

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. III.

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 V.

FROM THE RESTORATION OF KING CHARLES II. TO THE CONFERENCE AT THE SAVOY. 1660.

BEFORE we relate the conference between the Episcopal and Presbyterian divines, in order to a comprehension it will be proper to represent the views of the court, and of the bishops, who had promised to act with temper, and to bury all past offences under the foundation of the Restoration. The point in debate was, "Whether concessions should be made, and pains taken, to gain the Presbyterians?" The king seemed to be for it; but the court-bishops, with lord Clarendon at their head, were absolutely against it: Clarendon was a man of high and arbitrary principles, and gave himself up to the bishops, for the service they had done him in reconciling the king to his daughter's clandestine marriage with the duke of York. If his lordship had been a friend to moderate measures, the greatest part of the Presbyterians might have been gained; but he would not disoblige the bishops; the reasons of whose angry behaviour were, "1. Their high notions of the episcopal form of government, as necessary to the very essence of a Christian church. 2. The resentments that remained in their breasts against all who had engaged with the long-parliament, and had been the cause of their sufferings. 3. The Presbyterians being legally possessed of most of the benefices in church and state, it was thought necessary to dispossess them; and if there must be a schism, rather to have it out of the church than within it;" for it had been observed, that the half conformity of the Puritans before the war, had, in most cities and corporations, occasioned a faction between the incumbents and lecturers, which latter had endeavoured to render themselves popular at the expense of the hierarchy. 4. Besides, they had too much influence in the election of representatives to serve in parliament; therefore, instead of using methods to bring them into the church, says bishop Burnet,¹ they resolved to seek the most effectual ones for casting them out. Here was no generosity, or spirit of Catholicism, no remembrance of past services, no compassion for weak or prejudiced minds, but a fixed resolution to disarm their opponents at all events; so that the ensuing conferences with the Presbyterians were no other than an amusement to keep them quiet, till they could obtain a law for their utter expulsion.

The king was devoted to his pleasures, and had no principles of real religion; his grand design was to lay asleep the former controversies, and to unite both Protestant and Papist under his government; with this view he

¹ Vol. 1. p. 259, 260, 12mo.

submitted to the scheme of the bishops, in hopes of making it subservient to a general toleration; which nothing could render more necessary, than having great bodies of men shut out of the church, and put under severe penal laws, who must then be petitioners for a toleration which the legislature would probably grant; but it was his majesty's resolution, that whatsoever should be granted of that sort should pass in so limited a manner, that Papists as well as other sectaries should be comprehended within it. The duke of York and all the Roman Catholics were in this scheme; they declared absolutely against a comprehension, but were very much for a general toleration, as what was necessary for the peace of the nation, and promoting the Catholic cause.

The well-meaning Presbyterians were all this while striving against the stream, and making interest with a set of men who were now laughing in their sleeves at the abject condition to which their egregious credulity had reduced them. They offered archbishop Usher's model of primitive episcopacy as a plan of accommodation; that the surplice, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the communion, should be left indifferent.¹ They were content to set aside the assembly's confession, and let the articles of the church of England take place with some few amendments. About the middle of June, Mr. Calamy, Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Ashe, Mr. Baxter, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Manton, and Dr. Spurstow, waited upon the king, being introduced by the earl of Manchester, to crave his majesty's interposition for reconciling the differences in the church; that the people might not be deprived of their faithful pastors. Honest Mr. Baxter told his majesty, that the interest of the late usurpers with the people arose from the encouragement they had given religion; and he hoped the king would not undo, but rather go beyond, the good which Cromwell or any other had done.² They laid a good deal of stress on their own loyalty, and carefully distinguished between their own behaviour and that of other sectaries, who had been disloyal and factious. The king replied, that "he was glad to bear of their inclinations to an agreement; that he would do his part to bring them together, but this must not be by bringing one party over to another, but by abating somewhat on both sides, and meeting in the midway: and that if it were not accomplished it should not be his fault; nay, he said, he was resolved to see it brought to pass."³ Accordingly, his majesty required them to draw up such proposals as they thought meet for an agreement about church-government, and to set down the most they could yield; promising them a meeting with some episcopal divines in his majesty's presence, when the proposals were ready. Upon this they summoned the city ministers to meet and consult at Sion-

¹ Kennet's Chron. p. 173.

² Ibid. p. 182.

³ Kennet's Chron. p. 183.

college, not excluding such of their country brethren as would attend, that it might not be said afterward they took upon themselves the concluding so weighty an affair.¹ After two or three weeks' consultation they agreed upon a paper to the following purpose, drawn up chiefly by Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Worth, and Mr. Calamy, which, together with archbishop Usher's reduction of episcopacy, they offered to the king, with the following address:

“May it please your most excellent majesty,

“We, your majesty's most loyal subjects cannot but acknowledge it is a very great mercy of God, that immediately after so wonderful and peaceable restoration to your throne and government (for which we bless his name) he has stirred up your royal heart, as to a zealous testimony against profaneness, so to endeavour a happy composing of the differences, and healing the sad breaches which are in the church. And we shall, according to our bounden duty, become humble suitors to the throne of grace, that the God of peace, who has put such a thing as this into your majesty's heart, will, by his heavenly wisdom and Holy Spirit, assist you herein, that you may bring your resolutions to a perfect effect and issue.—

“In humble conformity to your majesty's Christian designs, we, taking it for granted that there is a firm agreement between our brethren and us in the doctrinal truths of the reformed religion, and in the substantial parts of divine worship, humbly desire,

First, “That we may be secured of those things in practice of which we seem to be agreed in principle; as,

1. “That those of our flocks that are serious in matters of their salvation may not be reproachfully handled by words of scorn, or any abusive language, but may be encouraged in their duties of exhorting and provoking one another in their most holy faith, and of farthering one another in the ways of eternal life.

2. “That each congregation may have a learned, orthodox, and godly pastor, that the people may be publicly instructed by preaching every Lord's day, by catechising, by frequent administering the Lord's supper and baptism; and that effectual provision by law may be made, that such as are insufficient, negligent, or scandalous, may not officiate.

3. “That none may be admitted to the Lord's supper till they personally own their baptismal covenant by a credible profession of faith and holiness, not contradicted by a scandalous life. That to such only confirmation may be administered; and that the approbation of the pastor to whom the instructing those under his charge doth appertain, may be produced before any person receives confirmation.

¹ Baxter, part 2. p. 232.

4. “That an effectual course be taken for the sanctification of the Lord’s day, appropriating the same to holy exercises both in public and private, without any unnecessary divertisements.”

“Then for matters in difference, viz. church-government, liturgy, and ceremonies, we humbly represent,

“That we do not renounce the true ancient primitive episcopacy or presidency, as it was balanced with a due commixtion of presbyters. If therefore your majesty, in your grave wisdom and moderation, shall constitute such an episcopacy, we shall humbly submit thereunto. And in order to an accommodation in this weighty affair, we desire humbly to offer some particulars which we conceive were amiss in the episcopal government as it was practised before the year 1640.

1. “The great extent of the bishop’s diocese, which we apprehend too large for his personal inspection.

2. “That by reason of this disability the bishops did depute the administration, in matters of spiritual cognizance, to commissaries, chancellors, officials, whereof some are secular persons, and could not administer that power that originally belongs to the officers of the church.

3. “That the bishops did assume the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction to themselves.

4. “That some of the bishops exercised an arbitrary power, by sending forth articles of visitation, inquiring unwarrantably into several things; and swearing churchwardens to present accordingly. Also many innovations and ceremonies were imposed upon ministers and people not required by law.

“For remedy of these evils we crave leave to offer,

1. “The late most reverend primate of Ireland, his reduction of episcopacy into the form of synodical government.

2. “We humbly desire, that the suffragans, or chorepiscopi, may be chosen by the respective synods.

3. “That no oaths, or promises of obedience to the bishops, nor any unnecessary subscriptions or engagements, be made necessary to ordination, institution, or induction, ministration, communion, or immunities, of ministers, they being responsible for any transgression of the law. And that no bishops or ecclesiastical governors may exercise their government by their private will or pleasure, but only by such rules, canons, and constitutions, as shall be established by parliament.

Secondly, “Concerning liturgy.

1. “We are satisfied in our judgments concerning the lawfulness of a liturgy, or form of worship, provided it be for matter agreeable to the word of God, and suited to the nature of the several ordinances and necessities of the church, neither too tedious, nor composed of too short prayers or re-

sponsals, not dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed churches, nor too rigorously imposed, nor the minister confined thereunto, but that he may also make use of his gifts for prayer and exhortation.

2. “Forasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer is in some things justly offensive, and needs amendment, we most humbly pray, that some learned, godly, and moderate divines of both persuasions, may be employed to compile such a form as is before described, as much as may be in Scripture words; or at least to revise and reform the old: together with an addition of other various forms in Scripture phrase, to be used at the minister’s choice.

Thirdly, “Concerning ceremonies.

“We hold ourselves obliged, in every part of divine worship, to do all things decently and in order, and to edification; and are willing to be determined by authority in such things as being merely circumstantial, or common to human actions and societies, are to be ordered by the light of nature, and human prudence.

“As to divers ceremonies formerly retained in the church of England, we do, in all humility, offer to your majesty, the following considerations:

“That the worship of God is in itself pure and perfect, and decent, without any such ceremonies. That it is then most pure and acceptable when it has least of human mixtures. That these ceremonies have been imposed and advanced by some, so as to draw near to the significancy and moral efficacy of sacraments. That they have been rejected by many of the reformed churches abroad, and have been ever the subject of contention and endless disputes in this church; and therefore being in their own nature indifferent, and mutable, they ought to be changed, lest in time they should be apprehended as necessary as the substantiate of worship themselves.

“May it therefore please your majesty graciously to grant, that kneeling at the Lord’s supper, and such holydays as are but of human institution, may not be imposed on such as scruple them. That the use of the surplice and cross in baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus, may be abolished. And forasmuch as erecting altars and bowing towards them, and such like (having no foundation in the law of the land), have been introduced and imposed, we humbly beseech your majesty, that such innovations may not be used or imposed for the future.”

When the Presbyterian divines came to court with these proposals, the king received them favourably, and promised to bring both parties together. His majesty expressed a satisfaction in hearing they were disposed to a liturgy, and forms of prayer, and that they were willing to yield to the essence of episcopacy, and therefore doubted not of procuring an accommodation. The ministers expected to have met the bishops with their papers of proposals, but none of them appeared, having been better instructed in a private conference with the lord-chancellor Hyde, who told them, it was not

their business to offer proposals, because they were in possession of the laws of the land; that the hierarchy and service-book, being the only legal establishment, ought to be the standard of agreement; and therefore their only concern was to answer the exceptions of the ministers against it. Accordingly, instead of a conference, or paper of proposals, which the ministers expected, the bishops, having obtained a copy of the paper of the Presbyterians, drew up an answer in writing, which was communicated to their ministers, July 8.

In this answer, the bishops take notice of the ministers' concessions in their preamble, as that they agree with them in the substantial of doctrine and worship; and infer from thence, that their particular exceptions are of less importance, and ought not to be stiffly insisted on to the disturbance of the peace of the church.¹

To the particulars they answer,

1. Concerning church-government, "That they never heard any just reasons for a dissent from the ecclesiastical hierarchy of this kingdom, which they believe in the main to be the true primitive episcopacy, which was more than a mere presidency of order. Nor do they find that it was balanced by an authoritative commixtion of presbyters, though it has been in all times exercised with the assistance and counsel of presbyters in subordination to bishops. They wonder that they should except against the government by one single person, which, if applied to the civil magistrate, is a most dangerous insinuation."²

As to the four particular instances of things amiss.

1. "We cannot grant the extent of any diocese is so great, but that a bishop may well perform his duty, which is not a personal inspection of every man's soul, but the pastoral charge, or taking care that the ministers, and other ecclesiastical officers within their diocess, do their duties; and if some dioceses should be too large, the law allows suffragans.

2. "Concerning lay-chancellors, &c. we confess the bishops did depute part of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction to chancellors, commissaries, officials, &c. as men better skilled in the civil and canon laws; but as for matters of mere spiritual concernment, as excommunication, absolution, and other censures of the church, we conceive they belong properly to the bishop himself, or his surrogate, wherein, if anything has been done amiss, we are willing it should be reformed.

3. "Whether bishops are a distinct order from presbyters, or not; or, whether they have the sole power of ordination, is not now the question; but we affirm, that the bishops of this realm have constantly ordained with

¹ Kennet's Chron. p. 200. Baxter's Life, part 2. p. 242.

² Baxter, p. 243.

the assistance of presbyters, and the imposition of their hands together with the bishops, and for this purpose the colleges of deans and chapters are instituted.

4. “As to archbishop Usher's model of church-government, we decline it, as not consistent with his other learned discourses on the original of episcopacy, and of metropolitans; nor with the king's supremacy in causes ecclesiastical.”

II. *Concerning Liturgy.*

“We esteem the liturgy of the church of England, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and by law established, to be such an one as is by them desired, according to the qualifications which they mention; the disuse of which has been the cause of the sad divisions of the church, and the restoring it may be, by God's blessing, a special means of making up the breach. Nor can the imposition of it be called rigorous, as long as clergymen have the liberty of using their gifts before and after sermon. Nevertheless we are not against revising the liturgy by such discreet persons as his majesty shall think fit to employ therein.

III. *Of Ceremonies.*

“Lawful authority has already determined the ceremonies in question to be decent and orderly, and for edification, and consequently to be agreeable to the general rules of the word. We allow the worship of God is in itself perfect in essentials, but still the church is at liberty to improve it with circumstantialia for decency and order. Ceremonies were never esteemed to be sacraments, nor imposed as such; they are retained by most Protestant churches; and that they have been the subject of contention is owing to men's weakness, and their unwillingness to submit their private opinions to the public judgment of the church. We acknowledge, that these things are in their nature mutable, but we can by no means think it expedient to remove them. However, as we are no way against such a tender and religious compassion in things of this nature, as his majesty's piety and wisdom shall think fit to extend: so we cannot think that the satisfaction of some private persons is to be laid in the balance against the public peace and uniformity of the church.

“As for kneeling at the Lord's supper, it is a gesture of the greatest reverence and devotion, and so most agreeable to that holy service.

“Holy-days of human institution having been observed by the people of God in the Old Testament, and by our blessed Saviour himself in the gospel, and by all the churches of Christ in the primitive and following times, as apt means to preserve the memorials of the chief mysteries of the Christian religion: and such holy-days also being fit times for the honest recrea-

tion of the meaner sort of people; for these reasons we humbly desire they may be continued in the church.

“As for the three other ceremonies, the surplice, the cross after baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus, though we see not any sufficient reason why they should be utterly abolished, nevertheless, how far forth, in regard of tender consciences, a liberty may be thought fit to be indulged to any, his majesty is best able to judge.”

They conclude thus: “We are so far from believing that his majesty’s condescending to the ministers’ demands will take away not only our differences, but the roots and causes of them, that we are confident it will prove the seminary of new differences, both by giving dissatisfaction to those that are well pleased with what is already established, who are much the greatest part of his majesty’s subjects: and by encouraging unquiet spirits, when these things shall be granted, to make farther demands; there being no assurance by them given, what will content all dissenters, than which nothing is more necessary for settling a firm peace in the church.”

About a week after, the Presbyterian divines sent the bishops a warm remonstrance, and defence of their proposals, drawn up chiefly by Mr. Baxter, to the following purpose:—

Concerning the preamble.

“We are not insensible of the danger of the church, through the doctrinal errors of those with whom we differ about points of government and worship; but we choose to say nothing of the party that we are agreed with in doctrinals, because we both subscribe the same Holy Scriptures, articles of religion, and books of homilies; and the contradictions to their own confessions, which too many are guilty of, we did not think just to charge upon the whole.”¹

Concerning Church-government.

“Had you read Gerson, Buccr, Parker, Baynes, Salmasius, Blondel, &c. you would have seen just reason given for our dissent from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as stated in England.”

Instances of things amiss.

“You would easily grant that dioceses are too great, if you had ever conscionably tried the task which Dr. Hammond describeth as the bishop’s work; or had ever believed Ignatius, and other ancient descriptions of a bishop’s church. You cannot be ignorant that our bishops have the sole government of pastors and people; that the whole power of the keys is in their hands, and that their presbyters are but cyphers.”

¹ Kennet’s Chron. p. 205. Baxter, part 2. p. 248.

Concerning Ceremonies.

“These divines argue for leaving them indifferent for the peace of the church, as being not essential to the perfection of Christian worship, especially when so many looked upon them as sinful.”

They conclude thus: “We perceive your counsels against peace are not likely to be frustrated. Your desires concerning us are likely to be accomplished. You are like to be gratified with our silence and ejection; and yet we will believe, that ‘Blessed are the peace-makers;’ and though we are prevented by you in our pursuits of peace, and are never like thus publicly to seek it more, yet are we resolved, as much as possible, to live peaceably with all men.”

The eyes of the Presbyterians were now opened, and they began to discern their weakness in expecting an agreement with the bishops, who appeared to be exasperated, and determined to tie them down to the old establishment. The former severities began already to be revived, and the laws were put in execution against some who did not make use of the old liturgy. Many were suspended and turned out of their livings on this account; upon which the leading Presbyterians applied to the king, and humbly requested,

1. “That they might with all convenient speed, see his majesty’s conclusions upon the proposals of mutual condescensions, before they pass into resolves.

2. “That his majesty would publicly declare his pleasure for the suspension of all proceedings upon the act of uniformity, against nonconformists to the liturgy and ceremonies, till they saw the issue of their hoped-for agreement.

3. “That until the said settlement, there may be no oath of canonical obedience, nor subscription to the liturgy and ceremonies required, nor renunciation of their ordination by mere presbyters, imposed as necessary to institution, induction, or confirmation.

4. “That his majesty would cause the broad seal to be revoked, where persons had been put into the possession of the livings of others not void by sequestration, but by the death of the former incumbents.

5. “That a remedy may be provided against the return of scandalous ministers, into the places from whence they had been ejected.¹

His majesty gave them a civil audience, and told them he would put what he thought fit to grant them into the form of a declaration, which they should have the liberty of perusing before it was made public. A copy of this was accordingly delivered by the chancellor to Mr. Baxter, and other Presbyterian divines, September 4, with liberty to make exceptions, and

¹ Baxter’s Life, part 2, p. 241.

give notice of what they disliked.¹ These divines petitioned for some farther amendments and alterations; upon which the king appointed a day to hear what could be said on both sides, and came to the chancellor's house, October 22, attended by the dukes of Albemarle and Ormond, the earls of Manchester, Anglesea, and lord Hollis.

On the part of the bishops were,

Dr. Sheldon,	bishop of London
Dr. Morley,	Worcester
Dr. Henchman,	Salisbury
Dr. Cosins,	Durham
Dr. Gauden,	Exeter
Dr. Hacket,	Litchfield and Coventry
Dr. Barwick,	dean of St. Paul's;—Dr. Gunning, &c.

On the side of the Presbyterians were,

Dr. Reynolds	Dr. Spurstow	Dr. Manton	Dr. Wallis.
Mr. Calamy	Mr. Ashe	Mr. Baxter	

As the chancellor read over the declaration, each party were to allege their exceptions, and the king to determine. The chief debates were on the high power of the bishops, and the necessity of reordination. Bishop Morley and Dr. Gunning spoke most on one side; and Mr. Calamy and Baxter on the other.² Upon hearing the whole, his majesty delivered his judgment as to what he thought proper should stand in the declaration; and appointed bishop Morley and Henchman, Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Calamy, to express it in proper words; and if they disagreed, the earl of Anglesea and lord Hollis to decide.

At length the declaration, with such amendments as the king would admit, was published under the following title:

“His majesty’s declaration to all his loving subjects of his kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, concerning ecclesiastical affairs.
Given at our court at Whitehall, October 25, 1660, in the twelfth year of our reign.”

The declaration being long,³ and to be met with in most of our historians, I shall give the reader only an abstract of it.

“Charles Rex.

“In our letter from Breda we promised in due time to propose something to the world for the propagation of the Protestant religion; and we

¹ Kennet’s Chron. p. 246. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 275, 276.

² Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 278.

³ This declaration was drawn up by lord-Chancellor Hyde: but many of the evasive clauses were suggested by some of the king’s more secret advisers. Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II. v. 1. p. 93.—ED.

think ourself more competent to propose, and with God's assistance determine many things now in difference, from the experience we have had in most of the reformed churches abroad, where we have had frequent conferences with the most learned men, who have unanimously lamented the distempers and too notorious schisms in matters of religion in England.

“When we were in Holland we were attended by many grave and learned ministers from hence of the Presbyterian opinion, and to our great satisfaction we found them full of affection to us, no enemies to episcopacy or liturgy (as they have been reported to be), but modestly desiring such alterations as, without shattering foundations, might give ease to the tenderness of some men's consciences. For the doing of this we intended to have called a synod of divines, but observing the over-passionate and turbulent way of proceeding of some persons, and the impatience of others for a speedy determination of these matters, we have been prevailed with to invert the method we proposed, and to give some determination ourself to the matters in difference, till such a synod may be called as may, without passion or prejudice, give us such farther assistance towards a perfect union of affections, as well as submission to authority, as is necessary.

“We must, for the honour of all with whom we have conferred, declare, that the professions and desires of all for the advancement of piety and true godliness are the same; their professions of zeal for the peace of the church, and of affection and duty to us, the same; they all approve episcopacy and a liturgy, and disapprove of sacrilege, and the alienation of the revenues of the church.”¹

His majesty then declares his esteem and affection for the church of England, and that his esteem of it is not lessened by his condescending to dispense with some particular ceremonies, and then proceeds to his concessions.

1. “We declare our purpose and resolution is, and shall be, to promote the power of godliness, to encourage the public and private exercises of religion, to take care of the due observation of the Lord's day; and that insufficient, negligent, and scandalous ministers be not permitted in the church. We shall take care to prefer none to the episcopal office and charge but men of learning, virtue, and piety; and we shall provide the best we can, that the bishops be frequent preachers, and that they do often preach in some church or other of their diocese.

2. “Because some dioceses may be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragans as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work.

3. “No bishop shall ordain or exercise any part of jurisdiction which

¹ Comp. Hist. vol. 3. p. 246. Baxter's Life, part 2. p. 259. Rennet's Chron. p. 289.

appertains to the censures of the church, without advice and assistance of the presbyters. No chancellors, commissaries, or officials, shall excommunicate, absolve, or exercise, any act of spiritual jurisdiction, wherein any of the ministry are concerned with reference to their pastoral charge. Nor shall the archdeacon exercise any jurisdiction without the advice and assistance of six ministers of his archdeaconry; three to be nominated by the bishop, and three by the suffrage of the presbyters within the archdeaconry.

4. "We will take care, that the preferment of deans and chapters shall be given to the most learned and pious presbyters of the diocese, and that an equal number (to those of the chapter) of the most learned and pious presbyters of the same diocese, annually chosen by the major vote of all the presbyters of that diocese present at such elections, shall be always advising and assisting, together with those of the chapter, in all ordinations, at all church-censures, and other important acts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction wherein any of the ministry are concerned. Provided that at all such meetings, the number of ministers so elected, and those of the chapter present, be equal; and to make the numbers equal, the juniors of the exceeding number shall withdraw to make way for the more ancient. Nor shall any suffragan bishop ordain or exercise any jurisdiction, without the advice and assistance of a sufficient number of presbyters annually chosen as before. And our will is, that ordination be constantly and solemnly performed by the bishop and his aforesaid presbytery at the four set times appointed by the church for that purpose.

5. "Confirmation shall be rightly and solemnly performed, by the information and with the consent of the minister of the place, who shall admit none to the Lord's supper, till they have made a credible profession of their faith, and promised obedience to the will of God, according to the rubric before the catechism; and all diligence shall be used for the instruction and reformation of scandalous offenders, whom the minister shall not suffer to partake of the Lord's supper till they have openly declared their repentance, and resolutions of amendment; provided there be place for appeals to superior powers. Every rural dean (to be nominated by the bishop as heretofore) with three or four ministers of that deanery chosen by the major part of all the ministers within the same, shall meet once a month to receive complaints from the ministers or churchwardens of parishes, and to compose such differences as shall be referred to them for arbitration, and to reform such things as are amiss, by their pastoral reproofs and admonitions, and what they cannot reform are to be presented to the bishop. Moreover, the rural dean and his assistants are to take care of the catechising children and youth, and that they can give a good account of their faith before they are brought to the bishop to be confirmed.

6. "No bishop shall exercise any arbitrary power, or impose any thing

upon his clergy or people, but according to the law of the land.

7. “We will appoint an equal number of divines of both persuasions to review the liturgy of the church of England, and to make such alterations as shall be thought necessary; and some additional forms in the Scripture phrase, as near as may be, suited to the nature of the several parts of worship, and that it be left to the minister’s choice to use one or the other at his discretion. In the mean time, we desire that the ministers in their several churches will not wholly lay aside the use of the common prayer, but will read those parts of it against which they have no exception; yet our will and pleasure is, that none be punished or troubled for not using it till it be reviewed and effectually reformed.

8. Lastly, “Concerning ceremonies, if any are practised contrary to law, the same shall cease. Every national church has a power to appoint ceremonies for its members, which, though before they were indifferent, yet cease to be so when established by law. We are therefore content to indulge tender consciences, so far as to dispense with their using such ceremonies as are an offence to them, but not to abolish them. We declare therefore, that none shall be compelled to receive the sacrament kneeling, nor to use the cross in baptism, nor to bow at the name of Jesus, nor to use the surplice, except in the royal chapel, and in cathedral and collegiate churches. Nor shall subscription, nor the oath of canonical obedience, be required at present, in order to ordination, institution, or induction, but only the taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; nor shall any lose their academical degrees, or forfeit a presentation, or be deprived of a benefice, for not declaring his assent to all the thirty-nine articles, provided he read and declare his assent to all the doctrinal articles, and to the sacraments. And we do again renew our declaration from Breda, that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom.

His majesty concludes, “with conjuring all his loving subjects, to acquiesce and submit to this declaration, concerning the differences that have so much disquieted the nation at home, and given offence to the Protestant churches abroad.”

Though this declaration did not satisfy all the ministers, yet the greatest numbers were content; but because it proceeded upon the plan of diocesan episcopacy which they had covenanted against, others were extremely uneasy; some ventured upon a second address to the king, in which they renew their requests for archbishop Usher’s scheme of primitive episcopacy, as most agreeable to Scripture; most conducive to good discipline, and as that which would save the nation from the violation of a solemn league and covenant, which, whether it were lawfully imposed or no, they conceive now to be binding.

Concerning the preamble of his majesty's declaration they tender these requests:

1. "That as they are persuaded it is not in his majesty's thoughts to intimate that they are guilty of the offences therein mentioned, they hope it will be a motive to hasten the union.

2. "Though they detest sacrilege, yet they will not determine, whether in some cases of superfluities of revenues, and the necessity of the church, there may not be an alienation, which is no sacrilege.

3. "His majesty having acknowledged their moderation, they still hope they may be received into the settlement, and continue their stations in the church.

4. "Since his majesty has declared, that the essence of episcopacy may be preserved, though the extent of the jurisdiction be altered, they hope his majesty will consent to such an alteration as may satisfy their consciences."

They then renew their requests for promoting of piety; of a religious and diligent ministry; of the requisites of church-communion; and for the observation of the sabbath. They complain, that parish-discipline is not sufficiently granted in his majesty's declaration, that inferior synods are passed by, and that the bishop is not *episcopus præsens*, but *episcopus princeps*, endowed with sole power of ordination and jurisdiction. They therefore pray again, that archbishop Usher's form of church-government may be established, at least in these three points:¹

1. "That the pastors of parishes may be allowed to preach, catechise, and deny the communion of the church to the impenitent, scandalous, or such as do not make a credible profession of faith and obedience to the commands of Christ.

2. "That the pastors of each rural deanery may meet once a month, to receive presentments and appeals, to admonish offenders, and after due patience to proceed to excommunication.

3. "That a diocesan synod of the delegates of rural synods may be called as often as need requires; that the bishop may not ordain or exercise spiritual censures without the consent of the majority; and that neither chancellors, archdeacons, commissaries, nor officials, may pass censures purely spiritual; but for the exercise of civil government coercively by mulcts, or corporal penalties, by power derived from your majesty, as supreme over all persons and things ecclesiastical, we presume not at all to interpose."

"As to the Liturgy.

"They rejoice that his majesty has declared, that none should suffer for

¹ Hist. of the Noncom. p. 14. Baxter, part 2. p. 268.

not using the common prayer and ceremonies; but then it grieves us (say they) to hear that it is given in charge to the judges at the assizes, to indict men upon the act of uniformity for not using the common prayer. That it is not only some obsolete words and phrases that are offensive, but that other things need amendment; therefore we pray, that none may be punished for not using the book, till it be reformed by the consent of the divines of both patties.”

“Concerning Ceremonies.

“They thank his majesty for his gracious concessions, but pray him to leave out of his declaration these words, ‘that we do not believe the practice of the particular ceremonies excepted against unlawful,’ because we are not all of that opinion; but we desire, that there may be no law nor canon for or against them (being allowed by our opponents as indifferent), as there is no canon against any particular gesture in singing psalms, and yet there is an uninterrupted unity.”

“For particular Ceremonies.

1. “We humbly crave, that there maybe liberty to receive the Lord’s sapper either kneeling, standing, or sitting. 2. That the observation of holy-days of human institution may be left indifferent. 3. We thank your majesty for liberty as to the cross in baptism, the surplice, and bowing at the name of Jesus; but we pray, that this liberty may extend to colleges and cathedrals for the benefit of youth as well as elder persons, and that the canons which impose these ceremonies may be repealed.

“We thank your majesty for your gracious concession of the forbearance of subscription; though we do not dissent from the doctrinal articles of the church of England; nor do we scruple the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, nor would we have the door left open for Papists and heretics to come in.

“But we take the liberty to represent to your majesty, that, notwithstanding your gracious concessions, our ministers cannot procure institution without renouncing their ordination by presbyters, or being reordained, nor without subscription and the oaths of canonical obedience. And we are apprehensive that your majesty’s indulgence does not extend to the abatement of reordination, or subscription, or the oath of canonical obedience. We therefore earnestly crave, that your majesty will declare your pleasure, 1. That ordination, and institution, and induction, may be conferred without the said subscription and oath. 2. That none may be urged to be reordained, or denied institution for want of ordination by prelates that have been ordained by presbyters. 3. That none may forfeit their presentation or bene-

fice for not reading those articles of the thirty-nine that relate to government and ceremonies.”

However, if the king’s declaration, without any amendments, had passed into a law, it would have prevented in a great measure the separation that followed; but neither the court nor ministry intended it, if they could stand their ground upon the foot of the old establishment. A reverend prelate of the church of England confesses, “that this declaration has in it a spirit of true wisdom and charity above any one public confession that was ever made in matters of religion. It shows the admirable temper and prudence of the king and his council in that tender juncture of affairs; it proves the charity and moderation of the suffering bishops, in thinking such concessions just and reasonable for peace and unity; and it shows a disposition in the other party to have accepted the terms of union consistent with our episcopacy and liturgy. It condemns the unhappy ferment that soon after followed for want of this temper; and it may stand for a pattern to posterity, whenever they are disposed, to restore the discipline and heal the breaches of the church.” Another conformist writer adds, “If ever a divine sentence was in the mouth of any king, and his mouth erred not in judgment; I verily believe it was thus with our present majesty when he composed that admirable declaration, which next to the Holy Scriptures I adore, and think that the united judgment of the whole nation cannot frame a better or a more unexceptionable expedient, for a firm and lasting concord of these distracted churches.”

The Presbyterians about London were so far pleased, that they drew up the following address of thanks, in the name of the city-ministers, and presented it to the king November 16, by the hands of the reverend Mr. Samuel Clarke.

“Most dread Sovereign!

“We your majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subjects, ministers of the gospel in your city of London, having perused your majesty’s late declaration, and finding it so full of indulgence and gracious condescension, we cannot but judge ourselves highly obliged first to render our unfeigned thanks to God, and next our most hearty and humble acknowledgments to your majesty, that we may testify to your royal self, and all the world, our just sentiments of your majesty’s great goodness and clemency therein expressed.”¹

The address then recites the several condescensions of his majesty in the declaration, and concludes thus, “We crave leave to profess, that though all things in this frame of government be not exactly suited to our judgments, yet your majesty’s moderation has so great an influence on us, that

¹ Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 279, 284. Kennet’s Chron. p. 311.

we shall to the utmost endeavour the healing of the breaches, and promoting the peace and union of the church.—We would beg of your majesty, with all humility upon our knees, that reordination, and the surplice in colleges, might not be imposed; and we hope God will incline your majesty's heart to gratify us in these our desires also."

Signed by

Samuel Clark	Jo. Rawlinson	Thomas Lye
William Cooper	Jo. Sheffield	John Jackson
Thomas Case	Thomas Gouge	John Meriton
Jo. Gibbon	Gab. Sanger	William Bates
William Whitaker	El. Pledger	With many others.
Thomas Jacomb	Matth. Pool	

The king having received the address, returned this answer, "¹ Gentlemen, I will endeavour to give you all satisfaction, and to make you as happy as myself."²

Upon the terms of this declaration Dr. Reynolds accepted of the bishopric of Norwich; Mr. Baxter was offered the bishopric of Hereford, but refused upon other reasons; and Mr. Calamy declined the bishopric of Litchfield and Coventry, till the king's declaration should be passed into a law. Dr. Manton, having been presented to the living of Covent-garden by the earl of Bedford, accepted it upon the terms of the declaration, and received episcopal institution from Dr. Sheldon bishop of London, January 10, 1660–61. Having first subscribed the doctrinal articles of the church of England only, and taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and of ca-

¹ Kennet's Chron. p. 315.

² December 11, 1729.—Waiting on Arthur Onslow, esq. speaker of the honourable house of commons, he was pleased to suffer me to peruse and afterward to transcribe a marginal note, which he had written with his own hand to pages 152, 153, and 154, of the first volume of my Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Life, where the subject of which I was treating, was king Charles's celebrated declaration for ecclesiastical affairs, which bore date October 25, 1660.

I had said, that the concessions there made were so highly pleasing, that an address of thanks was drawn up and signed by many of the dissenting members in and about London, &c.'

The marginal note before mentioned, was in the words following :

"Both houses of parliament did also severally present to the king an address of thanks for this declaration: and in the house of commons, November 6, 1660, a committee was appointed to bring in a bill to make the declaration effectual, and the person first named of the committee was serjeant Hale, who was therefore very probably the first mover of this bill. And as he was the next day (I think it was so soon) made chief lord baron, it is not unlikely that he was desirous to leave the house of commons with this mark of his moderation, as to the religious differences of that time, and what he thought would be the proper means to heal them. But his endeavours did not succeed; for on the 28th of November following, the bill being read the first time, and a question put that the bill be read a second time, it passed in the negative: the yeas one hundred and fifty-seven, the noes one hundred and eighty-three. The tellers for the yeas were sir Anthony Joby and sir George Booth; for the uoes, sir Solomon Swale and Mr. Palmer."

Note. " Sir Solomon Swale was afterward discharged being a member of the house of commons, for being a Popish recusant convict."—Dr. Calamy's History of his own Life.

I here insert this for the use of posterity.

nonical obedience in all things lawful and honest. The doctor was also content that the Common Prayer should be read in his church. Dr. Bates was offered the deanery of Lichfield; Dr. Manton the deanery of Rochester; and Mr. Bowles that of York; but finding how things were going at court, after some time, refused.

The lords and commons, upon reading the king's declaration, agreed to wait upon his majesty in a body, and return him thanks; and the commons ordered a bill into their house to pass it into a law; but when the bill had been read the first time, the question being put for a second reading, it passed in the negative; one of the secretaries of state opposing it, which was a sufficient indication, says Dr. Bates, of the king and court's aversion to it.¹ Sir Matthew Hale, who was zealous for the declaration, at that very juncture was taken out of the house of commons, and made lord-chief-baron of the exchequer, that he might not oppose the resolutions of the ministry. Strange! that a house of commons, which on the 9th of November had given the king thanks for his declaration by their speaker *nem. contradicente*, should on the 28th of the same month reject it before a second reading. This blasted all the expectations of the Presbyterian clergy at once. It was now apparent that the court did not design the declaration should be carried into execution, but only serve as a temporary expedient to keep them quiet, till the church should be in circumstances to bid them defiance. While the diocesan doctors were at Breda (says Mr. Baxter²) they did not dream that their way to the highest grandeur was so fair; then they would have been glad of the terms of the declaration of Breda; when they came in they proceeded by slow degrees, that they might feel the ground under them; for this purpose they proposed the declaration, which being but a temporary provision must give place to laws, but when they found the parliament and populace ripe for anything they should propose, they dropped the declaration, and all farther thoughts of accommodation.

The court and bishops were now at ease, and went on briskly with restoring all things to the old standard; the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance were revived; men of the highest principles, and most inveterate resentments, were preferred to bishoprics, by which they were more than compensated for their sufferings, by the large sums of money they raised on the renewal of leases,³ which after so long an interval were almost

¹ Kennet's Chron. p. 358.

² Life, p. 287.

³ The terms on which these leases were renewed, were high and oppressive, and the bishops incurred the severe censure of the Presbyterian ministers, and raised against themselves the clamour of the subordinate and dependent clergy. The fines raised by renewing the leases amounted to a million and half. In some sees they produced £40,000 or £50,000, which were applied to the enriching the bishops' families. Secret History of the Court and

expired; but what a sad use they made of their riches, I choose rather to relate in the words of bishop Burnet than my own. “What the bishops did with their great fines was a pattern to all their lower dignitaries, who generally took more care of themselves than of the church; the men of service were loaded with many livings, and many dignities. With this accession of wealth, there broke in upon the church a great deal of luxury and high living, on pretence of hospitality; and with this overset of wealth and pomp that came upon men in the decline of their age, they who were now growing into old age became lazy and negligent in all the true concerns of the church.”¹

From this time, says bishop Kennet, the Presbyterians began to prepare for the cry of persecution, and not without reason, for March 23, Mr. Zach. Crofton, minister of Aldgate, was sent to the Tower for writing in favour of the covenant; where he lay a considerable time at great expense, and was at last turned out of his parish without any consideration, though he had a wife and seven children, and had been very zealous for the king’s restoration,² Mr. Andrew Parsons, rector of Wem in Shropshire, a noted loyalist, was fetched from his house in the month of December by six soldiers, for seditious preaching, and nonconformity to the ceremonies; for which he was fined £200 and to continue in prison till it was paid.

Spies were sent into all the congregations of Presbyterians throughout England, to observe and report their behaviour to the bishops; and if a minister lamented the degeneracy of the times, or expressed his concern for the ark of God, if he preached against perfidiousness, or glanced at the vices of

Reign of King Charles II. vol. 1. p. 350–354; and Burnet’s History of his Own Times, vol. 1. p. 271, 12mo.—ED.

¹ Dr. Grey endeavours to show, that bishop Burnet’s representation, quoted above, was founded in a mistake; and with this view, he states the benefactions and charities of some of the bishops, deans, and chapters. According to his authorities, besides the expenditures of bishop Duppa, which we have mentioned before, Dr. Juxon, archbishop of Canterbury, gave to various purposes and public works, £48,000 and abated in fines £16,000. Dr. Sheldon, while bishop of London, expended £40,000, and abated to his tenants £17,000. Dr. Frewen, archbishop of York, disbursed in public payments, besides abatements to tenants, £15,000. Dr. Cosins bishop of Durham’s expenditures in building and repairing public edifices and in charities amounted to £44,000. Dr. Warner, bishop of Rochester, though his fines were small, gave in royal presents, benevolences, and subsidies, and redeeming captives, £25,000. The liberalities of various deans and chapters made the sum of £191,300. These expenditures bespeak munificence and generosity; and they appear to take off much of the edge of Bishop Burnet’s censure. He allows, that “some few exceptions are to be made: but so few (he adds), that if a new set of men had not appeared of another stamp, the church had quite lost her esteem over the nation.” The reader will also reflect, that the proportion not of the number of dignitaries only, who made a display of charity, or liberality, but of the sums they expended to the accession of wealth, is to be taken into the account. The above sums fall more than a million short of the amount of the fines that were raised: to these must be added the annual incomes of the ecclesiastical estates to which they were preferred. Grey’s Examination, vol. 3. p. 269–274. Burnet’s History, vol. 1. p. 271.—ED.

² Kennet’s Chron. p. 397. Conf. Plea, p. 34.

the court, he was marked for an enemy to the king and government. Many eminent and loyal Presbyterians were sent to prison upon such informations, among whom was the learned and prudent Mr. John Howe, and when they came to their trials, the court was guarded with soldiers, and their friends not suffered to attend them. Many were sequestered from their livings, and cited into the ecclesiastical courts, for not using the surplice and other ceremonies, while the discipline of the church was under a kind of suspension. So eager were the spiritual courts to renew the exercise of the sword; and so fiercely was it brandished against the falling Presbyterians!

The convention-parliament passed sundry acts with relation to the late times, of which these following deserve to be remembered: An act for the confirming and restoring of ministers, which enacts, among other things, “that every sequestered minister, who has not justified the late king’s murder, or declared against infant baptism, shall be restored to his living before the 25th of December next ensuing, and the present incumbent shall peaceably quit it, and be accountable for dilapidations, and all arrears of fifths not paid.” By this act some hundreds of nonconformist ministers were dispossessed of their livings, before the act of uniformity was penned. Here was no distinction between good or bad; but if the parson had been episcopally ordained, and in possession, he must be restored, though he had been ejected upon the strongest evidence of immorality or scandal.

The act for confirmation of marriages was very expedient for the peace of the kingdom, and the order and harmony of families. It enacts, “that all marriages since May 1, 1642, solemnized before a justice of peace, or reputed justice; and all marriages since the said time, had or solemnized according to the direction of any ordinance, or reputed act or ordinance of one or both houses of parliament, shall be adjudged and esteemed to be of the same force and effect, as if they had been solemnized according to the rites and ceremonies of the church of England.”

An act for the attainder of several persons guilty of the horrid murder of his late sacred majesty king Charles I. and for the perpetual observation of the 30th of January.¹ This was the subject of many conferences between the two houses, in one of which chancellor Hyde declared, that the king having sent him in embassy to the king of Spain, charged him to tell that monarch expressly, “that the horrible murder of his father ought not to be deemed as

¹ The service for this day, it has been remarked, was framed on the *jure divine* plan, consequently on principles inconsistent with those of the Revolution. It was drawn up by archbishop Sancroft, whose influence procured it to be adopted and published by the king’s authority, though another of a more moderate strain was at first preferred to it. When Sancroft himself was laid aside for adopting or adhering to principles suitable to his style, what had we to do any longer with Sancroft’s office ? Letters and Essays in Favour of Public Liberty, vol 1. p. 32. —ED.

the act of the parliament, or people of England, but of a small crew of wretches and miscreants who had usurped the sovereign power, and rendered themselves masters of the kingdom;”¹ for which the commons sent a deputation with thanks to the king. After the preamble, the act goes on to attain the king’s judges, dead or alive, except colonel Ingoldsby² and Thompson, who for their late good services were pardoned, but in their room were included colonel Lambert, sir Harry Vane,, and Hugh Peters, who were not of the judges. On the 30th of January this year, the bodies of O. Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Ireton, were taken out of their graves, and drawn upon hurdles to Tyburn, where they were hung up from ten in the morning till sunset of the next day, after which their heads were cut off, and their trunks buried altogether in one hole under the gallows.³ Colonel Lambert was sent to the isle of Jersey, where he continued shut up a patient prisoner almost thirty years; nineteen made their escape beyond sea; seven were made objects of the king’s clemency; nineteen others, who surrendered on the king’s proclamation of June 6, had their lives saved after trial; but underwent other penalties, as imprisonment, banishment, and forfeiture of estates; so that ten only were executed in the month of October, after the new sheriffs were entered upon their office, viz. Col. Harrison, Mr. Carew, Cook, Hugh Peters, Mr. Scot, Clement, Scroop, Jones, Hacker, and Axtel.⁴

Bishop Burnet says,⁵ “The trials and executions of the first that suffered, were attended by vast crowds of people. All men seemed pleased with the sight; but the firmness and show of piety of the sufferers, who went out of the world with a sort of triumph in the cause for which they suffered, turned the minds of the populace, insomuch that the king was advised to proceed no farther.” The prisoners were rudely treated in court; the spectators with their noise and clamour endeavouring to put them out of countenance. None of them denied the fact, but all pleaded “Not guilty to the treason,” because as they said they acted by authority of parliament; not

¹ This plea, it has been observed by a late writer, would have been precluded, had the parliament of 1641 proceeded against the king by way of attainder, about the time that Strafford and Laud were impeached. For then they were constitutionally invested with the legislative and judicial powers of a national representative: and they had sufficient overacts before them to convict him of the blackest treason against the majesty of the people of England. *Memoirs of Hollis*, vol. 2. p. 591.—ED.

² Dr. Grey observes, on the authority of lord Clarendon, that the case of colonel Ingoldsby was singular. He was drawn into the army about the time when he came first of age by Cromwell, to whom he was nearly allied. Though appointed to it, he never sat with the judges of the king: and his signature to the warrant for the king’s death was obtained by violence; Cromwell seized his hand, put the pen between his fingers, and with his own hand wrote Richard Ingoldsby, he making all the resistance he could. *Clarendon’s History*, vol. 3. p. 763.

³ This was done, says Dr. Grey, upon a 30th of January; a circumstance which Mr. Neal might probably think below his notice.—ED.

⁴ *Kennet’s Chron.* p. 367.

⁵ Vol. 1. p. 234. § *State Trials*, p. 404.

considering, that the house of commons is no court of judicature; or if it was, that it was packed and purged before the king was brought to his trial. Those who guarded the scaffold pleaded, that they acted by command of their superior officers, who would have cashiered or put them to death, if they had not obeyed. They were not permitted to enter into the merits of the cause between the king and parliament, but were condemned upon the statute of the 25th Edward III. for compassing and imagining the king's death.

The behaviour of the regicides at their execution was bold and resolute; colonel Harrison declared at the gibbet, that he was fully persuaded that what he had done was the cause and work of God, which he was confident God would own and raise up again, how much soever it suffered at that time. He went through all the indignities and severities of his sufferings, with a calmness or rather cheerfulness, that astonished the spectators; he was turned off, and cut down alive; for after his body was opened, he raised himself up, and gave the executioner a box on the ear.¹ When Mr. solicitor Cook and Hugh Peters went into the sledge, the head of major-general Harrison was put upon it, with the face bare towards them; but notwithstanding this, Mr. Cook went out of the world with surprising resolution, blessing God that he had a clear conscience. Hugh Peters was more timid; but after he had seen the execution and quartering of Mr. Cook, he resumed his courage at length (which some said was artificial,) and said to the sheriff, "Sir, you have here slain one of the servants of the Lord, and made me behold it, on purpose to terrify and discourage me; but God has made it an ordinance for my strengthening and encouragement."² Mr. Scot was not allowed to speak to the people, but said in his prayer, "that he had been engaged in a cause not to be repented of; I say, in a cause not to be repented of." Carew appeared very cheerful as he went to the gibbet, but said little of the cause for which he suffered. Clements also said nothing. Colonel Jones justified the king and court in their proceedings; but added, that they did not satisfy him in so great and deep a point. Colonel Scroop was drawn in the same sledge, whose grave and venerable countenance, accompanied with courage and cheerfulness, raised great compassion in some of the spectators, though the insults and rudeness of others were cruel and barbarous: he said he was born and bred a gentleman; and appealed to those who had known him for his behaviour; he forgave the instruments of his sufferings, and died for that which he judged to be the cause of Christ. Colonel Axtel and Hacker suffered last; the former behaved with great resolution,

¹ State Trials, p. 404.

² "It appears from this instance, and many others (observes Mr. Granger) that the presumption of an enthusiast is much greater than that of a saint. The one is always humble, and works out his own salvation with fear and trembling; the other is arrogant and assuming, and seems to demand it as his right." History of England, vol. 3. p. 339.—ED.

and holding the Bible in his hand said, "The very cause in which I was engaged is contained in this book of God; and having been fully convinced in my conscience of the justness of the war, I freely engaged in the parliament's service, which, as I do believe was the cause of the Lord, I ventured my life freely for it, and now die for it." Hacker read a paper to the same purpose; and after having expressed his charity towards his judges, jury, and witnesses, he said, "I have nothing lies upon my conscience as guilt whereof I am now condemned, and do not doubt but to have the sentence reversed."

Few, if any of these criminals, were friends of the protector Cromwell, but gave him all possible disturbance in favour of a commonwealth. Mr. H. Cromwell, in one of his letters from Ireland, 1657-8, says, "It is a sad case, when men, knowing the difficulties we labour under, seek occasions to quarrel and unsettle everything again; I hear Harrison, Carew, and Okey, have done new feats. I hope God will infatuate them in their endeavours to disturb the peace of the nation; their folly shows them to be no better than abusers of religion, and such whose hypocrisy the Lord will avenge in due time."

The regicides certainly confounded the cause of the parliament, or the necessity of entering into a war to bring delinquents to justice, with the king's execution; whereas they fall under a very distinct consideration; the former might be necessary, when the latter had neither law nor equity to support it:¹ for admitting, with them, that the king is accountable to his parliament; the house of commons alone is not the parliament; and if it was, it could not be so, after it was under restraint, and one half of the members forcibly kept from their places by the military power. They had no precedent for their conduct, nor any measure of law to try and condemn their sovereign; though the Scripture says, "He that sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" yet this is not a rule of duty for private persons, when there is a government subsisting. If the king had fallen in battle it had been a different case; but how criminal soever his majesty might be in their

¹ A distinguished writer, who now "ranks a peer, delivers a different opinion from our author. "If a king deserves (says he) to be opposed by force of arms, he deserves death: if he reduces his subjects to that extremity, the blood spilled in the quarrel lies on him:—the executing him afterward is a mere formality." Walpole's *Royal and Noble Authors*, vol. 2. p. 69, as quoted by Dr. Harris, *Life of Charles II.* vol. 1. p. 262. A sentiment of this last writer, which carries truth and force in it, may be properly brought forward in this connexion. "The depriving of the people of their rights and liberties, or the arguing for the expediency and justice of so doing, is a crime of a higher nature than the murdering, or magnifying the murder, of the wisest and best prince under heaven. The loss of a good prince is greatly to be lamented; but it is a loss which may be repaired: whereas the loss of a people's liberties is seldom or ever to be recovered: consequently the foe to the latter is much more detestable than the foe to the former." *Historical and Critical Account of Hugh Peters*, p. 49, 50. — ED.

apprehensions, they had no warrant to sit as his judges, and therefore could have no right by their verdict or sentence to put him to death.

There was another act passed this session, for a perpetual anniversary-thanksgiving on the 29th of May, for his majesty's happy restoration; upon which occasion the bishops were commanded to draw up a suitable form of prayer; and Mr. Robinson, in the preface to his *Review of the Case of Liturgies*, says, that in their first form, which is since altered, there are these unwarrantable expressions, which I mention only to show the spirit of the times. — "We beseech thee to give us grace, to remember, and provide for our latter end, by a careful and studious imitation of this thy blessed saint and martyr, and all other thy saints and martyrs that have gone before us; that we may be made worthy to receive the benefit by their prayers, which they, in communion with thy church catholic, offer up unto thee for that part of it here militant, and yet in sight with and danger from the flesh."¹—

The books of the great Milton, and Mr. John Goodwin, published in defence of the sentence of death passed upon his late majesty, were called in by proclamation. And upon the 27th of August Milton's *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano contra Salmasium*; and his answer to a book entitled, *The Portraiture of his sacred Majesty in his Solitude and Sufferings*; were burnt by the hands of the common hangman; together with Mr. John Goodwin's book, entitled, *The Obstructors of Justice*; but the authors absconded till the storm was over. It was a surprise to all, that they had escaped prosecution. None but Goodwin and Peters had magnified the king's execution in their sermons; but Goodwin's being a strenuous Arminian procured him friends.² Milton had appeared so boldly, though with much wit, and so great purity and elegance of style, upon the argument of the king's death, that it was thought a strange omission not to except him out of the act of indemnity;³ but he lived many years after, though blind, to acquire immortal renown by his celebrated poem of *Paradise Lost*.

The tide of joy which overflowed the nation at the king's restoration, brought with it the return of Popery, which had been at a very low ebb during the late commotions,: great numbers of that religion came over with his

¹ Dr. Grey asks, "What is there blameable in all this? Here is no praying to saints; and nothing but what was thought warrantable by the fathers, long before Popery had a being."—ED.

² Burnet, vol. 1. p. 236, 237, 12mo edit.

³ "And so indeed it was (says Dr. Grey), he being the most pestilent writer that appeared at that time in defence of the regicides, Peyton and John Goodwin excepted," Milton's safety, it is said, was owing to the powerful intercession and interest of secretary Morrice, sir Thomas Clarges, and Andrew Marvel: but principally to the influence and gratitude of Sir William Davenant, whose release Milton had procured when he was taken prisoner in 1650. Nor was Charles II. says Toland, such an enemy to the muses as to require his destruction. *British Biography*, vol. 5. p. 313, 314 ; and *Dr. Grey's Examination*, vol. 3. p. 298.—ED.

majesty, and crowded about the court, magnifying their sufferings for the late king. A list of the lords, gentlemen, and other officers, who were killed in his service, was printed in red letters, by which it appeared that several noblemen, ten knights and baronets, fourteen colonels, seven lieutenant-colonels, fourteen majors, sixty-six captains, eighteen lieutenants and cornets, and thirty-eight gentlemen, lost their lives in the civil war, besides great numbers who were wounded, and whose estates were sequestered. The queen-mother came from France, and resided at Somerset-house with her Catholic attendants, both religious and secular. Several Romish priests who had been confined in Newgate, Lancaster, and other jails, were by order of council set at liberty. Many Popish priests were sent over from Douay into England, as missionaries for propagating that religion; and their clergy appeared openly in defiance of the laws; they were busy about the court and city in dispersing Popish books of devotion; and the king gave open countenance and protection to such as had been serviceable to him abroad, and came over with him, or soon followed him, which, bishop Kennet says, his majesty could not avoid. Upon the whole, more Roman Catholics appeared openly this year than in all the twelve years of the interregnum.

In Ireland the Papists took possession of their estates, which had been forfeited by the rebellion and massacre, and turned out the purchasers; which occasioned such commotions in that kingdom, that the king was obliged to issue out a proclamation, commanding them to wait the determination of the ensuing parliament. The body of their clergy, by an instrument bearing date January 1, 1660, O. S. signed and sealed by the chief prelates and officials of their religion, ventured to depute a person of their own communion, to congratulate his majesty's restoration, and to present their humble supplications for the free exercise of their religion, pursuant to the articles of 1648, whom the king received very favourably, and encouraged to hope for an accomplishment of their requests in due time. Such amazing changes happened within nine months after the king's arrival at Whitehall.

The only persons who, under pretence of religion, attempted anything against the government, were a small number of enthusiasts, who said they were for king Jesus: their leader was Thomas Venner, a wine-cooper, who, in his little conventicle in Coleman-street, warmed his admirers with passionate expectations of a fifth universal monarchy, under the personal reign of king Jesus upon earth, and that the saints were to take the kingdom to themselves. To introduce this imaginary kingdom, they marched out of their meeting-house towards St. Paul's church-yard, on Sunday January 6, to the number of about fifty men well armed, and with a resolution to subvert the present government, or die in the attempt. They published a declaration of the design of their rising, and placed sentinels at proper places.

The lordmayor sent the trained-bands to disperse them, whom they quickly routed, but in the evening retired to Cane-wood, between Highgate and Hampstead. On Wednesday morning they returned and dispersed a party of the king's soldiers in Threadneedle-street. In Wood-street they repelled the trained-bands, and some of the horse-guards; but Venner himself was knocked down, and some of his company slain; from hence the remainder retreated to Cripplegate, and took possession of a house, which they threatened to defend with a desperate resolution, but nobody appearing to countenance their frenzy, they surrendered after they had lost about half their number; Venner and one of his officers were hanged before their meeting-house door in Coleman-street, January 19, and a few days after, nine more were executed in divers parts of the city.¹

This mad insurrection gave the court a handle for breaking through the late declaration of indulgence, within three months after it was published; for January 2, there was an order of council against the meetings of sectaries in great numbers, and at unusual times; and on the 10th of January a proclamation was published, whereby his majesty forbids the Anabaptists, Quakers, and fifth-monarchy men, to assemble or meet together under pretence of worshipping God, except it be in some parochial church or chapel, or in private houses by the persons there inhabiting.² All meetings in other places are declared to be unlawful and riotous. And his majesty commands all mayors, and other peaceofficers, to search for such conventicles, and cause the persons therein to be bound over to the next sessions. Upon this the Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, who dissented from the establishment, thought fit publicly to disown and renounce the late insurrection.

¹ It plainly appeared, on the examination of these insurgents, that they had entered into no plot with any other conspirators. The whole transaction was the unquestionable effect of the religious frenzy of a few individuals. Yet it was the origin of a national burden and evil felt to this day. At the council, on the morning after the insurrection was quelled, the duke of York availed himself of the opportunity to push his arbitrary measures. On the pretext, that so extravagant an attempt could not have arisen from the rashness of one man, but was the result of a plot formed by all the sectaries and fanatics to overthrow the present government, he moved, "to suspend at such an alarming crisis, the disbanding of general Monk's regiment of foot;" which had the guard of Whitehall; and was by order of parliament to have been disbanded the next day. Through different causes, the motion was adopted, and a letter was sent to the king to request him to approve and confirm the resolution of the council, and to appoint the continuance of the regiment till farther order. To this the king consented; and as the rumours of fresh conspiracies were industriously kept up, those troops were continued and augmented, and a way was prepared for the gradual establishment of a standing army, under the name of guards. This should be a memento to future ages, how they credit reports of plots and conspiracies thrown out by a minister, unless the evidence of their existence be brought forward. The cry of conspiracies has been frequently nothing more than the chimera of fear, or the invention of a wicked policy to carry the schemes of ambition and despotism. *Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II.* vol. 1. p. 346, 347.—ED.

² Kennet's Chron. p. 357

The Independents, though not named in the proclamation, were obnoxious to the government, and suspected to concur in all designs that might change the constitution into a commonwealth: to wipe off this odium, there was published, “A renunciation and declaration of the congregational churches and public preachers of the said judgment, living in and about the city of London, against the late horrid insurrection and rebellion acted in the said city.”¹ Dated January 1660. In this declaration they disown the principles of a fifth monarchy, or the personal reign of king Jesus on earth, as dishonourable to him, and prejudicial to his church; and abhor the propagating this or any other opinion by force or blood. They refer to their late meeting of messengers from one hundred and twenty churches of their way at the Savoy, in which they declare, (chap. 24. of their confession) that civil magistrates are of divine appointment, and that it is the duty of all subjects to pray for them, to honour their persons, to pay them tribute, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority; and that infidelity, or indifference in religion, does not make void the magistrates’ just and legal authority, nor free the people from their obedience. Accordingly they cease not to pray for all sorts of blessings, spiritual and temporal, upon the person and government of his majesty, and by the grace of God will continue to do so themselves, and persuade others thereunto. And with regard to the late impious and prodigiously-daring rebellion, they add, “Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel: O my soul! come not thou into their secret, but let God divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.” Signed by

¹ “This proclamation (Mr. Gough well observes) appears to be drawn up with more art and fallacy, than sound judgment and equity: while it reaches all the different sects of dissenters, all who do not assemble for worship in some parochial church or chapel, as rioters, it distinguishes only those looked upon as the most insignificant, and least formidable for their numbers or abilities. The Presbyterians are passed over in silence, for they could not with any colour of decency be pointed at as foes to the government they had just before been conducive to establishing. The Independents are also unnoticed, probably for fear of awakening the exertion of that vigour and of those abilities, the effects whereof were yet recent in the memory of the present administration. The Anabaptists and Quakers, as new or weaker sects, are treated with less ceremony: and are ranked with the wild disturbers of the public peace: wherein justice, the characteristic virtue of good government, was designedly violated by involving the innocent with the guilty in one confused mass.” *History of the Quakers*, vol. 1. p. 443, 444.—ED.

Jos. Caryl	Samuel Slater	William Greenhil
George Griffiths	George Cockyan	Matth. Barker
Richard Kenrick	Thomas Goodwin	Tho. Malory
Robert Bragge	Thomas Brooks	John Loder
Ralph Venning	Corn. Helme	John Yates
John Oxenbridge	John Hodges	Thomas Owen
Philip Nye	John Bachiler	Nath. Mather
John Rowe	Seth Wood	Will. Stoughton.
Thomas Weld		

The Baptists published an apology¹ in behalf of themselves and their brethren of the same judgment, with a protestation against the late wicked and most horrid treason and rebellion in this city of London; in which they avow their loyalty to the king, and promise that their practice shall be conformable; subscribed by William Kiffen, Henry Den, John Batty, Thomas Lamb, Thomas Cowper, and about twenty-nine or thirty other names. They also addressed the king, that the innocent might not suffer with the guilty; protesting in the most solemn manner, that they had not the least knowledge of the late insurrection, nor did, directly or indirectly, contrive, promote, assist, or approve of it. They offered to give security for their peaceable behaviour, and for their supporting his majesty's person and government. But notwithstanding this, their religious assemblies were disturbed in all places, and their ministers imprisoned;² great numbers were

¹ This was subscribed by thirty ministers and principal members of the Baptist congregations. It was accompanied by another paper, called also an "Apology," which had been presented to the king some months before Venner's insurrection; declaratory of their sentiments concerning magistracy, and of their readiness to obey the king and all in authority in all things lawful. Mr. Jessey, preaching soon after, declared to his congregation, that Venner should say, "that he believed there was not one Baptist among his adherents; and that if they succeeded, the Baptists should know, that infant-baptism was an ordinance of Jesus Christ." In farther vindication of this people, and to shew that they were unjustly charged with opposing magistracy and government, there was published about this time a small treatise entitled "Moderation: or arguments and motives tending thereto; humbly tendered to the honourable members of parliament." Copious extracts from this piece may be seen in Crosby's History of the English Baptists, vol. 2. p. 42. 83.—ED.

² Divers pious persons were haled out of their houses; four hundred were committed to Newgate; others to Wood-street Compter; and many to other prisons. The first and most violent persecution was chiefly levelled against them. Amongst others, who suffered on this occasion, was Mr. Hanserd Knollys. Mr. Vavasor Powel was, early in the morning, taken from his house by a company of soldiers, and carried to prison: from whence he was conducted to Salop, and committed with several others to the custody of a marshal: where they were detained nine weeks, till they were released by an order of the king and council. Mr. John Bunyan was apprehended at a meeting and committed to prison, though he offered bail, till the next sessions. He was then indicted for "devilishly and perniciously abstaining from coming to church to hear divine service: and as a common upholder of several unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the distraction of the good subjects of this kingdom, contrary to the laws of our sovereign lord the king." He frankly owned being at the meeting. The justices took this for a confession of the indictment; and, because he re-

crowded into Newgate, and other prisons, where they remained under close confinement till the king's coronation, when the general pardon published on that occasion set them at liberty.

The Quakers also addressed the king upon this occasion in the following words:¹

“Oh king Charles!

“Our desire is, that thou mayest live for ever in the fear of God, and thy council. We beseech thee, and thy council, to read these following lines, in tender bowels, and compassion for our souls, and for our good.

“And this consider; we are about four hundred imprisoned in and about this city, of men and women from their families; besides, in the country jails above ten hundred. We desire, that our meetings may not be broken up, but that all may come to a fair trial, that our innocency may be cleared up.”—

“London, 16th day eleventh month, 1660.”²

On the 28th of the same month, they published the declaration referred to in their address, entitled, “A declaration from the harmless and innocent people of God called Quakers, against all sedition, plotters and fighters in the world, for removing the ground of jealousy and suspicion from both magistrates and people in the kingdom, concerning wars and fightings.” Presented to the king the 21st day of the eleventh month, 1660.³ Upon which his majesty promised them, on the word of a king, that they should not suffer for their opinions as long as they lived peaceably; but his promises were little regarded.⁴

fused to conform, sentenced him to perpetual banishment, on an act made by the then-parliament. Though the sentence of banishment was never executed upon him, he was kept in prison twelve years and a half, and suffered much under cruel and oppressive jailers. Above sixty dissenters were imprisoned with him: among whom were Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Dun, two eminent ministers well known in Bedfordshire. Mr. Bunyan was, at last, liberated on the importunity of Dr. Barlow, bishop of Lincoln. Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. 2. p. 91–93; Vavasor Powel's Life, p. 129; and Robinson's Translation of Claude, vol. 2. p. 228.—ED.

¹ Mr. Neal, a respectable person of the society informs me, has given two short paragraphs only of an address containing seven quarto pages of close letter-press. It underwent, it seems, several editions, not fewer than eight or ten; for being fraught with much pertinent, solid matter, as persecution continued, it was made very public. Mr. Neal, or his author Kennet, is charged with having mutilated the paragraphs which he quotes. For the second sentence stands in the original thus: “We beseech thee and thy council to read these following lines; and in tender bowels and compassion to read them over, for we write in love and compassion to your souls, and for your good.” And after families should be added, “in close holes and prisons.”—ED.

² Kennet's Chron. p. 361.

³ Kennet's Chron. p. 366.

⁴ Dr. Grey impeaches here the candour and fidelity of Mr. Neal, as an historian: and adds, “Sewel, a Quaker, speaks more favourably. This writer, as Dr. Grey quotes him, does say, that at this time the king showed himself moderate, for at the solicitation of some he set at liberty about seven hundred of the people called Quakers: and that they were acquit-

The Presbyterian clergy were in some degree affected with these commotions, though envy itself could not charge them with guilt; but it was the wish and desire of the prelatical party, that they might discover their uneasiness in such a manner as might expose them to trouble; for their ruin was already determined, only some pretexts were wanting to cover the design, particularly such as affected the peace of the kingdom, and might not reflect on his majesty's declaration from Breda, which promised, that no person should be molested purely for religion.¹ But they were insulted by the mob in the streets; when their families were singing psalms in their houses they were frequently interrupted by blowing of horns, or throwing stones at the windows. The Presbyterian ministers made the best retreat they could, after they had unadvisedly delivered themselves up into the hands of their enemies; for while they were careful to maintain an inviolable loyalty to his majesty's person and government, they contended for their religious principles in the press; several new pamphlets were published, and a great many old ones reprinted, about the magistrates' right of imposing things indifferent in the worship of God.—Against bowing at the name of Jesus.—The unlawfulness of the ceremonies of the church of England.—The Common Prayer-book unmasked.—Grievances and corruptions in church-government, &c. most of which were answered by divines of the episcopal party.

But the most remarkable treatise that appeared about this time, and which, if it had taken place, must have prevented the mischiefs that followed,² was that of the reverend Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, rector of Sutton

ted from any hand in Venner's plot, and that, being continually importuned, the king issued forth a declaration, that the Quakers should be set at liberty without paying fees." But though Sewel states these facts, Dr. Grey either overlooked, or forgot to inform his reader, that Mr. Neal, in charging the king with the breach of his promise, speaks on the authority of Sewel: who says, "the king seemed a good-natured prince, yet he was so misled that in process of time he seemed to have forgot what he so solemnly promised on the word of a king." History of the Quakers, p. 257.—ED.

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 624, folio.

² A conciliating and liberal design formed by two respectable men deserves to be mentioned here. "Soon after the Restoration, the honourable Mr. Boyle and sir Peter Pett were discoursing of the severities practised by the bishops towards the Puritans in the reign of Charles I. and of those which were returned on the episcopal divines during the following usurpations; and being apprehensive that the restored clergy might be tempted by their late sufferings to such a vindictive retaliation as would be contrary to the true measures of Christianity and politics, they came at last to an agreement, that it would tend to the public good, to have something written and published in defence of liberty of conscience. Sir Peter Pett engaged to write on the political part of the question. Mr. Boyle undertook to engage Dr. Thomas Barlow to treat of the theological part: and he also prevailed on Mr. John Drury, who had spent many years in his travels, and had taken an active part in a scheme for reconciling the Lutherans and Calvinists, to state the fact of the allowance of liberty of conscience in foreign parts. Sir Peter Pett's and Mr. Drury's tracts were printed

in Bedfordshire, and afterward the learned and worthy bishop of Worcester, who first made himself known to the world at this time by his *Irenicum*, or, *A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds*; printed 1661, in which he attempts to prove, that no form of church-government is of divine right, and that the church had no power to impose things indifferent. I shall beg the reader's attention to a few passages out of his preface. "The design of our Saviour (says he) was to ease men of their former burdens, and not to lay on more; the duties he required were no other but such as were necessary, and withal very just and reasonable; he that came to take away the insupportable yoke of Jewish ceremonies, certainly did never intend to gall the necks of his disciples with another instead of it; and it would be strange the church should require more than Christ himself did, and make other conditions of her communion than our Saviour did of discipleship. What possible reason can be assigned or given why such things should not be sufficient for communion with the church, which are sufficient for eternal salvation? And certainly those things are sufficient for that, which are laid down as the necessary duties of Christianity by our Lord and Saviour in his word. What ground can there be why Christians should not stand upon the same terms now, which they did in the time of Christ and his apostles! Was not religion sufficiently guarded and fenced in then? Was there ever more true and cordial reverence in the worship of God? What charter hath Christ given the church to bind men up to more than himself hath done? Or to exclude those from her society who may be admitted into heaven? Will Christ ever thank men at the great day, for keeping such out from communion with his church, who he will vouchsafe not only crowns of glory to, but it may be *aureoæ* too, if there be any such things there? The grand commission the apostles were sent out with, was only to teach what Christ had commanded them; not the least intimation of any power given them to impose or require any thing beyond what himself had spoken to them, or they were directed to by the immediate guidance of the Spirit of God. It is not, whether the things commanded and required be lawful or not? It is not, whether indifferences may be determined or no? It is not how far Christians are bound to submit to a restraint of their Christian liberty, which I now inquire after, but whether they consult the church's peace and unity who suspend it upon

in 1660. But for particular reasons, the publication of Dr. Barlow's piece did not take place: but it was published after his death.

Dr. Barlow had given offence by writing, just before the Restoration, a letter to Mr. Tombs, and expressing in it some prejudice against the practice of infant baptism, and by refusing, even after the Restoration, to retract that letter. This refusal was a noble conduct: for the doctor was in danger by it of losing his station in the university of Oxford and all his hopes of future preferment." This shews how obnoxious was the sect of the Baptists. Birch's *Life of Boyle*, p. 299, 300.—ED.

such things. We never read of the apostles making laws but of things necessary, as Acts xv. 19. It was not enough with them that the things would be necessary when they had required them; but they looked upon an antecedent necessity either absolute or for the present state, which was the only ground of their imposing these commands upon the Gentile Christians. But the Holy Ghost never thought those things fit to be made matters of law to which all parties should conform. All that the apostles required as to this was mutual forbearance and condescension towards each other in them. The apostles valued not indifferences at all; and those things they accounted as such which were of no concernment to their salvation. And what reason is there why men should be tied up so strictly to such things which they may do or let alone, and yet be very good. Christians? Without all controversy, the main inlet of all the distractions, confusions, and divisions, of the Christian world, has been by adding other conditions of church-communion than Christ has done.—Would there ever be the less peace and unity in a church, if a diversity were allowed as to practices supposed indifferent? Yea, there would be so much more, as there was a mutual forbearance and condescension as to such things. The unity of the church is a unity of love and affection, and not a bare uniformity of practice and opinion.—There is nothing in the primitive church more deserving our imitation than that admirable temper, moderation, and condescension, which was used in it towards its members. It was never thought worth the while to make any standing laws for rites and customs that had no other original but tradition, much less to suspend men from her communion for not observing them.—¹

The doctor's proposals for an accommodation were, "1. That nothing be imposed as necessary but what is clearly revealed in the word of God. 2. That nothing be required or determined but what is sufficiently known to be indifferent in its own nature. 3. That whatever is thus determined be in order only to a due performance of what is in general required in the word of God, and not to be looked upon as any part of divine worship or service. 4. That no sanctions be made, nor mulcts or penalties be inflicted, on such who only dissent from the use of some things whose lawfulness they at present scruple, till sufficient time and means be used for their information of the nature and indifferency of these things. I am sure (says the doctor) it is contrary to the primitive practice, and the moderation then used, to suspend or deprive men of their ministerial function for not conforming in habits and gestures, or the like. Lastly, that religion be not clogged with ceremonies; for when they are multiplied too much, though lawful, they eat out the

¹ Irenicum, p. 8–10.

heart, heat, life, and vigour, of Christianity.—”¹ If the doctor had steadily adhered to those principles, he could hardly have subscribed the act of uniformity next year, much less have written so warmly against the dissenters, as he did twenty years afterward.² But all he could say or do at present availed nothing, the Presbyterians were in disgrace, and nothing could stem the torrent of popular fury that was now coming upon them.

[In the year 1660, April 25, died, when the king designed to advance him to the see of Worcester, the learned Dr. Henry Hammond. In addition to the short account given of him by Mr. Neal, in a former volume, some other particulars may be subjoined here. He was born 18th August, 1605, at Chertsey in Surrey; and was the youngest son of Dr. John Hammond, a physician. He received his grammar-learning at Eton-school, and in 1618 was sent to Magdalen-college in Oxford, of which he was elected fellow in July 1625, and entered into holy orders in 1629. The rectory of Penshurst was bestowed upon him by the earl of Leicester in 1633. In 1640, he was chosen one of the members of the convocation; in 1643 made archdeacon of Chichester, and the same year was named one of the assembly of divines, but never sat amongst them. He was distinguished in his youth for the sweetness of his carriage, and, at the times allowed for play, would steal, from his fellows, into places of privacy to pray:—omens of his future pacific temper and eminent devotion. When he was at the university he generally spent thirteen hours of the day in study. Charles I. said, “he was the most natural orator he had ever heard.” He was extremely liberal to the poor; and was used to say, that “it was a most unreasonable and unchristian thing to despise any one for his poverty, and it was one of the greatest sensualities in the world to give.” He gave it as a rule to his friends of estate and quality, “to treat their poor neighbours with such a cheerfulness, that they might be glad to have met with them.” The alms of lending had an eminent place in his practice. He was accustomed strongly to recommend to others, “to be always furnished with something to do,” as the best expedient both for innocence and pleasure. Devoted as he was to his studies, he would never suffer anybody to wait, that came to speak to him: and to the

¹ Irenicum, p. 66, 67.

² “If Mr. Neal (says Dr. Grey) would allow a man to retract his mistakes upon discovering them, he would not find fault with bishop Stillingfleet.” He then quotes the bishop’s apology for his conduct, from the preface to the Unreasonableness of Separation. “If any thing in the following treatise be found different from the sense of that book, I entreat them to allow me that, which I heartily wish to them, that in twenty years’ time, we may arrive to such maturity of thoughts, as to see reason to change our opinion of some things, and I wish I had not cause to add, of some persons.” But notwithstanding the force of the bishop’s plea, it will not, I conceive, be deemed a fortunate or honourable change, if a man’s views and spirit, instead of enlarging and becoming more liberal, are contracted and grow narrow and partial; if, instead of being the advocate for generous and conciliating measures, he should argue for oppression and intolerance.—ED.

poor he came with peculiar alacrity. *British Biography*, vol. v. p. 219. 225.—ED.]

The earl of Clarendon, lord-chancellor, was prime-minister, and at the head of the king's councils. The year [1661] began with new scenes of pleasure and diversion, occasioned by the king's marriage with the infanta of Portugal, which was consummated April 30. The match was promoted by general Monk and lord Clarendon, if, according to the Oxford historian, the latter was not the first mover of it.¹ And it was reckoned very strange, that a Protestant chancellor should advise the king to a Popish princess, when a Catholic king proposed at the same time a Protestant consort. But his lordship had farther views; for it was generally talked among the merchants, that the infanta could have no children, in which case the chancellor's daughter, who had been privately married to the king's brother, must succeed, and her issue by the duke of York become heirs to the throne; which happened accordingly in the persons of queen Mary II. and queen Anne. Such were the aspiring views of this great man, which, together with his haughty behaviour, in the end proved his ruin.

The convention-parliament being dissolved, a new one was elected, and summoned to meet May 8. The house of commons, by the interest of the court-party,² had a considerable majority of such as were zealous enemies of the Presbyterians, and abettors of the principles of archbishop Laud; many of whom, having impaired their fortunes in the late wars, became tools of the ministry in all their arbitrary and violent measures. The court kept above one hundred of them in constant pay, who went by the name of the club of

¹ Dr. Grey observes, that Mr. Neal antedates this marriage somewhat above a year; the king met the infanta at Portsmouth the 21st of May, 1662, and was then privately married to her by Dr. Sheldon, bishop of London. The doctor, on the authority of Echard, endeavours to invalidate the imputation which lies on lord Clarendon of being the promoter, if not the first mover, of this marriage. Mr. Neal is supported in his representation of the affair by the testimony of sir John Reresby, who says, "It is well known, that the lord-chancellor had the blame of this unfruitful match." He adds, that the queen was said to have had a constant fluor upon her, which rendered her incapable of conception. Though, on this occasion (says sir John), everything was gay, and splendid, and profusely joyful, it was easy to discern that the king was not excessively charmed with his new bride, who was a very little woman, with a pretty tolerable face. She neither in person or manners had any one article to stand in competition with the charms of the countess of Castlemain, afterward dutchess of Cleveland, the finest woman of her age." *Memoirs*, p. 9, 10.—ED.

² There were only fifty-six members of the Presbyterian party returned, notwithstanding their great interest in almost all the corporations. But in the interval, between the two parliaments, the court-party had been active; and the hints given at the dissolution of the late parliament by the chancellor, had great weight. He recommended that "such persons should be returned as were not likely to oppose the king, but had already served him, and were likely to serve him with their whole heart, and to gratify him in all his desires."—*Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II.* vol. I. p. 171 and 406.—Had the people been alive to a just sense of the design of representation and the nature of the constitution, they would have received these hints with indignant contempt—ED.

voters, and received large sums of money out of the exchequer, till they had almost subverted the constitution; and then, because they would not put the finishing hand to what they had unadvisedly begun, they were disbanded.

The king acquainted the houses at the opening of the session,¹ that “he valued himself much upon keeping his word, and upon making good whatsoever he had promised to his subjects.”² But the chancellor, who commented upon the king’s speech, spoke a different language, and told the house, “that there were a sort of patients in the kingdom that deserved their utmost severity, and none of their lenity; these were the seditious preachers, who could not be contented to be dispensed with for their full obedience to some laws established, without reproaching and inveighing against those laws, how established soever, who tell their auditories, that when the apostle bid them stand to their liberties he bid them stand to their arms, and who by repeating the very expressions and teaching the very doctrines they set on foot in the year 1640, sufficiently declare that they have no mind that twenty years should put an end to the miseries we have undergone. What good Christians can think, without horror, of these ministers of the gospel, who by their function should be messengers of peace, but are in their practice only the trumpets of war, and incendiaries towards rebellion?—And if the persons and place can aggravate their offence, so no doubt it does before God and man. Methinks the preaching rebellion and treason out of the pulpit, should be as much worse than advancing it in the market, as poisoning a man at a communion would be worse than killing him at a tavern.”—His lordship concludes thus: “If you do not provide for the thorough quenching these firebrands; king, lords, and commons, shall be the meaner subjects, and the whole kingdom will be kindled in a general flame.”³ This was a home-thrust at the Presbyterians; the chancellor did not explain himself upon the authors of these seditious sermons, his design being not to accuse particular persons, but to obtain a general order which might suppress all teachers who were not of the church of England; and the parliament was prepared to run blindfold into all the court-measures; for in this session the militia was given absolutely to the king—the solemn league and covenant was declared void and illegal—the act for disabling persons in holy orders to exercise temporal jurisdiction was repealed—the bishops were restored to their seats in parliament—the old ecclesiastical jurisdiction was revived by the repeal of the 17th of Charles I. except the oath, *ex offi-*

¹ The king went to the house of lords, to open the session, with almost as much pomp and splendour as had been displayed on the coronation-day; and, says my author, for the same reasons, to dazzle the mob, and to impress on the minds of the people very exalted notions of the dignity of regal government. Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II. vol. 1. p. 407, note.—ED.

² Kennet’s Chron. p. 434.

³ Ibid. p. 510, 511.

cio—and it was made a *premunire* to call the king a Papist.¹

The storm was all this while gathering very black over the Presbyterians; for when the parliament met a second time, November 20, the king complimented the bishops, who appeared now again in their places among the peers, and observed in his speech, that it was a felicity he had much desired to see, as the only thing wanting to restore the old constitution. He then spoke the language of the chancellor, and told the commons, “that there were many wicked instruments who laboured night and day to disturb the public peace.—That it was worthy of their care to provide proper remedies for the diseases of that kind; that if they found new diseases they must find new remedies. That the difficulties which concerned religion were too hard for him, and therefore he recommended them to their care and deliberation who could best provide for them.” The tendency of this speech was to make way for breaking through the Breda declaration, and to furnish the parliament with a pretence for treating the Nonconformists with rigour, to which they were themselves too well inclined.

Lord Clarendon, in a conference between the two houses, affirmed positively, that there was a real conspiracy against the peace of the kingdom; and though it was disconcerted in the city, it was carried on in divers counties; a committee was therefore appointed to inquire into the truth of the report; but after all their examinations not one single person was convicted, or so much as prosecuted for it.² Great pains were taken to fasten some treasonable designs on the Presbyterians; letters were sent from unknown hands to the chiefs of the party in several parts of the kingdom, intimating the project of a general insurrection, in which their friends were concerned, and desiring them to communicate it to certain persons in their neighbourhood, whom they name in their letters, that they may be ready at time and place. A letter of this kind was directed to the reverend Mr. Sparry, in Worcestershire, desiring him and captain Yarrington to be ready with money; and to acquaint Mr. Oatland and Mr. Baxter with the design. This, with a packet of the same kind, was said to be left under a hedge by a Scots pedlar; and as soon as they were found, they were carried to sir J. Packing-

¹ To Mr. Neal’s detail of the acts of this session, it should be added, that the commons voted, that all their members should receive the sacrament according to the prescribed liturgy, before a certain day, under penalty of expulsion. This was intended as a test of their religious sincerity. Besides repealing the solemn league and covenant, they ordered it to be taken out of all the courts and places where it was recorded, and to be burnt by the common hangman. To the same sentence were doomed all acts, ordinances, or engagements, which had been dictated by a republican spirit during the late times. And they enervated the right of petitioning by various restrictions; limiting the number of signatures to twenty, unless with the sanction of three justices, or the major part of the grand jury; and of those who should present a petition to the king or either house of parliament to ten persons, under the penalty of a fine of £100 and three months’ imprisonment. Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II. vol. 1. p. 412–414.—ED.

² Kennet’s Chron. p. 602.

ton, who immediately committed Sparry, Oatland, and Yarrington, to prison. The militia of the county was raised, and the city of Worcester put into a posture of defence; but the sham was so notorious, that the earl of Bristol, though a Papist, was ashamed of it; and after some time the prisoners, for want of evidence, were released. The members for Oxfordshire, Herefordshire, and Staffordshire, informed the commons, that they had rumours of the like conspiracies in their counties. Bishop Burnet says, “that many were taken up, but none tried; that this was done to fasten an odium on the Presbyterians, and to help to carry the penal laws through the house; and there were appearances of foul dealing (says he) among the fiercer sort.” Mr. Locke adds, that the reports of a general insurrection were spread over the whole nation, by the very persons who invented them; and though lord Clarendon could not but be acquainted with the farce, he kept it on foot to facilitate passing the severe laws that were now coming upon the carpet.¹ The government could not with decency attack the Nonconformists purely on account of their religion; the declaration from Breda was too express on that article; they were therefore to be charged with raising disturbances in the state. But supposing the fact to be true, that some few malecontents had been seditiously disposed, which yet was never made out, what reason can be assigned why it should be charged upon the principles of a whole body of men, who were unquestionably willing to be quiet?

It was nevertheless on this base and dishonourable suggestion, that the first penal law which passed against the Non-conformists this session was founded,² entitled,

“An act for the well-governing and regulating corporations;” which enacts, “that within the several cities, corporations, boroughs, cinque-ports, and other port-towns within the kingdom of England, dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, all mayors, aldermen, recorders, bailiffs, town-clerks, common-council-men, and other persons bearing any office or offices of magistracy, or places, or trusts, or other employment, relating to or concerning the government of the said respective cities, corporations, and boroughs, and cinque-ports, and their members, and other port-towns, shall take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and this oath following:

“I, A. B., do declare and believe, that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the king; and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him.”³

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 627.

² Kennet's Chron. p. 602.

³ “One would suppose (it has been well remarked), that the parliament, who prescribed such an oath, must have been as near-sighted and as stupid as they were servile and cor-

“They shall also subscribe the following declaration:

“‘I, A. B., do declare, that there lies no obligation upon me from the solemn league and covenant, and that the same was an unlawful oath imposed on the subject against the laws and liberties of the kingdom.’

“Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person shall hereafter be elected or chosen into any of the offices or places aforesaid, that shall not have, within one year next before such election or choice, taken the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, according to the rites of the church of England; and that every person so elected shall take the aforesaid oaths, and subscribe the said declaration at the same time when the oath for the due execution of the said places and offices shall be respectively administered.”

Thus all Nonconformists were turned out of all the branches of magistracy at once, and rendered incapable of serving their country in the offices of a common-council-man, or a burgess or bailiff of the smallest corporation. The oath imposed in this act robbed them of their right as subjects. Mr. Echard confesses that it seems at once to give up the whole constitution; and no wonder, says he, if many of the clergy as well as laity, on the account of this act, espoused a doctrine which, if rigidly taken, was hard to be reconciled to the great deliverance afterward. Mr. Rapin adds,¹ that to say that it is not lawful on any pretence whatever to resist the king, is, properly speaking, to deliver up the liberties of the nation into his hands. The high churchmen had then elevated ideas of the royal authority. But even this parliament did not think fit afterward to admit the dangerous consequences of their own maxims.

Commissioners were appointed, and employed during this and the following year, to visit the several corporations in England, and to turn out of office such as were in the least suspected; who executed their commissions with so much rigour, that the corporations had not one member left, who was not entirely devoted to the king and the church.

rapt. Such a maxim of nonresistance to the king, on any pretence, was directly subversive of their own consequence as well as of civil and religious liberty. The extent to which this principle might be carried, was put to the proof by James II., but the people of England rent asunder the chains which had been forged for them by their perfidious representatives.” *Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II.* vol. 1. p. 428, note.—ED.

¹ Vol. 2. p. 628.