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CHAPTER VII.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST CIVIL WAR, BY THE KING’S SURRENDERING HIS ROYAL PERSON TO THE SCOTS. PETITIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY AND CITY DIVINES AGAINST TOLERATION, AND FOR THE DIVINE RIGHT OF THE PRESBYTERIAL GOVERNMENT, WHICH IS ERECTED IN LONDON. DEBATES BETWEEN THE KING, MR. HENDERSON, AND THE SCOTS COMMISSIONERS. HIS MAJESTY IS REMOVED FROM NEWCASTLE TO HOLMBY-HOUSE. FARTHER ACCOUNT OF THE SECTARIES.

The king being returned to Oxford, November 6, 1646, after an unfortunate campaign, in which all his armies were beaten out of the field, and dispersed, had no other remedy left but to make peace with his subjects, which his friends in London encouraged him to expect he might be able to accomplish, by the help of some advantage from the growing divisions among the members, the majority of whom were inclined to an accommodation, provided the king would consent to abolish episcopacy, and offer sufficient assurances to govern for the future according to law.[[1]](#footnote-1) But though his majesty was willing to yield a little to the times, with regard to the security of the civil government, nothing could prevail with him to give up the church. Besides, as the king’s circumstances obliged him to recede, the parliament as conquerors advanced in their demands. In the month of December, his majesty sent several messages to the parliament, to obtain a personal treaty at London, upon the public faith, for himself and a certain number of his friends, residing there with safety and honour forty days; but the parliament would by no means trust their enemies within their own bowels, and therefore insisted peremptorily upon his signing the bills they were preparing to send him, as a preliminary to a well-grounded settlement.

The king made some concessions on his part, relating to the militia and liberty of conscience, but very far short of the demand of the two houses, who were so persuaded of his art and ability in the choice of ambiguous expressions, capable of a different sense from what appeared at first sight, that they durst not venture to make use of them as the basis of a treaty.[[2]](#footnote-2) Thus the winter was wasted in fruitless messages between London and Oxford, while the unfortunate king spent his time musing over his papers in a most disconsolate manner, forsaken by some of his best friends, and rudely treated by others. Mr. Locke says, the usage the king met with from his followers at Oxford made it a hard but almost an even choice, to be the parliament’s prisoner, or their slave. In his majesty’s letter to the queen he writes, “If thou knew what a life I lead in point of conversation, I dare say thou wouldst pity me.” The chief officers quarrelled, and became insupportably insolent in the royal presence; nor was the king himself without blame; for being deprived of his oracle the queen, he was like a ship in a storm without sails or rudder. Lord Clarendon[[3]](#footnote-3) therefore draws a veil over his majesty’s conduct in these words: “It is not possible to discourse of particulars with the clearness that is necessary to subject them to common understandings, without opening a door for such reflections upon the king himself, as seem to call both his wisdom and steadiness in question; as if he wanted the one to apprehend and discover, and the other to prevent, the mischiefs that were evident and impending.” And yet nothing could prevail with him to submit to the times, or deal frankly with those who alone were capable of retrieving his affairs.

The king having neither money nor forces, and the queen’s resources from abroad failing, his majesty could not take the field in the spring, which gave the parliament-army an easy conquest over his remaining forts and garrisons. All the west was reduced before Midsummer, by the victorious army of sir Thos. Fairfax; the city of Exeter surrendered April 9, in which one of the king’s daughters, princess Henrietta, was made prisoner, but her governess the countcss of Dalkeith found means afterward to convey her privately into France. Dennington-castle surrendered April 1, Barnstaple the 12th, and Woodstock the 26th; upon which it was resolved to strike the finishing blow, by besieging the king in his head-quarters at Oxford; upon the news of which, like a man in a fright, he left the city by night, April 27, and travelled as a servant to Dr. Hudson and Mr. Ashburnham, with his hair cut round to his ears, and a cloke-bag behind him, to the Scots army before Newark.[[4]](#footnote-4) His majesty surrendered himself to general Leven, May 5, who received him with respect, but sent an express immediately to the two houses, who were displeased at his majesty’s conduct, apprehending it calculated to prolong the war, and occasion a difference between the two nations; which was certainly intended, as appears by the king’s letter from Oxford to the duke of Ormond, in which he says, he had good security, that he and all his adherents should be safe in their persons, honours, and consciences, in the Scots army, and that they would join with him, and employ their forces to obtain a happy and well grounded peace; whereas the Scots commissioners, in their letter to the house of peers, aver, “they had given no assurance, nor made any capitulation for joining forces with the king, or combining against the two houses, or any other private or public agreement whatsoever, between the king on one part, and the kingdom of Scotland, their army, or any in their names, and having power from them, on the other part;” and they called the contrary assertion a damnable untruth; and add, “that they never expect a blessing from God any longer than they continue faithful to their covenant.”[[5]](#footnote-5) So that this must be the artifice of Montreville the French ambassador, who undertook to negotiate between the two parties, and drew the credulous and distressed king into that snare, out of which he could never escape.

His majesty surrendering his person to the Scots, and sending orders to the governors of Newark, Oxford, and all his other garrisons and forces, to surrender and disband, concluded the first civil war; upon which most of the officers, with prince Rupert and Maurice, retired beyond sea; so that by the middle of August all the king’s forces and castles were in the parliament’s hands; Ragland-castle being the last; which was four years wanting three days, from the setting up the royal standard at Nottingham.

Some time before the king left Oxford he had commissioned the marquis of Ormond to conclude a peace with the Irish Papists, in hopes of receiving succours from thence, which gave great offence to the parliament; but though his majesty upon surrendering himself to the Scots wrote to the marquis June 11,[[6]](#footnote-6) not to proceed; he ventured to put the finishing hand to the treaty, July 28, 1646, upon the following scandalous articles,[[7]](#footnote-7) among others which surely the marquis durst not have consented to, without some private instructions from the king and queen.

1. “That the Roman Catholics of that kingdom shall be discharged from taking the oath of supremacy.

2. “That all acts of parliament made against them shall be repealed; that they be allowed the freedom of their religion, and not be debarred from any of his majesty’s graces or favours.

3. “That all acts reflecting on the honour of the Roman-Catholic religion since August 7, 1641, be repealed.

4 “That all indictments, attainders, outlawries, &c. against them, or any of them, be vacated and made void.

5. “That all impediments that may hinder their sitting in parliament, or being chosen burgesses, or knights of the shire, be removed.

6. “That all incapacities imposed upon the nation be taken away, and that they have power to erect one or more inns of court in or near the city of Dublin; and that all Catholics educated there be capable of taking their degrees without the oath of supremacy.

7. “That the Roman Catholics shall be empowered to erect one or more universities, and keep free-schools for the education of their youth, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

8. “That places of command, honour, profit, and trust, shall be conferred on the Roman Catholics, without making any difference between them and Protestants, both in the army and in the civil government.[[8]](#footnote-8)

9. “That an act of oblivion shall be passed in the next parliament, to extend to all the Roman Catholics and their heirs, absolving them of all treasons and offences whatsoever, and particularly of the massacre of 1641,[[9]](#footnote-9) so that no persons shall be impeached, troubled, or molested, for any thing done on one side or the other.

10. “That the Roman Catholics shall continue in possession of all those cities, forts, garrisons, and towns, that they are possessed of, till things are come to a full settlement.”[[10]](#footnote-10)

Was this the way to establish a good understanding between the king and his two houses? or could they believe, that his majesty meant the security of the Protestant religion, and the extirpation of Popery in England, when his general consented to such a peace in Ireland, without any marks of his sovereign’s displeasure? nay, when, after a long treaty with the parliament-commissioners, he refused to deliver up the forts and garrisons into their hands, insomuch that after six weeks’ attendance, they were obliged to return to their ships, and carry back the supplies they had brought for the garrisons,[[11]](#footnote-11) having only published a declaration, that the parliament of England would take all the Protestants of Ireland into their protection, and send over an army to carry on the war against the Papists with vigour.

The king being now in the hands of the Scots, the English Presbyterians at London resumed their courage, concluding they could not fail of a full establishment of their discipline, and of bringing the parliament at Westminster to their terms of uniformity; for this purpose, they framed a bold remonstrance in the name of the lord-mayor, aldermen, and common-council, and presented it to the house May 26, complaining,[[12]](#footnote-12) “that the reins of discipline were let loose; that particular congregations were allowed to take up what form of divine service they pleased, and that sectaries began to swarm by virtue of a toleration granted to tender consciences. They put the parliament in mind of their covenant, which obliged them to endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever else was found contrary to sound doctrine; and at the same time to preserve and defend the person and authority of the king; they therefore desired, since the whole kingdom was now in a manner reduced to the obedience of the parliament, that all separate congregations may be suppressed; that all such separatists who conform not to the public discipline may be declared against, that no person disaffected to the presbyterial government set forth by parliament, may be employed in any place of public trust;[[13]](#footnote-13) that the house will endeavour to remove all jealousies between them and the Scots, and hasten their propositions to the king, for a safe and well-grounded peace.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

This remonstrance was supported by the whole Scots nation, who acted in concert with their English brethren, as appears by a letter of thanks to the lord-mayor, aldermen, and common-council, from the general assembly, dated June 10, 1646, within a month after the delivery of the remonstrance:[[15]](#footnote-15) the letter commends their courageous appearance against sects and sectaries; their firm adherence to the covenant, and their maintaining the presbyterial government to be the government of Jesus Christ. It beseeches them to go on boldly in the work they had begun, till the three kingdoms were united in one faith and worship. At the same time they directed letters to the parliament, beseeching them also, in the bowels of Jesus Christ, to give to him the glory that is due to his name, by an immediate establishing of all his ordinances in their full integrity and power, according to the covenant. Nor did they forget to encourage the assembly at Westminster to proceed in their zeal against sectaries, and to stand boldly for the sceptre of Jesus Christ against the encroachments of earthly powers. These letters were printed and dispersed over the whole kingdom.

The wise parliament received the lord-mayor and his brethren with marks of great respect and civility; for neither the Scots nor English Presbyterians were to be disgusted, while the prize was in their hands, for which both had been contending; but the majority of the commons were displeased with the remonstrance and the high manner of enforcing it, as aiming, by a united force, to establish a sovereign despotic power in the church, with a uniformity, to which themselves, and many of their friends, were unwilling to submit; however, they dismissed the petitioners with a promise to take the particulars into consideration.

But the Independents and sectarians in the army, being alarmed at the impending storm, procured a counter petition from the city with great numbers of hands, “applauding the labours and successes of the parliament in the cause of liberty, and praying them to go on with managing the affairs of the kingdom according to their wisdoms, and not suffer the freeborn people of England to be enslaved upon any pretence whatsoever; nor to suffer any set of people to prescribe to them in matters of government or conscience, and the petitioners will stand by them with their lives and fortunes.” Mr. Whitelocke says, the hands of the royalists were in this affair, who, being beaten out of the field, resolved now to attempt the ruin of the parliament, by sowing discord among their friends.[[16]](#footnote-16)

The houses were embarrassed between the contenders for liberty and uniformity, and endeavoured to avoid a decision, till they saw the effect of their treaty with the king. They kept the Presbyterians in suspense, by pressing the assembly for their answer to the questions relating to the *jus divinum* of presbytery already mentioned, insinuating that they themselves were the obstacles to a full settlement, and assuring them, when this point was agreed, they would concur in such an ordinance as they desired. Upon this the assembly appointed three committees to take the questions into consideration; but the Independents took this opportunity to withdraw, refusing absolutely to be concerned in the affair.

The first committee was appointed to determine, whether any particular church-government was *jure divino,* and to bring their proofs from Scripture. But here they stumbled at the very threshold, for the Erastians divided them, and entered their dissent, so that when the answer was laid before the assembly, it was not called the answer of the committee, but of some brethren of the committee; and when the question was put, they withdrew from the assembly, and left the high Presbyterians to themselves, who agreed, with only one dissenting voice, that Jesus Christ, as king of the church, hath himself appointed a church-government distinct from the civil magistrate. The names of those who subscribed this proposition were:

Rev. Mr. White

Mr. Palmer

Dr. Wincop

Mr. Ley

Dr. Gouge

Mr. Walker

Mr. Sedgwick

Mr. Marshal

Mr. Whitaker

Mr. Newcomen

Mr. Spurstow

Mr. Delmy

Mr. Calamy

Mr. Proffet

Mr. Feme

Mr. Scuddir

Mr. Carter, sen.

Mr. Caryl

Rev. Mr. Woodcocke

Mr. Carter, jun.

Mr. Goodwin

Mr. Nye

Mr. Greenhill

Mr. Valentine

Mr. Price

Dr. Smith

Dr. Staunton

Dr. Hoyle

Mr. Bayly

Mr. Taylor

Mr. Young

Mr. Cawdrey

Mr. Ash

Mr. Gibson

Mr. Good

Rev. Mr. Vines

Mr. Seaman

Mr. Chambers

Mr. Corbet

Mr. Dury

Mr. Salway

Mr. Hardwicke

Mr. Langley

Mr. Simpson

Mr. Conant

Mr. De la March

Mr. Byfield

Mr. Herle

Mr. De la Place

Mr. Wilison

Mr. Reyner

Mr. Gower.

The divine who entered his dissent was Mr. Lightfoot, with whom Mr. Colman would have joined, if he had not fallen sick at this juncture, and died.

The discussing the remaining questions engaged the assembly from May till the latter end of July, and even then they thought it not safe to present their determinations to parliament for fear of a premunire; upon which the city-divines at Sion-college took up the controversy, in a treatise entitled, “The divine right of church-government,” by the London ministers. Wherein they give a distinct answer to the several queries of the house of commons, and undertake to prove every branch of the presbyterial discipline to be *jure divino,* and that the civil magistrate had no right to intermeddle with the censures of the church.

And to show the parliament they were in earnest, they resolved to stand by each other, and not comply with the present establishment, till it was delivered from the yoke of the civil magistrate; for which purpose they drew up a paper of reasons, and presented it to the lord-mayor, who, having advised with the common council, sent a deputation to Sion-college, offering to concur in a petition for redress, which they did accordingly, though without effect; for the parliament, taking notice of the combination of the city-ministers, published an order June 9, requiring those of the province of London to observe the ordinance relating to church-government, enjoining the members for the city to send copies thereof to their several parishes, and to take effectual care that they were immediately put in execution. Upon this the ministers of London and Westminster met again at Sion college June 19, and being a little more submissive, published certain considerations and cautions, according to which they agree to put the presbyterial government in practice according to the present establishment. Here they declare, “that the power of church-censures ought to be in church-officers, by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ, but then they are pleased to admit, that the magistracy ought to be satisfied in the truth of the government they authorize; and though it be not right in every particular, yet church officers may act under that rule, provided they do not acknowledge the rule to be right in all points. Therefore though they conceive the ordinances of parliament already published, are not a complete rule, nor in all points satisfactory to their consciences, yet because in many things they are so, and provision being made to enable the elderships, by their authority, to keep away from the Lord’s supper all ignorant and scandalous persons; and a farther declaration being made, that there shall be an addition to the scandalous offences formerly enumerated, therefore they conceive it their duty to put in practice the present settlement, as far as they conceive it correspondent with the word of God; hoping that the parliament will in due time supply what is lacking, to make the government entire, and rectify what shall appear to be amiss.” Thus reluctantly did these gentlemen bend to the authority of the parliament!

The kingdom of England, instead of so many dioceses, was now divided into a certain number of provinces, made up of representatives from the several classes within their respective boundaries; every parish had a congregational or parochial presbytery for the affairs of the parish; the parochial presbyteries were combined into classes; these returned representatives to the provincial assembly, as the provincial did to the national; for example, the province of London being composed of twelve classes, according to the following division, each classis chose two ministers, and four lay-elders, to represent them in a provincial assembly, which received general appeals from the parochial and classical presbyteries, as the national assembly did from the provincial.

The division of the province of London.

*The first classis to contain the following parishes.*





Thus the Presbyterian ecclesiastical government began to appear in its proper form; but new obstructions being raised by the ministers to the choice of representatives, the provincial assembly did not meet till next year, nor did it ever obtain except in London and Lancashire. The parliament never heartily approved it, and the interest that supported it being quickly disabled, Mr. Echard says, the Presbyterians never saw their dear presbytery settled in any one part of England.[[17]](#footnote-17) But Mr. Baxter, who is a much better authority, says, the ordinance was executed in London and Lancashire, though it remained unexecuted in almost all other parts. However, the Presbyterian ministers had their voluntary associations for church-affairs in most counties, though without any authoritative jurisdiction.

To return to the king, who marched with the Scots army from Newark to Newcastle, where he continued about eight months, being treated with some respect, but not with all the duty of subjects to a sovereign. The first sermon that was preached before him gave hopes,[[18]](#footnote-18) that they would be mediators between him and the parliament; it was from 2 Sam. xix. 41‒43, “And behold, all the men of Israel came to the king, and said to the king, Why have the men of Judah stolen thee away?—And all the men of Judah anwered the men of Israel, Because the king is near of kin to us; wherefore then be ye angry for this matter? have we eaten at all of the king’s cost? or hath he given us any gift?—And the men of Israel answered the men of Judah, and said, We have ten parts in the king; and we have also more right in David than ye; why then did ye despise us, that our advice should not be first had, in bringing back our king?—And the words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the words of the men of Israel.” But it quickly appeared, that nothing would be done except upon condition of the king’s taking the covenant, and establishing the presbyterial government in both kingdoms. When the king was pressed upon these heads, he pleaded his conscience, and declared that though he was content the Scots should enjoy their own discipline, he apprehended his honour and conscience were concerned to support episcopacy in England, because it had been established from the Reformation, and that he was bound to uphold it by his coronation-oath; however, he was willing to enter into a conference with any person whom they should appoint, protesting he was not ashamed to change his judgment, or alter his resolution, provided they could satisfy him in two points:

1st. That the episcopacy he contended for was not of divine institution.—2dly. That his coronation-oath did not bind him to support and defend the church of England as it was then established.

To satisfy the king in these points the Scots sent for Mr. Alexander Henderson from Edinburgh, pastor of a church in that city, rector of the university, and one of the king’s chaplains, a divine of great learning and abilities, as well as discretion and prudence. Mr. Rushworth says, that he had more moderation than most of his way. And Collyer adds, that he was a person of learning, elocution, and judgment, and seems to have been the top of his party.[[19]](#footnote-19) The debate was managed in writing: the king drew up his own papers, and gave them sir Robert Murray to transcribe, and deliver to Mr. Henderson;[[20]](#footnote-20) and Mr. Henderson’s hand not being so legible as his, sir Robert, by the king’s appointment, transcribed Mr. Henderson’s papers for his majesty’s use.[[21]](#footnote-21)

The king, in his first paper of May 29, declares his esteem for the English reformation, because it was effected without tumult; and was directed by those who ought to have the conduct of such an affair.[[22]](#footnote-22) He apprehends they kept close to apostolical appointment, and the universal custom of the primitive church; that therefore the adhering to episcopacy must be of the last importance, as without it the priesthood must sink, and the sacraments be administered without effect; for these reasons he conceives episcopacy necessary to the being of a church, and also, that he is bound to support it by his coronation-oath. Lastly, his majesty desires to know of Mr. Henderson, what warrant there is in the word of God for subjects to endeavour to force their king’s conscience, or to make him alter laws against his will.

Mr. Henderson, in his first paper of June 3, after an introduction of modesty and respect, wishes when occasion requires, that religion might always be reformed by the civil magistrate, and not left either to the prelates or the people; but when princes or magistrates are negligent of their duty, God may stir up the subject to perform this work.[[23]](#footnote-23) He observes, that the reformation of king Henry VIII. was very defective in the essentials of doctrine, worship, and government; that it proceeded with a Laodicean lukewarmness; that the supremacy was transferred from one wrong head to another, and the limbs of the antichristian hierarchy were visible in the body. He adds, that the imperfection of the English reformation had been the complaint of many religious and godly persons; that it had occasioned more schism and separation than had been heard of elsewhere, and had been matter of unspeakable grief to other churches. As to the king’s argument, that the validity of the priesthood, and the efficacy of the sacraments, depended upon episcopacy, he replies, that episcopacy cannot make out its claim to apostolical appointment; that when the apostles were living, there was no difference between a bishop and a presbyter; no inequality in power or degree, but an exact parity in every branch of their character: that there is no mention in Scripture of a pastor or bishop superior to other pastors. There is a beautiful subordination in the ministry of the New Testament; one kind of ministers being placed in degree and dignity above another, as first apostles, then evangelists, then pastors and teachers, but in offices of the same rank and kind we do not find any preference; no apostle is constituted superior to other apostles; no evangelist is raised above other evangelists; nor has any pastor or deacon a superiority above others of their order.

Farther, Mr. Henderson humbly desires his majesty to take notice, that arguing from the practice of the primitive church, and the consent of the fathers, is fallacious and uncertain, and that the law and testimony of the word of God are the only rule. The practice of the primitive church, in many things, cannot certainly be known, as Eusebius confesses, that even in the apostles’ time Diotrephes moved for the pre-eminence, and the mystery of iniquity began to work; and that afterward ambition and weakness quickly made way for a change in church-government.

Mr. Henderson hopes his majesty will not deny the lawfulness of the ministry, and due administration of the sacraments, in those reformed churches where there are no diocesan bishops; that it is evident from Scripture, and confessed by many champions for episcopacy, that presbyters may ordain presbyters; and to disengage his majesty from his coronation-oath, as far as relates to the church, he conceives, when the formal reason of an oath ceases, the obligation is discharged: when an oath has a special regard to the benefit of those to whom the engagement is made, if the parties interested relax upon the point, dispense with the promise, and give up their advantage, the obligation is at an end. Thus when the parliaments of both kingdoms have agreed to the repealing of a law, the king’s conscience is not tied against signing the bill, for then the altering any law would be impracticable.—He concludes with observing, that king James never admitted episcopacy upon divine right; and that could his ghost now speak, he would not advise your majesty to run such hazards, for men [prelates] who would pull down your throne with their own, rather than that they perish alone.

The king, in his second paper[[24]](#footnote-24) of June 6, avers, no reformation is lawful, unless under the conduct of the royal authority; that king Henry VIII.’s reformation being imperfect, is no proof of defects in that of king Edward VI. and queen Elizabeth; that Mr. Henderson can never prove, God has given the multitude leave to reform the negligence of princes; that his comparing our reformation to the Laodicean lukewarmness, was an unhandsome way of begging the question, for he should have first made out, that those men [the Puritans] had reason to complain, and that the schism was chargeable upon the conformists. His majesty is so far from allowing the Presbyterian government to be practised in the primitive times, that he affirms, it was never set up before Calvin; and admits, that it was his province to show the lawfulness, and uninterrupted succession, and by consequence the necessity, of episcopacy, but that he had not then the convenience of books, nor the assistance of such learned men as he could trust, and therefore proposes a conference with his divines. And whereas Mr. Henderson excepts to his reasoning from the primitive church, and consent of the fathers; his majesty conceives his exception indefensible, for if the sense of a doubtful place of Scripture is not to be governed by such an authority, the interpretation of the inspired writings must be left to the direction of every private spirit, which is contrary to St. Peter’s doctrine, 2 Pet. i. 20, “No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation;” it is likewise the source of all sects, and without prevention will bring these kingdoms into confusion. His majesty adds, that it is Mr. Henderson’s part to prove, that presbyters without a bishop may ordain other presbyters. As to the administration of the sacraments, Mr. Henderson himself will not deny, a lawfully-ordained presbyter’s being necessary to that office; so that the determination of this latter question will depend in some measure on the former. With regard to oaths, his majesty allows Mr. Henderson’s general rule, but thinks he is mistaken in the application; for the clause touching religion in the coronation-oath was made only for the benefit of the church of England; that therefore it is not in the power of the two houses of parliament to discharge the obligation of this oath, without their consent. That this church never made any submission to the two houses, nor owned herself subordinate to them; that the reformation was managed by the king and clergy, and the parliament assisted only in giving a civil sanction to the ecclesiastical establishment.—These points being clear to his majesty, it follows by necessary consequence, that it is only the church of England, in whose favour he took this oath, that can release him from it, and that therefore, when the church of England, lawfully assembled, shall declare his majesty discharged, he shall then, and not till then, reckon himself at liberty.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Mr. Henderson, in his reply to this second paper of June 17, agrees with the king, that the prime reforming power is in kings and princes, but adds, that in case they fail of their duty, this authority devolves upon the inferior magistrate, and upon their failure, to the body of the people, upon supposition that a reformation is necessary, and that people’s superiors will by no means give way to it; he allows that such a reformation is more imperfect with respect to the manner, but commonly more perfect and refined in the product and issue. He adds, that the government of the church of England is not supposed to be built on the foundation of Christ and his apostles, by those who confess that church-government is mutable and ambulatory, as was formerly the opinion of most of the English bishops; that the divine right was not pleaded till of late by some few; that the English reformation has not perfectly purged out the Roman leaven, but rather depraved the discipline of the church by conforming to the civil polity, and adding many supplemental officers to those instituted by the Son of God. To his majesty’s objections, that the Presbyterian government was never practised before Calvin’s time, he answers, that it is to be found in Scripture; and the assembly of divines at Westminster had made it evident, that the primitive church at Jerusalem was governed by a presbytery; that the church at Jerusalem consisted of more congregations than one; that all these congregations were combined under one presbyterial government, and made but one church; that this church was governed by elders of the same body, and met together for functions of authority, and that the apostles acted not in quality of apostles, but only as elders, Acts xv.; that the same government was settled in the churches of Ephesus, Corinth, Thessalonica, and continued many years after; and at last, when one of the presbytery presided over the rest with the style of bishop, even then, as St. Jerome says, churches were governed with the joint consent of the presbytery, and it was custom, rather than divine appointment, which raised a bishop above a presbyter. To his majesty’s argument, that where the meaning of Scripture is doubtful, we must have recourse to the fathers, Mr. Henderson replies, that notwithstanding the decrees of councils, and the resolutions of the fathers, a liberty must be left for a judgment of discretion, as had been sufficiently shown by bishop Davenant and others. To prove presbyters may ordain other presbyters without a bishop, he cites St. Paul’s advice to Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 14, not to neglect the gift that was given him by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery; but granting bishops and presbyters to be distinct functions, it will not follow, that the authority and force of the presbyter’s character were derived from the bishop; for though the evangelists and seventy disciples were inferior to the apostles, they received not their commission from the apostles, but from Christ himself.

Concerning the king’s coronation-oath, Mr. Henderson apprehends nothing need be added. As to the supremacy, he thinks such a headship as the kings of England claim, or such a one as the two houses of parliament now insist on, that is, an authority to receive appeals from the supreme ecclesiastical judicatures, in things purely spiritual, is not to be justified; nor does he apprehend the consent of the clergy to be absolutely necessary to church-reformation, for if so, what reformation can be expected in France, in Spain, or in Rome itself? It is not to be imagined, that the pope or prelates will consent to their own ruin. His majesty had said, that if his father king James had been consulted upon the question of resistance, he would have answered, that prayers and tears are the church’s weapons. To which Mr. Henderson replies, that he could never hear a good reason to prove a necessary defensive war, a war against unjust violence, unlawful; and that bishop Jewel and Bilson were of this mind. To the question, what warrant there was in Scripture for subjects to endeavour to force their king’s conscience? he replies, that when a man’s conscience is mistaken, it lies under a necessity of doing amiss; the way therefore to disentangle himself is to get his conscience better informed, and not to move till he has struck a light and made farther discoveries.[[26]](#footnote-26)

The king, in his answer of June 22 to Mr. Henderson’s second paper, still insists, that inferior magistrates and people have no authority to reform religion. If this point can be proved by Scripture, his majesty is ready to submit; but the sacred history in the Book of Numbers, chap, xvi., is an evidence of God’s disapproving such methods. Private men’s opinions disjoined from the general consent of the church signify little, for rebels, says his majesty, never want writers to maintain their revolt. Though his majesty has a regard for bishop Jewel and Bilson’s memories, he never thought them infallible; as for episcopal government, he is ready to prove it an apostolical institution, and that it has been handed down through all ages and countries till Calvin’s time, as soon as he is furnished with books, or such divines as he shall make choice of; he does not think that Mr. Henderson’s arguments to prove the church of England not built on the foundation of Christ and his apostles are valid, nor will he admit that most of the prelates, about the time of the Reformation, did not insist upon the divine right. The king adds, Mr. Henderson would do well to show where our Saviour has prohibited the addition of more church-officers than those named by him: and yet the church of England has not so much as offered at this, for an archbishop is not a new officer, but only a distinction in the order of government, like the moderator of assemblies in Scotland. His majesty denies that bishops and presbyters always import the same thing in Scripture, and when they do, it only respects the apostles’ times, for it may be proved, that the order of bishops succeeded that of the apostles, and that the title was altered in regard to those who were immediately chosen by our Saviour. As for the several congregations in Jerusalem, united in one church, his majesty replies, Are there not many parishes in one diocese? And do not the deans and chapters, and sometimes the inferior clergy, assist the bishop? So that unless some positive and direct proof can be brought of an equality between the apostles and other presbyters, all arguments are with him inconclusive. The king confesses, that in case he cannot prove from antiquity that ordination and jurisdiction are peculiar branches of authority belonging to bishops, he shall begin to suspect the truth of his principles. As for bishop Davenant’s testimony, he refuses to be governed by that; nor will he admit of Mr. Henderson’s exception against the fathers, till he can find out a better rule of interpreting Scripture. And whereas Mr. Henderson urged the precedent of foreign reformed churches in favour of presbytery, his majesty does not undertake to censure them, but supposes necessity may excuse many things which would otherwise be unlawful; the church of England, in his majesty’s judgment, has this advantage, that it comes nearest the primitive doctrine and discipline; and that Mr. Henderson has failed in proving presbyters may ordain without a bishop, for it is evident St. Paul had a share in Timothy’s ordination, 2 Tim. i. 6. As to the obligation of the coronation-oath, the king is still of opinion, none but the representative body of the clergy can absolve him; and as for the impracticableness of reformation upon the king’s principles, he cannot answer for that, but thinks it sufficient to let him know, that *incommodum non solvit argumentum.* His majesty then declares, that as it is a great sin for a prince to oppress the church; so, on the other hand, he holds it absolutely unlawful for subjects to make war (though defensively) against their lawful sovereign, upon any pretence whatsoever.

Mr. Henderson, in his third paper of July 2, considers chiefly the rules his majesty had laid down for determining the controversy of church-government, which are the practice of the primitive church, and the universal consent of the fathers; and affirms, there is no such primitive testimony, no such universal consent in favour of modern episcopacy; the fathers very often contradicting one another, or at least not concurring in their testimony. But to show the uncertainty of his majesty’s rule for determining controversies of faith, Mr. Henderson observes,

1. That some critics join the word of God and antiquity together; others make Scripture the only rule, and antiquity the authentic interpreter. Now he thinks the latter a greater mistake than the former, for the Papists bring tradition no farther than to an equality of regard with the inspired writings, but the others make antiquity the very ground of their belief of the sense of Scripture, and by that means exalt it above the Scripture; for the interpretation of the fathers is made the very formal reason why I believe the Scripture interpretable in such a sense; and thus, contrary to the apostle’s doctrine,—our faith must stand in the wisdom of man, and not in the power of God,

2. He observes, that Scripture can only be authentically interpreted by Scripture itself. Thus the Levites had recourse only to one part of Scripture for the interpreting another, Neh. viii. 8. So likewise our Saviour interprets the Old Testament, by comparing scripture with scripture, and not having recourse to the rabbis. This was likewise the apostles’ method. Besides, when persons insist so much upon the necessity of the fathers, they are in danger of charging the Scriptures with obscurity or imperfection.

3. The fathers themselves say, that Scripture is not to be interpreted but by Scripture.

4. Many errors have passed under the shelter of antiquity and tradition; Mr. Henderson cites a great many examples under this head.

And lastly, He insists, that the universal consent and practice of the primitive church are impossible to be known; that many of the fathers were no authors; that many of their tracts are lost; that many performances which go under their names are spurious, especially upon the subject of episcopacy, and that therefore they are an uncertain rule.

The king, in his papers[[27]](#footnote-27) of July 3 and 16, says, no man can reverence Scripture more than himself; but when Mr. Henderson and he differ about the interpretation of a text, there must be some judge or umpire, otherwise the dispute can never be ended; and when there are no parallel texts, the surest guide must be the fathers. In answer to Mr. Henderson’s particulars, his majesty answers, that if some people overrate tradition, that can be no argument against the serviceableness of it; but to charge the primitive church with error, and to call the customs and practices of it unlawful, unless the charge can be supported from Scripture, is an unpardonable presumption. Those who object to the ancient rites and usages of the church must prove them unlawful, otherwise the practice of the church is sufficient to warrant them. His majesty denies it is impossible to discover the universal consent, and understand the practice, of the primitive church; and concludes with this maxim, that though he never esteemed any authority equal to the Scriptures, yet he believes the unanimous consent of the fathers, and the universal practice of the primitive church, the best and most authentic interpreters, and by consequence the best qualified judges between himself and Mr. Henderson.

One may learn, from this controversy, some of the principles in which king Charles I. was instructed; as,

(1.) The divine right of diocesan episcopacy.

(2.) The uninterrupted succession of bishops, rightly ordained, from the time of the apostles; upon which the whole validity of the administration of the Christian sacraments depends.

(3.) The necessity of a judge of controversies, which his majesty lodges with the fathers of the Christian church, and by that means leaves little or no room for private judgment.

(4.) The independency of the church upon the state.

(5.) That no reformation of religion is lawful but what arises from the prince or legislature; and this only in cases of necessity, when a general council cannot be obtained.

(6.) That the multitude or common people may not in any case take upon them to reform the negligence of princes. Neither,

(7.) May they take up arms against their prince, even for self-defence, in cases of extreme necessity.

How far these principles are defensible in themselves, or consistent with the English constitution, I leave with the reader; but it is very surprising that his majesty should be so much entangled with that part of his coronation-oath which relates to the church, when for fifteen years together he broke through all the bounds of it with relation to the civil liberties of his subjects, without the least remorse.

Upon the close of this debate, and the death of Mr. Henderson, which followed within six weeks; the king’s friends gave out, that his majesty had broke his adversary’s heart.[[28]](#footnote-28) Bishop Kennet and Mr. Echard have published the following recantation, which they would have the world believe this divine dictated, or signed upon his death-bed:

“I do declare before God and the world, that since I had the honour and happiness to converse and confer with his majesty with all sorts of freedom, especially in matters of religion, whether in relation to the kirk or state, that I found him the most intelligent man that I ever spoke with, as far beyond my expression as expectation. I profess, that I was oftentimes astonished with the solidity and quickness of his reasons and replies; and wondered how he, spending his time so much in sports and recreations, could have attained to so great knowledge; and must confess ingenuously, that I was convinced in conscience, and knew not how to give him any reasonable satisfaction; yet the sweetness of his disposition is such, that whatsoever I said was well taken. I must say, I never met with any disputant of that mild and calm temper, which convinced me the more, and made me think, that such wisdom and moderation could not be, without an extraordinary measure of divine grace. I had heard much of his carriage towards the priests in Spain, and that king James told the duke of Buckingham, upon his going thither, that he durst venture his son Charles with all the Jesuits in the world, he knew him to be so well grounded in the Protestant religion, but could never believe it before. I observed all his actions, more particularly those of devotion, which I must truly say are more than ordinary,—If I should speak of his justice, magnanimity, charity, sobriety, chastity, patience, humility, and of all his other Christian and moral virtues, 1 should run myself into a panegyric; no man can say, there is conspicuously any predominant vice in him; never man saw him passionately angry; never man heard him curse, or given to swearing; or heard him complain in the greatest durance of war, or confinement.—But I should seem to flatter him, to such as do not know him, if the present condition that I lie in did not exempt me from any suspicion of worldly ends, when I expect every hour to be called from all transitory vanities to eternal felicity, and the discharging of my conscience before God and man did not oblige me to declare the truth simply and nakedly, in satisfaction of that which I have done ignorantly, though not altogether innocently.”[[29]](#footnote-29) The declaration adds, that he was heartily sorry for the share he had had in the war; that the parliament and synod of England had been abused with false aspersions of his majesty; and that they ought to restore him to his just rights, and his crown and dignity, lest an indelible character of ingratitude lie upon him.

Mr. Echard confesses[[30]](#footnote-30) he had been informed, that this declaration was spurious,[[31]](#footnote-31) but could find no authority sufficient to support such an assertion. It will be proper therefore to trace the history of this imposture, and set it in a clear and convincing light, from a memorial sent me from one of the principal Scots divines, professor Hamilton of Edinburgh. The story was invented by one of the Scots episcopal writers, who had fled to London, and was first published in the beginning of the year 1648, in a small pamphlet in quarto, about two years after Mr. Henderson’s death. From this pamphlet Dr. Heylin published it as a credible report. Between thirty and forty years after Heylin had published it, viz. 1693, Dr. Hollingworth in his character of king Charles I. republished the paper above mentioned, entitled “The declaration of Mr. Alexander Henderson, principal minister of the word of God at Edinburgh, and chief commissioner, of the kirk of Scotland to the parliament and synod of England;” which paper the doctor says he had from Mr. Lamplugh, son to the late archbishop of York of that name, from whom the historians above mentioned, and some others, have copied it; but, says the memorial, upon publishing the aforesaid story to the word, the assembly of the kirk of Scotland appointed a committee to examine into the affair, who, after a full inquiry, by their act of August 7, 1648, declared the whole to be a forgery, as may be seen in the printed acts of the general assembly for that year, quarto, page 420, &c. in which they signify their satisfaction and assurance, that Mr. Henderson persisted in his former sentiments to his death;[[32]](#footnote-32) that when he left the king at Newcastle he was greatly decayed in his natural strength; that he came from thence by sea in a languishing condition, and died within eight days after his arrival at Edinburgh;[[33]](#footnote-33) that he was not able to frame such a declaration as is palmed upon him; and that all he spoke upon his death-bed showed his judgment was the same as it ever had been about church-reformation. This was attested before the assembly by several ministers who visited him upon his death-bed, and particularly by two who constantly attended him from the time he came home till the time he expired. After this and a great deal more to the same purpose, “they declare the above-mentioned paper, entitled ‘A declaration of Mr. Alexander Henderson’s,’ &c. to be forged, scandalous, and false,[[34]](#footnote-34) and the author and contriver of the same to be void of charity and a good conscience; a gross liar and a calumniator, and led by the spirit of the accuser of the brethren.”[[35]](#footnote-35)

While the king was debating the cause of episcopacy, the parliament were preparing their propositions for a peace, which were ready for the royal assent by the 11th of July. The Scots commissioners demurred to them for some time, for not coming up fully to their standard, but at length acquiescing, they were engrossed, and carried to the king by the earl of Pembroke, and Montgomery and the earl of Suffolk, of the house of peers; and by sir Walter Erle, sir John Hippisly, Robert Goodwin, and Luke Robertson, esq. of the house of commons; the earls of Argyle and Loudon were commissioners for Scotland, and the reverend Mr. Marshal was ordered to attend as their chaplain.[[36]](#footnote-36) The commissioners arrived at Newcastle July 23; next day they waited upon his majesty, and having kissed his hand, Mr. Goodwin delivered the following propositions:—

Those relating to the civil government were,

(1.) That the king should call in all his declarations against the parliament.

(2.) That he should put the militia into their hands for twenty years, with a power to raise money for their maintenance.

(3.) That all peerages since May 21, 1642, should be made void.

(4.) That the delinquents therein mentioned should undergo the penalties assigned in the bill. And,

(5.) That the cessation with the Irish be disannulled, and the management of the war left to the parliament.

The propositions relating to religion were,

1. “That his majesty, according to the laudable example of his father, would be pleased to swear and sign the late solemn league and covenant, and give his consent to an act of parliament, enjoining the taking it throughout the three kingdoms, under certain penalties, to be agreed upon in parliament.

2. “That a bill be passed for the utter abolishing and taking away all archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans, sub-deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, canons and prebendaries, and all chanters, chancellors, treasurers, sub-treasurers, succentors, sacrists, and all vicars and choristers, old vicars, and new vicars of any cathedral or collegiate church, and all other under-officers, out of the church of England, and out of the church of Ireland, with such alterations as shall agree with the articles of the late treaty of Edinburgh, November 29, 1643, and the joint declaration of both kingdoms.

3. “That the ordinance for the calling and sitting of the assembly of divines be confirmed.

4. “That reformation of religion, according to the covenant, be settled by act of parliament in such manner as both houses have agreed, or shall agree, after consultation with the assembly of divines.

5. “Forasmuch as both kingdoms are obliged by covenant to endeavour such a uniformity of religion as shall be agreed upon by both houses of parliament in England, and by the church and kingdom of Scotland, after consultation had with the divines of both kingdoms assembled, that this be confirmed by acts of parliament of both kingdoms respectively.

6. “That for the more effectual disabling Jesuits, priests, Papists, and Popish recusants, from disturbing the state, and eluding the laws, an oath be established by act of parliament, wherein they shall abjure and renounce the pope’s supremacy, the doctrine of transubstantiation, purgatory, worshipping of the consecrated host, crucifixes, and images, and all other Popish superstitions and errors; and the refusal of the said oath, legally tendered, shall be a sufficient conviction of recusancy.

7. “That an act of parliament be passed, for educating of the children of Papists by Protestants, in the Protestant religion.

8. “That an act be passed for the better levying the penalties against Papists; and another for the better preventing their plotting against the state; and that a stricter course may be taken to prevent saying or hearing of mass in the court, or any other part of the kingdom: the like for Scotland, if the parliament of that kingdom shall think fit.

9. “That his majesty give his royal assent to an act for the due observation of the Lord’s day; to the bill for the suppression of innovations in churches and chapels in and about the worship of God; to an act for the better advancement of the preaching of God’s holy word in all parts of the kingdom; to the bill against pluralities of benefices and nonresidency; and, to an act to be framed for the reforming and regulating both universities, and the colleges of Westminster, Winchester, and Eton.”

About sixty persons were by name excepted out of the general pardon;[[37]](#footnote-37) besides,

(1.) All Papists that had been in the army.

(2.) All persons that had been concerned in the Irish rebellion.

(3.) Such as had deserted the two houses at Westminster and went to Oxford.

(4.) Such members of parliament as had deserted their places, and borne arms against the two houses. And,

(5.) Such bishops or clergymen, masters or fellows of colleges, or masters of schools or hospitals, or any ecclesiastical living, who had deserted the parliament, and adhered to the enemies thereof, were declared incapable of any preferment or employment in church or commonwealth; all their places, preferments, and promotions, were to be utterly void, as if they were naturally dead; nor might they be permitted to use their function of the ministry, without advice and consent of both houses of parliament; provided that no lapse shall incur by this vacancy till six months after notice thereof.

When Mr. Goodwin had done, the king asked the commissioners if they had power to treat, to which they replied, that they were only to receive his majesty’s answer; then said the king, “Saving the honour of the business, a trumpeter might have done as well;”[[38]](#footnote-38) the very same language as at the treaty of Oxford; but the earl of Pembroke told his majesty, they must receive his peremptory answer in ten days, or return without it.

Great intercessions were made with the king to comply with these proposals,[[39]](#footnote-39) particularly in the point of religion, for without full satisfaction in that, nothing would please the Scots nation, nor the city of London, by whom alone his majesty could hope to be preserved; but if this was yielded they would interpose for the moderating other demands; the Scots general, at the head of one hundred officers, presented a petition upon their knees, beseeching his majesty to give them satisfaction in the point of religion, and to take the covenant. Duke Hamilton, and the rest of the Scots commissioners, pressed his majesty in the most earnest manner, to make use of the present opportunity for peace.[[40]](#footnote-40) The lord-chancellor for that kingdom spoke to this effect: “The differences between your majesty and your parliament are grown to such a height, that after many bloody battles they have your majesty, with all your garrisons and strongholds in their hands, and the whole kingdom at their disposal; they are now in a capacity to do what they will in church and state; and some are so afraid, and others so unwilling, to submit to your majesty’s government, that they desire not you, nor any of your race, longer to reign over them; but they are unwilling to proceed to extremities, till they know your majesty’s last resolutions.—Now, sir, if your majesty “shall refuse to assent to the propositions, you will lose all your friends in the houses, and in the city, and all England will join against you as one man; they will depose you, and set up another government; they will charge us to deliver your majesty to them, and remove our armies out of England; and upon your refusal, we shall be constrained to settle religion and peace without you, which will ruin your majesty and your posterity. We own the propositions are higher in some things than we approve of, but the only way to establish your majesty’s throne is to consent to them at present, and your majesty may recover, in a time of peace, all that you have lost in this time of tempest and trouble.”[[41]](#footnote-41)

This was plain-dealing: the king’s best friends prayed his majesty to consider his present circumstances, and not hazard his crown for a form of church-government; or, if he had no regard to himself, to consider his royal posterity; but the king replied, his conscience was dearer to him than his crown; that till he had received better satisfaction about the divine right of episcopacy, and the obligation of his coronation-oath, no considerations should prevail with him;[[42]](#footnote-42) he told the officers of the army, he neither could nor would take the covenant, till he had heard from the queen.[[43]](#footnote-43) Which was only an excuse to gain time to divide his enemies, for the king had then actually heard from his queen by monsieur Bellievre, the French ambassador, who pressed his majesty, pursuant to positive instructions given him for that purpose, as the advice of the king of France, of the queen, and of his own party, to give the Presbyterians satisfaction about the church.[[44]](#footnote-44) Bellievre, not being able to prevail, dispatched an express to France, with a desire, that some person of more weight with the king might be sent. Upon which sir William Davenant came over, with a letter of credit from the queen, beseeching him to part with the church for his peace and security. When sir William had delivered the letter, he ventured to support it with some arguments of his own, and told his majesty, in a most humble manner, that it was the advice of lord Culpeper, Jermyn, and of all his friends; upon which the king was so transported with indignation, that he forbid him his presence. When therefore the ten days for considering the propositions were expired, instead of consenting, his majesty gave the commissioners his answer in a paper, directed to the speaker of the house of peers, to this effect, “that the propositions contained so great alterations both in church and state, that his majesty could not give a particular and positive answer to them:” but, after some few concessions hereafter to be mentioned, “he proposes to come to London, or any of his houses thereabouts, and enter upon a personal treaty with both houses; and he conjures them, as Christians and subjects, and as men that desire to leave a good name behind them, to accept of this proposal, that the unhappy distractions of the nation may be peaceably settled.”[[45]](#footnote-45)

When this answer was reported to the house, August 12, it was resolved, to settle accounts with the Scots, and to receive the king into their own custody; but in the meantime his majesty attempted to bring that nation over to his interest, by playing the Independents against them, and telling them, the only way to destroy the sectarians was to join with the episcopalians, and admit of the establishment of both religions.[[46]](#footnote-46) “I do by no means persuade you (says the king) to do anything contrary to your covenant, but I desire you to consider whether it be not a great step towards your reformation (which I take to be the chief end of your covenant), that the presbyterial government be legally settled. It is true, I desire that the liberty of my own conscience, and those who are of the same opinion with myself, may be preserved, which I confess, does not as yet totally take away episcopal government. But then consider withal, that this will take away all the superstitious sects and heresies of the Papists and Independents, to which you are no less obliged by your covenant, than to the taking away of episcopacy. And this that I demand is likely to be but temporary; for if it be so clear as you believe, that episcopacy is unlawful, I doubt not but God will so enlighten my eyes that I shall soon perceive it, and then I promise to concur with you fully in matters of religion; but I am sure you cannot imagine, that there are any hopes of converting or silencing the Independent party, which undoubtedly will get a toleration in religion from the parliament of England, unless you join with me in that way that I have proposed for the establishing of my crown; or at least, that you do not press me to do this (which is yet against my conscience) till I may do it without sinning, which, as I am confident none of you will persuade me to do, so I hope you have so much charity as not to put things to such a desperate issue as to hazard the loss of all, because for the present you cannot have full satisfaction from me in point of religion, not considering, that besides the other mischiefs that may happen, it will infallibly set up the innumerable sects of the Independents, nothing being more against your covenant than the suffering those schisms to increase.”[[47]](#footnote-47) His majesty then added, “that he should be content to restrain episcopal government to the dioceses of Oxford, Winchester, Bath and Wells, and Exeter, leaving all the rest of England fully to the presbyterial discipline, with the strictest clauses that could be thought of in an act of parliament against the Papists and Independents.” But the Scots would abate nothing in the articles of religion; even for the overthrow of the sectaries. Duke Hamilton left no methods unattempted to persuade his majesty to comply, but without effect.[[48]](#footnote-48)

When the king could not gain the commissioners, he applied by his friends to the kirk, who laid his proposals before the general assembly, with his offer to make any declaration they should desire against the Independents, and that really, without any reserve or equivocation; but the kirk were as peremptory as the commissioners; they said, the king’s heart was not with them, nor could they depend upon his promises any longer than it was not in his power to set them aside.[[49]](#footnote-49)

In the meantime the English parliament were debating with the Scots commissioners at London, the right of disposing of the king’s person, the latter claiming an equal right to him with the former; and the parliament voted that the kingdom of Scotland had no joint right to dispose of the person of the king, in the kingdom of England. To which the Scots would hardly have submitted, had it not been for fear of engaging in a new war, and losing all their arrears. His majesty would willingly have retired into Scotland, but the clergy of that nation would not receive him, as appears by their solemn warning to all estates and degrees of persons throughout the land, dated December 17, 1646, in which they say, “So long as his majesty does not approve in his heart, and seal with his hand, the league and covenant, we cannot but apprehend, that according to his former principles he will walk contrary to it, and study to draw us into the violation of it. Besides, our receiving his majesty into Scotland at this time, will confirm the suspicion of the English nation, of our underhand dealing with him before he came into our army. Nor do we see how it is consistent with our covenant and treaties, but on the contrary, it would involve us in the guilt of perjury, and expose us to the hazard of a bloody war. We are bound by our covenant to defend the king’s person and authority, in the defence and preservation of the true religion, and the liberties of the kingdom, and so far as his majesty is for these we will be for him; but if his majesty will not satisfy the just desires of his people, both nations are engaged to pursue the ends thereof, against all lets and impediments; we therefore desire, that those who are intrusted with the public affairs of this kingdom, would still insist upon his majesty’s settling religion according to the covenant, as the only means of preserving himself, his crown, and posterity.” Upon reading this admonition of the kirk, the Scots parliament resolved, that his majesty be desired to grant the whole propositions; that in case of refusal, the kingdom should be secured without him. They declared farther, that the kingdom of Scotland could not lawfully engage for the king, as long as he refused to take the covenant, and give them satisfaction in point of religion.[[50]](#footnote-50) Nor would they admit him to come into Scotland, unless he gave a satisfactory answer to the proposition lately presented to him in the name of both kingdoms.

The resolutions above mentioned were not communicated in form to the king, till the beginning of January, when the Scots commissioners pressing him again in the most humble and importunate manner to give them satisfaction, at least in the point of religion, his majesty remained immovable: which being reported back to Edinburgh, the question was put in that parliament, whether they should leave the king in England, to his two houses of parliament? and it was carried in the affirmative. January 16, a declaration was published in the name of the whole kingdom of Scotland, wherein they say, “that when his majesty came to their army before Newark, he professed that he absolutely resolved to comply with his parliaments in everything, for settling of truth and peace; in confidence whereof the committees of the kingdom of Scotland declared to himself, and to the kingdom of England, that they received him into their protection only upon these terms, since which time propositions of peace have been presented to his majesty for the royal assent, with earnest supplications to the same purpose, but without effect. The parliament of Scotland therefore being now to recall their army out of England, considering that his majesty in several messages has desired to be near his two houses of parliament, and that the parliament has appointed his majesty to reside at Holmby-house with safety to his royal person; and in regard of his majesty’s not giving a satisfactory answer to the propositions for peace; and from a desire to preserve a right understanding between the two kingdoms, and for preventing new troubles, the states of parliament of the kingdom of Scotland do declare their concurrence for the king’s majesty’s going to Holmby-house, to remain there till he give satisfaction about the propositions for peace; and that, in the meantime, there be no harm, prejudice, injury or violence, done to his royal person; that there be no change of government; and, that his posterity be no way prejudiced in their lawful succession to the crown and government of these kingdoms.”[[51]](#footnote-51)

While the parliament and kirk of Scotland were debating the king's proposals, his majesty wrote to the parliament of England in the most pressing terms, for a personal treaty at London; “It is your king (says he in his letter of December 10) that desires to be heard, the which, if refused to a subject by a king, he would be thought a tyrant; wherefore I conjure you, as you would show yourselves really what you profess, good Christians and good subjects, that you accept this offer.” But the houses were afraid to trust his majesty in London, and therefore appointed commissioners to receive him from the Scots,[[52]](#footnote-52) and convoy him to Holmby-house in Northamptonshire, where he arrived February 6, 1646‒7. The sum of £200,000, being half the arrears due to the Scots army, having been paid them by agreement before they marched out of Newcastle, it has been commonly said, They sold their king. An unjust and malicious aspersion! It ought to be considered, that the money was their due before the king delivered himself into their hands; for that in settling the accounts between the two nations, his majesty’s name was not mentioned:[[53]](#footnote-53) that it was impossible to detain him without a war with England, and that the officers of the army durst not carry the king to Edinburgh, because both parliament and kirk had declared against receiving him.[[54]](#footnote-54)

But how amazing was his majesty’s conduct! What cross and inconsistent proposals did he make at this time! While he was treating with the Scots, and offering to concur in the severest measures against the Independents, he was listening to the offers of those very Independents to set him upon the throne, without taking the covenant, or renouncing the liturgy of the church, provided they might secure a toleration for themselves. This agreeing with the king’s inclinations, had too great a hearing from him, says bishop Burnet, till Lauderdale wrote from London, “that he was infallibly sure, they designed the destruction of monarchy, and the ruin of the king and his posterity; but that if he would consent to the propositions, all would be well, in spite of the devil and the Independents too.”[[55]](#footnote-55) If his majesty had in good earnest fallen in with the overtures of the army at this time, I am of opinion they would have set him upon the throne, without the shackles of the Scots covenant.

While the king was at Holmby-house, he was attended with great respect,[[56]](#footnote-56) and suffered to divert himself at bowls with gentlemen in the neighbouring villages, under a proper guard. The parliament appointed two of their clergy, viz. Mr. Caryl and Mr. Marshal, to preach in the chapel, morning and afternoon on the Lord’s day, and perform the devotions of the chapel on week-days, but his majesty never gave his attendance.[[57]](#footnote-57) He spent his Sundays in private; and though they waited at table he would not so much as admit them to ask a blessing.

Before the king removed from Newcastle, the parliament put the finishing hand to the destruction of the hierarchy, by abolishing the very names and titles of archbishops, bishops, &c. and alienating their revenues for payment of the public debts. This was done by two ordinances, bearing date October 9 and November 16, 1646, entitled, “Ordinances for abolishing archbishops and bishops, and providing for the payment of the just and necessary debts of the kingdom, into which the same has been drawn by a war, mainly promoted by and in favour of the said archbishops, bishops, and other their adherents and dependants. The ordinance appoints, “that the name, title, style, and dignity, of archbishop of Canterbury, archbishop of York, bishop of Winchester, bishop of Durham, and all other bishops of any bishoprics within the kingdom of England, and dominion of Wales, be, from and after September 5, 1646, wholly abolished and taken away; and all and every person and persons are to be thenceforth disabled to hold the place, function, or style, of archbishop or bishop of any church, see, or diocese, now established or erected within the kingdom of England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-on-Tweed; or to use, or put in use, any archiepiscopal or episcopal jurisdiction or authority, by force of any letters patent from the crown, made, or to be made, or by any other authority whatsoever, any law, statute, usage, or custom, to the contrary notwithstanding.”[[58]](#footnote-58)

By the ordinance of November 16, it is farther ordained, “that all counties palatine, honours, manors, lordships, styles, circuits, precincts, castles, granges, messuages, mills, lands, tenements, meadows, pastures, parsonages, appropriate tithes, oblations, obventions, pensions, portions of tithes, vicarages, churches, chapels, advowsons, donations, nominations, rights of patronage and presentations, parks, woods, rents, reversions, services, annuities, franchises, liberties, privileges, immunities, rights of action and of entry, interests, titles of entry, conditions, commons, eourt-lcets and court-barons, and all other possessions and hereditaments whatsoever, which now are, or within ten years before the beginning of the present parliament were, belonging to the said archbishops and bishops, archbishoprics or bishoprics, or any of them, together with all chattels, deeds, books, accompts, rolls, and other writings and evidences whatsoever, concerning the premises, which did belong to any of the said archbishops, bishops, &c.[[59]](#footnote-59) are vested and settled, adjudged and deemed to be, in the real and actual possession and seisin of the twenty-four trustees mentioned in the ordinance, their heirs and assigns, upon trust that they shall dispose of the same, and the rents and profits thereof, as both houses of parliament shall order and appoint, i. e. for payment of the public debts, and other necessary charges occasioned by the war, promoted chiefly by and in favour of the said hierarchy, saving and excepting all tithes appropriate, oblations, obventions, and portions of tithes, &c. belonging to the said archbishops, bishops, and others of the said hierarchy; all which, together with £30,000 yearly rent belonging to the crown, they reserve for the maintenance of preaching ministers. The trustees are not to avoid any lease made for three lives, or twenty-one years, provided the said lease or leases were not obtained since the month of December 1641. They are empowered to appoint proper officers to survey, and take a particular estimate of, all the bishops’ lands, to receive the rents and profits of them, and to make a sufficient title to such as shall purchase them, by order of parliament.”[[60]](#footnote-60) By virtue of this ordinance the trustees were empowered to pay, or cause to be paid, to the assembly of divines, their constant salary allowed them by a former order of parliament, with all their arrears, out of the rents, revenues, and profits, belonging to the late archbishop of Canterbury, till such time as the said lands and revenues shall happen to be sold. These church-lands were at first mortgaged as a security for several large sums of money, which the parliament borrowed at eight per cent interest. Several members of parliament, and officers of the army, afterward purchased them at low rates, but the bargain proved dear enough in the end. And surely it was wrong to set them to sale; the lands having been originally given for the service of religion, ought to have been continued for such uses, and the substance of the donors’ intentions pursued; unless it appeared that too great a proportion of the national property had been settled in mortmain. But herein they followed the ill examples of the kings and queens of England at the Reformation.

The Presbyterians were now in the height of their power, the hierarchy being destroyed, the king their prisoner, and the best, if not all, the livings in the kingdom distributed among them; yet still they were dissatisfied for want of the top-stone to their new building, which was church-power; the pulpits and conversation of the city were filled with invectives against the men in power, because they would not leave the church independent on the state; the Presbyterian ministers were very troublesome, the parliament being teased every week with church-grievances of one kind or another; December 19, the lord-mayor and his brethren went up to Westminster with a representation of some of them, and a petition for redress. The grievances were,

1. “The contempt that began to be put upon the covenant, some refusing to take it, and others declaiming loudly against it; they therefore pray, that it may be imposed upon the whole nation, under such penalties as the houses shall think fit; and that such as refuse it be disqualified from all places of profit and trust.

2. “The growth of heresy and schism; the pulpits having been often usurped by preaching soldiers, who infected all places where they came with dangerous errors; they therefore pray, that all such persons may be forbid to preach as have not taken the covenant, and been regularly ordained, and that all separate congregations, the very nurseries of damnable heretics, may be suppressed; that an ordinance be made for the exemplary punishment of heretics and schismatics, and that all godly and orthodox ministers may have a competent maintenance, many pulpits being vacant of a settled minister for want of it; and here (say they) we would lay the stress of our desires, and the urgency of our affections.” They complain farther, of the “undue practices of country committees, of the threatening power of the army, and of some breaches in the constitution; all which they desire may be redressed, and that his majesty’s royal person and authority may be preserved and defended, together with the liberties of the kingdom, according to the covenant.”

To satisfy the petitioners, the house of commons published a declaration December 31, “wherein they express their dislike of lay-preachers, and their resolution to proceed against all such as shall take upon them to preach, or expound the Scriptures in any church or chapel, or any other public place, except they be ordained either here, or in some other reformed churches; likewise against all such ministers and others, as shall publish, or maintain by preaching, writing, printing, or any other way, anything against, or in derogation of, the church-government which is now established by authority of parliament; and also against all and every person or persons who shall willingly or purposely interrupt or disturb a preacher in the public exercise of his function, and they command all officers of the peace, and officers of the army, to take notice of this declaration, and by all lawful means to prevent offences of this kind, to apprehend offenders, that a course maybe speedily taken for a due punishment to be inflicted upon them.” The house of lords published an order, bearing date December 22, requiring the headboroughs and constables, in the several parishes of England and Wales, to arrest the bodies of such persons as shall disturb any minister in holy orders, in the exercise of his public calling, by speech or action, and carry them before some justice of peace, who is required to put the laws in execution against them. February 4, they published an ordinance to prevent the growth and spreading of errors, heresies, and blasphemies; but these orders not coming up to their covenant-uniformity, the lord-mayor and common-council presented another petition to the two houses March 17, and appointed a committee to attend the parliament from day to day, till their grievances were redressed, of which we shall hear more under the next year.

We have already accounted for the unhappy rise of the sectarians in the army when it was new-modelled, who were now grown so extravagant as to call for some proper restraint, the mischief being spread not only over the whole country, but into the city of London itself: it was first pleaded in excuse for this practise, that a gifted brother had better preach and pray to the people than nobody; but now learning, good sense, and the rational interpretation of Scripture, began to be cried down, and every bold pretender to inspiration was preferred to the most grave and sober divines of the age; some advanced themselves into the rank of prophets, and others uttered all such crude and undigested absurdities as came first into their minds, calling them the dictates of the Spirit within them; by which the public peace was frequently disturbed, and great numbers of ignorant people led into the belief of the most dangerous errors. The assembly of divines did what they could to stand in the gap, by writing against them, and publishing a Detestation of the Errors of the Times. The parliament also appointed a fast on that account February 4, 1645-6, and many books were published against the Antinomians, Anabaptists, Seekers, &c. not forgetting the Independents, whose insisting upon a toleration was reckoned the inlet to all the rest.

The most furious writer against the sectaries was Mr. Thomas Edwards,[[61]](#footnote-61) minister of Christ-church, London, a zealous Presbyterian, who became remarkable by a book entitled Gangræna, or a catalogue of many of the errors, heresies, blasphemies, and pernicious practices, of this time; in the epistle dedicatory he calls upon the higher powers to rain down all their vengeance upon these deluded people, in the following language: “You have done worthily against Papists, prelates, and scandalous ministers, in casting down images, altars, crucifixes, throwing out ceremonies, &c. but what have you done (says he) against heresy, schism, disorder, against Seekers, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Brownists, Libertines, and other sects; you have made a reformation, but with the reformation have we not worse things come upon us than we had before, as denying the Scriptures, pleading for toleration of all religions and worships; yea, for blasphemy, and denying there is a God. You have put down the Common Prayer, and there are many among us that are for putting down the Scriptures. You have broken down the images of the Trinity, and we have those who oppose the Trinity. You have cast out bishops and their officers, and we have many that cast down to the ground all ministers. You have cast out ceremonies in the sacraments, as the cross, kneeling at the Lord’s supper, and many cast out the sacraments themselves. You have put down saints’ days, and many make nothing of the Lord’s day. You have taken away the superfluous maintenance of bishops and deans, and we have many that cry down the necessary maintenance of ministers. In the bishops’ days we had singing of psalms taken away in some places, conceived prayer, preaching, and in their room anthems, stinted forms, and reading, brought in, and now singing of psalms is spoken against, public prayer questioned, and all ministerial preaching denied. In the bishops’ time Popish innovations were introduced, as bowing at altars, &c. and now we have anointing the sick with oil; then we had bishoping of children, now we have bishoping of men and women, by laying on of hands. In the bishops’ days we had the fourth commandment taken away, and now all ten are taken away by the Antinomians. The worst of the prelates held many sound doctrines, and had many commendable practices, but many of our sectaries deny all principles of religion, are enemies to all holy duties, order, learning, overthrowing all, being whirligig spirits, and the great opinion of a universal toleration tends to the laying all waste, and dissolution of all religion and good manners. Now (says our author) a connivance at, and suffering without punishment, such false doctrines and disorders, provokes God to send judgments. A toleration doth eclipse the glory of the most excellent reformation, and makes these sins to be the sins of the legislature that countenances them. Amagistrate should use coercive power to punish and suppress evils, as appears from the example of Eli. Now, right honourable, though you do not own these heresies, but have put out several orders against them, yet there is a strange unheard-of suffering of them, such a one as there hardly ever was the like, under any orthodox Christian magistrate and state. Many sectaries are countenanced, and employed in places of trust: there has not been any exemplary restraint of the sectaries, by virtue of any of your ordinances, but they are slighted and scorned; preaching of laymen was never more in request than since your ordinance against it; presbyterial government never more preached and printed against, than since it was established. Our dear brethren of Scotland stand amazed, and are astonished at these things; the orthodox ministers and people both in city and country are grieved and discouraged, and the common enemy scorns and blasphemes; it is high time therefore for your honours to suffer no longer these sects and schisms, but to do something worthy of a parliament against them, and God will be with you.”

After this dedication there are one hundred and seventy-six erroneous passages collected from sundry pamphlets printed about this time, and from the reports of friends in all parts of the kingdom, to whom he sent for materials to fill up his book; however, the heretics are at length reduced under sixteen general heads.

The industrious writer might have enlarged his catalogue with Papists and prelates, Deists, Ranters, Behemenists, &c. &c., or if he had pleased, a less number might have served his turn, for very few of these sectaries were collected into societies; but his business was to blacken the adversaries of Presbyterian uniformity, that the parliament might crush them by sanguinary methods. Among his heresies there are some which do not deserve that name; and among his errors, some that never grew into a sect, but fell occasionally from the pen or lips of some wild enthusiast, and died with the author. The Independents are put at the head of the sectaries, because they were for toleration of all Christians who agreed in the fundamentals of religion; to prove this, which they never denied, he has collected several passages out of their public prayers; one Independent minister (says he) prayed that presbytery might be removed, and the kingdom of Christ set up; another prayed two or three times, that the parliament might give liberty to tender consciences; another thanked God for the liberty of conscience granted in America; and said, Why, Lord, not in England? Another prayed, Since God had delivered both Presbyterians and Independents from prelatical bondage, that the former might not be guilty of bringing their brethren into bondage. The reader will judge of the spirit of this writer, by the foregoing specimen of his performance, which I should not have thought worth remembering, if our church-writers had not reported the state of religion from his writings. “I knew Mr. Edwards very well (says Fuller[[62]](#footnote-62)), my contemporary in Queen’s college, who often was transported beyond due bounds with the keenness and eagerness of his spirit, and therefore I have just cause in some things to suspect him.” He adds farther, “I am most credibly informed, by such who I am confident will not abuse me and posterity therein, that Mr. Herbert Palmer (an anti-Independent to the height), being convinced that Mr. Edwards had printed some falsehoods in one sheet of his Gangræna, proffered to have the sheet reprinted at his own charge, but some accident obstructed it.” However, our author went on publishing a second and third Gangraena, full of most bitter invectives and reproaches, till his own friends were nauseated with his performances.

The reverend Mr. Baxter, who attended the victorious army, mentions the Independents, Anabaptists, and Antimonians, as the chief separatists, to whom he adds some other names, as Seekers, Ranters, Behemenists, Vanists, all which died in their infancy, or united in the people afterward known by the name of Quakers; but when he went into the army he found “almost one half of the religious party among them orthodox, or but very lightly touched with the above-mentioned mistakes, and almost another half honest men, that had stepped farther into the contending way than they ought, but with a little help might be recovered; a few fiery, self-conceited men among them, kindled the rest, and made all the noise and bustle; for the greatest part of the common soldiers were ignorant men, and of little religion; these would do anything to please their officers, and were instruments for the seducers in their great work, which was to cry down the covenant, to vilify parish-ministers, and especially the Scots and the Presbyterians.” Mr. Baxter observes,[[63]](#footnote-63) that “these fiery hot men were hatched among the old separatists; that they were fierce with pride, and conceit, and uncharitableness, but many of the honest soldiers, who were only tainted with some doubts about liberty of conscience, and independency, would discourse of the points of sanctification and Christian experience very savourily; the seducers above mentioned were great preachers, and fierce disputants, but of no settled principles of religion; some were of levelling principles as to the state, but all were agreed, that the civil magistrate had nothing to do in matters of religion, any farther than to keep the peace, and protect the church-liberties.” The same writer adds, “To speak impartially, some of the Presbyterian ministers frightened the sectaries into this fury, by the unpeaceableness and impatience of their minds; they ran from libertinism into the other extreme, and were so little sensible of their own infirmity, that they would not have them tolerated, who were not only tolerable, but worthy instruments and members in the churches.” Lord Clarendon says, that Cromwell and his officers preached and prayed publicly with their troops, and admitted few or no chaplains in the army, except such as bitterly inveighed against the Presbyterian government, as more tyrannical than episcopacy; and that the common soldiers, as well as the officers, did not only pray and preach themselves, but went up into the pulpits in all churches, and preached to the people, who quickly became inspired with the same spirit; women as well as men taking upon them to pray and preach; which made as great a noise and confusion in all opinions concerning religion, as there was in the civil government of the state.

Bishop Bramhall, in one of his letters to archbishop Usher, writes, that, “the Papists took advantage of these confusions, and sent over above one hundred of their clergy, that had been educated in France, Italy, and Spain, by order from Rome. In these nurseries the scholars were taught several handicraft trades and callings, according to their ingenuities, besides their functions in the church; they have many yet at Paris (says the bishop) fitting up to be sent over, who twice in the week oppose one the other; one pretending presbytery, the other independency, some anabaptism, and others contrary tenets. The hundred that went over this year (according to the bishop) were most of them soldiers in the parliament-army.”[[64]](#footnote-64) But Mr. Baxter,[[65]](#footnote-65) after a most diligent inquiry, declares, “that he could not find them out;” which renders the bishop’s account suspected. “The most that I could suspect for Papists among Cromwell’s soldiers (says he) were but a few that began as strangers among the common soldiers, and by degrees rose up to some inferior officers, but none of the superior officers seemed such.” The body of the army had a vast aversion to the Papists, and the parliament took all occasions of treating them with rigour; for, June 30, Morgan, a priest, was drawn, hanged, and quartered, for going out of the kingdom to receive orders from Rome, and then returning again. However, without all question, both church and state were in the utmost disorder and confusion at the close of this year [1646].

Among the illustrious men of the parliament’s side who died about this time, was Robert D’Evereux, earl of Essex, son of the famous favourite of queen Elizabeth; he was educated to arms in the Netherlands, and afterward served the king and queen of Bohemia for the recovery of the Palatinate. King Charles I. made him lieutenant of his army in his expedition against the Scots, and lord-chamberlain of the household; but the earl, being unwilling to go into the arbitrary measures of the court in favour of Popery and slavery, engaged on the side of the parliament, and accepted of the commission of captain-general of their forces, for which the king proclaimed him a traitor. He was a person of great honour, and served the parliament with fidelity; but being of opinion, that the war should be ended rather by treaty than conquest, did not always push his successes as far as he might. Upon the new-modelling of the army, the cautious general was dismissed with an honourable pension for his past services; after which he retired to his house at Eltham in Kent, where he died of a lethargy, occasioned by overheating himself in the chase of a stag in Windsor-forest, September 14, 1646, in the fifty-fifth year of his age.[[66]](#footnote-66) He was buried with great funereal solemnity in Westminster-abbey, October 22, at the public expense, both houses of parliament attending the procession. His effigy was afterward erected in Westminster-hall, but some of the king’s party found means in the night to cut off the head, and break the sword, arms, and escutcheons. Mr. Vines preached his funeral sermon, and gave him a very high encomium, though lord Clarendon has stained his character for taking part with the parliament, which he says was owing to his pride and vanity. The earl’s countenance appeared stern and solemn, but to his familiar acquaintance his behaviour was mild and affable. Upon the whole, he was a truly great and excellent person; his death was an unspeakable loss to the king, for he was the only nobleman perhaps in the kingdom who had interest enough with both parties, to have put an end to the civil war, at the very time when Providence called him out of the world.

Among the remarkable divines may be reckoned the reverend and learned Mr. Thomas Colman, rector of St. Peter’s church in Cornhill: he was born at Oxford, and entered in Magdalen-college in the seventeenth year of his age; he afterward became so perfect a master of the Hebrew language, that he was commonly called Rabbi Colman. In the beginning of the civil war he left his rectory of Blyton in Lincolnshire, being persecuted from thence by the cavaliers. Upon his coming to London, he was preferred to the rectory of St. Peter’s Cornhill, and made one of the assembly of divines. Mr. Wood says, he behaved modestly and learnedly in the assembly; and Mr. Fuller gives him the character of a modest and learned divine; he was equally an enemy to presbytery and prelacy, being of Erastian principles; he fell sick while the assembly was debating the *jus divinum* of presbytery; and when they sent some of their members to visit him, he desired they would not come to an absolute determination till they heard what he had to offer upon the question; but his distemper increasing he died in a few days, and the whole assembly did him the honour to attend his funeral in a body March 30, 1646.[[67]](#footnote-67)

About the middle of July died the learned doctor William Twisse, vicar of Newbury, and prolocutor of the assembly of divines; he was born at Speenham-Land, near Newbury in Berkshire; his father was a substantial clothier in that town, and educated his son at Winchester-school, from whence he was translated to New-college in Oxford, of which he was fellow; here he employed himself in the study of divinity with the closest application, for sixteen years together. In the year 1604, he proceeded master of arts; about the same time he entered into holy orders, and became a diligent and frequent preacher; he was admired by the universities for his subtle wit, exact judgment, exemplary life and conversation, and many other valuable qualities which became a man of his function. In the year 1614, he proceeded doctor of divinity, after which he travelled into Germany, and became chaplain to the princess palatine, daughter of king James I. After his return to England, he was made vicar of Newbury, where he gained a vast reputation by his useful preaching and exemplary living. His most able adversaries have confessed, that there was nothing then extant more accurate and full, touching the Arminian controversy, than what he published: and hardly any who have written upon this argument since the publishing Dr. Twisse’s works, but have made an honourable mention of him.[[68]](#footnote-68) The doctor was offered the prebend of Winchester, and several preferments in the church of England; the states of Friesland invited him to the professorship of divinity in their university of Franeker, but he refused all. In the beginning of the civil war, he was forced from his living at Newbury by the cavaliers, and upon convening the assembly of divines, was appointed by parliament their prolocutor, in which station he continued to his death, which happened after a lingering indisposition, about the 20th of July, 1646, in the seventy-first year of his age. He died in very necessitous circumstances, having lost all his substance by the king’s soldiers, insomuch that when some of the assembly were deputed to visit him in his sickness, they reported, that he was very sick, and in great straits. He was allowed to be a person of extensive knowledge in school-divinity; a subtle disputant,[[69]](#footnote-69) and withal, a modest, humble, and religious person. He was buried, at the request of the assembly, in the collegiate church of St. Peter’s Westminster, near the upper end of the poor folks’ table, next the vestry, July 24, and was attended by the whole assembly of divines: there his body rested till the restoration of king Charles II. when his bones were dug up by order of council, September 14, 1661, and thrown with several others into a hole in the churchyard of St. Margaret’s, before the back-door of the lodgings of one of the prebendaries.

Towards the end of the year died the reverend and pious Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs; he was educated in Cambridge, but obliged to quit the university and kingdom for nonconformity in the late times.[[70]](#footnote-70) Upon his leaving England, he was chosen minister of an English congregation at Rotterdam, with which he continued till the year 1642, when he returned to England, and became preacher to two of the largest and most numerous congregations about London, viz. Stepney and Cripplegate. He was one of the dissenting brethren in the assembly, but was a divine of great candour, modesty, and charity. He never gathered a separate congregation, nor accepted of a parochial living, exhausting his strength in continual preaching, and other services of the church. He was an excellent scholar, a good expositor, a popular preacher; he published several treatises while he lived, and his friends have published many others since his death, which have met with a general acceptance. It was said, the divisions of the times broke his heart, because one of the last subjects he preached upon, and printed, was his Irenicum, or an attempt to heal divisions among Christians. Mr. Baxter used to say, if all the Presbyterians had been like Mr. Marshal, and the Independents like Mr. Burroughs, their differences might easily have been compromised. He died of a consumptive illness November 14, 1646, about the fortyseventh year of his age.
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12. Vol. Pamp. no. 31. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
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14. Whitelocke’s Memorials, p. 212. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Rushworth, p. 306. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
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18. Mr. Whitelocke informs us, Memorials, p. 234, “that a Scotch minister preached boldly before the king, December 16, 1646, at Newcastle, and after his sermon called for the fifty-second psalm, which begins,
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‘Thy wicked works to praise?’
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The people waived the minister’s psalm, and sung that which the king called for.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
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In addition to the encomium bestowed by bishop Burnet on the king’s papers, which we have already quoted, it may be subjoined, that sir Philip Warwick also extolled them, as shewing his majesty’s “great ability and knowledge, when he was destitute of all aids.” Yet it is remarkable, as observes Dr. Harris, who had turned over Stillingfleet’s Irenicum, and Unreasonableness of Separation, Hoadly’s Defence of Episcopal Ordination, and many other volumes, these royal “papers have been little read, and are seldom or never quoted on the subject of episcopacy.” So that it is “possible, these learned churchmen had not so great an opinion of the arguments made use of by Charles in these papers, as the historians (viz. Burnet and sir P. Warwick) I have quoted.” Life of Charles I. p. 101.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
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