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CHAPTER IX.

THE VISITATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. STATE OF RELIGION AT THE END OF THE YEAR 1647.

Sad and deplorable was the condition of the university of Oxford when it fell into the hands of the parliament; the colleges and halls were gone to ruin, five of them perfectly deserted, and the rest in a very shattered condition. The public acts had been discontinued for some years, the schools were turned into magazines for the king’s army, and the chambers filled with officers and soldiers, or let out to towns-men: there was little or no instruction for youth, nor hardly the face of a university; poverty, desolation, and plunder, the sad effects of war, were to be seen in every corner; the bursaries were emptied of the public money, the plate melted down for the king’s service, and the colleges involved in debts which they were not able to satisfy; there were few heads of colleges or scholars remaining, except such as were strongly prejudiced against the parliament, having employed their wits, during the course of the war, in writing weekly mercuries, and satirical pamphlets, in which they aspersed the proceedings of the two houses, and treated their divines as the most infamous, ignorant, and hypocritical traitors; nor were their tempers in the least softened, though their lives and fortunes were in the hands of their adversaries. It was therefore thought necessary to put the education of youth into such hands as the parliament could confide in, a power being reserved for that purpose in the articles of surrender.

But before they proceeded to extremes, the two houses, about the beginning of September 1646, appointed seven of their most popular divines to repair to Oxford, with authority to preach in any pulpits of the university for six months, in order to soften the spirits of the people,[[1]](#footnote-1) and give them a better opinion of their cause, viz. the reverend Mr. Robert Harris, of Hanwell, Oxfordshire; Mr. Edward Reynolds, afterward bishop of Norwich; Mr. Henry Wilkinson, of Magdalen-college; Mr. Francis Cheynel, Mr. Edward Corbet, of Merton-college; Mr. Henry Cornish, of New-Inn, and Mr. Henry Langley, of Pembroke-college; men of reputation and character,[[2]](#footnote-2) sober divines and popular preachers, though A. Wood, the Oxford historian, is pleased to say, “Their sermons were the contempt and scorn of the university, because they were too long and had too little learning; because they prayed very coldly for the king, but were very earnest for a blessing upon the councils and arms of the parliament, and did not always conclude with the Lord’s prayer; because they reflected on some of the heads of the university, calling them dumb dogs, having a form of religion without the power; and, because their manner of delivery was rather theatrical than serious: nevertheless, their auditories were crowded, though none of the heads of colleges or senior scholars attended.”

The ministers were very diligent in the discharge of their trust, preaching twice every Lord’s day; and that they might gain the affections of the people, set up a weekly conference every Thursday, in which they proposed to solve such objections as should be raised against their new confession of faith and discipline, and to answer any other important cases in divinity: the question or case was to be propounded the week before, that it might be well considered; a moderator also was appointed to keep order, who began and concluded with a short prayer, and the whole was conducted with decency and gravity.[[3]](#footnote-3) But several of the scholars ridiculed their proceedings, and by way of contempt called their place of meeting, the scruple shop; however, it was frequented by great numbers of people, some of whom were prevailed with to renounce the Oxford oath; and others to take the solemn league and covenant. They met with some little disturbance from one Erbury, a turbulent Antinomian, and chaplain in the garrison; but upon the whole, when the ministers returned to London, they declared, the citizens showed them a great deal of respect, although the university poured all the contempt upon them imaginable, so that they apprehended themselves to have the same lot as Saint Paul had at Athens, Acts xvii. 32. 34, “Some mocked them, others slighted them, but certain clave to them, and believed.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

There being no prospect of reforming the university by these methods, the two houses resolved to proceed upon a visitation, which they apprehended they might undertake without the king, by virtue of the fourteenth article of their recapitulation, which says “that the chancellor, masters, and scholars, of the university, and all heads, governors, masters, fellows, and scholars, of the colleges, halls, bodies corporate, and societies, of the said university, and the public professors, readers, and orators, thereof, and all other persons belonging to the said university, shall and may, according to their statutes, charters, and customs, enjoy their ancient form of government, subordinate to the immediate authority and power of parliament, and that all the rights, privileges, franchises, lands, tenements, houses, rents, revenues, libraries, debts, goods, and chattels, &c. belonging to the said university, shall be enjoyed by them respectively as aforesaid, free from sequestrations, fines, taxes, and all other molestations whatsoever, under colour of anything relating to the present war. And if any removal shall be made by the parliament of any head or other members of the university, that they shall enjoy their profits for six months after the surrendering of Oxon, and shall have convenient time allowed them for the removal of themselves and their goods; provided that this shall not extend to retard any reformation there intended by the parliament, or give them any liberty to intermeddle with the government.”[[5]](#footnote-5) But the heads of colleges did not think themselves obliged by this capitulation, nor anything contained in it, because they were not made parties, nor called upon to give their separate consent to the articles, though they took advantage of everything that was stipulated in their favour.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

May 1, 1647, an ordinance passed both houses for visiting the university, and nominating the following gentlemen, lawyers, and divines, for that service, viz.[[7]](#footnote-7)
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The ordinance empowers the visitors, or any five of them, “to hear and determine all crimes, offences, abuses, and disorders, which by the laws and statutes of this realm, or by the customs and statutes, rightly established, of that university, or by the several statutes of the respective colleges or halls, may lawfully be inquired of, heard, or determined, in the course and way of visitation of the university, or of the colleges, halls, masters, scholars, fellows, members, and officers, or any of them, respectively. They are more particularly to inquire by oath concerning those that neglect to take the solemn league and covenant, and the negative oath, being tendered to them by such as are authorised by parliament; and concerning those who oppose the execution of the ordinance of parliament, concerning the discipline and directory; and those who shall teach or write against any point of doctrine, the ignorance whereof doth exclude from the Lord’s supper. They are likewise to inquire upon oath, eoncerning all such who have taken up arms against the parliament. And they are to certify to a committee of the house of lords and commons mentioned in the ordinance, what masters, scholars, fellows, members, or officers, have committed any of the offences above mentioned, and the quality and condition of the offenders, that such farther proceedings may be had thereupon as the committee of lords and commons shall think fit. The visitors are farther empowered to examine and consider all such oaths as are enjoined by the statutes of the university, or any of the halls and colleges, as are not fit to be taken, and present their opinion to the committee above mentioned; provided always, that if any of the masters, scholars, fellows, &c. shall find themselves aggrieved by any sentence given by the visitors, it shall be lawful for them to appeal to the committee of lords and commons, who are authorised finally to hear and determine every such case brought before them,”

Before the visitation could take place the vice-chancellor, Dr. Fell, summoned a convocation [June 1], wherein it was agreed not to submit to the parliament-visitors. A paper of reasons against the covenant,[[8]](#footnote-8) the negative oath, and the directory, drawn up chiefly by Dr. Sanderson, was also consented to, and ordered to be published to the world both in Latin and English, against the time the visitors were to come down, under the title of “Reasons of the present judgment of the university of Oxford, concerning the solemn league and covenant, the negative oath, and the ordi-nances concerning discipline and worship, approved by general consent in a full convocation, June 1, 1647;” an abstract of which I shall now set before the reader.[[9]](#footnote-9)

To the Preface of the Covenant [transcribed under the year 1643].

They declare, “We cannot say the rage, power, and presumption, of the enemies of God (in the sense there intended) are increased. Nor that we have consented to any supplication or remonstrance to the purposes therein expressed. We do not think the taking the covenant to be a lawful and probable means to preserve ourselves and our religion from ruin: nor do we believe it to be according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms, or the example of God’s people in other nations.”

To the Covenant in general

“We are of opinion, that a covenant ought to be a voluntary contract, and not imposed. Now we cannot voluntarily consent to this covenant without betraying our liberties, one of which is, not to be obliged to take any oath but what is established by act of parliament; and without acknowledging in the imposers a greater power than has been challenged in former time, or can subsist with our former protestation. But if the covenant were not imposed, but only recommended, we apprehend the taking it to be inconsistent with our loyalty to the king, especially since he has by proclamation forbid it.”

Objections to the several Articles of the Covenant.

To *the first Article.*

“We cannot swear to preserve the religion of another kingdom (Scotland), whereof we have very little understanding, which, as far as we are acquainted with it, is much worse than our own in worship, discipline, and government, and in doctrine not at all better; wherein there are some things so far tending to superstition and schism, that it seems reasonable to us that we should call upon them to reform, rather than we should be bound to preserve it entire.

“Neither are we satisfied in the present reformation of religion in our own kingdom, in doctrine, worship, and discipline, because, (1.) It gives a manifest scandal to the Papist and separatist, by giving up the cause for which the martyrs and bishops have contended since the Reformation; by justifying the Papists in their recusancy, who reproach us, by saying, we know not what religion we are of; nor where to stop, since we have left them; and, that ours is a parliamentary religion. Besides, this would be a tacit acknowledgment, that there has been something in the church of England not agreeable to the word of God, and so justify the separation, and condemn all the penal laws that have been made to oblige people to conform.[[10]](#footnote-10) (2.) By the intended reformation we should wrong ourselves, by swearing to reform that which we have formerly by our subscriptions approved, and which we do still believe to be more agreeable to the word of God than that which by this covenant we must swear to preserve; and to which, by the laws still in being, every clerk, at his admission to a benefice, is bound to give his consent. (3.) Besides, we would be in danger of perjury, because it is contrary to our former protestation, which obliges us to maintain the doctrine of the church of England, which may take in the whole establishment; and it is contrary to the oath of supremacy, which gives the sole power to the king in matters ecclesiastical.”

*Objections to the second Article.*

“We are very much grieved to see the prelacy of the church of England ranked with Popery, superstition, heresy, schism, and profaneness, with an intimation, that it is contrary to sound doctrine, or the power of godliness.[[11]](#footnote-11) Nor can we swear to the extirpation of it, because, (1.) We believe it to be of apostolical institution. Or, (2.) At least that episcopal aristocracy hath a fairer claim to a divine institution than any other form of church-government. (3.) That episcopal government has continued in the church without interruption for fifteen hundred years, therefore to extirpate it would give advantage to the Papists, who are wont to charge us with a contempt of antiquity, and love of novelty, and it would diminish the just authority due to the consent and practice of the Catholic church. (4.) Besides, we cannot swear to the extirpating this government, because we have subscribed the thirty-nine articles, one of which says, the book containing the form of consecration has nothing in it contrary to the word of God. We have been ordained by bishops; we have petitioned the parliament for the continuance of them; and some of us hold our livelihoods by the titles of deans, deans and chapters, &c. (5.) We are not satisfied that the inconveniences of the new government will be less than the old, the house of commons having remonstrated [December 15, 1641], that it was far from their purpose to abolish this government, but only to regulate it, and that it was a sign of malignancy to infuse into the people that they had any other meaning. Lastly, In respect of our obligation to his majesty, having acknowledged him to be supreme governor in all causes ecclesiastical, we cannot endeavour to extirpate this government without the royal assent, which we are so far from desiring that we are continually praying, that the king may not be prevailed with to do an act so prejudicial to his conscience and honour, and which, by his coronation-oath, he is bound to preserve.[[12]](#footnote-12) By the laws of the land there are sundry privileges and emoluments arising to the crown from the ecclesiastical estate, which are a considerable part of the revenue, which by the extirpation of prelacy will be cut off; whereas we are bound by the oath of allegiance to maintain the king’s honour and estate. And after all, the prelatical government is best suited to monarchy, insomuch that king James used to say, No bishop, no king.”

*Objections to the third Article,*

“We are dissatisfied with the limitation of our loyalty in these words, ‘in the preservation and defence of the true religion, and liberties of the kingdom;’ because no such limitation is to be found in the oath of allegiance, nor in the word of God; because it leaves the duty of the subject loose, and the safety of the king uncertain. The conscience of a Papist, or sectary, may swallow an oath with such a limitation, but the conscience of a good Protestant cannot but strain at it.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

*Objections to the fourth Article.*

They reply, “That the imposing the covenant in this article may lay a necessity upon the son to accuse the father, in case he be a malignant, which is contrary to religion, nature, and humanity; or it may open a way for children that are sick of their fathers, to effect their unlawful intentions, by accusing them of malignancy; besides, the subjecting ourselves to an arbitrary punishment, at the sole pleasure of such uncertain judges as may be deputed for that effect, is betraying the liberty of the subject.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

*Objections to the fifth Article.*

“We cannot acknowledge the happiness of such a peace as in the article is mentioned, for no peace can be firm and well-grounded, unless the respective authority, power, and liberty, of king, parliament, and subject, be preserved full and entire, according to the known laws and respective customs of the kingdom, before the beginning of these distractions.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

*Objections to the sixth Article.*

They say, “We are not satisfied, that the cause of our joining in covenant for the prosecution of the late war, was the cause of religion, liberty, and peace, of the kingdom, or that the glory of God and the honour of the king were concerned in it. And if it was, we are not satisfied that it ought to be supported and carried on by such means as are destitute of all warrant from the word of God, or the laws of the realm.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

In conclusion, say they, “Our hearts tremble to think that we should be required to pray, that other Christian churches may be encouraged by our example to join in the like covenant to free themselves from the antichristian yoke, for we do not know any antichristian yoke we were under; nor do we yet see such good fruits of this covenant among ourselves as to invite us to pray, that other churches should follow our example; it is as if we should pray, that the God of love and peace would take away all love and peace, and set the Christian world in a combustion; that he would render the reformed religion odious to the world; that Christian princes might be provoked to use more severity towards those of the reformed religion, if not to root it out of their dominions; for the yoke of antichrist, if laid upon subjects by their lawful sovereigns, is to be thrown off by Christian boldness in confessing the truth, and suffering for it, not by taking up arms, or violent resisting of the higher powers.”

After these remarks upon the several articles, they take notice,

(1.) Of the following seeming contradictions in that covenant, as, “The preserving and yet reforming one and the same reformed religion. The reforming church-government according to the word of God, and yet extirpating that government which we apprehend agreeable to it. The extirpating heresy and schism, and yet dissolving that government in the church, the want of the due exercise of which has been the occasion of the growth of these evils. The preserving the liberties of the kingdom, and yet submitting to a covenant and oath not established by law.”[[17]](#footnote-17)

(2.) They observe some dark and doubtful expressions which they do not well understand; as, “Who are the common enemies? Which are the best reformed churches? Who are malignants? How far the hindering reformation may be extended, &c.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

(3.) By the use that has been made of the covenant, they apprehend “the conduct of the parliament to be contrary to the meaning of it, for instead of reforming the worship and service of the church they have quite abolished it; instead of reforming the discipline of the church, it is quite destroyed, or put upon such a foot as is not agreeable to the word of God, or the example of any church since the creation. Instead of extirpating heresy and profaneness, little or nothing has been done towards it, but only the extirpation of prelacy, and something else that looks so like sacrilege (say they) that we do not venture upon it. And as for the preservation of the king’s honour and estate in defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdom, though we apprehend all other things should be subordinate to it, yet by some bold speeches that have been made we are afraid nothing less is intended.”

*Of the Salvoes for taking the Covenant.*

(1.) “It has been said, that we may take it in our own sensc. But this we apprehend contrary to the nature and end of an oath; contrary to the end of speech; contrary to the design of the covenant, and contrary to the solemn profession at the conclusion of it, viz. That we shall take it with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer it to the Searcher of all hearts at the great day. Besides, this would be Jesuitical; it would be taking the name of God in vain; and it would strengthen the objection of those who say, There is no faith to be given to Protestants.[[19]](#footnote-19)

(2.) “It has been said, we may take the covenant with these salvoes expressed, so far as lawfully I may, so far as it is agreeable to the word of God, and the laws of the land, saving all oaths by me formerly taken, &c. which is no better than vile hypocrisy; for by the same rule one might subscribe to the council of Trent, or the Turkish Alcoran.

(3.) “It is said, that we may take the covenant in our present circumstances, notwithstanding our allegiance to the king, because protection and subjection are relatives, and the king being unable to protect us any longer, we are free from subjection to him. But we answer, that the king’s inability to perform his duty does not discharge the subject from his, as long as he is able; much less when the non-protection on the king’s part is not from want of will, but of power.

(4.) “It is said, that the parliament being the supreme judicatory of the kingdom, wheresoever the king is in person he is always present with his parliament in power; as what is done in courts of justice is not done without the king, but by him, though not personally present. But we deny the king to be always present with his parliament in power, for then his actual royal assent would not be necessary to the making of laws, but only a virtual assent included in the votes of both houses: the houses need not then desire the royal assent, nor can the king be supposed to have a negative voice. Besides, the statute which provides, that the king’s assent to any bill signified under his great seal shall be as valid as if he were personally present, imports, that the king’s power is not present with his two houses, otherwise than it appears in his person, or under his great seal. As to the analogy of other courts, we conceive it of no consequence; in other courts the judges are the king’s servants, and do all in his name, and by his authority; they sit there not by any proper interest of their own, but in right of the king, whose judges they are; but the parliament is the king’s council, and have their several proper rights and interests distinct from the king’s, by virtue of which they are distinct orders and conservators of their several interests. Besides, the judges of other courts are bounded by the laws in being, and therefore the king’s personal presence is not necessary; but the case is quite different in making new laws, for the making new laws is the exercise of a legislative rather than a judicial power; now, no act of legislative power can be valid, unless it be confirmed by such person or persons as the sovereignty of that community resideth in. Upon the whole, since all judicial power is radically in the king, who is therefore called the fountain of justice, it seems to us, that neither the judges in inferior courts, nor the lords and commons assembled in parliament, may exercise any other power over the subjects of this realm, than such as by their respective patents and writs issued from the king, or by the established laws of the land, formerly assented to by the kings of this realm, does appear to be derived from them; by which writs, patents, and laws, it does not appear that the two houses of parliament have any power without the king, to order, command, or transact; but only with him to treat, consult, and advise, concerning the great affairs of the kingdom.”

*Concerning the negative Oath.*

They say, “We cannot take it without giving up our liberties, without abusing our natural allegiance, and without diminution of his majesty’s just power and greatness.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

*Concerning the Discipline and Directory.*

“We are not satisfied to submit to the ordinance for establishing the Directory, because it has not the royal assent, and yet abrogates acts of parliament made by the joint consent of king, lords, and commons, especially one, which annexes the whole power of ordering all ecclesiastical matters for ever to the imperial crown of this realm; now we are not satisfied that a less power can have a just right to abrogate a greater.

“If under the title of discipline be comprehended the government of the church also, we declare, we cannot consent to the eradication of a government of such reverend antiquity, which has from time to time been confirmed by the laws of the kingdom, and which the kings at their successive coronations have sworn to preserve. If the word discipline be distinguished from government, as in the first article of the covenant, yet are we not satisfied to place so much power in the hands of persons (many of whom may be of mean quality) for the keeping back thousands of well-meaning Christians from the blessed sacrament, when St. Paul, in a church abounding with sundry errors and corruptions in faith and manners, satisfies himself with a general declaration of the danger of unworthy communicating, and enjoins every particular person a self-examination, without empowering either ministers or lay-elders to exclude any from the communion upon their examination.

“As to the Directory itself, we cannot, without regret of conscience, and during the continuance of the present laws, consent to the taking away the Book of Common Prayer, which we have subscribed, and solemnly promised to use no other; which we believe contains in it nothing but what is justly defensible; and which we think ourselves able to justify against all Papists and sectaries. Besides, we look upon the statute enjoining the use of the Common Prayer to be still in force, and will always remain so, till it shall be repealed by the same good and full authority by which it was made; that is, by the free consent of king, lords, and commons.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

By comparing these reasons with those of the parliament divines for taking the covenant, the reader will be capable of judging how far they are conclusive. Many of them are unquestionably good, and had the constitution remained entire, and the laws had their free and ordinary course, as in times of peace, most of them would have been conclusive; but how far the necessity of the war, and the right of self-defence, will vindicate the extraordinary proceedings of parliament, I shall not take upon me to determine for others. I am no advocate for the particulars of the covenant, any more than for the high and arbitrary principles of government contained in the university’s reasons. The consciences of men are not under the direction of their wills, but of their judgments, and therefore ought not to be constrained by oaths, protestations, or covenants, to attempt those things in matters of religion for which their own hearts must condemn them. Religion and civil government stand upon a distinct foundation, and are designed for very different ends; the magistrate may demand security for men’s peaceable submission to the civil government, but ought not to force them to be active against the light of their consciences in matters of religion. The university’s reasons are not built upon these principles; for those gentlemen were as much for the coercive power of the magistrate in cases of conscience as the Puritans; and whereas they say, the allegiance of the subject, and the protection of the king, are not relatives; and that the king’s inability to discharge his duty does not absolve the subject from his, I shall only observe, that upon these principles the crown can never be forfeited; a coronation oath is of very little significance; nor may a nation submit to a conqueror even when they can resist no longer. Inability alone in the prince, I grant, may not in all cases absolve us from our allegiance; but tyranny, oppression, and open attempts to subvert the whole constitution and laws of the country, certainly may: upon what other ground can we justify the late revolution, and the present happy establishment of the Protestant succession? When the Oxford divines at the period of the revolution had taken the oath of allegiance to king James II. and the corporation-oath, which says, “it is not lawful to resist or take up arms against the king upon any pretence whatsoever;” what could absolve them from these engagements, or justify their joining the prince of Orange with a foreign force against a king upon the throne? However, the stand now made by the university was a bold and adventurous attempt, for which they received the applause of the Oxford parliament in the year 1665, when it was resolved, “that the thanks of the house of commons be returned to the chancellor, masters, and scholars of the university of Oxford, for their bold opposition to the rebellious visitors; for refusing to submit to their league and covenant; and lastly, for the illustrious performance they printed, entitled, ‘The judgment of the university,’ &c. in which they have learnedly maintained the king’s cause.” This was the fashionable doctrine of king Charles II.’s reign, when the laws were suspended and infringed, and arbitrary power in the prince rose to such a height as in the next reign issued in a revolution of government. The university of Oxford did all they could to countenance the triumphs of the prerogative; for in the year 1663 they passed a decree in full convocation, affirming the necessity of passive obedience and non-resistance in the strongest terms; but how soon were the tables turned! when within five years these very gentlemen thought fit to enter into an association to adhere to the prince of Orange against the king upon the throne, and have since had the mortification to see that same decree burnt by the hands of the common hangman.

To return to the visitation, May 15, a citation was issued in the names of ten of the visitors then in London, to the proctors, and heads of houses, or their vice-principals, requiring them and all the officers, scholars, &c to appear in the convocation-house, on Friday June 4, between the hours of nine and eleven in the morning, and to bring with them a list of the several names of those who were absent, and of the colleges to which they belonged. At the time appointed the reverend Mr. Harris, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Henry Wilkinson, Mr. Cheynel, Mr. John Wilkinson, Mr. Dunce, and Mr. Draper, &c. opened the visitation with prayers and a sermon at St. Mary’s church, from whence they proceeded to the convocation-house, where the vice-chancellor [Dr. Fell] and a few of the scholars had been waiting a considerable time; but perceiving the visitors were like to outstay the precise hour of summons, he ordered the sexton to set the elock exactly with the sun, and as soon as it struck eleven he dismissed the scholars, marching away with the beadles before him; the visitors met them in their return at the *pro-scholium,* where the passage being narrow, the beadle cried out, “Make way for Mr. vice-chancellor,” which the visitors did. And the vice-chancellor having moved his hat, as he passed by said, “How do ye, gentlemen, it is past eleven o’clock.” But the visitors went forward, and having consulted about an hour upon the vice-chancellor’s behaviour, resolved to adjourn till Michaelmas, and return to London, in order to obtain farther powers from the parliament. In the meantime Dr. Fell summoned a committee of the heads of the several colleges, who came to the following resolutions:

1. That no man should appear before the visitors unless the summons had five names.

2. That no one should appear upon a holy day.

3. That he should demand by what authority he was summoned; and, if denied an answer, should presently depart.

4. That if they declared their authority, he should answer with a *salvis juribus regni, academics et collegii,* &c.

5. That he should demand his accusation in writing, as also time to put in his answer, and should return it in writing, and no otherwise. Lastly, That he should utterly refuse to answer on oath, because that would be to accuse himself, and would plainly revive the oath *ex officio.*

Such was the stout behaviour of these few academics, “who (according to Dr. Walker) poured upon the visitors all manner of contempt and scorn, though they knew their very lives and fortunes were at their disposal. The university (says he) held out a siege of more than a year and half; the convocation-house proved a citadel, and each single college a fort not easy to be reduced;”[[22]](#footnote-22) a clear evidence of the humanity of the visitors, and an unanswerable demonstration of the necessity of the parliament’s acting with greater vigour.

The two houses having resolved to support their visitors, and enable them to go through their work, passed an ordinance August 26, empowering them “to administer the covenant, and the negative-oath: to demand the perusal of the statutes, registers, accompts, &c. and of all other papers of the university, and of the respective colleges and halls; and to seize and detain in custody any person, who after a personal citation, refused to appear and produce their books and papers after a second citation; a jury was also to be impannelled, of members of the university, above the age of twenty-one, to inquire by oath on the articles contained in the ordinance of visitation;”[[23]](#footnote-23) and a new commission was drawn up by Mr. Attorney-general St. John, with the great seal affixed to it, September 27, authorizing the persons above named to visit the university without any farther warrant; the commission began in the usual form, “Charles, by the grace of God, &c. to our trusty and well-beloved sir Nath. Brent, &c. Know ye, that we intending the regulation and reformation of our university of Oxford, &c.” which was a very strange style considering the king was never consulted about the visitation, much less gave any consent; but the houses affected this form, from a mistaken supposition that the king was always present with his parliament, in his legislative capacity; though it served no other purpose than giving the adversary an opportunity to expose their proceedings, and charge them with assuming and acting under a forged authority.

Furnished with these new powers, the visitors returned to Oxford the latter end of September, the mayor, sheriffs, and other magistrates, being commanded to aid and assist them as there should be occasion. On Michaelmas-day a paper was fixed to the door of University-church, giving notice, that the visitation would now proceed *de die in diem.[[24]](#footnote-24)* Next day a citation was issued to all the heads of houses, requiring them to bring in their statutes, registers, accompts, and all their public writings, to the warden’s lodgings at Merton-college. The vice-chancellor was ordered to appear at the same time, to answer to such questions as should be demanded of him, and to send by the hands of the persons who served those orders, all the books and acts belonging to the university. The proctors were likewise enjoined to bring in their books, keys, and other public things in their custody. But it is not enough to say, says the Oxford antiquary, that every one of these orders was disobeyed; they were also despised and contemned. However, the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges condescended to appear at the second summons, October 6, when, instead of bringing their books and papers, they demanded to know by what authority they were summoned? upon which the visitors produced their commission under the broad seal, at the same time serving them with a third citation, to appear four days after with their books and papers, or with their reasons in writing why they refused so to do. Next day they sent for the keys of the convocation-house and school, and for the beadles’ staves, but they were denied. The day following, the proctors appeared, and delivered a protestation, attested by a public notary, in the name of the vice-chancellor, delegates, and all the scholars, to this purpose, that “they could not own any visitor but the king, and that having sworn to maintain his right, they could not, without perjury, submit themselves to acquaint the parliament.”[[25]](#footnote-25) Hereupon Dr. Fell the vice-chancellor, the very same day, was deprived of his vice-chancellorship, and public notice was given to the proctors, and other officers of the university, not to obey him any longer under that character; but the doctor, without regard to his deprivation, or to the prorogation of the term, which the visitors had adjourned from the 10th to the 15th instant, proceeding on the 11th to hold a congregation, and open the term as usual, was taken into custody, and some time after, by order of parliament, brought to London; immediately upon which, Dr. Potter, president of Trinity-college, ordered the beadles with their staves to attend him as pro-vice-chancellor. November 2 and 4, the several heads of colleges then present appeared before the visitors, but without their statute-books and papers, and being called in severally, were asked in their turns, Whether they approved of the *judicium universitatis,* or the reasons of the university, above mentioned? Whether they owned the power of the visitors? Or, whether they approved of the answer of the proctors in the name of the whole university?[[26]](#footnote-26) And refusing to give a direct answer, were served with a citation to appear before the committee for the reformation of the university at Westminster the 11th instant, which they did accordingly; and having owned their approbation of the answer of the proctors in the name of the university, they tendered a paper to the committee in the name of all who had been cited, setting forth, “that what they had done was not out of obstinacy, but from conscience; and praying that in an affair of so much consequence they might be allowed time to advise with counsel.” Their request being readily granted, two gentlemen of the long robe of their own nomination, viz. Mr. Hale and Mr. Chute, were appointed their counsel. The day of hearing was December 9; the position they offered to maintain was, that it was one of the privileges of the university to be subject only to a royal visitation: the counsel for the university made a learned argument upon this head; but, as Mr. Collyer observes, this question had been debated before the king in council in the year 1637, when archbishop Laud claimed a right of visiting the two universities *jure* *metropolitico.*[[27]](#footnote-27)It was then admitted, that the king might visit when he pleased; yet after a full hearing, his majesty, with the advice of his council, declared and adjudged the right of visiting both universities, as universities, to belong to the archbishop and metropolitical church of Canterbury, by themselves or commissaries, and that the universities should from time to time be obedient thereunto. Which determination of his majesty, the archbishop moved might be drawn up by counsel learned in the law, and put under the broad seal, to prevent disputes for the future. And the same was accordingly done; the university therefore lost their question in the committee. The counsel for the visitors were farther of opinion, that the kingly power was always virtually present with his great council of parliament, and that therefore they might visit; but supposing this to be a mistake, they affirmed, that the parliament had an undoubted right to reform the university by the articles of capitulation, in which they had expressly reserved this power to themselves. After a full hearing on both sides, the committee voted, that the answer of the several heads of houses, and of others of the university, was derogatory to the authority of parliament.

The Oxford divines, not satisfied with this determination, appealed soon after to the public, in a letter to the learned Mr. Selden, representative for the university, entitled “The case of the university of Oxford; or the sad dilemma that all the members thereof are put to, to be perjured or destroyed.”[[28]](#footnote-28) The letter says, “that the only question proposed by the visitors to every single person in the university is, Whether he will submit to the power of the parliament in this visitation? To which they reply, that unless they have the personal consent of the king, they cannot submit to any visitation without danger of perjury, as appears by the words of the oath, which are, ‘You shall swear to observe all the statutes, liberties, privileges, and customs of the university;’ to which the scholar answers, ‘I swear.’ Now it being one of our privileges to be visited by none but the king, or by the archbishop of Canterbury; the archbishop being dead, it follows we can be visited by none but the king; to submit therefore to another visitation, must be a breach of our liberties, and consequently downright perjury.—They urged farther, the statutes of their several colleges, which bind them to certain rules in their electing of proctors, in the calling and meeting of convocations, in the choice of several officers in case of a vacancy, all which, instead of being referred to the members of the university, is now done by the arbitrary power of the visitors. Nothing (say they) can be alleged in answer to this, but the pretended sovereign power of the two houses to make and abolish laws, which we absolutely disbelieve. Upon the whole, they appeal to any divine, whether they ought to submit to the visitation as long as they believe their oaths to be in full force, and are confident that the two houses cannot dispense with them? And consequently whether they ought to be turned out of their freeholds on this account?”

The committee at London having waited till the end of the month of December, to see if any of the heads of colleges would submit, voted Dr. Fell out of his deanery of Christ-church for contumacy;[[29]](#footnote-29) and passed the same sentence upon

Dr. Oliver, president of Magdalen-college

Dr. Potter,—Trinity

Dr. Bayly,—St. John’s

Dr. Radcliffe, principal of Brazen-nose

Dr. Gardner, canon of Christ-church.

Dr. Iles, canon of Christ-church.

Dr. Morley, canon of Christ-church.

When these resolutions were sent to Oxford, the proper officers refused to publish them, and when they were pasted upon the walls of the colleges, they were torn down, and trampled under foot; upon which the pro-vice-chancellor and the two proctors were ordered into custody; but they absconded, and Dr. Oliver assumed the office of pro-vice-chancellor. The parliament, provoked at this usage, passed an ordinance January 22, 1647–8, constituting the carl of Pembroke chancellor of Oxford, and March 8 they ordered him to repair thither in person, to support the visitors, and place the several persons whom the committee had chosen, in the respective chairs of those they had ejected.[[30]](#footnote-30)

April 11, the chancellor made his public entrance into the city, attended with a great number of clergy, and gentlemen of the country, and about one hundred horse out of Oxford itself; the mayor welcomed him at his entrance into the city with a congratulatory speech; and when he came to his lodgings, Mr. Button, one of the new proctors, made a speech to him in Latin, but not one of the heads of colleges came near him; the insignia of the university were not to be found, and the scholars treated the chancellor and his retinue with all that rudeness they had been taught to express towards all who adhered to the parliament.

Next morning the earl, attended with a guard of soldiers, went to Christ-church, and having in vain desired Mrs. Fell the dean’s wife to quit the lodgings peaceably, he commanded the soldiers to break open the doors, and carry her out into a chair in the middle of the quadrangle;[[31]](#footnote-31) he then put the new-elected dean Mr. Reynolds, afterward bishop of Norwich, into possession; from thence his lordship with the visitors went to the hall, and having got the Buttery-book, struck out Dr. Fell’s name, and inserted that of Mr. Reynolds; the like they did by Dr. Hammond, subdean and public orator; by Dr. Gardner, Dr. Rayne, Dr. Iles, and Dr. Morley,[[32]](#footnote-32) placing in their stead Mr. Corbet, who was made public orator; Mr. Rogers, Mr. Mills, Mr. Cornish, Mr. Henry Wilkinson, sen. and Mr. Langley; Dr. Sanderson being spared, because he was out of town when the last summons was issued.

In the afternoon they held a convocation, which was opened with an elegant Latin oration, pronounced by Mr. Corbet their new orator.[[33]](#footnote-33) When the chancellor had taken the chair in the convocation-house, he declared Mr. Reynolds vice-chancellor, to whom an oath was administered that he would observe the statutes and privileges of the university, subject to the authority of parliament. Mr. Button and Mr. Cross were declared proctors, and all three returned their thanks to the chancellor in Latin speeches. On this occasion degrees were conferred upon divers learned men. Mr. Chambers, Mr. Gallicott, and Mr. Harris, were made doctors of divinity; Mr. Palmer doctor of physic; Mr. J. Wilkins [afterward bishop], Mr. Langley, Mr. Cornish, and Mr. Cheynel, bachelors of divinity; the young earl of Carnarvon, the chancellor’s two youngest sons, and several other gentlemen, masters of arts.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Next morning, April 13, the chancellor and visitors, with a guard of musketeers, went to Magdalen-college, and having broke open the doors of the president’s lodgings [Dr. Oliver,] who was out of the way, they gave Dr. Wilkinson possession. In the afternoon they went to All-Souls, where Dr. Sheldon the warden appearing, and refusing to submit, returned to his lodgings, and locked the doors; which being broke open, the doctor was taken into custody for contempt, and Dr. Palmer put in his place; from thence they went to Trinity-college, and having broke open the lodgings, Dr. Harris was put into possession in the room of Dr. Potter. In like manner Dr. Cheynel had possession given him of St. John’s in the room of Dr. Bayly; Mr. Wilkins was appointed president of Wadham-college in the room of Dr. Pit; and Mr. Greenwood was put into possession of Brazen-nose college in the room of Dr. Radcliffe, allowing those they displaced a month’s time to remove their effects. But some of the students of Christchurch having got the Buttery-book, impudently cut out the names of those whom the visitors had inserted; so that they were forced to return the next day, and write over again the names of their new clean and canons.[[35]](#footnote-35) The heads of colleges being thus fixed in their several stations, the chancellor took leave of the university and departed for London; and having reported his conduct April 21, received the thanks of the two houses.

But Dr. Wilkinson, sen. and Mr. Cheynel, who returned with the chancellor, having represented to the parliament, that the fellows, scholars, and under officers, still refused to submit to their orders, it was resolved, “that the visitors should cite all the officers, fellows, and scholars, before them, and that such as refused to appear, or upon appearance did not submit, should be suspended from their places, and their names returned to the committee, who were authorized to expel them from the university; and the new heads (on signification of such sentence from the committee) in conjunction with the visitors, were empowered to put others in their places. They resolved farther, that the bursars should make no dividend of money till they had orders from the committee; and that the tenants should pay their rents to none but the heads appointed by the authority of parliament.”[[36]](#footnote-36) But the bursars absconded, and were not to be found.

By virtue of these orders the visitors cited the fellows, scholars of houses, gentlemen-commoners, and servitors, to appear before them at several times; the only question demanded of them was. Will you submit to the power of the parliament in this visitation? To which they were to give their answer in writing, and according to it were confirmed or displaced. Great numbers were absent from the university, and did not appear; others, who disowned the power of the parliament at first, afterward submitted, but the main body stood it out to the last: Dr. Walker says, that one hundred and eighty withdrew;[[37]](#footnote-37) that of about six hundred and seventy-six who appeared, five hundred and forty-eight refused at first to own the authority of the visitation, but that afterward many submitted and made their peace.[[38]](#footnote-38) In another place he supposes one fourth submitted; and makes the whole number of fellows and scholars deprived three hundred and seventy-five; and then by a list of new elections in some following years, reduces them to three hundred and fifty-six; but considering that some may have been omitted, he guesses the whole to be about four hundred. The Oxford historian Mr. Wood says, the number of those that refused to submit was about three hundred and thirty-four, but that they were not presently expelled; for though the visitors were obliged to return their names to the committee, and were empowered to expel them, yet they deferred the execution of their power, in hopes that time might bring them to a compliance; which it is very likely it did, because it appears by the register, that in the eight succeeding years i.e. between the years 1648 and 1656, there were no more than three hundred and ninety-six new elections, which, allowing for deaths and removals, must infer the deprivations at this time could not be very considerable; however, had their numbers been much greater than they really were, the parliament were obliged, in their own defence, to dispossess them.

The few scholars that remained in the university treated the visitors with insufferable rudeness; scurrilous and invective satires, equal if not superior in raillery and ill language to Martin Mar-Prelate, and the rest of the Brownistical pamphlets in the reign of queen Elizabeth, were dispersed in the most public places of the city every week; as Mercurius Academicus; Pegasus, or the Flying Horse from Oxon; Pegasus taught to dance to the.Tune of Lachrymæ; News from Pembroke and Montgomery, or Oxford Manchestered. The Owl at Athens; or the Entrance of the Earl of Pembroke into Oxford April 11. The Oxford Tragi-comedy, in heroic Latin verse. Lord have mercy upon us!—which is the inscription put upon houses that have the plague; and many others; which the visitors took no farther notice of, than to forbid the booksellers to print or sell the like for the future.[[39]](#footnote-39) If the Puritans had published such pamphlets against the exorbitances of the high-commission court in the late times, the authors or publishers must have lost their ears, as the Brownists did their lives towards the latter end of queen Elizabeth; and surely the university might have evinced their loyalty without offering such unmannerly provocations to gentlemen, who were disposed to behave towards them with all gentleness and moderation.

The visitors being informed that an insurrection was designed among the scholars in favour of the king, and in concert with the loyalists in other parts of the kingdom, acquainted the commanding officers of the garrison, who gave immediate orders to search the colleges for arms; and on the 26th of May 1648, the visitors ordered all the members of the university to deliver a peremptory answer in writing within seven days, whether they would submit to the authority of the parliament in this visitation or no. And that none should depart the university without leave from the pro-vice-chancellor. The day following both houses of parliament passed an order, “that forasmuch as many doctors, and other members of the university, notwithstanding the example that had been made of some of them, did still persist in their contempt of the authority of parliament, which might be of dangerous consequence; therefore the committee for reforming the university should have power to send for them under the custody of a guard, and commit them to prison.” When this order came to Oxford, the visitors declared, that whosoever should not plainly, and without reserve, declare his submission to the visitation, should be deemed as flatly denying its authority, and be taken into custody; and that whosoever laid claim to any place in the university, should within fifteen days declare his submission, or be deprived; accordingly, at the expiration of the time, such as did not appear were deprived of their fellowships, and expelled the university: but still the scholars would not remove, being too stubborn to be evicted by votes at London, or papers and programmas at Oxford. The visitors therefore, after having waited above six months, were obliged to proceed to the last extremity; and July 5, 1649, ordered a serjeant, attended with some files of musketeers, to publish by beat of drum before the gates of the several colleges, that “if any of those who had been expelled by the visitors, should presume to continue any longer in the university, they should be taken into custody, and be made prisoners by the governor.” This not answering the proposed end, the Oxford historian adds, that four days after they published a farther order by beat of drum before the gate of every college, “that if any one who had been expelled, did presume to tarry in the town, or was taken within five miles of it, he should be deemed as a spy, and punished with death.” And to enforce this order general Fairfax, who was then in the field, gave public notice, that he would proceed accordingly with such as did not depart in four days, unless they obtained leave from the vice-chancellor and visitors to continue longer. At length their courage cooled, and the young gentlemen were prevailed on to retire. Thus the university of Oxford was cleared of the royalists, and the visitors at liberty to fill up their vacancies in the best manner they could; in all which one cannot tell which most to admire the unparalleled patience and forbearance of a victorious parliament for almost two years, or the stubborn perverseness and provoking behaviour of a few academics, against a power that could have battered their colleges about their ears, and buried them in their ruins in a few days.

About ten of the old heads of colleges, and professors of sciences, submitted to the visitors, and kept their places, and about nineteen or twenty were expelled. Those who submitted were,
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The following characters of these gentlemen, with those of their predecessors and successors, I have taken for the most part from writers not to be suspected of partiality in favour of the Puritans.

Dr. Gerard Langbain, provost of Queen’s college, was a great ornament to his college; he was elected keeper of the archives or records of the university, being in general esteem for his great learning and honesty. He was an excellent linguist, an able philosopher and divine, a good common lawyer, a public-spirited man, a lover of learning and learned men, beloved of archbishop Usher, Selden, and the great Goliaths of literature. He was also an excellent antiquary, indefatigable in his studies, and of immense undertakings. He died February 10, 1657-8, and was buried in the inner chapel of Queen’s college.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Dr. Paul Hood, rector of Lincoln-college, had been many years governor of this house, and continued in it through all changes till his death; he was vice-chancellor of the university in the year 1660, when he conformed to the established church, and died in the year 1668.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Dr. John Saunders, provost of Oriel-college, disowned the authority of the visitors at first, but afterward complied; for, as Dr. Walker observes, there was no other provost till after his death, which was in the year 1652.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Dr. George Hakewell, rector of Exeter-college, had been chaplain to prince Charles and archdeacon of Surrey; upon the promotion of Dr. Prideaux to the see of Worcester, he was chosen rector of this college, but resided little there, retiring during the war to his rectory of Heanton in Devon, where be led a recluse life, and died in April 1649. He was, according to Dr. Walker, a great divine, a very good philosopher, and a noted preacher.[[43]](#footnote-43)

Sir Nathaniel Brent, warden of Merton-college, was probationer fellow in the year 1594, and proctor of the university in 1607; he afterward travelled into several parts of the learned world, and underwent dangerous adventures in Italy to procure the history of the council of Trent, which he translated into English, and therefore, says Mr. Wood,[[44]](#footnote-44) deserves an honourable mention. By the favour of archbishop Abbot he was made commissary of the diocese of Canterbury, and vicar-general to the archbishop, being doctor of laws, and at length judge of the prerogative. In 1629 he was knighted at Woodstock, and at the commencement of the civil war took part with the parliament, for which reason he was ejected his wardenship of this college, but restored again when it came into the parliament’s hands in 1646. He was one of the visitors of the university, and esteemed a very learned and judicious civilian. He resigned his wardenship in the year 1650, and died in London in 1652, after he had lived seventy-nine years.

Richard Zouch, LL.D, principal of Alban-hall, was of noble birth, and served in parliament for the borough of Hythe in Kent. He was chancellor of the diocese of Oxon, principal of St. Alban-hall in 1625, and at length judge of the high court of admiralty; he was very able and eminent in his own profession, a subtle logician, an expert historian, and for the knowledge and practice of the civil law the chief person of his time. As his birth was noble, says Mr. Wood,[[45]](#footnote-45) so was his behaviour and discourse; and as he was personable and handsome, so naturally sweet, pleasing, and affable; he kept his principalship and professorship till his death, which happened March 1, 1660-1.

Dr. Thomas Lawrence, master of Baliol-college, and Margaret professor of divinity, had been chaplain to king Charles I. and prebendary of Litchfield, and by the interest of archbishop Laud preferred to the mastership of this college in 1637. He submitted to the authority of the visitors, and had a certificate under their hands, dated August 3, 1648, wherein they attest, that he had engaged to observe the Directory in all ecclesiastical administrations, to preach practical divinity to the people, and to forbear preaching any of those opinions that the reformed church had condemned.[[46]](#footnote-46) Dr. Walker says, he resigned all his preferments in the university in the year 1650, but does not say upon what occasion; only that he grew careless, and did much degenerate in his life and manners; that he died in the year 1657, but that if he had lived three years longer, he would notwithstanding have been consecrated an Irish bishop.[[47]](#footnote-47)

The professors of sciences who submitted to the visitors, and were continued, were,

Dr. Edward Pocock, professor of the Hebrew and Arabic languages; one of the most learned men of his age, and justly celebrated at home and abroad for his great skill in the oriental languages, and for many works that he published. He was afterward ejected from his canonry of Christ-church for refusing the engagement 1651,[[48]](#footnote-48) but was suffered to enjoy his professorship of Arabic and Hebrew; he conformed in the year 1660, and lived in great reputation till the year 1691.[[49]](#footnote-49)

Thomas Clayton, M.D. king’s professor of anatomy, which professorship he resigned to Dr. William Petty, in January 1650. He was made warden of Merton-college upon the resignation of Dr. Reynolds, March 26, 1661, and the next day was knighted by the interest of his brother-in-law sir Charles Cotterel.

Mr. Arthur Philips, professor of music, of whom I have met with no account.

The heads of colleges ejected by the visitors, with their successors, may be seen in the following table.
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Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, warden of All-Souls-colIege, was ejected April 3, 1648, and lived retired with his friends in Staffordshire till 1659, when he was restored to his wardenship upon the death of Dr. Palmer. After the Restoration he was successively bishop of London, chancellor of Oxford, and archbishop of Canterbury: he built the noble theatre at Oxford, and did a great many other works of charity,[[50]](#footnote-50) but never gave any great specimens of his piety or learning to the world.[[51]](#footnote-51)

Dr. Samuel Fell, vice-chancellor of the university, and dean of Christ-church, dispossessed of his deanery April 12, 1648.[[52]](#footnote-52) He gave the visitors all the disturbance he could, and was therefore taken into custody for a time, but being quickly released he retired to his rectory at Sunningwell in Berkshire, where he died February 1, 1648-9. He had been a Calvinist, but changed his sentiments, and after great creepings and cringings to archbishop Laud, says Mr. Wood,[[53]](#footnote-53) he became his creature, and if the rebellion had not broke out, would, no doubt, have been made a bishop. He left no remarkable traces of his learning behind him.

Dr. Samuel Radcliffe, principal of Brazen-nose-college, was elected to his headship 1614, and was in an infirm condition when he was ejected for disowning the authority of the visitors, April 13, 1648, and died the June following.[[54]](#footnote-54) Neither Mr. Wood nor Walker says anything of his learning, nor are his works extant.

Dr. Robert Newlin, president, of Corpus-Christi-college, and pro-vice-chancellor in the year 1648. He was restored to his presidentship again in the year 1660, and died in it 1687. But neither Wood nor Walker has given him any character.[[55]](#footnote-55)

Dr. Richard Bayly, president of St. John’s college, a kinsman of archbishop Laud, and one of his executors; he had been president of this college twenty years when he was ejected; but was restored in 1660, and died at Salisbury 1667.[[56]](#footnote-56) He was hospitable and charitable, but very faulty, says Mr. Wood, in using some kind of oaths in common conversation.[[57]](#footnote-57) I do not know that he published anything.

Dr. John Oliver, president of Magdalen-college, had been domestic chaplain to archbishop Laud, and was a man, says Dr. Walker,[[58]](#footnote-58) of great learning and sound principles in religion (that is, of the principles of the archbishop); he was restored to his preferments 1660, but died soon after, October 27, 1661.

Dr. Hannibal Potter, president of Trinity-college, elected 1643, and turned out with the rest who disowned the authority of the visitors, April 13, 1648. He afterward accepted of a curacy in Somersetshire, and was ejected for insufficiency; but Dr. Walker says,[[59]](#footnote-59) it was because he used part of the church-service. He was restored in 1660, and died in 1664.

Dr. John Pit, warden of Wadham-college, elected April 16, 1644, after that city was garrisoned for the king; he behaved very refractorily towards the visitors, and died soon after his ejectment.[[60]](#footnote-60)

Dr. Francis Mansel, principal of Jesus-college, elected to this principalship in the year 1630, and ejected May 22, 1648. He was restored again in 1660, and died 1665, having been an eminent benefactor to his college.

Dr. Thomas Walker, master of University-college, elected 1632, and dispossessed by the visitors July 10, 1648. He was restored in the year 1660, and died in 1665. He was related to archbishop Laud, and was one of his executors, and, according to Lloyd, a deserving modest man and a great sufferer.[[61]](#footnote-61)

Mr. Henry Wightwick, B.D. elected to the mastership of Pembroke college in direct opposition to the order of parliament, July 13, 1647, for which reason he was soon after removed. In the year 1660 he was restored, but turned out again in 1664, for what reasons Dr. Walker says he does not know. He died in Lincolnshire 1671.[[62]](#footnote-62)

Dr. Henry Stringer, elected to the wardenship of New-college, after the same manner, in direct opposition to the visitors, November 18, 1647, for which reason he was deprived August 1, 1648. He was professor of the Greek language, but resigned, and died at London 1657.[[63]](#footnote-63)

The professors ejected by the visitors were,

Dr. Robert Saunderson, regius professor of divinity; a very learned man, and an excellent casuist;[[64]](#footnote-64) he was nominated one of the assembly of divines, but did not sit among them. He had a very considerable hand in drawing up the reasons of the university against the covenant, and the negative oath. After his ejectment he retired to his living at Boothby, where he continued preaching, though not without some difficulties, till the Restoration, when he was preferred to the bishopric of Lincoln, and died 1662-3.[[65]](#footnote-65)

Mr. John Birkenhead, A.M. moral philosophy reader; he was employed by the court to write the Mercurius Aulicus, a paper filled with most bitter invectives against the parliament, for which he was rewarded with this lectureship. After his ejectment he lived privately till the Restoration, when he was knighted, and chosen burgess in parliament for the borough of Wilton. He was also created LL.D, and master of the faculties, and died in 1679, leaving behind him, according to Wood, a very sorry character.[[66]](#footnote-66)

Mr. Robert Waring, Camden history professor; he bore arms for the king in the garrison at Oxford, and was not elected to this professorship till after the visitation began. He was reckoned, says Wood, among the wits of the university, and was a good poet and orator. He died 1658.[[67]](#footnote-67)

John Edwards, M. D. natural philosophy lecturer; who behaved rudely towards the visitors, and was therefore not only dispossessed of his preferment, but expelled the university;[[68]](#footnote-68)  but neither Wood nor Walker gives any character of him.

Peter Turner, M. D. Savilian professor of geometry; he served his majesty as a volunteer under the command of sir J. Byron, and being a zealous loyalist, was expelled the university by the visitors, after which he retired to London, and died 1650. He was a good mathematician, well read in the fathers, an excellent linguist, and highly esteemed by archbishop Laud.[[69]](#footnote-69)

John Greaves, A. M. professor of astronomy, was sent by archbishop Laud to travel into the eastern parts of the world to make a collection of books in those languages.[[70]](#footnote-70) After his return he was preferred to this professorship, but was ejected by the visitors, and November 9, 1648, expelled the university, for sending the college-treasure to the king, and other offences of the like nature. He died at London 1652, with the reputation of a good scholar, having been well respected by Mr. Selden and others.[[71]](#footnote-71)

Dr. Henry Hammond, university-orator, was a very learned man, and a great divine, highly esteemed by king Charles I. He assisted at the treaty of Uxbridge, and attended the king as his chaplain when he was permitted. After his ejectment he retired to the house of sir John Packington of Worcestershire, where he employed his time in writing several valuable and learned treatises in defence of the hierarchy of the church of England, and in the study of the New Testament. He died April 25, 1660.

The heads of colleges who succeeded those that were ejected by authority of parliament, were,

Dr. Edward Reynolds, vice-chancellor of the university, and dean of Christ-church in the place of Dr. Fell; he was probationer-fellow of Merton-collegein the year 1620, which he obtained by his uncommon skill in the Greek tongue; he was a good disputant and orator, a popular divine, and in great esteem in the city of London, being preacher to the honourable society of Lincoln’s-Inn. Mr. Wood confesses,[[72]](#footnote-72) he was a person of excellent parts and endowments, of a very good wit, fancy, and judgment, and much esteemed by all parties for his florid style. Sir Thomas Brown adds, that he was a divine of singular affability, meekness, and humility; of great learning, a frequent preacher, and a constant resident. He conformed at the Restoration, and was made bishop of Norwich, and died 1676.

Dr. John Wilkins, promoted to the wardenship of Wadham-college in the place of Dr. Pit. He was educated in Magdalen-hall, and was chaplain to Charles count-palatine of the Rhine. A little before the Restoration he came to London, and was minister of St. Lawrence-Jewry, and preacher to the society at Lincoln’s-Inn. Mr. Wood admits,[[73]](#footnote-73) that he was a person of rare gifts, a noted theologist and preacher, a curious critic, an excellent mathematician, and as well seen in mechanism and the new philosophy as any in his time. In the year 1656 he married the sister of O. Cromwell, then lord-protector of England, and had the headship of Trinity-college in Cambridge conferred upon him, which is the best preferment in that university. He was afterward a member of the Royal Society, to which he was a considerable benefactor. Dr. Burnet says, that bishop Wilkins was a man of as great a mind, as true a judgment, of as eminent virtue, and as good a soul, as any he ever knew. Archbishop Tillotson gives him an equal character; and several members of the Royal Society acknowledge him to have been an ornament to the university and the English nation. He was created bishop of Chester in the year 1668, and died of the stone in the house of Dr. Tillotson 1672.[[74]](#footnote-74)

Dr. Joshua Hoyle, preferred to the headship of University-college in the room of Dr. Walker; he was educated at Magdalen-hall, Oxford, but being invited into Ireland became fellow of Trinity-college, and professor of divinity in the university of Dublin. In the beginning of the Irish rebellion he came over to England, and was made vicar of Stepney, a member of the assembly of divines, and at length master of this college, and king’s professor of divinity in the room of Dr. Sanderson. Mr. Wood says,[[75]](#footnote-75) he was a person of great reading and memory, but of less judgment. He was exactly acquainted with the schoolmen, and so much devoted to his book, that he was in a manner a stranger to the world; he was indefatigably industrious, and as well qualified for an academic as any person of his time. He died 1654.

Dr. Daniel Greenwood, principal of Brazen-nose-college, in the room of Dr. Radcliffe; he had been fellow of the college for a considerable time, and had the reputation of a profound scholar and divine. Mr. Wood says,[[76]](#footnote-76) he was a severe and good governor, as well in his vice-chancellorship as in his principalship; he continued in his college with an unspotted character till the Restoration, when he was ejected by the king’s commissioners, after which he lived privately till 1673, when he died.

Dr. John Wilkinson had been principal of Magdalen-hall before the civil wars, but when that university was garrisoned by the king, he fled into the parliament’s quarters, and was succeeded by Dr. Thomas Read, who was admitted by the king’s mandate, October 16, 1643, but in 1646 Dr. Wilkinson was restored. The year following (1647) he was made president of Magdalen-college in the room of Dr. Oliver; he was a learned and pious man, died January 2, 1649, and was buried in the church of Great-Milton, Oxfordshire.

Dr. Henry Wilkinson, junior, commonly called Dean Harry, principal of Magdalen-hall; he was a noted tutor and moderator in his college before the commencement of the civil wars, upon the breaking out of which he left Oxford and came to London, but when that city was surrendered to the parliament he returned to the university, and was created D. D. made principal of his hall, and moral philosophy professor in the room of Mr. Birkenhead. Mr. Wood says,[[77]](#footnote-77) that he took all ways imaginable to make his house flourish with young students: that he was a frequent and active preacher, and a good disciplinarian; for which reason the heads of the university persuaded him earnestly to conform at the Restoration, that they might keep him among them, but he refused. After his ejectment he suffered for his nonconformity, by imprisonments, mulcts, and the loss of his goods and books; though, according to the same author, he was very courteous in speech and carriage, communicative of his knowledge, generous, charitable to the poor, and so public-spirited, that he always regarded the common good more than his own private concerns. He published several learned works, and died 1690, æt. 74.

Dr. Robert Harris, president of Trinity-college in the room of Dr. Potter, was educated in Magdalen-hall, and had been a famous preacher in Oxfordshire for about forty years; upon the breaking out of the war he came to London, where he continued till appointed one of the visitors of the university, and head of this college, over which he presided ten years, though he was now seventy. He was a person of great piety and gravity, an exact master of the Hebrew language, and well versed in chronology, church-history, the councils, and fathers. He governed his college with great prudence, and gained the affections of all the students, who reverenced him as a father, though he had been stigmatized by the royalists as a notorious pluralist.—To which the writer of his life replies, that whatever benefices he might have been nominated to, he declared he did not receive the profits of them. The inscription upon his tombstone says, that he was “præses æternum celebrandus; perspicacissimus indolum scrutator, potestatis arbiter mitissimus, merentium fautor integerrimus,” &c. He died 1658.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Dr. Henry Langley, master of Pembroke-college in the room of Mr. Wightwick, was originally fellow of his college, and made master of it in 1647. He kept his place till the Restoration, after which he set up a private academy among the dissenters; having the character of a solid and judicious divine, and being a frequent preacher. He died 1679.[[79]](#footnote-79)

Dr. Francis Cheynel, president of St. John’s college in the room of Dr. Bayly, was probationer-fellow of Merton-college in the year 1629, and afterward rector of Petworth, a member of the assembly of divines, and this year made president of that college, and Margaret professor in the room of Dr. Lawrence, both which he quitted after some time for refusing the engagement, and retired to his living at Petworth, from whence he was ejected at the Restoration. He was a person of a great deal of indiscreet zeal, as appears by his behaviour at the funeral of the great Mr. Chillingworth, already mentioned. Bishop Hoadly says, he was exactly orthodox, and as pious, honest, and charitable, as his bigotry would permit; and Mr. Echard adds, that he was of considerable learning and great abilities.[[80]](#footnote-80)

Dr. Michael Roberts, principal of Jesus-college in the room of Dr. Mansel, was a good scholar, and would, no doubt, have conformed at the Restoration, had he been inclined to have accepted any preferment, but he had resigned his principalship into the hands of the protector 1657, and being rich chose a private life.[[81]](#footnote-81) He published a Latin elegy upon general Monk, duke of Albemarle, and died in Oxford 1679.

Dr. Edmund Staunton, president of Corpus-Christi-college in the room of Dr. Newlin, was admitted fellow of this college 1616, and afterward minister of Kingston-upon-Thames. He took the degrees in divinity 1634, and was afterward one of the assembly of divines. He kept his principalship till he was ejected by the king’s commissioners at the Restoration; he was a diligent popular preacher, a good scholar, and continued his labours among the Nonconformists till his death, which happened 1671.[[82]](#footnote-82)

John Palmer, M. D. warden of All-Souls in the room of Dr. Sheldon, had been bachelor of physic of Queen’s college, and was now created M. D. in presence of the chancellor; he was a learned man, and held his preferment till his death, which happened March 4, 1659; at which time, there being a near prospect of the restoration, Dr. Sheldon was restored to his wardenship.[[83]](#footnote-83)

Upon the death of Dr. Pink, the visitors nominated old Mr. White of Dorchester to succeed him, but I think he refused it, being very much advanced in years.[[84]](#footnote-84)

The professors of sciences, who succeeded the ejected ones, were,

Dr. Seth Ward, professor of astronomy in the place of Dr. Greaves, and, according to Mr. Wood, the most noted mathematician[[85]](#footnote-85) and astronomer of his time; he was educated in Sidney-college, Cambridge, and in the year 1643, ejected for adhering to the king, but having afterward changed his mind, he made friends to the committee for reforming the university of Oxford, and was nominated to this preferment; he was afterward master of Trinitycollege, and upon his majesty’s restoration preferred, first to the bishopric of Exeter, and then to that of Salisbury, where he died 1668.[[86]](#footnote-86)

Dr. John Wallis, Savilian professor of geometry in the room of Dr. Turner; the fame of this gentleman’s learning is well known to the world; he was of Emanuel-college, Cambridge, and afterward fellow of Queen’s college in the same university, then minister of St. Martin’s, Ironmonger-lane, London, one of the scribes in the assembly of divines, and now, by the appointment of the committee, geometry professor;[[87]](#footnote-87) he conformed at the Restoration, and maintained his post, and was an ornament to the university to a very advanced age.[[88]](#footnote-88)

Lewis du Moulin, M. D. of the university of Leyden, Camden professor of history in the place of Mr. Robert Waring, was incorporated in the same degree at Cambridge, 1634; he was son of the famous Peter du Moulin, the French Protestant, and kept his preferment till the Restoration, when he was turned out by his majesty’s commissioners, and persisted in his nonconformity till his death. He was a valuable and learned man, as appears by his writings; but Mr. Wood observes,[[89]](#footnote-89) he was a violent Independent, and ill-natured; he died in London 1680.

Joshua Crosse, LL.D., natural philosophy reader in the room of Dr. Edwards, and one of the proctors of the university; he was fellow of Magdalen-college, and kept his reader’s place till the Restoration, after which he lived privately in Oxford till his death, which happened in 1676. He was a gentleman much honoured for his becoming conversation.[[90]](#footnote-90)

Ralph Button, A. M. university-orator in the room of Dr. Hammond, and one of the proctors of the university; he was originally of Exeter-college, where he made so great a progress in philosophy, and other literature, that when he was only bachelor of arts he was recommended by Dr. Prideaux to stand for a fellowship in Merton-college, and was accordingly chosen 1683. He was afterward a celebrated tutor in his house, but was obliged to quit Oxford in the beginning of the civil wars, because he would not bear arms for the king. When the war was over he resumed his employment as tutor, and upon the refusal of Edward Corbet was made canon of Christ-church, and university-orator; he was ejected at the Restoration, and afterward taught academical learning at Islington, near London, till 1680, when he died. He was an excellent scholar, a most humble upright man, and a great sufferer for nonconformity.[[91]](#footnote-91)

Mr. John Harman, A. M., professor of the Greek language in the room of Dr. Stringer, was educated in Magdalen-college, and took his degrees 1617; he was afterward master of the free-school at St. Albans, and one of the masters of Westminster-school; from thence he was removed to the Greek professorship in this university. He was, says Mr. Wood,[[92]](#footnote-92) a great philologist, a tolerable Latin poet, and one of the most excellent Grecians of his time, but otherwise an honest weak man. He was turned out at the Restoration, and afterward lived privately at Steventon in Hampshire till the year 1670, when he died.

These were all the changes that were made among the heads of colleges and professors at this time; and upon the whole, though it must be allowed that many of the ejected loyalists were men of learning and great merit, it is certain, those that kept their places, and the successors of such as were ejected, were men of equal probity and virtue, and no less eminent in their several professions, as appears by the monuments of their learning, some of which are remaining to this day.

The very enemies of the new heads of colleges have confessed, that they were strict in the government of their several houses, that they kept a more than common watch over the morals of the students, and obliged them to an exact compliance with their statutes. The professors were indefatigable in instructing their pupils both in public and private; drunkenness, oaths, and profanation of the Lord’s day, were banished; strict piety, and a profession of religion, were in fashion; the scholars often met together for prayer and religious conference; so that, as Mr. Philip Henry, who lived then in the university, observes, “If those of the old spirit and way were at first the better scholars, these were the better men.”

Let the reader now judge of the spirit and candour of those writers, who insinuate, “that the new professors could neither pronounce Latin, nor write English; that in the room of the ejected loyalists there succeeded an illiterate rabble, swept up from the plough-tail, from shops, and grammar-schools, and the dregs of the neighbouring university; that the muses were driven from their ancient seats; that all loyalty, learning, and good sense, were banished; and that there succeeded in their room nothing but barbarism, enthusiasm, and ignorance, till the dawn of the Restoration.”[[93]](#footnote-93) Lord Clarendon was a declared enemy to these changes, and has painted them in the most odious colours, yet the force of truth has obliged him to confess, that “though it might have been reasonably expected, that this wild and barbarous depopulation (as he calls it) would have extirpated all the learning, religion, and loyalty, which had flourished there, and that the succeeding ill husbandry, and unskilful cultivation, would have made it fruitful only in ignorance, profaneness, atheism, and rebellion; yet by God’s wonderful providence that fruitful soil could not be made barren by all that stupidity and negligence; it choked the weeds, and would not suffer the poisonous seeds that were sown with industry enough, to spring up, but after several tyrannical governors mutually succeeding each other, and with the same malice and perverseness endeavouring to extinguish all good literature and allegiance, it yielded a harvest of extraordinary good knowledge in all parts of learning; and many who were wickedly introduced applied themselves to the study of good learning, and the practice of virtue, and had inclinations to that duty and obedience they had never been taught, that when it pleased God to bring king Charles II. back to his throne he found the university abounding in excellent learning, and devoted to duty and obedience little inferior to what it was before its desolation.” Considering the ill-nature that runs through this paragraph, it must be acknowledged to be an unanswerable testimony to the learning and application of the new professors, and with equal justice it may be added, that the university was in a much better state for learning, religion, and good sense, at the Restoration, than before the civil wars, as all the eminent philosophers and divines of the establishment, who did so much honour to their country in the three succeeding reigns, owed their education to these professors, viz. the Tillotsons, Stillingfleets, Patricks, Souths, Caves, Sprats, Kidders, Whitbys, Bulls, Boyles, Newtons, Lockes, and others. The university was in high reputation in foreign parts, and produced as many learned performances as in any former period. So that admitting the new professors were not introduced into their places in a legal way, according to the statutes, because of the necessity of the times, yet it is certain, they proved wise and watchful governors, strict observers of their statutes, and industrious promoters of piety and the liberal arts; and were far from deserving the brand of “ignorant, illiterate, hypocritical blockheads, enemies to the legal constitution of their country,” or of being pronounced unworthy the high preferments they enjoyed.

There were no doubt, at first, very considerable vacancies in the several colleges; many of the fellows and scholars being dead, or killed in the king’s service, and others having resigned their places in the university for benefices in the church, besides those who were expelled by the visitors as already mentioned; but to supply the deficiency of fellows and tutors, the committee encouraged several learned graduates in the university of Cambridge to translate themselves to Oxford, and accept of preferments according to their merits. Many who had deserted the university when it became a garrison for the king, returned to their colleges, and were promoted according to their seniority. Great numbers of youths, who had been kept at home because of the public commotions, were now sent to Oxford by their parents to perfect their education; and if it be considered farther, that there had been no admissions from Westminster, Eton, St. Paul’s, Merchant-Taylors’, and other public schools, for five or six years past, it is not to be wondered that there was an unusual flow of youth to the university at this time, so that the damage occasioned by this revolution of affairs was quickly repaired, and the muses returned to their ancient seats.

The long interruption of education in the university produced a very great scarcity of orthodox and learned ministers in the counties, some being silenced for refusing the covenant, and others dispersed, or killed in the wars. Many pulpits also were vacant by reason of the scandal or insufficiency of the incumbents, which was one occasion of the increase of lay-preachers, for the country people would go to hear anybody rather than have no sermons; besides, the Presbyterian clergy would authorize none to preach, except such as would take the covenant, and consent to their discipline. To remedy these evils, the northern counties petitioned the houses to erect a new university in the city of York, but the confusion of the times prevented their prosecuting the design. The Independents, who were less zealous about clerical orders, encouraged or at least connived at the lay-preachers, apprehending that in cases of necessity, pious men of good natural parts might exercise their gifts publicly to the edification of the church; till under this cover they saw every bold enthusiast almost begin to usurp the office of a teacher. To bring things therefore into a little better order the following petition was presented to both houses of parliament, October 6, under the title of “The humble petition of many citizens of London, and others.”

“Your petitioners are deeply sensible of the extreme want of preaching the gospel throughout this kingdom, there being many hundreds of towns and villages altogether destitute of any preaching ministers, and many others are not well supplied; by reason whereof ignorance, drunkenness, profaneness, disaffection to the parliament, and to others in authority, everywhere abound, there being scarce so much as the face of religion in many places. There is a great cry of people from several counties of the kingdom, for men to preach to them the word of eternal life; and there are many men of competent gifts and abilities, of good life and honest conversation, who being willing to employ their talents in the Lord’s work, and to submit themselves for approbation to moderate and judicious men, are yet, by occasion of some scruples about ordination, discouraged from engaging in this work of publishing the gospel, wherein they might be helpful to many. And seeing that in the days of queen Elizabeth, upon occasion of people’s necessities, many such men were sent forth to publish the gospel, who had no formal act of ministerial ordination passed upon them, whose endeavours the Lord blessed to the good of many souls, and the furthering of the kingdom’s peace; and since also we nothing doubt, but the propagation of the gospel throughout this kingdom, and the information of men in the things of their peace, and the peace and safety of the kingdom, are worthy of your greatest zeal, and are not the least of your care;

“Therefore your petitioners humbly pray, that those who shall be approved of as men meet to dispense the mysteries of the gospel, by such judicious, moderate, and able men, whom you in wisdom shall appoint thereunto, may receive from this honourable house encouragement and protection in preaching the gospel in any place of this kingdom, or dominion of Wales, where need requires, that so the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified; ignorant men may be instructed; drunkenness, profaneness, and disaffection to the parliament, and to others in authority, may be abandoned; and both the temporal and spiritual peace and prosperity of all sorts of men be the more advanced.”[[94]](#footnote-94)

The houses thanked the petitioners for their good affection, but did nothing upon it.

By an ordinance of February 11, this year, “all stage-players were declared to be rogues punishable by the acts of the 39th of queen Elizabeth and 7th of king James, notwithstanding any licence they might have from the king, or any other person. All stage galleries, seats, and boxes, are ordered to be pulled down by warrant of two justices of peace; all actors in plays for time to come being convicted shall be publicly whipped, and find sureties for their not offending in like manner for the future; and all spectators of plays for every offence are to pay five shillings.”[[95]](#footnote-95)

The controversies about church-government, and liberty of conscience, ran still as high as ever; the Presbyterians, who had the government of the city of London in their hands, were for pressing covenant-uniformity in their sermons, which the Independents, and others of more Catholic principles, endeavoured to oppose with all their might. Lord Clarendon is pleased to represent this in a ludicrous manner; “The pulpit-skirmishes (says his lordship) were now higher than ever; the Presbyterians in those fields losing nothing of their courage; having a notorious power in the city, notwithstanding the emulation of the Independents, who were more learned and rational, who, though they had not so great congregations of the common people, yet infected and were followed by the most substantial citizens, and by others of better condition. To these men Cromwell and most of the officers of the army adhered; but the divinity of the times was not to be judged by the preaching and congregations in churches, which were now thought not to be the fit and proper places of devotion and religious exercises, where the bishops had exercised such unlimited tyranny, and which had been polluted by their consecrations. Liberty of conscience was now become the great charter, and men who were inspired preached and prayed when and where they would. Anabaptists grew very numerous, with whom the Independents concurred, so far as to join with them for the abolishing of tithes, as of Judaical institution—If any honest man could have been at so much ease as to have beheld the prospect with delight, never was such a scene of confusion as had spread itself at this time over the whole kingdom.”[[96]](#footnote-96) And yet it is certain, that the laws against vice and immorality were strictly executed, the Lord’s day was duly observed, the churches were crowded with attentive hearers, family devotion was in repute, neither servants nor children being allowed to walk in the fields, or frequent the public houses. In a word, notwithstanding the difference of men’s opinions, and political views, there was a zeal for God, and a much greater appearance of sobriety, virtue, and true religion, than before the civil war, or after the blessed Restoration.

Among the Puritan divines who died this year, was the reverend Mr. Herbert Palmer, B. D., of whom mention has been made among the Cambridge professors; his father was sir Thomas Palmer, of Wingham in Kent, his mother the eldest daughter of Herbert Pelham of Sussex, esq.[[97]](#footnote-97) Our divine was born at Wingham, and baptized there March 29, 1601; he had a polite education in his father’s house, and learned the French language almost as soon as he could speak. In the year 1615, he was admitted fellow-commoner in St. John’s college Cambridge. In 1622, he took the degree of M. A. In 1623, he was chosen fellow of Queen’s college in that university; the year following he was ordained to the ministry, to which he had devoted himself from his infancy: his first exercise was at a lecture in the city of Canterbury, where he preached once a week, till it was put down with the rest of the afternoon-sermons. In the year 1632, he was presented by archbishop Laud to the vicarage of Ashwell in Hertfordshire, where he preached twice every Lord’s day, and catechised the children of his parishioners. The same year he was chosen one of the university-preachers of Cambridge, by which he had authority to preach, as he should have occasion, in any part of England. In the year 1640, he and Dr. Tuckney were chosen clerks of the convocation for the diocese of Lincoln. In the year 1643, he was called to be a member of the assembly of divines at Westminster, and after some time chosen one of their assessors, in which place he behaved with great wisdom and integrity. April 11, 1644, he was constituted master of Queen’s college, Cambridge, by the earl of Manchester; here he set himself industriously to the promoting of religion and learning, being very solicitous that none should be admitted to a scholarship or fellowship in his college, but such as were qualified in both these respects, the good effects of which appeared in the reputation and credit of that society, beyond most others of the university in his time. Mr. Palmer was a gentleman of a low stature, and a weakly constitution, but indefatigable in business; his leisure was employed in works of devotion and charity, and as he had a competent estate, and chose a single life, he had an opportunity of doing a great deal of good; he maintained several poor scholars at his own expense in the college, and when he died left a considerable benefaction to the same purpose. His last sickness was not long, his constitution being spent; but his behaviour was uncommon; he looked the king of terrors in the face with an unshaken resolution, and resigned his life this summer with a firm expectation of the mercy of God to eternal life, in the forty-sixth year of his age, and was buried at the new church at Westminster.

Mr. Henry Wilkinson, B.D., was born in Yorkshire, and educated at Merton-college, Oxford. In the year 1586, he was chosen probationer-fellow, and proceeded in arts; after some time he was made B.D., and in the year 1601 became pastor of Waddesdon in Bucks. He was a person of considerable learning and piety, and being an old Puritan, says Mr. Wood,[[98]](#footnote-98) was elected one of the assembly of divines in 1643, but he spent the chief of his time and labours among his parishioners at Waddesdon, by whom he was greatly beloved; here he died in a very advanced age, March 19, 1647-8, and lies buried in his own church.

Mr. John Saltmarsh, descendant of an ancient family in Yorkshire, was educated in Magdalen-college, Cambridge, and graduated there; he was esteemed a person of a fine active fancy, no contemptible poet, and a good preacher; he was first minister at Northampton, afterward at Braisted in Kent, and at length chaplain in sir Thomas Fairfax’s army, where he always preached up love and unity; he meddled not with presbytery or independency, but laboured to draw souls from sin to Christ. He published some treatises, by which it appears he was of Antinomian principles. The manner of his death was extraordinary; December the 4th, 1647, being at his house at Ilford in Essex, he told his wife he had been in a trance, and received a message from God which he must immediately deliver to the army. He went that night to London, and next day to Windsor; being come to the council of officers he told them, that the Lord had left them: that he would not prosper their consultations, but destroy them by divisions among themselves, because they had sought to destroy the people of God, those who had stood by them in their greatest difficulties. He then went to the general, and without moving his hat told him, that God was highly displeased with him for committing of saints to prison. The like message he delivered to Cromwell, requiring him to take effectual means for the enlargement of the members of the army, who were committed for not complying with the general council. He then took his leave of the officers, telling them, he had now done his errand, and must never see them any more. After which he went to London, and took leave of his friends there, telling them his work was done, and desiring some of them to be careful of his wife. Thursday December 9, he returned to Ilford in perfect health; next day he told his wife, that he had now finished his work, and must go to his Father. Saturday morning, December 11, he was taken speechless, and about four in the afternoon he died.[[99]](#footnote-99)
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