

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

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

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

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

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE;

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

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

1837.

PART IV.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING CHARLES I. TO THE CORONATION OF KING CHARLES II. IN SCOTLAND. 1648.

UPON the death of the late king, the legal constitution was dissolved, and all that followed till the restoration of king Charles II. was no better than a usurpation, under different shapes; the house of commons, if it may deserve that name, after it had been purged of a third part of its members,¹ relying on the act of continuation, called themselves the supreme authority of the nation, and began with an act to disinherit the prince of Wales, forbidding all persons to proclaim him king of England, on pain of high-treason. The house of lords was voted useless; and the office of a king unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous. The form of government for the future was declared to be a free commonwealth; the executive power lodged in the hands of a council of state of forty persons,² with full powers to take care of the whole administration for one year; new keepers of the great seal were appointed, from whom the judges received their commissions, with the name, style, and title, of *custodes libertatis Angliæ auctoritate parliamenti*; i. e. keepers of the liberties of England by authority of parliament. The coin was stamped on one side with the arms of England between a laurel and a palm, with this inscription, "The Commonwealth of England;" and on the other, a cross and harp, with this motto, "God with us."³ The oaths of allegiance and supremacy were abolished, and a new one appointed, called the Engagement, which was, to be true and faithful to the government established, without king or house of peers. Such as refused the oath were declared incapable of holding any place or office of trust in the commonwealth; but as many of the excluded members of the house of commons as would take it resumed their places.

Such was the foundation of this new constitution, which had neither the consent of the people of England, nor of their representatives in a free parliament. "And if ever there was an usurped government mutilated, and

¹ According to Echard, not above a fifth part of the commons were left. On account of the reduced and mutilated state of the house, they were called the Rump Parliament. This name was first given to them by Walker, the author of the History of Independency, by way of derision, in allusion to a fowl, all devoured but the rump; and they were compared to a man "who would never cease to whet and whet his knife, till there was no steel left to make it useful." Dr. Grey, and Rapin.—ED.

² According to Whitelocke, who gives their names, the council consisted of thirtyeight persons only.—ED.

³ On which a man of wit observed, "that God and the commonwealth were not both on a side." Dr. Grey.—ED.

founded only in violence (says Rapin),⁴ it was that of this parliament.” But though it was unsupported by any other power than that of the army, it was carried on with the most consummate wisdom, resolution, and success, till the same military power that set it up was permitted, by Divine Providence, with equal violence to pull it down.

The new commonwealth in its infant state met with opposition from divers quarters: the levellers in the army gave out, that the people had only changed their yoke, not shaken it off; and that the Rump’s little finger (for so the house of commons was now called) would be heavier than the king’s loins. The agitators therefore petitioned the house to dissolve themselves, that new representatives might be chosen. The commons, alarmed at these proceedings, ordered their general officers to cashier the petitioners, and break their swords over their heads, which was done accordingly. But when the forces passed under a general review at Ware, their friends in the army agreed to distinguish themselves by wearing something white in their hats;⁵ which Cromwell having some intelligence of beforehand, commanded two regiments of horse, who were not in the secret, to surround one of the regiments of foot; and having condemned four of the ringleaders in a council of war, he commanded two of them to be shot to death by their other two associates, in sight of the whole army; and to break the combination, eleven regiments were ordered for Ireland; upon which great numbers deserted, and marched into Oxfordshire; but generals Fairfax and Cromwell, having overtaken them at Abingdon, held them in treaty till colonel Reynolds came up, and after some few skirmishes dispersed them.

The Scots threatened the commonwealth with a formidable invasion, for upon the death of king Charles I. they proclaimed the prince of Wales king of Scotland, and sent commissioners to the Hague, to invite him into that kingdom, provided he would renounce popery and prelacy, and take the solemn league and covenant. To prevent the effects of this treaty, and cultivate a good understanding with the Dutch, the parliament sent Dr. Dorislaus,⁶ an eminent civilian, concerned in the late king’s trial, agent to the States-General; but the very first night after his arrival, May 3, 1649, he was murdered in his own chamber by twelve desperate cavaliers in dis-

⁴ Vol. 2, p. 573, folio.

⁵ Whitelocke, p. 387. 389.

⁶ This person was a native of Holland, and doctor of the civil law at Leyden. On his coming to England he was patronised by Fulk lord Brook, who appointed him to read lectures on history in Cambridge. But, as in the opening of his course he decried monarchy, he was silenced; he then resided some time near to Maldon in Essex, where he had married an English woman. He was afterward a judge advocate, first, in the king’s army, and then in the army of the parliament, and at length one of the judges of the court of admiralty. The parliament ordered 250/. for his funeral; settled on his son £200 per annum for his life, and gave £500 a piece to his daughters. Wood’s *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. 2. p. 228; and Whitelocke’s *Memorials*, p. 390.—En.

guise, who rushed in upon him while he was at supper, and with their drawn swords killed him on the spot.⁷ Both the parliament and states of Holland resented this base action⁸ so highly, that the young king thought proper to remove into France; from whence he went to the Isle of Jersey, and towards the latter end of the year fixed at Breda; where the Scots commissioners concluded a treaty with him, upon the foot of which he ventured his royal person into that kingdom the ensuing year.

But to strike terror into the cavaliers, the parliament erected another high court of justice, and sentenced to death three illustrious noblemen, for the part they had acted in the last civil war; duke Hamilton, the earl of Holland, and lord Capel, who were all executed March 9, in the Palace-yard at Westminster: duke Hamilton declared himself a Presbyterian; and the earl of Holland was attended by two ministers of the same persuasion; but lord Capel was a thorough loyalist, and went off the stage with the courage and bravery of a Roman.

But the chief scene of great exploits this year was in Ireland, which Cromwell, a bold and enterprising commander, had been appointed to reduce; for this purpose he was made lord-lieutenant for three years, and having taken leave of the parliament, sailed from Milford-haven about the middle of August, with an army of fourteen thousand men of resolute principles, who before the embarkation observed a day of fasting and prayer; in which, Mr. Whitelocke remarks, after three ministers had prayed, lieutenant-general Cromwell himself, and the colonels Gough and Harrison, expounded some parts of Scripture excellently well, and pertinently to the occasion. The army was under a severe discipline; not an oath was to be heard throughout the whole camp, the soldiers spending their leisure hours in reading their Bibles, in singing psalms, and religious conferences.

Almost all Ireland was in the hands of the royalists and Roman Catholics, except Dublin and Londonderry; the former of these places had been lately besieged by the duke of Ormond with twenty thousand men,⁹ but the

⁷ Whitelocke, p. 386.

⁸ Dr. Grey cannot easily believe that the murder of Dr. Dorislaus was resented by the states of Holland; because they had bravely remonstrated by their two ambassadors against the king's death: he cannot, therefore, be easily induced to think, that, after this, they could resent the death of one of his execrable murderers. But Dr. Grey does not consider what was due in this case to the honour of their own police, and to the reputation and weight of their own laws. Mr. Neal is justified in his representations by Whitelocke; who says, "that letters from the Hague reported, that the States caused earnest inquisition to be made after the murderers of Dr. Dorislaus; promised one thousand guilders to him who should bring any of them; and published it death to any who should harbour any one of them." Memorials, p. 390.—ED.

⁹ Dr. Grey controverts Mr. Neal's account of the number of the duke of Ormond's army, on the authority of lord Clarendon and Mr. Carte: the former says, that Jones sallied out with a body of six thousand foot and one thousand nine hundred horse, and that the army encamped at Rathmincs was not so strong in horse and foot: the latter, that Jones's

garrison being recruited with three regiments from England, the governor, colonel Jones, surprised the besiegers, and after a vigorous sally stormed their camp, and routed the whole army, which dispersed itself into Drogheda, and other fortified places. Cromwell upon his arrival was received with the acclamations of a vast concourse of people, to whom he addressed himself from a rising ground, with hat in hand, in a soldierlike manner, telling them “he was come to cut down and destroy the barbarous and blood-thirsty Irish, with all their adherents;¹⁰ but that all who were for the Protestant Religion, and the liberties of their country, should find suitable encouragement from the parliament of England and himself, in proportion to their merits.” Having refreshed his forces he marched directly to Drogheda, which was garrisoned with two thousand five hundred foot and three hundred horse, and was therefore thought capable of holding out a month; but the general neglecting the common forms of approach, battered the walls with his cannon, and having made two accessible breaches, like an impetuous conqueror, entered the town in person at the head of colonel Ewer’s regiment of foot, and put all the garrison to the sword. From thence he marched to Wexford, which he took likewise by storm, and after the example of Drogheda, put the garrison to the sword; the general declaring, that he would sacrifice all the Irish Papists to the ghosts of the English Protestants whom they had massacred in cold blood.¹¹ The conquest of

forces amounted to only four thousand foot and one thousand two hundred horse, which was a body nearly equal to the whole Irish army, if it had been all engaged. These authorities are set against Mr. Neal. On the other hand, Whitelocke informs us that, previously to this defeat, letters from Ireland represented the duke of Ormond as approaching Dublin with twelve thousand foot and two thousand four hundred horse; and letters from Chester reported him forty thousand strong before Dublin. Ludlow says, that his forces were double in number to those of Jones. Borlase says, that Jones, with very few forces, comparatively, fell on the besiegers, killed four thousand, and took two thousand five hundred and seventeen prisoners. The plunder of the field, we are told, was so rich, that the camp was like a fair, presenting for sale cloth, silk, and all manner of clothes. The parliament settled 1000/. per annum in land on Jones, for his services. Whitelocke’s Memorials, p. 393. 401.404. Ludlow’s Memoirs, p. 101, 4to. ed. And Harris’s Life of Cromwell, p. 228.—ED.

¹⁰ Dr. Grey spends here more than ten pages in detailing, from lord Clarendon, various acts of oppression, cruelty, and murder, perpetrated by individuals of Cromwell’s army; to shew that they were not less barbarous and blood-thirsty than the inhuman wretches concerned in the Irish massacre. Such deeds, undoubtedly, shock humanity; and ought to shock every party. But the guilt lieth originally at the door of those who were the first aggressors; whose conduct furnished the precedent and provoked retaliation—ED.

¹¹ Great reproach, on this account, has fallen on the name of Cromwell. He reconciled himself to the execution of such severe orders, for putting to the sword and giving no quarter, by considering them as necessary to prevent the effusion of blood for the future, and as the instrument of the righteous judgment of God upon those barbarous wretches who had imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood. If ever such measures are justifiable, “it is in such a case as this (observes Dr. Harris), where the known disposition and behaviour of the sufferers are remarkably barbarous, inhuman, and cruel.” Such horror, we are told, had the barbarities committed by the Irish, in the beginning of the Rebellion and during the course of the war, impressed on every English breast, that even the humane and gentle Fairfax expressed in warm and severe terms his disapprobation at granting them quarter.

these places struck such a terror into the rest, that they surrendered upon the first summons; the name of Cromwell carrying victory on its wings before himself appeared, the whole country was reduced by the middle of May, except Limerick, Galway, and one or two other places, which Ireton took the following summer. Lord Inchequin deserted the remains of the royal army, and Ormond fled into France. Lieutenant-general Cromwell being called home to march against the Scots, arrived at London about the middle of May, and was received by the parliament and city with distinguished respect and honour, as a soldier who had gained more laurels, and done more wonders, in nine months, than any age or history could parallel.

It is a remarkable account the lieutenant-general gives in one of his letters, of the behaviour of the army after their arrival in Ireland: “Their diligence, courage, and behaviour, are such (says he) through the providence of God, and strict care of the chief officers, that never men did obey orders more cheerfully, nor go upon duty more courageously. Never did greater harmony and resolution appear to prosecute this cause of God, than in this army. Such a consent of hearts and hands; such a sympathy of affections, not only in carnal but in spiritual bonds, which tie faster than chains of adamant! I have often observed a wonderful consent of the officers and soldiers upon the grounds of doing service to God, and how miraculously they have succeeded. The mind of man being satisfied, and fixed on God, and that his undertaking is for God’s glory, it gives the greatest courage to those men, and prosperity to their actions.”¹²

To put the affairs of Ireland together: The Roman Catholics charged the ill success of their affairs upon the duke of Ormond, and sent him word, “that they were determined not to submit any longer to his commands, it not being fit that a Catholic army should be under the direction of a Protestant general; but that if he would depart the kingdom, they would undertake of themselves to drive Ireton out of Dublin.” After this they offered the kingdom to the duke of Lorraine, a bigoted Papist, who was wise enough to decline the offer,¹³ and then quarrelling among themselves they were soon driven out of all the strongholds of the kingdom, and forced to submit to the mercy of the conqueror. All who had borne arms in the late insurrection, were shipped away into France, Spain, or Flanders, never to return on pain of death. Those who had a hand in murdering the Protestants at the time of the massacre, were brought from several parts of the country, and

Harris’s *Life of Cromwell*, p. 229; and Macaulay’s *History of England*, vol. 5. p. 15, note, 8vo. ed.—ED.

¹² Whitlocke, p. 434.

¹³ Dr. Grey insinuates here a reflection on Mr. Neal’s veracity; by remarking that he produces no authority for the assertion. But that Ireland was offered to the guardianship of the duke of Lorraine has been since mentioned, as an incontrovertible fact, by Dr. Harris and Mrs. Macaulay.—ED.

after conviction upon a fair trial were executed. The rest of the natives, who were called Tories, were shut up in the most inland counties, and their lands given partly in payment to the soldiers who settled there, and the rest to the first adventurers.¹⁴ Lord Clarendon relates it thus: “Near one hundred thousand of them were transported into foreign parts, for the service of the kings of France and Spain; double that number were consumed by the plague, famine, and other severities exercised upon them in their own country; the remainder were by Cromwell transplanted into the most inland, barren, desolate, and mountainous part of the province of Connaught, and it was lawful for any man to kill any of the Irish that were found out of the bounds appointed them within that circuit. Such a proportion of land was allotted to every man, as the protector thought competent for them; upon which they were to give formal releases of all their titles to their lands in any other provinces; if they refused to give such releases, they were still deprived, and left to starve within the limits prescribed them, out of which they durst not withdraw; so that very few refused to sign those releases, or other acts, which were demanded. It was a considerable time before these Irish could raise any thing out of their lands to support their lives; but necessity was the spring of industry.” Thus they lived under all the infamy of a conquered nation till the restoration of king Charles II. a just judgment of God for their barbarous and unheard-of cruelties to the Irish Protestants!

To return to England: The body of the Presbyterians acted in concert with the Scots, for restoring the king’s family upon the foot of the covenant; several of their ministers carried on a private correspondence with the chiefs of that nation, and instead of taking the engagement to the present powers, called them usurpers, and declined praying for them in their churches; they also declared against a general toleration, for which the army and parliament contended.

When lieutenant-general Cromwell was embarking for Ireland, he sent letters to the parliament, recommending the removal of all the penal laws relating to religion; upon which the house ordered a committee to make report concerning a method for the ease of tender consciences, and an act to be brought in to appoint commissioners in every county, for the approbation of able and well-qualified persons to be made ministers, who cannot comply with the present ordinance for ordination of ministers.¹⁵

August 16, general Fairfax and his council of officers presented a petition to the same purpose, praying “that all penal statutes formerly made, and ordinances lately made, whereby many conscientious people were molested, and the propagation of the gospel hindered, might be removed. Not

¹⁴ Carrington's Life of Cromwell, p. 155. Clarendon, p. 153.

¹⁵ Whitelocke, p. 405.

that they desired this liberty should extend to the setting up Popery, or the late hierarchy; or to the countenancing any sort of immorality or profaneness; for they earnestly desired, that drunkenness, swearing, uncleanness, and all acts of profaneness, might be vigorously prosecuted in all persons whatsoever.”¹⁶ The house promised to take the petition into speedy consideration, and after some time passed it into a law.

But to bring the Presbyterian clergy to the test, the engagement, which had been appointed to be taken by all civil and military officers within a limited time, on pain of forfeiting their places, was now required to be sworn and subscribed by all ministers, heads of colleges and halls, fellows of houses, graduates, and all officers in the universities; and by the masters, fellows, schoolmasters, and scholars, of Eton-college, Westminster, and Winchester schools; no minister was to be admitted to any ecclesiastical living, no clergyman to sit as member of the assembly of divines, nor be capable of enjoying any preferment in the church, unless he qualified himself by taking the engagement within six months, publicly in the face of the congregation.¹⁷

November 9, it was referred to a committee, to consider how the engagement might be subscribed by all the people of the nation, of eighteen years of age and upwards. Pursuant to which a bill was brought in, and passed, January 2, to debar all who should refuse to take and subscribe it from the benefit of the law; and to disable them from suing in any court of law or equity.

This was a severe test on the Presbyterians, occasioned by the apprehended rupture with the Scots; but their clergy inveighed bitterly against it in their sermons, and refused to observe the days of humiliation appointed by authority for a blessing upon their arms. Mr. Baxter says,¹⁸ that he wrote several letters to the soldiers, to convince them of the unlawfulness of the present expedition: and in his sermons declared it a sin to force ministers to pray for the success of those who had violated the covenant, and were going to destroy their brethren. That he both spoke and preached against the engagement, and dissuaded men from taking it. At Exeter, says Mr. Whitelocke, the ministers went out of town on the fast-day, and shut up the church-doors; and all the magistrates refused the engagement. At Taunton, the fast was not kept by the Presbyterian ministers; and at Chester they condemned the engagement to the pit of hell; as did many of the London ministers, who kept days of private fasting and prayer, against the present government. Some of them (says Whitelocke) joined the royalists, and refused to read the ordinances of parliament in their pulpits, as was usual in

¹⁶ Whitelocke, p. 404.

¹⁷ Walker, p. 146.

¹⁸ Life, p. 64. 66.

those times; nay, when the Scots were beaten, they refused to observe the day of thanksgiving,¹⁹ but shut up their churches and went out of town; for which they were summoned before the committee and reprimanded; but the times being unsettled no farther notice was taken of them at present.

Most of the sectarian party, says Mr. Baxter,²⁰ swallowed the engagement; and so did the king's old cavaliers, very few of them being sick of the disease of a scrupulous conscience: some wrote for it, but the moderate episcopal men and Presbyterians generally refused it. Those of Lancashire and Cheshire published the following reasons against it:

(1.) "Because they apprehended the oath of allegiance, and the solemn league and covenant, were still binding.

(2.) "Because the present powers were no better than usurpers.

(3.) "Because the taking of it was a prejudice to the right heir of the crown, and of the ancient legal constitution."

To which it was answered, "that it was absurd to suppose the oath of allegiance, or the solemn league and covenant, to be in force after the king's death; for how could they be obliged to preserve the king's person, when the king's person was destroyed, and the kingly office abolished? and as to his successor, his right had been forfeited and taken away by parliament." With regard to the present powers, it was said, "that it was not for private persons to dispute the rights and titles of their supreme governors. Here was a government *de facto*, under which they lived; as long therefore as they enjoyed the protection of the government, it was their duty to give all reasonable security that they would not disturb it, or else to remove." The body of the common people being weary of war, and willing to live quiet under any administration, submitted to the engagement, as being little more than a promise not to attempt the subversion of the present government, but many of the Presbyterian clergy chose rather to quit their preferments in the church and university, than comply; which made way for the promotion of several Independent divines, and among others, of Dr. Thomas Goodwin, one of the dissenting brethren in the assembly, who by order of parliament, January 8, 1649-50, was appointed president of Magdalen-college, Oxford, with the privilege of nominating fellows and demies in such places as should become vacant by death, or by the possessors refusing to take the engagement.²¹

¹⁹ Lord Grey, at the desire of some who were zealously attached to the parliament, complained, in a letter to the lord-president of the council of state, of the neglect of the ministers, in Leicestershire and another county, in this instance: and urged the importance of noticing their contempt of the thanksgiving-day, expressed by their non-observance of it. Dr. Grey's Appendix, No. 8.—ED.

²⁰ Life, p. 64, 65.

²¹ Whitelocke, p. 453.

The parliament tried several methods to reconcile the Presbyterians to the present administration; persons were appointed to treat with them, and assure them of the protection of the government, and of the full enjoyment of their ecclesiastical preferments according to law; when this could not prevail, an order was published, that ministers in their pulpits should not meddle with state-affairs. After this the celebrated Milton was appointed to write for the government, who rallied the seditious preachers with his satirical pen in a severe manner; at length, when all other methods failed, a committee was chosen to receive informations against such ministers as in their pulpits vilified and aspersed the authority of parliament, and an act was passed, that all such should be sequestered from their ecclesiastical preferments.²²

The Presbyterians supported themselves under these hardships by their alliance with the Scots, and their hope of a speedy alteration of affairs by their assistance; for in the remonstrance of the general assembly of that kirk, dated July 27, they declare, that “the spirit which has acted in the councils of those who have obstructed the work of God, despised the covenant, corrupted the truth, forced the parliament, murdered the king, changed the government, and established such an unlimited toleration in religion, cannot be the spirit of righteousness and holiness. They therefore warn the subjects of Scotland against joining with them, and in case of an invasion to stand up in their own defence. The English have no controversy with us (say they), but because the kirk and state have declared against their unlawful engagement; because we still adhere to our covenant, and have borne our testimony against their toleration; and taking away the king’s life.”²³ But then they warn their people also against malignants, “who value themselves upon their attachment to the young king; and if any from that quarter should invade the kingdom, before his majesty has given satisfaction to the parliament and kirk, they exhort their people to resist them, as abettors of an absolute and arbitrary government.”

About two months after this, the parliament of England published a declaration on their part, wherein they complain of the revolt of the English and Scots Presbyterians, and of their taking part with the enemy, because their discipline was not the exact standard of reformation. “But we are still determined (say they²⁴) not to be discouraged in our endeavours to promote the purity of religion, and the liberty of the commonwealth; and for the satisfaction of our Presbyterian brethren, we declare, that we will continue all those ordinances, which have been made for the promoting a reformation of religion, in doctrine, worship, and discipline, in their full force; and will

²² Whitelocke, p. 387.

²³ Vol. Pamph. No. 34. p. 6.

²⁴ Ibid. No. 34.

uphold the same, in order to suppress Popery, superstition, blasphemy, and all kinds of profaneness. Only we conceive ourselves obliged to take away all such acts and ordinances as are penal and coercive in matters of conscience. And because this has given so great offence, we declare, as in the presence of God, that by whomsoever this liberty shall be abused, we will be ready to testify our displeasure against them, by an effectual prosecution of such offenders.”

The Scots commissioners were all this while treating with the king in Holland, and insisting on his subscribing the solemn league and covenant; his establishing the Westminster confession, the Directory, and the Presbyterian government, in both kingdoms. The king being under discouraging circumstances, consented to all their demands with regard to Scotland, and as to England, referred himself to a free parliament; but the Scots, not satisfied with his majesty’s exceptions as to England, replied, that “such an answer as this would grieve the whole kirk of Scotland, and all their covenanting brethren in England and Ireland, who under pain of the most solemn perjury stand bound to God and one another, to live and die by their covenant, as the chief security of their religion and liberties, against popish and prelatical malignants. Your majesty’s father (say they), in his last message to our kirk, offered to ratify the solemn league and covenant. He offered likewise at the Isle of Wight to confirm the Directory, and the Presbyterian government in England and Ireland, till he and his parliament should agree upon a settled order of the church. Besides, your majesty having offered to confirm the abolishing of episcopacy, and the service-book in Scotland, it cannot certainly be against your conscience to do it in England.” But the king would advance no farther till he had heard from the queen-mother, who sent him word, that it was the opinion of the council of France, that he should agree with the Scots upon the best terms he was able, which he did accordingly, as will be related the next year.

The fifth provincial assembly of London met the beginning of May [1649] at Sion-college, the reverend Mr. Jackson, of St. Michael Woodstreet, moderator. A committee was appointed to prepare materials for proof of the divine right of presbyterial church-government. The proofs were examined and approved by this, and the assembly that met in November following, of which Mr. Walker was moderator, Mr. Calamy and Mr. Jackson assessors, and Mr. Blackwell scribe. The treatise was printed, and asserts,

- (1.) That there is a church-government of divine institution.
- (2.) That the civil magistrate is not the origin or head of church-government. And,
- (3.) That the government of the church by synods and classes is the government that Christ appointed. It maintains separation from their

churches to be schism; that ministers formerly ordained by bishops need not be re-ordained: and for private Christians in particular churches to assume a right of sending persons forth to preach, and to administer the sacraments, is in their opinion insufferable.

The parliament did all they could to satisfy the malcontent Presbyterians, by securing them in their livings, and by ordering the dean and chapter lands to be sold,²⁵ and their names to be extinct, except the deanery of Christ-church, and the foundations of Westminster, Winchester, and Eton schools. The bishops'

lands, which had been sequestered since the year 1646, were now, by an ordinance of June 8, 1649, vested in the hands of new trustees, and appropriated to the augmentation of poor livings in the church.²⁶ The first-fruits and tenths of all ecclesiastical livings, formerly payable to the crown, were vested in the same hands, free from all incumbrances, on trust, that they should pay yearly all such salaries, stipends, allowances, and provisions, as have been settled and confirmed by parliament, for preaching ministers, schoolmasters, or professors in the universities; provided the assignment to any one do not exceed £100. It is farther provided, that the maintenance of all incumbents shall not be less than £100 a year, and the commissioners of the great seal are empowered to inquire into the yearly value of all ecclesiastical livings, to which any cure of souls is annexed; and to certify into the court of chancery, the names of the present incumbents who supply the cure, with their respective salaries; how many chapels belong to parish-churches, and how the several churches and chapels are supplied with preaching ministers; that so some course may be taken for providing for a better maintenance where it is wanting. Dr. Walker says,²⁷ the value of bishops' lands forfeited and sold amounted to a million of money: but though they sold very cheap, they that bought them had a very dear bargain in the end.

Upon debate of an ordinance concerning public worship, and church-government, the house declared, that the Presbyterian government should be the established government. And upon the question, whether tithes should be continued, it was resolved, that they should not be taken away, till another maintenance equally large and honourable should be substituted in its room.

²⁵ The money raised by the sale of those lands amounted to a very considerable sum. The return of the value of the lands, contracted for to the 29th of August 1650, made to the committee for the sale of them, fixed it at the sum of £948,409 18s. 2¼d., of which, on the 31st of August, the total of the purchasers' acquittances amounted to £658,501 2s. 9d. Dr. Grey, vol. 3. Appendix, p. 18.—ED.

²⁶ Scobel, p. 41. 113.

²⁷ P. 14.

The inhabitants of the principality of Wales were destitute of the means of Christian knowledge, the language was little understood, their clergy were ignorant and idle; so that they had hardly a sermon from one quarter of a year to another. The people had neither bibles nor catechisms; nor was there a sufficient maintenance for such as were capable of instructing them. The parliament taking the case of these people into consideration, passed an act, February 22, 1649, for the better propagation and preaching of the gospel in Wales, for the ejecting scandalous ministers and schoolmasters, and redress of some grievances; to continue in force for three years. What was done in pursuance of this ordinance will be related hereafter; but the parliament were so intent upon the affair of religion at this time, that Mr. Whitelocke says, they devoted Friday in every week to consult ways and means for promoting it.

Nor did they confine themselves to England, but as soon as lieutenant-general Cromwell had reduced Ireland, the parliament passed an ordinance, March 8, 1649, for the encouragement of religion and learning in that country; “they invested all the manors and lands late of the archbishop of Dublin, and of the dean and chapter of St. Patrick, together with the parsonage of Trym belonging to the bishopric of Meath, in the hands of trustees, for the maintenance and support of Trinity-college in Dublin; and for the creating, settling, and maintaining another college in the said city, and of a master, fellows, scholars, and public professors: and also for erecting a free-school, with a master, usher, scholars, and officers, in such manner as any five of the trustees, with the consent of the lord-lieutenant, shall direct and appoint. The lord-lieutenant to nominate the governor, masters, &c. and to appoint them their salaries; and the trustees, with the consent of the lord-lieutenant, shall draw up statutes and ordinances, to be confirmed by the parliament of England.”

The university of Dublin being thus revived, and put upon a new foot, the parliament sent over six of their most acceptable preachers to give it reputation, appointed them £200 a year out of the bishops’ lands; and till that could be duly raised, to be paid out of the public revenues: and for their farther encouragement, if they died in that service, their families were to be provided for. By these methods learning began to revive, and in a few years religion appeared with a better face than it had ever done before in that kingdom.

A prospect being opened for spreading the Christian religion among the Indians, upon the borders of New-England, the parliament allowed a general collection throughout England, and erected a corporation for this service, who purchased an estate in land of between £500 and £600 a year; but on the restoration of king Charles II. the charter became void, and colonel Bedingfield, a Roman-Catholic officer in the king’s army, of whom a con-

siderable part of the land was purchased, seized it for his own use, pretending he had sold it under the real value, in hopes of recovering it upon the king's return. In order to defeat the colonel's design, the society solicited the king for a new charter, which they obtained by the interest of the lord-chancellor. It bears date February 7, in the fourteenth year of his majesty's reign, and differs but little from the old one. The honourable Robert Boyle, esq. was the first governor. They afterward recovered colonel Bedingfield's estate, and are at this time in possession of about £500 a year, which they employ for the conversion of the Indians in America.

But all that parliament could do was not sufficient to stop the mouths of the loyalists and discontented Presbyterians; the pulpit and press sounded to sedition; the latter brought forth invectives every week against the government; it was therefore resolved to lay a severe fine upon offenders of this kind, by an ordinance bearing date September 20, 1649, the preamble to which sets forth, that "Whereas divers scandalous and seditious pamphlets are daily printed, and dispersed with officious industry, by the malignant party both at home and abroad, with a design to subvert the present government, and to take off the affections of the people from it, it is therefore ordained,

"That the author of every seditious libel or pamphlet shall be fined ten pounds, or suffer forty days' imprisonment. The printer five pounds, and his printing-press to be broken. The bookseller forty shillings; the buyer twenty shillings, if he conceals it, and does not deliver it up to a justice of peace. It is farther ordained, that no newspaper shall be printed or sold without licence, under the hand of the clerk of the parliament, or the secretary of the army, or such other person as the council of state shall appoint. No printing-presses are to be allowed but in London, and in the two universities. All printers are to enter into bonds of three hundred pounds, not to print any pamphlet against the state without licence, as aforesaid, unless the author's or licenser's name, with the place of his abode, be prefixed. All importers of seditious pamphlets are to forfeit five pounds for every such book or pamphlet. No books are to be landed in any other port but that of London, and to be viewed by the master and wardens of the company of stationers. This act to continue in force for two years."²⁸

But the pulpit was no less dangerous than the press; the Presbyterian ministers in their public prayers and sermons, especially on fast-days, keeping alive the discontents of the people. The government therefore, by an ordinance, abolished the monthly fast, which had subsisted for about seven years, and had been in a great measure a fast for strife and debate; but de-

²⁸ Scobel, p. 88. cap. 60.

clared at the same time, that they should appoint occasional fasts, from time to time for the future, as the providences of God should require.²⁹

In the midst of all these disorders, there was a very great appearance of sobriety both in city and country; the indefatigable pains of the Presbyterian ministers in catechising, instructing, and visiting their parishioners, can never be sufficiently commended. The whole nation was civilized, and considerably improved in sound knowledge, though bishop Kennet and Mr. Echard are pleased to say, that heresies and blasphemies against heaven were swelled up to a most prodigious height. "I know (says Mr. Baxter³⁰) you may meet with men who will confidently affirm, that in these times all religion was trodden under foot, and that heresy and schism were the only piety; but I give warning to all ages, that they take heed how they believe any, while they are speaking for the interest of their factions and opinions against their real or supposed adversaries." However, the parliament did what they could to suppress and discountenance all such extravagances; and even the officers of the army, having convicted one of their quartermasters of blasphemy in a council of war, sentenced him to have his tongue bored through with a hot iron, his sword broken over his head, and to be cashiered the army.

But bishop Kennet says, even the Turkish Alcoran was coming in; that it was translated into English, and said to be licensed by one of the ministers of London. Sad times! Was his lordship then afraid that the Alcoran should prevail against the Bible? or that the doctrines of Christ could not support themselves against the extravagant follies of an impostor? But the book did no harm, though the commons immediately published an order for suppressing it; and since the restitution of monarchy and episcopacy, we have lived to see the life of Mahomet and his Koran published without mischief or offence.

His lordship adds, that the Papists took advantage of the liberty of the times, who were never more numerous and busy; which is not very probable, because the parliament had banished all Papists twenty miles from the city of London, and excepted them out of their acts of indulgence and toleration; the spirit of the people against Popery was kept up to the height; the mob carried the pope's effigy in triumph, and burnt it publicly on queen Elizabeth's birthday; and the ministers in their pulpits pronounced him Antichrist; but such is the zeal of this right reverend historian!³¹

²⁹ Whitelocke, p. 383.

³⁰ Life, p. 86.

³¹ In this place we may notice, that colonel Lilburne, who in the reign of Charles I. felt the severe effects of regal and episcopal anger, now incurred the displeasure of a republican government. On October 26, 1646, he was tried for transgressing the new statute of treasons enacted by the commonwealth. He was acquitted by the jury; and Westminster-hall, on the verdict being given, resounded with the acclamations of the people. A print

The beginning of this year, the marquis of Montrose was taken in the north of Scotland by colonel Straughan³² with a small body of troops, and hanged at Edinburgh on a gallows thirty feet high; his body was buried under the gallows, and his quarters set upon the gates of the principal towns in Scotland; but his behaviour was great and firm to the last. The marquis appeared openly for the king in the year 1643, and having routed a small party of covenanters in Perthshire, acquired considerable renown; but his little successes were very mischievous to the king's affairs, being always magnified beyond what they really were;³³ his vanity was the occasion of breaking off the treaty of Uxbridge, and his fears lest king Charles II. should agree with the Scots, and revoke his commission before he had executed it, now hurried him to his own ruin.

was struck on the occasion, representing him standing at the bar on his trial: at the top of it was a medal of his head, with this inscription, "John Lilburne, saved by the power of the Lord, and the integrity of his jury, who are judges of law as well as fact, October 6, 1646." On the reverse were the names of the jury. He was a very popular character; as appears from the many petitions presented to the house in his favour during his imprisonment; one of which came from a number of women. When some were sent to seize his books, he persuaded them, "to look to their own liberties, and let his books alone;" and on his trial, he behaved with singular intrepidity. After he was discharged by the jury, he was, by the order of parliament, committed to the Tower. He seems to have been a bold and consistent oppugner of tyranny, under whatever form of government it was practised. He died a Quaker, at Eltham, August 28, 1658. The following character was given of him by sir Thomas Wortley, in a song, at the feast kept by the prisoners in the Tower, in August 1647.

John Lilburne is a stirring blade,
 And understands the matter;
 He neither will king, bishops, lords.
 Nor th' house of commons flatter.

John loves no power prerogative,
 But that deriv'd from Sion;
 As for the mitre and the crown,
 Those two he looks awry on.

Granger's History of England, vol. 3, p. 78, 8vo. Whitlocke's Mem. p. 383, 384. and 405. Dr. Grey, vol. 1. p. 167, and vol. 3. p. 17.—ED.

³² This is not accurate. Colonel Straughan's forces in conjunction with others fell on lord Montrose's party, routed them, and took six hundred prisoners: but the marquis himself escaped, though with difficulty, for his horse, pistols, belt, and scabbard, were seized: and two or three days after the fight, he was taken sixteen miles from the place of engagement, in a disguise, and sorely wounded: having been betrayed, some say by lord Aston, but, according to bishop Burnet, by Mackland, of Assin. Dr. Grey; and Whitlocke's Memorials, p. 438, 439.—ED.

³³ If his successes were magnified beyond the truth, his character has also been handed down with the highest eulogiums. The marquis of Montrose (says Mr. Granger) was comparable to the greatest heroes of antiquity. We meet with many instances of valour in this active reign; but Montrose is the only instance of heroism. Amongst other circumstances of indignity, which accompanied his execution, the book of his exploits, a small octavo written in elegant Latin, which is now very scarce, was tied appendant to his neck. Dr. Grey; and Granger's History of England, vol. 2. p. 245, 246, 8vo.—ED.

The young king being in treaty with the Scots covenanters at Breda, was forced to stifle his resentments for the death of the marquis, and submit to the following hard conditions:

(1.) “That all persons excommunicated by the kirk should be forbid the court.

(2.) “That the king by his solemn oath, and under his hand and seal, declare his allowance of the covenant.

(3.) “That he confirm those acts of parliament which enjoin the covenant. That he establish the Presbyterian worship and discipline, and swear never to oppose or endeavour to alter them.

(4.) “That all civil matters be determined by parliament; and all ecclesiastical affairs by the kirk.

(5.) “That his majesty ratify all that has been done in the parliament of Scotland in some late sessions, and sign the covenant upon his arrival in that kingdom, if the kirk desired.”³⁴

The king arrived in Scotland June 23; but before his landing the commissioners insisted on his signing the covenant, and upon parting with all his old councillors, which he did, and was then conducted by the way of Aberdeen and St. Andrew’s to his house at Faulkland. July 11, his majesty was proclaimed at the cross at Edinburgh, but the ceremony of his coronation was deferred to the beginning of the next year. In the meantime the English commonwealth was providing for a war which they saw was unavoidable, and general Fairfax refusing to act against the Scots, his commission was immediately given to Cromwell, with the title of captain-general in chief of all the forces raised and to be raised by authority of parliament, within the commonwealth of England. Three days after, viz. June 29, he marched with eleven thousand foot and five thousand horse towards the borders of Scotland, being resolved not to wait for the Scots invading England, but to carry the war into their country. The Scots complained to the English parliament of this conduct, as a breach of the act of pacification, and of the covenant; but were answered, that they had already broken the peace by their treaty with Charles Stuart, whom they had not only received as their king, but promised to assist in recovering the crown of England. Their receiving the king was certainly their right as an independent nation; but whether their engaging to assist him in recovering the crown of England was not declaring war, must be left to the reader.

³⁴ Besides taking the covenant, it was exacted of the king also to acknowledge twelve articles of repentance, in which were enumerated the sins of his father and grandfather, and idolatry of his mother; and in which were declarations, that he sought the restitution of his rights for the sole advantage of religion, and in subordination to the kingdom of Christ. Mrs. Macaulay’s History of England, vol. 5. p. 62, 8vo.—ED.

July 22, the general crossed the Tweed, and marched his army almost as far as Edinburgh without much opposition, the country being deserted by reason of the terror of the name of Cromwell, and the reports that were spread of his cruelty in Ireland. Not a Scotsman appeared under sixty, nor a youth above six years old, to interrupt his march. All provisions were destroyed, or removed, to prevent the subsistence of the army, which was supplied from time to time by sea; but the general having made proclamation, that no man should be injured in his person or goods who was not found in arms, the people took heart and returned to their dwellings.

The Scots army, under the command of general Lesley, stood on the defensive, and watched the motions of the English all the month of August; the main body being intrenched within six miles of Edinburgh, to the number of thirty thousand of the best men that ever Scotland saw; general Cromwell did everything he could to draw them to a battle, till by the fall of rain and bad weather he was obliged to retreat to Musselborough, and from thence to Dunbar, where he was reduced to the utmost straits, having no way left but to conquer or die.³⁵ In this extremity he summoned the officers to prayer; after which he bid all about him take heart, for God had heard them; then walking in the earl of Roxborough's gardens, that lay under the hill upon which the Scots army was encamped, and discovering by perspective glasses that they were coming down to attack him, he said God was delivering them into his hands. That night proving very rainy, the general refreshed his men in the town, and ordered them to take particular care of their firelocks, which the Scots neglected, who were all the night coming down the hill. Early next morning, September 3, the general with a strong party of horse beat their guards, and then advancing with his whole army, after about an hour's dispute, entered their camp and carried all before him: about four thousand Scots fell in battle, ten thousand were made prisoners, with fifteen hundred arms, and all their artillery and ammunition; the loss of the English amounting to no more than about three hundred men.

It is an odd reflection lord Clarendon³⁶ makes upon this victory: "Never was victory obtained (says his lordship) with less lamentation; for as Cromwell had great argument of triumph, so the king was glad of it, as the greatest happiness that could befall him, in the loss of so strong a body of his enemies."³⁷ Such was the encouragement the Scots had to fight for their king!

³⁵ Life of Cromwell, p. 178. Burnet's Hist. vol. 1. p. 74. Edinb. edit.

³⁶ Vol. 3. p. 377.

³⁷ Dr. Grey adds the reason which lord Clarendon assigns for the king's rejoicing in this victory; which was, his apprehension that if the Scots had prevailed, they would have shut him up in prison the next day: whereas, after this defeat, they looked upon the king as one they might stand in need of, gave him more liberty than they had before allowed, per-

Immediately after this action, the general took possession of Edinburgh, which was in a manner deserted by the clergy; some having shut themselves up in the castle, and others fled with their effects to Stirling; the general, to deliver them from their fright, sent a trumpet to the castle, to assure the governor that the ministers might return to their churches, and preach without any disturbance from him, for he had no quarrel with the Scots nation on the score of religion.³⁸ But the ministers replied, that having no security for their persons, they thought it their duty to reserve themselves for better times. Upon which the general wrote to the governor,

“That his kindness offered to the ministers in the castle, was without any fraudulent reserve; that if their Master’s service was their principal concern, they would not be so excessively afraid of suffering for it. That those divines had misrepresented the conduct of his party, when they charged them with persecuting the ministers of Christ in England; for the ministers in England (says he) are supported, and have liberty to preach the gospel, though not to rail at their superiors at discretion; nor, under a pretended privilege of character, to overtop the civil powers, or debase them as they please.—No man has been disturbed in England or Ireland for preaching the gospel; nor has any minister been molested in Scotland since the coming of the army hither; speaking truth becomes the ministers of Christ; but when ministers pretend to a glorious reformation, and lay the foundation thereof in getting to themselves power, and can make worldly mixtures to accomplish the same, such as the late agreement with their king, they may know, that the Sion promised is not to be built with such untempered mortar. And for the unjust invasion they [the ministers] mention, time was when an army out of Scotland came into England, not called by the supreme authority—we have said in our papers, with what hearts and upon what account we came, and the Lord has heard us, though you would not, upon as solemn an appeal as any experience can parallel.—I have nothing to say to you, but that I am,

“Sir, your humble servant,

“O. CROMWELL.”³⁹

mitted his servants to wait on him, and began to talk of a parliament and of a time for his coronation.—ED.

³⁸ It is a proof of this, that while Oliver Cromwell was at Edinburgh, he attended divine worship in the great church there, when Mr. William Derham preached, and called Oliver a usurper to his face. He was so far from resenting this, that he invited Mr. Derham to visit him in the evening, when they supped together in great harmony. Oliver observed, however, “that it was well known to him, how much he and his brethren disliked him: but they might assure themselves that, if any of the Stuart line came to the throne, they would find their little fingers greater than his loins.” Dr. Gibbon’s *Account of the Cromwell Family*, annexed to his *Funeral Sermon for William Cromwell, esq.* p. 47—ED.

³⁹ *Life of Cromwell*, p. 182.

The Scots ministers, in their reply to this letter, objected to the general his opening the pulpit-doors to all intruders, by which means a flood of errors was broke in upon the nation. To which the general replied, "We look on ministers as helpers of, not lords over, the faith of God's people: I appeal to their consciences, whether any denying of their doctrines, or dissenting from them, will not incur the censure of a sectary; and what is this but to deny Christians their liberty, and assume the infallible chair? Where do you find in Scripture that preaching is included within your function? Though an approbation from men has order in it, and may be well, yet he that hath not a better than that, hath none at all.

"I hope He that ascended up on high may give his gifts to whom he pleases; and if those gifts be the seal of mission, are not you envious, though Eldad and Medad prophesy? You know who has bid us covet earnestly the best gifts, but chiefly, that we may prophesy; which the apostle explains to be a speaking to instruction, edification, and comfort, which the instructed, edified, and comforted, can best tell the energy and effect of.

"Now, if this be evidence, take heed you envy not for your own sakes, lest you be guilty of a greater fault than Moses reproved in Joshua, when he envied for his sake. Indeed you err through mistake of the Scriptures. Approbation is an act of convenience in respect of order, not of necessity, to give faculty to preach the gospel.

"Your pretended fear, lest error should step in, is like the man that would keep all the wine out of the country lest men should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousy, to deny a man the liberty he hath by nature, upon a supposition he may abuse it. When he doth abuse it, then judge."⁴⁰

The governor complained to the general, that the parliament at Westminster had fallen from their principles, not being true to the ends of the covenant. And then adds with the ministers, that men of secular employments had usurped the office of the ministry, to the scandal of the reformed churches.

In answer to the first part of this expostulation, general Cromwell desired to know, whether their bearing witness to themselves, was a good evidence of their having prosecuted the ends of the covenant? "To infer this (says he,) is to have too favourable an opinion of your own judgment and impartiality. Your doctrines and practice ought to be tried by the word of God, and other people must have a liberty of examining them upon these heads, and of giving sentence."⁴¹

⁴⁰ Whitelocke, p. 458. Collyer's Ecclesiastical History, p. 863.

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 864.

As to the charge of indulging the use of the pulpit to the laity, the general admits it, and adds, "Are ye troubled that Christ is preached? does it scandalize the reformed churches, and Scotland in particular? is it against the covenant? away with the covenant if it be so. I thought the covenant and these men would have been willing, that any should speak good of the name of Christ; if not, it is no covenant of God's approving; nor the kirk you mention so much the spouse of Christ."

The general, in one of his letters, lays considerable stress upon the success of their arms, after a most solemn appeal to God on both sides. To which the Scots governor replied, "We have not so learned Christ, as to hang the equity of a cause upon events." To which Cromwell answers, "We could wish that blindness had not been upon your eyes to those marvellous dispensations which God has lately wrought in England. But did you not solemnly appeal and pray? Did not we do so too? And ought not we and you to think with fear and trembling on the hand of the great God in this mighty and strange appearance of his, and not slightly call it an event? Were not your expectations and ours renewed from time to time, whilst we waited on God to see how he would manifest himself upon our appeals? And shall we after all these our prayers, fastings, tears, expectations, and solemn appeals, call these bare events? The Lord pity you."—

From this correspondence the reader may form a judgment of the governing principles of the Scots and English at this time; the former were so inviolably attached to their covenant that they would depart from nothing that was inconsistent with it. The English, after seeking God in prayer, judged of the goodness of their cause by the appearance of Providence in its favour; most of the officers and soldiers were men of strict devotion, but went upon this mistaken principle, that God would never appear for a bad cause after a solemn appeal to him for decision. However, the Scots lost their courage, and surrendered the impregnable castle of Edinburgh into the hands of the conqueror December 24, the garrison having liberty to march out with their baggage to Burnt-Island in Fife; and soon after the whole kingdom was subdued.

The provincial assembly of London met this year as usual, in the months of May and November, but did nothing remarkable; the parliament waited to reconcile them to the engagement, and prolonged the time limited for taking it; but when they continued inflexible, and instead of submitting to the present powers were plotting with the Scots, it was resolved to clip their wings, and make some examples, as a terror to the rest. June 21, the committee for regulating the universities was ordered to tender the engagement to all such officers, masters, and fellows, as had neglected to take it, and upon their refusal, to displace them. Accordingly, in the university of Cambridge, Mr. Vines, Dr. Rainbow, and some others, were displaced,

and succeeded by Mr. Sydrach Sympson, Mr. Jo. Sadler, and Mr. Dell. In the university of Oxford, Dr. Reynolds the vice-chancellor refused the engagement, but after some time offered to take it, in hopes of saving his deanery of Christchurch; but the parliament resenting the example took advantage of his forfeiture, and gave the deanery to Dr. John Owen, an Independent divine, who took possession of it, March 18, 1650–1.⁴²

Upon the resignation of the vice-chancellor, Dr. Daniel Greenwood, principal of Brazen-nose college, and a Presbyterian divine, was appointed his successor, October 12, and on the 15th of January following, Oliver Cromwell, now in Scotland, was chosen unanimously, in full convocation, chancellor of the university in the room of the earl of Pembroke lately deceased.⁴³ When the doctor and masters who were sent to Edinburgh acquainted him with the choice, he wrote a letter to the university, in which after a modest refusal of their favour he adds, “If these arguments prevail not, and that I must continue this honour till I can personally serve you, you shall not want my prayers, that piety and learning may flourish among you, and be rendered useful and subservient to that great and glorious kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; of the approach of which so plentiful an effusion of the Holy Spirit upon those hopeful plants among you is one of the best presages.”—When the general’s letter was read in convocation, the house resounded with cheerful acclamations. Dr. Greenwood continued vice-chancellor two years, but was then displaced for his disaffection to the government, and the honour was conferred on Dr. Owen. Thus by degrees the Presbyterians

lost their influence in the universities, and delivered them up into the hands of the Independents.

To strengthen the hands of the government yet farther, the parliament, by an ordinance bearing date September 20, took away all the penal statutes for religion.⁴⁴ The preamble sets forth, “that divers religious and peaceable people, well-affected to the commonwealth, having not only been molested and imprisoned, but brought into danger of abjuring their country, or in case of return to suffer death as felons, by sundry acts made in the times of former kings and queens of this nation, against recusants not coming to church, &c. they therefore enact and ordain,

“That all the clauses, articles, and provisos, in the ensuing acts of parliament, viz. 1 Eliz., 23 Eliz., 35 Eliz., and all and every branch, clause, article, or proviso, in any other act or ordinance of parliament, whereby any penalty or punishment is imposed or meant to be imposed on any person

⁴² Baxter’s Life, p. 64.

⁴³ Wood’s Fasti, p. 92; or Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 772.

⁴⁴ Scobel, p. 131.

whatsoever, for not repairing to their respective parish-churches; or for not keeping of holy days; or for not hearing Common Prayer, &c. shall be, and are hereby, wholly repealed and made void.

“And to the end that no profane or licentious persons may take occasion, by the repeal of the said laws, to neglect the performance of religious duties, it is farther ordained, that all persons not having a reasonable excuse, shall on every Lord’s day, and day of public thanksgiving or humiliation, resort to some place of public worship; or be present at some other place, in the practice of some religious duty, either of prayer or preaching, reading or expounding the Scriptures.”—

By this law the doors were set open, and the state was at liberty to employ all such in their service as would take the oaths to the civil government, without any regard to their religious principles.

Sundry severe ordinances were made for suppressing of vice, error, and all sorts of profaneness and impiety. May 10, it was ordained, “that incest and adultery should be made felony; and that fornication should be punished with three months’ imprisonment for the first offence; and that the second offence should be felony without benefit of clergy. Common bawds, or persons who keep lewd houses, are to be set in the pillory; to be whipped, and marked in the forehead with the letter B, and then committed to the house of correction for three years for the first offence; and for the second to suffer death, provided the prosecution be within twelve months.”⁴⁵

June 28, it was ordained, “that every nobleman who shall be convicted of profane cursing and swearing, by the oath of one or more witnesses, or by his own confession, shall pay for the first offence thirty shillings to the poor of the parish; a baronet, or knight, twenty shillings; an esquire ten shillings; a gentleman six shillings and eight-pence; and all inferior persons three shillings and four-pence. For the second offence they are to pay double, according to their qualities above mentioned. And for the tenth offence they are to be judged common swearers and cursers, and to be bound over to their good behaviour for three years. The like punishment for women, whose fines are to be determined according to their own or their husbands’ quality.”⁴⁶

August 9, an ordinance was passed, for punishing blasphemous and execrable opinions. The preamble takes notice, that “though several laws had been made for promoting reformation in doctrines and manners, yet there were divers men and women who had lately discovered monstrous opinions, even such as tended to the dissolution of human society; the parlia-

⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 121.

⁴⁶ Scobel, p- 123.

ment therefore, according to their declaration of September 27, 1649, in which they said, they should be ready to testify their displeasure against such offenders, by strict and effectual proceedings against them who should abuse and turn into licentiousness the liberty given in matters of religion, do therefore ordain and enact,

“That any persons not distempered in their brains, who shall maintain any mere creature to be God, or to be infinite, almighty, &c. or that shall deny the holiness of God; or shall maintain, that all acts of wickedness and unrighteousness are not forbidden in Holy Scripture; or that God approves them: anyone who shall maintain, that acts of drunkenness, adultery, swearing, &c. are not in themselves shameful, wicked, sinful, and impious; or that there is not any real difference between moral good and evil, &c. all such persons shall suffer six months’ imprisonment for the first offence; and for the second shall be banished; and if they return without licence shall be treated as felons.”⁴⁷

Though several ordinances had been made heretofore for the strict observation of the Lord’s day, the present house of commons thought fit to enforce them by another, dated April 19, 1650, in which they ordain, “that all goods cried or put to sale on the Lord’s day, or other days of humiliation and thanksgiving appointed by authority, shall be seized. No waggoner or drover shall travel on the Lord’s day on penalty of 10s. for every offence. No persons shall travel in boats, horses, or coaches, except to church, on penalty of 10s. The like penalty for being in a tavern. And where distress is not to be made, the offender is to be put into the stocks six hours. All peace-officers are required to make diligent search for discovering offenders; and in case of neglect, the justice of peace is fined £5 and every constable 20s.” Such was the severity of these times.⁴⁸

The parliament having ordered the sale of bishops’ lands, and the lands of deans and chapters, and vested the money in the hands of trustees, as has been related, appointed this year, April 5, part of the money to be appropriated for the support and maintenance of such late bishops, deans, prebendaries, singing-men, choristers, and other members, officers, and persons destitute of maintenance, whose respective offices, places, and livelihoods, were taken away, and abolished, distributing and proportioning the same according to their necessities. How well this was executed I cannot determine; but it was a generous act of compassion, and more than the church of England would do for the Nonconformists at the Restoration.⁴⁹

A motion being made in the house about translating all law-books into the English language, Mr. Whitelocke made a learned speech on the argu-

⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 124.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 119.

⁴⁹ Scobel, p. 111.

ment, wherein he observes, that “Moses read the law to the Jews in the Hebrew language; that the laws of all the eastern nations were in their mother-tongue; the laws of Constantinople were in Greek: at Rome they were in Latin; in France, Spain, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and other places, their laws are published in their native language. As for our own country (says he), those who can read the Saxon character may find the laws of our ancestors in that language. Pursuant to this regulation, William duke of Normandy, commonly called the Conqueror, commanded the laws to be published in English, that none might pretend ignorance. He observes farther, that by 36 Eliz. cap. 3, it was ordered, that all pleadings should be in English; and even in the reigns of those princes, wherein our statutes were enrolled in French, the sheriffs were obliged to proclaim them in English, because the people were deeply concerned to know the laws of their country, and not to be kept in ignorance of the rule by which their interests and duty were directed,”⁵⁰

The arguments in this speech were so forcible, that the house agreed unanimously to a bill, wherein they ordain, “that all books of law be translated into English; and all proceedings in any court of justice, except the court of Admiralty, after Easter term 1651, shall be in English only; and all writs, &c. shall be in a legible hand, and not in court-hand, on forfeiture of £20. for the first offence, half to the commonwealth, and the other half to them that will sue for the same.”⁵¹ And though this regulation ceased at the Restoration, as all other ordinances did that were made in these times, the late parliament has thought fit to revive it.

From this time we may date the rise of the people called Quakers, in whom most of the enthusiasts of these times centred: their first leader was George Fox, born at Drayton in Lancashire 1624; his father, being a poor weaver,⁵² put him apprentice to a country shoemaker, but having a peculiar

⁵⁰ Whitelocke, p. 460.

⁵¹ Scobel, p. 155.

⁵² It is to be wished, that Mr. Neal had not used this epithet, poor. It is not in the author whom he quotes, was needless, and has the appearance of contempt. The parents of Fox were truly respectable; his father, Christopher Fox, of such a virtuous life, that, his neighbours called him righteous Christer; his mother, of the stock of martyrs, and a woman of qualifications superior to the generality of her circumstances in life: they were both members of the national church, distinguished by piety, and cherished the religious turn of mind which their son discovered in his earliest years. Virtuous and sober manners, a peculiar staidness of mind, and gravity of demeanour, marked his youth. His chief employment under his master, who also dealt in wool and cattle, was to keep sheep, which was well suited to his disposition both for innocence and solitude. He acquitted himself with a fidelity and diligence, that conduced much to the success of his master’s affairs. It was a custom with him to ratify his dealing with the word *verily*; to which he so firmly and conscientiously adhered, that those who knew him would remark, “If George says *verily*, there is no altering.” Mr. Neal’s expression, “he went away from his master,” may be understood as intimating a clandestine and dishonourable leaving his master’s service: which was not the case. He did not begin his solitary travels, till after his apprenticeship was finished, and

turn of mind for religion, he went away from his master, and wandered up and down the country like a hermit in a leathern doublet; at length his friends hearing he was at London, persuaded him to return home, and settle in some regular course of employment; but after he had been some months in the country, he went from his friends a second time, in the year 1646, and threw off all farther attendance on the public service in the churches: the reasons he gave for his conduct were, because it was revealed to him, that a learned education at the university was no qualification for a minister, but that all depended on the anointing of the Spirit, and that God who made the world did not dwell in temples made with hands. In the year 1647, he travelled into Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, walking through divers towns and villages, which way soever his mind turned, in a solitary manner. He fasted much (says my author), and walked often abroad in retired places, with no other companion but his Bible. He would sometimes sit in a hollow tree all day, and frequently walked about the fields in the night, like a man possessed with deep melancholy: which the writer of his life calls the “time of the first working of the Lord upon him.”⁵³ Towards the latter end of this year, he began first to set up for a teacher of others, about Duckinfield and Manchester; the principal argument of his discourse being, that people should receive the inward divine teachings of the Lord, and take that for their rule.

In the year 1648, there being a dissolution of all government both civil and ecclesiastical, George Fox waxed bold,⁵⁴ and travelled through the counties of Leicester, Northampton, and Derby, speaking to the people in market-places, &c. about the inward light of Christ within them.⁵⁵ At this

he had returned home to his parents. The leathern dress was adopted by him, on account of its simplicity and its durability, as it required little repairing, which was convenient to him in his wandering and unsettled course of life. Sewel’s Hist. p. 6—12; and Gough’s History of the Quakers, vol. 1. p. 60.—ED.

⁵³ Sewel’s History of the Quakers, p. 6—12.

⁵⁴ The circumstances of this period, as stated by Gough, will shew the propriety of our author’s language here, and preclude the suspicion that has fallen on him, of intending to insinuate that the boldness of George Fox was criminal, and that the dissolution of government had rendered him licentious. At this time the Independents and Republicans had accomplished their purpose: regal dominion, the peculiar privileges of the nobility, and the office of bishops, were abolished. Their professed principles were in favour of civil and religious liberty. The places of public worship seem, for a season, to have been open to teachers of different denominations, and not uncommonly appropriated to theological discussion and disputation between the teachers or members of various sects. These propitious circumstances furnished Fox and others with opportunities of disseminating their opinions: and a fair opportunity naturally inspires and emboldens to any undertaking. Gough’s History, vol. 1. p. 72.—ED.

⁵⁵ The words of Sewel are, “that every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ.” The term used, by this historian, for the followers of Fox, is fellow-believers, without any reference to their sex; nor does his narrative show, that they consisted more of women than men; which Mr. Neal’s expression seems to intimate. —ED.

time, says my author,⁵⁶ he apprehended the Lord had forbid him to put off his hat to anyone, high or low; he was required also to speak to the people without distinction in the language of thou and thee. He was not to bid people good-morrow, or good-night; neither might he bend his knee to the chief magistrate in the nation; the women⁵⁷ that followed him would not make a courtesy to their superiors, nor comply with the common forms of speech. Both men and women affected a plain and simple dress, distinct from the fashion of the times. They neither gave nor accepted any titles of respect or honour, nor would they call any man master on earth. They refused to take an oath on the most solemn occasion. These and the like peculiarities, he supported by such passages of Scripture as these, "Swear not at all;" "How can ye believe who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour which comes from God only?" But these marks of distinction which George Fox and his followers were so tenacious of, unhappily brought them into a great deal of trouble, when they were called to appear before the civil magistrate.

In the year 1649, he grew more troublesome, and began to interrupt the public ministers in time of divine service: his first essay of this kind was at Nottingham, where the minister preaching from these words of St. Peter, "We have a more sure word of prophecy," &c. told the people, that they were to try all doctrines, opinions, and religions, by the Holy Scriptures. Upon which George Fox stood up in the middle of the congregation and said, "Oh no! it is not the Scripture, but it is the Holy Spirit, by which opinions and religions are to be tried; for it was the Spirit that led people into all truth, and gave them the knowledge of it." And continuing his speech to the disturbance of the congregation, the officers were obliged to turn him out of the church, and carry him to the sheriff's house; next day he was committed to the castle, but was quickly released without any other punishment.⁵⁸ Af-

⁵⁶ History of the Quakers, p. 18.

⁵⁷ See note 1 of this page.

⁵⁸ Mr. Neal's account of this imprisonment of George Fox is censured by a late historian, as not strictly true, nor supported by his authority, Sewel, and through a partial bias a very palliative narration. The fact more exactly and fully stated is this: That Fox was not taken immediately from the church to the sheriff's house, but to prison, and put into a place so filthy and intolerably noisome, that the smell thereof was very grievous to be endured. At night he was carried before the mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs, of the town, and after examination was recommitted. But one of the sheriffs, whose name was Reckless, being much affected with the sentiments he had advanced, removed him to his own house. During his residence there, Mr. Fox was visited by persons of considerable condition; the sheriff, as well as his wife and family, was greatly affected with his doctrine; insomuch that he and several others exhorted the people and the magistrates to repentance. This provoked the latter to remove Fox back to the common prison, where he lay till the assizes. When he was to have been brought before the judge, the officer was-so dilatory in the execution of his business, that the court was broken up before he was conducted to it. He was, on this, again ordered into the common gaol, and detained there some time longer. As far as appears, he was imprisoned, detained in prison, and released, at the mere will and pleasure

ter this he disturbed the minister of Mansfield in time of divine service, for which he was set in the stocks, and turned out of the town.⁵⁹ The like treatment he met with at Market-Bosworth, and several other towns.⁶⁰ At length the magistrates of Derby confined him six months in prison, for uttering divers blasphemous opinions,⁶¹ pursuant to a late act of parliament

of the magistrates of Nottingham, without any legal cause assigned. "Such arbitrary exertion of power (well observes my author) ill agrees with a regard for chartered privileges and equal liberty." Gough's Hist. of the Quakers, vol. 1. p. 8.3, 84. Sewel's Hist. 21, 22—ED.

⁵⁹ Mr. Neal is considered as passing over this treatment of Fox in too "cursory a manner:" and is blamed for placing his conduct in the most invidious light it would bear, disturbing the minister. But, surely, if Mr. Fox spoke while the minister was preaching, without waiting till he had finished his discourse, it was disturbing him by an unseasonable interruption. But this circumstance is not to be clearly ascertained by Sewel. The treatment which Fox met with was iniquitous and violent to an extreme degree. The hearers of the minister "converted the place of divine worship into a scene of lawless riot, and the time set apart for the service of God into an enormous abuse of a fellow-creature; manifesting their religion to be such (observes Mr. Gough with great propriety) at the time when it should most affect their minds, as admitted of injury, revenge, and violating the peace and order of society. For they assaulted Mr. Fox in a furious manner, struck him down, and beat him cruelly with their hands, bibles, and sticks, whereby he was grievously bruised. After they had thus vented their rage, they haled him out, and put him into the stocks, where he sat some hours: and then they took him before a magistrate, who, seeing how grossly he had been abused, after much threatening, set him at liberty. But still the rude multitude, insatiate in abuse, stoned him out of the town, though hardly able to go, or well to stand, by reason of their violent usage." It should be remarked here, that the magistrate's conduct was extremely culpable, in not inflicting a punishment on these disturbers of the peace, for this unjust and violent attack on a man who had done them no harm, but meant to do them good; and in not affording to him his protection. Gough's Hist. vol. 1. p. 84—86.—ED.

⁶⁰ Sewel, p. 22.

⁶¹ This was the language of the mittimus, by which Fox and another were committed to the house of correction; we regret that Mr. Neal should have adopted it, without giving his reader the grounds on which the severe epithet was applied to their opinions. After the service of a lecture, at which Mr. Fox had attended, was finished, he spoke what was on his mind, and was heard without molestation: when he had done, an officer took him by the hand, and carried him before the magistrates. Being asked, "why he came thither?" he answered, that "God had moved him to it;" and added, "that God did not dwell in temples made with hands; and that all their preaching, baptism, and sacrifices, would never sanctify them; but that they ought to look unto Christ in them, and not unto men, for it is Christ that sanctifies." As they were very full of words, sometimes disputing, and sometimes deriding, he told them, "they were not to dispute of God and Christ, but to obey him." At last they asked him, "if he was sanctified?" he replied, "Yes:" "if he had no sin?" his answer was, "Christ my Saviour hath taken away my sin, and in him there is no sin." To the next question, "How he and his friends knew Christ was in them?" he replied, "By his Spirit, which he hath given us." Then they were asked "if any of them were Christ?" to which insidious query he answered, "Nay, we are nothing; Christ is all." He was next interrogated, "If a mau steal, is it no sin?" to which his reply was, "All unrighteousness is sin." With what candour, with what propriety, with what truth, could the charge of blasphemy be grounded on these declarations, especially by the magistrates who examined and committed him? The names to the mittimus were Ger. Bennet and Nath. Barton: both of them were Independents, the latter an officer and preacher: men whose own tenets implied a supernatural influence, and admitted no interference of the civil magistrate in spiritual concerns, but were pointed in favour of universal toleration: one of whom could himself have no commission to preach but on the ground of God's moving him to it. These were

for that purpose. By this time there began to appear some other visionaries, of the same make and complexion with George Fox, who spoke in places of public resort; being moved, as they said, by the Holy Ghost; and even some women, contrary to the modesty of their sex, went about streets, and entered into churches, crying down the teaching of men, and exhorting people to attend to the light within themselves.

It was in the year 1650 that these wandering lights first received the denomination of Quakers, upon this ground, that their speaking to the people was usually attended with convulsive agitations, and shakings of the body. All their speakers had these tremblings, which they gloried in, asserting it to be the character of a good man to tremble before God. When George Fox appeared before Gervas Bennet, esq. one of the justices of Derby, October 30, 1650, he had one of his agitations, or fits of trembling, upon him, and with a loud voice and vehement emotion of body, bid the justice and those about him tremble at the word of the Lord; whereupon the justice gave him and his friends the name of Quakers, which being agreeable to their common behaviour, quickly became the distinguishing denomination of this people.⁶²

the men who accused Fox of blasphemy, and imprisoned him: a remarkable instance (observes Mr. Gough) of the inconsistency of men with themselves in different stations of life:" a remarkable instance, it may be added, how the law may be wrested and justice perverted by passion and prejudice. Mr. Neal's manner of relating this transaction unhappily conceals the criminal conduct of these magistrates, and is too much calculated to perpetuate the prejudice which misled and governed them. Sewel's History, p. 24; and Gough's History, vol. 1. p. 90-94.—ED.

⁶² The above paragraph has given great offence, and is severely censured by Mr. Gough, as "an opprobrious description approaching to scurrility." The plain fact, as it stands in Sewel, has none of those circumstances of agitations, a loud voice and vehement emotions, with which Mr. Neal has described it, and for which he has quoted no authority. Fox, according to Sewel, having bid the justice and those about him to "tremble at the word of the Lord," Mr. Bennet took hold of this weighty saying with such an airy mind, that from thence he took occasion to call him, and his friends, scornfully, Quakers. This name was eagerly taken up and spread among the people. As to the convulsive emotions with which, it is said, the preaching of these Christians was accompanied, it is but fair to hear their advocate. "We readily admit (says Mr. Gough) these promulgators of primitive Christianity had no university education, were not trained in schools of oratory. It was plain truth and righteousness they sought to follow and recommend in a plain simple way, without the studied decorations of fine language, or the engaging attractions of a graceful motion; they spoke not to the head, or to the eye, but to the hearts of their auditors. Being themselves animated, and deeply affected in spirit with the inward feeling of the power of that truth, to the knowledge of which they aimed to bring others, that thereby they might be saved; an unaffected warmth of zeal in recommending righteousness, and testifying against vice and wickedness, might produce a warmth of expression, and action also, which to an invidious eye might appear convulsive: but their convulsions did not bereave them of understanding; they spake with the spirit and with the understanding also, of things which they knew, and testified of things which they had seen. And their doctrine was often effectual to open the understanding of their hearers, to see clearly the state of their minds, both what they were and what they ought to be." Gough's History, vol. 1. p. 96, note.—ED.

At length they disturbed the public worship by appearing in ridiculous habits, with emblematical or typical representations of some impending calamity; they also took the liberty of giving ministers the reproachful names of hirelings, deceivers of the people, false prophets, &c. Some of them went through divers towns and villages naked, denouncing judgments and calamities upon the nation. Some have famished and destroyed themselves by deep melancholy; and others have undertaken to raise their friends from the dead. Mr. Baxter says,⁶³ many Franciscan friars and other Papists have been disguised speakers in their assemblies; but little credit is to be given to such reports.⁶⁴

It cannot be expected that such an unsettled people should have a uniform system of rational principles. Their first and chief design, if they had any, was to reduce all revealed religion to allegory; and because some had laid too great stress upon rites and ceremonies, these would have neither order nor regularity, nor stated seasons of worship, but all must arise from the inward impulse of their spirits. Agreeable to this rule, they declared against all sorts of clergy, or settled ministers; against people's assembling in steeple-houses; against fixed times⁶⁵ of public devotion, and consequently against the observation of the sabbath. Their own meetings were occasional, and when they met, one or another spake as they were moved from

⁶³ Baxter's Life, p. 77.

⁶⁴ If but little credit is to be given to such reports, it may be asked, why are they introduced: when, if not refuted, they tend to mislead the reader, and to fix a reproach on an innocent people? Is it becoming the candour and dignity of an historian, by recording, to appear to give them a sanction? As to the case in hand, Mr. Baxter, on whose authority Mr. Neal speaks, though he was a great and excellent man, was not entirely exempt from the influence of prejudice and credulity. In general, stories to the discredit of a new, despised, and hated sect, are often eagerly adopted and spread with circumstances of aggravation. So it happened to the first Christians. This has befallen the Methodists in our times. And the Quakers, being particular objects of priestly indignation, had reason to complain of this. They were often confounded with an ephemeron sect, whose principles were totally incompatible with theirs, called Ranters, and whose practices outraged all decency and order. An active preacher amongst the Quakers, Mr. Edward Burroughs, and the celebrated Barclay, wrote against the practices of these people. Gough's History, vol. 1. p. 128, 129, note; and vol. 3. p. 15.—ED.

⁶⁵ This is not accurate, or is applicable only to the infancy of the sect. For, though they did not esteem one house more holy than another, and believed all times equally the Lord's, and that all days should be sabbaths or times of continual rest and abstinence from evil; yet as soon as their numbers were sufficient for the purpose, they held fixed and regular meetings for worship, particularly on the first day of the week, which they chose as more convenient, because more generally accepted than any other. In 1654, meetings were settled in many places in the north, and also in the city of London, which were held in private houses, till the body growing too large to be accommodated in them, a house known by the name of Bull-and-Mouth, in Martin's-Le-Grand, near Aldersgate-street, was hired for a meeting-house. And no body of Christians were more open, steady, and regular, than they have been in their public associations for worship or discipline. Sewel's History, p. 80. 84. Gough's Hist. vol. 1. p. 144 and 509.—ED.

within, and sometimes they departed without any one's being moved to speak at all.

The doctrines they delivered were as vague and uncertain⁶⁶ as the principles from which they acted. They denied the Holy Scriptures to be the only rule of their faith, calling it a dead letter, and maintaining that every man had a light within himself, which was a sufficient rule. They denied the received doctrine of the Trinity and incarnation. They disowned the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper; nay, some of them proceeded so far as to deny a Christ without them; or at least, to place more of their dependence upon a Christ within. They spake little or nothing, says Mr. Baxter,⁶⁷ about the depravity of nature; about the covenant of grace; about pardon of sin, and reconciliation with God: or about moral duties.⁶⁸ But the disturbance they gave to the public religion for a course of years was so insufferable, that the magistrates could not avoid punishing them as disturbers of the peace; though of late they are become a more sober and inof-

⁶⁶ The account which Mr. Neal gives of the sentiments and practices of the Quakers in this and the preceding paragraph, is not drawn up with the accuracy and precision, not to say candour, which should mark the historic page. It has too much the appearance of the loose desultory representation, which those who had not investigated their principles, nor looked into their writings, would exhibit of this sect. It is, I think, introduced at an improper place, in too early a period of their history; when Mr. Neal himself has related only what concerned George Fox, and before his followers were formed into a body. At that time it was not to be expected, that their principles should be made into a system; and their doctrines being delivered as the assertions of individuals only, and deriving their complexion from their different tastes, capacities, and views, would to the public eye wear the aspect of variety and uncertainty. But long before Mr. Neal wrote, their principles had assumed a systematic form. Penn had published his Key, and Robert Barclay his Catechism and Confession of Faith, and that elaborate work his Apology. The propositions illustrated and defended in this treatise exhibit a concise view of the chief principles of the Quakers; and that they may speak for themselves we will give them in the Appendix, No. 12.—ED.

⁶⁷ Baxter, p. 77.

⁶⁸ This quotation is not correct. Mr. Baxter's words, concerning the strain of their preaching, are these: "They speak much for the dwelling and working of the Spirit in us; but little of justification, and the pardon of sin, and our reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ." Here is nothing said about their neglecting to insist on "moral duties." The great object of Fox's zeal, we are told, was a heavenly temper and a life of righteousness: and his endeavours to propagate true religion and righteousness were not confined to public or private meetings, but exerted in other places as occasion offered; particularly, in courts of judicature, to admonish to justice, and caution against oppression: in markets, to recommend truth, candour, and fair dealings, and to bear his testimony against fraud and deceitful merchandize; at public houses of entertainment, to warn against indulging intemperance, by supplying their guests with more liquor than would do them good: at schools and in private families, to exhort to the training up of children and servants to sobriety, in the fear of their Maker; to testify against vain sports, plays, and shows, as tending to draw people into vanity and libertinism, and from that state of circumspection and attentive consideration, wherein our salvation is to be wrought out, forewarning all of the great day of account for all the deeds done in the body. This was certainly insisting on moral duties, and bringing home the principles of righteousness to the various circumstances of human life, with much propriety and energy. Gough's History, vol. 1. p. 67. 75. — ED.

fensive people; and by the wisdom of their managers, have formed themselves into a sort of body politic, and are in general very worthy members of society.