrants, to summon before them such ministers and witnesses, as the articles preferred against them should require.

Thirdly, “That the party accused should not be present at the taking the depositions, because of discountenancing the witnesses, and disturbing the service;[[60]](#footnote-60) but when the depositions were taken upon oath the party accused should have a copy, and have a day given him to return his answer in writing, and to make his defence within fourteen days, or thereabouts.

Fourthly, “They were to return both the accusation and defence to Mr. Good and Mr. Ashe, the earl’s chaplains, and upon such receipts they should have farther directions.

Fifthly, “If the party accused would not appear to make his defence, they were to certify the cause of his absence, because if they were non-residents, or in arms against the parliament, the earl would proceed against them.[[61]](#footnote-61)

Sixthly, “It being found by experience, that parishioners were not forward to complain of their ministers, though very scandalous; some being enemies to the intended reformation, and others sparing their ministers, because they favoured them in their tithes, and were therefore esteemed quiet men; therefore they were required to call unto them some well-affected men within every hundred, who, having no private engagements, were to be encouraged by the committees to inquire after the doctrines, lives, and conversations, of all ministers and schoolmasters, and to give information what could be deposed, and who could depose the same.

Seventhly, “Each commissioner shall have five shillings for every day he sits; and the clerk to receive some pay, that he might not have occasion to demand fees for every warrant or copy, unless the writings were very large.

Eighthly, “Upon the ejecting of any scandalous or malignant ministers, they were to require the parishioners to make choice of some fit and able person to succeed, who was to have a testimonial from the well-affected gentry and ministry; and to take particular care that no Anabaptist, or Antinomian, be recommended.

Ninthly, “They were to certify the true value of each living: as also the estate, livelihood, and charge, of children, which the accused person had, for his lordship’s direction in the assignment of the fifths. And,

Lastly, “They were to use all other proper ways and methods for speeding the service.”

With these instructions the earl sent an exhortation by letter in the following words:

“Gentlemen,

“I send you by this bearer a commission, with instructions for executing the ordinance, &c. within your county. I neither doubt of your abilities nor affections to further this service, yet according to the great trust reposed in me herein by the parliament, I must be earnest with you to be diligent therein. You know how much the people of this kingdom have formerly suffered in their persons, souls, and estates, under an idle, ill-affected, scandalous, and insolent clergy, upheld by the bishops; and you cannot but foresee, that their pressures and burdens will still continue, though the form of government be altered, unless great care be taken to displace such ministers, and to place orthodox and holy men in every parish; for let the government be what it will for the form thereof, yet it will never be good, unless the parties employed therein be good themselves. By the providence of God it now lies in your power to reform the former abuses, and to remove these offenders. Your power is great, and so is your trust. If a general reformation follows not within your county, assuredly the blame will be laid upon you, and you must expect to be called to an account for it both here and hereafter. For my part, I am resolved to employ the utmost of my power given to me by the ordinance, for procuring a general reformation in all the associated counties, expecting your forwardness, and heartily joining with me herein.— [[62]](#footnote-62)

“I rest,” &c.

When a clergyman was convicted according to the instructions above mentioned, report was made to the earl, who directed a warrant to the churchwardens of the parish, to eject him out of his parsonage, and all the profits thereof; and another to receive the tithes, and all the benefits into their own hands, and to keep them in safe custody till they should receive farther orders from himself.[[63]](#footnote-63) At the same time he directed the parishioners to choose a proper minister for the vacant place, and upon their presentation his lordship sent him to the assembly of divines at Westminster, with an account of his character, for their trial and examination. And upon a certificate from the assembly, that they approved of him as an orthodox divine, and qualified to officiate in the pastoral function, his lordship issued out his last warrant, setting forth that “such a one having been approved by the assembly, &c. he did therefore authorize and appoint him the said —, to officiate as minister, to preach, teach, and catechise, in such a parish during his (the earl’s) pleasure, and then empower him to take possession of the church, parsonage-houses, glebe-lands, and to receive the tithes and profits, and enjoy the same, until his lordship should take farther order concerning the same, requiring all officers to aid and assist him for that purpose.”

If the committees observed these articles there could be no reasonable ground of complaint, except of the sixth, which may be construed as giving too much encouragement to informers; but the methods of conviction were unexceptionable. The persons to be called before the commissioners were scandalous, or enemies to the parliament; the depositions were upon oath; a copy of them was allowed the defendant, with time- to give in his answer in writing; then a day appointed to make his defence in presence of the witnesses, to whom he might take exceptions; and after all, the final judgment not left with the commissioners, but with the earl. The filling the vacant benefice was no less prudent; the parishioners were to choose their own minister, who was to produce testimonials of his sobriety and virtue; the assembly were then to examine into his learning and ministerial qualifications; and after all, the new incumbent to hold his living only during pleasure; the parliament being willing to leave open a door, at the conclusion of a peace, for restoring such royalists as were displaced merely for adhering to the king, without prejudice to the present possessor. One cannot answer for particulars under such uncommon distractions and violence of parties; but the orders were, in my opinion, not only reasonable but expedient, for the support of the cause in which the parliament was engaged.

The committees for the associated counties acted, I apprehend, no longer than the year 1644. The last warrant of ejectment mentioned by Dr. Nalson, bearing date March 17, 1644-5, in which time affairs were brought to such a settlement in those parts, that the royalists could give them no disturbance.[[64]](#footnote-64) The associated counties, says Mr. Fuller, escaped the best of all parts in this civil war, the smoke thereof only offending them, while the fire was felt in other places. The chief ejectments by the commissioners in other parts of England, were in the years 1644, 1645, and till the change of government in the year 1649, when the covenant itself was set aside, and changed into an engagement to the new commonwealth.

It is hard to compute the number of clergymen that might lose their livings by the several committees during the war, nor is it of any great importance, for the law is the same whether more or fewer suffer by it; and the not putting it in execution might be owing to want of power or opportunity. Dr. Nalson says, that in five of the associated counties one hundred and fifty-six clergymen were ejected in little more than a year; namely, in Norfolk fifty-one, Suffolk thirty-seven, Cambridgeshire thirty-one, Essex twenty-one, Lincolnshire sixteen; and if we allow a proportionable number for the other two, the whole will amount to two hundred and eighteen, and if in seven counties there were two hundred and eighteen sufferers, the fifty-two counties of England, by a like proportion, will produce upwards of sixteen hundred. Dr. Walker has fallaciously increased the number of suffering clergymen to eight thousand, even though the list at the end of his book makes out little more than a fifth part. Among his cathedral clergy he reckons up several prebends and canonries, in which he supposes sufferers without any evidence. Of this sort Dr. Calamy has reckoned above two hundred.[[65]](#footnote-65) If one clergyman was possessed of three or four dignities, there appear to be as many sufferers. The like is observable in the case of pluralists; for example, Richard Stuart, LL.D, is set down as a sufferer in the deanery of St. Paul’s, as prebendary of St. Pancras, and residentiary; in the deanery and prebend of the third stall in Westminster; in the deanery of the royal chapel; in the provostship of Eton-college, and prebend of Northalton in the church of Salisbury; all which preferments he enjoyed, says Dr. Walker, or was entitled to, together, and his name is repeated in the several places. By such a calculation it is easy to deceive the reader, and swell the account beyond measure. The reverend Mr. Withers,[[66]](#footnote-66) a late Nonconformist minister at Exeter, has taken care to make an exact computation in the associated counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, and Cambridgeshire, in which are one thousand three hundred and ninetyeight parishes, and two hundred and fifty-three sequestrations; so that if these may be reckoned as a standard for the whole kingdom, the whole number will be reduced considerably under two thousand. He has also made another computation from the county of Devon, in which arc three hundred and ninety-four parishes, and one hundred and thirty-nine sequestrations, out of which thirty-nine are deducted for pluralities, &c.; and then by comparing this county, in which both Dr. Walker and Mr. Withers lived, with the rest of the kingdom, the amount of sufferers, according to him, is one thousand seven hundred and twenty-six; but admitting they should arise to the number of the doctor’s names in his index, which are about two thousand four hundred, yet when such were deducted as were fairly convicted, upon oath, of immoralities of life, &c. (which were a fourth in the associated counties), and all such as took part with the king in the war, or disowned the authority of the parliament; preaching up doctrines inconsistent with the cause for which they had taken arms, and exciting the people to an absolute submission to the authority of the crown, the remainder that were displaced only for refusing the covenant, must be very inconsiderable. Mr. Baxter says, they cast out the grosser sort of insufficient and scandalous clergy, and some few civil men that had acted in the wars for the king, and set up the late innovations, but left in near one half of those that were but barely tolerable. He adds farther, “that in all the counties in which he was acquainted six to one at least, if not more, that were sequestered by the committees, were by the oaths of witnesses proved insufficient, or scandalous, or both.”[[67]](#footnote-67)

But admitting their numbers to be equal to those Puritan ministers ejected at the Restoration, yet the cause of their ejectment, and the circumstances of the times, being very different, the sufferings of the former ought not to be compared to the latter; though Dr. Walker is pleased to say in his preface, that “if the sufferings of the dissenters bear any tolerable proportion to those of the ejected loyalists, in number, degrees, or circumstances, he will be gladly deemed not only to have lost all his labour, but to have revived a great and unanswerable scandal on the cause he has undertaken to defend.” I shall leave the reader to pass his own judgment upon this declaration, after I have produced the testimony of one or two divines of the church of England. “Who can answer (says one) for the violence and injustice of actions in a civil war? Those sufferings were in a time of general calamity, but these [in 1662] were ejected not only in a time of peace, but a time of joy to all the land, and after an act of oblivion, to which common rejoicing these suffering ministers had contributed their earnest prayers, and great endeavours.”[[68]](#footnote-68)—“I must own (says another of the doctor’s correspondents) that though both sides have been excessively to blame, yet that the severities used by the church to the dissenters are less excusable than those used by the dissenters to the church; my reason is, that the former were used in time of peace, and a settled government, whereas the latter were inflicted in a time of tumult and confusion, so that the plundering and ravaging endured by the church-ministers were owing, many of them at least, to the rudeness of the soldiers, and the chances of war; they were plundered not because they were Conformists, but cavaliers, and of the king’s party.”[[69]](#footnote-69) The case of those who were sober and virtuous, seems to be much the same with the nonjurors at the late revolution of king William III.; and I readily agree with Mr. Fuller, that “moderate men bemoaned these severities, for, as much corruption was let out by these ejectments (many scandalous ministers being deservedly punished), so at the same time the veins of the English church were also emptied of much good blood.”[[70]](#footnote-70)

We have already observed, that a fifth part of the revenues of these ejected clergymen was reserved for the maintenance of their poor families, “which was a Christian act, and which I should have been glad (says the divine above mentioned) to have seen imitated at the Restoration.”[[71]](#footnote-71) Upon this the cavaliers sent their wives and children to be maintained by the parliament-ministers, while themselves were fighting for their king. The houses therefore ordained, September 8, 1645, that the fifths should not be paid to the wives and children of those who came into the parliament-quarters without their husbands or fathers, or who were not bred in the Protestant religion.[[72]](#footnote-72) Yet when the war was over, all were allowed their fifths, though in some places they were ill paid, the incumbent being hardly able to allow them, by reason of the smallness of his living, and the devastation of the war. When some pretended to excuse themselves on the forementioned exceptions, the two houses published the following explanation, November 11, 1647, viz. “that the wives and children of all such persons whose estates and livings are, have been, or shall be, sequestered by order of either house of parliament, shall be comprehended within the ordinance which allows a fifth part for wives and children, and shall have their fifth part allowed them: and the committee of lords and commons for sequestrations, and the committees for plundered ministers, and all other ministers, are required to take notice hereof, and yield obedience hereunto.”[[73]](#footnote-73) Afterward, when it was questioned whether the fifths should pay their proportion of the public taxes, it was ordained, that the incumbent only should pay them. Under the government of the protector Cromwell it was ordained, that if the ejected minister left the quiet possession of his house and glebe to his successor within a certain time, he should receive his fifths, and all his arrears, provided he had not a real estate of his own of £30 per annum, or £500 in money.

After all, it was a hard case on both sides; the incumbents thought it hard to be obliged to all the duties of their place, and another to go away with a fifth of the profit, at a time when the value of church-lands was considerably lessened by the neglect of tillage, and exorbitant taxes laid upon all the necessaries of life. To which may be added, an opinion that began to prevail among the farmers, of the unlawfulness of paying tithes: Mr. Selden had led the way to this in his book of tithes, whereupon the parliament, by an ordinance of November 8, 1644, “strictly enjoined all persons fully, truly, and effectually, to set out, yield, and pay respectively, all and singular tithes, offerings, oblations, obventions, rates for tithes, and all other duties commonly known by the name of tithes.” Others who had no scruple about the payment of tithes, refused to pay them to the new incumbent, because the ejected minister had the legal right; insomuch that the Presbyterian ministers were obliged in many places to sue their parishioners, which created disturbances and divisions, and at length gave rise to several petitions from the counties of Buckingham, Oxford, Hertford, &c. praying, that their ministers might be provided for some other way. The parliament referred them to a committee, which produced no redress, because they could not fix upon another fund, nor provide for the lay-impropriations.

1. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 560. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “What was all this (says Dr. Grey) but high treason?” To confirm his opinion he refers to Dr. Wood’s Institute of the Laws of England, and to the 25th of Edw. III. cap. 2, as authorities to show, that the acts of parliament were acts of treason. As if laws formed to preserve the allegiance of the subject to a king acting constitutionally and fulfilling faithfully his part of the political contract, applied to extraordinary emergencies and to a sovereign who had violated the constitution. As if laws made to restrain individuals bound the majority of the representative body of the nation. See also Rapin, vol. 2. p. 494, folio.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “And pray (asks Dr. Grey), what form of law had the rebels for raising contributions?” That form of law, our readers will probably reply, and that spirit of the constitution, which invest the representatives of the people with the power and right of appointing the taxes.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The impolicy of this step is forcibly, though somewhat jocularly, represented by Mr. Selden: “The king calling his friends from the parliament (said this great man), because he had use of them at Oxford, is as if a man should have use of a little piece of wood, and he runs down into the cellar, and takes the spigot: in the meantime all the beer runs about the house: when his friends are absent the king will be lost.” Table-talk on the word King.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Clarendon’s Remains, p. 165. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Memoirs, p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Rushworth, p. 567. 688. Rapin, p. 496. 502, folio. Oldmixon’s History of the Stuarts, p. 246. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. On another occasion, in his speech to the inhabitants of Somersetshire, July 13, 1644.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Rushworth, vol. 5. p. 383. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 497. 506, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. “There is no circumstance (observes bishop Warburton) that bears harder on the king’s conduct than this. It is not to be conceived that these men, who hazarded all to support the king’s right, could advise him to any thing base in a mutinous manner. I doubt that this is too strong a proof that nothing less than arbitrary government would heartily satisfy him.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Rapin, p. 512, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Rushworth, vol. 6. p. 603. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Ibid. vol. 5. p. 601 701. 705. 710. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 504, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Whitelocke, p. 62. 87. 103.

The reference here, in the former editions of Mr. Neal, is to p. 87 of Whitelocke’s Memoirs; where all that is said concerning prince Rupert is, “that he took in Liverpool a garrison of the parliament’s in Lancashire, but they first shipped all their arms, ammunition, and portable goods, and most of the officers and soldiers went on ship board, whilst a few made good the fort, which they rendered to the prince upon quarter, yet were all put to the sword. This indeed (says Dr. Grey) was bad enough, but not quite so bad as Mr. Neal has represented it. Not one word of stripping aged and unarmed people naked, or murdering people in cold blood, or of half hanging or burning others. A dismal character of prince Rupert this indeed, had we not reason to call the truth of it in question.” The references, which we have now supplied, will show that the truth of this character ought not to have been questioned, and that it was drawn from facts stated by Mr. Whitelocke. From whom we will give another instance of the severity with which prince Rupert, at the commencement of his military career, pursued his conquests, and of the cruelty of the royal party from the beginning, before mutual provocations had inflamed their passions; or they had been familiarized to scenes of blood. When the prince had taken the magazine of the county at Cirencester, and one thousand one hundred prisoners, he sent these captives, tied together with cords, almost naked, beaten and driven along like dogs, in triumph to Oxford; where the king and the lords looked on them, and too many smiled at their misery. Memoirs, p. 64.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
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