

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

THEIR ATTEMPTS FOR A FARTHER REFORMATION IN THE CHURCH, THEIR SUFFERINGS, AND
THE LIVES AND CHARACTERS OF THEIR MOST CONSIDERABLE DIVINES.

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

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

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

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

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

1837.

CHAPTER VIII.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSEMBLY UPON THEIR CONFESSION OF FAITH AND CATECHISMS. PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLIES OF LONDON. THE KING TAKEN OUT OF THE PARLIAMENT'S CUSTODY, AND CONVEYED TO THE ARMY. CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE PARLIAMENT AND ARMY. HIS MAJESTY'S CONDUCT. HE ESCAPES FROM HAMPTON-COURT, AND IS CONFINED IN THE ISLE OF WIGHT.

THE reverend Mr. Charles Herle succeeded to the prolocutor's chair by order of parliament July 22, 1646, in the room of the late Dr. Twisse, when the discipline of the church being pretty well settled, it was moved to finish their confession of faith. The English divines would have been content with revising and explaining the thirty-nine articles of the church of England, but the Scots insisting on a system of their own, a committee was appointed to prepare materials for this purpose May 9, 1645; their names were, Dr. Gouge, Dr. Hoyle, Mr. Herle, Gataker, Tuckney, Reynolds, and Vines, with the Scots divines, who having first settled the titles of the several chapters, as they now stand in their confession of faith, in number thirty-two, distributed them, for greater expedition, among several sub-committees, which sat two days every week, and then reported what they had finished to the committee, and so to the assembly, where it was debated paragraph by paragraph. The disputes about discipline had occasioned so many interruptions that it was a year and half before this work was finished, but on November 26, 1646, the prolocutor returned thanks to the several committees, in the name of the assembly, for their great pains in prelecting the work committed to them. At the same time Dr. Burges was appointed to get it transcribed, in order to its being presented to parliament, which was done December 11, by the whole assembly in a body, under the title of "The humble advice of the assembly of divines and others, now, by the authority of parliament, sitting at Westminster, concerning a confession of faith." The house of commons having voted the assembly thanks, desired them to insert the proofs of the several articles in their proper places, and then to print six hundred copies¹ and no more, for the perusal of the houses. The reverend Mr. Wilson, Mr. Byfield, and Mr. Gower, were appointed, January 6, to be a committee to collect the Scriptures for confirmation of the several articles; all which, after examination by the assembly, were inserted in the margin. And then the whole confession was committed once more to a re-

¹ The MSS. to which Mr. Neal refers, though supported by the authority of Rushworth, made a mistake here: for by a copy of the original order, given by Dr. Grey, in his Appendix, No. 71, it appears, that the order of the house was for printing five hundred copies, and no more, of "The humble advice," &c. See also Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 233.—ED.

view of the three committees, who made report to the assembly of such farther amendments as they thought necessary; which being agreed to by the house, it was sent to the press, May 11, 1647. Mr. Byfield, by order of the house of commons, delivered to the members the printed copies of their confession of faith, with Scripture notes, signed,

Charles Herle, prolocutor;

Corn. Burges, Herbert Palmer, assessors;

Henry Roborough, Adoniram Byfield, scribes.

And because no more were to be given out at present, every member subscribed his name to the receipt thereof.

The house of commons began their examination of this confession May 19, when they considered the whole first chapter article by article;¹ but the disturbances which arose between the parliament and army interrupted their proceeding the whole summer; but when these were quieted they resumed their work, and October 2, ordered a chapter of the confession of faith at least to be debated every Wednesday, by which means they got through the whole before the end of March following; for at a conference with the house of lords March 22, 1647–8, the commons presented them with the confession of faith as passed by their house, with some alterations: they agreed with the assembly in the doctrinal part of the confession; and ordered it to be published, June 20, 1648, for the satisfaction of the foreign churches, under the title of “Articles of religion approved and passed by both houses of parliament, after advice had with an assembly of divines called together by them for that purpose.”² The parliament not thinking it proper to call it a confession of faith, because the sections did not begin with the words I confess;³ nor to annex matters of church-government, about which they were not agreed, to doctrinal articles; those chapters therefore, which relate to discipline, as they now stand in the assembly’s confession, were not printed by order of the house, but recommitted, and at last laid aside; as the whole thirtieth chapter, of church censures, and of the power of the keys; the thirty-first chapter, of synods and councils, by whom to be called, and of what force in their decrees and determinations: a great part of the twenty-fourth chapter, of marriage, and divorce, which they referred to the laws of the land; and the fourth paragraph of the twentieth chapter, which determines what opinions and parties disturb the peace of the church, and how such disturbers ought to be proceeded against by the censures of the church, and punished by the civil magistrate. These propositions, in which the very life and soul of presbytery consists, never were approved by the English parliament, nor had the force of a law in this country:

¹ Rushworth, part 4. vol. 1. p. 482.

² Ibid. p. 1035.

³ Savoy Conf. Pref. p. 18. 19.

but the whole confession, as it came from the assembly, being sent into Scotland, was immediately approved by the general assembly, and parliament of that kingdom, as the established doctrine and discipline of their kirk;¹ and thus it has been published to the world ever since, though the chapter above mentioned, relating to discipline, received no parliamentary sanction in England; nevertheless, as the entire confession was agreed to by an assembly of English divines, I have given it a place in the Appendix.²

Nor is it to be supposed, that the confession of faith itself, which determines so many abstruse points of divinity, should have the unanimous and hearty assent of the whole assembly or parliament: for though all the divines were in the anti-Arminian scheme, yet some had a greater latitude than others. I find in my MS. the dissent of several members against some expressions relating to reprobation, to the imputation of the active as well as passive obedience of Christ, and to several passages in the chapters of liberty of conscience and church-discipline; but the confession, as far as related to articles of faith, passed the assembly and parliament by a very great majority.

Various censures have been passed by learned men upon this laboured performance: some have loaded it with undeserved reproaches; and others, perhaps, have advanced its reputation too high. Mr. Collyer condemns it, for determining in favour of the morality of the sabbath; for pronouncing the pope to be antichrist; and for maintaining the Calvinian rigours of absolute predestination, irresistible grace, and the impotency of man's will; doctrines, in his opinion, inconsistent with Christianity.³ But then, he observes very justly, that it falls very short of the Scots claim in points of discipline; it yields the magistrate a power of convening church-assemblies, and of superintending their proceedings; it is silent as to the independency of the church, and the divine right of presbytery, &c. Upon the whole, the assembly's confession, with all its faults, has been ranked by very good judges among the most perfect systems of divinity,⁴ that have been published upon the Calvinistic or anti-Arminian principles in the last age.

While the confession was carrying through the assembly, committees were appointed to reduce it into the form of catechisms; one larger, for the service of a public exposition in the pulpit, according to the custom of foreign churches; the other smaller, for the instruction of children; in both

¹ Savoy Conf. Pref. p. 20.

² Appendix, No. 8.

³ Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 842.

⁴ Here may be introduced, as it escaped our recollection in the more proper place, the remark made by Mr. Robinson on the Directory. "The best state instructions to preachers were given in the Directory by the assembly of divines; but even these (he properly adds) include the great, the fatal error, the subjection of God's word to human laws." Translation of Claude on the Composition of a Sermon, vol. 2. Prefatory Dissertation, p. 63.—ED.

which the articles relating to church-discipline are entirely omitted.¹ The larger catechism is a comprehensive system of divinity, and the smaller, a very accurate summary, though it has by some been thought a little too long, and in some particulars too abstruse for the capacities of children. The shorter catechism was presented to the house of commons, November 5, but the larger, by reason of the marginal references to Scripture, which the houses desired might be inserted, was not ready till the 14th of April, 1648, when the house ordered six hundred copies to be printed for the service of the members; and having examined and approved it, they allowed it to be printed by authority, for public use, September 15, 1648. The king, after many solicitations, at the treaty of the Isle of Wight, offered to license the shorter catechism with a suitable preface; but that treaty proving unsuccessful, it was not accomplished.²

The chief affairs committed to the assembly being thus finished, Mr. Rutherford, one of the Scots divines, moved, October 24, 1647, that it might be recorded in the scribes' books, that the assembly had enjoyed the assistance of the honourable, reverend, and learned commissioners of the church of Scotland, during all the time they had been debating and perfecting these four things mentioned in the covenant, viz. their composing a directory for public worship; a uniform confession of faith; a form of church-government and discipline; and a public catechism; some of their number having been present during the whole of these transactions; which being done, about a week after, he and the rest of the commissioners took their leave, and returned home; upon which occasion Mr. Herle the prolocutor rose up, and, in the name of the assembly, "thanked the honourable and reverend commissioners, for their assistance; he excused in the best manner he could, the Directory's not being so well observed as it ought; and lamented that the assembly had not power to call offenders to an account: he confesses, that their affairs were very much embarrassed, and that they were still in a chaos of confusion [the king being now taken out of the hands of the parliament, and in custody of the army]; he takes notice of what distresses the parliament were in, while the common enemy was high and strong; and adds, that their extraordinary successes hitherto, were owing to the prayers of their brethren of Scotland, and other Protestants abroad, as well as to their own. He then mentions with concern some other restraints the assembly lay under, but that this was not a proper season for redress."

The commissioners went home under a very heavy concern for the storm that was gathering over England, and for the hardships the Presbyter-

¹ Rushworth, p. 888. 1060.

² Rushworth, p. 1326.

ians lay under with respect to their discipline; and having obtained the establishment of the Directory, the confession of faith and catechisms, the Presbyterian discipline, and Rouse's psalms in metre, for the service of their kirk, they appointed a general fast, to lament their own defection from the solemn league and covenant, and the distressed condition of their brethren in England, who were zealous for carrying on the work of God, but were now oppressed, under pretence of liberty, when no less was aimed at than tyranny and arbitrary power.

If the parliament had dissolved the assembly at this time, as they ought to have done, they had broke up with honour and reputation, for after this they did little more than examine candidates for the ministry, and squabble about the *jus divinum* of presbytery; the grand consultations concerning public affairs, and practising upon the new establishment, being translated to the provincial assemblies, and weekly meetings of the London clergy at Sion-college.¹

Though the city and suburbs of London had been formed into a province, and divided into twelve classical presbyteries, (as has been remembered under the last year) new complaints were still made to the parliament of certain obstructions to their proceedings; upon which the houses published their resolutions of April 22, 1647, entitled, "Remedies for removing some obstructions in Church-government;"² in which they ordered letters to

¹ * Rapin, vol. 2. p. 297, note. That the reader may form a judgment of what was intended to be established in England, it may not be improper to set before him, in one view, the discipline that was then settled in the kirk of Scotland, and subsists at this time. "In Scotland there are eight hundred and ninety parishes, each of which is divided, in proportion to its extent, into particular districts, and every district has its own ruling elders and deacons; the ruling elders are men of the principal quality and interest in the parish, and the deacons are persons of a good character for manners and understanding. A consistory of ministers, elders, and deacons, is called a kirk-session, the lowest ecclesiastical judicatory, which meets once a week, to consider the affairs of the parish. The minister is always moderator, but without a negative; appeals lie from hence to their own presbyteries, which are the next higher judicatories. Scotland is divided into sixty-nine presbyteries, each consisting of from twelve to twenty-four contiguous parishes. The ministers of these parishes, with one ruling elder, chosen half-yearly out of every kirk-session, compose a presbytery. They meet in the head town and choose their moderator, who must be a minister, half-yearly; from hence appeals lie to provincial synods, which are composed of several adjacent presbyteries; two, three, four, to eight—there are fifteen in all. The members are, a minister and a ruling elder out of every parish. These synods meet twice a year, at the principal town of their bounds. They choose a moderator, who is their prolocutor. The acts of the synods are subject to the review of the general assembly, the dernier resort of the kirk of Scotland. It consists of commissioners from presbyteries, royal burghs, and universities. A presbytery of twelve ministers sends two ministers and one ruling elder; a presbytery of between twelve and eighteen sends three, and one ruling elder; of between eighteen and twenty-four sends four, and two ruling elders; of twenty-four sends five, and two elders; every royal burgh sends one elder, and Edinburgh two; every university sends one commissioner, usually a minister. The general assembly meets once a year, in the month of May, and is opened and adjourned, by the king's royal commissioner appointed for that purpose."

² Vol. Pamp. No. 4.

be sent from the speakers of both houses to the several counties of England, immediately to divide themselves into distinct presbyteries and classes; “they then appoint the elders and ministers of the several classes of the province of London, to hold their provincial assembly in the convocation-house of St. Paul’s in London, upon the first Monday in May next ensuing, and to adjourn their meetings *de die in diem*, and conclude them with adjournment to the next opportunity, according to the ordinance of parliament; but that no act shall pass or be valid in the said province of London, except it be done by the number of thirty-six present, or the major part of them, whereof twelve to be ministers, and twenty-four ruling elders. That in the classical meetings, that which shall be done by the major part present, shall be esteemed the act of the whole; but no act done by any classes shall be valid, unless it be done by the number of fifteen present, or the major part of them, whereof five be ministers and ten ruling elders.” So that the number of lay-elders in these assemblies was double to the number of ministers.

According to this appointment the first provincial assembly met at the convocation-house of St. Paul’s May 3, consisting of three ministers and six ruling elders from the several classes, in all about one hundred and eight persons; at their first session they chose the reverend Dr. Gouge prolocutor, who opened the assembly with a sermon at his own church in Blackfriars; the reverend Mr. Thomas Manton, Mr. Ralph Robinson, and Mr. Cardel, being appointed scribes. After their return to the convocation-house, a committee of seven ministers and fourteen ruling elders were chosen to consider of the business of the province.

The ministers were,

Rev. Mr. Whitaker Dr. Seaman Mr. Ed. Calamy	Rev. Mr. Spurstow Mr. Tuckney	Rev. Mr. Proffet Mr. Jackson.
---	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

The ruling elders were,

Sir Edward Popham Dr. Clarke Dr. Bastwicke Dr. Brinley Mr. Bence	Mr. Russel Mr. Baius Mr. Houghton Mr. Eyres Mr. Vaughan	Mr. Webbe Mr. English Col. Sowtonstall Mr. ———.
--	---	--

Any six to be a quorum, provided there be two ministers and four ruling elders. Their next meeting to be at Sion-college, May 6, at two in the afternoon.

At the second sessions, it was moved, that application be made to parliament, for liberty to remove the assembly from the convocation-house to some other place; and accordingly they were allowed to adjourn to any

place within the city or liberties of London, upon which they agreed upon Sion-college, where they continued to meet twice a week to the end of the year 1659, as appears by a manuscript of the late Mr. Grange, now in Sion-college library.

Before the adjournment from the convocation-house at St. Paul's, they came to the following resolutions; Resolved,

1. That the provincial assembly shall meet twice every week, Mondays and Thursdays.

2. That the moderator for the time being shall begin and end every session with prayer.

3. When a new moderator is to be chosen, the senior minister shall preside.

4. The moderator shall be subject to the censure of the majority of the assembly, in case of complaint, and shall leave the chair while the complaint is debating, and the senior minister shall preside.

5. Every one that speaks shall direct his speech to the moderator, and be uncovered.

6. No man shall speak above three times to the same question at one sessions.

7. When any business is before the assembly relating to any particular member, he shall withdraw, if desired by the majority.

8. After the assembly is set, no member shall withdraw without leave.

9. The names of the members present shall be recorded by the scribes.

Every provincial assembly was dissolved in course at the end of six months, when notice was given to the several classes to return new representatives, but it was an ill omen upon them, that their meetings were interrupted almost the whole summer, by reason of the distraction of the times.

The second provincial assembly met November 8, Dr. Seaman moderator, and presented a petition to the parliament in a body January 11, in which they humbly pray,

1. "That the number of delegates to the provincial assembly may be enlarged, because they found it difficult sometimes to make up the number of thirty-six.

2. "That the houses would quicken the settlement of those classes [in London] that were not yet formed, which they say were four.

3. "That some more effectual encouragement may be provided for a learned ministry.

4. "That effectual provision may be made against clandestine marriages, for the punishment of fornication, adultery, and such uncleanness as is not fit to be named.

5. "That church-censures may be so established, that scandalous persons may be effectually excluded from church-communion."

The parliament received them with respect, and promised to take the matter of the petition into consideration, which was all that was done in the affair.

But besides the provincial assembly, it has been remembered, that the London clergy had their weekly meetings at Sion-college, to consult about church affairs, in one of which they agreed, since they could do no more, to bear their public testimony against the errors of the times; and accordingly they published a treatise, entitled, “A testimony to the truth of Jesus Christ, and to our solemn league and covenant; as also against the errors, heresies, and blasphemies, of these times, and the toleration of them; to which is added a catalogue of the said errors,” &c. dated from Sion-college, December 14, 1647, and subscribed by fifty-eight of the most eminent pastors in London, of whom seventeen were of the assembly of divines. Some time after the ministers of Gloucestershire published their concurrence with the London ministers, subscribed by sixty-four names; the ministers of the province of Lancashire by eighty-four; the Devonshire ministers by eighty-three; and the Somerset ministers by seventy-one.

The London ministers, in their first article, “touching matters of doctrine, declare their assent to the Westminster assembly’s confession of faith, and heartily desire it may receive the sanction of authority, as the joint confession of faith of the three kingdoms, in pursuance of the covenant.”

Touching heresies and errors, they declare their detestation and abhorrence of these following, among; others,

1. “That the Holy Scriptures are not of divine authority, and the only rule of faith.¹

2. “That God hath a bodily shape; that God is the name of a person; and that God is the author of sin, having a greater hand in it than men themselves.²

3. “That there is not a trinity of persons in the Godhead; that the Son is not co-equal with the Father; and that the Holy Ghost is only a ministering spirit.³

4. “That God has not elected some to salvation from eternity, and rejected or reprobated others; and, that no man shall perish in hell for Adam’s sin.⁴

5. “That Christ died for the sins of all mankind; that the benefits of his death were intended for all; and, that natural men may do such things as whereunto God has by way of promise annexed grace and acceptance.¹

¹ L. Clarkson. Biddle, p. 6.

² Crisp, Eaton, Saltmarsh.

³ Paul Best. Biddle, p. 8.

⁴ Fulness of God’s Love to Mankind, by L. S.

6. “That man hath a free will and power in himself to repent, to believe, to obey the gospel, and do everything that God requires to salvation.²

7. “That faith is not a supernatural grace, and that faithful actions are the only things by which a man is justified.³

8. “That the moral law is not the rule of life; that believers are as clean from sin as Christ himself; that such have no occasion to pray for pardon of sin; that God sees no sin in his people, nor does he ever chastise them for it.⁴

9. “That there is no church, nor sacraments, nor sabbath—the opinions of the Seekers, now called Quakers.⁵

10. “That the children of believers ought not to be baptized, nor baptism continued among Christians; that the meaning of the third commandment is, Thou shalt not forswear thyself.⁶

11. “That persons of the next kindred may marry; and that indisposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind, arising from natural causes, are a just reason of divorce.⁷

12. “That the soul of man is mortal; that it sleeps with the body; and, that there is neither heaven nor hell till the day of judgment.”⁸

The last error they witness against, and in which all agree, is called the “error of toleration,⁹ patronising and promoting all other errors, heresies, and blasphemies, whatsoever, under the grossly abused notion of liberty of conscience;” and here they complain as a very great grievance, “that men should have liberty to worship God in that way and manner as shall appear to them most agreeable to the word of God; and no man be punished or discountenanced by authority for the same; and, that an enforced uniformity of religion throughout a nation or state confounds the civil and religious, and denies the very principles of Christianity and civility.”¹⁰

They then bear their testimony to the covenant, and to the divine right of presbytery. They lament the imperfect settlement of their discipline by the parliament, and lay the foundation of all their calamities in the countenancing of a public and general toleration, and conclude thus: “Upon all these considerations, we the ministers of Jesus Christ do hereby testify to

¹ Hammond’s Pract. Cat. J. Goodwin, p. 149.

² J. Goodwin.

³ Ham.

⁴ Randal, John Simpson.

⁵ Saltmarsh, Smoak in the Temple, p. 17.

⁶ Tombes.

⁷ Saltmarsh. Ham. Milton, p. 19.

⁸ P. 20. Man’s Mortality, by R. O.

⁹ Mr. Emlyn justly observes, “that the principle of the admired assembly’s larger catechism, under the second commandment, is, that it forbids toleration of all false religion.” Emlyn’s Works, vol. 1. p. 60. of the narrative edition of 1746. — ED.

¹⁰ Bloody Tenet. Five Holland Ministers, p. 22.

our flocks, to all the kingdom, and to the reformed world, our great dislike of prelacy, Erastianism, Brownism, and Independency; and our utter abhorrence of anti-Scripturism, Popery, Arianism, Socinianism, Arminianism, Antinomianism, Anabaptism, Libertinism, and Familism; and that we detest the forementioned toleration, so much pursued and endeavoured in this kingdom, accounting it unlawful and pernicious.” What sad work would these divines-have made, had the sword of the magistrate been at their disposal!¹

The principal authors, from whom these errors were collected, are mentioned in the margin; two of whom determined to vindicate the citations out of their books: Dr. Hammond published a vindication of three passages in his Practical Catechism, from the censures of the London ministers; in which he very justly complains of the hard names with which the ministers load the opinions they reject, as “abominable errors, damnable heresies, horrid blasphemies, many of which are destructive of the fundamentals of Christianity, and all of them repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, the scandal and offence of the reformed churches abroad, and the unparalleled reproach of this church and nation; and, in a word, the dregs and spawn of those old cursed heresies which have been already condemned.” The doctor then recites his three passages: the first concerning universal redemption; the second concerning faith’s being the condition of our justification; and the third concerning the interpretation of the third commandment; and avers them all to be true, and agreeable to the doctrine of the church of England. In conclusion the doctor desires this favour, that either the first subscriber, Mr. J. Downham, who licensed his catechism for the press, or else Dr. Gouge or Mr. Gataker, who are foremost in the second rank, or some other persons of learning, Christianity, and candour, would afford him their patience, personally and by fair discourse, or any other Christian way, to debate the truth of these assertions, for which he will wait their leisure. Dated from Oxford, January 24, 1647–8, but nobody thought fit to accept the challenge.

Mr. John Goodwin was a learned divine, and a smart disputant, but of a peculiar mould, being a republican, an Independent, and a thorough Arminian; he had been vicar of Coleman-street, whence he was ejected in the year

¹ It deserves to be mentioned here, as a fact remarkable in itself, and honourable to the assembly at Westminster, that, notwithstanding the zeal expressed against toleration, the confession of faith it drew up was not made the legal standard of orthodoxy. It was not subscribed by any member of that assembly, except by the prolocutor, assessors, and clerks. Nor till forty years after was a subscription or assent to it required of any layman or minister, as a term of Christian communion. And Mr. Nye, a member of the assembly, informs us, when the Scots commissioners proposed, that the answers in the shorter catechism should be subscribed by all the members, the motion was rejected; after a considerable number in the assembly had shown it was an unwarrantable imposition. *Conscientious Nonconformity*, printed for Noon, 1737, p. 77. *The Religious Establishment in Scotland Examined*, 1771, p. 101. —ED.

1645, by the committee for plundered ministers, because he refused to baptize the children of his parishioners promiscuously, and to administer the sacrament to his whole parish. He had published several large and learned books; as, *The Divine Authority of the Scriptures*; *Redemption Redeemed*; *A Treatise of Justification*; and, *An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter to the Romans*;—out of which the above-mentioned exceptions were taken. This divine, taking it amiss to be marked for a heretic, challenged any of the London clergy to a disputation, as thinking it a very unrighteous method to condemn opinions before they had been confuted. Mr. William Jenkins, at that time a warm and zealous Presbyterian, though afterward softened into more catholic principles, entered the lists with our author, in a pamphlet entitled, “*The busy bishop*.” To which the other replied, in a book entitled, “*The novice presbyter instructed*.” By some passages in which, one may discover the angry spirit of the times.

Mr. Jenkins had complained that the orthodox clergy “had short commons, and were under the cross, whereas the sectaries met with the greatest encouragement. To which Mr. Goodwin replies, “If by orthodox ministers, he means those of the adored order of presbytery, with what face can he say that they are under the cross? Is not the whole English element of church-livings offered up by the state to their service? Are not all the benefices of the kingdom appropriated to their order? And all others thrust out of doors to make room for them? Must they feed with hecatombs every day, or else complain of short commons? Or is Mr. Jenkins of Mar. Crassus’s mind, who would have no one accounted rich, unless he could maintain an army with his revenue? In what sense can he affirm the Presbyterian clergy to be under the cross? Are they under the cross who are scarce under the crown? who are carried by authority upon eagles’ wings: over whom the parliament itself rejoices to do good; heaping ordinance upon ordinance to advance both them and their livings together. But certainly there is something that Mr. Jenkins calls a cross which few men know by that name, but those who are baptized into the spirit of high presbytery; for the cross he speaks of is no other than this, that his orthodox brethren have not the power to do all the evil that is in their hearts against a quiet, peaceable, harmless generation of men, of whom they are jealous, lest they should take their kingdom from them. How can this writer say, that the Independent preachers meet with encouragement, and are under worldly glory? Does he account it matter of worldly glory, to be discountenanced by the state, to be declared incapable of those favours and privileges which other ministers in the land enjoy; to be sequestered from their livings, and to be thrust into holes and corners; to be represented both to the magistrate and people, as sectaries, schismatics, erroneous, heretical, factious, troublesome, dangerous to the state, and what not? If this be worldly glory, then may the preachers, against whom Mr.

Jenkins writes, be truly said to be under worldly glory.” Old Mr. Vicars and some others carried on the controversy, but their writings are not worth remembering; especially since the English Presbyterians of the present age have openly renounced and disavowed their principles.

To return to more public affairs. Hitherto the army had acted in perfect subordination to the parliament; but the war being over, and the king a prisoner, the great difficulty was to settle the nation upon such a foot as might content the several parties, or bring them at least to acquiesce; this was the rock upon which they split, and which in the end proved the ruin of their cause. To give light to this affair it will be proper to consider the separate views of the king, the parliament, and the army.

The royal party being broken, and the king a prisoner, his majesty had no prospect of recovering his throne but by dividing his enemies, in order to the making the best terms with them he could; the Presbyterians being in league with the Scots nation, were most numerous and powerful; but that which rendered their agreement with the king impracticable, was his majesty’s zealous attachment to this point, that episcopal government was essential to Christianity, and that he was bound by his coronation-oath to maintain it; whereas the others held themselves equally bound by their solemn league and covenant to abolish episcopacy, and establish presbytery in its room. Both parties were immovable, and therefore irreconcilable. His majesty’s agreement with the army was more open and practicable, because they would have set aside the covenant, and obliged the parliament to tolerate episcopal government as well as the sectaries; but the king could never forgive those officers who had destroyed his armies, and driven him out of the field: though he dreaded their military valour, he had a very mean opinion of their politics, and therefore affected to play them against the parliament, hoping to take advantage of their divisions, and establish himself upon the ruins of both; for it was his majesty’s maxim, which he did not scruple to avow, that neither party could subsist without him, and that those must be ruined whom he abandoned. By which unhappy principle he lost his interest, both in the parliament and army, and (as bishop Kennet observes) laid the foundation of his ruin.

The Presbyterians were no less unhappy in an imagination, that as the majority of the house of commons, with the city of London, and the whole Scots nation, were firmly attached to their interest, no opposition could stand before them, and therefore would abate nothing of their demands, nor hearken to any other terms of accommodation with the king, than those of the covenant, which were the entire abolishing of prelacy, and the establishing presbyterian uniformity throughout both kingdoms, with an absolute extirpation of all sectaries whatsoever. This was not only an effectual bar to their union with the king (as has been observed,) but awakened the jealousy

of the army, who were thoroughly convinced, that when the Presbyterians were in the legal possession of their demands, they would exercise equal tyranny over the consciences of men with the bishops; and indeed nothing less was to be expected, considering their steady adherence to the covenant in all their treaties, their efforts in parliament to get the power of the keys into their own hands, their frequent addresses for the suppressing all sectaries by the civil authority, and their declarations both from the pulpit and press, against toleration and liberty of conscience. In all their treaties with the king, even to that in the Isle of Wight (except when the army was in possession of the cities of London and Westminster,) this was one article of peace, "That an effectual course be taken by act of parliament, and all other ways needful or expedient, for suppressing the opinions of the Independents, and all other sectaries." To which his majesty had agreed in his private treaty with the Scots in the Isle of Wight, signed December 27, so that the army was left unsatisfied.

For although there were some few Presbyterians in the army, the greatest part consisted of Independents, Anabaptists, and men of unsettled principles in religion, who, for want of regular chaplains to their regiments, had used their own talents among themselves in religious exercises. The Scots treaty of the Isle of Wight says, the army was made up of Anti-Trinitarians, Arians, Socinians, Anti-Scripturists, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Arminians, Familists, Brownists, Separatists, Independents, Libertines, Seekers, &c.

Mr. Rapin, contrary to the testimony of all other writers, calls them all Independents, and represents the controversy between the parliament and them as a dispute, whether Presbytery or Independency should be uppermost; whereas the grand controversy was, Presbytery with a toleration, or without one. The army consented that Presbytery should be the national religion, but insisted upon a toleration of all Christians in the enjoyment of all their civil and religious rights. This, says lord Clarendon, was their great charter, and till they had obtained it by a legal settlement, they agreed not to lay down their arms: they had fought the parliament's battles, and therefore thought it unreasonable to be told openly, if they could not comply with the Presbyterian settlement, they must expect to be punished as sectaries, and driven out of the land. To avoid this, they treated separately with the king, both before and after they had him in their bands; and when they apprehended he did not deal sincerely with them, they made proposals to the parliament to establish the Presbyterian discipline, with a toleration to all Protestants, without him; but when they found the Presbyterians, even in their last treaty with the king, in the year 1648, insisted upon the Presbyterian uniformity, without making the least provision for that liberty of conscience they had been contending for, they were exasperated and grew outrageous; they seized his majesty's person a second time, and having purged

the house of commons in a most arbitrary manner, of all who were not disposed to their desperate measures, they blew up the whole constitution, and buried king, parliament, and presbytery in its ruins. This was not in their original intention, nor the result of any set of religious principles they embraced, as Rapin insinuates, but was a violence resulting from despair, to which they had been driven by a series of disappointments, and a train of mistaken conduct in the royalists and Presbyterians.

We left the king the beginning of the spring at his house at Holmby, where he continued under an easy restraint from the 16th of February to the 4th of June following. The war being ended, the houses attempted to get rid of the army, by offering six months' pay, and six weeks' advance to as many as would go over to Ireland; and by voting, that the remainder should be disbanded, with an act of indemnity for all hostilities committed by them, in pursuance of the powers vested in them by parliament; but the army, being apprehensive that the Presbyterians would make peace with the king, upon the foot of covenant-uniformity, and without a toleration, resolved to secure this as a kind of preliminary point; for which purpose they chose a council of officers, and a committee of agitators, consisting of two inferior officers out of each regiment, to manage their affairs; these met in distinct bodies, like the two houses of parliament, and came to the following resolutions, which they sent to Westminster by three of their number, who delivered them in at the bar of the house: "That they would not disband without their arrears, nor without full provision for liberty of conscience: that they did not look upon themselves as a band of janizaries, but as volunteers, that had been fighting for the liberties of the nation, of which they were a part, and that they were resolved to see those ends secured."¹ It was moved in the house, that the messengers might be committed to the Tower; but, after a long debate, they were dismissed only with a reprimand for meddling in affairs of state, and for presuming to offer a petition to parliament without their general. Upon this the officers sent their petition by the general himself, but the parliament, instead of taking it into consideration, ordered, May 21, that all who would not list for the Irish service, should be immediately paid off and disbanded; upon which the officers, seeing the snare that was laid for them, bound themselves and the army by an engagement, May 29, not to disband till the grievances above mentioned were redressed. Whereupon the two houses ordered lieutenant-general Cromwell, who was then in town, and suspected to be at the head of these counsels, to be seized; but being advertised of the design, he made his escape to the army. They then voted the petition seditious, and all those traitors who had promoted it; and having sent a message to the general, to re-

¹ Rushworth, vol. 6. p. 485. 498. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 529, folio ed.

move the army farther from London, they raised the city trained-bands, and determined to put an end to the power of the army by a speedy conclusion of peace with the king.

His majesty's answer to the propositions at Newcastle were read in the house May 18, in which "he agrees to settle the Presbyterian government for three years—to ratify the assembly of divines at Westminster, proposing a few of his own clergy to consider what government to settle afterward—he yields the militia for ten years—desires ministers of his own to satisfy him about the covenant—consents to the act against Papists—and to an act of oblivion—and desires to come to London, in order to give the parliament satisfaction upon the other articles." Two days after the lords voted, that the king be removed to his house at Oatlands, and that it be immediately fitted for his reception.

Things being come to this crisis, the agitators considered, that the king being the prize contended for, whoever had him in their power must be masters of the peace, and make their own terms; they therefore resolved, by the advice and direction of lieutenant-general Cromwell, to get possession of his majesty's person, which they accomplished by a bold stratagem, in the night of June 4, with very little opposition from his attendants or guards; cornet Joyce, at the head of fifty resolute horse, having secured the avenues to Holmby-house, entered with two or three of his company, and going to the king's chamber, acquainted him with his design of carrying him to the army at Newmarket; his majesty being surprised at so unexpected a visit, and so late at night, asked for his commission, who pointed to his troops drawn up before the gates; his majesty answered, it was very legible; and finding it in vain to resist, consented to go with the cornet next morning, on promise of safety to his person, and that he should not be forced to anything against his conscience; the chief officers of the army met his majesty at Childerley, four miles from Cambridge, and were admitted to kiss his hand; from thence he was removed to Newmarket, where he took the diversion of the heath, had the liberty of four of his own chaplains to wait upon him, and was attended with all due ceremony and respect; Cromwell, being heard to say among his friends, that "now he had got the king into his hands he had the parliament in his pocket."¹

The two houses received the news of the king's being carried off to the army with the utmost surprise and astonishment; the whole city was in confusion, and all persons within the lines of communication ordered to arms; the lobby at Westminster was thronged with the disbanded officers of the earl of Essex's army offering their service to the parliament, for every one imagined the army would be at the gates of the city in a few hours; when

¹ Rushworth, p. 545. 549. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 530, folio ed.

their panic was a little abated, commissioners were sent to the general, not to advance within forty miles of London; but being already at St. Alban's, the general promised not to march his army nearer without due notice;¹ and assured the two houses, that they would not oppose the presbyterial government, nor set up the Independent; but only insisted that some effectual course might be taken, that such who upon conscientious grounds differed from the establishment, might not be debarred from the common rights, liberties, or benefits, belonging equally to all, while they lived soberly and inoffensively towards others, and peaceably and faithfully towards the state.² June 10, another letter was sent to the lord-mayor, aldermen, and common-council, of London, signed by Fairfax, Cromwell, and twelve other officers, assuring them, "they intended no alteration of the civil government; nor to interrupt the settlement of presbytery; nor to introduce a licentious liberty, under colour of obtaining ease for tender consciences, but that when the state had made a settlement they would submit or suffer. They wished that every peaceable subject might have liberty and encouragement, for the obtaining which (say they) we are drawing near the city.—We seek the good of all, and shall wait for a time to see if these things may be settled without us, and then we will embark for Ireland."³—The commons took no notice of these remonstrances, but declared in print, that his majesty was a prisoner, and barbarously used, because their commissioners could have no access to him, but in the presence of some officers; the army replied, "that all suggestions of that nature were absolutely false, and contrary to their principles, which are most clearly for a general right and just freedom to all men, and therefore upon this occasion they declare to the world, that they desire the same for the king, and others of his party, so far as can consist with common right and freedom, and with the security of the same for the future. And we do clearly profess (say they) that we do not see how there can be any peace to this kingdom firm or lasting, without a due provision for the rights, quiet, and immunity, of his majesty, his royal family, and his late partakers; and herein we think, that tender and equitable dealings (as supposing their cases had been ours), and a spirit of common love and justice diffusing itself to the good and preservation of all, will make the most glorious conquest over their hearts, to make them, and the whole people of the land, lasting friends."⁴

The leading members of the Presbyterian party in the house of commons could not contain themselves within any reasonable bounds at these proceedings; they said it was insufferable that the parliament, instead of

¹ Rushworth, p. 546. 561. 589, &c.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 379. 531.

³ Rushworth, p. 554.

⁴ Ibid. p. 589, 590.

treating with the king, should be obliged to treat with their own servants, and therefore advised raising a new army, and opposing force with force, till those who had the king in their custody should submit to their superiors, and deliver him back. On the other hand, the officers and agitators resolved to get rid of these resolute gentlemen, and therefore impeached eleven of the members of high treason, June 16, for obstructing the business of Ireland; for acting against the army and against the laws and liberties of the subject, &c. and desired they might be suspended from the house till they were legally acquitted;¹ their names were Denzil Hollis, esq., sir Phil. Stapleton, sir William Lewis, sir John Clotworthy, sir William Waller, sir John Maynard, major-general Massey, Mr. Glyn recorder, colonel Walter Long, colonel Edward Hartley, Anthony Nichols, esq. The commons not only rejected their impeachment, but ordered the king to be brought to Richmond, and that four full companies of the militia should guard the two houses. This quickened the resentments of the army, who sent the following proposals, among others, June 23, “—That the king's coming to Richmond be suspended;—that no place be appointed for his residence nearer London than the parliament will allow the quarters of the army;—that the impeached members be sequestered the house;—that the multitude of soldiers that flock together about the city be dispersed; and that no new forces be raised, nor any preparations made for a new war.”² If these particulars are not complied within a week's time, they declare they will march to London, and do themselves justice. The houses, being terrified with the approach of the army, agreed to content them for the present, in order to gain time; and the impeached members having desired leave to withdraw, retired first into the city, and after some time left the kingdom. The other requests of the army were also complied with; whereupon, after returning thanks to the houses, they retreated to Wickham, and appointed commissioners to settle all remaining differences with the parliament.³

But the city of London, by the influence of the impeached members, kindled into a flame; for the parliament, by an ordinance of May 4, having put the nomination of the officers of the militia into the hands of the common-council, these had discharged the old ones, and put in such as they could confide in for opposing the army, and establishing uniformity according to the covenant; the officers in order to defeat their design insisted, that the ordinance of May 4 be repealed, and the militia put into the hands of those who had conducted it during the course of the late war.⁴ The houses, with much reluctance, consented to the repeal July 23, which alarmed the

¹ Ibid. p. 570. 572. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 531.

² Rushworth, p. 585.

³ Whitelocke, p. 261. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 532.

⁴ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 533

citizens, and occasioned those tumults which brought upon them the very mischiefs they were afraid of. Denzil Hollis, with the other impeached members who were retired into the city, prevailed with the common-council to oppose the repeal, and petition the house, that the ordinance of May 4 might remain in full force. At the same time some citizens met at Skinner's-hall, and subscribed a solemn engagement to endeavour with the hazard of their lives to procure a "personal treaty with the king;—that he might return to his two houses with honour and safety;—that his majesty's concessions of May 11 might be confirmed, and the militia continue in the hands of the present committee."¹ How vain was all this bustle, when they knew the king was in the custody of those who would pay no regard to their demands! The houses indeed forbade the signing of the engagement by sound of trumpet; but such was the misguided zeal of the citizens, that they held assemblies, enlisted soldiers, and gave them orders to be ready on the first notice.

The parliament was now in great perplexity, considering the impossibility of contenting the Presbyterians and the army at the same time; while the citizens, resolved to carry their point by one method or another, went up to Westminster July 26, with such a number of apprentices and young men, as terrified the houses by their tumultuous and insolent behaviour; for they would scarce suffer the door to be shut; some thrust themselves into the house with their hats on, crying out, Vote, vote; and when the speaker would have left the chair to put an end to the confusion, they obliged him to return, till the militia was settled to their mind, and the king voted to come to London.² This, says Mr. Baxter, looked like a force upon the parliament; and indeed both houses were so terrified and pressed between the city Presbyterians on one side, and the army on the other, that they adjourned immediately from Monday to Friday, in which interval the earl of Manchester, speaker of the house of lords, with eight peers and the speaker of the house of commons, with about a hundred members,³ withdrew privately from the city, and joined the army;—a surprising event in their favour! The officers received them with the utmost satisfaction and transport, paying them all imaginable honours, and assuring them, that they would reestablish them in their full power, or die in the attempt. There must surely have been some very pressing reasons for this conduct,⁴ otherwise so many zealous Presby-

¹ Rushworth, p. 637. Rapin, vol 2. p. 533, 534.

² Rushworth, p. 642. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 534.

³ Dr. Zach. Grey says there was but fifty-nine, but I do not know his authority.—ED.

⁴ Rapin, as well as Mr. Neal, expresses his surprise at this secession of these members of parliament: he supposes, that it proceeded from a disapprobation of the measures pursued by their brethren and the common-council of London; and from an apprehension, that they would be infallibly oppressed by the army. By joining the army they sought their security from the ruin which threatened their own party; and, says Mr. Hume, "paid their

terians, as were most of the members who quitted the parliament-house, would not have had recourse to the protection of the army. Lord Clarendon believes, that they apprehended the army designed to restore the king to all his rights at this time, and that they were willing to avoid his majesty's vengeance, by concurring with them in his restoration, which is not unlikely, if they could have brought him to their terms.

However, the Presbyterian members that remained in London assembled on Friday according to adjournment, and having chosen a new speaker, voted that the king should come to London;—that the eleven impeached members should be restored;—that a committee of safety should join the city-militia;—and that forces should be immediately raised under the command of Waller, Massey, and Poyntz; in all which they appeared so resolute, that no man could imagine but either that they had the king at their disposal, or intended a brave and valiant defence of the city.¹ The common-council gave orders for the trained-bands to repair to the works, and for all capable of bearing arms to appear at the places of rendezvous. Massey, Waller, and Poyntz, were also busy in forming regiments and companies; and the committee of the militia were empowered to punish such as did not repair to their colours. At the same time they wrote to their brethren in Scotland, to return with their army immediately to their assistance; but alas! they were at too great a distance; however, they published a declaration in the name of the kirk and whole kingdom, August 13, wherein they engage, by a solemn oath, to establish the Presbyterian government in England;—to redeem his majesty out of the hands of schismatics, and place him at the head of his parliament with honour;—to vindicate the honour of the eleven impeached members, and to settle the privileges of parliament against the overawing power of the army. A little after they declared against toleration and liberty of conscience, resolving to the last man to stand by the covenant, whatever the English parliament might submit to.

Pursuant to the order of the two houses, the general had removed his head-quarters above forty miles from the city, till, upon the representation of the members, who fled to them for protection from the outrageous violence of the city-mob, they resolved to push their advantage, and bring the

court in time to that authority, which began to predominate in the nation." What Whitelocke reports concerning the reason which the earls of Warwick, Manchester, &c. assigned for their conduct, appears to have escaped the attention of these writers. He says, that they sent to the general to acquaint him, "that they had quitted the parliament, for that there was no free-sitting for them, and they cast themselves into his protection." Memorials, p. 265. Dr. Grey, in his Appendix, No. 72, has confirmed this account of the matter, by giving at length their letter to sir Thomas Fairfax, signed by the speaker of the house of lords and eight peers, and by the speaker and fifty-eight of the commons. Mr. Neal, and since him Mrs. Macaulay, says, a hundred commoners seceded. All, probably, did not sign the letter. Dr. Grey is rather severe here upon our author.—ED.

¹ Rapin, vol. 2.p. 399. 534. Rushworth, p. 737.

mutineers to justice; accordingly they resolved to march to London, and rendezvous the whole army on Hounslow-heath, August 3, to the number of twenty thousand men, with a suitable train of artillery, accompanied with fourteen peers, and about one hundred members of the house of commons.¹ The citizens were no sooner informed of this, than their courage sunk at once, and, instead of defending the city, they ordered the militia to retire from the lines, and sent their submission to the general, promising to open their passes, and give all assistance to the replacing of those members who had withdrawn to the army. August 6, being appointed for this service, the mayor and aldermen met the general at Hyde-park with a present of a gold cup, beseeching him to excuse what had been amiss; but his excellency refused the present, and having dismissed them with very little ceremony, conducted the members to their seats in parliament, who immediately voted all proceedings in their absence void, and gave thanks to the army for their safe conduct.² Next day the army marched through the city without any disorder, and constituted colonel Titeburn lieutenant of the Tower, contrary to the request of the lord-mayor and citizens; the militia was changed, and put into the hands of the old officers who had conducted it before; the fortifications and lines of circumvallation about the city were levelled, and sundry peers, who had been at the head of the late tumults, were impeached of high treason, as the earl of Suffolk, Middlesex, Lincoln, lord Willoughby of Parham, Hudson, &c.; the lord-mayor and some of the principal citizens were sent to the Tower; and it was resolved to purge the house of all who had been active in the late unhappy riot; which put a full period to the Presbyterian power for the present; and the army being quartered near the city all the next winter, there was a council of officers at their head-quarters at Putney, whose debates and resolutions had, no doubt, a very powerful influence upon the resolutions of the two houses.

The odium of this grand revolution, by which the army became masters of the city of London, and of the parliament itself, fell chiefly on the Presbyterians themselves, whose intemperate zeal for covenant-uniformity carried them to very impolitic excesses. The sermons of their ministers were filled with invective against the army while at a distance; in their public prayers they entreated the Almighty to incline the hearts of the Scots to return to their relief; and the conversation of their people was riotous and disorderly; however, lest the weight of this revolution should fall too heavily on the London ministers,³ as the chief incendiaries of the people, they wisely prepared a vindication of themselves, and published it four days before

¹ Rushworth, p. 745. 750.

² Ibid. p. 751. 756.

³ The assembly of divines also, Dr. Grey informs us, presented a petition for peace: which he has preserved, from the MSS. of Dr. Williams, no. 74 of his Appendix.—ED.

the army entered the city; it was dated from Sion-college, August 2, 1647, and is to this purpose:

“We the ministers of London, whose names are subscribed, do profess, in the presence of the Searcher of all hearts,

1. “That we have never done anything purposely and wittingly to engage the city against the army, or the army against the city, but have sincerely and faithfully endeavoured to prevent it.

2. “That seeing both the parliament and city have declared the necessity of putting the city into a present posture of defence, yet protesting against any desires of a new war, and thereupon have called upon us to stir up the people to prepare for their defence; we accordingly have done and shall do our duty therein, that the people may be encouraged to their own just and necessary preservation.

3. “But withal, we profess our abhorrence of the shedding any blood on either side; and we humbly pray all whom it may concern, that they will be very careful in preventing it by a seasonable treaty.”

Signed by about twenty of the London ministers, and presented to a committee of both houses, sitting at Guildhall.

Let the reader now pause a little, and judge of the authors of this grand revolution, which brought the parliament under the power of the army, and how far the Presbyterian ministers were concerned in it. Mr. Baxter, in a very angry style, lays all the blame at the door of the Independents. “A few dissenting members of the Westminster synod (says he) began all this, and carried it far on. Afterward they increased, and others joined them, who partly by stiffness, and partly by policy, increased our flames, and kept open our wounds, as if there had been none but they considerable in the world; and having an army, and city-agents fit to second them, effectually hindered all remedy, till they had dashed all into pieces as a broken glass. One would have thought, that if all their opinions had been certainly true, and their church-order good, yet the interest of Christ and the souls of men, and of greater truths, should have been so regarded by the dividers in England, as that the safety of all these should have been preferred, and not all ruined, rather than their way should want its carnal arm and liberty; and that they should not tear the government of Christ all to pieces rather than it should want their lace.”¹ I am far from clearing the Independents from all manner of blame in their conduct; their principles might be too narrow and mistaken in some points, and their zeal for Christian liberty betray them into some imprudences. But on which side was the stiffness? on theirs who only desired a peaceable toleration; or, on theirs who were determined to make the whole nation stoop to Presbyterian uniformity? Were not these

¹ Abridg. p. 97.

the men who kept open the church's wounds? Had their discipline been ever so good, yet certainly they might have had some regard to men of piety and virtue, who had not equal discernment with themselves; could they not be content with being the established religion, and having most of the livings of the kingdom divided among them, without trampling on the religious rights of mankind, by enforcing an absolute uniformity, which can never be maintained but on the ruins of a good conscience, and therefore is no means of promoting the true interest of Christ and salvation of souls? Mr. Baxter had milder sentiments in his latter days; and it is for the honour of the present generation of those commonly called Presbyterians, that they have not only abandoned and renounced these servile doctrines,¹ but have appeared in defence of the civil and religious liberties of mankind' upon the most solid and generous principles.

His majesty was obliged all this time to attend the removes of the army: from Newmarket he came to Royston, June 24; from thence to Hatfield; from thence to Windsor, and two days after to Caversham, where he had the pleasure of conversing with his children. But when the city of London threatened a new war, his majesty was removed to a greater distance; about the middle of July he was at Maidenhead; and towards the end of the month at Latimer's in Buckinghamshire; when the army had got possession of the city they brought his majesty back to Oatlands, August 14, and two days after to Hampton-court, where he appeared in state and splendour about three months, being attended by the proper officers of the court, and a vast resort of people both from city and country.

¹ "To know whether the Presbyterians have indeed abandoned their persecuting principles (says bishop Warburton), we should see them under an establishment. It is no wonder, that a tolerated sect should espouse those principles of Christian liberty which support their toleration. Now the Scottish Presbyterians are established, and we find they still adhere to the old principle of intolerance." His lordship's reflections are too well founded in fact and experience. The recent persecution of Dr. M'Gill for his valuable and guarded Essay on the Death of Christ, may be adduced as a new proof of the intolerance of Scotch Presbyterianism. But, strictly speaking, Presbyterianism hath no existence amongst the English dissenters; who form so many independent societies. The name is, indeed, applied to one part of them; but they are invested with no power but what arises from the management of a fund for the assistance of small congregations. This they are known to direct on a truly liberal plan, without demanding subscription to any articles, or making any inquisition into the sentiments, on doctrine or discipline, of the ministers or churches to whom they grant exhibitions. And the writings of those who have been called Presbyterians, the bishop could not but know, were most able vindications of the principles of liberty. In this cause did a Browne, an Evans, a Grosvenor, a Chandler, and many others, argue and plead. His lordship's argument, I would add, applies to an extent to which it is conceived he did not wish to have it carried; it more than implies, that toleration and an establishment are incompatible; that when once the tolerated are possessed of power they of course become intolerant. If so, an establishment cannot exist without being inimical to the interests of truth and the rights of conscience. Could a severer reflection be passed on establishments, than is here conveyed by an episcopal pen?—ED.

While the king was with the army, lieutenant-general Cromwell and Ireton took sundry opportunities to confer with his majesty privately about his restoration. They offered to set him upon the throne with the freedom of his conscience upon the point of episcopacy, or lose their lives in the attempt, if he would consent to their proposals to the parliament, and bestow some particular preferments on themselves and a few of their friends, wishing that God would deal with them and their families according to their sincerity.¹ Nay, they engaged to indemnify his whole party, if they would be quiet.² Sir J. Berkley, the king's agent, entreated his majesty in the most importunate and submissive manner, considering the state of his affairs, to accept of the said proposals; but the king treated them with a haughty reserve, and said, if they intended an accommodation they would not impose such conditions upon him. Sir J. Berkley said, he should suspect they designed to abuse him if they had demanded less; and that a crown so near lost was never recovered on easier terms. But Mr. Ashburnham, who came with instructions from France, fell in with the king's humour, and encouraged him to stand his ground, relying upon an ill-judged maxim which his majesty had imbibed, and which his best friends could not make him depart from, viz. that it was in his power to turn the scale, and that the party must sink which he abandoned.³ This sealed his ruin, and made him play between both, till neither would trust him. When the parliament brought their propositions, he put them in mind of the offers of the army; and when the proposals of the latter were tendered in the most respectful manner, he put on a frown, and said, "I shall see you glad, ere long, to accept more equal terms; you cannot be without me; you will fall to ruin if I do not sustain you; no man shall suffer for my sake; the church must be established according to law—." The officers were confounded at this language. "Sir (says sir J. Berkley), you speak as if you had some secret strength, which, since you have concealed from me, I wish you had concealed from these men."⁴ After divers conferences of this kind to no purpose, Cromwell told him plainly, "Sir, we perceive you have a design to be arbitrator between the parliament and us; but we now design to be the same between your majesty and the parliament." This fluctuating temper (says bishop Kennet) was the king's ruin, which he repented of when it was too late. Mr. Whitelocke says, the king's bishops persuaded him against what he was inclined to in his own judgment, and thereby ruined him and themselves.⁵

¹ Dr. Grey fills, here, four pages with authorities to prove the insincerity and hypocrisy of Cromwell and Ireton: by which nothing that Mr. Neal had advanced above is invalidated.—ED.

² Dugdale's *Troubles of England*, p. 264.

³ Rushworth, p. 807. 810.

⁴ *History of the Stuarts*, p. 330.

⁵ *Memorials*, p. 271.

When the officers found they could make no impression on the king, and had discovered his secret correspondence with the queen, they withdrew from court, which raised suspicions in his majesty's mind of a secret design against his life, and put him on attempting to escape out of their hands. It is very certain that Cromwell withdrew his parole of honour for the king's safety, and sent him word, a few days before he left Hampton-court, that he would not be answerable any longer for what might befall him, which was owing to a discovery he had made of the king's insincerity in treating with him. Mr. Coke says, there was a report at that time, and he is confident that in time it will appear, that in the army's treaty with the king, Cromwell had made a private article of advantage for himself,¹ but his majesty not allowing himself to conclude anything without the queen, wrote her word, "that if he consented to those proposals, it would be easier to take off Cromwell afterward, than now he was at the head of the army."² Which letter Cromwell intercepted. Bishop Kennet says, "that it was reported, that Cromwell was to have £10,000 and a garter; and that the bargain had certainly taken effect, if the king had not made an apology to the queen, and sufficiently implied that he did it by constraint, and that when he was at liberty, and in power, he should think himself discharged from the obligation. This letter was sewed up in the skirt of a saddle to be sent to France; but Cromwell and Ireton, having information of it, went to an inn in Holborn, and seized the letter—." Dr. Lane of the commons frequently declared, "that he had seen this original letter, that he knew it to be the king's own hand, and that the contents were as above." Another writer says, that the letter mentioned his majesty's being courted by the Scots Presbyterians as well as the army, and that they that bid fairest for him should have him.³ Upon the discovery of this letter, Cromwell went to Mr. Ashburnham who attended the king's person, and told him, that he was now satisfied the king could not be trusted; that he had no confidence in the army, but was jealous of them and their officers—that he had treaties with the city Presbyterians, and with the Scots commissioners, to engage the nation again in blood, and that therefore he could not be answerable if anything fell out contrary to expectation. Sir Richard Baker, Mr. Coke, and others, are of opinion, that till this time Cromwell and Ireton were hearty and zealous for restoring the king, and opposing the levellers who began to arise in the army, but that after this discovery they forsook him, as did the rest of the chief officers, who seldom came to court: the guards also changed their language, and said that God had hardened the king's heart, and blinded his eyes.

¹ Detect, p. 323.

² Complete History, p. 270.

³ History of the Stuarts, p. 390.

Under these circumstances the infatuated king left Hampton-court, November 11, at night, and having crossed the Thames, took horse in company with sir J. Berkley, Mr. Leg, and Mr. Ashburnham, and next morning arrived at Titchfield-house, where he stayed while Leg went over to the Isle of Wight, to treat with colonel Hammond the governor about the safety of his person, who, without any treaty, brought the governor to the house where his majesty was, upon which the king said, he was betrayed; as indeed he was in all his affairs.”¹ Hammond carried him over to the Isle November 13, and after some time shut him up in Carisbrook-castle, where his majesty remained almost a year with one or two servants only, having little conversation with the world, and time sufficient to contemplate on the uncertainty of all human affairs, and on the miserable circumstances to which Divine Providence had suffered his own imprudent conduct to reduce him.

Let us now attend to the projects of the several parties for restoring the public tranquillity. As soon as the army had got possession of the city of London, they made the following proposals to the two houses. With regard to religion; “That an act be passed to take away all coercive power and jurisdiction of bishops extending to any civil penalties upon any.—That there be a repeal of all acts, or clauses of acts, enjoining the use of the Common Prayer, and imposing any penalty for neglect thereof, and for not coming to church, or for meeting elsewhere.—That the taking of the covenant be not enforced upon any, but that all orders and ordinances tending to that purpose be repealed.” With regard to the state, “—That the militia and great officers be disposed of by parliament for ten years, and after that the houses to nominate three, out of which the king to choose one.—That there be acts of indemnity and revocation of all declarations against the proceedings of parliament.—That the present unequal and troublesome and contentious way of ministers’ maintenance by tithes be considered of, and some remedy applied.—That none may be obliged to accuse themselves or relations in criminal causes; and no man’s life taken away under two witnesses.—That consideration be had of all statutes, laws or customs of corporations, imposing any oaths tending to molest or ensnare religious and peaceable people merely for nonconformity in religion.—That the arbitrary power given to committees, and deputy-lieutenants, be recalled.”²

After several debates upon these proposals with regard to religion, the lords agreed, October 13, “that the king be desired to give his consent to the settling the presbyterial government for three years, with a provision, that no person shall be liable to any penalty for nonconformity to the said government, or form of divine service; but such persons shall have liberty to

¹ Rushworth, p. 920, 960.

² Rushworth, p. 736. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 538, 539.

meet for the service and worship of God, and for exercise of religious duties and ordinances in any fit and convenient places, so as nothing be done by them to the disturbance of the peace of the kingdom. Provided this shall not be construed to extend to a toleration of the Popish religion, nor to exempt Popish recusants from any penalties imposed upon them for the exercise of the same. Nor shall it extend to the toleration of anything contrary to the principles of the Christian religion, contained in the Apostles' creed, as it is expounded in the fifteen first articles of the church of England, as they had been cleared and vindicated by the assembly of divines now sitting at Westminster; nor of anything contrary to such points of faith, for the ignorance whereof men are to be kept from the sacrament, according to the ordinance of October 20, 1645. Nor shall it extend to excuse any persons from the penalties of 1 Elizabeth, cap. 2, for not coming to hear the word of God on the Lord's day in any parish-church or chapel, unless he can show a reasonable cause for his absence, or that he was present to hear the word of God preached or expounded elsewhere."¹

The commons likewise agreed, "that presbytery be established till the end of the next sessions of parliament, or till the second sessions; that the tenths, and all other maintenance belonging to any church or chapel, shall be only for the use of them who can submit to the presbyterial government, and none other. The liberty of conscience shall extend to none who shall print, preach, or publish, contrary to the first fifteen articles of the thirty-nine, except the eighth, relating to the three creeds. That nothing-contained in this ordinance shall extend to Popish recusants."² October 14, they agreed further, "that such tender consciences should be freed, by way of indulgence, from the penalty of the statute for the Presbyterian government, for their nonconformity, who do meet in some other congregation for the worship of God on the Lord's day, and do nothing against the laws and peace of the kingdom, and that none others shall be freed from the penalty of the statute of Eliz. cap. 2." October 16, the commons voted, "that the indulgence granted to tender consciences should not extend to tolerate the use of common prayer in any part of the kingdom."³ Which was against the sense of the army, who were for a general indulgence, as appears from the declaration of the agitators, dated November 1, in which they say, that "matters of religion and the ways of God's worship, are not at all intrusted by us to any human power, because therein we cannot omit or exceed a tittle of what our consciences dictate to be the mind of God, without wilful sin; nevertheless, the public way of instructing the nation, so it be not com-

¹ Rushworth, p. 840.

² Rushworth, p. 841.

³ Ibid. p. 842.

pulsive, is left to their discretion.”¹ Here was a fair plan of accommodation, but no ordinance was brought into the house to confirm these resolutions. November 8, both houses agreed to the addition of some new propositions. As,

1. “For the due observation of the Lord’s day.
2. “Against innovations in religion.
3. “A new oath for the conviction of Papists.
4. “For the education of the children of Papists in the Protestant religion.
5. “Against pluralities.”

The proposals of the Presbyterians were the same with those of Newcastle already mentioned; but whereas the king declined to accept them without a personal treaty, they determined in the house of commons, to reduce them into four bills, which if his majesty refused to sign as preliminaries, they resolved to settle the nation without him; but before they were perfected, the king withdrew from Hampton-court, and was secured in the Isle of Wight, where the commissioners from the two houses waited on him, and tendered him the following bills, December 24; the first was settling the militia, as has been related; the second, for calling in all his majesty’s declarations and proclamations against the two houses, and those that adhered to them; the third, to disqualify those peers from sitting in the house, that had been created after the great seal had been conveyed to Oxford; the fourth, to empower the two houses to adjourn, as they should think fit. In matters of religion they insisted peremptorily on the establishment of the Presbyterian church-government upon the ruins of the prelatical: upon the extirpation of all sectaries; and upon covenant-uniformity in both nations, as will appear more fully hereafter. But the king, instead of signing the preliminaries, insisted strenuously on a personal treaty, which it was hardly reasonable for him to expect, when he had so lately attempted to escape out of their hands, and now refused to yield anything in a way of condescension.

It had not been possible to unriddle the mystery of this escape, if it had not appeared soon after, that the king was at that very time throwing himself into the hands of the Scots, who being offended with the parliament (now under the influence of the army) for not acting in concert with them in the present treaty, according to their covenant, determined on a separate negotiation for themselves; and accordingly, by the mediation of some of their own nation, they concluded a secret treaty with the king, which was begun before his majesty left Hampton-court, but not signed till the 27th of December following, three days after his majesty’s refusal of the parlia-

¹ Ibid. p. 160.

ment's four bills. "This alliance (says lord Clarendon¹) was most scandalous, and derogatory to the honour and interest of the English nation, and would have been abominated if known and understood by all men." But Rapin thinks it not so criminal on the part of the Scots as his lordship represents, since they yielded to the establishment of their beloved presbytery in England only for three years; however, it laid the foundation of the king's ruin with the army.

In the preamble his majesty gives "a favourable testimony to the solemn league and covenant, and to the good intentions of those that entered into it." In the treaty "he obliges himself to confirm the covenant by act of parliament as soon as he can do it with honour and freedom in both kingdoms; with a proviso, that none that were unwilling should be obliged to take it for the future. He engages farther, to confirm by act of parliament the presbyterial government in England, the Directory for public worship, and the assembly of divines, for three years only, with liberty for himself and his household to use that form of divine service they had formerly practised; and that during the three years there should be a consultation with the assembly of divines, to whom twenty of the king's nomination should be added, and some from the church of Scotland, to determine what form of church-government should be established afterward."²—Then follows a scourge for the army; "That an effectual course should be taken to suppress the opinions of the Anti-Trinitarians, Arians, Socinians, Arminians, Independents, Brownists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Separatists, Seekers; and in general, all blasphemy, heresy, schism, and other doctrines contrary to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, conversation, or the power of godliness, or which may be destructive to order and government, or to the peace of the church and kingdom."

In return for these concessions "the Scots engaged to raise an army to deliver his majesty out of captivity, to assert his right to the militia, the great seal, the negative voice in parliament; and in a word, to restore him to his throne with honour and freedom;" which occasioned a second civil war the next year.

As soon as his majesty arrived in the Isle of Wight from Hampton-court, he sent a letter to the speaker of the house of lords, to be communicated to the commons, with the following concessions on his part, very inconsistent with the treaty last mentioned.—"For the abolishing archbishops, bishops, &c. his majesty clearly professeth, that he cannot consent to it either as a Christian or a king; for the first he avows, that he is satisfied in his judgment, that this order was placed in the church by the apostles them-

¹ Vol. 3. p. 103.

² Rapin, vol. 2. p. 543, 544.

selves, and ever since their time has continued in all Christian churches throughout the world till this last century; and in this church, in all times of change and reformation, it has been upheld, by the wisdom of his ancestors, as the great preserver of doctrine, discipline, and order, in the service of God. As a king, at his coronation he not only swore to maintain this order, but his majesty and his predecessors, in their confirmations of the great charter, have inseparably woven the rights of the church into the liberty of the subject; and yet he is willing that it be provided, that particular bishops perform the several duties of their callings, both by their personal residence, and frequent preaching; that in their personal exercise no act of jurisdiction or ordination be without consent of their presbyters; and will consent, that in all things their powers be so limited, that they may not be grievous to the tender consciences of others; his majesty sees no reason why he alone, and those of his judgment, should be pressed to a violation of theirs.

“Nor can his majesty consent to the alienation of church-lands, because it cannot be denied to be the sin of sacrilege; as also, that it subverts the intentions of so many pious donors, who have laid a heavy curse upon all such profane violations. And besides, his majesty believes it to be a prejudice to the public good; many of his subjects having the benefit of renewing leases at much easier rates, than if those possessions were in the hands of private men; not omitting the discouragement it will be to learning and industry, when such eminent rewards shall be taken away; yet considering the present distempers concerning church-discipline, and that the Presbyterian government is now in practice, his majesty to avoid confusion as much as may be, and for the satisfaction of his two houses, is content, that the same government be legally permitted to stand in the same condition it now is for three years, provided that his majesty, and those of his judgment, or any others who cannot in conscience submit thereunto, be not obliged to comply with the Presbyterian government, but have free practice of our own profession, without any prejudice thereby; and that free consultation be had with the divines at Westminster, twenty of his majesty’s nomination being added to them, to consider how to settle the church afterward, with full liberty to all those who shall differ upon conscientious grounds from that settlement; always provided, that nothing aforesaid be understood to tolerate those of the Popish profession, or exempt them from penal laws, or to tolerate the public profession of atheism or blasphemy, contrary to the doctrine of the apostles, the Nicene and Athanasian creeds; they having been received by, and had in reverence of, all Christian churches, and more especially the church of England since the Reformation.”¹ This was inserted

¹ Rushworth, p. 880. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 541.

to cajole the army, and was entirely reversed by the Scots treaty five weeks after.

From these inconsistent views of the contending parties, we may easily discern the precarious situation of the public tranquillity, especially as there was a general distrust on all sides, and each party resolved to carry their point without any abatements: the king was held by ties of conscience and honour (as he said) to preserve episcopacy; the Scots and English Presbyterians, though divided at present, thought themselves equally bound to stand by their solemn league and covenant; and the army was under a solemn engagement to agree with neither without a toleration. If the king could have submitted to covenant uniformity, he might have been restored by the Presbyterians; or, if either king or parliament would have declared heartily for a toleration, they might have established themselves by the assistance of the military power; but his majesty seems to have been playing an unsteady if not a double game. The reader will judge of the equity of the several proposals, and of the prudential conduct of each party, from the respective circumstances in which they stood: the king was a prisoner; the parliament in possession of the whole legislative authority; but the sword was in the hands of the army, who were determined not to sheathe it till they had secured to themselves that liberty for which they had been fighting: this they had in vain solicited from the king, and were next determined to try their interest with the parliament.

The houses being informed of the king's design to make his escape out of the Isle of Wight, ordered the governor to put away his servants, and confine him a close prisoner in the castle, so that no person might be admitted to speak to him without leave. His majesty having also declared, when he rejected the parliament's four bills, that nothing which could befall him could ever prevail with him to consent to any one act, till the conditions of the whole peace were concluded, they began to despair of an accommodation. In this juncture the officers of the army sent a message to the houses, assuring them, that they would live and die with them in settling the nation either with or without the king, and leave all transactions of state for the future to them alone.¹

However, after the seclusion of the eleven impeached members, and the quartering the army in the neighbourhood of the city, the parliament, either from interest or fear, had a great regard to the opinion of those officers who were members of the house. Upon a motion that no more addresses be made to the king from the parliament, nor any messages received from him, Ireton and Cromwell opened themselves very freely: Ireton said, "Subjection to the king was but in lieu of protection from him, which being denied,

¹ Rushworth, p. 951. 9.53. 962. Rapin, vol. 2 p. 515.

we may settle the kingdom without him. Let us then show our resolution (says he), and not desert those valiant men who have engaged for us beyond all possibility of retreat." Cromwell said, "that the parliament should govern by their own power, and not teach the people any longer to expect safety from an obstinate man, whose heart God had hardened.—The army will defend you against all opposition. Teach them not, by neglecting yours and the kingdom's safety, in which their own is involved, to think themselves betrayed, and left hereafter to the rage and malice of an irreconcilable enemy, whom they have subdued for your sake, lest despair teach them to seek their safety by some other means than adhering to you [here he put his hand to his sword]; and how destructive such a resolution will be (says he) I tremble to think, and leave you to judge!" The question being then put, it was carried by a majority of fifty voices; yeas one hundred and forty-one, noes ninety-one. January 17, the lords concurred with the commons in their votes of non-addresses. Till this very time, says lord Clarendon, no man mentioned the king's person without duty and respect. But now a new scene was opened, and some of their officers at their meetings at Windsor, began to talk of deposing the king, or prosecuting him as a criminal, of which his majesty was advertised by Watson the quarter-master, but it made no impression upon him.

The two houses having concurred in their votes for non-addresses, the army agreed to stand by the parliament, in settling the nation without the king; and that the people might be satisfied with the reasons of their proceedings, a remonstrance was published by order of parliament, February 15, in which they recapitulate all the errors of his majesty's government; his insincerity in the several treaties of peace he had entered into with them; and that though they had applied to him seven times with propositions, in all which the Scots had concurred except the last, yet he had never complied with any; from whence they conclude, either that the nation must continue under the present distractions, or they must settle it without him. In the posthumous works of lord Clarendon,¹ there is a large reply to this remonstrance, in which his lordship endeavours to vindicate the king and throw all the blame upon the parliament; but though there were ill instruments on both sides, and there might be no real occasion to rip up the misdemeanours of the king's government from the beginning, yet it is hardly possible for the art of man to justify his majesty's conduct before the war, or to vindicate his prudence and sincerity in his treaties afterward; the design of commencing a new war being evidently at this time concerted and agreed upon, with his majesty's allowance, in pursuance of the Scots treaty,

¹ Vol. 3. p. 92, 93.

while he was amusing both the parliament and army with overtures of peace.

Among the ordinances that passed this year for reformation of the church, none occasioned so much noise and disturbance as that of June 8, for abolishing the observation of saints' days, and the three grand festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide; the ordinance says, "Forasmuch as the feast of the nativity of Christ, Easter, Whitsuntide, and other festivals, commonly called holydays, have been heretofore superstitiously used and observed; be it ordained, that the said feasts, and all other festivals, commonly called holy-days, be no longer observed as festivals; any law, statute, custom, constitution, or canon, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding."¹

"And that there may be a convenient time allotted for scholars, apprentices, and other servants, for their recreation, be it ordained, that all scholars, apprentices, and other servants, shall, with the leave of their masters, have such convenient reasonable recreation, and relaxation from labour, every second Tuesday in the month throughout the year, as formerly they used to have upon the festivals; and masters of scholars, apprentices, and servants, shall grant to them respectively such time for their recreation, on the aforesaid second Tuesday in the month, as they may conveniently spare from their extraordinary necessary service and occasions; and if any difference arise between masters and servants concerning the liberty hereby granted, the next justice of peace shall reconcile it."

The king was highly displeased with this ordinance; and therefore while the affair was under debate, he put this query to the parliament-commissioners at Holmby-house, April, 23, 1647.

I desire to be out-resolved of this question, Why the new reformers discharge the keeping of Easter? My reason for this query is, "I conceive the celebration of this feast was instituted by the same authority which changed the Jewish sabbath into the Lord's day or Sunday, for it will not be found in Scripture where Saturday is discharged to be kept, or turned into the Sunday; wherefore it must be the church's authority that changed the one and instituted the other; therefore my opinion is, that those who will not keep this feast may as well return to the observation of Saturday, and refuse the weekly Sunday. When anybody can show me that herein I am in an error, I shall not be ashamed to confess and amend it; till when you know my mind."² C. R."

Sir James Harrington presented his majesty with an answer to this query, in which he denies, that the change of the sabbath was from the authori-

¹ Scobel, p. 128.

² Relig. Car. p. 370.

ty of the church, but derives it from the authority and example of our Saviour and his apostles in the New Testament; he admits, that if there was the like mention of the observation of Easter, it would be of divine or apostolical authority; but as the case stands, he apprehends with great reason, that the observation of the Christian sabbath, and of Easter, stands upon a very different footing.

The changing the festival of Christmas into a fast last winter, was not so much taken notice of, because all parties were employed in acts of devotion; but when it returned this year there appeared a strong propensity in the people to observe it; the shops were generally shut, many Presbyterian ministers preached; in some places the common-prayer was read, and one or two of the sequestered clergy getting into pulpits prayed publicly for the bishops; several of the citizens of London, who opened their shops, were abused; in some places there were riots and insurrections, especially in Canterbury, where the mayor, endeavouring to keep the peace, had his head broke by the populace, and was dragged about the streets; the mob broke into divers houses of the most religious in the town, broke their windows, abused their persons, and threw their goods into the streets, because they exposed them to sale on Christmas-day.¹ At length their numbers being increased to above two thousand, they put themselves into a posture of defence against the magistrates, kept guard, stopped passes, examined passengers, and seized the magazine and arms in the town-hall, and were not dispersed without difficulty. The like disorders were at Ealing in Middlesex, and in several other counties. The parliament was alarmed at these disorders, and therefore commanded all Papists and delinquent clergymen to retire without the lines of communication, and punished some of the principal rioters as a terror to the rest, it being apparent that the king's party took advantage of the holy-days to try the temper of the people in favour of his release, for during the space of the following twelve years, wherein the festivals were laid aside, there was not the least tumult on account of the holidays, the observation of Christmas being left as a matter of indifference.

The war being thought to be at an end, many of the clergy who had followed the camp returned home, and endeavoured to repossess themselves of their sequestered livings, to the prejudice of those whom the parliament had put into their places; they petitioned the king while he was with the army, and in a state of honour and dignity, to take their poor distressed condition into his gracious consideration. His majesty recommended them to the general, at the very time when the difference between the parliament and army was subsisting, upon which they represented their grievances to him in a petition, showing, that "whereas for divers years they had been outed

¹ Rushworth, p. 948.

of their livings, contrary to the fundamental laws of the land, by the arbitrary power of committees, whose proceedings have usually been by no rule of law, but by their own wills; most of them having been turned out for refusing the covenant, or adhering to the king, and the religion established, and of those, divers never called to answer, and scarce one had articles proved by oath, or other legal process; by which means your petitioners are reduced to extreme want and misery; and whereas those who are put into our places labour to stir up the people to involve the kingdom in a new war, and are generally men ignorant and unable to instruct the people; and many of them scandalous in their practices, if impartially examined, and divers of them hold three or four of the best benefices, whilst divers other churches are void, and without any constant preacher. And forasmuch as the main profit of our benefices consists in the harvest which is now at hand, which many of the present possessors, if they could receive, would presently be gone, whereby the burden of the cure will lie upon your petitioners, having nothing to live upon the next year. Your petitioners therefore pray, that your excellency would make stay of the profits of the harvest, that those of us that are charged with any legal scandal may come to a just trial, and if we are found innocent may enjoy our rights, according to the known laws of the land.”¹

By this bold petition, it is evident these gentlemen were encouraged to hope, that the army would carry their resentments so far as to unravel all they had been doing for five years; that they would not only renounce the covenant, but disclaim the proceedings of their committees, and even countenance the clergy’s adhering to the king; and no doubt, if his majesty had complied with the proposals of the army, he might have made good terms for them; for the general received them with respect, and having debated their address in council, proposed it to the parliament, that the estates of all sequestered persons, including the clergy, should remain in the hands of the tenants till a general peace. Upon which the old incumbents grew very troublesome, forbidding the parishioners to pay their tithes, and threatening the present possessors of their livings with legal prosecutions.

On the other hand the Presbyterian clergy addressed the general August 12, a few days after the parliament and army were united, with a complaint, that “divers delinquent ministers, who had been put out of their livings, did now trouble and seek to turn out those ministers, whom the parliament had put in; and particularly, that Dr. Layfield, by a counterfeit warrant from the general, had endeavoured to remove a minister from his benefice in Surrey.” The general and his council declared their dislike of these proceedings, and promised to write to the parliament, that such offenders may be

¹ Sufferings of the Clergy, p. 115.

brought to punishment, which he did accordingly. The difference between the parliament and army being now in a manner compromised, which cut off the expectations of the clergy, August 19, the lords and commons acquainted the general, that they would take care for the punishment of those delinquent ministers and others, by whose practices ministers put into livings by the parliament had been disquieted and turned out; and on the 23rd of the same month they passed an ordinance, setting forth “that whereas divers ministers in the several counties had been displaced by authority of parliament, for notorious scandals and delinquency, and godly, learned, and orthodox ministers had been placed in their room; and whereas the said scandalous and delinquent ministers, by force, or otherwise, had entered upon the churches, and gained possession of the tithes, &c. the lords and commons did therefore ordain, that all sheriffs, mayors, committees, &c., do forthwith apprehend such ministers, and all such persons as have been aiding and abetting to them, and commit them to prison, there to remain, till those they had thus dispossessed and molested, should receive satisfaction for their damages; and that the said sheriffs, &c. do restore those molested ministers to the quiet possession of their respective places, and do in case of need raise the trained-bands to put this ordinance in execution; and do also take effectual course that the tithes, profits, &c. be for the future duly paid to those ministers put in by parliament, &c. And if any such disturbance should hereafter be given, the offender was to suffer for every such disturbance one month’s imprisonment.”

However, some small favour was shown, about this time, to those bishops and others, who had lived peaceably, and been little more than spectators of the distracting miseries of their country; the committee was ordered to make payment of the £800 per year granted to the bishop of Durham, the real estate of the pious bishop Hall, who had lately published his *Hard Pleasure*, was discharged; archbishop Usher had an allowance of £400 per annum, till he could be otherwise provided for: and was soon after allowed to be preacher at Lincoln’s-Inn, only upon taking the negative oath. But the bishops were not much considered in these donations. The commissioners of the great seal were ordered to fill up the vacant livings in the gift of the crown, without obliging the incumbents to take the covenant; but the new disturbances which arose in favour of the captive king, brought down new severities upon the episcopal clergy, before the end of the following year.¹

¹ Rushworth, p. 831. 937. 948. 958.