

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

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

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

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

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE;

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

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

1837.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE PROTECTORSHIP OF OLIVER CROMWELL TO HIS DEATH.

IF the reader will carefully review the divided state of the nation at this time, the strength of the several parties in opposite interests, and almost equal in power, each sanguine for his own scheme of settlement, and all conspiring against the present, he will be surprised that any wise man should be prevailed with to put himself at the head of such a distracted body; and yet more, that such a genius should arise, who without any foreign alliances should be capable of guarding against so many foreign and domestic enemies, and of steering the commonwealth through such a hurricane, clear of the rocks and quicksands which threatened its ruin.

This was the province that the enterprising Oliver undertook, with the style and title of lord protector of the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland. He assumed all the state and ceremony of a crowned head; his household officers and guards attended in their places, and his court appeared in as great splendour, and more order, than had been seen at Whitehall since Queen Elizabeth's reign. His first concern was to fill the courts of justice with the ablest lawyers; sir Matthew Hale was made lord-chief-justice of the common pleas; Mr. Maynard, Twisden, Newdigate, and Windham, serjeants at law; Mr. Thurloe, secretary of state; and Monk, governor of Scotland. His next care was to deliver himself from his foreign enemies; for this purpose he gave peace to the Dutch, which the fame of his power enabled him to accomplish without the ceremony of a formal treaty; he therefore sent his secretary Thurloe with the conditions to which they were to submit; the Dutch pleaded for abatements, but his highness was at a point, and obliged them to deliver up the island of Polerone in the East-Indies; to pay £300,000 for the affair of Amboyna; to abandon the interests of king Charles II. to exclude the prince of Orange from being stadtholder, and to yield up the sovereignty of the seas.

When this was accomplished, most of the sovereign princes in Europe sent to compliment his highness upon his advancement, and to cultivate his friendship: the king of Portugal asked pardon for receiving prince Rupert into his ports; the Danes got themselves included in the Dutch treaty, and became security for £140,000 damages done to the English shipping; the Swedes sued for an alliance, which was concluded with their ambassador; the crown of Spain made offers which the protector rejected; but the address of the French ambassador was most extraordinary; the protector received him in the Banqueting-house at Whitehall, with all the state and magnificence of a crowned head; and the ambassador, having made his

obeisance, acquainted his highness with the king his master's desire to establish a correspondence between his dominions and England. He mentioned the value of the friendship of France, and how much it was courted by the greatest potentates of the earth; "but (says the ambassador) the king my master communicates his resolutions to none with so much joy and cheerfulness, as to those whose virtuous actions, and extraordinary merits, render them more conspicuously famous than the largeness of their dominions. His majesty is sensible, that all these advantages do wholly reside in your highness, and that the Divine Providence, after so many calamities, could not deal more favourably with these three nations, nor cause them to forget their past miseries with greater satisfaction, than by subjecting them to so just a government——"

The protector's most dangerous enemies were the royalists, Presbyterians, and republicans, at home; the former menaced him with an assassination, upon which he declared openly, that though he would never begin so detestable a practice, yet if any of the king's party should attempt it and fail, he would make an assassinating war of it, and exterminate the whole family, which his servants were ready to execute; the terror of this threatening was a greater security to him than his coat of mail or guards. The protector had the skill always to discover the most secret designs of the royalists by some of their own number, whom he spared no cost to gain over to his interests. Sir Richard Willis was chancellor Hyde's chief confidant, to whom he wrote often, and in whom all the party confided, as in an able and wise statesman: but the protector gained him with £200 a year, by which means he had all the king's party in a net, and let them dance in it at pleasure.¹ He had another correspondent in the king's little family, one Manning a Roman Catholic, who gave secretary Thurloe intelligence of all his majesty's councils and proceedings. But though the king's friends were always in one plot or other against the protector's person and government, he always behaved with decency towards them, as long as they kept within tolerable bounds; and without all question, the severe laws that were made against the episcopal party were not on the account of religion, but of their irreconcilable aversion to the government.

The whole body of the Presbyterians were in principle for the king and the covenant, but after the battle of Worcester, and the execution of Mr. Love, they were terrified into a compliance with the commonwealth, though they disallowed their proceedings, and were pleased to see them broken in pieces; but the surprising advancement of Cromwell to the protectorship filled them with new terrors, and threatened the overthrow of their church-power, for they considered him not only as a usurper, but a

¹ Buruet, p. 91. vol. 1. Edin, edit.

sectarian, who would countenance the free exercise of religion to all that would live peaceably under his government; and though he assured them he would continue religion upon the footing of the present establishment, yet nothing would satisfy them as long as their discipline was disarmed of its coercive power.

But the protector's most determined adversaries were the commonwealth-party; these were divided into two branches; one had little or no religion, but were for a democracy in the state, and universal liberty of conscience in religion; the heads of them were Deists, or in the language of the protector, Heathens, as Algernon Sidney, Henry Neville, Martin, Wildman, and Harrington. It was impossible to work upon these men, or reconcile them to the government of a single person, and therefore he disarmed them of their power. The others were high enthusiasts, and fifth monarchy men, who were in expectation of king Jesus, and of a glorious thousand years' reign of Christ upon earth. They were for pulling down churches, says bishop Burnet,² for discharging tithes, and leaving religion free (as they called it), without either encouragement or restraint. Most of them were for destroying the clergy, and for breaking everything that looked like a national establishment. These the protector endeavoured to gain, by assuring them in private conversation, "that he had no manner of inclination to assume the government, but had rather have been content with a shepherd's staff, were it not absolutely necessary to keep the nation from falling to pieces, and becoming a prey to the common enemy; that he only stepped in between the living and the dead, as he expressed it, and this only till God should direct them on what bottom to settle, when he would surrender his dignity with a joy equal to the sorrow with which he had taken it up." With the chiefs of this party he affected to converse upon terms of great familiarity, shutting the door, and making them sit down covered in his presence, to let them see how little he valued those distances he was bound to observe for form's sake with others; he talked with them in their own language, and the conversation commonly ended with a long prayer.

The protector's chief support against these powerful adversaries were the Independents, the city of London, and the army; the former looked upon him as the head of their party, though he was no more theirs than as he was averse to church-power, and for a universal toleration. He courted the city of London with a decent respect, declaring, upon all occasions, his resolution to confirm their privileges, and consult measures for promoting trade and commerce. These, in return, after his instalment, entertained him at dinner in a most magnificent and princelike manner, and by degrees modelled their magistrates to his mind. But his chief dependence was upon the

² Vol. p. 93.

army, which being made up of different parties, he took care to reform by degrees, till they were in a manner entirely at his devotion. He paid the soldiers well, and advanced them according to their merits, and zeal for his government, without regard to their birth or seniority.

It was the protector's felicity, that the parties above mentioned had as great an enmity to each other as to him; the cavaliers hated the Presbyterians and republicans, as these did the cavaliers; the royalists fancied that all who were against the protector must join with them in restoring the king; while the Presbyterians were pushing for their covenant-uniformity, and the republicans for a commonwealth. Cromwell had the skill not only to keep them divided, but to increase their jealousies of each other, and by that means to disconcert all their measures against himself. Let the reader recollect what a difficult situation this was; and what a genius it must require to maintain so high a reputation abroad, in the midst of so many domestic enemies, who were continually plotting his destruction.

In pursuance of the instrument of government, the protector published an ordinance, April 12, to incorporate the two kingdoms of Scotland and England. The ordinance sets forth, "that whereas the parliament in 1651 had sent commissioners into Scotland, to invite that nation to a union with England under one government; and whereas the consent of the shires and boroughs was then obtained, therefore for completing that work, he ordains, that the people of Scotland, and all the territories thereunto belonging, shall be incorporated into one commonwealth with England, and that in every parliament to be held successively for the said commonwealth thirty members shall be called from thence to serve for Scotland.—Shortly after Ireland was incorporated after the same manner; and from this time the arms of Scotland and Ireland were quartered with those of England.

But the protector was hardly fixed in his chair before an assassination-plot of the royalists was discovered, and three of the conspirators, viz. Mr. Fox, Mr. Gerhard, and Mr. Vowel, were apprehended, and tried before a high court of justice, for conspiring to murder the lord-protector as he was going to Hampton-court, to seize the guards, and the Tower of London; and to proclaim the king. Mr. Fox, who confessed most of what was alleged against him, pleaded guilty, and was reprieved; but the other two, putting themselves on their trial, though they denied the jurisdiction of the court, were convicted, and executed July 10. Gerhard, a young hot-headed ensign in the late king's army, was beheaded; and Vowel, a schoolmaster at Islington, hanged at Charing-cross: Gerhard confessed he knew of the plot, but

Vowel was silent.³ These commotions were the occasion of the hardships the royalists underwent some time after.

Don Pantaleon Sa, brother of the Portuguese ambassador, was beheaded the same day, upon account of a riot and murder in the New Exchange. Pantaleon had quarrelled with the above-mentioned Gerhard, and to revenge himself, brought his servants next day armed with swords and pistols to kill him; but instead of Gerhard, they killed another man, and wounded several others. The Portuguese knight and his associates fled to his brother the ambassador's house for sanctuary, but the mob followed them, and threatened to pull down the house, unless they were delivered up to justice. The protector, being informed of the tumult, sent an officer with a party of soldiers to demand the murderers. The ambassador pleaded his public character, but the protector would admit of no excuse; and therefore being forced to deliver them up, they were all tried and convicted, by a jury half English and half foreigners; the servants (says Whitelocke⁴) were reprieved and pardoned; but the ambassador's brother, who was the principal, notwithstanding all the intercession that could be made for his life, was carried in a mourning-coach to Tower-hill, and beheaded. This remarkable act of justice raised the people's esteem of the protector's resolution, and of the justice of his government.

In order to a farther settlement of the nation, the protector summoned a parliament to meet at Westminster, September 3; which being reckoned one of his auspicious days he would not alter, though it fell on a Sunday; the house met accordingly, and having waited upon the protector in the painted chamber, adjourned to the next day, September 4, when his highness rode from Whitehall to Westminster with all the pomp and state of the greatest monarch: some hundreds of gentlemen went before him uncovered; his pages and lackeys in the richest liveries; the captains of his guards on each side of his coach, with their attendants, all uncovered; then followed the commissioners of the treasury, master of ceremonies, and other officers. The sword, the great seal, the purse, and four maces, were carried before him by their proper officers.

After a sermon preached by Dr. Thomas Goodwin, his highness⁵ repaired to the painted chamber, and being seated in a chair of state, raised by

³ Mr. Neal's account, as Dr. Grey remarks, does not agree with lord Clarendon: who represents Vowel as earnestly and pathetically addressing the people, and the soldiers, exhorting them to loyalty: and Gerhard as declaring, "that he was innocent, and had not entered into or consented to any plot, nor given any countenance to any discourse to that purpose." Whitelocke says, that when they were brought before the high court, they both denied all the charges alleged against them. Clarendon's History, vol. 3. p. 192; Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 575.

⁴ Mem. p. 577.

⁵ Whitelocke, p. 582.

sundry steps, he made a speech to the members, in which he complained of the levellers and fifth monarchy men, who were for subverting the established laws, and for throwing all things back into confusion. He put them in mind of the difficulties in which the nation was involved at the time he assumed the government. "That it was at war with Portugal, Holland, and France; which together with the divisions among ourselves (says he), begat a confidence in the enemy that we could not hold out long. In this heap of confusion it was necessary to apply some remedy, that the nation might not sink; and the remedy (says he) is this government, which is calculated for the interest of the people alone, without regard to any other, let men say what they will; I can speak with comfort before a greater than you all as to my own intention. Since this government has been erected, men of the most known integrity and ability have been put into seats of justice. The chancery has been reformed. It has put a stop to that heady way for every man that will, to make himself a preacher, by settling a way for approbation of men of piety and fitness for the work. It hath taken care to expunge men unfit for that work; and now, at length, it has been instrumental of calling a free parliament.

"A peace is now made with Sweden, and with the Danes; a peace honourable to the nation, and satisfactory to the merchants. A peace is made with the Dutch, and with Portugal; and such a one that the people that trade thither have liberty of conscience, without being subject to the bloody inquisition." He then advises them to concert measures for the support of the present government, and desires them to believe, that he spoke to them not as one that intended to be a lord over them, but as one that was resolved to be a fellow-servant with them for the interest of their country; and then, having exhorted them to unanimity, he dismissed them to their house to choose a speaker.

William Lenthal, esq. master of the rolls, and speaker of the long-parliament, was chosen without opposition. The first point the house entered on was the instrument of government, which occasioned many warm debates, and was like to have occasioned a fatal breach amongst them. To prevent this the protector gave orders, September 12, that as the members came to the house they should be directed to attend his highness in the painted chamber, where he made the following remarkable speech, which is deserving the reader's careful attention: "Gentlemen, I am surprised at your conduct, in debating so freely the instrument of government; for the same power that has made you a parliament has appointed me protector, so that if you dispute the one, you must disown the other."⁶ He added, "that he was a gentleman by birth, and had been called to several employments in parlia-

⁶ Dugdale's Late Troubles, p. 12G, &c.

ment, and in the wars, which being at an end, he was willing to retire to a private life, and prayed to be dismissed, but could not obtain it. That he had pressed the long-parliament, as a member, to dissolve themselves; but finding they intended to continue their sessions, he thought himself obliged to dismiss them, and to call some persons together from the several parts of the nation, to see if they could fall upon a better settlement. Accordingly he resigned up all his power into their hands, but they after some time returned it back to him. After this (says he) divers gentlemen having consulted together, framed the present model without my privity, and told me, that unless I would undertake the same, blood and confusion would break in upon them; but I refused again and again, till considering that it did not put me into a higher capacity than I was in before, I consented; since which time I have had the thanks of the army, the fleet, the city of London, and of great numbers of gentry in the three nations. Now the government being thus settled, I apprehend there are four fundamentals which may not be examined into, or altered. (1.) That the government be in a single person and a parliament. (2.) That parliaments be not perpetual. (3.) The article relating to the militia. And, (4.) A due liberty of conscience in matters of religion. Other things in the government may be changed as occasion requires. Forasmuch therefore as you have gone about to subvert the fundamentals of this government, and throw all things back into confusion, to prevent the like for the future I am necessitated to appoint you a test or recognition of the government, by which you are made a parliament, before you go any more into the house.”⁷ Accordingly at their return, they found a guard at the door denying entrance to any who would not first sign the following engagement: “I, A. B. do hereby freely promise, and engage to be true and faithful to the lord-protector of the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and will not propose or give my consent to alter the government, as it is settled in one single person and a parliament.” About three hundred of the members signed the recognition, and having taken their places in the house, with some difficulty confirmed the instrument of government almost in everything, but the right of nominating a successor to the present protector; which they reserved to the parliament. They voted the present lord-protector to continue for life. They continued the standing army of ten thousand horse and twenty thousand foot, and £60,000 a month for their maintenance. They gave the protector £200,000 a year for his civil list, and assigned Whitehall, St. James’s, and the rest of the late king’s houses, for his use; but they were out of humour, and were so far from showing respect to the court, that they held no manner of correspondence with it; which together with their voting, that no one clause of what they

⁷ Whitelocke, p. 587.

had agreed upon should be binding, unless the whole were consented to, provoked the protector,⁸ as derogating from his power of consenting to or refusing particular bills, and therefore, having discovered several plots against his government ready to break out, in which some of the members were concerned, he scut for them into the painted chamber, January 22; and after a long and intricate speech, in which, after some strong expressions in favour of liberty to men of the same faith, though of different judgments in lesser matters, he complained, that they had taken no more notice of him, either by message or address, than if there had been no such person in being; that they had done nothing for the honour and support of the government, but spent their time in fruitless debates of little consequence, while the nation was bleeding to death; and instead of making things easy, that they had laid a foundation for future dissatisfactions; he therefore dissolved them, without confirming any of their acts, after they had sat five months, according to the instrument of government, reckoning twenty-eight days to a month. This was deemed an unpopular action, and a renouncing the additional title the parliament would have given him; but this great man with the sword in his hand was not to be jostled out of the saddle with votes and resolutions; and if one may credit his speech, his assuming the government was not so much the effect of his own ambition, as of a bold resolution to prevent the nation's falling back into anarchy and blood.

Upon the rising of the parliament major-general Harrison, one of the chiefs of the republicans, was taken into custody; and Mr. John Wildman, who had been expelled the house, was apprehended as he was drawing up a paper, entitled, "A declaration of the free and well-affected people of England now in arms against the tyrant Oliver Cromwell;" which prevented the rising of that party.⁹

The royalists were buying up arms at the same time, and preparing to rise in several parts of the kingdom.¹⁰ They had procured commissions from the young king at Cologne, and desired his majesty to be ready on the sea-coast by the 11th of March, when there would be a revolt in the army, and when Dover-castle would be delivered into their hands. The king accordingly removed to Middleburgh in Zealand; but the protector had intelligence of it from his spies, and declared it openly as soon as he was arrived, which intimidated the conspirators, and made them fear they were discovered: however, about the time appointed, some small parties of royalists got together in Shropshire with an intent to surprise Shrewsbury and Chirk-castle. A cart-load of arms was brought to a place of rendezvous for the northern parts, where they were to be headed by Wilmot, earl of Roch-

⁸ Life of Cromwell, p. 291.

⁹ Whiteloeke, p. 600.

¹⁰ Clarendon, vol. 3. p. 551.

ester; but they no sooner met but they dispersed for fear of being fallen upon by the regular troops. In the west sir Joseph Wagstaffe, colonel Penruddock, captain Hugh Grove, Mr. Jones, and others, entered the city of Salisbury, with two hundred horse well armed, in the time of the assizes, and seized the judges Rolls and Nichols, with the sheriff of the county, whom they resolved to hang. They proclaimed the king, and threatened violence to such as would not join them; but the country not coming in according to their expectations they were intimidated, and after five or six hours marched away into Dorsetshire, and from thence to Devonshire, where captain Crook overtook them, and with one single troop of horse defeated and took most of them prisoners; Penruddock and Grove were beheaded at Exeter; and some few others were executed at Salisbury, the place were they had so lately triumphed.

The vigilance of the protector on this occasion is almost incredible; he caused a great many suspected lords and gentlemen to be secured; he sent letters to the justices of peace in every county, whom he had already changed to his mind, commanding them to look out, and secure all persons who should make the least disturbance. And his private intelligence of people's discourse and behaviour, in every corner of the land, never failed.¹¹

If the reader will duly consider the danger arising from these commotions, and the necessity of striking some terror into the authors of them, he will easily account for the protector's severity against the royalists; when therefore the insurrection was quashed, he resolved to make the whole party pay the expense; and accordingly, with the consent of his council, published an order, "that all who had been in arms for the king, or had declared themselves of the royal party, should be decimated; that is, pay a tenth part of their estates, to support the charge of such extraordinary forces as their turbulent and seditious practices obliged him to keep up; for which purpose commissioners were appointed in every county, and considerable sums were brought into the treasury." To justify this extraordinary procedure, the protector published another declaration; in which he complains of the irreconcilableness of those who had adhered to the king, towards all those who had served their country on the side of the parliament; that they were now to be looked upon as public enemies, and to be kept from being able to do mischief, since it sufficiently appeared that they were always disposed to do all they could. Upon these accounts he thought it highly reasonable, and declares it to be his resolution, that if any desperate attempts were undertaken by them for the future, the whole party should suffer for it.

To return to the affairs of religion: though the Presbyterian discipline was at a low ebb, it was still the established religion of the nation. The pro-

¹¹ Whilelocke, p. 602.

vincial assembly of London continued their sessions at Sion-college every half year, and endeavoured to support the dignity of the ministerial office. Complaint having been made that the pulpit-doors were set open to laymen, and gifted brethren, they appointed a committee to collect materials for the vindication of the ministerial character, which being revised by the synod, was published this, summer under the title of “Jus Divinum Ministerii Evanglici: or, the Divine Right of an Evangelical Ministry, in two parts. By the provincial assembly of London. With an appendix, of the judgment and practice of antiquity.”

In the debates of parliament upon the instrument of government it was observed, that by the thirty-seventh article, all who professed faith in God by Jesus Christ should be protected in their religion.¹² This was interpreted to imply an agreement in fundamentals. Upon which it was voted, that all should be tolerated or indulged who professed the fundamentals of Christianity; and a committee was appointed to nominate certain divines to draw up a catalogue of fundamentals to be presented to the house: the committee being above fourteen, named each of them a divine; among others arch-bishop Usher was nominated, but he declining the affair, Mr. Baxter was appointed in his room; the rest who acted were,

¹² Baxter's Life, part 2. p. 197.

Dr. Owen	Mr. Reyner	
Dr. Goodwin	Mr. Nye	Mr. Vines
Dr. Cheynel	Mr. Sydrach Simp-	Mr. Manton
Mr. Marshal	son	Mr. Jacomb.

Mr. Baxter¹ would have persuaded his brethren to offer the committee the Apostles' creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, alone, as containing the fundamentals of religion: but it was objected, that this would include Socinians and Papists. Mr. Baxter replied, that it was so much fitter for a centre of unity or concord, because it was impossible, in his opinion, to devise a form of words which heretics would not subscribe, when they had perverted them to their own sense. These arguments not prevailing, the following articles were presented to the committee, but not brought into the house; under the title of "The principles of faith, presented by Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simpson, and other ministers, to the committee of parliament for religion, by way of explanation to the proposals for propagating the gospel."

1st. That the Holy Scripture is that rule of knowing God and living unto him, which whoso does not believe cannot be saved.—2 Thess. ii. 10–12. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 1–3. 2 Cor. i. 13. John v. 39. 2 Peter ii. 1.

2dly. That there is a God, who is the creator, governor, and judge, of the world, which is to be received by faith, and every other way of the knowledge of him is insufficient.—Heb. xi. 3. 6. Rom. i. 19–22. 1 Cor. i. 21. 2 Thess. i. 8.

3dly. That this God, who is the creator, is eternally distinct from all creatures in his being and blessedness.—Rom. i. 18. 25. 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

4thly. That this God is one in three persons or subsistences.—

1 John v. 5–9, compared with John viii. 17–19. 21. Matt, xxviii. 19, compared with Ephesians iv. 4–6. 1 John ii. 22, 23. 2 John 9, 10.

5thly. That Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and man, without the knowledge of whom there is no salvation.—1 Tim. ii. 4–6. 2 Tim. iii. 15. 1 John ii. 22. Acts iv. 10. 12. 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11.

6thly. That this Jesus Christ is the true God.—1 John v. 29. Isaiah xlv. 21–25.

7thly. That this Jesus Christ is also true man.—1 John iv. 2, 3. 2 John 7.

8thly. That this Jesus Christ is God and man in one person.—Tim. iii. 16. Matt. xvi. 13–18.

9thly. That this Jesus Christ is our redeemer, who by paying a ransom, and bearing our sins, has made satisfaction for them.—Isaiah liiii. 11. 1 Pet. ii. 24, 25. 1 Cor. xv. 2, 3. 1 Tim. ii. 4–6.

¹ Life, part 2. p. 198.

10thly. That this same Lord Jesus Christ is he that was crucified at Jerusalem, and rose again, and ascended into heaven.—John viii. 24. Acts iv. 10–12. Acts x. 38–43. 1 Cor. xv. 2–8. Acts xxii. 2. Acts ii. 36.

11thly. That this same Jesus Christ, being the only God and man in one person, remains for ever a distinct person from all saints and angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him.—Col. ii. 8–10. 19. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

12thly. That all men by nature are dead in sins and trespasses; and no man can be saved unless he be born again, repent and believe.—John iii. 3. 5–7. 10. Acts xvii. 30, 31. Acts xxvi. 17–20. Luke xxiv. 47. Acts xx. 20, 21. John v. 24, 25.

13thly. That we are justified and saved by grace, and faith in Jesus Christ, and not by works.—Acts xv. 24, compared with Gal. i. 6–9. Gal. v. 2. 4, 5. Rom. ix. 31–33. Rom. x. 3, 4. Rom. i. 16, 17. Gal. iii. 11. Ephes, ii. 8–10.

14thly. That to continue in any known sin, upon what pretence or principle soever, is damnable.—Rom. i. 32. Rom. vi. 1, 2. 15, 16. 1 John, i. 6. 8. and iii. 3–8. 2 Pct. ii. 19, 20. Rom. viii. 13.

15thly. That God is to be worshipped according to his own will; and whosoever shall forsake and despise all the duties of his worship cannot be saved.—Jcr. x. 15. Psalm xiv. 4. Jude 18–21. Rom. x. 13.

16thly. That the dead shall rise; and that there is a day of judgment, wherein all shall appear, some to go into everlasting life, and some into everlasting condemnation.—1 Tim. i. 19, 20, compared with 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18. Acts xvii. 30, 31. John v. 28, 29. 1 Cor. xv. 19.

Mr. Baxter¹ says, Dr. Owen worded these articles; that Dr. Goodwin, Mr. Nyc, and Mr. Simpson, were his assistants; that Dr. Chcynel was scribe; and that Mr. Marshal, a sober worthy man, did something; but that the rest were little better than passive. He adds, that twenty of their propositions were printed, though in my copy, licensed by Scobel, there are only sixteen: however, the parliament being abruptly dissolved, they were all buried in oblivion.

It appears by these articles, that these divines intended to exclude, not only Deists, Socinians, and Papists, but Arians, Antinomians, Quakers, and others. Into such difficulties do wise and good men fall, when they usurp the kingly office of Christ, and pretend to restrain that liberty which is the birthright of every reasonable creature! It is an unwarrantable presumption for any number of men to declare what is fundamental in the Christian religion, any further than the Scriptures have expressly declared it. It is one thing to maintain a doctrine to be true, and another to declare, that without

¹ Life, p. 205.

the belief of it no man can be saved: none may say this but God himself. Besides, why should the civil magistrate protect none but those who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ? If a colony of English merchants should settle among the Mahometans or Chinese, should we not think that the government of those countries ought to protect them in their religion as long as they invaded no man's property, and paid obedience and submission to the government under which they lived? Why then should Christians deny others the same liberty?

The protector and his council were in more generous sentiments of liberty, as will appear hereafter.¹ Mr. Baxter says,² the protector and his friends gave out, that they could not understand what the magistrates had to do in matters of religion; they thought that all men should be left to the liberty of their own consciences, and that the magistrate could not interpose without ensnaring himself in the guilt of persecution. And were not these just and noble sentiments, though the parliament would not accept them? His highness therefore, in his speech at their dissolution, reproaches them in these words:³—“How proper is it to labour for liberty, that men should not be trampled upon for their consciences! Have we not lately laboured under the weight of persecution; and is it fit then to sit heavy upon others? Is it ingenuous to ask liberty, and not to give it? What greater hypocrisy, than for those who were oppressed by the bishops to become the greatest oppressors themselves, so soon as their yoke is removed? I could wish, that they who call for liberty now also, had not too much of that spirit, if the power were in their hands. As for profane persons, blasphemers, such as preach sedition, contentious railers, evil-speakers, who seek by evil words to corrupt good manners, and persons of loose conversation, punishment from the civil magistrate ought to meet with them; because if these pretend conscience, yet walking disorderly, and not according, but contrary to, the gospel and natural light, they are judged of all, and their sins being open, make them the subject of the magistrates' sword, who ought not to bear it in vain.”—

Agreeable to these principles, Dr. George Bates, an eminent royalist, and a great enemy of Cromwell's, writes, “that the protector indulged the use of the Common Prayer in families, and in private conventicles; and though the condition of the church of England was but melancholy, yet (says the doctor) it cannot be denied, but they had a great deal more favour and indulgence than under the parliament; which would never have been

¹ “Bigotry (says Dr. Harris) made no part of Cromwell's character:” and he proves the truth of his assertion by a full elucidation and a minute detail. *Life of Cromwell*, p. 37—45—ED.

² *Life*, p. 193.

³ *Life of Cromwell*, p. 307.

interrupted had they not insulted the protector, and forfeited their liberty by their seditious practices and plottings against his person and government.”

The approbation of public ministers had been hitherto reserved to the several presbyteries in city and country; but the protector observing some inconvenience in this method, and not being willing to intrust the qualification of candidates all over England to a number of Presbyterians only, who might admit none but those of their own persuasion, contrived a middle way of joining the several parties together, and intrusting the affair with certain commissioners of each denomination, men of as known abilities and integrity as any the nation had.¹ This was done by an ordinance of council bearing date March 20, 1653–4; the preamble to which sets forth, “that whereas for some time past, there had not been any certain course established for supplying vacant places with able and fit persons to preach the gospel, by reason whereof the rights and titles of patrons were prejudiced, and many weak, scandalous, Popish, and ill-affected persons had intruded themselves, or been brought in; for remedy of which it is ordained by his highness the lord-protector, by and with the consent of his council, that every person who shall, after the 25th of March, 1654, be presented, nominated, chosen, or appointed, to any benefice with care of souls, or to any public settled lecture in England or Wales, shall, before he be admitted, be examined and approved by the persons hereafter named, to be a person, for the grace of God in him, his holy and unblameable conversation, as also for his knowledge and utterance, able and fit to preach the gospel.”² Among the commissioners were eight or nine laymen, the rest ministers; their names were,

Francis Rouse, esq.	Rev. Dr. Horton	Rev. Mr. Walter Craddock
Alderman Tiebbourne	Thankful Owen, M.A.	Mr. Samuel Fairclough
Mark Hildesley, esq.	Mr. Joseph Caryl	Mr. Hugh Peters
Thomas Wood, esq.	Mr. Philip Nye	Mr. Peter Sterry
John Sadler, esq.	Mr. William Carter	Mr. Samuel Bamford
William Goffe, esq.	Mr. Sydrach Simpson	Thomas Valentine, of
Thomas St. Nicholas, esq.	Mr. William Greenhill	Chaford, B.D.
William Packer, esq.	Mr. William Strong	Mr. Henry Jesse
Edward Cresset, esq.	Dr. Thomas Manton	Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick
Rev. Dr. John Owen	Mr. Samuel Slater	Mr. Nicholas Lockyer
Dr. Thomas Goodwin	Mr. William Cooper	Mr. Dan. Dike
Dr. Arrowsmith	Mr. Stephen Marshall	Mr. James Russel
Dr. Tuckney	John Tombes, B.D.	Mr. Nath. Campfield.

These were commonly called triers; in all thirty-eight; of whom some were Presbyterians, others Independents, and two or three were Baptists. Any five were sufficient to approve; but no number under nine had power to reject a person as unqualified. In case of death, or removal of any of the commissioners, their numbers were to be filled up by the protector and his council; or by the parliament, if sitting. But some of the Presbyterian di-

¹ Baxter's Life, p. 72.

² Scobel, p. 279.

vines declined acting, for want of a better authority; or because they did not like the company; though the authority was as good as any these times could produce till the next sessions of parliament.¹ By an ordinance of September 2, 1654, I find the Rev. Mr. John Rowe, Mr. John Bond, Mr. George Griffith of the Charter-house, Mr. John Turner, and Godfrey Bosville, esq., added to the commissioners above mentioned.

To such as were approved, the commissioners gave an instrument in writing under a common seal for that purpose, by virtue of which they were put into as full possession of the living to which they were nominated or chosen, as if they had been admitted by institution and induction.

It was farther provided, that all who presented themselves for approbation should produce a certificate signed by three persons at least of known integrity, one of whom to be a preacher of the gospel in some settled place, testifying on their personal knowledge the holy and good conversation of the person to be admitted; which certificate was to be registered and filed. And all penalties for not subscribing, or reading the articles of religion, according to the act of 13 Eliz., were to cease and be void.

And forasmuch as some persons might have been preferred to livings within the last twelvemonth, when there was no settled method of approbation, the ordinance looks back and ordains, "that no person who had been placed in any benefice or lecture since April 1, 1653, should be allowed to continue in it, unless he got himself approved by the 24th of June, or at farthest the 23rd of July, 1654."

It is observable, that this ordinance provides no security for the civil government, the commissioners not being empowered to administer an oath of allegiance or fidelity to the protector. By this means some of the sequestered clergy, taking advantage of the act of oblivion in 1651, passed their trials before the commissioners and returned to their livings. The protector being advised of this defect, by advice of his council, published an additional ordinance, September 2, 1654, requiring the commissioners not to give admission to any who had been sequestered from their ecclesiastical benefices for delinquency, till by experience of their conformity, and submission to the present government, his highness and his council should be satisfied of their fitness to be admitted into ecclesiastical promotions; and the same to be signified to the said commissioners.² Both these ordinances were confirmed by parliament in the year 1656, with this proviso, "that the commissioners appointed by his highness in the intervals of parliament should afterward be confirmed by the succeeding parliament." Another defect in the ordinance was, that it did not appoint some standard or rule for

¹ Scobel, p. 366,

² Scobel, p. 366.

the triers to go by; this would have taken off all odium from themselves, and prevented a great many needless disputes; but, as matters now stood, men's qualifications were perhaps left too much to the arbitrary opinions and votes of the commissioners. After examination they gave the candidate a copy of the presentation in these words:¹ "Know all men by these presents, that the — day of —, in the year, —, there was exhibited to the commissioners for examination of public ministers, a presentation of Mr. — to the rectory of —, in the county of —, made to him by Mr. —, the patron thereof, under his hand and seal, together with a testimony of his holy and godly conversation. Upon perusal, and due consideration of the premises, and finding him to be a person qualified, as in and by the ordinance for such qualifications is required, the commissioners above mentioned have adjudged and approved the said Mr. — to be a fit person to preach the gospel, and have granted him admission, and do admit the said Mr. — to the rectory of — aforesaid, to be full and perfect possessor and incumbent thereof: and do hereby signify to all persons concerned therein, that he is hereby entitled to all the profits and perquisites, and to all rights and dues incident and belonging to the said rectory, as fully and effectually as if he had been instituted and inducted according to any such laws and customs as have in this case formerly been made or used in this realm. In witness whereof they have caused the common seal to be hereunto affixed, and the same to be attested by the hand of the registrar, by his highness in that behalf appointed. Dated at —, the — day of —, in the year —.

“(L. S.)

JOHN NYE, Reg.”

Loud complaints have been made against these triers; Mr. Collyer objects to there being eight laymen among the commissioners, and that any five having power to act, it might sometimes happen that none but secular men might determine the qualifications of such who were to preach and administer the sacraments.

Mr. John Goodwin, an Independent divine of Arminian principles, observes, the triers made their own narrow Calvinian sentiments in divinity the door of admission to all church-preferments; and that their power was greater than the bishops', because the laws had provided a remedy against their arbitrary proceedings, by a *quare impedit*; or if the bishop might determine absolutely of the qualifications of the candidate or clerk to be admitted into a living, yet these qualifications were sufficiently specified, and particularized in the ecclesiastical laws or canons, and the bishop might be obliged, by due course of law, to assign the reasons of his refusal; whereas the determinations of these commissioners for approbation were final; nor

¹ Calamy, vol. 2. p. 247.

were they obliged so much as to specify any reason for their rejecting any person, but only their vote, *not approved*.

It was farther complained of as a very great hardship, that “there was but one set of triers for the whole nation, who resided always at London, which must occasion great expense, and long journeys, to such as lived in the remoter counties.” But to remedy this inconvenience, Dr. Walker says,¹ they appointed subcommissioners in the remoter counties. And, according to Mr. Baxter, if any were unable to come to London, or were of doubtful qualifications, the commissioners of London used to refer them to some ministers in the county where they lived; and under their testimonial they approved or rejected them. Amidst such variety of sentiments it was next to impossible to please all parties; when there were no triers, the complaint was, that the pulpit-doors were left open to all intruders, and “now they cannot agree upon any one method of examination.” And it must be left to every one’s judgment, whether a bishop and his chaplain, or a classis of presbyters, or the present mixture of laity and clergy, be most eligible.

The chief objections against these triers has been to the manner of executing their powers. Bishop Kennet says,² “that this holy inquisition was turned into a snare to catch men of probity, and sense, and sound divinity, and to let none escape but ignorant, bold, canting fellows; for these triers (says the bishop) asked few or no questions in knowledge or learning, but only about conversation, and the grace of God in the heart, to which the readiest answers would arise from infatuation in some, and the trade of hypocrisy in others. By this means the rights of patronage were at their pleasure, and the character and abilities of divines whatever they pleased to make them, and churches were filled with little creatures of the state.” But the bishop has produced no examples of this; nor were any of these canting little creatures turned out for insufficiency at the Restoration. Dr. George Bates, an eminent Royalist, with a little more temper and truth, says, “that they inquired more narrowly into their affection to the present government, and into the eternal marks and character of the grace of God in their heart, than into their learning; by which means many ignorant laics, mechanics, and pedlars, were admitted to livings, when persons of greater merit were rejected.” But it may be observed again, that, ignorant as they were, not one of the mechanics or pedlars who conformed at the Restoration was ejected for insufficiency. When the commissioners had to do with persons of known learning, sobriety, reputed orthodoxy, and a peaceable behaviour, they made but little inquiry into the marks of their conversation; as appears from the example of Mr. Fuller the historian, who being presented to a liv-

¹ Walker, p. 172.

² Complete History, p. 209.

ing was approved by the triers, without giving any other evidence of the grace of God in him than this, that he made conscience of his thoughts.

Dr. Walker has published the examinations of two or three clergymen, who were notorious for their malignity and disaffection to the government, whom the commissioners puzzled with dark and abstruse questions in divinity, that they might set them aside, without encountering their political principles; for when they had private intimations of notorious malignants to come before them, they frequently had recourse to this method; though it is not unlikely that, upon some other occasions, they might lay too great stress upon the internal characters of regeneration, the truth of which depends entirely upon the integrity of the respondent. But I believe not a single instance can be produced of any who were rejected for insufficiency without being first convicted either of immorality, of obnoxious sentiments in the Socinian or Pelagian controversy, or of disaffection to the present government. Mr. Sadler, who was presented to a living in Dorsetshire, but rejected by the triers, published his examination in a pamphlet, which he calls *Inquisitio Anglicana*, wherein he endeavours to expose the commissioners in a very contemptuous manner; but Mr. John Nye, clerk to the commissioners, followed him with an answer entitled, “Sadler examined; or, his Disguise discovered;” showing the gross mistakes and most notorious falsehoods in his dealings with the commissioners for approbation of public preachers,¹ in his *Inquisitio Anglicana*. To which Mr. Sadler never replied.

Dr. George Bates and Dr. Walker have charged the triers with simony, upon no other proof, but that Hugh Peters said once to Mr. Camplin, a clergyman of Somersetshire, upon his applying to him, by a friend, for dispatch, “Has thy friend any money;” a slender proof of so heavy a charge. They who are acquainted with the jocose conversation of Hugh Peters, will not wonder at such an expression. But I refer the reader back to the names and characters of the commissioners, most of whom were men of unquestionable probity, for a sufficient answer to this calumny.

No doubt the triers did commit sundry mistakes, which it was hardly possible to avoid in their station. I am far from vindicating all their proceedings; they had a difficult work on their hands, lived in times when the extent of Christian liberty was not well understood, had to deal with men of different principles in religion and politics; and those who were not approved, would of course complain. Had this power been lodged with the bishops of these times, or their chaplains; or with the high Presbyterians, would they not have had their shibboleth, for which ill-natured men might have called them a holy inquisition? But Mr. Baxter has given a very fair and candid account of them; his words are these, “Because this assembly of

¹ Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 370.

triers is most heavily accused and reproached by some men, I shall speak the truth of them, and suppose my word will be taken, because most of them took me for one of their boldest adversaries: the truth is, though their authority was null, and though some few over-rigid and over-busy Independents among them were too severe against all that were Arminians, and too particular in inquiring after evidences of sanctification in those whom they examined; and somewhat too lax in admitting of unlearned and erroneous men, that favoured Antinomianism or Anabaptism; yet, to give them their due, they did abundance of good to the church. They saved many a congregation from ignorant, ungodly, drunken teachers, that sort of men who intend no more in the ministry than to say a sermon, as readers say their common prayers on a Sunday, and all the rest of the week go with the people to the alehouse, and harden them in sin; and that sort of ministers who either preached against a holy life, or preached as men that were never acquainted with it; these they usually rejected, and in their stead admitted of any that were able, serious preachers, and lived a godly life, of what tolerable opinion soever they were; so that though many of them were a little partial for the Independents, separatists, fifth monarchy men, and Anabaptists, and against the Prelatists and Arminians, yet so great was the benefit above the hurt which they brought to the church, that many thousands of souls blessed God for the faithful ministers whom they let in, and grieved when the Prelatists afterward cast them out again.”¹

The commissioners were not empowered to look farther back than one year before the date of the ordinance that constituted them. All who were in possession of livings before that time were out of their reach; nor would the protector have given these any disturbance, had he not received certain information of their stirring up the people to join the insurrection that was now on foot for the restoration of the king. They continued sitting at Whitehall till the protector’s death, or the year 1659, and were then discontinued.

But to humble the clergy yet farther, and keep them within the bounds of their spiritual function, his highness, by the advice of his council, published an ordinance, bearing date August 28, 1654, entitled, “An ordinance for ejecting scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters.” The ordinance appoints and nominates certain lay-commissioners for every county, and joins with them ten or more of the gravest and most noted ministers, their assistants, and empowers any five or more of them to call before them any public preacher, lecturer, parson, vicar, curate, or schoolmaster, who is or shall be reputed ignorant, scandalous, insufficient, or negligent; and to receive all articles or charges that shall be exhibited

¹ Baxter’s Life. p. 72.

against them on this account; and to proceed to the examination and determination of such offences, according to the following rules.¹

“Such ministers and schoolmasters shall be accounted scandalous in their lives and conversations, as shall hold or maintain such blasphemous or atheistical opinions, as are punishable by the act, entitled ‘An act against several blasphemous and atheistical opinions,’ &c., or that shall be guilty of profane swearing and cursing, perjury, and subornation of perjury; such as maintain any Popish opinions, required to be abjured by the oath of abjuration; or are guilty of adultery, fornication, drunkenness, common haunting of taverns or alehouses; frequent quarrellings or fightings; frequent playing at cards or dice; profaning of the sabbath; or that do allow and countenance the same in their families, or in their parishes. Such as have frequently read or used the Common Prayer-book in public since the first of January last; or shall at any time hereafter do the same. Such as publicly and profanely scoff at the strict profession or professors of godliness. Such as encourage or countenance Whitsun-ales, wakes, morrice-dancing, may-poles, stage-plays, or such-like licentious practices. Such as have declared, or shall declare, by writing, preaching, or otherwise publishing, their disaffection to the present government.

“Such ministers shall be accounted negligent, as omit the public exercise of preaching and praying on the Lord’s day (not being hindered by necessary absence or infirmity of body); or that are or shall be non-residents. Such schoolmasters shall be accounted negligent as absent themselves from their schools, and wilfully neglect to teach their scholars.

“Such ministers or schoolmasters shall be accounted ignorant and insufficient, as shall be so declared and adjudged by the commissioners in every county, or any five of them, together with five of the ministers mentioned in the ordinance.”

The lay-commissioners were to proceed upon oath, both for and against the person accused; but in cases of ignorance or insufficiency, they were to be joined by five of the assistant clergy at least: and if ten of the commissioners, whereof five to be ministers, gave it under their hands, that the party was ignorant or insufficient, then the said minister or schoolmaster was to be ejected, and the said judgment entered in a register-book with the reason thereof. After ejection, the party might not preach or teach school in the parish from whence he was ejected; but convenient time was to be allowed for his removal, and the fifths reserved for the support of his family. The rightful patron was to present to the vacant living an approved preacher; and in case of lapse it fell to the protector and his council.

¹ Scobel, p. 335. 340.

This ordinance being confirmed by the parliament of 1656, gave great offence to the old clergy; Mr. Gatford, the sequestered rector of Denington, published a pamphlet, entitled “A Petition for the Vindication of the Use of Common Prayer, &c.,” occasioned by the late ordinance for ejecting scandalous ministers; as also thirty-seven queries concerning the said ordinance; which he presented to the parliament, which met September 3, 1654; but they took no notice of it.

Mr. Gatford observes, that the protector and his council had no legal authority to make this or any other ordinance without consent of a parliament: whereas the instrument of government empowered them to provide for the safety of the state, by making laws till the parliament should meet. He observes farther, that such a proceeding must justify his late majesty and council in all their illegal proceedings before the civil wars; that it would justify the high-commission court; and that, by the same authority, an ordinance might be published to eject freeholders out of their estates.

He complains, that the power of the commissioners is final and admits of no appeal; that it looks back to crimes antecedent to the law for a twelvemonth; whereas it ought only to declare, that for the future such offences shall be punished with deprivation.

That the commissioners who were to sit in judgment upon the clergy were all laymen, the ministers being called in only in cases of ignorance and insufficiency; that the ordinance admits of the oath of one witness, provided it be supported with other concurrent evidence, which is contrary to the laws of God and man.

That some crimes in the ordinance were none at all, and others of a very doubtful nature; as how often a minister omitting to pray and preach in his pulpit should render him negligent; and what should be deemed non-residence. Above all, he complains that the public reading of the Common Prayer should be ranked with the sins of swearing and drunkenness, and be an evidence of a scandalous life and conversation; which observation was unquestionably just.

To give the reader an example or two of the proceedings of the commissioners: those for Berkshire summoned Dr. Pordage, rector of Bradfield, to appear before them at Speenhamland, near Newbury, to answer to divers articles of blasphemy and heresy. After several days’ hearing and witnesses produced on

both sides, the commissioners determined December 8, 1654, that the said doctor was guilty of denying the Deity of Christ; the merits of his precious blood and passion; and several other such-like opinions. It is farther declared under the hands of six of the commissioners, and a sufficient number of ministers their assistants, that the said doctor was ignorant, and

insufficient for the work of the ministry; it is therefore ordered, that the said doctor be and he is hereby ejected out of the rectory of Bradfield, and the profits thereof; but the said commissioners do grant him time, till the 2d of February to remove himself, his family, his goods and chattels, out of the said parsonage-house; and farther time to remove his corn out of the barns, till the 23d of March.

The Oxford historian says, this Pordage was a doctor by Charientismus, and had been preacher of St. Lawrence-church in Reading before he came to Bradfield.¹ That he was a mystic enthusiast, and used to talk of the fiery Deity of Christ dwelling in the soul, and mixing itself with our flesh.² He dealt much in astrology, and pretended to converse with the world of spirits. After his ejection he wrote against the commissioners a pamphlet, entitled, *In-nocency appearing*; which was answered by Mr. Christopher Fowler, vicar of St. Mary, Reading, in his *Dominium Meridianum*. However, the doctor was restored to his living at Bradfield at the Restoration.

The Wiltshire commissioners summoned Mr. Walter Bushnel, vicar of Box near Malmesbury, before them, to answer to a charge of drunkenness, profanation of the sabbath, gaming, and disaffection to the government;³ and after a full hearing, and proof upon oath, they ejected him. The vicar prepared for the press, “A narrative of the proceedings of the commissioners appointed by O. Cromwell for ejecting scandalous and ignorant ministers, in the case of Walter Bushnel,” &c. but it was not printed till the king’s restoration; and even then the commissioners did themselves justice in a reply, which they entitled, “A vindication of the Marlborough commissioners, by the commissioners themselves.” And Dr. Chambers, who was reproached by the said Bushnel, did himself justice in a distinct vindication. However, the vicar was restored to his vicarage in a lump with the rest at the Restoration.

Upon the whole, the industrious Dr. Walker says, he can find no footsteps of the numbers of the clergy that were ejected by the commissioners, though he imagines they might be considerable. But I am well satisfied there were none of any considerable character; for there were not a great many zealous loyalists in livings at this time; and those that were had the

¹ Athens Oxon. vol. 2. p. 450.

² Mr. Neal is not correct here. For, as Dr. Grey observes, this passage is not in the Oxford historian. It is probable that Mr. Neal took this charge against Dr. Pordage, either from his narrative of the proceedings of the commissioners, or from Mr. Fowler’s animadversions: though, by not specifying his author, the reader is led to suppose that the whole paragraph is grounded on the representation of the Oxford historian. He, it should be also noticed, does not ascribe a skill in astrology to Dr. Pordage; but says, that “Mr. Ashmale commended him for his knowledge in, or great affection to, astronomy.”—Ed.

³ This last, Dr. Grey supposes, was the main reason; for Wood says, “he continued at Box in good esteem the greatest part of the interrupted times, but was at length ejected from his living in the reign of Oliver.” *Athenæ Oxon*, vol. 2. p. 273. —Ed.

wisdom to be silent about public affairs, while they saw the eyes of the government were upon them in every corner of the land. The commissioners continued to act till some time after the protector's death, and were a greater terror to the fanatics and visionaries of those times, than to the regular clergy of any denomination.

The protector and his council passed another ordinance, August 30, for the service of Wales, appointing sir Hugh Owen, and about eighteen other commissioners, for the six counties of South Wales, with the county of Monmouth; and Matthew Morgan, with about twelve other commissioners, for the six counties of North Wales; any three of which were empowered to call before them all such who, by authority of the act for propagating the gospel in Wales, had received or disposed of any of the profits of the rectories, vicarages, &c. in that principality; and to give an account upon oath, of all such rents and profits; and the surplus money in the hands of the commissioners, to be paid into the exchequer.¹

To set this affair before the reader in one view: the principality of Wales, by reason of the poverty of the people, and the small endowments of church-livings, was never well supplied with a learned or pious clergy; the people were generally very ignorant, and only one remove from Heathens. In 1641 a petition was presented to the king and parliament, which declares, that there were not so many conscientious and constant preachers in Wales as there were counties; and that these were either silenced or much persecuted.² The civil wars had made their condition worse; for as they generally adhered to the king, and received great numbers of Irish Papists into their country, their preachers went into his majesty's service, or fled from their cures, when the parliament-forces took possession of it. After the king's death the parliament passed the ordinance already mentioned, for the better propagating of the preaching of the gospel in Wales, and for ejecting scandalous ministers and schoolmasters, and for redress of some grievances; it bears date February 22, 1649, and empowers the commissioners therein mentioned, or any twelve of them, to receive and dispose of all and singular rents, issues, and profits, of all ecclesiastical livings, impropriations, and glebe-lands, within the said counties, which then were or afterward should be under sequestration, or in the disposal of the parliament, and out of them to order and appoint a constant yearly maintenance for such persons as should be recommended, and approved for the work of the ministry, or education of children; and for such other ministers as were then residing in the said counties. The ordinance to continue in force for three years, from March 25, 1650.

¹ Scobel, p. 347.

² Calamy's Com. of Church and Dissenters, p. 47, note.

By virtue of this ordinance many clergymen were ejected, but not all, for in Montgomeryshire eleven or twelve remained, as did several in other counties; but all who were ejected for manifest scandal.¹ Afterward complaints being made, that the people were turning Papists or Heathens, for want of the word of God, several were sent into Montgomeryshire, where there were at least sixteen preachers, of which ten were university-men, the meanest of whom were approved and settled in parishes at the Restoration. The commissioners were empowered to examine into the behaviour of such as were reputed ignorant, insufficient, nonresident, scandalous, or enemies to the present government. And it being impossible to fill up the vacant livings with such as could preach in the Welsh language, the revenues were to be collected and brought into a common treasury, out of which £100 per annum was to be given to sundry itinerant preachers in each county.

Dr. Walker says, that, from the account drawn up by the commissioners themselves in April 1652, it appears that there had been ejected in South Wales, and Monmouthshire, one hundred and seventy-five ministers; that is, fifty-six from the year 1645 to the time when this act took place, and one hundred and nineteen by the present commissioners. Mr. Vavasor Powel, who had a chief hand in the sequestrations, says, that by virtue of this act between fifty and sixty of the old clergy were dispossessed of their livings when he wrote. Upon the whole, the commissioners, who continued to act as long as the protector lived, charge themselves with between three hundred and twenty and three hundred and thirty several and distinct livings; but there could not be an equal number of sequestered clergymen, because in the compass of seven years a great many must die; some fled, or were killed in the wars; in many parishes the tithes were not duly paid by reason of the confusion of the times, and the livings being being but from £5 to £10 or £20 a year, most of the incumbents were pluralists. It is computed that about one half of the church lands and revenues in the principality of Wales, by the several accidents of death, desertion, sequestration, &c. fell into the hands of the government before the expiration of this ordinance in 1653, the profits of which, if duly collected and paid, must amount to a very considerable sum. There were thirteen counties in North and South Wales within the limits of the commission; but the largest sum that the sequestrators and agents charge themselves with for the county of Brecknock, in any one year, till the year 1658, when the propagation had subsisted eight years, is £1,543, by which the reader may make a tolerable computation of the whole; and if we may believe Mr. Whitelocke,² who lived through these times, in the year 1653 there were one hundred and fifty good

¹ Ibid. p. 47.

² Memor. p. 518.

preachers in the thirteen Welsh counties, most of whom preached three or four times a week; that in every market-town there was a schoolmaster, and in most great towns two able, learned, and university men; and that the tithes were all employed to the uses directed by act of parliament,¹ there can be no great reason to complain of the negligence of the commissioners.

The crimes for which the old clergy were ejected, were, malignancy, insufficiency, drunkenness, and negligence of their cures. Mr. Vavasor Powel says, that of all the men they had put out in North Wales, he knew not any that had the power of godliness, and very few the form; but that most of them were unpreaching curates, or scandalous in their morals. The commissioners affirm, that of the sixteen they had dispossessed in Cardiganshire, there were but three that were preachers, and those most scandalous livers. And Mr. Baxter admits, that they were all weak, and bad enough for the most part. But the writers on the other side say, that the commissioners had no regard to ability in preaching, or sobriety in conversation. And Dr. Walker thinks, the sequestered Welsh clergy need no other vindication than to let the world know, that many of them were graduates in the university; as if every graduate must of course be possessed of all ministerial qualifications. There might possibly be some few pious and industrious preachers among the ejected Welsh clergy; but they who will argue very strenuously in favour of the body of them, must know very little of the country, or their manner of life.

It was not in the power of the commissioners to find a succession of pious and learned preachers in the Welsh language; but to remedy this in the best manner they could, they appointed six itinerant preachers of university education for each county, to whom they allowed £100 a year; besides which, they sent out thirty-two ministers, of whom twenty-four were university-men, and some of the rest good scholars; but these were too few for the work, though they were indefatigable in their labours. To supply what was farther wanting, they approved of several gifted laymen, members of churches, to travel into the neighbourhood, and assist the people's devotions, and to these they allowed from £17 to £30 per annum. In an article of the sequestrators' accounts there appears £340 per annum distributed among godly members of the church of Lanvacles, and Mynthists Loyn, who had been sent out to exercise their gifts among the Welsh mountaineers, and to help forward the work of the Lord. Many others of the same

¹ These uses and the proportions of the appropriation were as follows: viz. The tithes were divided into six parts; one of which went to the ejected ministers; a second to other settled and itinerant ministers; a third to maintain schools, of some of which the ejected ministers and their sons were masters; a fourth to the widows and children of the ejected ministers; a fifth to under-officers, as treasurers, solicitors, sequestrators, &c.; and a sixth to the widows of ministers deceased. Whitlocke's Mem. p. 518; Calamy's Church and Dissenters Compared, p. 47, note.—ED.

quality were approved by the commissioners, who went through great difficulties and hardships in their work. Mr. Powel says, that some hundreds, if not thousands, had been converted and reformed by the propagators.¹ But after all, it must be confessed, that at first the number of itinerants, both scholars and others, was by no means equal to their work; the parishes in that mountainous country are large and wide, and there being but one itinerant to several of those parishes, the people must have been neglected, and their children too much without instruction; but this was owing to the necessity of the times.

When the commissioners had acted about two years, a petition was presented to the parliament by the inhabitants of South Wales, signed by above a thousand hands, in favour of the old ejected clergy, setting forth the numbers that had been dispossessed, and the want of a competent number of preachers in their places, upon which account the country was reduced to a very miserable condition. They therefore pray the house to take some course for a future supply of godly and able preachers; and to call those persons to account who had received all the profits of church-livings into their hands.² The house received the petition, and referred it to the committee for plundered ministers, who were empowered to examine witnesses, and to authorize other commissioners in the country to examine witnesses upon oath, touching the matters contained in the petition. The committee ordered the commissioners to bring in their accounts in a month's time, which they did accordingly. And the petitioners were ordered to deliver in the particulars on which the desired witnesses might be examined within two days; but not being provided, they desired liberty to make good their allegations in the country; to which the commissioners willingly agreed. But this taking up some time, the long-parliament was dissolved, and the prosecution of this inquiry suspended for the present; but as soon as the protector was fixed in his government, he published an ordinance, August 20, 1654, to bring the propagators to an account; pursuant to which the sequestrators and treasurer for South Wales delivered in their accounts for the years 1650, 1651, 1652, which was all the time the ordinance continued in force; and the commissioners appointed by the protector having received and examined them, after a full inquiry allowed and passed them, August 10, 1655.

It is hard to read with temper the reproaches cast upon these commissioners by our angry historians, who have charged them with all manner of corruption, as if they had got great estates out of the revenues of the church, though without producing a single example. Mr. Powel, who took more

¹ Calamy's Comp. p. 48.

² Walker, p. 168.

pains among them than any man of his time, declares, that he never received for all his preaching in Wales, by salary, above £600 or £700. that he never had anything from the tithes. And whereas it was said, that he had enriched himself by purchasing some thousands a year of crown-lands, he protests, that he never purchased above £70 a year, which he lost at the Restoration.¹ And if Mr. Powel did not enrich himself, I apprehend none of his brethren could. Besides, if this had been true, the protector's commissioners would have discovered them; or if they had escaped the protector's inquiry, their enemies would have exposed them at the Restoration, when king Charles appointed a commission to make the strictest inquiry into their management. "All persons who had acted as commissioners for propagating the gospel, were by his majesty's instructions to be summoned before his commissioners; and all that had acted under them as farmers, tenants, &c. all that had succeeded in the sequestered livings, or received any of the profits; all parishioners, who had kept any of the tithes in their hands; the heirs, executors, or administrators, of any of the aforesaid persons; and all credible persons, who could give evidence of any of these matters. They were likewise to inquire after books and writings; and to signify to all persons concerned, that if they would forthwith apply to his majesty's commissioners, they might compound for what they stood charged with, and so avoid the expense of a lawsuit." But after all this mighty outcry and scrutiny, nothing of any consequence appeared, and therefore it was thought proper to drop the commission, and bury the whole affair in silence. Mr. Vavasor Powel, above mentioned, was cruelly handled by the Welsh clergy, but he did himself justice in a pamphlet, entitled, *Examen et Purgamen Vavasoris*, published 1653, wherein he vindicates his proceedings in the propagation.² And when he was in the Fleet after the Restoration, he published a brief narrative concerning the proceedings of the commissioners in Wales against the ejected clergy occasioned by a report that he had been thrown into that prison for some of the revenues; which was never answered.

By an ordinance of September 2, commissioners were appointed to inquire into the yearly value of all ecclesiastical livings and benefices without

¹ Mr. Powel vindicated his character in two publications: one entitled *Examen et Purgamen Vavasoris*, 1651: wherein he was cleared by the authentic certificates of persons of great credit, and many of them gentlemen of good landed property: the other called, "The Bird in the Cage chirping: or a Brief Narrative of the former propagation and late restriction of the Gospel in Wales," 12mo. 1661. The author of his life, in 1671, says, "that he received nothing from the churches in Wales but neighbourly and brotherly kindness. The parliament ordered him £100 per annum, but of a sinecure, whereof he received about £60 for seven or eight years: many considerable gifts be refused; and never did he get any thing by the act for the propagation of the gospel in Wales." *Life*, p. 112; *Calamy's Church and Dissenters Compared*, p. 47, 48, note.—ED.

² Walker, p. 149.

cure of souls; what person or persons received the profits, and who was the patron; and to certify the same into chancery; and if, upon a careful consideration of things, it shall be found convenient and advantageous to unite two parishes or more into one, and that the whole ecclesiastical revenues, tithes, and profits, belonging to the said parishes so united, should be applied for a provision for one godly and painful minister, to preach in the said united parishes, then the trustees, or commissioners appointed by this act, shall represent the same to his highness and council, upon whose approbation they shall, by an instrument under the hands and seals of any five or more of them, declare, that they do thereby unite such parishes into one; which instrument being enrolled in chancery, the said parishes from thenceforth shall be adjudged and taken to be consolidated into one. If there happen to be more patrons than one in the parishes thus united, the patrons shall present by turns; but the union shall not take place till the avoidance of one of the livings by the death of the incumbent.¹

On the other hand, where parishes were too large, the trustees for the augmentation of poor livings were empowered to divide them into two, or more, upon their avoidance by death.

Farther, if, when two or more parishes were united into one, the income or salary did not amount to £100 per annum, the trustees for receiving impropriations, tithes, first-fruits, and tenths, &c. were directed to make up the deficiency; and where there was a considerable surplus, they might take off the augmentations formerly granted: provided this ordinance be not construed to restrain the said trustees from granting augmentations to preachers in cities and market-towns, where there shall be cause, to a greater proportion, with the consent of the protector and his council. This was a noble and generous design; and if the protector had lived to have seen it executed, must have been of general service to the body of the clergy.

Though his highness himself was no great scholar, he was a patron of learning and learned men.² He settled £100 a year on a divinity-professor in Oxford; and gave twenty-four rare manuscripts to the Bodleian library. He erected and endowed a college in Durham for the benefit of the northern counties, Mr. Frankland, M. A. being one of the first fellows. But these,

¹ Scobel, p. 353.

² To the proofs which Mr. Neal produces of the patronage Cromwell afforded to learning, may be added, that he permitted the paper of Dr. Walton's Polyglott to be imported free of duty; and that when, through his pre-engagement to another, Dr. Seth Ward, afterward bishop of Exeter, lost the principalship of Jesus-college in Oxford, in 1567: on being informed of his merit and learning he promised him an annuity equal to the value of the principal ship. Dr. Harris's Life of Oliver Cromwell, p. 429—431; and Calamy's Life of Mr. Howe, p. 19.—ED.

and some other designs that he had formed for the advancement of learning, died with him.¹

In order to secure the education of youth he took care to regulate both universities, by appointing new visitors, the former ceasing with the dissolution of the long parliament, viz.^{2, 3}

For the University of Oxford†.

The vice-chancellor for the time being.

Dr. Harris, president of Trinity-college	Mr. James Baron, of Magdalen-college
Dr. Rogers, principal of New-Inn hall	Mr. Francis Howel, fellow of Exeter-college
Dr. T. Goodwin, president of Magdalen-college	William, viscount Say and Seal
Dr. John Owen, dean of Christ-church	Nathaniel Fiennes, esq.
Dr. Henry Wilkinson, Margaret-professor of divinity	Bulstrode Whitelocke, comun. of the great seal
Dr. Peter French, prebend of Christ-church	Samuel Dunch, esq.
Dr. John Conant, rector of Exeter-college	Sir John Dreyden
Dr. John Goddard, warden of Merton-college	Richard Ingoldsly,
Mr. Thankful Owen, president of St. John's	John Crew,
Mr. Stephens, principal of Hart-hall	George Fleetwood,
	John Bright,
	——— Jenkinson,
	——— Greenfield, †

For the University of Cambridge.

The vice-chancellor for the time being.

Dr. Tuckney, master of St. John's college	Mr. William Moses, fellow of Pembroke-hall
Dr. Arrowsmith, master of Trinity-college	Mr. Wood, fellow of Magdalen-college
Dr. Horton, president of Queen's-college	Henry Cromwell
Dr. Sam. Bolton, master of Christ's-college	Henry Lawrence, lord president of his highness's council
Dr. Law. Seaman, master of Peter-house	J. Lambert, } esqrs.
Dr. Lightfoot, master of Katherine-hall	J. Desborough, }
Mr. John Sadler, master of Magdalen-college	Sir Gilbert Pickering
Dr. Whichcote	Col. Ed. Montague
Dr. Cudworth	Francis Rouse, esq.
Mr. Worthington, master of Jesus-college	Oliver St. John, lord-chief-justice of the common-pleas
Mr. Dillingham, master of Emm.-col.	J. Thurloe,
Mr. Simpson, master of Pembroke-hall	Robert Castle,
Mr. Templer, fellow of Trinity-college	Tho. Bendish,
Mr. Mowbrey, fellow of St. John's college	Rob. Viner,
	Griffith Lloyd,
	Sir William Strickland.

Any seven or more of the commissioners above named were authorized to visit all colleges and halls within their respective universities; to examine what statutes were fit to be abrogated, altered, or added, and to exhibit the same to his highness and the parliament. They are farther authorized, to explain such statutes as are ambiguous and obscure; to determine appeals; and are to be assisted upon all occasions by the mayor, sheriffs, and justices of peace. The said visitors, or any four of them, are authorized to visit Westminster-school, Winchester-school, Merchant-Taylors' school, and Eton-college; and to consider of such statutes

¹ Whitelocke, p. 588.

² Scobel, p. 366.

³ Add, [after Greenfield], from Dr. Grey, sir Charles Wolaeley, bart. and Humphrey Mackworth, esq.

as are ambiguous and obscure; to determine appeals; and arc to be assisted upon all occasions by the mayor, sheriffs, and justices of peace. The said visiters, or any four of them, are authorized to visit Westminster-school, Winchester-school, Merchant-Tailors'-school, and Eton-college; and to consider of such statutes of the said schools as are fit to be abrogated, and of others that may be proper to be added, for the well-government of the said schools and colleges.

The visitors discharged their duty with great fidelity; and the heads of colleges had a watchful eye over their several houses; drunkenness, swearing, gaming, and all kinds of immorality, were severely punished; all students, graduates, and others, were obliged to be at home in proper hours; the public-houses were searched; and the practice of religion in the several colleges enforced with rigour. One of the professors writes, that there was more frequent practical preaching in the colleges than ever had been known. On the Lord's day, at different hours, there were three or four sermons in several churches; and on the week-days, lectures on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. The tutors were very diligent in discharge of their duty; the public lectures were well attended, and the students under strict discipline; learning revived, and the Muses returned to their seats, as appears by the number of learned men that flourished in the reign of king Charles II., who owed their education to these times.

The protector's zeal for the welfare of the Protestant churches abroad deserves a particular notice, and was highly valued by all the reformed in foreign countries.¹ He took all imaginable care to appear at the head of that interest on all occasions, and to show his power in protecting them. The prince of Tarente having written a respectful letter to the protector, his highness returned him the following answer: "that it was with extreme pleasure he had learned by letters his inviolable zeal and attachment to the reformed churches, for which his praise was the greater, inasmuch as he showed that zeal at a time and in a place where such flattering hopes were given to persons of his rank, if they would forsake the orthodox faith; and where those who continued steadfast arc threatened with so many troubles. He rejoices that his own conduct in religion was so pleasing to him; he calls God to witness, that he desired nothing so much as an opportunity to answer the favourable opinion the churches have of his zeal and piety, by endeavouring to propagate the true faith, and procure rest and peace for the church. He exhorts the prince to hold out firm to the end in the orthodox religion which he received from his fathers; and adds, that nothing would bring him greater glory, than to protect it as much as lay in his power." What projects the protector formed for this purpose will be seen hereafter.

¹ History of the Stuarts, p. 423.

But the royal interest abroad was inclining towards Popery; the duke of York was already perverted to the Romish faith:¹ no attempts were unesayed by the queen-mother, the queen of France, and others, to gain the young duke of Gloucester, who had been under the instruction of parliamentary tutors till the last year:² but this young prince was too well established in his religion to be perverted at present,³ upon which the queen forbade him her presence; and the marquis of Ormond conducted him to his brother at Cologne. The king was a man of no religion, and having little to do, devoted his leisure hours to the ladies, and other private pleasures. His majesty had some trial (says bishop Kennet⁴) of his conscience and courage in resisting the little arguments, or rather importunities, of Popery. The Papists put him in mind, that all his hopes from the Protestant party were at an end; that the bishops were dead, except a very few; and the church-lands sold; and that since the late defeat at Worcester the Presbyterian power was destroyed; all his hopes therefore must be from the Roman Catholics, from whose assistance only he could now hope for his restoration. But the prospect was so distant, that the king, by advice of lord Clarendon, was prevailed with not to declare himself openly at present.

On the last of November died the learned Mr. John Selden, the glory of the English nation:⁵ he was born in Sussex December 6, 1584, and educated in Hart-hall, Oxford; after which he was transplanted to the Inner-Temple, where he became a prodigy in the most uncommon parts of science. He was a great philologist, antiquary, herald, linguist, statesman, and lawyer, but seldom appeared at the bar. He was chosen burgess for several parliaments, where he displayed his profound erudition in speeches and debates in favour of the liberties of his country; for which he was imprisoned, and severely fined with Mr. Pym in the parliament of 1618 and 1628. He was chosen again in the long-parliament, and appeared against the prerogative, as he had formerly done. He was one of the lay-members of the assembly of divines, and by his vast skill in the oriental learning, and Jewish antiquities, frequently silenced the most able divines. He wrote on various sub-

¹ Compl. Hist. p. 203.

² Kennet's Chron. p. 599).

³ The manner of expression used by Mr. Neal may lead the reader, Dr. Grey observes, to think, that the duke of Gloucester was at last perverted: which he apprehends was not the case. For Echard affirms, that the duke was an invincible assertor of his father's faith: and Carte represents him as withstanding the arguments of the abbot of Pontoise, and rejecting the offers of a cardinal's hat, and even the promise of placing him on the throne. But, on the other hand, Oldmixon assures his reader, on the authority of a minister of state, a man of known wisdom and probity, who was a particular favourite with the prince of Orange, at the Hague, from whose mouth he had the information, that the duke was afterward reconciled to the church of Rome. Grey, vol. 3. p. 175. History of the Stuarts, p. 489.—Ed.

⁴ Compl. Hist. p. 213.

⁵ Athenæ Oxon. vol. 2. p. 107, 108.

jects, which gained him the title among foreigners of the dictator of learning in the English nation.¹ Among other remarkable pieces, we may reckon his *History of Tithes*, published 1618, in which he proves them not to be due to the Christian clergy by divine institution: for this he was summoned before the high-commission court, and obliged to make a public recantation.² But after some time his reputation was so great, that it was thought worth while to gain him over to the court: and upon the new civilities he received at Lambeth, he was prevailed with to publish his *Mare Clausum* against Hugo Grotius, which was esteemed such an invaluable treasure, that it was ordered to be laid up in the court of records. The archbishop offered him preferments, but he would accept of nothing. Upon the first pressures against the bishops, he published his *Euty chius* in Greek and Latin, with notes, in which he proves that bishops and presbyters differ only in degree, he afterward answered his majesty's declaration about the commission of array, and was made master of the rolls by the long-parliament. He had a large and curious library of books; in the frontispiece of each he used to write this motto, *Περί παντός ελευθερίαν*; Above all, liberty. At length being worn out with age and hard study, he died at his house in the Whitefriars, aged seventy years, and was magnificently interred in the Templechurch on the south side of the round walk, according to the Directory, in the presence of all the judges, some parliament-men, benchers, and great officers. His funeral sermon was preached by archbishop Usher, who acknowledged he was not worthy to carry his books after him. His works are lately collected, and printed together in six volumes folio.

Mr. Thomas Gataker was born in London 1574, and was educated in St. John's college, Cambridge, where he proceeded M.A., and was afterward removed to Sidney-college, where he became remarkable for his skill in the

¹ It does honour to Grotius, his antagonist, that he pronounced Mr- Selden to be "the glory of the English nation." Like a man of genius, he was for striking out new paths of learning, and enlarging the territories of science. The greater part of his works are on uncommon subjects. But towards the close of life he saw the emptiness of all human learning; and owned, that out of the numberless volumes he had read and digested, nothing stuck so close to his heart, or gave him such solid satisfaction, as a single passage of Paul's Epistles: Tit. ii. 11–14. Granger's *History of England*, vol. 2. p. 228, 229, 8vo.—ED.

² It is judiciously remarked by Le Clerc, that it was great impolicy in the church and court party to offend and irritate such a man as Selden: a man of deep learning, not in Jewish antiquities only, but in those of his own country, the laws of which he understood to their first grounds. Such persons ought at all times to be courted and favoured, on account of the great use which may be made of them on all occasions; but especially in seasons of public discontents, when they can turn the balance on the side which they join. Whereas it generally happens, that they are ill-treated, and the court-favours are bestowed on those only who are fit for nothing but to feed on a great benefice or a good pension. It would have been more wise to have secured Selden, since he was by no means a fanatic, as many places in his *Table-talk* show; and even was partial to the old ecclesiastical government, in opposition to those who often set it at nought. *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne*, tom. 6. p. 253.—ED.

Hebrew and Greek languages.¹ After his ordination he was chosen minister of Lincoln's-Inn, and occupied that station ten years; but in the year 1611 he was presented to the rectory of Rotherhithe, where he continued till his death. In the year 1643 he was chosen a member of the assembly of divines, and was an ornament and reputation to it. When the earl of Manchester visited and reformed the university of Cambridge, he offered Mr. Gataker the mastership of Trinity-college, but he refused it on account of his health. Mr. Gataker was a very learned man, and a considerable critic and linguist, as appears by his writings, which were very numerous, considering his infirm state of health. He was a constant preacher, of a most holy and exemplary deportment, but withal of great modesty. It is hard, says Mr. Echard, to say, which was most remarkable, his exemplary piety and charity, his polite literature, or his humility and modesty in refusing preferments. He maintained a correspondence with Salmasius, Hornbeck, and other learned foreigners, and was in high esteem both at home and in the Low Countries, where he had travelled. He died of age, and a complication of infirmities, July 27, 1654, in the eightieth year of his age.²

Mr. William Strong was educated in Katherine-hall, Cambridge, of which he was a fellow. He was afterward rector of More-Crichel in Dorsetshire, where he continued till he was forced to fly from the cavaliers;³ he then came to London, and was chosen one of the assembly of divines, and minister of St. Dunstan's in the West. After some time he became preacher at Westminster abbey, where he died suddenly in the vigour of life, and was buried in the Abbey-church July 4, 1654. His funeral sermon was preached by Mr. Ob. Sedgwick, who says, that he was so plain in heart, so deep in judgment, so painful in study, so exact in preaching, and, in a word, so fit for all the parts of the ministerial service, that he did not know his equal. But after the Restoration his bones were dug up, and removed to St. Margaret's churchyard, with those of other eminent Presbyterian divines. He published several sermons and theological treatises in his lifetime; and after his death there was a posthumous one upon the covenants, in the preface to which Mr. Theophilus Gale observes, that the author was a wonder of nature for natural parts, and a miracle of grace for his deep insight into the more profound mysteries of the gospel. His thoughts were sublime, but clear and penetrating, especially in interpreting difficult texts.

¹ Clarke's General Martyrology, p. 248, &c. of the Lives.

² The most celebrated of his works is a valuable edition of Marcus Antoninus, with a Latin translation and commentary, and a preliminary discourse on the philosophy of the Stoics, which is much esteemed. His house was a private seminary for divers young gentlemen of this nation, and many foreigners resorted to him, and lodged at his house in order to receive from him advice in their studies. British Biography, vol. 4. p. 354, note.—ED.

³ Athenæ Oxon. p. 218.

Mr. Andrew Pern was educated in Cambridge, and from thence removed to Welby in Northamptonshire, where he maintained the character of a zealous, laborious, and successful preacher, for twenty-seven years. In the year 1643, he was chosen a member of the assembly of divines at Westminster. When he was at London he was offered several considerable preferments, but refused them, resolving to return to his people at Welby, who honoured him as a father; for by his awakening sermons, and exemplary life and conversation, he accomplished a great reformation of manners in that town. He was full of spiritual warmth, says the preacher of his funeral sermon, filled with a holy indignation against sin, active in his work, and never more in his element than in the pulpit. As his life was holy, so his death was comfortable. He blessed God that he was not afraid to die; nay, he earnestly desired to be gone, often crying out, in his last sickness, "When will that hour come? One assault more, and this earthen vessel will be broken, and I shall be with God." He died the beginning of December, 1654, before he was arrived to the age of sixty.

Dr. Samuel Bolton was educated in Cambridge, and from thence removed to the living of St. Martin's, Ludgate. Upon his coming to the city he was chosen one of the additional members of the assembly of divines, being a person of great name and character for learning and practical preaching. He was a burning and shining light, says Mr. Clarke,¹ an interpreter one of a thousand, an admirable preacher, and his life was an excellent commentary upon his sermons. Upon the death of Dr. Bainbrigg he was chosen master of Christ's college, Cambridge, which he governed with great wisdom and prudence till his death, which happened about the 10th of October, 1654. He was buried with great solemnity in his parish-church of Ludgate on the 16th of the same month, very much lamented by the London clergy of those times.

Mr. Jer. Whitaker was born at Wakefield in Yorkshire, 1599, and educated in Sidney-college, Cambridge, where he proceeded in arts. He taught the free-school at Okeham in Rutlandshire seven years, and then became minister of Stretton in the same county, where he continued thirteen years. In 1643, he was nominated one of the assembly of divines at Westminster, which brought him to London, where he was chosen to the rectory of St. Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey, in Southwark. He preached three or four sermons every week; two in Southwark, one at Westminster, and one at Christ-church, London. He never withdrew from any opportunity of preaching if he was in health; and though he preached often, his sermons were solid and judicious. He was a universal scholar, both in arts and languages; well acquainted with the fathers and school-men, an acute disputant, and

¹ Lives of Eminent Persons, p. 43.

inferior to none in his acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures.¹ He was of the Presbyterian persuasion, and had a chief hand in composing the Defence of the Gospel Ministry, published this year by the provincial synod of London. He refused the engagement, and lamented the wars between England, Scotland, and Holland. No man was more beloved by the Presbyterian ministers of London than Mr. Whitaker. When he was seized with the violent and acute pain of the stone about the beginning of November, many days of prayer and fasting were observed for his recovery, but the distemper was incurable. He bore his pains with uncommon patience, fearing nothing more than to dishonour God by unreasonable complaints. When his distemper was most violent he would desire his friends to withdraw, that they might not be affected with his roarings. At length nature being quite spent, he cheerfully resigned his soul into the hands of his Redeemer, about the fifty-fifth year of his age. His funeral sermon was preached by Mr. Calamy, who gave him a large and deserved encomium.

Mr. Richard Vines, of whom mention has been made already, was born at Blazon in Leicestershire, and educated in Magdalen-college, Cambridge, where he commenced M.A. He was first schoolmaster at Hinckley, then minister of Weddington in Warwickshire. At the beginning of the civil war he was driven from his parish, and forced to take shelter in Coventry. When the assembly of divines was convened he was chosen one of their number; and, as Fuller says,² was the champion of their party. While he was at London he became minister of St. Clement's Danes; afterward he removed to Watton in Hertfordshire, and was chosen master of Pembroke-hall in Cambridge, but resigned that, and his living of St. Lawrence-Jewry, on account of the engagement. He was a son of thunder, and therefore compared to Luther; but moderate and charitable to those who differed from him in judgment. The parliament employed him in all their treaties with the king; and his majesty, though of a different judgment, valued him for his ingenuity, seldom speaking to him without touching his hat, which Mr. Vines returned with most respectful language and gestures. He was an admirable scholar; holy and pious in his conversation, and indefatigable in his labours, which wasted his strength, and brought him into a consumption, when he had lived but about fifty-six years. He was buried in his own parish-church, February 7, 1655, his funeral sermon being preached by Dr. Jacomb, who gave him his just commendation. He was a perfect master of the Greek tongue, a good philologist, and an admirable disputant. He was a thorough Calvinist, and a bold honest man without pride or flattery.³ Mr. Newcomen

¹ Clarke's General Martyrology, in the Lives, p. 264.

² Fuller's "Worthies, p. 134.

³ Dr. Grey insinuates a reflection on Mr. Vines's simplicity and integrity, by a story of his praying in the morning of an Easter Sunday, before the marquis of Hertford, for the

calls him “disputator acutissimus, concionator felicissimus, theologus eximius.” Many funeral poems and elegies were published on his death.¹

The protector having dissolved his second parliament without confirming their acts, was obliged still to rely on the military arm; this, together with the insurrections in several parts of the country, induced him, for his greater security, to canton the nation into eleven districts, and place over them major-generals, whose commission it was to inspect the behaviour of the inferior commissioners within their districts; to commit to prison all suspected persons; to take care of collecting the public taxes; and to sequester such as did not pay their decimation. They were to inquire after all private assemblies of suspected persons, and after such as bought up arms; after vagabonds and idle persons; after such as lived at a higher rate than they could afford; after such as frequented taverns and gaming-houses, and after scandalous and unlearned ministers and schoolmasters; and there was no appeal from them but to the protector and his council. They were ordered to list a body of reserves both horse and foot at half pay, who were to be called together upon any sudden emergency, and to attend so many days at their own expense, but if they were detained longer to have full pay; by which means the protector had a second army in view, if any disaster should befall the first; but these officers became so severe and arbitrary, that his highness found it necessary after some time to reduce their power, and when affairs were a little more settled to dissolve them.

Having provided for the security of his government at home, the protector concluded an alliance with France, October 23, in which it is remarkable that Lewis XIV. is not allowed to style himself King of France, but king of the French, his highness claiming the protectorship of that kingdom among his other titles; and, which is more surprising, the name of Oliver stands in the treaty before that of the French king. At the same time he sent admiral Blake with a fleet into the Mediterranean, who spread the terror of the English name all over Italy, even to Rome itself; processions being made, and the host exposed for forty hours, to avert the judgments of Heaven, and preserve the patrimony of the church. But Blake’s commission was only to demand £60,000 of the duke of Tuscany, for damages sustained by

king’s restoration to his throne and legal rights; but, in the afternoon, when the marquis was absent, and lord Fairfax came to church, praying, in *stylo parliamentary*, that God would turn the heart of the king, and give him grace to repent of his grievous sins, especially all the blood shed in those civil, uncivil wars. On which it was observed, that Mr. Vines was much more altered between the forenoon and afternoon, than the difference between an English marquis and an Irish baron. The reader, perhaps, will think, that each prayer might very consistently be formed by the same person. Not a week before Mr. Vines’s death, as he was preaching at St. Gregory’s, a rude fellow cried out to him, “Lift up your voice, for I cannot hear you;” to whom Mr. Vines returned, “Lift up your ears, for I can speak no louder.” Fuller’s Worthies, p. 116, 8vo. edition, 1681—ED.

¹ Clarke’s Lives of Eminent Persons, p. 18.

the English merchants while he harboured prince Rupert, which he paid immediately. The admiral released all the English slaves on the coast of Barbary to the number of four hundred, and obtained satisfaction for the ships taken by the pirates of Algiers, Tunis, &c. Upon the whole he brought home sixteen ships laden with booty, which sailed up the river Thames to the port of London, as a grateful spectacle of triumph to the people.

While Blake was in the Mediterranean, admiral Pen and Venables, with thirty men-of-war and some land-forces, sailed to the West-Indies, with a design to surprise the town of Hispaniola; but miscarrying in the attempt, they re-embarked and took possession of the island of Jamaica, which is in possession of the crown of Great Britain to this day.

The protector did not commission Blake to assault the Spanish coasts in the Mediterranean, because there was no open rupture between the two nations in Europe; but the West-Indies not being included in the treaty, he thought himself at liberty in those parts: which occasioned a declaration of war, on the part of Spain, with all the English dominions; upon which Blake was ordered to cruise upon the Spanish coasts, and to wait for the return of the Plate-fleet, of which he gave a very good account the next summer.

To support these additional expenses, the protector, by advice of his council, raised some extraordinary taxes before the parliament met, which he knew to be illegal, and did not pretend to justify, upon any other foot than “the absolute necessity of the public safety; the distracted condition of the nation; that it was impracticable in the present juncture to call a parliament, or to proceed in the ordinary course of law; and that in extraordinary cases, wherein all was at stake, some extraordinary methods were allowable.” How far this reasoning will excuse the protector, or vindicate his conduct, must be left with the reader. But it is agreed on all hands, that in things that did not affect the very being of his government, he never interposed, but let the laws have their free course. He had a zeal for trade and commerce beyond all his predecessors, and appointed a standing committee of merchants for advancing it, which met for the first time in the painted chamber November 27, 1655, and continued to his death.

The provincial assembly of London, finding their attempts to establish their discipline ineffectual, employed themselves this year in promoting the religious education of youth; for which purpose they published an exhortation to catechising; with the following directions for the more orderly carrying it on.

1. “That the ministers on some Lord’s day prove in their sermons the necessity and usefulness of such a work, and exhort all parents, and masters of families, to prepare their children and servants for it, by catechising them at home, that they may more readily make their answers in public.

2. "That the catechism to be used be the lesser catechism of the assembly of divines. This catechism excelling all others in this respect, that every answer is a perfect proposition without the question.

3. "That the persons to be catechised be children and servants, that have not been admitted to the Lord's Supper by the eldership.

4. "That the time of catechising be on the Lord's day in the afternoon, before the sermon, to the end that the whole congregation may receive benefit thereby.

5. "That the catechism may be explained briefly, at the first going over, that the people may in a short time have a notion of the whole body of divinity.

6. "That the parish be desired at the common charge, to provide catechisms for the poorer sort, who cannot well provide for themselves, and that the distribution of them be referred to the respective ministers.

7. "It is desired, that an account in writing, what progress is made in the premises, maybe returned from the classes to the provincial assembly within forty days after the receipt hereof..

"Signed in the name and by the appointment of the assembly,

"Edmund Calamy, moderator.

"William Harrison, scribe

"William Blackmore, scribe

These instructions were sent to the several classes of London; and after their example, the associated ministers in the several counties of England published the like exhortations to their brethren.

The occasion of this proceeding was the publishing two catechisms of Mr. John Biddle, a Socinian, one called a Scripture Catechism; and the other, a Brief Scripture Catechism, for the Use of Children. Complaints of which being made to the last parliament, they were ordered to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, and the author to be imprisoned in the Gatehouse. Mr. Biddle had been in custody for his opinions before the late king's death. While he was there, he had published twelve questions or arguments against the Deity of the Holy Spirit, in quarto, 1647, which were answered by Mr. Pool, and the book ordered to be burnt. Next year, being still in prison, he published seven articles against the Deity of Christ, with the testimonies of several of the fathers on this head; upon which some zealous in the assembly moved, that he might be put to death as a heretic; but he went on, and being set at liberty, in the year 1651, he composed and published the catechisms above mentioned, in which he maintains, "(1.) That God is confined to a certain place. (2.) That he has a bodily shape. (3.) That he has passions. (4.) That he is neither omnipotent nor unchangeable. (5.) That we are not to believe three persons in the Godhead. (6.) That Jesus Christ has not the nature of God, but only a divine lordship. (7.) That he

was not a priest while upon earth, nor did reconcile men to God. And, (8.) That there is no Deity in the Holy Ghost.” These propositions¹ were condemned by the parliament, and the author committed to the Gatehouse. But as soon as the protector had dissolved his parliament he gave him his liberty.

After this, being of a restless spirit,² he challenged Mr. Griffin, a Baptist preacher³ to dispute with him in St. Paul’s cathedral, on this question, “Whether Jesus Christ be the Most High, or Almighty God? “This occasioning new disturbances, the council committed him to Newgate; but the protector thought it best to send him out of the way, and accordingly transported him to Scilly, and allowed him one hundred crowns a year for his maintenance. Here he remained till the year 1658, when the noise being over he was set at liberty; his catechisms having been answered by Dr. Owen, in a learned and elaborate treatise, entitled, *Vindiciæ Evangelicæ*, &c.

After the protector’s death, Biddle set up a private conventicle in London, which continued till the Restoration, when the church being restored to its coercive power, he was apprehended while preaching, and committed to prison, where he died in September 1662, and was buried in the burying-ground in Old Bedlam. He had such a prodigious memory (says Wood), that he could repeat all St. Paul’s Epistles in Greek, and was reckoned by those of his persuasion a sober man, and so devout, that he seldom prayed without lying prostrate on the ground.

Though it was well known by this, as well as other examples, that the protector was averse to all acts of severity on the account of religion, yet

¹ Mr. Biddle was a pious, holy, and humble man; a conscientious sufferer for what appeared to him divine and important truth. The propositions objected to him above do not appear in his catechisms under the form of principles, which he asserts, but of questions, which he proposes, and the answers to which are numerous texts of Scripture, that appear to speak to the point. E. g., The first proposition is this question: “Is not God, according to the current of the Scripture, in a certain place, namely, in heaven?” The answer consists of twenty-nine passages of Scripture, which represent God, as “looking from heaven, as our Father who art in heaven,” and the like. For a full account of these catechisms I would refer the reader to my Review of the Life, Character, and Writings, of Mr. John Biddle, section 8—ED.

² It is to be regretted, that Mr. Neal should speak in this manner of one, who thought it his duty, by the fair and peaceable means of preaching and writing, to advance and disseminate sentiments which he judged to be the truths of Scripture, and only called men to inquire and examine. Such language fixes a stigma upon the honest advocate for truth, and is the illiberal cry of those who cannot bear to have established opinions attacked. The first teachers of Christianity were reproached as men of restless spirits; as men who “would turn the world upside down,” Acts xvii. 6.—In the present case, the term was not deserved, Mr. Neal has misstated the transaction. Mr. Biddle was not the first in the business. The challenge came from Mr. Griffin, and Mr. Biddle waived accepting it, and declined the disputation for some time. And when he entered the lists, there were in the auditory many of his bitter and fiery adversaries. See Review of his Life, p. 117, 118; or a modern Collection of Unitarian Tracts, in 12mo. vol. 4. p. 91.—ED.

such was the turbulent behaviour of the royalists, who threatened an assassination, published the most daring libels against the government, and were actually in arms, that he thought it necessary to crush them, and therefore an order was published November 24, "That no persons after January 1, 1655–6, shall keep in their houses or families, as chaplains or schoolmasters for the education of their children, any sequestered or ejected minister, fellow of a college, or schoolmaster, nor permit their children to be taught by such. That no such persons shall keep school either publicly or privately, nor preach in any public place, or private meeting, of any others than those of his own family; nor shall administer baptism, or the Lord's Supper, or marry any persons, or use the Book of Common Prayer, or the forms of prayer therein contained, on pain of being prosecuted, according to the orders lately published by his highness and council, for securing the peace of the commonwealth. Nevertheless his highness declares, that towards such of the said persons as have, since their ejection or sequestration, given, or hereafter shall give, a real testimony of their godliness, and good affection to the present government, so much tenderness shall be used as may consist with the safety and good of the nation,"¹

This was a severe and terrible order² upon the Episcopalians, and absolutely unjustifiable in itself; but the title of the act, which is "An Ordinance for securing the Peace of the Commonwealth," as well as the last clause, shows it was made for the safety of the government, against a number of men who were undermining it, and was published chiefly *in terrorem*, for no person was prosecuted upon it; and the parliament which met next year, not confirming it, it became absolutely void.

Dr. Gauden presented a petitionary remonstrance to the protector against this order; and archbishop Usher was desired to use his interest with his highness in behalf of the Episcopal clergy; upon which, says the writer of the archbishop's life,³ the protector promised either to recall his declaration, or prevent its being put in execution, provided the clergy were inoffensive in their language and sermons, and stood clear in meddling with matters of state. His highness accordingly laid the matter before his council, who were of opinion,⁴ that it was not safe for him to recall his declaration,

¹ Hughes's Exact Abridgment of Public Acts and Ordinances, 4to. p. 597.

² "It would be useless (says Dr. Harris) to spend words in exposing the cruelty of this declaration. Persecution is written on the face of it, nor is it capable of a vindication." Life of Oliver Cromwell, p. 438—ED.

³ Parr's Life of Usher, p. 75.

⁴ On this ground, when the lord-primate went to him a second time to get the promise which the protector on the first application had made of taking off these restraints ratified and put into writing, he retracted his engagement, which both grieved and irritated the archbishop. He had, indeed, good reason to be displeased. By this it appears, that Mr. Neal's statement above is not accurate. The ordinance was executed: and though some worthy Episcopalians were permitted to officiate, it cannot be doubted but many innocent

and give open liberty to men who were declared enemies to his government, but that he should suspend the execution of it as far as their behaviour should deserve; so that in the event here was no great cause of complaint; for notwithstanding this ordinance, the sober Episcopal clergy preached publicly in the churches, at London and in the country, as Dr. Hall, afterward bishop of Chester, Dr. Ball, Dr. Wild, Dr. Hardy, Dr. Griffith, Dr. Pearson bishop of Chester, and others. Remarkable are the words of bishop Kennet to this purpose; "It is certain (says his lordship) that the protector was for liberty, and the utmost latitude to all parties, so far as consisted with the peace and safety of his person and government, and therefore he was never jealous of any cause or sect on the account of heresy and falsehood, but on his wiser accounts of political peace and quiet; and even the prejudice he had against the episcopal party was more for their being royalists, than for being of the good old church. Dr. Gunning, afterward bishop of Ely, kept a conventicle in London, in as open a manner as dissenters did after the toleration; and so did several other episcopal divines."¹

For the same reasons his highness girt the laws close upon the Papists, not upon account of their religion, but because they were enemies to his government; for in the month of May a proclamation was published for the better executing the laws against Jesuits and priests, and for the conviction of Popish recusants; the reasons of which the protector gives in his declaration of October 31, published with the advice of his council, in these words; "Because it was not only commonly observed, but there remains with us somewhat of proof, that Jesuits have been found among discontented parties of this nation, who are observed to quarrel and fall out with every form of administration in church and state."² The protector gave notice of the like kind to the republicans, fifth monarchy men, levellers, and to the Presbyterians, that they should stand upon the same foot with royalists, in case of any future delinquencies.

Such was the protector's latitude, that he was for indulging the Jews, who petitioned for liberty of their religion, and for carrying on a trade in London. Manasseh Ben Israel, one of their chief rabbis, with some others,

and worthy men must have received very hard measure. The ordinance was marked with horrid severity: and it is "a barbarous thing to prohibit men the use of those forms of address to the Deity, which they imagine are most honourable and acceptable to him." Besides, men ought not to suffer in their most valuable and inalienable rights on suspicion; and instead of being amenable for overt acts, be punished, as it were, for crimes they have never committed. This is injustice and cruelty: has its origin in fear and the consciousness of oppressive government: and tends to make the government, which it would protect from danger, odious and hateful. Grey's Remarks, vol. 3. p. 177, 178. Harris's Life of Oliver Cromwell, p. 438, 139.—ED.

¹ Conf. Plea, part 4. p. 510, Compl. Hist. p. 223.

² Compl. Hist. p. 255. in marg.

came from Amsterdam to Whitehall for this purpose, whom the protector treated with respect, and summoned an assembly of divines, lawyers, and merchants, to consult upon the affair.¹ The divines were to consider it as a case of conscience; the lawyers to report how far it was consistent with the laws of England; and the merchants, whether it was

for the advantage of trade and commerce. Bishop Burnet apprehends, that the protector designed the Jews for spies in the several nations of Europe; however, he was of opinion, that their admission under certain limitation might be for the advantage of commerce; and told the divines, that since there was a promise in Holy Scripture of the conversion of the Jews, he did not know but the preaching of the Christian religion, as it was then in England, without idolatry or superstition, might conduce to it. But the assembly not agreeing in their opinions, the affair was dropped, and the petitioners returned to Holland, where Manasseh Ben Israel wrote a handsome letter, now before me, which he calls, "An Answer to certain Questions propounded by a noble and learned Gentleman, touching the Reproaches cast upon the Nation of the Jews, wherein all Objections are candidly and fully stated." The famous Mr. Prynne, and Mr. Dury, a Presbyterian minister, wrote fiercely against the admission of the Jews; but other divines, whom the protector consulted, were for admitting them with some limitations. I shall report their resolution on this point in their own language.

Question, Whether the Jews; at their desire, may be admitted into this nation to traffic and dwell among us, as Providence shall give occasion?

The answer of those who were against it was, that they could not think it lawful for the following reasons:

1. "Because the motives on which Manasseh Ben Israel, in his book lately printed, desires their admission into this commonwealth, are such as we conceive to be very sinful.

2. "The danger of seducing the people of this nation, by their admission, is very great.

3. "Their having synagogues, or any public meetings for the exercise of their religion, is not only evil in itself, but likewise very scandalous to other Christian churches.

4. "Their customs and practices concerning marriage and divorce are unlawful, and will be of very evil example among us.

¹ It is a proof of the protector's good dispositions towards this business, and of his respect for the rabbi who came to negotiate it, that, by an order of the 24th of March 1655, he directed £200 to be paid to him out of the treasury. Whitlocke's Memorials, p. 673.—ED.

5. “The principles of not making conscience of oaths made, and injuries done to Christians in life, chastity, goods, or good name, have been very notoriously charged upon them by valuable testimony.

6. “Great prejudice is like to arise to the natives of this commonwealth in matters of trade, which, besides other dangers here mentioned, we find very commonly suggested by the inhabitants of the city of London.”

Other divines were of opinion, that the civil magistrate might tolerate them under the following limitations:

1. “That they be not admitted to have any public judicatories civil or ecclesiastical.

2. “That they be not permitted to speak or do anything to the defamation or dishonour of the names of our Lord Jesus Christ, or of the Christian religion.

3. “That they be not permitted to do any work, or anything, to the open profanation of the Lord’s day, or Christian sabbath.

4. “That they be not permitted to have any Christians dwell with them as their servants.

5. “That they have no public office or trust in this commonwealth.

6. “That they be not allowed to print anything in our language against the Christian religion.

7. “That so far as may be, they be not suffered to discourage any of their own from using any proper means, or applying themselves to any who may convince them of their error, and turn them to Christianity. And that some severe penalty be imposed upon them who shall apostatize from Christianity to Judaism.”

Mr. Archdeacon Echard says,¹ “The Jews offered the protector £200,000. provided they might have St. Paul’s cathedral for a settlement.” And he adds the following malicious reflection, that “the money made his highness look upon it as the cause of God, but that both the clergy and laity so declaimed against them, that the religious juggle would not take place.” This the archdeacon himself could not believe, as being quite out of character, for he knew that the protector did not enrich his family, nor value money, but for the public service. He concludes, that “the Jews could never be permitted to live long in a well-settled monarchy.” What then does he call the monarchy of England, where the Jews have been indulged the free exercise of their religion, without doing any damage to the religion or commerce of the nation, for above sixty years?

The protector’s zeal for the reformed religion made him the refuge of persecuted Protestants in all parts of the world. The duke of Savoy, at the instance of his duchess, sister to the queen of England, determined to oblige

¹ P. 716.

his reformed subjects in the valleys of Piedmont to embrace the Roman Catholic religion, or depart the country. For this purpose he quartered an army upon them, which ate up their substance. The Protestants making some little resistance to the rudeness of the soldiers, the duke gave orders, that all the Protestant families in the valley of Lucerne should go into banishment, which some obeyed, whilst the rest sent deputies to the court of Turin, to implore mercy; but the pope and the princes of Italy advised the duke to improve the present opportunity for extirpating the reformed, and making all his subjects of one religion. The duke accordingly sent express orders to his general to drive them all out of the country, with their wives and children, and to put to death such as should remain. This was executed with great severity, April 20, 1655. Those who escaped the sword fled into the mountains, from whence, being ready to perish with hunger and cold, they sent their agents to the lord-protector of England, and other Protestant powers, for relief. It was the beginning of May when his highness was first made acquainted with their distress, whereupon he appointed a general fast, and charitable contributions throughout all England for their present assistance; and such was the compassion of the people, that the collection amounted to £37,097 7s. 3d. About £30,000 was remitted to their deputies at several payments, in this and the next year; but the confusions which followed upon the protector's death prevented the clearing the whole account till the convention-parliament at the Restoration, who ordered the remaining £7000 to be paid. The protector applied to the Protestant kings of Sweden and Denmark; to the states of Holland, the cantons of Switzerland, and the reformed churches of Germany and France; and by his powerful instances procured large contributions from those parts. He wrote to the king of France, and to cardinal Mazarine; and being glad of an opportunity to strike terror into the Roman Catholic powers, he sent Samuel Moreland, esq. with a letter to the duke of Savoy, in which, having represented the cruelty and injustice of his behaviour towards the Protestants in the valleys, he tells him, "that he was pierced with grief at the news of the sufferings of the Vaudois, being united to them not only by the common ties of humanity, but by the profession of the same faith, which obliged him to regard them as his brethren; and he should think himself wanting in his duty to God, to charity, and to his religion, if he should be satisfied with pitying them only (whose miserable condition was enough to raise compassion in the most barbarous minds;) unless he also exerted himself to the utmost of his ability to deliver them out of it." This awakened the Popish powers, insomuch that Mazarine wrote in the most pressing language to the court of Turin, to give the protector immediate satisfaction; with which the duchess

reproached him, because he had made no terms for the English Papists;¹ but his eminence replied, “We must leave to God the care of defending the Catholics, whose cause is most just; but that of the heretics needs for its support the clemency of princes.” Upon this the persecution immediately ceased: the duke recalled his army out of the valleys, and restored their goods; the poor people returned to their houses, and recovered all their ancient rights and privileges. But to strike some farther terror into the pope, and the little princes of Italy, the protector gave out, that forasmuch as he was satisfied they had been the promoters of this persecution, he would keep it in mind, and lay hold of the first opportunity to send his fleet into the Mediterranean to visit Civita Vecchia, and other parts of the ecclesiastical territories; and that the sound of his cannon should be heard in Rome itself. He declared publicly that he would not suffer the Protestant faith to be insulted in any part of the world; and therefore procured liberty to the reformed in Bohemia and France; nor was there any potentate in Europe so hardy as to risk his displeasure by denying his requests.²

The charitable society for the relief of the widows and children of clergymen, since known by the name of the Corporation for the Sons of the Clergy, had its beginning this year; the first sermon being preached by the reverend Mr. George Hall, son of the famous Joseph Hall bishop of Exeter, then minister of Aldersgate, afterward archdeacon of Canterbury, and bishop of Chester. The sermon was entitled “God’s appearing for the Tribe of Levi, improved in a sermon preached at St. Paul’s November 8, 1655, to the Sons of Ministers then solemnly assembled,” from Numb, xvii. 8, “The rod of Aaron budded, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds.” The preacher’s design was to enforce the necessity and usefulness of a settled ministry; and though there were some passages that discovered him to be a prelatist, the main part of the sermon breathes moderation; “Let those ill-invented terms (says he) whereby we have been distinguished from each other, be swallowed up in that name which will lead us hand in hand to heaven, the name of Christians. If my stomach, or any of yours, rise against the name of brotherly communion, which may consist with our several principles retained, not differing in substantial, God take down that stomach, and make us see how much we are concerned to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.—Why should some, in the height of their zeal for a liturgy, suppose there can be no service of God but where that is used? Why should others, again, think their piety concerned and trespassed upon,

¹ Burnet, vol. 1. p. 108. Edin. edit.

² Mr. Neal’s statement of Cromwell’s interference in behalf of the Waldenses is, in general, correct; but when he says, “the poor people returned to their houses *and recovered all their ancient rights and privileges*”—his representation is not borne out by facts. If the reader wishes a more detailed and correct account of this tragical affair, he should consult *Jones’s History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2. c. 6. sect. 6. p. 358–398.—W. J.

if I prefer and think fit to use a set form? There must be abatements and allowances of each other; a coming down from our punctilios, or we shall never give up a good account to God.” From this time sermons have been preached annually, and large contributions made for the service of this charity. In the reign of king Charles II. they became a body corporate; and their present grandeur is sufficiently known to the whole nation.

On the 21st of March this year, died the most reverend and learned archbishop Usher, born in Dublin 1580, and educated in Trinity-college.¹ He proceeded M. A. in the year 1600, and next year was ordained deacon and priest by his uncle Henry Usher, then archbishop of Armagh. In the year 1620 he was made bishop of Meath, and four years after archbishop of Armagh; in which station he remained till the dissolution of the hierarchy during the civil wars. In his younger years he was a Calvinist, but in his advanced age he embraced the middle way between Calvin and Arminius. He was one of the most moderate prelates of his time, and allowed of the ordinations of foreign Protestants; which none but he and bishop Davenant, and one or two more among the bishops of those times, would admit. The archbishop having lost all his revenues by the Irish rebellion, the king conferred upon him the bishopric of Carlisle *in commendam*. In 1643 he was nominated one of the assembly of divines at Westminster, but did not appear among them. As long as the king was at Oxford he continued with him, but when the war was ended, he returned to London and lived privately, without any molestation. He assisted at the treaty of the Isle of Wight, but could do no service, the contending parties being then at too great a distance to be reconciled. A little before the king’s death, the archbishop was chosen preacher to the honourable society of Lincoln’s-inn, preaching constantly all term-time, till his eyes failing, he quitted that post, about a year and a half before his death, and retired with the countess of Peterborough to her house at Ryegate. The protector had a high esteem for this excellent prelate, and consulted him about proper measures for advancing the Protestant interest at home and abroad: he allowed him a pension, and promised him a lease of part of the lands of his archbishopric in Ireland for twenty-one years; but his death prevented the accomplishment of his design. About the middle of February the archbishop went down to Ryegate, and on the 20th of March was seized with a pleurisy, of which he died the

¹ It is a curious and singular circumstance, that archbishop Usher received his first elements of learning from two aunts, who were both born blind, yet found out a method of teaching him to read English. These ladies had vast memories, and could repeat most part of the Scriptures by heart distinctly and without mistake. When it was debated, whether Dr. Usher should be nominated one of the assembly at Westminster, Mr. Selden is reported to have said, “that they had as good inquire, whether they had best admit Inigo Jones, the king’s architect, to the company of mousetrap-makers.” *British Biography*, vol. 4. p. 336. 350.—ED.

next day, in the seventy-sixth year of his age, having been fifty-five years a preacher, four years bishop of Meath, and thirty-one years archbishop of Armagh. The archbishop was one of the most learned men of his age; he had a penetrating judgment, a tenacious memory; above all, he was a most pious, humble, exemplary Christian.¹ His body was of the smaller size, his complexion sanguine, but his presence always commanded reverence. The protector did him the honour of a public funeral, and buried him at his own expense,² in king Henry VII.'s chapel.³

Stephen Marshall, B. D., was born at Godmanchester in Huntingdonshire, and was educated in Cambridge, and afterwards beneficed at Finchington in Essex, where he acquired such reputation by his preaching, that he was often called to preach before "the long-parliament, who consulted him in all affairs relating to religion. He was one of the assembly of divines, and employed in most, if not all, the treaties between the king and parliament, Mr. Echard, according to his usual candour, calls him "a famous incendiary, and assistant to the parliamentarians, their trumpet in their fasts, their confessor in their sickness, their counsellor in their assemblies, their chaplain in their treaties, and their champion in their disputations;"⁴ and then adds, "This great Shimei, being taken with a desperate

¹ "With his great and vast learning (it is said), no man had a better soul, and a more apostolical mind. Passion, pride, self-will, or the love of the world, seemed not to be so much as in his nature. He had all the innocence of the dove in him. But no man is entirely perfect. He was not made for the governing part of his function. His soul was too gentle to manage the rough work of reforming abuses; therefore he left things as he found them. He saw the necessity of cutting off many abuses, and hoped for a time of reformation, yet he did not exert himself to correct or remove those corruptions which he apprehended would bring a curse and ruin upon the church. It seems that this sat heavy upon his mind in his last illness; for he prayed often and with great humility, that God would forgive his sins of omission, and his failings in his duty." *Life of Bishop Bedel*, p. 86, 87. —ED.

Cromwell prevented the sale of archbishop Usher's valuable library of prints and manuscripts to foreigners; and caused it to be purchased and sent over to Dublin, with an intention to bestow it on a new college, or hall, which he proposed to build and endow there. The lease, which, as Mr. Neal says, Cromwell promised to the archbishop, was never executed: and it admits a doubt, whether the pension was ever enjoyed. Dr. Grey, on the authority of Dr. Parr, the primate's biographer.—ED.

² Here Mr. Neal was, it seems, in a mistake. The protector, though he directed that this prelate should be buried with great pomp at Westminster-abbey, bore but half the expense of the funeral; the other half fell very heavily upon his relations. His *Annals of the Old and New Testament* is esteemed the most valuable of his numerous works; and the first draught of this work was drawn up by him, when he was only fifteen years of age. The western world owes its first acquaintance with the Samaritan Bible to this prelate. Four copies were procured for him by a factor, and sent to him, from Syria, in 1625. He gave one copy to the library at Oxford: a second he lodged in sir Robert Cotton's library: he sent a third to Leyden, and reserved the fourth to himself. The Old Testament in Syriac was obtained for him not long after. *Clarke's Martyrology*, in the *Lives*, p. 280, and 292. *Granger's History of England*, vol. 3. p. 27, 8vo.

³ *Clarke's General Martyrology*, p. 277, &c. of the *Lives*.

⁴ The words of Mr. Echard are almost verbatim borrowed from Fuller. Dr. Grey, to confute the character given of Mr. Marshall, as an admired preacher, quotes some passages

sickness, departed the world mad and raving.” An unjust aspersion! for he was a person of sober and moderate principles, inasmuch that Mr. Baxter used to say, that if all the bishops had been of the spirit and temper of archbishop Usher, the Presbyterians of the temper of Mr. Marshall, and the Independents like Mr. Jer. Burroughs, the divisions of the church would have been easily compromised. When he was taken ill, and obliged to retire into the country for the air, the Oxford Mercury said he was distracted, and in his rage constantly cried out, that he was damned for adhering to the parliament in their war against their king. But he lived to confute the calumny, and published a treatise to prove the lawfulness of defensive arms in cases of necessity. He was an admired preacher, and far from running into the extremes of the times. In the decline of his life he retired from the city, and spent the two last years of his life in Ipswich. The reverend Mr. G. Firmin, in a preface to one of Mr. Marshall’s posthumous sermons, writes, that he had left few labourers like himself behind him; that he was a Christian by practice as well as profession; that he lived by faith, and died by faith, and was an example to the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, and purity. That when he and others were talking with Mr. Marshall about his death, he replied, “I cannot say, as he, I have not so lived that I should now be afraid to die; but this I can say, I have so learned Christ, that I am not afraid to die.” He enjoyed the full use of his understanding to the last; but lost the use of his hands and appetite, insomuch that he could eat nothing for some months before he died. Mr. Fuller says, that he performed his exercise for bachelor of divinity with general applause; that he was a good preacher, but so supple, that he brake not a joint in all the alteration of the times; and although some suspected him of deserting his Presbyterian principles, yet upon his death-bed he gave them full satisfaction that he had not.¹ His remains were solemnly interred in Westminster-abbey, but were dug up again at the Restoration.

The protector having as yet no better than a military title to his high dignity, resolved to obtain a more legal one as soon as the times would admit. He had now cut his way through a great many difficulties, and the success of his arms this summer having raised his reputation to an uncommon pitch of greatness, he resolved to summon a new parliament to meet at Westminster, September 17, 1656, to confirm his title to the protectorship; and the republicans being his most dangerous enemies, the protector sent for sir H. Vane and major-general Ludlow, to give security not to act

from his sermons; which certainly are not in the taste of modern eloquence: but they had a point in them, and abounded in antitheses and comparisons, which, it is easy to conceive, might gain admiration. Besides, compositions should be, in part, at least, judged of by the spirit and taste of the age to which they were adapted.—ED.

¹ Fuller’s Worthies, book 2. p. 5.3.

against the present government.¹ He asked Ludlow, what made him uneasy? or what he would have? Ludlow answered, He would have the nation governed by its own consent. I am, said the protector, as much for a government by consent as any man; but where shall we find that consent: among the Prelatical, Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptist, or Levelling parties? The other replied, Among those of all sorts who have acted with fidelity and affection to the public. The protector, apprehending that he was for throwing all things back into confusion, told him, that all men now enjoyed as much liberty and protection as they could desire, and that he was resolved to keep the nation from being imbrued again in blood. “I desire not (says he) to put any more hardships upon you than upon myself; nor do I aim at anything by this proceeding but the public quiet and security.

As to my own circumstances in the world, I have not much improved them, as these gentlemen (pointing to his council) well know.” But Ludlow, sir Henry Vane, and colonel Rich, persisting in their refusal to give security, were taken into custody. Bishop Burnet says, that others solicited him to restore the young king, and that the earl of Orrery told him he might make his own terms; but that Cromwell replied, “that the son could never forgive his father’s blood; and that he was so debauched he would undo everything.¹¹ It was therefore resolved to set him aside, and proceed upon the present plan.

When the parliament met according to appointment, the reverend Dr. Owen preached before them; his text was Isa. xiv. 32; “What shall one then answer, the messengers of the nation? that the Lord hath founded Zion, and the poor of his people shall trust in it.” From the abbey, the protector went with the members to the painted chamber, where he made a speech and then dismissed them to their house: but to prevent their entering into debates about his title, a guard was placed at the door, with a paper of recognition for each member to subscribe, wherein they promised not to act anything prejudicial to the government as it was established under a protector. Upon their subscribing this, if they were under no disqualification, they had a certificate of their return, and of their being approved by his highness and council.² This measure was certainly inconsistent with the freedom of parliaments: for if the crown has a negative upon the return of the members, they are tools of the crown, and not representatives of the people; because, though they are legally chosen and returned by the proper officer, a superior tribunal may set them aside. Besides, if the parliament was to give a sanction to the new government, the recognition was absurd, because it obliged them to consent to that which they had no liberty to debate. It must

¹ Life of Cromwell, p. 340.

² Whitelocke, p. 639.

therefore be allowed, that Cromwell's protectorship was built solely upon the authority of the council of officers: this being one of those fundamentals which his highness would not suffer any of his parliaments to debate. But it is highly probable that these stretches of power might be absolutely unavoidable at this time, to maintain government under any form; and that without them the several parties would have fallen to pieces, and involved the nation in confusion and a new war. The parliament, in their humble petition and advice, guarded against the exclusion of their members for the future, except by a vote of the house, which the protector freely consented to; so that this was only a temporary expedient, and not to be made a precedent of: but at present almost one hundred members refused to subscribe, and were therefore excluded. These presented a petition to the sitting members for redress, and were answered, that the protector had promised to relieve them if they could show cause of complaint. But instead of this, they appealed to the people in a severe remonstrance, charging his highness with invading their fundamental rights and liberties, and preventing the free meeting of the representatives of the people in parliament. To which it was replied, that if they would not so much as own the protector, they had no colour or pretence to call themselves members of parliament.

The sitting members having chosen sir Thomas Widdrington their speaker, approved of the war with Spain, and voted supplies to support his highness in the prosecution of it. They renounced and disannulled the title of Charles Stuart; and passed an act, making it high treason to compass or imagine the death of the lord-protector. They reviewed the orders and ordinances of the protector and his council in the intervals of parliament, and confirmed most of them. They abrogated the authority and power of the major-generals, conceiving it inconsistent with the laws of England, and liberties of the people. These, and some other acts hereafter mentioned, were presented to his highness, November 27, for confirmation; and as he was pleased to confirm them all, he told them, that as it had been the custom of the chief governors to acknowledge the care and kindness of the commons upon such occasions, so he did very heartily and thankfully acknowledge their kindness therein. But the parliament continued sitting till next year, when we shall meet with more important transactions.

The act for security of the protector's person was no sooner passed than a plot was discovered against his life. Miles Syndercomb, a leveller, a bold resolute man, having been disbanded in Scotland, combined with one Cecil, and another of the protector's lifeguards, to assassinate him as he was going to Hampton-court; but being disappointed once and again by some unexpected accidents, the other conspirators betrayed the design. Syndercomb put himself on his trial, and was condemned on the statute 25th of Edward III., the chief-justice Glynne declaring, that by the word king in the statute,

any chief magistrate was understood. But Syndercomb prevented the execution; for the very morning he was to suffer, he was found dead in his bed; whereupon his body was tied to a horse's tail, and dragged naked to the scaffold on Tower-hill, and then buried with a stake driven through it. However, a day of public thanksgiving was appointed for the protector's deliverance, February 20; when his highness gave the speaker and members of parliament a splendid entertainment at the Banqueting-house.

The war with Spain this summer was attended with vast success, for no sooner had the king of Spain seized the effects of the English merchants in his country, than the protector ordered his admirals, Blake and Montague, to block up the harbour of Cadiz, and look out for the Plate fleet, which captain Stayner, who was left with seven men-of-war upon the coast, while the admirals were gone to Portugal for fresh water, discovered, consisting of eight men-of-war, making directly for Cadiz; Stayner bore up to them with all the sail he could make, and engaged them within four leagues of their port; the Spanish admiral ran his ship ashore with six hundred thousand pieces of eight; but the vice-admiral, with twelve hundred thousand pieces of eight, and another galleon, were fired and sunk; the rear-admiral, with two millions of plate in her, was taken; and upon the whole, six of the eight ships were destroyed; the plate, to the value of two millions, was brought to Portsmouth, and conveyed in carts to London, and carried through the city to the Tower to be coined. Admiral Blake, with the rest of the fleet, wintered upon the coast of Spain, and destroyed another fleet of much greater value the next summer.

After the discovery of Syndercomb's plot, the Prelatists, Presbyterians, and Levellers, were pretty quiet, but the Quakers began to be very troublesome. The reader has been informed, under the year 1650, that George Fox travelled the countries, declaiming in the market-places, and in churches, against all ordained ministers, and placing the whole of religion in an inward light, and an extraordinary impulse of the Holy Spirit. In the year 1652 the Quakers set up separate assemblies in Lancashire, and the adjacent parts. In 1654 they opened the first separate meeting of the people called Quakers in the house of Robert Dring, in Watling-street, London. These unwary people, by interrupting public worship, and refusing to pay any respect to the magistrate, frequently exposed themselves to sufferings.¹

¹ Gough says, "that mostly (though not always) they waited till the worship was ended." The Quakers, he observes, were not singular concerning gospel liberty of prophesying. The Baptists and Independents adopted the opinion, that ordained ministers had not, either from the appointment of Christ, or the practice of the primitive Christians, an exclusive right of speaking in the church; but that all properly gifted might speak one by one. During the civil wars it had been usual for laymen, soldiers, and others, with the connivance, if not with the approbation, of the ruling powers, to speak or preach in the public places of worship, or elsewhere. Oliver Cromwell, in his correspondence with the minis-

One of them, in a letter to the protector, says, “that though there are no penal laws in force, obliging men to comply with the established religion, yet the Quakers are exposed upon other accounts; they are fined and imprisoned for refusing to take an oath; for not paying their tithes; for disturbing the public assemblies, and meeting in the streets, and places of public resort; some of them have been whipped for vagabonds, and for their plain speeches to the magistrates.” But the Quakers were so far from being discouraged, that they opened a public meeting under favour of the toleration, at the Bull-and-Mouth Inn, in Aldersgate-street, where women as well as men spake as they were moved; and when none were

moved, there was no speaking at all.¹ The novelty of this assembly drew great numbers of people thither out of curiosity; nor did any give them disturbance, as long as they continued quiet within themselves; but in several places where they had no business, the extravagance of their speakers was insufferable; one of them interrupted the minister in Whitechapel-church, and disturbed the whole assembly. A female came into Whitehall-chapel, stark naked, in the midst of public worship,² the lord protector himself being present. Another came into the parliament-house with a trenchard in her hand, which she broke in pieces, saying, “Thus shall ye be broke in pieces.” Thomas Aldam, having complained to the protector of the imprisonment of some friends in the country, and not finding redress, took off his cap and tore it in pieces, saying, “So shall thy government be torn from thee and thy house.” Several pretending an extraordinary message from

ters of Scotland, in 1650, had vindicated the practice. The members of this infant society, who thought it their duty to declare the burden of the word on their minds, were sanctioned by the opinions and manners of the age. They were reprehensible only when the impetuosity of their zeal interrupted the service as it was proceeding. And then the irregularity and rudeness of this conduct did not justify the violence and outrage with which they were often treated, as contrary to humanity and civilization as to the professed principles of religious liberty. Gough’s *History of the Quakers*, vol. 1. p. 87.—ED.

¹ Sewel’s *History*, p. 84.

² It does not appear on what authority Mr. Neal brings forward this story. It is not to be met with in Sewel, who does relate the two following facts, p. 144. If it were a well authenticated fact, and if this female were a Quaker, the impropriety and indecency of her conduct ought not to be imputed to the society, unless it directly arose from their avowed principles, and had been sanctioned by their approbation. Mr. Neal, farther on, speaks of “other extravagances of this people recorded by our historians about that time.” The matter of inquiry will be whether those historians wrote on good evidence, and were candid and fair in their representations. He says, that “the protector was continually teased with their importunities:” others may applaud the firmness and perseverance with which their remonstrances, on the persecutions they suffered, here called teasing importunities, were renewed. “Fox and others (he adds) wrote letters to him, filled with denunciations of the divine judgments.” If we may judge by the specimens of these letters, which Sewel and Gough have given us, the candid reader will find reason rather to applaud the honest simplicity and undisguised plain dealing in them, than contempt of authority, or bitter invectives.—ED.

Heaven, went about the streets of London, denouncing the judgments of God against the protector and his council. One came to the door of the parliament-house with a drawn sword, and wounded several who were present, saying, "he was inspired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in the house."¹ Others in their prophetic raptures denounced judgments on the whole nation, and frequently disturbed the public assemblies where the chief-magistrate himself was present. Many opened their shops on the Lord's day, in defiance of the laws, and were so very obstinate and intractable, that it was impossible to keep the peace without some marks of severity.

But the most extravagant Quaker that appeared at this time was James Naylor, formerly an officer in major-general Lambert's troops in Scotland, a man of good natural parts, and an admired speaker among these people; some of whom had such a veneration for him, that they styled him in blasphemous language, the "everlasting Sun of righteousness; the Prince of peace; the only begotten Son of God; the fairest among ten thousand." Some of the friends kissed his feet in the prison at Exeter, and after his release went before him into the city of Bristol, after the manner of our Saviour's entrance into Jerusalem; one walked bareheaded; another of the women led his horse; others spread their scarfs and handkerchiefs before him in the way, crying continually as they went on "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts: Hosanna in the highest; holy, holy, is the Lord God of Israel."² Upon this the magistrates of Bristol caused him to be apprehended, and sent up to the parliament, who appointed a committee to examine the witnesses against him, upon a charge of blasphemy; (1.) For admitting religious worship to be paid to him; and, (2.) For assuming the names and

¹ Whitelocke, p. 592.

² The story of James Naylor was too remarkable, both on account of the extravagant delusions which misled him and his admirers, and the severe and illegal sentence under which he suffered, not to be recorded. But to give it as a picture of Quakerism is not fair or candid: for not only Sewel himself condemns the behaviour of Naylor and his followers, and resolves it into his being stupefied in his understanding, and beguiled by the wiles of Satan; but informs us that the Quakers in general spoke against him and his doings. They disowned him and his adherents. Gough therefore, not without reason, complains that this has been passed over unnoticed, while the enormities of this man, instead of being overlooked, have been rather exaggerated. The reflection he makes on this is just, and deserves serious attention. "There seem to be a pride and malignity in human nature, while unreformed by religion, diametrically opposite to Christian charity, which, unconscious of sublime virtue in itself, and aiming to depress the rest of mankind below its own level, delights to dwell on the dark side of characters, to magnify the failings of men, and draw a suspicious shade over their virtues, or the mitigating circumstances of their defects; and this malevolent disposition receives new force from the spirit of party, which peculiarly characterized this age, and raged with unabated violence against the Quakers."—It may be added, though it should be with deep concern, that even good and liberal minds do not always rise wholly superior to the influence of these dispositions. Gough's History, vol. 1. p. 247, 248. 251. Sewel's History, p. 143. 150—ED.

incommunicable titles and attributes of our blessed Saviour, as the name Jesus, the fairest amongst ten thousand, the only begotten Son of God, the Prophet of the Most High, the King of Israel, the everlasting Sun of righteousness, the Prince of peace.” All which he confessed,¹ but alleged in his own defence, that these honours were not paid to him, but to Christ who dwelt in him.

The committee asked him, why he came in so extraordinary a manner into Bristol. To which he replied, that he might not refuse any honours which others who were moved by the Lord gave him. Being farther asked whether he had reprov'd the persons who gave him those titles and attributes, he answered, “If they had it from the Lord, what had I to do to reprove them? If the Father has moved them to give these honours to Christ, I may not deny them; if they have given them to any other but to Christ, I disown them.” He concluded his defence thus: “I do abhor that any honours due to God should be given to me, as I am a creature; but it pleased the Lord to set me up as a sign of the coming of the righteous one, and what has been done to me passing through the town, I was commanded by the power of the Lord to suffer to be done to the outward man, as a sign; but I abhor any honour as a creature.”

From the committee, he was brought to the bar of the house, where the report being read, he confessed it; upon which the house voted him guilty of blasphemy, and ordered him to be set in the pillory two hours at Westminster, and two hours at the Old Exchange; that he should be whipped through the streets from Westminster to the Old Exchange; that his tongue should be bored through with a hot iron, and his forehead stigmatized with the letter B; he was afterward to be sent to Bristol, and to ride through the city with his face to the horse's tail, and to be whipped the next market day after he came thither. Last of all, he was to be committed to Bridewell, in London, to be restrained from company, and to be put to hard labour till he should be released by parliament; during which time he was to be debarred from pen, ink, and paper, and to have no sustenance² but what he got by his

¹ This is not accurate. When the speaker Widdrington was going to pronounce the sentence, J. Naylor said, “he did not know his offence.” To which the speaker replied, “he should know his offence by his punishment.” The trial was published, but the extravagancy of the sentence countenances the suspicion, that the account was partially taken and published to justify the cruelty of it. Some of his answers were innocent enough: some not clear, and some wrested and aggravated by his-adversaries: they reported the worst, and more than was true: adding and diminishing, it is said, as they were minded; and leaving out much of what was spoken to the committee. His words were perverted, and ensnaring questions proposed to him. Sewel's History, p. 139, note, and p. 140; or Gough, vol. 1. p. 237, 238, note—ED.

² It ought to be mentioned, to the honour of humanity, and as a proof that some persons of equity and moderation existed in those times, that several persons of different persuasions had offered petitions to parliament on his behalf, but it was resolved not to read them till sentence had been passed: when by the execution of the first part of it he was reduced

hard labour. A sentence much too severe for such a wrongheaded obstinate creature.¹

December 18, James Naylor stood in the pillory in the Palace yard, Westminster, and was whipped to the Old Exchange; the remainder of the sentence being respited for a week, in which time the reverend Mr. Caryl, Manton, Nye, Griffith, and Reynolds, went to him, in order to bring him to some acknowledgment of his crime;² but not being able to reclaim him, the remainder of his sentence was executed December 27, when some of his followers licked his wounds, and paid him other honours both ridiculous and superstitious. He was afterward sent to Bristol, and whipped from the middle of Thomas-street, over the bridge to the middle of Broad-street. From Bristol he was brought back to Bridewell, London, where he remained sullen for three days, and would not work, but then begged for victuals, and was content to labour.

At length, after two years' imprisonment, he recanted his errors so far as to acknowledge, that the honours he received at his entrance into Bristol were wrong; "and all those ranting, wild spirits, which gathered about me (says he) at that time of darkness, with all their wild acts, and wicked works, against the honour of God and his pure spirit and people, I renounce. And whereas I gave advantage, through want of judgment, to that

to a state of extreme weakness, many again interposed in his favour by a petition, which was presented to the house by more than a hundred on behalf of the subscribers, while the execution of the remaining part was respited for a week, pleading that this respite had refreshed the hearts of many thousands altogether unconcerned in his practice, and praying that it might be wholly remitted. But intolerance and vindictiveness resisted these solicitations. The protector was then addressed; on which he wrote a letter to the house; but this, though it occasioned some debate, obtained no resolution in favour of the prisoner. On this the petitioners presented a second address to the protector: but it is said, the public preachers by their influence prevented its effect. Sewel, p. 141; and Gough, vol. 1. p. 240, 241.—ED.

¹ Mr. Neal's censure of this sentence is too gentle. It was repugnant to humanity, equity, and wisdom. For though the religious extravagances of Naylor might reasonably shock pious and sober minds, his criminality ought to have been estimated, not by the sound of the titles and claims he assumed or which were given to him, but by the delusion and frenzy which had seized his brain; and on this ground he was an object of pity, not of indignation; and he should have been assigned over to a physician for a cure of his madness, and not to the executioner of public justice to be punished. His features, we are told, bore a near resemblance to the common pictures of Christ; which is candidly mentioned by Mr. Granger to account for his imagining that he was transformed into Christ; and which circumstance ought to have had its influence with his judges. *History of England*, vol. 3. p. 149, 8vo.—ED.

² These gentlemen, in many respects excellent characters, did not manage this interview in a manner worthy of themselves, or honourable to their memory. For they would admit no friend of his, nor any other person, into the room, although requested. When Naylor insisted that what had passed should be put in writing, and a copy left with him or the jailor, they consented: but on his remarking afterward in the course of the conversation, on perceiving they meant to wrest his words, "how soon they forgot the work of the bishops who were now treading the same steps, seeking to ensnare the innocent," they rose up in a rage, and burnt what they had written. Sewel, p. 142. Gough, vol. 1. p. 242.—ED.

evil spirit, I take shame to myself.” After the protector’s death James Naylor was released out of prison, and wrote several things in defence of the Quakers, who owned him as a friend, notwithstanding his extravagant behaviour;¹ but he did not long survive his enlargement, for retiring into Huntingdonshire, he died there towards the latter end of the year 1660, about the forty-fourth year of his age.² Mr. Whitelocke observes very justly, that many thought he was too furiously prosecuted by some rigid men.³

Other extravagances of this people, about this time, are recorded by our historians. The protector was continually teased with their importunities; they waited for him on the road, and watched about his palace, till they got an opportunity to speak to him. George Fox, and others, wrote letters filled with denunciations of divine judgments, unless he would pull down the remains of antichrist, by which they understood church-ministers, and church-maintenance. To which the protector paid no regard.

As new inroads were made upon the ordinances for observation of the sabbath, the parliament took care to amend them. This year they ordained,

¹ The reflections insinuated here against the Quakers might have been well spared: and it would have been more handsome in our author to have stated the matter as Sewel has: “James Naylor (says he) came to very great sorrow and deep humiliation of mind: and therefore, because God forgives-the transgressions of the penitent, and blotteth them out, and remembereth them no more, so could James Naylor’s friends do no other than forgive his crime, and thus take back the lost sheep into their society.” Sewel’s History, p. 153—ED.

² The expressions uttered by James Naylor, about two hours before his death, both in justice to his name, and on account of their own excellence, deserve to be preserved here. “There is a spirit which I feel (he said), that delights to do no evil, nor to revenge any wrong, but delights to endure all things, in hopes to enjoy its own to the end: its hope is to outlive all wrath and contention, and to weary out all exaltation and cruelty, or whatever is of a nature contrary to itself. It sees to the end of all temptation: as it bears no evil in itself, so it conceives none in thought to any other: if it be betrayed, it bears it; for its ground and spring are the mercies and forgiveness of God: its crown is meekness, its life is everlasting love unfeigned, and takes its kingdom with entreaty and not with contention, and keeps it by lowliness of mind. In God alone it can rejoice, though none else can regard it, or can own its life: it is conceived in sorrow, and brought forth without any pity to it; nor doth it murmur at grief and oppression. It never rejoiceth but through sufferings, for with the world’s joy it is murdered: I found it alone being forsaken; I have fellowship therein with them who lived in dens and desolate places in the earth, who through death obtained this resurrection and eternal life.” After his fall James Naylor was a man of great self-denial, and very diffident and jealous of himself. Sewel, p. 159. Gough’s History, vol. 1. p. 246—ED.

³ Whitelocke’s observation on Naylor’s sentence, just as it is, is not sufficiently strong and poignant. In its cruelty this sentence bore a great resemblance to that passed on Dr. Leighton by the infamous court of star-chamber: and it vied with it in illegality, for the house of commons, as Gough remarks, is no court of judicature, nor hath any power to inflict a punishment beyond imprisonment during its session. Hist. of the Quakers, vol. 1. p. 239. It ought not to be omitted, that many of the members were very averse to the severity of the measures taken against this persecuted man, whom a temporary frenzy misled. Though it may be added here, the recantation of this bewildered victim was not published till after his release, yet that and other pieces were written by him while he was in prison: during which period he recovered a sound state of mind, and repented of his errors. Sewel, p. 141.—ED.

that “the sabbath should be deemed to extend from twelve of the clock on Saturday night, to twelve of the clock on the Lord’s day night; and within that compass of time they prohibited all kinds of business and diversions, except works of necessity and mercy. No election of magistrates is to be on the Lord’s day; no holding of courts, or return of writs, but if, according to their charters, they fall upon the Lord’s day, they are to be deferred to Monday. It is farther enacted, That all persons not having a reasonable excuse, to be allowed by a justice of peace, shall resort to some church or chapel, where the true worship of God is performed, or to some meeting-place of Christians not differing in matters of faith from the public profession of the nation, on penalty of two shilling and six-pence for every offence. It is farther ordered, that no minister shall be molested or disturbed in the discharge of his office on the Lord’s day, or any other day, when he is performing his duty, or in going and coming from the place of public worship. Nor shall any wilful disturbance be given to the congregation, on penalty of five pounds, or being sent to the workhouse for six months, provided the information be within one month after the offence is committed.”¹ This ordinance to be read in every church or chapel of this nation annually, the first Lord’s day in every March.

The oath of abjuration, for discovering Popish recusants, not being effectual, it was now farther ordained, “that all justices of peace, at the quarter-sessions, should charge the grand juries to present all persons whom they suspected to be popishly affected; and that every such person should appear at the next quarter-sessions, and take and subscribe the following oath of abjuration, on penalty of being adjudged Popish recusants convict, to all intents and purposes whatsoever.

“ I, A. B., do abjure and renounce the pope’s supremacy and authority over the Catholic church in general, and over myself in particular. And I do believe the church of Rome is not the true church; and that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine after consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever. And I do also believe, that there is not any purgatory; and that consecrated hosts, crucifixes, or images, ought not to be worshipped; neither that any worship is due unto them. And I also believe, that salvation cannot be merited by works. And I do sincerely testify and declare, that the pope, neither of himself, nor by any authority of the church or see of Rome, or by any other means, with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the chief magistrate of these nations, or to dispose of any of the countries or territories thereunto belonging; or to authorize any foreign prince or state to invade or annoy him or them; or to discharge any of the people of these na-

¹ Scobel, p. 138.

tions from their obedience to the chief magistrate; or to give licence or leave to any of the said people to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer any violence or hurt to the person of the said chief magistrate, or to the state or government of these nations, or to any of the people thereof. And I do farther swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes, rulers, or governors, which be excommunicated or deprived by the pope, may, by virtue of such excommunication or deprivation, be killed, murdered, or deposed from their rule or government; or any outrage or violence done to them by the people that are under them; or by any other whatsoever upon such pretence. And I do farther swear, that I do believe that the pope, or bishop of Rome, hath no authority, power, or jurisdiction, whatsoever, within England, Scotland, and Ireland, or any or either of them, or the dominions or territories thereunto belonging, or any or either of them. And all doctrine's in affirmation of the same points I do abjure and renounce, without any equivocation, mental reservation, or secret evasion, whatsoever, taking the words by me spoken according to the common and usual meaning of them. And I do believe no power derived from the pope or church of Rome, or any other person, can absolve me from this mine oath. And I do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. So help me God.”¹

Upon refusal of this oath, the protector and his successors might, by process in the exchequer, seize upon two-thirds of their estates both real and personal, for the use of the public, during the time of their recusancy; but after their decease, the same were to return to the right heir, provided they took the above-mentioned oath. It was farther ordained, “that no subject of this commonwealth shall at any time be present at mass, in the house of any foreign ambassador, or agent, or at any other place, on penalty of 1007. and imprisonment for six months, half to the protector, and half to the informer.”

How far these severities were needful or justifiable I leave with the judgment of the reader.

The protector had an opportunity this year, of appearing for the Protestants of France,² as he had done last year for those of the Valleys; there happened a quarrel between the burghers of Nismes, who were mostly Huguenots, and the magistrates and bishop of the city; the intendant of the

¹ Scobel, p. 444.

² The conduct of Cromwell, in this instance, does him the more honour, as, unhappily for the suffering Protestants of France, it is unparalleled. It was not formed on any precedent; nor has his generous example been followed. “When an opportunity (observes an ingenious writer) offered for doing something for them at the peace of Ryswick, in 1697: and again of Utrecht, 1713, at which time four hundred were still groaning on board the galleys, or perishing in dungeons, there was not one stipulation in their favour.- Bicheno’s Signs of the Times, part 1. p. 46, note.—ED.

province being informed of it, repaired thitherto prevent an insurrection; but the burghers standing in their own defence raised a tumult, of which the intendant sent an account to court. The burghers, being soon sensible of their folly, submitted and begged pardon; but the court, laying hold of the opportunity, resolved to ruin them. Upon which they dispatched a messenger privately to Cromwell, and begged his interposition. The protector, having heard the whole account, bid the messenger stay and refresh himself, and before he could return to Paris, his business should be done. Accordingly, an express was immediately dispatched with a letter to the king of France, under cover of the following to cardinal Mazarin.

“To his Eminence the Lord Cardinal Mazarine.

“Having thought necessary to dispatch this gentleman to the king with the enclosed letter, I commanded him to salute your eminence on my part; and having charged him to communicate to you certain affairs which I have entrusted him with, I therefore pray your highness to give credit to what he shall say, having an entire confidence in him.

“Your eminence’s most affectionate,

“O. CROMWELL, protector of the

“Commonwealth of England, &c.

“Whitehall, December 28th, 1656.”

The protector added the following postscript with his own hand; “I have been informed of the tumult at Nismes: I recommend to your highness the interest of the reformed.” And in his instructions to his ambassador Lockhart, he commanded him to insist peremptorily, that the tumult of Nismes be forgiven, or else to leave the court immediately. Mazarine complained of this usage, as too high and imperious; but his eminence stood in too much awe of the protector to quarrel with him, and therefore sent orders to the intendant to make up the matter as well as he could. Mr. Welwood says, the cardinal would change countenance whenever he heard the name of the protector, insomuch that it became a proverb in France, that Mazarine was not so much afraid of the devil as of Oliver Cromwell. Such was the terror of this great man’s name in the principal courts of Europe!

This year¹ died the right reverend and pious Dr. Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich, whose practical works have been in great esteem among the dis-

¹ In September, this year [1656], there happened at Abingdon in Berkshire a tumult, which was attended with singular circumstances, expressive of the political as well as religious frenzy of the times. It was occasioned by the burial of Mr. Pendarvis, the pastor of the Baptist church in that town; who died in London, and was brought down to Abingdon by water, in a sugar-cask filled up with sand, to be interred. As he was one of the fifth-monarchy men, and the people to whom he ministered were of that stamp, and famous among the party in general, his interment drew together so vast a concourse of people,

senters. He was born at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire, and educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge. When he left the university, he travelled with sir Edmund Bacon to the Spa in Germany. Upon his return, he was taken into the service of prince Henry, and preferred to the rectory of Waltham in Essex, which he held twenty-two years. King James sent him to the synod of Dort with other English divines, where he preached a Latin sermon; but was forced to retire to England before the synod broke up, on the account of his health. Some time after his return, he was preferred to the bishopric of Exeter, and from thence translated to Norwich. At the beginning of the troubles between the king and parliament, the bishop published several treatises in favour of diocesan episcopacy, which was answered by Smectymnuus, as has been already related. He was afterward imprisoned in the Tower with the rest of the protesting bishops; upon his release he retired to Norwich, the revenues of which bishopric being soon sequestered, together with his own real and personal estate, he was forced to be content with the fifths. The soldiers used him severely, turning him out of his palace, and threatening to sell his books, if a friend had not given bond for the money, at which they were appraised. The bishop complained very justly of this usage, in a pamphlet entitled *Hard Measure*. At length the parliament, to make him some amends, voted him £40 per annum; and when the war was ended, in the year 1647, they took off the sequestration from his estate, and the bishop lived peaceably upon it afterward, spending his solitude in acts of charity and divine meditation. He was a learned and pious man, and of great humility and goodness in conversation; but being the tool of archbishop Laud, in supporting the divine right of diocesan episcopacy, lessened him in the esteem of the parliament. Mr. Fuller says,¹ he was frequent-

even from the remotest parts of the kingdom, that the governing powers took notice of it, and sent major general Bridges with a party of soldiers to attend on the occasion. Several days were spent by the people in religious exercises, in which were thrown out many railing accusations against the existing government, and exhortations to “arise and fight the Lord’s battles,” &c. At last the major-general sent an order to dissolve the meeting in these words: “It is the order of the state, that you depart to your habitations.” They refused to obey this order, and persisted in their exercises. A guard was then set upon the house where they were assembled. On this they repaired to the market-place, and continued in the most insolent manner to rail at the protector, and abuse the soldiers; crying out, “Now, Lord, appear; down with the priests,” &c. the very women exciting the men to violence. The soldiers at last pulled down the men from their stools. A fray ensued, and swords and canes were brandished together in the greatest confusion, and some few slightly hurt. The major-general then entered the town with his whole brigade of horse. The ringleaders were apprehended and brought before him: with whom he reasoned and expostulated in the most friendly manner, but without success. For none of them would own their fault, or acknowledge the existing government, nor even promise to behave peaceably, saying, “they knew not how soon they might be called forth to do the Lord’s work.” However, five only were committed to prison, and they were soon afterward released. Thompson’s Collections, under word Abingdon MSS.—ED.

¹ Fuller’s Worthies, book 2. p. 130.

ly called our English Seneca, for the pureness, plainness, and fulness, of his style.¹ He was more happy in his practical than polemical writings. There is one remarkable passage in his will, which is this: after having desired a private funeral, he adds, “I do not hold God’s house a meet repository for the dead bodies of the greatest saints.” In his last sickness he was afflicted with violent pains of the stone and strangury, which he bore with wonderful patience, till death put an end to all his troubles, September 8, 1656, in the eighty-second year of his age.

Towards the latter end of this year died the reverend Mr. Richard Capel, born at Gloucester 1586, and educated in Magdalen-college, Oxon, where he proceeded M. A.² His eminence in the university, says the Oxford historian, was great; he had divers learned men for his pupils, who were afterwards famous in the church, as Accepted Frewen, archbishop of York, William Pemble, and others. He left the university for the rectory of Eastington in his own county, where he became celebrated for his painful and practical preaching, as well as for his exemplary life. When the book of sports came out 1633, he refused to read it, but resigned his rectory, and commenced physician. In 1641 he closed with the parliament, and was chosen one of the assembly of divines, but declined sitting among them, choosing to reside at his living at Pitchcomb, near Stroud, where he was in great reputation as a physician and divine, preaching gratis to his congregation. He published several valuable treatises, and among others a celebrated one, *Of Temptations, their Nature, Danger, and Cure*. He was a good old Puritan, of the stamp of Mr. Dod, Cleaver, and Hildersham; and died at Pitchcomb in Gloucestershire, September 21, 1656, aged seventy-two years.³

¹ In his younger years he composed a book of satires, and was the first writer in that kind of our English poets. Mr. Pope said high things of this performance. Granger’s *History of England*, vol. 2. p. 157, 8vo—ED.

² Fuller’s *Worthies*, 260.

³ Mr. Neal has passed over here a name of great worth and eminence, which ought not to be forgotten in a history of the progress of religious liberty; that of the “ever-memorable” John Hales of Eton, as he has been usually called, who died on the 19th of May, 1656, aged seventy-two years: whose writings, though not numerous, especially his *Discourse on Schism*, have much contributed to promote just sentiments and a liberality of spirit. He was born at Bath, in 1584, and made so early a proficiency in grammar-learning, that at thirteen years of age he was sent to Corpus-Christi college in Oxford; and studied under George Abbot, afterward archbishop of Canterbury, under whom he imbibed an attachment to the doctrines of Galvanism. In 1605, by the interest of sir Henry Saville, warden of Merton-college, whose notice and patronage his merit and learning had attracted, he was chosen fellow of the same: and his assistance was engaged in the excellent edition of Chrysostom’s work by sir Henry; which is the best printed Greek book England can boast, and cost the learned editor several thousand pound. Harwood’s *View of the Editions of the Classics*, second edition, p. 143.—Mr. Hales was also appointed to read the Greek lecture in his college, and in 1612 he was elected Greek professor to the university. In 1612–13 he was called upon to compose and speak the funeral oration for sir Thomas Bodley, founder of the Bodleian library, whose corpse the university determined to inter in the most solemn manner. On the 24th of May in that year, he was admitted fellow of Eton-college, being

The parliament which met September 17 continued sitting till the next year, having before them an affair of the greatest consequence, which was confirming the government under Cromwell as lord-protector, or changing it for the title of king. Colonel Jephson, one of the members from Ireland, moved, that the protector might have the crown, with the title of king, and was seconded by alderman Pack, one of the representatives for the city of London; but the republicans in the house opposed it with great vehemence; however, upon putting the question, it was carried for a king; most of the lawyers, as serjeant Glyn, Maynard, Fountain, St. John, and others, being on that side.¹ April 4, a petition was presented to the protector, recommending the title and office of a king, as best fitted to the laws and temper of the

then in holy orders. In 1618 he accompanied sir Dudley Carleton, king James's ambassador to the States of Holland, as his chaplain; and was present at many of the sessions of the synod of Dort: from whence he returned an Arminian: "There (he said) I bid John Calvin good night." On the 27th of June, 1639, by the interest of archbishop Laud, he was installed a canon of Windsor: but he enjoyed this preferment, which he reluctantly accepted, little more than two years, till the beginning of the civil wars in 1642. About the beginning of 1645 he retired into a private chamber at Eton; where he remained a quarter of a year [in a very obscure manner, and he is said, during that time, to have lived only upon bread and beer. His fellowship was continued, though he refused to sign the covenant; but he was ejected from it on refusing to take the oath of fidelity to the commonwealth. His necessities at length obliged him to sell his admirable library for £700., which had cost him £2,500. His love of retirement and study induced him to decline a generous offer of one of the Seldian family. When he held the fellowship and bursar's place of his college, he was wont to say, they were worth to him £50 a year more than he could spend. His body, it is reported, was well-proportioned, and his motion brisk and lively. His countenance was sanguine, cheerful, and full of air. His parts were great: his genius acute and piercing, his judgment profound; his learning various, polite, and universal; so that he was called "a walking library." His manners were most amiable and engaging. He was most exemplarily meek and humble; and beyond all example charitable: of great candour and moderation; judging for himself, but not others; none more studious of the knowledge of the gospel, or more curious in the search: of the strictest integrity, and sincerely pious. He had a great detestation of an imposing, censorious, and intolerant spirit: and would often say, that "he would renounce the religion of the church of England tomorrow, if it obliged him to believe that any other Christians would be damned: and that nobody would conclude another man to be damned, who did not wish him so." The force, eloquence, and simplicity, with which he wrote to archbishop Laud, give a picture of his mind, as well as convey excellent instruction. The pursuit of truth (says he) has been my only care ever since I understood the meaning of the word. For this I have forsaken all hopes, all friends, all desires, which might bias me, and hinder me from driving right at what I aimed. For this I have spent my money, my means, my youth, my age, and all that I have.—If with all this cost and pains my purchase is but error, I may safely say, to err has cost me more than it has many to find the truth; and truth shall give me this testimony at last, that if I have missed of her, it is not my fault, but my misfortune." He was buried, according to his desire, in Eton-college churchyard, on the day after his death: and a monument was erected over his grave by Mr. Peter Curwen. A complete edition of his work was, for the first time, offered to the public, from the press of the Foulis at Glasgow, 1765, in three volumes 12mo. undertaken with the approbation of Dr. Warburton, the bishop of Gloucester. "The greatness of his character (observes Mr. Granger) has stamped a value upon some of his compositions, which are thought to have but little merit in themselves." *History of England*, vol. 2. 8vo. p. 172. *British Biography*, vol. 4. p. 368—375; and *Works*, vol. 1. Testimonies prefixed, and p. 137, 138.

¹ Clarke's *General Martyrology*, p. 303, of the annexed Lives.—ED.

people of England: and upon his desiring time to consider of it, a committee was appointed to give him satisfaction in any difficulties that might arise, who urged, that “the name of protector was unknown to our English constitution—that his highness had already the office and power of a king, and therefore the dispute was only about a name.—That his person would never be secure till he assumed it, because the laws did not take notice of him as chief magistrate, and juries were backward to find persons guilty of treason where there was no king.—They urged the advantages of a mixed monarchy, and insisted on the safety and security of himself and his friends.—That by the laws of Edward IV. and Henry VII. whatever was done by a king in possession, with the consent of a house of lords and commons, was valid, and all that served under him were exempt from punishment.—That, without this title all the grants and sales that had been made were null and void; and all who had collected the public moneys were accountable.—In short, that the inclinations of the nation were for a king.—That his not accepting the office would occasion the changing many ancient laws, customs, and formalities.—That there would be no lasting settlement till things reverted to this channel.—To all which they added, that it was the advice and opinion of the representatives of the three nations; and since the parliament of England, Scotland, and Ireland, advised and desired him to accept the title, he ought not in reason or equity to decline it.”¹

The protector attended to these arguments, and would no doubt have complied, if he could have relied upon the army, but the chief officers remonstrated strongly against it, and many of his old friends, among whom was his own son-in-law Fleetwood, threatened to lay down their commissions. All the republicans declaimed loudly against his accepting the crown, and presented a petition to the house against it, drawn up by Dr. Owen, and presented by lieutenant-general Mason: they said, “they had pulled down monarchy with the monarch, and should they now build it up?—They had appealed to God in the late war, who had answered in their favour, and should they now distrust him?—They had voted to be true to the commonwealth, without king or kingship, and should they break their vows, and go back to Egypt for security?—They thought it rather their happiness to be under a legal danger, which might make them more cautious and diligent.—Some said, if they must have a king, why not the legal one?”²—Upon these grounds they stood out, and rejected with scorn all limitations of the prerogative under monarchy. So that whatever might be the protector's inclination,³ he judged it most prudent to decline the crown at present;

¹ Whitelocke, p. 646.

² Burnet, vol. i. p. 98, 12mo. Edinb. edit.

³ The inclinations of Cromwell were strongly in favour of kingship: for he used all possible means to prevail with the officers of the army to concur with his scheme of royalty.

and accordingly, May 8, he sent for the house, and acquainted them, that, as the circumstances of affairs then stood, he could not undertake the government with the title of king.¹

Some have been of opinion, that the protector's great genius forsook him in this affair; but it is impossible, at this distance of time, to judge of the strength of the reasons that determined him the other way. Had he assumed the title of king, the army would have revolted; the cavaliers would have joined the republicans to have pulled him down from the throne, the whole nation would in all probability have been thrown into confusion, and himself have been the sacrifice. The protector had made large advances in power already, and he might apprehend it not worth while at present to risk the whole for the sake of a name; though I make no question, but if he had lived to see his government established, and the spirits of the people calmed, he would in a proper time have accepted of the style and title, as he had already done the office, of king. Nay, Mr. Welwood² says, that a crown was actually made, and brought to Whitehall for that purpose.

Upon Cromwell's declining the title of king, the parliament concluded upon a humble petition and advice, which was presented to the protector May 25, containing, among others, the following articles—"That his highness would exercise the office of chief magistrate of this nation under the title of lord-protector; and that during life he would declare his successor.—That for the future he would be pleased to call parliaments, consisting of two houses, to meet once in three years, and oftener, if there be occasion.—That the ancient liberties of parliament may be preserved; and that none who are chosen may be excluded but by the judgment and consent of the house of which they are members.—That no Papist, no person that has borne arms against the parliament, unless he has since given proof of his good affection to the commonwealth; no clergyman, no atheist, or openly profane person, be qualified to be chosen member of parliament.—That the other house of parliament be not more than seventy, nor less than forty, of which twenty-one to make a house.—That they may not vote by proxy.—That as any of them die, no new ones be admitted but by consent of the house itself, but the nomination to be in the protector; and that they may not proceed in any criminal causes but by impeachment of the commons.—That no laws be abrogated, suspended, or repealed, but by act of parliament; and that no person be compelled to contribute to any gift, loans, be-

With this view he invited himself to dine with colonel Desborough, and carried lieutenant-general Fleetwood with him, as he knew the influence of these officers, and their aversion to his wearing the crown. He then even stooped to solicit their indulgence: "It is but a feather in a man's cap (said he), and therefore he wondered that men would not please children, and permit them to enjoy their rattle." Ludlow's *Memoirs*, 4to. p. 248.—ED.

¹ Whitelocke, p. 646.

² *Memoirs*, p. 111.

nevolences, or taxes, without consent of parliament.—That the number of his highness’s council be not more than twenty-one, of which seven to be a quorum; and that no privy-councillor be removed but by consent of parliament; though in the intervals of parliament they may be suspended.—That the chancellor, or keeper of the great seal, the commissioners of the treasury, and other chief officers of state, may be approved by both houses of parliament.”

The article relating to religion was in these words; “That the Protestant Christian religion contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and no other, be asserted and held forth, as the public profession of this nation; and that a confession of faith, to be agreed upon by your highness and this present parliament, be asserted, and recommended to the people of the nation; and that none shall be permitted by opprobrious words or writings to revile or reproach the said confession. That such who profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Ghost, God coequal and coeternal with the Father and the Son, one God blessed for ever, and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the revealed will and word of God, though in other things they may differ in word and doctrine, or discipline, from the public profession held forth, shall not be compelled by penalties or restraints from their profession, but shall be protected from all injuries and molestations in the profession of their faith, and exercise of their religion, while they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others, or the disturbance of the public peace; provided this liberty do not extend to Popery or prelacy, or to the countenance of such who publish horrid blasphemies; or who practise or hold forth licentiousness or profaneness, under the profession of Christ; and those ministers, or public preachers, who agree with the public profession aforesaid in matters of faith, though they differ in matters of worship or discipline, shall not only have protection in the way of their churches or worship, but shall be deemed equally fit and capable (being otherwise qualified) of any trust, promotion, or employment, in this nation, with those who agree with the public profession of faith, only they shall not be capable of receiving the public maintenance appointed for the ministry. And all ministers shall remain disqualified from holding any civil employment according to the act for disabling all persons in holy orders to exercise any temporal jurisdiction and authority, which is hereby confirmed.¹

The protector having consented to these, and some other articles, to the number of eighteen, an oath was appointed to be taken by all privy-councillors and members of parliament for the future, “to maintain the

¹ Whitelocke’s Memoirs, p. 678.

Protestant religion; to be faithful to the lord-protector; and to preserve the rights and liberties of the people;” and a few days after Oliver Cromwell was proclaimed a second time lord-protector in the cities of London and Westminster; this being esteemed a new and more parliamentary title; and if the house had been full and free it might have been so, but the council’s assuming a power to approve or disapprove of the members after they were returned; their forbidding them to debate the fundamentals of the new government, and obliging them to sign a recognition of it before they entered the house, looks like a force, or taking the election out of their hands. But lame and imperfect as the protector’s title may seem, it was as good as that of the Roman emperors, or the original claims of many of the royal houses of Europe; and in the present disjointed state of the English nation, not only necessary, but it may be the best thing that could be done; for if the protectorship had been set aside, there was hardly a man in the house who would have ventured to vote for the king; an absolute commonwealth could not have been supported, and therefore anarchy would inevitably have ensued.

This being the last settlement of government in the protector’s time, the reader will observe, that the four fundamental articles already mentioned, viz. (1.) that the government be in a single person and a parliament; (2.) that parliaments be not perpetual; (3.) the militia; and (4.) liberty of conscience in matters of religion; were not suffered to be examined or altered, but were supposed as the basis upon which the new government was founded. That though Oliver’s title to the government had the sanction and confirmation of the present parliament, it was derived originally from the choice of the council of officers, and was never suffered to be debated in the house afterward.—That the humble petition and advice approaches nearer the old legal constitution, by appointing two houses of parliament, and would most likely, in time, have been converted into it.—That the regulations it makes in the constitution are for the most part reasonable.—That the Presbyterians were still left in possession of all the ecclesiastical revenues of the kingdom, though an open and free liberty was granted to all Christians, except Papists and Prelatists, who were excluded for reasons of state; and the penal laws made against the latter were dropped by the parliament’s not confirming them. Remarkable are the words of the lord commissioner Fiennes, at the opening of the second session of this parliament, in which he “warns the houses of the rock on which many had split, which was a spirit of imposing upon men’s consciences in things wherein God leaves them a latitude, and would have them free. The prelates and their adherents, nay, and their master and supporter, with all his posterity, have split upon it. The bloody rebels in Ireland, who would endure no religion but their own, have split upon it; and we doubt not but the prince of those satanical spirits will in due time split upon it, and be brought to the ground

with his bloody inquisition. But as God is no respecter of persons, so he is no respecter of forms, but in what form soever the spirit of imposition appears, he would testify against it. If men, though otherwise good, will turn ceremony into substance, and make the kingdom of Christ consist in circumstances, in discipline and in forms; and if they carry their animosities to such a height, that if one says Sibboleth instead of Shibboleth, it shall be accounted ground enough to cut his throat: if they shall account such devils, or the seed of the serpent, that are not within such a circle or of such an opinion, in vain do they protest against the persecution of God's people, when they make the definition of God's people so narrow, that their persecution is as broad as any other, and usually more fierce, because edged with a sharp temper of spirit. Blessed therefore be God, who in mercy to us and them has placed the power in such hands as make it their business to preserve peace, and hinder men from biting and devouring one another.—It is good to hold forth a public profession of the truth, but not so as to exclude those that cannot come up to it in all points, from the privilege that belongs to them as Christians, much less from the privilege that belongs to them as men.”¹

His highness having now a more parliamentary title, it was thought proper that he should have a more solemn inauguration, which was accordingly appointed to be celebrated on June 26, in Westminster-hall, which was adorned and beautified for this purpose as for a coronation. At the upper end there was an ascent of two degrees covered with carpets, in the midst of which there was a rich canopy, and under it a chair of state. Before the canopy there was a table and chair for the speaker,² and on each side seats for the members of parliament, for the judges, for the lord-mayor and aldermen of London. The protector was conducted from the house of lords with all the state and grandeur of a king, and being seated under the canopy of state, the speaker of the parliament, the earl of Warwick, and commissioner White-locke, vested him with a purple velvet robe lined with ermine: they delivered into one of his hands a Bible richly gilt, and embossed with gold; and into the other a sceptre of massy gold; and, lastly, they girt him with a rich sword; after this they administered an oath to the protector, to govern according to law. The solemnity concluded with a short prayer pronounced by Dr. Manton; and then the herald having proclaimed his highness's titles, the people shouted with loud acclamations, “Long live the lord-protector,” &c., and the day concluded with feasting, and all other kinds of public rejoicing.

¹ Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 93.

² Dr. Grey gives at length the speech with which the speaker, lord Widdrington, addressed the protector.—ED.

The protector, having waded through all these difficulties to the supreme government of these nations, appeared on a sudden like a comet or blazing star,¹ raised up by Providence to exalt this nation to a distinguished pitch of glory, and to strike terror into the rest of Europe.² His management for the little time he survived was the admiration of all mankind; for though he would never suffer his title to the supreme government to be disputed, yet his greatest enemies have confessed, that in all other cases distributive justice was restored to its ancient splendour. The judges executed their duty according to equity, without partiality or bribery; the laws had their full and free course without impediment or delay; men's manners were wonderfully reformed, and the protector's court kept under an exact discipline. Trade flourished, and the arts of peace were cultivated throughout the whole nation; the public money was managed with frugality, and to the best advantage; the army and navy were well paid, and served accordingly.++ As the protector proceeded with great steadiness and resolution against the enemies of his government, he was no less generous and bountiful to those of all parties who submitted to it; for as he would not declare himself of any particular sect, he gave out, that "it was his only wish, that all would gather into one sheepfold, under one shepherd, Jesus Christ, and love one another." He respected the clergy in their places, but confined them to their spiritual function. Nor was he jealous of any who did not meddle in politics, and endeavour to raise disturbances in the state: even the prejudice he had against the episcopal party, says bishop Kennet, was more for their being royalists, than being of the church of England. But when one party of the clergy began to lift up their heads above their brethren, or to act out of their sphere, he always found means to take them down. He had a watchful eye over the royalists and republicans, who were always plotting against his person and government; but his erecting a house of lords, or upper house, so quickly after his instalment, roused the malecontents, and had like to have subverted his government in its infancy.

The protector was in high reputation abroad, and carried victory with his armies and navies wherever they appeared. There had been a negotiation with France concerning an alliance against Spain, begun at London, 1655, but not concluded till March 13, 1657, by which the protector obliged himself to join six thousand men with the French army, and to fur-

¹ Echard, p. 719. t Complete Hist. p. 223.

² Dr. Grey controverts the truth of this representation of the happy state of things under Cromwell's government: though Mr. Neal quotes Echard and Kennet, whose authority Dr. Grey does not attempt to invalidate. He refers principally to a speech of Cromwell, 25th January 1657, complaining that the army was unpaid, and that Ireland and Scotland were suffering by poverty. For a review of the administration of Cromwell, the reader is referred to Dr. Harris's *Life of Cromwell*, p. 412–475: and Mrs. Macaulay's *History of England*, vol. 5. 8vo. p. 194–203, who is by no means partial to the protector.—ED.

nish fifty men-of-war to conquer the maritime towns belonging to Spain in the Low Countries, on this condition, that Dunkirk and Mardyke should be put into his hands, and the family of the Stuarts depart the territories of France. That which determined him to join with France rather than Spain, was the numerous parties that were against him at home; for if the young king, assisted by France, should have made a descent upon England with an army of French Protestants, it might have been of fatal consequence to his infant government; whereas the Spaniards were at a distance, and having no Protestant subjects, were less to be feared. Upon the conclusion of this treaty, king Charles entered into an alliance with the Spaniards, who allowed him a small pension, and promised him the command of six thousand men, as soon as he was possessed of any seaport in England. In consequence of this treaty, most of the royalists enlisted in the Spanish service. But the protector's six thousand men in Flanders behaved with undaunted bravery, and took St. Venant, Mardyke, and some other places, from the Spaniards this summer.¹

Admiral Blake was no less successful at sea; for having received advice of the return of the Spanish West-India fleet, he sailed to the Canaries with twenty-five men-of-war, and on the 20th of April arrived at the Bay of Santa-Cruz, in the island of Teneriff, where the galleons, to the number of sixteen, richly laden, lay close under a strong castle, defended by seven forts mounted with cannon; the admiral, finding it impossible to make them prize, had the good fortune to burn and destroy them all, only with the loss of one ship, and one hundred and sixty men. When the news of this success arrived in England, a day of thanksgiving was appointed, and a rich present ordered the admiral upon his return: but this great sea-officer, having been three years at sea, died as he was entering Plymouth-sound, August 17, in the sixty-seventh year of his age.² He was of the ancient family of the Blakes, of Planchfield, Somersetshire, and was educated in Wadham-college, Oxford.³ He was small of stature, but the bravest and boldest sailor that England ever bred, and consulted the honour of his country beyond all his predecessors. When some of his men being ashore at Malaga refused to do honour to the host as it passed by, one of the priests raised the mob upon them. Upon which Blake sent a trumpet to the viceroy to demand the priest, who saying he had no authority to deliver him up, the admiral answered, that if he did not send him aboard in three hours he would burn the town about their ears: upon which he came, and begged pardon; the admiral, after a severe reprimand, told him, that if he had complained to him of his sailors he would have punished them, but he would have all the world

¹ Burnet, p. 73.

² Other accounts say in the fifty-ninth year of his age.—ED.

³ Echard, p. 725.

know, that an Englishman was only to be punished by an Englishman, and so dismissed him, being satisfied with having struck terror into the priest, and had him at his mercy. When Oliver read this passage of Blake's letter in council, he said, "he hoped to make the name of an Englishman as great as ever that of a Roman had been."¹ The admiral preserved an exact discipline in the fleet, and taught his men to despise castles on shore, as well as ships at sea.² Valour seldom missed its reward with him, nor cowardice its punishment. He had a noble public spirit; for after all his services for his country, and opportunities of acquiring immense riches from the Spaniards, he died not £500 richer than his father left him. His body was brought by water to Greenwich, and deposited, in a most magnificent manner, in a vault made on purpose in king Henry VII.'s chapel, at the public expense; but at the Restoration his body was taken out of the grave, and flung with others into a common pit;³ and his brother, being a dissenter, suffered so many hardships for religion, in king Charles II.'s reign, that he was obliged to sell the little estate the admiral left him, and transport himself and children to Carolina.

By the second article of the humble advice, which appoints all future parliaments to consist of two houses, the form of the present government began to change in favour of the ancient constitution. The protector, pursuant to the powers given him, made several promotions of knights and lords, and in the month of December issued out writs, by advice of his council, to divers lords and gentlemen, to sit as members of the other house,⁴ at the next session of parliament, January 20. His intention was to have this house considered as a house of peers, though he declined giving it that name till a more favourable conjuncture. Some declined the honour, and chose to sit in the lower house, but between fifty and sixty appeared, among whom were seven or eight of the ancient peers, divers knights and gentlemen of good families, and some few chief officers of the army. They met in the house of

¹ Burnet, vol. 1. p. 113. 114.

² It is remarkable, that Blake did not take the command of the fleet till he was above fifty years of age. "His want of experience (says Mr. Granger) seems to have been of great advantage to him; he followed the light of his own genius only, and was presently seen to have all the courage, the conduct, and precipitancy, of a good sea-officer."—ED.

³ Bishop Kennet, whom Dr. Grey quotes here, being ashamed, it is probable, of the base contempt with which the body of Blake was treated, says, "it was taken up and buried in the churchyard." But Wood plainly says, that his body, with others, by his majesty's express command sent to the dean of Westminster, was taken up and buried in a pit in St. Margaret's churchyard. The other bodies treated thus ignominiously were admiral Dean's, a brave man, who lost his life in the service of his country; colonel Humphrey Mackworth's; sir W. Constable's; colonel Boscawen's, a Cornish gentleman of a family distinguished by its constant attachment to liberty; and many others too long to be here mentioned. "Such (observes Dr. Harris) was the politeness and humanity introduced by the Restoration!" Life of Cromwell, p. 400. Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. 1. p. 285, 286.

⁴ Dr. Grey gives a catalogue of the names of the persons whom the writ summoned, with degrading anecdotes of some of them.—ED.

lords, whither his highness came at the time of their meeting, and, according to ancient custom, sent the usher of the black rod to bring up the commons, to whom he made a short speech from the throne, beginning with the usual form, "My lords, and you the knights, citizens, and burgesses, &c.," and then, as our kings used to do, he referred them to the lord-commissioner Fiennes, who tired them with a long and perplexed harangue before they entered upon business.

This hasty resolution of the protector and his council had like to have subverted the infant government, for many of the protector's best friends being called out of the lower house to the upper, the balance of power among the commons was changed; whereas, if he had deferred the settling of the upper house till the present parliament had been dissolved, they would have gone through their business without interruption; but the lower house was now in a flame, some being disappointed of their expectations, and others envied for their advancement, insomuch that as soon as they returned to their house, they called for the third article of the humble advice, which says, that no "members legally chosen shall be excluded from performing their duty, but by consent of the house of which they are members;" and then to strengthen their party, they ordered all those who had been excluded last sessions, because they would not recognise the new government, to return to their places; which was no sooner done, than they began to call in question the authority and jurisdiction of the other house, though themselves had advised it, and though there was almost as good reason for their being an upper, as for the other being a lower house; but these gentlemen were determined to erect an absolute commonwealth on the ruins of the present family. Many degrading speeches were made in the lower house against the persons who had been thus promoted, who were no less resolute in defending their honours and characters; so that there was no prospect of an agreement, till the protector himself appeared, and having sent for them to Whitehall, spoke with such an accent in favour of the other house, that they returned and acknowledged it; but then they went on to re-examine the validity of the whole instrument of government, as being made when many members were excluded. Upon which the protector, being out of all patience, went to the house and dissolved them, after they had sat about fifteen days.

The protector's speech upon this occasion will give the reader the best idea of the state of the nation: "I had comfortable expectations that God would make the meeting of this parliament a blessing for the improvement of mercy, truth, righteousness, and peace. I was drawn into this office of protector by your petition and advice: there is not a man living that can say I sought it; but after I was petitioned and advised to take the government upon me, I expected that the same men that made the frame, should make it

good to me.—I told you at a conference, that I would not accept the government, unless there might be some persons to interpose between me and the house of commons, and it was granted I should name another house, which I did, of men of your own rank and quality, who will shake hands with you while you love the interest of England and religion.—Again, I would not have accepted the government, unless mutual oaths were taken to make good what was agreed upon in the petition and advice; and, God knows, I took the oath upon the condition expressed, and thought we had now been upon a foundation and bottom, otherwise we must necessarily have been in confusion. I do not say what the meaning of the oath was to you, that were to go against my own principles, but God will judge between us; but if there had been any intention in you of a settlement, you would have settled on this basis.

“But there have been contrivances in the army against this settlement by your consent. I speak not this to the gentlemen or lords (pointing to his right hand), whatsoever you will call them, of the other house, but to you; you advised me to accept of this office, and now you dispute the thing that was taken for granted, and are in danger of running the nation back into more confusion within these fifteen days you have sat, than it has been in since the rising of the last session, from an immoderate design of restoring a commonwealth, that some people might be the men that might rule all, and they are endeavouring to engage the army in the design; which is hardly consistent with the oath you have taken to the present government. Has that man been true to the nation, whosoever he is, that has taken an oath, thus to prevaricate? These things are not according to truth, pretend what you will, but tend to play the king of Scots’ game, which I think myself bound before God to do what I can to prevent. There are preparations of force to invade us; the king of Scots has an army at the water-side, ready to be shipped for England. I have it from those who have been eye-witnesses of it; and while this is doing, there are endeavours of some not far from this place, to stir up the people of this town into tumulting, what if I had said rebellion? and I hope to make it appear to be no better, if God assist me. You have not only endeavoured to pervert the army while you have been sitting, but some of you have been listing persons

by commission from Charles Stuart to join with any insurrection that may be made; and what is like to be the end of this but blood and confusion! Now if this be the case, I think it high time to put an end to your sitting, and I do accordingly dissolve this parliament; and let God judge between me and you.”¹

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 598, folio.

The protector, being now convinced that the disturbances in parliament arose from the chief officers of the army, who clogged his affairs, in order to introduce a commonwealth government, resolved to clear his hands of them at once; Harrison and Ludlow were laid aside; Fleetwood was recalled from his government in Ireland; major-general Lambert was ordered to surrender his commission; and the rest were obliged to take an oath not to oppose the present government. By such methods he went on purging the army and navy; and if he had lived a little longer would have had none in power, but such as were thoroughly attached to his person and government. It was observed after this, that all things succeeded at home and abroad according to his wish; and that his power and greatness were better established than ever, though there were a few malecontents who were hardy enough to attempt some little disturbances; but the disasters that befel the protector's family soon after broke the firmness of his constitution, and hastened his end.

It was his highness's ambition, not only to set himself at the head, but to strengthen the whole body, of the Protestant interest, and unite its several members, so that it might maintain its ground against the church of Rome. Bishop Burnet¹ informs us, that he had projected a sort of general council, to be set up in opposition to the congregation *de Propaganda Fide* at Rome: it was to consist of seven councillors, and four secretaries for different provinces; the first was for France, Switzerland, and the Valleys; the second for the Palatinate, and other Calvinists; the third for Germany, for the North, and for Turkey; the fourth for the East and West Indies. The secretaries were to have £500 a year each, and to hold a correspondence everywhere, to acquaint themselves with the state of religion all over the world, that so all good designs for the welfare of the whole, and of the several parts, might by their means be protected and encouraged. They were to have a fund of £10,000 a year, and to be farther supplied as occasion should require. Chelsea-college was to be fitted up for them. This was a noble project, says the bishop, and must have been attended with extraordinary effects under the protection of a power, which was formidable and terrible to all nations to whom it was known.

About the beginning of this year, Dr. Bryan Walton, afterward bishop of Chester, published the *Biblia Polyglotta*, in six volumes in folio, wherein the sacred text is printed in the Vulgar Latin, Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, Chaldee, Samaritan, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Persic languages, each having its peculiar Latin translation, with an apparatus for the better understanding those tongues. This laborious performance, by the assistance of several who engaged in it, was completed in about four years, and was reckoned the most

¹ Burnet, vol. 1. p. 109, 12mo.

absolute edition of the Bible that the world had ever seen. Several learned persons, both Puritans and others, assisted in correcting the press, and in collating the copies. Many noblemen, and gentlemen of quality, contributed to the expense of printing this work, without which it could not have seen the light.¹ After the Restoration, the doctor presented king Charles II. with the six volumes, which his majesty received very graciously, and rewarded the author with the bishopric of Chester.

The learned Dr. Owen made some remarks on the prolegomena of this work; but after a high commendation of the performance in general, complains that he had weakened the certainty of the sacred text, (1.) By maintaining that the points or vowels of the Hebrew language were of novel invention. (2.) By producing a great number of various readings from the ancient copies of little moment. (3.) By his own critical remarks and amendments not supported by ancient authorities. The doctor maintains, on the other hand, the antiquity of the Hebrew points, and their absolute necessity to fix the determinate sense of Scripture; that the various readings are of little consequence, and that conjectural amendments ought not to be admitted without the authority of ancient copies. The doctor writes with great modesty, but the validity of his arguments must be submitted to the learned reader.

On the 3d of July the protector resigned his chancellorship of Oxford, and upon the 18th day of the same month, his eldest son Richard was chosen his successor, and installed² at Whitehall on the 29th. About six weeks after, the new chancellor dismissed Dr. Owen, who had been vice-chancellor of the university about five years, and appointed Dr. John Conant, rector of Exeter-college, to succeed him. This gentleman, says the Oxford historian,³ was a good Latinist and Grecian, a profound theologian, a learned, pious, and meek divine, and an excellent preacher. He had been one of the assembly of divines, and was elected rector of this college, upon the death of Dr. Hakewell, in June 1649. In the latter end of the year 1654, he became king's professor of divinity in the room of Dr. Hoyle. He continued in the vice-chancellorship two years with due commendation, keeping a severe discipline in his college, as did all the heads of colleges in these times. He was ejected out of everything in 1662 for nonconformity; but some time after, being persuaded to comply with the establishment, he became vicar of All-Saints in Northampton, archdeacon of Norwich, and

¹ "This (Mr. Granger says) was the first book published in England by subscription. The design of this great work was formed in 1645. Dr. Walton died 1661." History of England, vol. 3. p. 29, 8vo.—ED.

² The ceremonial of the instalment may be seen in Dr. Grey, vol. 3. p. 200, note.—ED.

³ Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 785.

prebendary of Worcester; which places he held till his death, which did not happen till 1693.

November 24, his highness signed a commission, appointing his younger son Henry to be lord-lieutenant of Ireland, with a power of conferring the honour of knighthood. Henry was a wise and discreet governor, and by his prudent behaviour kept the Irish in awe, and brought the nation into a flourishing condition. Upon the accession of Richard to the protectorship, he advised him to abide by the parliament, and have a watchful eye over the army, whom he suspected to be designing mischief (as appears by his letters now before me). Nay, he offered to come over to his assistance, but was forbid till it was too late. When Richard was deposed, his brother Henry laid down his charge, and came over to England, and lived privately upon an estate of his own of about £600 a year, at Spinny-abbey in Cambridgeshire, not far from Newmarket, till his death. While he was in Ireland he behaved with such a generous impartiality as gained him the esteem even of the royalists themselves; and after his retirement king Charles II. did him once the honour of a visit: he had a son Henry, who was bred to arms, and had a major's commission, and died in the service of the crown about the year 1711, and left behind him several children; some of the sons are yet living in good reputation in the city of London, and are the only male descendants of the protector Cromwell, the posterity of Richard being extinct.

The Royal Society, which has been the ornament of the English nation, by the vast improvement it has made in natural and experimental philosophy, was formed at Oxford in these times, which some have represented as covered with ignorance, barbarism, and pedantry; the words of bishop Sprat,¹ their historian, are these: "It was some space after the end of the civil wars at Oxford, in Dr. Wilkins's lodgings, in Wadham-college, which was then the place of resort for virtuous and learned men, that the first meetings were made which laid the foundation of all that followed. The university had, at that time, many members of its own, who had begun a free way of reasoning, and was also frequented by some gentlemen of philosophical minds, whom the misfortune of the kingdom, and the security and ease of a retirement among gownsmen, had drawn thither. The principal and most constant of them were, Dr. Seth Ward, Mr. Boyle, Dr. Wilkins, sir William Petty, Mr. Matthew Wren, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Goddard, Dr. Willis, Dr. Bathurst, Dr. Christopher Wren, and Mr. Rook, besides several others who joined them on occasions.—Their meetings were as frequent as their occasions would permit; their proceedings were upon some particular trials in chemistry or mechanics, which they communicated to each other.

¹ P. 53, 57.

They continued without any great interruption till the death of the protector, when their meetings were transferred to London." Here they began to enlarge their design, and formed the platform of a philosophical college, to inquire into the works of nature: they set up a correspondence with learned foreigners, and admitted such into their numbers without distinction of names or parties in religion; and were at length incorporated by the royal patent or charter, in the year 1663.

This year [1657] died Mr. John Langley, the noted master of St. Paul's school, London; he was born near Banbury in Oxfordshire, and became a commoner or brother of Magdalen-hall about 1612; was also prebendary of Gloucester, where he kept the college-school for twenty years. In the year 1640 he succeeded Dr. Gill, chief master of St. Paul's school, where he educated many who were afterward eminent in church and state. He was a universal scholar, an excellent linguist, grammarian, historian, cosmographer, a most judicious divine, and so great an antiquarian, says the Oxford historian, that his delight and acquaintance in antiquity deserve greater commendation than can be given in a few lines.¹ He was esteemed by learned men, and particularly by Mr. Selden; but was not regarded by the clergy, because he was a Puritan, and a witness against archbishop Laud at his trial. He was a member of the assembly of divines, and died at his house next adjoining to St. Paul's school September 13, 1657. Dr. Reynolds preached his funeral sermon, and gave him a very high encomium.²

Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick was born at Marlborough in the year 1600, and educated in Magdalen-college, Oxford, where he took the degrees in arts, and was afterward chaplain to sir Horatio Vere, with whom he travelled into the Low Countries. After his return he became reader of the sentences 1629, and was afterward chosen preacher to the inhabitants of St. Mildred, Breadstreet, London; but being driven from thence by the severity of the governors of the church, he retired to Coggeshall in Essex, where he continued till the breaking out of the civil wars. In 1643 he was chosen a member of the assembly of divines. In 1646 he became a preacher at St. Paul's, Covent garden: he often preached before the parliament, and was esteemed an orthodox, as well as an admired preacher.³ In the year 1653 he was ap-

¹ Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 135.

² Dr. Fuller calls him "the able and religious schoolmaster." He had a very awful presence and speech, that struck a mighty respect and fear in his scholars; yet his behaviour towards them was such, that they both loved and feared him. When he was buried, all the scholars attended his funeral, walking before the corpse, hung with verses instead of escutcheons, with white gloves, as he died a single man, from the school through Cheapside to Mercer's chapel; where he was buried. He was so much in favour with the worshipful company of Mercers, that they accepted his recommendation of his successor. Knight's Life of Dr. John Colet, p. 379, &c—ED.

³ Dr. Grey quotes passages from some of Mr. Sedgwick's sermons, to show that he was a preacher of treason, rebellion, and nonsense.—ED.

pointed one of the triers, and the year after, one of the commissioners, for ejecting scandalous ministers; but finding his health declining he resigned his preferments, and retired to his native town of Marlborough, where he died the beginning of January 1657.¹

Mr. Edward Corbet was born in Shropshire, and educated in Merton-college, Oxford, where he took the degrees in arts, and was made probationer fellow of his college.² In 1638 he was one of the proctors of the university; but being a Puritan divine, was denied the rectory of Chatham by archbishop Laud, then in the Tower; upon which an ordinance of parliament came out May 17, 1643, appointing him rector of Chatham. He was a member of the assembly of divines, a witness against the archbishop at his trial; one of the preachers appointed to reconcile the Oxford scholars to the parliament; and afterward one of the visitors, orator, and canon, of Christ-church, in the room of Dr. Hammond, which he soon after quitted, and became rector of Great-Hasely in Oxfordshire, where he continued to his death. He was a very considerable divine, a valuable preacher, and a person of remarkable integrity and steadiness of conscience.

Mr. James Cranford was born in Coventry, and some time master of the free-school there: he was educated in Baliol-college, Oxford, where he took the degrees in arts, and was at length rector of St. Christopher's-le-Stocks, near the Old Exchange, London.³ He was an exact linguist, well acquainted with the fathers and schoolmen, as well as with the modern divines; a zealous Presbyterian, and a laborious preacher. Mr. Fuller adds,⁴ that he was a subtle disputant, orthodox in judgment, and a person of great humility, charity, and moderation towards all men. In the beginning of the civil wars, he was appointed licenser of the press in London, which gave him an occasion to write several epistles before books, besides some treatises that he published of his own. He died April 27, 1657, aged about fifty-five years.

The protector's arms were no less successful this summer than they had been the last, for in the month of June, marshal Turenne, in conjunction with the English forces, laid siege to Dunkirk, then in possession of the Spaniards, which brought on an engagement between the two armies: the Spanish forces consisted of thirty thousand men, but major-general Morgan, who covered the siege, attacked the right wing of the Spanish army which came to relieve it with six thousand English, who routed the whole army, which was followed with the surrender of the town June 25. The French looked on, and said, they never saw a more glorious action in their

¹ Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 138.

² Ibid. p. 749.

³ Ibid. p. 133.

⁴ Fuller's Worthies, book 3. p. 128.

lives.¹ Cardinal Mazarine intended to keep this important place in French hands, contrary to the late treaty; of which his highness being informed, acquainted the ambassador; but his excellency denying any such intended breach of contract, the protector pulled out of his pocket a copy of the cardinal's private order, and desired him to let his eminence know, that if the keys of Dunkirk were not delivered to Lockhart within an hour after it was taken, he would come in person, and demand them at the gates of Paris;² and the cardinal had too great a dread of the name of Cromwell, to deny anything he required. By this conquest the protector gained immortal glory, because it gave the English a settlement on the continent, and made them masters of both sides of the channel.³ How basely it was sold by lord Clarendon to the French, will be seen hereafter.

The enthusiastic republicans, or fifth-monarchy men, having failed in their design in parliament, agreed, to the number of three hundred, to attempt a revolution of government by force, and having killed the protector, to proclaim King Jesus; but secretary Thurloe, who never spared expense to gain intelligence, had a spy among them, who discovered their intrigues, and seized their arms and ammunition in Shoreditch, with their standard, containing a lion couchant, alluding to the lion of the tribe of Judah, with this motto, Who will rouse him up? The chief of the conspirators, as Verner, Grey, Hopkins, &c., were imprisoned in the Gate-house till the protector's death, with their accomplices, major-general Harrison, colonel Rich, colonel Danvers, and others, after which they created new disturbances, which hastened their own destruction soon after the king's restoration.

But the most formidable conspiracy against the government was a new one of the cavaliers, with which the protector acquainted the lord-mayor

¹ Dr. Grey, though he allows that Mr. Neal had the authority of Echard for the merit which he imputes to the English forces in the siege of Dunkirk, yet contends that the French had their share in the glories of the day. And, to prove this, he gives a full detail of the action from the History of Vise. Turenne. Impartial Examination, vol. 3, p. 207. 213.—ED.

² Dr. Grey, while he grants that Cromwell was a vain man, very much questions the truth of what is said above; as it does not agree with what Whitelocke says concerning the surrender of Dunkirk. The story Mr. Neal relates is the same that we find in Welwood's Memoirs, p. 97, 6th edition. Dr. Harris treats it as all falsehood and invention; and as, authoritatively, confuted by Thurloe's State Papers, vol. 7. p. 173; where Lockhart, in his letter to Thurloe written the day before the surrender of Dunkirk, has these expressions: "Tomorrow before five of the clock at night, his highness's forces under my command will be possessed of Dunkirk. I have a great many disputes with the cardinal about several things;— nevertheless, I must say, I find him willing to hear reason; and though the generality of court and arms are even mad to see themselves part with what they call *vn si bon morceau*, or so delicate a bit, yet he is still constant to his promises, and seems to be as glad in the general (notwithstanding our differences in little particulars), to give this place to his highness, as I can be to receive it. The king is also exceeding obliging and civil, and hath more true worth in him than I could have imagined." Life of Cromwell, p. 402, 403.—ED.

³ Compl. Hist. p. 223. Echard, p. 730.

and common-council of the city in a speech, wherein he takes notice, that the marquis of Ormond had been privately in London three weeks, to promote the king's affairs, who lay ready on the coast with an army of eight thousand men, and twenty-two ships; that there was a design to seize the Tower; and that several ill-affected persons were endeavouring to put themselves in arms for that purpose; he therefore desired them to put the city into a posture of defence, professing a more passionate regard for their safety than his own. The citizens returned his highness thanks, and in an address promised to defend his person and government with their lives and fortunes. The like addresses came from several of the regiments at home, and from the English army in Flanders. This was the plot the protector mentioned in his speech to the parliament, and was discovered by one Stapley, whose father had been one of the king's judges. Immediately after the dissolution of the parliament, three of the conspirators were apprehended, and tried before a high court of justice, according to the late act for the security of his highness's person. Mr. Mordaunt, youngest son and brother of the earl of Peterborough, was acquitted by one vote; but the other two, sir Henry Slingsby and Dr. Hewet, were condemned. The doctor was indicted for holding correspondence with Charles Stuart, for publishing him to be king of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and for sending him money. He behaved with great boldness towards his judges, keeping his hat upon his head while the indictment was reading; but an officer being sent to take it off, he saved him the trouble. The doctor then refused to plead three times, disowning the jurisdiction of the court; but though they read the clause in the late act, by which they were empowered to be his judges, he continued mute; upon which one of the judges summed up the charge, and was going to pronounce sentence, when he offered to put himself upon his trial, but was told it was then too late, so judgment was given against him as a mute. The doctor had prepared a plea and demurrer to the jurisdiction and proceedings of the court, and exceptions to their judgment, drawn up in form by counsel, and ready to be engrossed, but was not suffered to have them argued. However, he had the favour of being beheaded on Tower-hill, June 8, 1658, being attended by Dr. Wild, Dr. Warmestry, and Dr. Barwick.¹ His funeral sermon was preached the Sunday following, by Mr. Nath. Hardy, at St. Dionis Backchurch, in Lime-street; and soon after, both the sermon and the doctor's intended defence were published, entitled, "Beheaded Dr. John Hewet's Ghost crying for Justice;" containing his legal plea, demurrer, and exceptions to the jurisdiction of the court, &c., drawn up by his counsel Mr. William Prynne. The doctor was a Cambridge divine, but lived at Oxford, and in the army, till the end of the war, when he came to London, and was

¹ Life of Barwick, p. 175.

permitted to preach in the church of St. Gregory's, London, though he was known to be a malignant. After his conviction, the lady Claypole and lady Falconbridge, the protector's daughters, interceded with their father for his life; but because he disputed the authority of the court, which struck at the very life of his government, the protector would not pardon him. He told Dr. Manton, one of his chaplains, that if Dr. Hewet had shown himself an ingenuous person, and would have owned what he knew was his share in the design against him, he would have spared his life; but he said he would not be trifled with, and the doctor was of so obstinate a temper that he was resolved he should die; and the protector convinced Dr. Manton before they parted, that he knew, without his confession, how far he was engaged in the plot. Three more of the conspirators were executed in other parts of the city, but the rest were pardoned.

A little before the protector's death, the Independents petitioned his highness for liberty to hold a synod, in order to publish to the world a uniform confession of their faith. They were now become a considerable body, their churches being increased both in city and country,¹ by the addition of great numbers of rich and substantial persons; but they were not agreed upon any standard of faith or discipline. The Presbyterians in the assembly of divines had urged them to this, and their brethren in New England had done

¹ The number of these churches was, proportionally, much greater in the two counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, than in most other parts of the kingdom. This was owing to the particular intercourse which those counties have with the city of Rotterdam and Holland, where the more rigid Puritans, who were driven out of England by the severities of the times, before the civil wars began, had taken refuge, and formed several congregational churches. On the return of the English exiles to England, at the commencement of those dissensions, they brought with them their sentiments on church-government, and formed churches on the Independent plan. Of these the most ancient was the church of Yarmouth, consisting of members resident in that town and at Norwich: and the Lord's supper was administered alternately at the two places. This, after a time, was found very troublesome, and by a majority of votes the seat of the church was fixed at Yarmouth. This new arrangement was attended with great inconvenience to those who lived at Norwich. They therefore, with the consent of the other part who resided at Yarmouth, formed a separate church, June 10, 1644. This consent was given with expressions of the most tender and endeared affection; as having been, many of them, "companions together in the patience of our Lord Jesus in their own and in a strange land, and having long enjoyed sweet communion together in divine ordinances." On these models other churches were settled through these counties. As at Denton in May or June of the year 1655. At Tunstead, North-Walsham, Wymondham, and Guestwick, in 1652. In the same year was laid the foundation of the congregational church of Beccles in Suffolk, by nine persons joining together in church-fellowship, and by July 29, 1653, their number was increased to forty. The church at Walpole was settled into fellowship in the year 1647. That of St. Edmund's Bury in 1648. That of Woodbridge, in 1651. That at Wottesfield, May 2, 1678. That of Wrentham was first gathered February 1, 1649, under Mr. John Philip, and one of its first members was Francis Brewster, esq. lord of the manor of Wrentham, who gave the church-plate which bears his arms; and some considerable legacies were left by him and different branches of his family. The hall was a place of refuge and concealment for the ministers or any of the people in time of persecution. Mr. Thompson's MS. Collections, under the words Norfolk and Suffolk.—ED.

it ten years ago; nor were the English Independents insensible of the defect; for hitherto, say they, there have “been no association of our churches, no meetings of our ministers to promote the common interest; our churches are like so many ships launched singly, and sailing apart and alone in the vast ocean of these tumultuous times, exposed to every wind of doctrine; under no other conduct than the word and Spirit, and their particular elders, and principal brethren, without associations among themselves, or so much as holding out a common light to others, whereby to know where they were.”¹ To remedy this, some of their divines and principal brethren in London met together, and proposed that there might be a correspondence among their churches in city and country for counsel and mutual edification; and forasmuch as all sects and parties of Christians had published a confession of their faith, they apprehended the world might reasonably expect it from them; for these reasons they petitioned the protector for liberty to assemble for this purpose. This was opposed by some of the court, as tending to establish a separation between them and the Presbyterians; nor was the protector himself fond of it; however, he gave way to their importunity; and, as Mr. Echard represents that matter, when he was moved upon his death-bed to discountenance their petition, he replied, “They must be satisfied, they must be satisfied, or we shall all run back into blood again.”

However, the protector did not live to see the fruits of this assembly, which was appointed to be held at the Savoy, October 12, 1658, where ministers and messengers from above one hundred congregational churches met together, of which the majority were laymen, the rest pastors in churches, and some younger divines about the court, as the reverend and learned Mr. John Howe, at that time chaplain to the young protector, and others.² They opened their synod with a day of fasting and prayer, and after some debate, whether they should adopt the doctrinal articles of the Westminster assembly for their own, with some amendments and additions, it was thought more advisable to draw up a new confession, but to keep as near as possible to the method and order of the other. A committee of the most eminent divines was chosen for this work, viz. Dr. Thomas Goodwin, Dr. Owen, Mr. Phil. Nye, Mr. William Bridge of Yarmouth, Mr. Jos. Caryl, and Mr. William Greenhill. While these were employed in preparing and putting together the articles of their confession, the synod heard complaints, and gave advice in several cases which were brought before them, relating to disputes or differences in their churches. The particular heads of doctrine agreed to by the committee, were presented to the synod every morning, and read by the reverend Mr. George Griffith their scribe. There were some

¹ Confess. Pref. p. 6.

² Calamy's Abridg. vol. 2. p. 444.

speeches and debates upon words and phrases, but at length all acquiesced, and the whole was soon after published in quarto, under the title of “A declaration of the faith and order owned and practised in the congregational churches in England, agreed upon and consented unto by their elders and messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658.” Next year it was translated into Latin by professor Hornbeck, and published at the end of his *Epistola ad Duræum de Independentissimo*. Some imputed their unanimity to the authority and influence of Dr. Owen, Mr. Nye, and the rest of the elder divines, over the younger; but they themselves, in their preface, “look upon it as a great and special work of the Holy Ghost, that so numerous a company of ministers, and other principal brethren, should so readily, speedily, and jointly, give up themselves to such a whole body of truths as is there collected.” They add farther, “that this agreement of theirs fell out without their having held any correspondence together, or prepared consultation, by which they might be advised of one another’s minds.” Which I confess is very extraordinary, considering the confession consists of thirty-three chapters, in which are almost two hundred distinct articles of faith and discipline; and that the whole time of the synod’s sessions or continuance, was not above eleven or twelve days.

The Savoy confession proceeds upon the plan of the Westminster assembly, which made the work very easy; and in most places retains their very words. They tell the world in their preface, that they fully consent to the Westminster confession for the substance of it, but have taken liberty to add a few things, in order to obviate some erroneous opinions that have been more boldly maintained of late than in former times. They have likewise varied the method in some places, and have here and there expressed themselves more clearly, as they found occasion. They have omitted all those chapters in the assembly’s confession which relate to discipline, as the thirtieth and thirty-first, with part of the twentieth and twenty-fourth, relating to the power of synods, councils, church-censures, marriage, and divorce, and the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. These (say they) were such doubtful assertions, and so unsuited to a confession of faith, that the English parliament would never ratify them, there being nothing that tends more to heighten dissensions among brethren, than to place these doubtful speculations under so high a title as a confession of faith. After the nineteenth chapter of the assembly’s confession, of the law, the Savoy divines have added an entire chapter, of the gospel, in which what is dispersed up and down the assembly’s confession is collected, and put together. Upon the whole, the difference between these two confessions, in points of doctrine, is so very small, that the modern Independents have in a manner laid aside the use of it in their families, and agreed with the Presbyterians in the use of the assembly’s catechism.

At the end of the Savoy confession there is a chapter of discipline, entitled, "Of the institution of churches, and the order appointed in them by Jesus Christ;" in which they assert,

"That every particular society of visible professors agreeing to walk together in the faith and order of the gospel is a complete church, and has full power within itself to elect and ordain all church-officers, to exclude all offenders, and to do all other acts relating to the edification and well-being of the church.

"That the way of ordaining officers, that is, pastors, teachers, or elders, is after their election, by the suffrage of the church, to set them apart with fasting and prayer, and imposition of the hands of the eldership of the church, though if there be no imposition of hands, they are nevertheless rightly constituted ministers of Christ; but they do not allow that ordination to the work of the ministry, though it be by persons rightly ordained, does convey any office-power, without a previous election of the church.

"That no persons may administer the sacrament but such as are ordained and appointed thereunto. Nor are the pastors of one church obliged to administer the sacraments to any other than to the members of that church to whom they stand related in that capacity. Nor may any person be added to the church, as a private member, but¹ by the consent of the church, after a confession of his faith, declared by himself, or otherwise manifested.

"They disallow the power of all stated synods, presbyteries, convocations, and assemblies of divines, over particular churches; but admit, that in cases of difficulty, or difference relating to doctrine or order, churches may meet together by their messengers in synods or councils, to consider and give advice, but without exercising any jurisdiction.

"And lastly, they agree, that churches, consisting of persons sound in the faith and of good conversation, ought not to refuse communion with each other, though they walk not in all things according to the same rule of church-order; and if they judge other churches to be true churches, though less pure, they may receive to occasional communion such members of

¹ It was also a practice of the Independents, at the first formation of their churches, to sign an agreement, or covenant, which they entered on their churchbooks. This, sometimes, ran out into various articles, expressive of their devotedness to the service of God, their trust in Christ, their determination to study the Scriptures, and to form their faith and worship by them, of their mutual engagement to keep the Christian ordinances, to watch over one another in the Lord, to bear one another's burdens, and to preserve union and love, and of their resolutions to persevere in a course of faith and holiness. Of these forms of agreement, one of the most simple is that which was adopted by the church at Wottesfield in Suffolk. It was in these words: "We do covenant or agree in the presence of God, through the assistance of his Holy Spirit, to Walk together in all the ordinances of the Lord Jesus, as far as the same are made clear unto us, endeavouring the advancement of the glory of our Father, the subjection of our will to the will of our Redeemer, and the mutual edification of each other in his most holy faith and fear." Mr. Thompson's MS. Collections, under the name Wottesfield.—ED.

those churches as are credibly testified to be godly, and to live without offence.

“These opinions (say they) may appear new to a great many people, because they have not been openly and publicly professed in the English nation, but we are able to trace the footsteps of an Independent congregational way in the ancientest practice of the church, and in the writings of the soundest Protestant divines.” They add, “that their principles do not in the least interfere with the authority of the civil magistrate, nor do they concern themselves upon any occasions with him, any farther than to implore his protection, for the preservation of the peace and liberty of their churches.” They glory in this, that ever since they appeared in the world, they have distinguished themselves in the cause of Christian liberty. “We have always, say they, maintained this principle, that among all Christian states and churches, there ought to be a forbearance and mutual indulgence to Christians of all persuasions, that keep to and hold fast the necessary foundations of faith and holiness. This principle we have maintained for the sake of others, when we ourselves had no need of it.” They conclude with thankfulness to their present governors, for permitting those who could not comply with the Presbyterian establishment to enjoy the liberty of their consciences, and equal encouragement and protection with others; and that this liberty is established by law, as long as they disturb not the public peace. This should engage us (say they) to promote the honour and prosperity of such a government, to be peaceably disposed one towards another, and to love as brethren; forasmuch as the differences between Presbyterians and Independents are differences between fellow servants, neither of them having authority, from God or man, to impose their opinions upon one another.

Mr. Baxter, in the main a very peaceable and candid divine, loses all temper when he speaks of this assembly; he finds fault with their definition of justification, and makes these remarks: “They thought it not enough expressly to contradict St. James, and to say unlimitedly, that we are justified by the righteousness of Christ only, and not by any works, but they contradicted St. Paul also, who says, that ‘faith is imputed for righteousness;’ and not only so, but they asserted, that we have no other righteousness but that of Christ. A doctrine abhorred by all the reformed and Christian churches, and which (says he) would be an utter shame of the Protestant name, if what such men held and did were imputable to sober Protestants.” But is it possible that Mr. Baxter could believe, that the Savoy divines denied the necessity of sanctification, or personal holiness? when they have a whole chapter in their Confession upon sanctification, another upon repentance and good works, and a third upon the moral law, which they declare does for ever bind all men to obedience, both justified and unjustified. When Mr.

Baxter asked some honest men who joined them, whether they subscribed the confession? they said no; he then inquired, why they did not contradict this? To which they answered, because the meaning was, that they had no other righteousness but that of Christ to be justified by; which is certainly the doctrine of the Westminster assembly. What does Mr. Baxter reply to this? Why nothing, but adds, very uncharitably, “that the Independent confessions are like such oaths as speak one thing and mean another; so much could two men [Dr. Owen and Goodwin] do with many honest tractable young men, who had more zeal for separating strictness than judgment to understand the word of God, the interest of the churches and of themselves.”¹ And yet there were in that assembly many divines of as great age and learning as himself; their design was not to undervalue the Westminster confession, but rather to answer the desires of that assembly, by publishing to the world such a declaration of their faith and discipline as they had demanded. And the confession was so far from raising any new divisions, that Mr. Philip Henry observes, upon the death of Cromwell, that there was a great change in the tempers of good people throughout the nation, and a mighty tendency to peace and unity, as if they were by consent weary of their long clashings. However, the Independents lost their best friend in the protector, who was not only their patron upon the principle of liberty, but a balance to the Presbyterian pretences to ecclesiastical power.

The hierarchy of the church of England was now at a very low ebb, and in danger of being lost beyond recovery; for if the bishops, who were now very ancient, had all died off, before others had been consecrated, the line of succession must have failed; for the church of Rome was so far from supporting it, that they published a treatise this year, *Of the Nature of the Catholic Faith, and of Heresy*; in which they endeavour to invalidate the English ordinations, and revived the story of the Nag’s-head club; for the truth of which they appealed to Dr. Moreton, the ancient bishop of Durham, who in a solemn speech made in full parliament (say they) declared in express words, that our first bishops after the Reformation had been consecrated in a tavern; and that this was so far from being doubted, that it was a fact most notorious to all the world; adding, that the rest of the bishops present rather approved than in the least opposed what he had said. The bishop, then in the ninety-fourth year of his age, being advised of this calumny, sent for a public notary from London, and in the presence of proper witnesses, made a solemn protestation of the falsehood of this story, and signed it in due form July 17, 1658. He then sent his chaplain Dr. Barwick² to all the lords spiritual and temporal then alive, who had sat in that parlia-

¹ Life, p. 104.

² Ibid. p. 40.

ment, desiring that if they believed him undeservedly aspersed, they would attest it by subscribing their names; which was done by six bishops, and fourteen temporal lords, and by the several clerks and registrars of the house. The bishop died soon after, but his protestation, with the proofs, was afterward published by Dr. Bramhal, bishop of Derry, in a treatise entitled, "The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops Justified; the Bishop of Duresme Vindicated; and the Fable of the Ordination of the Nag's-head Club Clearly Confuted." This awakened the clergy to enter upon measures for the continuance of a succession of bishops, though they could not be regularly chosen, lest the validity of the episcopal ministry should cease; which will come under consideration in the transactions of the next year.

Lord Clarendon mentions an address of the Anabaptists to the king, who, being disappointed in their expectations of a commonwealth, threw themselves at his majesty's feet, offering their assistance to pull down the present government. In their address they say, "they took up arms in the late war for liberty and reformation, but assure his majesty that they were so far from entertaining any thoughts of casting off their allegiance, or extirpating the royal family, that they had not the least intent to abridge him of his just prerogatives, but only the restraining those excesses of government, which were nothing but the excrescences of a wanton power, and were rather a burden than an ornament to the royal diadem." They then go on to declaim against the protector, calling him that grand impostor, that loathsome hypocrite, that detestable traitor, the prodigy of nature, the opprobrium of mankind, a landskip of iniquity, a sink of sin, a compendium of baseness. And then, begging pardon for their former offences, they promise to sacrifice their lives and fortunes for his majesty's restoration, provided his majesty would be so gracious as to restore the remains of the long-parliament; to ratify the treaty of the Isle of Wight; to establish liberty of conscience; to take away tithes, and provide some other maintenance for the national clergy; and to pass an act of oblivion, for all who had been in arms against his father and himself, except those who should adhere to that ungodly tyrant who calls himself protector. His lordship adds, that the messenger that brought these propositions, asking the sum of £2,000 to carry on the project, his majesty dismissed him with civil expressions, telling him, he had no designs to trouble any man for his opinion. However, if there had been such an address from the body of the Anabaptists, it is a little strange that after the Restoration it was not remembered to their advantage. But his lordship seems to have had no great acquaintance with these men, when he says, they always pretended a just esteem and value for all men who faithfully adhered to the king; whereas they were of all sects the most zealous for a commonwealth, and were enemies to the protector for no other reason

but because he was for government by a single person. In truth, this whole affair seems no more than an artifice to get a little money out of the poor king's purse.¹

The protector's health was now declining, through his advanced age and excessive toils and fatigues. The restless spirits of the royalists and republicans put him upon his guard, insomuch that he usually wore under his clothes a piece of armour, or a coat of mail. The loss of his beloved daughter Claypole, who died this summer, had also a very sensible influence on his health. About the middle of August he was seized with a slow fever, which turned to a tertian ague; but the distemper appeared so favourable for a while, that he walked abroad in the gardens at Hampton-court. Ludlow says, the protector had a humour in his leg, which he desired the physicians to disperse, by which means it was thrown into his blood: at length his pulse began to inter-mit, and he was advised to keep his bed; and his ague fits growing stronger, it was thought proper to remove him to Whitehall, where he began to be light-headed; upon which his physicians declared his life in danger, and the council being summoned to desire him to nominate his successor, he appointed his eldest son Richard. In the intervals of his fits, he behaved with great devotion and piety, but manifested no remorse for his public actions; he declared in general, that he designed the good of the nation, and to preserve it from anarchy and a new war. He once asked Dr. Goodwin, who attended at his bed-side, and is said to have expressed an unbecoming assurance² to Almighty God in prayer of his recovery, whether a man could fall from grace? which the doctor answering in the negative, the protector replied, "Then I am safe, for I am sure I was once in a state of grace."³ About twelve hours before he died he lay very quiet, when major Butler being in his chamber, says he heard him make his last prayer to this purpose: "Lord, I am a poor foolish creature; this people would fain have me live; they think it best for them, and that it will redound much to thy glory, and all the stir is about this. Others would fain have me die; Lord, pardon them, and pardon thy foolish people, forgive their sins,

¹ Notwithstanding the suspicions which rest upon this affair, Crosby has seen fit to preserve the address, propositions, and letter, in the Appendix to his first volume, no. 5.—ED.

² The language of Dr. Goodwin was thus extravagant: "Lord, we beg not for his recovery; for that thou hast already granted and assured us of; but for his speedy recovery." And when news was brought of his death, Mr. Peter Sterry stood up, and desired them not to be troubled. "For (said he) this is good news: because if he was of great use to the people of God when he was amongst us, now he will be much more so, being ascended to heaven to sit at the right hand of Jesus Christ, there to intercede for us, and to be mindful of us on all occasions." Ludlow's *Memoirs*, 4to. p. 258, 259. Dr. Grey does not fail to notice these strange flights. And Sewel the historian's reflection on this last instance of the flattery, or frenzy, of these courtiers, was just. "O horrid flattery! Thus I call it, though he had been the greatest saint on earth; which he came much short of, though he was once endued with some eminent virtues." *History of the Quakers*, p. 189. —ED.

³ Baxter's *Life*, p. 98.

and do not forsake them, but love and bless, and give them rest, and bring them to a consistency, and give them rest, for Jesus Christ's sake, to whom, with thee and thy Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory, now and for ever, Amen." The protector died, September 3, 1658, about three in the afternoon, the day on which he had triumphed in the battles of Marston-Moor,¹ Dunbar, and Worcester, when he had lived fifty-nine years, four months, and eight days: four years and eight months after he had been declared protector by the instrument of government; and one year and three months after his confirmation by the humble petition and advice. As he had lived most part of his life in a storm, his death was attended with one of the greatest hurricanes that had been known for many years.² Some have said, that next night after his death, his body was wrapped up in lead, and buried in Naseby-field, according to his desire. Others, more probably, that it was deposited privately in a vault in king Henry VII.'s chapel, some time before the public funeral, which was performed November 23, with all imaginable grandeur and military pomp,³ from Somerset-house, where he had lain in state, to the Abbeychurch in Westminster, where a fine mausoleum was erected for him, on which his effigy was placed, and exhibited to the view of all spectators for a time; but after the king's restoration, his coffin was taken out of the vault, and drawn upon a sledge to Tyburn, where he was hanged up till sunset, and then buried under the gallows.

Thus died the mighty Oliver Cromwell, the greatest soldier and statesman of his age, after he had undergone excessive fatigues and labours in a long course of warlike actions, and escaped innumerable dangers from the plots and conspiracies of domestic enemies. Few historians have spoken of him with temper, though no other genius, it may be, could have held the reins, or steered the commonwealth, through so many storms and hurri-

¹ This, as Dr. Grey notices, is an error; the battle of Marston-Moor was fought on the 2nd July, 1644—ED.

² Dr. Grey tells us also, that on the day his coffin was taken up and hung at Tyburn, almost as remarkable a storm rose in the northern parts of the kingdom. Superstition and a hatred of Cromwell construed these circumstances as appearances of nature or the God of nature, by physical phenomena, expressing an abhorrence of his character. But sound philosophy sees nothing but a singular coincidence of events, happening together, but without any correspondence in their causes: and will reflect, how many storms disturb the elements, when no wicked tyrant dies in the political world!—ED.

³ The expenses of Cromwell's funeral amounted to £60,000. The body was laid in a more private apartment, till the 1st of November; in imitation of the solemnities used upon the like occasion for Philip II. king of Spain, who was thus represented to be in purgatory for two months. It was then removed into the great hall of Somerset-house; the part where the bed stood was railed in, and the rails and ground within covered with crimson velvet. Four or five hundred candles set in flat shining candlesticks were so placed round near the roof of the hall, that the light they gave seemed like the rays of the sun: by all which he was represented to be in a state of glory. This folly and profusion so far provoked the people, that they threw dirt, in the night, on his escutcheon, placed over the great gate. Ludlow's Memoirs, Ito. p. 260.—ED.

canes, as the factions of these times had raised in the nation. He was born at Huntingdon, April 25, 1599, and descended of the family of Williams, of Glamorgan in Wales, which assumed the name of Cromwell by marrying with a daughter of Cromwell earl of Essex, in the reign of king Henry VIII. The seat of the eldest branch of the family was called Hinchinbrook, now belonging to the earl of Sandwich, who were reputed to possess an estate of £30,000 a year. Oliver, who was descended of a younger branch, was educated in Cambridge, and from thence became a student of Lincoln's-Inn, being a wild and extravagant youth till about the thirty-fifth year of his age, when he quitted his irregular life, and became remarkably sober. In the year 1640, he was chosen representative in parliament for the town of Cambridge, and sat two years undistinguished in the house, as a mere country gentleman, appearing, says sir Philip Warwick, in a plain cloth suit of clothes made by a country tailor, his linen not very clean, his band unfashionable, his hat without a hatband, and his sword close by his side; his countenance was swollen and reddish, his voice hoarse and untunable, but his elocution was full of fervour and warmth, and he was well heard in the house. His person somewhat exceeded the middle stature,¹ but was well proportioned, compact, and strong. He had a masculine countenance, a sparkling eye, a manly stern look, a vigorous constitution, and was an enemy to ease and excess; the motto upon his coat of arms was, *Pax queritur bello*.

Upon the breaking out of the civil war he took arms for the parliament, and though he was forty-three years of age before he drew a sword, he soon became colonel of a regiment of chosen men, who declared they fought not for gain, but for the cause of religion and liberty. He always went to prayer before battle, and returned solemn thanks for his success afterward. He was careful to promote an exact discipline in the army, and would not have pardoned his own brother, says my author,² if he had found him plundering the country people. The army had not an officer who faced danger with greater

¹ Sir John Resesby calls Cromwell "one of the greatest and bravest men, had his cause been good, the world ever saw. His figure did not come up to his character; he was indeed a likely person, but not handsome, nor had he a very bold look with him. He was plain in his apparel, and rather negligent than not.. Tears he had at will, and was, doubtless, the greatest dissembler on earth." *Memoirs*, p. 2. Since Mr. Neal wrote, various historians have reviewed the actions and character of Cromwell. Amongst whom the faithful and judicious Dr. Harris deserves particular mention. The candid and copious account of this extraordinary man in the first edition of the *Biographia Britannica*, has been enriched with new and curious matter by the learned and accurate pen which has conducted the second edition. The history of the Cromwell family has been accurately investigated by Mr. Noble, in his *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell*; not to mention other writers, who have elucidated this subject. To other particulars, with which Dr. Kippis has improved the article Cromwell, in the *Biogr. Britan*, is added an ample exhibition of the characters of him, drawn by foreigners and natives—ED.

² Carrington's *Life of Cromwell*, p. 213. Welwood's *.Mem.* p. 104.

intrepidity, or more eagerly sought occasions to distinguish his personal valour. He had a great presence of mind in the heat of action, and taught his soldiers to fight in a more desperate manner than usual, not allowing them to discharge their muskets till they were so near the enemy as to be sure of doing execution. His reputation rose so fast, that he quickly became a major-general, then lieutenant-general, under Fairfax, and at last supplanted him. His troops believed themselves invincible under his conduct; he never lost a battle where he had the chief command. The victory of Marston-Moor was chiefly ascribed to his valour. The reduction of Ireland in less than a year made him the terror of his enemies; and the battles of Dunbar and Worcester completed his martial glory.

How far his usurping the protectorship of the three nations, without the previous consent of a free parliament, was the result of ambition or necessity, has been considered already; but if we view him as a statesman, he was an able politician, a steady resolute governor; and though he had more numerous and powerful enemies than any man of the age, he was never intimidated, having a peculiar art of keeping men quiet, and giving them by turns hopes of his favour. He had a wonderful knowledge of mankind, and an inimitable sagacity and penetration. If there was a man in England who excelled in any faculty or science, he would find him out, and reward him according to his merit. In nothing was his good understanding better discovered, says bishop Burnet, than in seeking out able and worthy men for all employments, which gave a general satisfaction. By these methods, in the space of four or five years, he carried the reputation and glory of the English nation as high as it was capable of being raised. He was equally dreaded by France, Spain, and the United Provinces, who condescended to servile compliances to obtain his friendship; Charles Gustavus, king of Sweden, thought himself honoured by his alliance; and cardinal Mazarine said, that nothing but the king of France's having the small-pox could have hindered him from coming over to England, that he might have the honour of waiting on one of the greatest men.

The protector had an uncommon command of his passions, and knew how to behave in character upon all occasions, though in private life he would be jocose and merry with his inferiors; yet no prince was more jealous of his dignity on public occasions. His ambassadors in foreign courts had all the respects paid them that our kings ever had. All Europe trembled at his name! And though he could converse with no foreigners but in broken Latin, yet no man ever had better intelligence, nor understood the views and interests of the several courts of Europe better than himself. He had spies at Madrid and Paris, and was so happy as to fix upon persons who never failed him. Mr. Algernon Sydney, who was not inclined to think or speak well of kings, commended him to bishop Burnet, as one who had just

notions of public liberty; and though he made some severe and cruel laws against the episcopal clergy, it was not for their religion, but because they were open and declared enemies to his person and government.

The protector was a Protestant, but affected to go under no denomination or party: he had chaplains of all persuasions; and though he was by principle an Independent, he esteemed all reformed churches as part of the catholic church; and without aiming to establish any tenets by force or violence, he witnessed, on all occasions, an extreme zeal for the Protestant religion, and a just regard for liberty of conscience.

As to his moral character, his greatest enemies have not charged him with any public vices. Dr. Welwood admits that he was not addicted to swearing, gluttony, drunkenness, gaming, avarice, or the love of women, but kept close to his marriage-bed. Nor is he chargeable with covetousness, for it has been computed, says the writer of his life,¹ that he distributed £40,000 a year out of his privy purse to charitable uses.² He promoted virtuous men, and was inflexible in his punishment of ill actions. His court was regulated according to a most strict discipline, says Mr. Echard, where every vice was banished or severely punished. He maintained a constant appearance of piety, and was regular in his private and public devotions: he retired constantly every day to read the Scriptures and prayer; and some who watched him narrowly have reported, that after he had read and expounded a chapter, he prostrated himself with his face on the ground, and with tears poured out his soul to God for a quarter of an hour. He was a strict observer of the sabbath, and an encourager of goodness and austerity of life.³ Mr. Baxter admits, that “he kept as much honesty and godliness as his cause and interest would allow: that he had a zeal for religion, meant honestly in the main, and was pious in the main course of his life,⁴ till prosperity corrupted him.”

¹ Carrington, p. 248.

² An observation of Dr. Gibbons, as just in itself and doing honour to Cromwell, deserves to be mentioned here. It is this: “that it does not appear that in the height of his power he ever diverted any part of the national property to the private emolument of himself or family, as he left them possessed of the small estates only which he enjoyed before he arrived to the protectorate.” Funeral Sermon for William Cromwell, p. 48.—ED.

³ To this must be ascribed his prohibition of all theatrical exhibitions. There was, indeed, a remarkable exception, in his permitting, from hatred to the Spaniards, the representation of a performance entitled, “The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru.” Roscius Anglicanus, p. 29, in the Literary Museum, 8vo. printed in 1792.—ED.

⁴ That his religious character was not originally assumed, however it might afterward be abused, to carry political views, and was prior to his dignity and power, it has been observed, is evinced from his letters written long before that period, and from what Milton says of him; “that being arrived to manly and mature age, which he spent as a private person, and noted for nothing more than the cultivation of pure religion and integrity of life, he was grown wealthy in retirement at home.” Gibbons’s Funeral Sermon for William Cromwell, p. 47, 48.—ED.

But with all these good qualities it is certain, the protector was a strong enthusiast, and did not take up his religion upon rational or solid principles, which led him into sundry mistakes, not supported by reason or Scripture. One of his favourite principles was, a particular faith; that is, if anything was strongly impressed upon his mind in prayer, he apprehended it came immediately from God, and was a rule of action; but if there were no impressions, but a flatness in his devotions, it was a denial.

Upon this maxim he is said to have suffered the late king to be put to death, in an arbitrary and illegal manner.—Another maxim was, that “in extraordinary cases something extraordinary, or beyond the common rules of justice, may be done; that the moral laws, which are binding in ordinary cases, may then be dispensed with; and that private justice must give way to public necessity.” Which was the protector’s governing principle in all his unwarrantable stretches of power. A third principle by which the protector was misled, was, his determining the goodness of a cause by its success. An appeal to the sword was with him an appeal to God; and as victory inclined, God owned or discountenanced the cause.—It is impossible that a man’s conduct could be just or consistent, while it was directed by such mistaken principles.

It has been farther objected to the protector’s character, that he was notoriously guilty of hypocrisy and dissimulation both to God and man! that he mocked God by the pretence of piety and devotion, and by long prayers full of hypocritical zeal. But who can penetrate the heart, to see whether the outward actions flow from an inward principle? With regard to men, it is certain the protector knew how to address their passions, and talk to them in their own way; and if in his devotions he uttered with his mouth what his heart never meant, no one can vindicate him: but men are not slightly to be arraigned, says Rapin, for the inward motions of their heart, which pass all human knowledge. Besides, it is not easy to conceive the watchful eyes that were upon him, and the vast difficulties he had to contend with. Queen Elizabeth’s dissimulation has been extolled, for the very same reason that the protector’s is condemned: if therefore such a conduct was necessary to govern the several parties, there is nothing greatly blameworthy in it, says the same author, unless it was a crime in him not to put it into the power of his enemies to destroy him with the greater ease.

Ambition and thirst of glory might sometimes lead the protector aside, for he imagined himself to be a second Phineas, raised up by Providence to be the scourge of idolatry and superstition; and in climbing up to the pinnacle of supreme power, he did not always keep within the bounds of law and equity: to this passion some have ascribed his assuming the protectorship, and putting himself at the head of three kingdoms; though others are of opinion, it was owing to hard necessity and self-preservation. I will not

venture to decide in this case; possibly there might be a mixture of both. When he was in possession of the sovereign power, no man ever used it to greater public advantage, for he had a due veneration for the laws of his country, in all things wherein the life of his jurisdiction was not concerned: and though he kept a standing army, they were under an exact discipline, and very little burden to the people.

The charge of cruelty, which is brought against him, for having put some men to death for conspiring against his person and government, deserves no confutation, unless they would have had him sit still, till some conspiracy or other had succeeded. Cruelty was not in his nature;¹ he was not for unnecessary effusion of blood. Lord Clarendon assures us, that when a general massacre of the royalists was proposed by the officers in council, he warmly opposed and prevented it.

Dr. Welwood² compares the protector to an unusual meteor, which with its surprising influences overawed not only three kingdoms, but the most powerful princes and states about us. A great man he was, says he, and posterity might have paid a just homage to his memory, if he had not imbrued his hands in the blood of his prince, and trampled upon the liberties of his country.

Upon the whole, it is not to be wondered, that the character of this great man has been transmitted down to posterity with some disadvantage, by the several factions of Royalists, Presbyterians, and Republicans, because each were disappointed, and enraged to see the supreme power wrested from them: but his management is a convincing proof of his great abilities: he was at the helm in the most stormy and tempestuous season that England ever saw; but by his consummate wisdom and valour, he disconcerted the measures and designs of his enemies, and preserved both himself and the commonwealth from shipwreck. I shall only observe farther, with Rapin, that the confusions which prevailed in England after the death of Cromwell, clearly evidence the necessity of this usurpation, at least till the constitution could be restored. After his death his great achievements were celebrated in verse, by the greatest wits of the age, as Dr. Sprat, afterward bishop of Rochester, Waller, Dryden, and others, who in their panegyrics outdid everything which till that time had been written in the English language.

¹ Such was the sensibility of his spirit, that if an account were given him of a distressed case, the narration would draw tears from his eyes. It speaks strongly in favour of his temper and his domestic deportment, that the daughter of sir Francis Russel, married to his second son Henry, who before her marriage had entertained an ill opinion of his father Oliver, upon her coming into the family felt all her prejudice removed, and changed into a most affectionate esteem for her father-in-law, as the most amiable of parents. Gibbons's Funeral Sermon for William Cromwell, esq. p. 46.—Ed.

² P. 102.

Four divines of the assembly died this year; Dr. John Harris, son of Richard Harris of Buckinghamshire, born in the parsonage-house of Hardwick in the same county, educated in Wickhamschool near Winchester, and in the year 1606 admitted perpetual fellow of New-college. He was so admirable a Grecian, and eloquent a preacher, that sir Henry Saville called him a second St. Chrysostom. In 1619 he was chosen Greek professor of the university. He was afterward prebendary of Winchester, rector of Meonstoke in Hampshire, and in the year 1630, warden of Wickham-college near Winchester; in all which places he behaved with great reputation. In the beginning of the civil wars he took part with the parliament, was chosen one of the assembly of divines, took the covenant, and other oaths, and kept his wardenship till his death; he published several learned works, and died at Winchester, August 11, 1658, aged seventy years.

Mr. Sydrach Sympson, a meek and quiet divine of the Independent persuasion, was educated in Cambridge, but forced to fly his country for non-conformity in the times of archbishop Laud. He was one of the dissenting brethren in the assembly, and behaved with great temper and moderation. Bishop Rennet says, he was silenced for some time from preaching, because he differed in judgment from the assembly in points of church-discipline, but was restored to his liberty October 28, 1646. He afterward gathered a congregation in London, after the manner of the Independents, which met in Ab-church near Cannon-street. Upon the resignation of Mr. Vines in the year 1650, for refusing the engagement, he was by the visitors made master of Pembroke-hall, Cambridge. He was a divine of considerable learning, and of great piety and devotion. In his last sickness he was under some darkness, and melancholy apprehensions; upon which account some of his friends and brethren assembled in his own house to assist him with their prayers; and in the evening, when they took their leave, he thanked them, and said, he was now satisfied in his soul; and lifting up his hands towards heaven said, "He is come, he is come." And that night died.

Dr. Robert Harris was born at Broad-Camden in Gloucestershire, 1578, and educated in Magdalen-college, Oxon. He preached for some time about Oxford, and settled afterward at Hanwell, in the place of famous Mr. Dodd, then suspended for nonconformity; here he continued till the breaking out of the civil wars, when by the king's soldiers he was driven to London. He was appointed one of the assembly of divines, and minister of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate. In the year 1646, he was one of the six preachers to the university of Oxford, and next year one of their visitors, when he was created D. D. and made president of Trinity-college, and rector of Garlington near Oxford, which is always annexed to it. Here he continued till his death, governing his college with a paternal affection, being revered by the students as a father. The inscription over his grave gives him a great char-

acter; but the royalists charge him, and I believe justly, with being a notorious pluralist.¹ He died December 11, 1658, in the eightieth year of his age.²

Mr. William Carter was educated in Cambridge, and afterward a very popular preacher in London. He was a good scholar, of great seriousness, and though a young man, appointed one of the assembly of divines. After some time he joined the Independents, and became one of the dissenting brethren in the assembly. He had offers of many livings but refused them, being dissatisfied with the parochial discipline of those times; nevertheless, he was indefatigable in his ministry, preaching twice every Lord's day to two large congregations in the city, besides lectures on the week days: this wasted his strength, and put an end to his life about Midsummer 1658, in the fifty-third year of his age. His family were afterward great sufferers by the purchase of bishops' lands.

END OF VOL II.

¹ Against this charge, if the truth of it should be admitted, ought to be set his charity; which, we are told, exceeded the ordinary proportion of his revenues. —ED.

² Clarke's Lives, in his Martyrology, p. 314–339.