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CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE CONFERENCE AT THE SAVOY, TO THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY. 1661.

According to his majesty’s declaration of October 25, 1660, concerning ecclesiastical affairs, twelve bishops[[1]](#footnote-1) and nine assistants were appointed on the part of the episcopal church of Eng­land, and as many ministers on the side of the Presbyterians, to assemble at the bishop of London’s lodgings at the Savoy, “to review the Book of Common Prayer, comparing it with the most ancient and purest liturgies; and to take into their serious and grave considerations the several directions and rules, forms of prayer, and things in the said Book of Common Prayer con­tained, and to advise and consult upon the same, and the several objections and exceptions which shall now be raised against the same; and if occasion be, to make such reasonable aad necessary alterations, corrections, and amendments, as shall be agreed upon to be needful and expedient for giving satisfaction to tender consciences, and the restoring and continuance of peace and unity in the churches under his majesty’s government and direction.” They were to continue four months from the 25th of March, 1661, and then present the result of their conferences to his ma­jesty under their several hands.

The names of the episcopal divines on the side of the estab­lishment at the Savoy conference were,

A close-up of a document

Description automatically generated

The names of the Presbyterian divines, or those who were for alterations in the hierarchy of the church at the Savoy conference, were,
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When the commissioners[[2]](#footnote-2) were assembled the first time April 15, the Archbishop of York stood up and said, he knew little of the business they were met about, and therefore referred it to Dr. Sheldon, bishop of London, who gave it as his opinion, that the Presbyterians having desired this conference, they [the bishops] should neither say nor do anything till the others had brought in all their exceptions and complaints against the liturgy in writing, with their additional forms and amendments.[[3]](#footnote-3) The Presbyterians humbly moved for a conference according to the words of the commission, but the bishop of London insisting peremptorily upon his own method, the others consented to bring in their exceptions at one time, and their additions at another. For this purpose bishop Reynolds, Dr. Wallis, and the rest of the Presbyterian party, met from day to day to collect their ex­ceptions;[[4]](#footnote-4) but the additions, or drawing up a new form, was in­trusted with Mr. Baxter alone. “Bishop Sheldon saw well enough (says Burnet[[5]](#footnote-5)) what the effect would be of obliging them to make all their demands at once, that the number would raise a mighty outcry against them as a people that could never be satisfied.” On the other hand, the Presbyterians were di­vided in their sentiments; some were for insisting only on a few important things, reckoning that if they were gained, and a union followed, it might be easier to obtain others afterward. But the majority, by the influence of Mr. Baxter, were for ex­tending their desires to the utmost, and thought themselves bound by the words of the commission to offer everything they thought might conduce to the peace of the church, without con­sidering what an aspect this would have with the world, or what influence their numerous demands might have upon the minds of those who were now their superiors in numbers and strength,[[6]](#footnote-6) but when they were put in mind that the king’s commission gave them no power to alter the government of the church, nor to insist upon archbishop Usher’s model, nor so much as to claim the concessions of his majesty’s late declaration, they were quite heartless; for they were now convinced that all they were to ex­pect was a few amendments in the liturgy and Common Prayer­book. This was concluded beforehand at court, and nothing more intended than to drop the Presbyterians with a show of decency.

The ministers were under this farther hardship, that they were to transact for a body of men from whom they had no power, and therefore could not be obliged to abide by their decisions; they told the king and the prime-minister, that they should be glad to consult their absent brethren, and receive from them a commis­sion in form, but this was denied, and they were required to give in their own sense of things, to which they consented, provided the bishops at the same time would bring in their concessions; but these being content to abide by the liturgy as it then stood, had nothing to offer, nor would they admit of any alterations but what the Presbyterians should make appear to be necessary. With this dark and melancholy prospect the conference was opened.[[7]](#footnote-7) It would interrupt the course of this history too much, to insert all the exceptions of the Presbyterians to the present liturgy, and the papers which passed between the commissioners, with the letter of the Presbyterian ministers to the archbishop and bishops, and the report they made of the whole to the king. I shall only take notice in this place, that, instead of drawing up a few supplemental forms, and making some amendments to the old liturgy, Mr. Baxter composed an entire new one in the lan­guage of Scripture, which he called the reformed liturgy; not with a design entirely to set aside the old one, but to give men liberty to use either as they approved. It was drawn up in a short compass of time, and after it had been examined, and ap­proved by his brethren, was presented to the bishops in the con­ference, together with their exceptions to the old liturgy. This gave great offence, as presuming that a liturgy drawn up by a single hand in fourteen days, was to be preferred, or stand in competition with one which had been received in the church for a whole century. Besides, it was inconsistent with the commis­sion and the bishops’ declaration of varying no farther from the old standard than should appear to be necessary; and therefore the reformed liturgy, as it was called, was rejected at once with­out being examined.

When the Presbyterians brought in their exceptions to the liturgy, they presented at the same time a petition for peace, beseeching the bishops to yield to their amendments; to free them from the subscriptions and oaths in his majesty’s late de­claration, and not to insist upon the reordination of those who had been ordained without a diocesan bishop, nor upon the sur­plice, the cross in baptism, and other indifferent ceremonies; for this purpose they make use of various motives and arguments, sufficient, in my judgment, to influence all who had any concern for the honour of God, and the salvation of souls. The bishops gave a particular answer to these exceptions; to which the Pres­byterians made such a reply as, in the opinion of their adver­saries, showed them to be men of learning, and well versed in the practice of the ancient church; however, the bishops would indulge nothing to their prejudices; upon which they sent them a large expostulatory letter, wherein, after having repeated their objec­tions, they lay the wounds of the church at their door.

The term for the treaty being almost spun out in a paper con­troversy,[[8]](#footnote-8) about ten days before the commission expired, a disputation was agreed on, to argue the necessity of alterations in the present liturgy.[[9]](#footnote-9) Three of each party were chosen to manage the argument; Dr. Pearson, Gunning, and Sparrow, on one side; and Dr. Bates, Jacomb, and Mr. Baxter, on the other. The rest were at liberty to withdraw if they pleased. Mr. Baxter was opponent, and began to prove the sinfulness of impo­sitions; but through want of order, frequent interruptions, and personal reflections, the dispute issued in nothing; a number of young divines interrupting the Presbyterian ministers, and laughing them to scorn. At length bishop Cosins produced a paper,[[10]](#footnote-10) containing an expedient to shorten the debate, which was, to put the ministers on distinguishing between those things which they charged as sinful, and those which were only inexpe­dient. The three disputants on the ministers’ side were desired to draw up an answer to this paper, which they did, and charged the rubric and injunctions of the church with eight things flatly sinful, and contrary to the word of God.[[11]](#footnote-11)

1. That no minister be admitted to baptize without using the sign of the cross.

2. That no minister be admitted to officiate without wearing a surplice.

3. That none be admitted to the Lord’s supper without he receive it kneeling.

4. That ministers be obliged to pronounce all baptized persons regenerated by the Holy Ghost, whether they be the children of Christians or not.

5*.* That ministers be obliged to deliver the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ to the unfit both in health and sickness, and that, by personal application, putting it into their hands, even those who are forced to receive it against their wills, through consciousness of their impenitency.

6. That ministers are obliged to absolve the unfit, and that in absolute expressions.

7. That ministers are forced to give thanks for all whom they bury, as brethren whom God has taken to himself.

8. That none may be preachers who do not subscribe, that there is nothing in the Common Prayer-book, book of ordination, and the thirty-nine articles, contrary to the word of God.;

After a great deal of loose discourse it was agreed to debate the third article, of denying the communion to such as could not kneel. The ministers proved their assertion thus, that it was denying the sacrament to such whom the Holy Ghost commanded us to receive; Rom. xiv. 1–3; “Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations: one believes he may eat all things; another, that is weak, eateth herbs: let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God has received him.” The episcopal divines would not understand this of the commu­nion. They also distinguished between things lawful in them­selves, and things both lawful in themselves and required by law­ful authority. In the former case they admit a liberty, but the latter being enjoined by authority become necessary. The mi­nisters replied, that things about which there is to be a forbear­ance ought not to be enjoined by authority, and made necessary; and for governors to reject men by this rule is to defeat the apos­tle’s reasoning, and so contradict the law of God. But when Dr. Gunning had read certain citations[[12]](#footnote-12) and authorities for the other side of the question, bishop Cosins the moderator called out to the rest of the bishops and doctors, and put the question, “All you that think Dr. Gunning has proved that Romans xiv. speaketh not of receiving the sacrament, say Aye.” Upon which there was a general cry among the hearers, Aye, aye; the episcopal divines having great numbers of their party in the hall; whereas the ministers had not above two or three gen­tlemen and scholars who had the courage to appear with them. Nevertheless they maintained their point, and, as bishop Bur­net observes, insisted upon it, that a “law which excludes all from the sacrament who dare not kneel, was unlawful, as it was a limitation in point of communion put upon the laws of Christ, which ought to be the only condition of those that have a right to it.”

At length the episcopal divines became opponents upon the same question, and argued thus: “That command which enjoins only an act in itself lawful, is not sinful.” Which Mr. Baxter denied. They then added, “That command which enjoins only an act in itself lawful, and no other act or circumstance unlaw­ful, is not sinful.” This also Mr. Baxter denied. They then advanced farther. “That command which enjoins only an act in itself lawful, and no other act whereby an unjust penalty is enjoined, or any circumstance whence directly or *per accidens* any sin is consequent which the commander ought to provide against, hath in it all things requisite to the lawfulness of a com­mand, and particularly cannot be charged with enjoining an act *per accidens* unlawful, nor of commanding an act under an unjust penalty.” This also was denied, because, though it does not command that which is sinful, it may restrain from that which is lawful, and it may be applied to undue subjects. Other reasons were assigned;[[13]](#footnote-13) but the dispute broke off with noise and confu­sion, and high reflections upon Mr. Baxter’s dark and cloudy imagination, and his perplexed, scholastic, metaphysical manner of distinguishing, which tended rather to confound than to clear up that which was doubtful; and bishop Saunderson being then in the chair, pronounced that Dr. Gunning had the better of the argument.

Bishop Morley said, that Mr. Baxter’s denying that plain pro­position, was destructive of all authority human and divine; that it struck the church out of all its claims for making canons, and for settling order and discipline; nay, that it took away all legis­lative power from the king and parliament, and even from God himself; for no act can be so good in itself, but may lead to a sin by accident; and if to command such an act be a sin, then every command must be a sin.

Bishop Burnet adds,[[14]](#footnote-14) “that Baxter and Gunning spent seve­ral days in logical arguing, to the diversion of the town, who looked upon them as a couple of fencers engaged in a dispute that could not be brought to any end. The bishops insisted upon the laws being’ still in force; to which they would admit of no exception, unless it was proved that the matter of them was sin­ful. They charged the Presbyterians with making a schism for that which they could not prove to be sinful. They said there was no reason to gratify such men; that one demand granted would draw on many more; that all authority in church and state was struck at by the position they had insisted on, namely, that it was not lawful to impose things indifferent, since these seemed to be the only matters in which authority could interfere.”—Thus ended the disputation.

From arguments the ministers descended to entreaties, and prayed the bishops to have compassion on scrupulous minds, and not despise their weaker brethren. If the Nonconformists should be ejected, they urged, that there would not be clergymen enough to fill the vacant pulpits; they put them in mind of their peaceable behaviour in the late times; what they had suf­fered for the royal cause, and the great share they had in restor­ing the king; they pleaded his majesty’s late declaration, and the design of the present conference. To all which the bishops replied, that they were only commissioned to make such altera­tions in the liturgy as should be necessary, and such as should be agreed upon. The ministers replied, that the word necessary must refer to the satisfying tender consciences; but the bishops insisted, that they saw no alterations necessary, and therefore were not obliged to make any till they could prove them so. The ministers prayed them to consider the ill consequence that might follow upon a separation. But all was to no purpose, their lord­ships were in the saddle, and, if we may believe Mr. Baxter, would not abate the smallest ceremony, nor correct the grossest error, for the peace of the church. Thus the king’s commission expired July 25, and the conferences ended without any prospect of accommodation.

It was agreed at the conclusion, that each party might repre­sent to his majesty, that they were all agreed upon the ends of the conference, which were the church’s welfare, unity, and peace, but still disagreed as to the means of procuring them. The bishops thought they had no occasion to represent their case in writing; but the Presbyterian commissioners met by them­selves, and drew up an account of their proceedings, with a peti­tion for that relief which they could not obtain from the bishops.[[15]](#footnote-15) They presented it to the king by bishop Reynolds, Dr. Bates, Dr. Manton, and Mr. Baxter;[[16]](#footnote-16) but received no answer.

Before we leave this famous conference at the Savoy, it will not be amiss to remark the behaviour of the commissioners on both sides, some of whom seldom or never appeared, as, Dr. King bishop of Chichester, Dr. Heylin, Barwick, and Earle;[[17]](#footnote-17) Sheldon bishop of London came but seldom, though he, with Henchman and Morley, had the chief management of affairs;[[18]](#footnote-18) others who were present, but did not much concern themselves in the debate, as, Dr. Frewen archbishop of York; Lucy of St. David’s; Warner of Rochester; Saunderson of Lincoln; Laney of Peterborough; Walton of Chester; Sterne of Carlisle; Dr. Racket and Dr. Sparrow. On the side of the Presbyterians, Dr. Horton never appeared, nor Dr. Drake, because of a misnomer in the commission; Dr. Lightfoot, Tuckney, and Mr. Woodbridge, were present only once or twice.

Among the bishops, Dr. Morley was the chief speaker; his manner was vehement, and he was against all abatements. He frequently interrupted Mr. Baxter;[[19]](#footnote-19) and when Dr. Bates said, “Pray, my lord, give him leave to speak,” he could not obtain it.

Bishop Cosins was there constantly, and though he was inclined to moderate measures, said some very severe things. When the ministers prayed the bishops to have some compassion on their brethren, and not cast such great numbers unnecessarily out of the ministry, he replied, “What, do you threaten us with numbers? For my part, I think the king would do well to make you name them all.” Again, when the ministers complained; that after so many years’ calamity the bishops would not yield to that which their predecessors offered them before the war, bishop Cosins replied, “Do you threaten us then with a new war? It is time for the king to look to you.”

Bishop Gauden often took part with the Presbyterian divines, and was the only moderator among the bishops, except bishop Reynolds, who spoke much the first day for abatements and moderation; but afterward, sitting among the bishops, he only spoke now and then a qualifying word, though he was heartily grieved for the fruitless issue of the conference.

Of the disputants, it is said, Dr. Pearson, afterward bishop of Chester, disputed accurately, soberly, and calmly. The Presbyterian ministers had a great regard for him, and believed, that if he had been an umpire in the controversy his concessions would have greatly relieved them.

Dr. Gunning was the most forward speaker, and stuck at nothing. Bishop Burnet says,[[20]](#footnote-20) that all the arts of sophistry were used by him in as confident a manner as if they had been sound reasoning; that he was unweariedly active to very little purpose, and being very fond of the Popish rituals and ceremonies, he was very much set upon reconciling the church of England to Rome.

On the side of the Presbyterians, Dr. Bates and Manton behaved with great modesty: the most active disputant was Mr. Baxter, who had a very metaphysical head and fertile invention, and was one of the most ready men of his time for an argument, but too eager and tenacious of his own opinions. Next to him was Mr. Calamy, who had a great interest among the Presbyterian ministers in city and country, and for his age and gravity was respected as their father.

Among the auditors, Mr. Baxter observes,[[21]](#footnote-21) there was with the bishops a crowd of young divines who behaved indecently; but mentions only two or three scholars and laymen, who, as auditors, came in with the Presbyterians, as Mr. Miles, Mr. Tillotson, &c.

This Mr. Tillotson was afterward the most reverend and learned archbishop of Canterbury, one of the most celebrated divines and preachers of the age. We shall have frequent occasion to mention him hereafter, and therefore, I shall give a short account of him in this place. He was born in Yorkshire 1680, and received his first education among the Puritans; and though he had freer notions, he still stuck to the strictness of life to which he was bred, and retained a just value and a due tenderness for men of that persuasion. He was admitted student of Clare-hall in Cambridge, under the tuition of Mr. David Clarkson, in the year 1647. He was bachelor of arts 1650, and within the compass of a year was elected fellow. He had then a sweetness of temper which he retained as long as he lived; and in those early years was respected as a person of very great parts and prudence.[[22]](#footnote-22) In the year 1661, he continued a Nonconformist, and has a sermon in the morning exercises on Matt. vii. 12. He appeared with the Presbyterians at the Savoy disputation; and though he conformed upon the act of uniformity in 1662, he was always inclined to the Puritans, never fond of the ceremonies of the church, but would dispense sometimes with those who could not conscientiously submit to them. He owned the dissenters had some plausible objections against the common-prayer; and, in the opinion of some, persuaded men rather to bear with the church, than be zealous for it. In the year 1663, he was preferred to the rectory of Keddington in Suffolk, vacant by the nonsubscription of Mr. Samuel Fairclough. Next year he was chosen preacher to Lincolns-inn, and lecturer of St. Lawrence’s church in London, where his excellent sermons, delivered in a most graceful manner, drew the attention of great numbers of the quality, and most of the divines and gentlemen in the city. In 1669,[[23]](#footnote-23) he was made canon of Christ-church in Canterbury; and in 1672, dean of that church, and residentiary: but rose no higher till the revolution of king William and queen Mary, when he was first made clerk of the closet, and then advanced at once to the archbishopric of Canterbury, in the room of Dr. Sancroft a nonjuror. He was a divine of moderate principles to the last, and always disposed to promote a toleration, and if possible a comprehension of the dissenters within the church. Upon the whole, he was a second Cranmer, and one of the most valuable prelates that this, or it may be any other, church ever produced.

Various censures were passed within doors upon the Savoy conference; the Independents were disgusted, because none of them were consulted, though it does not appear to me what concern they could have in it, their views being only to a toleration, not a comprehension. Some blamed their brethren for yielding too much, and others thought they might have yielded more; but when they saw the fruitless end of the treaty, and the papers that were published, most of them were satisfied.—Bishop Burnet says,[[24]](#footnote-24) the conference did rather hurt than good, it heightened the sharpness which was already on people’s minds to such a degree, that it needed no addition to raise it higher.—Mr. Robinson says,[[25]](#footnote-25) “It was notorious that the business of the episcopal party was not to consult the interest of religion, but to cover a political design, which was too bad to appear at first; nor did they mean to heal the church’s wounds, so much as to revenge their own. When they knew what the Presbyterians scrupled, they said, now they knew their minds they would have matters so fixed that not one of that sort should be able to keep his living. They did not desire, but rather fear, their compliance.” Nay, so unacceptable was the publishing the papers relating to the conference, that bishop Saunderson and some of his brethren cautioned their clergy against reading them. From this time the Presbyterians were out of the question, and the settlement of the church referred entirely to the convocation and parliament.

It had been debated in council, whether there should be a convocation while the conference at the Savoy was depending; but at the intercession of Dr. Heylin and others, the court was prevailed with to consent that there should; and such care was taken in the choice of members, as bishop Burnet observes, that everything went among them as was directed by bishop Sheldon and Morley. If a convocation had been holden with the convention-parliament, the majority would have been against the hierarchy; but it is not to be wondered they were otherwise now, when some hundreds of the Presbyterian clergy, who were in possession of sequestered livings, had been dispossessed; and the necessity of ordination by a bishop being urged upon those who had been ordained by presbyters only, great numbers were denied their votes in elections. Nevertheless, the Presbyterian interest carried it in London for Mr. Baxter and Calamy by three voices; but the bishop of London, having a power of choosing two out of four, or four out of six, within a certain circuit, left them both out; by which means the city of London had no clerks in the convocation. The author of the Conformists’ Plea[[26]](#footnote-26) says, “that to frame a convocation to their mind great care and pains were used to keep out, and to get men in, by very undue proceedings; and that protestations were made against all incumbents not ordained by bishops.

The Savoy conference having ended without success, the king sent a letter to the convocation, November 20, commanding them to review the Book of Common Prayer, and make such additions and amendments[[27]](#footnote-27) as they thought necessary. Letters to the same purpose were sent to the archbishop of York, to be communicated to the clergy of his province, who for the greater expedition sent proxies with procuratorial letters to those of Canterbury, and obliged themselves to abide by their votes under forfeiture of their goods and chattels.

“It is inconceivable, says Dr. Nichols, what difficulties the bishops had to contend with, about making these alterations; they were not only to conquer their own former resentments, and the unreasonable demands of Presbyterians, but they had the court to deal with, who pushed them on to all acts of severity.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Whereas on the contrary, the tide was strong on their side, the bishops pushed on the court, who were willing to give them the reins, that when the breach was made as wide as possible, a door might be opened for the toleration of Papists. The review of the Common Prayer-book engaged the convocation a whole month; and on the 20th of December it was signed, and approved by all the members of both houses.

The alterations were these,[[29]](#footnote-29)

1. The rubric for singing of lessons,[[30]](#footnote-30) &c. was omitted, the distinct reading of them being thought more proper.

2. Several collects for Sundays and holy-days complained of, were omitted, and others substituted in their room.

3. Communicants at the Lord’s supper were enjoined to signify their names to the curate some time the day before.

4. The preface to the ten commandments was restored.[[31]](#footnote-31)

5. The exhortations to the holy communion were amended.

6. The general confession in the communion-office was appointed to be read by one of the ministers.

7. In the office for Christmas-day the words “this day” were changed for “as at this time.”

8. In the prayer of consecration the priest is directed to break the bread.

9. The rubric for explaining the reason of kneeling at the sacrament was restored.

10. Private baptism is not to be administered but by a lawful minister.

11. The answer to the question in the catechism, “Why then are children baptized?” is thus amended, “Because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform.”

12. In the last rubric before the catechism these words are expunged, “And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation,” &c.

13. It is appointed that the curate of every parish shall either bring or send in writing, with his hand subscribed thereunto, the names of all such persons within his parish, as he shall think fit to be presented to the bishop to be confirmed.

14. The rubric after confirmation was thus softened; “None shall be admitted to the communion till such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.”

15. In the form of matrimony, instead of, “till death us depart,” it is, “till death us do part.”

16. In the rubrics after the form of matrimony, it is thus altered. “After which, if there be no sermon declaring the duties of man and wife, the minister shall read as followeth:”— and instead of the second rubric, it is advised to be convenient, that the new-married persons should receive the communion at the time of marriage, or at the first opportunity afterward.

17. In the order for visitation of the sick it is thus amended: “Here the sick person shall be moved to make special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort.”—

18. In the communion for the sick the minister is not enjoined to administer the sacrament to every sick person that shall desire it, but only as he shall judge expedient.

19. In the order for the burial of the dead it is thus altered: The priests and clerks meeting the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard, and going before it either into the church, or towards the grave, shall say or sing,—In the office itself, these words, “In sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life,” are thus altered, “in sure and certain hope of *the* resurrection to eternal life;” and to lessen the objection of “God’s taking to himself the soul of this our dear brother departed ,” &c. the following rubric is added: “Here is to be noted, that the office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized or excommunicate, or who have laid violent hands upon themselves.”

20. In the churching of women the new rubric directs, that the woman at the usual time after her delivery, shall come into the church decently apparelled, and there shall kneel down in some convenient place, as has been accustomed, or as the ordinary shall direct, and the hundred and sixteenth or hundred and seventeenth psalm shall be read.

Dr. Tenison, afterward archbishop of Canterbury, says,—“They made about six hundred small alterations or additions,” but then adds, “If there was reason for these changes, there was equal if not greater reason for some farther improvements. If they had foreseen what is since come to pass, I charitably believe they would not have done all they did, and just so much and no more; and yet I also believe, if they had offered to move much farther, ‘a stone would have been laid under their wheel, by a secret but powerful hand;’ for the mystery of Popery did even then work.”[[32]](#footnote-32) Bishop Burnet confesses, that no alterations were made in favour of the Presbyterians, for it was resolved to gratify them in nothing.

But besides the alterations and amendments already mentioned, there were several additional forms of prayer,[[33]](#footnote-33) as for the 30th of January and the 29th of May; forms of prayer to be used at sea; and a new office for the administration of baptism to grown persons.[[34]](#footnote-34) Some corrections were made in the calendar. Some new holidays were added, as the conversion of St. Paul and St. Barnabas.[[35]](#footnote-35) More new lessons were taken out of the Apocrypha, as, the story of Bel and the Dragon, &c. But it was agreed, that no Apocryphal lessons should be read on Sundays. These were all the concessions the convocation would admit;[[36]](#footnote-36) and this was all the fruit of the conference at the Savoy, by which, according to Mr. Baxter and bishop Burnet, the Common Prayerbook was rendered more exceptionable, and the terms of conformity much harder than before the civil war.

The Common Prayer-book thus altered and amended was sent up to the king and council, and from thence transmitted to the house of peers, February 24, with this message, That his majesty had duly considered of the alterations, and does with the advice of his council fully approve and allow the same; and doth recommend it to the house of peers, that “the said books of Common Prayer, and of the forms of ordination, and consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons, with those'additions and alterations that have been made, and presented to his majesty by the convocation, be the book which in and by the intended act of uniformity shall be appointed to be used by all that officiate in all cathedral and collegiate churches and chapels, &c. and in all parish-churches of England and Wales, under such sanctions or penalties as the parliament shall think fit.”[[37]](#footnote-37) When the lords had gone through the book, the lord-chancellor Hyde, by order of the house, gave the bishops thanks, March 15, for their care in this business,[[38]](#footnote-38) and desired their lordships to give the like thanks to the lower house of convocation, and acquaint them, that their amendments were well received and approved, though some of them met with a considerable opposition. From the lords they were sent down to the commons, and inserted in the act of uniformity, as will be seen under the next year.

But before this famous act had passed either house the Presbyterians were reduced to the utmost distress. In the month of March, 1661–2,[[39]](#footnote-39) the grand jury at Exeter found above forty bills of indictment against some eminent Non-conformist ministers for not reading the common-prayer according to law. They likewise presented the travelling about of divers itinerant preachers, ejected out of sequestered livings, as dangerous to the peace of the nation. They complained of their teaching sedition and rebellion in private houses, and other congregations, tending to foment a new war. They also presented such as neglected their own parish-churches, and ran abroad to hear factious ministers; and such as walked in the churchyards, or other places, while divine service was reading; all which were the certain forerunners of a general persecution.

In Scotland the court carried their measures with a high hand; for having got a parliament to their mind,[[40]](#footnote-40) the earl of Middleton, a most notorious debauchee, opened it, with presenting a letter of his majesty’s to the house; after which they passed an act, declaring all leagues not made with the king’s authority illegal. This struck at the root of the covenant made with England in 1643.[[41]](#footnote-41) They passed another act rescinding all acts made since the late troubles, and another empowering the king to settle the government of the church as he should please. It was a mad, roaring time, says the bishop, and no wonder it was so, when the men of affairs were almost perpetually drunk. The king hereupon directed that the church should be governed by synods, presbyters, and kirk-sessions, till he should appoint another government, which he did by a letter to his council of Scotland, bearing date August 14, 1661, in which he recites the inconveniences which had attended the Presbyterian government for the last twenty-three years, and its inconsistency with monarchy.—“Therefore (says he) from our respect to the glory of God, the good and interest of the Protestant religion, and the better harmony with the government of the church of England, we declare our firm resolution to interpose our royal authority for restoring the church of Scotland to its right government by bishops, as it was before the late troubles. And our will and pleasure is, that you take effectual care to restore the rents belonging to the several bishoprics; that you prohibit the assembling of ministers in their synodical meetings till our farther pleasure; and that you keep a watchful eye over those, who by discourse or preaching endeavour to alienate the affections of our people from us or our government.”—Pursuant to these directions the lords of the council ordered the heralds to make public proclamation at the market-cross in Edinburgh, September 6, of this his majesty’s royal will and pleasure. In the month of December a commission was issued out to the bishops of London and Worcester[[42]](#footnote-42) to ordain and consecrate according to the rites and ceremonies of the church of England, Mr. James Sharp, archbishop of St. Andrews, Mr. Andrew Fairfoul, archbishop of Glasgow, Mr. Robert Leighton, bishop of Dunblain, and Mr. James Hamilton, bishop of Galloway. A very bad choice, says bishop Burnet. Sharp was one of the falsest and vilest dissemblers in the world. Fairfoul was next akin to a natural. Leighton was an excellent prelate; but Hamilton’s life was scarce free from scandal.[[43]](#footnote-43) He had sworn to the covenant, and when one objected to him, that it went against his conscience, he said, “Such medicines as could not be chewed must be swallowed whole.”[[44]](#footnote-44) The English bishops insisted upon their renouncing their Presbyterian orders, which they consented to, and were, in one and the same day, ordained, first deacons, then priests, and last of all bishops, according to the rites of the church of England.

Bishop Burnet says, that though the king had a natural hatred to presbytery, he went very coldly into this design; nay, that he had a visible reluctancy against it, because of the temper of the Scots nation, and his unwillingness to involve his government in new troubles; but the Earl of Clarendon[[45]](#footnote-45) pushed it forward with great zeal; and the duke of Ormond said, that episcopacy could not be established in Ireland, if presbytery continued in Scotland. The earls of Lauderdale and Crawford indeed opposed it, but the councils of Scotland not protesting, it was determined; but it was a large strain of the prerogative for a king by a royal proclamation to alter the government of a church established by law, without consent of parliament, convocation, or synod, of any kind whatsoever: for it was not until May the next year that this affair was decided in parliament.

Some of the Scots ministers preached boldly against this change of government; and among others, Mr. James Guthrie, minister of Stirling, for which, and some other things, he was convicted of sedition and treason. Bishop Burnet,[[46]](#footnote-46) who saw him suffer, says that he expressed a contempt of death; that he spoke an hour upon the ladder with the composure of a man that was delivering a sermon rather than his last words; that he justified all he had done, exhorting all people to adhere to the covenant, which he magnified highly. He was executed June 14, 1661, and concluded his dying speech with these words,[[47]](#footnote-47) “I take God to record upon my soul, that I would not exchange this scaffold with the palace or mitre of the greatest prelate in Britain. Blessed be God, who hath showed mercy to such a wretch, and hath revealed his Son in me, and made me a minister of the everlasting gospel; and that he has designed, in the midst of much contradiction from Satan and the world, to seal my ministry upon the hearts of not a few of this people, and especially in the congregation and presbytery of Stirling.” There was with him on the same scaffold, young Captain Govan, whose last words were these, “I bear witness with my blood to the persecuted government of this church, by synods and presbyteries. I bear witness to the solemn league and covenant, and seal it with my blood. I likewise testify against all Popery, prelacy, idolatry, superstition, and the servicebook, which is no better than a relic of the Romish idolatry—.”[[48]](#footnote-48) Soon after this the rights of patronages were restored, and all the Presbyterian ministers silenced, though the court had not a supply of men of any sort to fill up their vacancies.

The account that bishop Burnet gives of the old Scots Presbyterian ministers, who were possessed of the church-livings before the Restoration, is very remarkable, and deserves a place in this history. “They were (says he) a brave and solemn people; their spirits were eager, and their tempers sour, but they had an appearance that created respect; they visited their parishes much, and were so full of Scripture, and so ready at extempore prayer, that from that they grew to practise sermons; for the custom in Scotland was, after dinner or supper, to read a chapter in the Bible, and when they happened to come in, if it was acceptable, they would on a sudden expound the chapter; by this means the people had such a vast degree of knowledge, that the poor cottagers could pray extempore. Their preachers went all in one track in their sermons, of doctrine, reason, and use; and this was so methodical, that the people could follow a sermon quite through every branch of it. It can hardly be imagined to what a degree these ministers were loved and reverenced by their people. They kept scandalous persons under severe discipline; for breach of the sabbath, for an oath, or drunkenness, they were cited before the kirk-sessions, and solemnly rebuked for it; for fornication they stood on the stool of repentance in the church, at the time of worship, for three days, receiving admonition, and making professions of repentance, which some did with many tears, and exhortations to others to take warning by them; for adultery they sat in the same place six months covered with sackcloth. But with all this (says the bishop) they had but a narrow compass of learning, were very affected in their deportment, and were apt in their sermons to make themselves popular, by preaching against the sins of princes and courts, which the people delighted to hear, because they had no share in them.”[[49]](#footnote-49)

The bishops and clergy, who succeeded the Presbyterians, were of a quite different stamp; most of them were very mean divines, vicious in their morals, idle and negligent of their cures; by which means they became obnoxious to the whole nation, and were hardly capable of supporting their authority through the reign of king Charles II. even with the assistance of the civil power. Bishop Burnet adds, that they were mean and despicable in all respects; the worst preachers he ever heard; ignorant to a reproach, and many of them openly vicious; that they were a disgrace to their order, and to the sacred functions, and were indeed the dregs and refuse of the northern parts. The few who were above contempt or scandal were men of such violent tempers, that they were as much hated as the others were despised.

In Ireland the hierarchy was restored after the same manner as in Scotland; the king by his letters patent, in right of his power to appoint bishops to the vacant sees, issued his royal mandate to Dr. Bramhall, archbishop of Armagh, and Dr. Taylor, bishop of Down and Connor, by virtue of which they consecrated two archbishops and ten bishops in one day.[[50]](#footnote-50) His grace insisted on the reordination of those who had been ordained in the late times without the hands of a bishop, but with this softening clause in their orders: “Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec validitatem aut invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos propriô judicio relinquimus: sed solummodo supplentes qnicquid prius defuit per canones ecclesia Anglicanse requi-situm”—i. e. “Not annihilating his former orders (if he had any) nor determining concerning their validity or invalidity, much less condemning all the sacred ordinations of foreign churches whom we leave to their own judge, but only supplying what was wanting according to the canons of the church of England.—” Without such an explication as this, few of the clergy of Ireland would have kept their stations in the church.[[51]](#footnote-51) On the 17th of May, the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in parliament assembled in Ireland, declared their opinion and high esteem of episcopal government, and of the Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the church of England; and thus the old constitution, in church as well as state, was restored in the three kingdoms.

The French ministers, who had been tools to persuade the English Presbyterians to restore the king without a treaty, went along with the torrent, and complimented the church of England upon her re-establishment; they commended the liturgy, which they formerly treated with contemptuous language. Some few of them pretended to bemoan the want of episcopacy among themselves, and to wonder that any of the English Presbyterians should scruple conformity.[[52]](#footnote-52) The French church at the Savoy submitted to the rites and ceremonies of the English hierarchy; and M. Du Bose, minister of Caen, writes to the minister of the Savoy, that he was as dear to him under the surplice of England, as under the robe of France.[[53]](#footnote-53) So complaisant were these mercenary divines towards those who disallowed their orders, disowned their churches and the validity of all their administrations.

Lord Clarendon and the bishops having got over the Savoy conference, and carried the service-book with the amendments through the convocation, were now improving the present temper of the parliament to procure it the sanction of the legislature; for this purpose the king, though a Papist, is made to speak the language of a zealous churchman. In his speech to the parliament, March 1st, he has these words: “Gentlemen, I hear you are zealous for the church, and very solicitous, and even jealous, that there is not expedition enough used in that affair. I thank you for it, since I presume it proceeds from a good root of piety and devotion; but I must tell you, that I have the worst luck in the world, if after all the reproaches of being a Papist, while I was abroad, I am suspected of being a Presbyterian now I am come home. I know you will not take it unkindly if I tell you, Iam as zealous for the church of England as any of you can be, and am enough acquainted with the enemies of it on all sides. I am as much in love with the Book of Common Prayer as you can wish, and have prejudices enough against those who do not love it; who I hope, in time, will be better informed, and change their minds. And you may be confident, I do as much desire to see a uniformity settled as any among you; and pray trust me in that affair, I promise you to hasten the dispatch of it with all convenient speed; you may rely upon me in it. I have transmitted the Book of Common Prayer with the amendments to the house of lords—but when we have done all we can, the well settling that affair will require great prudence and discretion, and the absence of all passion and precipitation.”[[54]](#footnote-54)

The reason of the king’s requiring discretion in the parliament, and the absence of passion, was not in favour of the Presbyterians, but the Papists, who went all the lengths of the prerogative, and published a remonstrance about this time, “wherein they acknowledge his majesty to be God’s vicegerent upon earth in all temporal affairs; that they are bound to obey him under pain of sin, and that they renounce all foreign power and authority, as incapable of absolving them from this obligation.” It was given out, that they were to have forty chapels in and about the city of London, and much more was understood by them, says archbishop Tenison, who have penetrated into the designs of a certain paper, commonly called the Declaration of Somersethouse; but the design miscarried, partly by their divisions among themselves, and partly by the resoluteness of the prime-minister, who charged them with principles inconsistent with the peace of the kingdom.[[55]](#footnote-55) Father Orleans says, “There were great debates in this parliament about liberty of conscience.—The Catholic party was supported by the earl of Bristol, a man in great repute; the Protestant party by chancellor Hyde, chief of an opposite faction, and a person of no less consideration, who, putting himself at the head of the prevailing church-of-England party in that parliament, declared not only against the Roman Catholics, but against the Presbyterians, and all those the church of England call Nonconformists. The king, who was no good Christian in his actions, but a Catholic in his heart, did all that could be expected from his easy temper, to maintain the common liberty, that so the Catholics might have a share in it; but the church of England and chancellor Hyde were so hot upon that point, that his majesty was obliged to yield rather to the chancellor’s importunity than to his reason.”[[56]](#footnote-56) However, by the favour of the queen-mother, swarms of Papists came over into England, and settled about the court; they set up private seminaries for the education of youth; and though they could not obtain an open toleration, they multiplied exceedingly, and laid the foundation of all the dangers which threatened the constitution and Protestant religion in the latter part of this and in the next reign.

Towards the latter end of this year, the court and bishops, not content with their triumphs over the living Presbyterians, descended into the grave, and dug up the bodies of those who had been deposited in Westminster-abbey in the late times, lest their dust should one time or other mix with the loyalists; for besides the bodies of Cromwell, and others already mentioned, his majesty’s warrant to the dean and chapter of Westminster was now obtained, to take up the bodies of such persons who had been unwarrantably buried in the chapel of king Henry VII. and in other chapels and places within the collegiate church of Westminster since the year 1641, and to inter them in the churchyard adjacent; by which warrant they might have taken up all the bodies that had been buried there for twenty years past. Pursuant to these orders, on the 12th and 14th of September they went to work, and took up about twenty,[[57]](#footnote-57) among whom were,

The body of Eliz. Cromwell, mother of Oliver, daughter of sir Richard Stewart, who died November 18, 1654, and was buried in Henry VII.’s chapel.

The body of Eliz. Claypole, daughter of Oliver, who died August 7, 1658, and was buried in a vault made for her in Henry VII.’s chapel.

The body of Robert Blake, the famous English admiral, who after his victorious fight at Santa Cruz, died in Plymouth-sound, August 7, 1657, and was buried in Henry VII.’s chapel:—a man, whose great services to the English nation will be an everlasting monument of his renown.

The body of the famous Mr. John Pym, a Cornish gentleman, and member of the long-parliament, who was buried in the year 1643, and attended to his grave by most of the lords and commons in parliament.

The body of Dr. Dorislaus, employed as an assistant in drawing up the charge against the king, for which he was murdered by the royalists, when he was ambassador to the states of Holland in 1649.

The body of sir William Constable, one of the king’s judges, governor of Gloucester, and colonel of a regiment of foot, who died 1655.

The body of colonel Edward Popham, one of the admirals of the fleet, who died 1651.

The body of William Stroud, esq. one of the five members of parliament demanded by king Charles I.

The body of colonel Humphrey Mackworth, one of Oliver Cromwell’s colonels, buried in Henry Vll.’s chapel, 1654.

The body of Dennis Bond, esq. one of the council of state, who died August 8, 1658.

The body of Thomas May, esq. who compiled the history of the long-pafliament with great integrity, and in a beautiful style. He died in the year 1650.

The body of colonel John Meldrum, a Scotsman, who died in the wars.

The body of colonel Boscawen, a Cornish man.

To these may be added, several eminent Presbyterian divines; as,

The body of Dr. William Twisse, prolocutor of the assembly of divines, buried in the south cross of the Abbey-church, July 24, 1645.

The body of Mr. Stephen Marshal, buried in the south aisle, November 23, 1655.

The body of Mr. William Strong, preacher in the Abbeychurch, and buried there July 4, 1654. These, with some others of lesser note, both men and women, were thrown together into one pit in St. Margaret’s churchyard, near the back-door of one of the prebendaries; but the work was so indecent, and drew such a general odium on the government, that a stop was put to any farther proceedings.

Among others who were obnoxious to the ministry, were the people called Quakers, who, having declared openly against the lawfulness of making use of carnal weapons, even in self-defence, had the courage to petition the house of lords for a toleration of their religion, and for a dispensation from taking the oaths, which they held unlawful, not from any disaffection to the government, or a belief that they were less obliged by an affirmation, but from a persuasion that all oaths were unlawful; and that swearing, upon the most solemn occasions, was forbidden in the New Testament. The lords in a committee rejected their petition, and, instead of granting them relief, passed the following act[[58]](#footnote-58) May 2, the preamble to which sets forth, “That whereas sundry persons have taken up an opinion, that an oath, even before a magistrate, is unlawful, and contrary to the word of God. And whereas, under pretence of religious worship, the said persons do assemble in great numbers in several parts of the kingdom, separating themselves from the rest of his majesty’s subjects, and from the public congregations, and usual places of divine worship; be it therefore enacted, that if any such persons after the 24th of March, 1661–2, shall refuse to take an oath when lawfully tendered, or persuade others to do it, or maintain, in writing or otherwise, the unlawfulness of taking an oath; or if they shall assemble for religious worship to the number of five or more, of the age of fifteen, they shall for the first offence forfeit £5; for the second £10; and for the third shall abjure the realm, or be transported to the plantations: and the justices of peace at their open sessions may hear and finally determine in the affair.” The act was passed by commission, and had a dreadful influence upon that people, though it was notorious they were far from sedition or disaffection to the government. G. Fox, in his address to the king, acquaints his majesty, that three thousand and sixty-eight of their friends had been imprisoned since his majesty’s restoration; that their meetings were daily broken up by men with clubs and arms, and their friends thrown into the water, and trampled under foot, till the blood gushed out, which gave rise to their meeting in the open streets. Another narrative was printed, signed by twelve witnesses, which says, that more than four thousand two hundred Quakers were imprisoned; and of them five hundred were in and about London, and the suburbs; several of whom were dead in the jails.[[59]](#footnote-59) But these were only the beginning of sorrows.

Religion, which had been in vogue in the late times, was now universally discountenanced; the name of it was hardly mentioned but with contempt, in a health or a play. Those who observed the sabbath, and scrupled profane swearing and drinking healths, were exposed under the opprobrious names of Puritans, Fanatics, Presbyterians, Republicans, seditious persons, &c. The Presbyterian ministers were everywhere suspended or deprived, for some unguarded expressions in their sermons or prayers. Lord Clarendon was at the head of all this madness, and declared in parliament, “that the king could distinguish between tenderness of conscience and pride of conscience; that he was a prince of so excellent a nature, and of so tender a conscience himself, that he had the highest compassion for all errors of that kind, and would never suffer the weak to undergo the punishment ordained for the wicked.” Such was the deep penetration of the chancellor; and such the reward the Presbyterians received for their past services!

The profligate manners of the court, at the same time, spread over the whole land, and occasioned such a general licentiousness, that the king took notice of it in his speech at the end of this session of parliament. “I cannot but observe (says his majesty) that the whole nation seems to be a little corrupted in their excess of living; sure all men spend much more in their clothes, in their diet, and all other expenses, than they have been used to do; I hope it has been only the excess of joy after so long suffering, that has transported us to these other excesses, but let us take heed that the continuance of them does not indeed corrupt our natures. I do believe I have been faulty myself; I promise you I will reform, and if you will join with me in your several capacities, we shall, by our examples, do more good both in city and country, than any new laws would do.” This was a frank acknowledgment and a good resolution, but it was not in the king’s nature to retrench his expenses, or control his vices, for the public good.[[60]](#footnote-60)

Though the revenues of the crown were augmented above double what they had been at any time since the Reformation; and though the king had a vast dowry with his queen, whom he married this spring, yet all was not sufficient to defray the extravagance of the court; for besides the king’s own expenses, the queen-mother maintained a splendid court of Roman Catholics at Somerset-house, and might have done so as long as she had lived, if she could have kept within moderate bounds; but her conduct was so imprudent and profuse, that she was obliged to return to France, after three or four years, where she died in the year 1669. A lady of such bigotry in religion,[[61]](#footnote-61) and intrigue in politics, that her alliance to this nation was little less than a judgment from heaven.

To procure more ready money for these extravagances, it was resolved to sell the town of Dunkirk to the French, for £500,000. The lord-chancellor Clarendon was the projector of this vile bargain,[[62]](#footnote-62) as appears by the letters of count D’Estrades, published since his death, in one of which his lordship acknowledges, that the thought came from himself.[[63]](#footnote-63) Several mercenary pamphlets were dispersed to justify this sale; but the wars with France, in the reigns of king William and queen Anne, have sufficiently convinced us, that it was a fatal stab to our trade and commerce: insomuch, that even the queen’s last ministry durst not venture to make a peace with France, till the fortifications of it were demolished.

But to divert the people’s eyes to other objects, it was resolved to go on with the prosecution of state-criminals, and with humbling and crushing the Nonconformists: Three of the late king’s judges being apprehended in Holland, by the forward zeal of Sir G. Downing, viz. colonel Okey, Corbet, and Berkstead, were brought over to England by permission of the States, and executed on the act of attainder, April 19. They died with the same resolution and courage as the former had done, declaring they had no malice against the late king, but apprehended the authority of parliament sufficient to justify their conduct.

Before the parliament rose the house addressed the king to bring colonel Lambert and sir Henry Vane, prisoners in the Tower, to their trial; and accordingly, June 4, they were arraigned at the King’s-Bench bar; the former for levying war against the king; and the latter for compassing his death. Lambert was convicted, but for his submissive behaviour was pardoned as to life, but confined in the isle of Guernsey, where he remained a patient prisoner till his death, which happened about thirty years after. Sir Henry Vane had such an interest in the convention-parliament, that both lords and commons petitioned for his life, which his majesty promised; and yet afterward, at the instigation of the present house of commons, he was tried and executed. Sir Harry made a brave defence; but it was determined to sacrifice him to the ghost of the earl of Strafford; and when his friends would have had him petition for his life, he refused, saying, if the king had not a greater regard for his word and honour than he had for his life, he might take it. Nevertheless bishop Burnet says,[[64]](#footnote-64) “He was naturally a fearful man, and had a head as dark in the notions of religion; but when he saw his death was determined, he composed himself to it with a resolution that surprised all who knew how little of that was natural to him. He was beheaded on Tower-hill, June 14, where a new and very indecent practice was begun; it was observed that the dying speeches of the regicides had left impressions on the hearers, that were not at all to the advantage of the government; and strains of a peculiar nature being expected from him, drummers were placed under the scaffold, who, as soon as he began to speak to the public, upon a sign given, struck up with their drums. But this put him into no disorder; he desired they might be stopped, for he knew what was meant by it. Then he went to his devotion; and as he was taking leave of those about him, he happened to say something again with relation to the times, when the drums struck up a second time; so he gave over, saying, It was a sorry cause that would not bear the words of a dying man; and died with so much composedness, that it was generally thought the government lost more than it gained by his death.” The Oxford historian says, he appeared on the scaffold like an old Roman, and died without the least symptoms of concern or trouble.

But the grand affair that employed the parliament this spring, was the famous act of uniformity of public prayers, &c. designed for the enclosure of the church, and the only door of admission to all ecclesiastical preferments. The review of the Common Prayer had been in convocation three or four months,[[65]](#footnote-65) and was brought into parliament, with their alterations and amendments, before Christmas;[[66]](#footnote-66) the bill was read the first time in the house of commons Jan. 14, and passed, after sundry debates, but by six voices, yeas 186, noes 180; but it met with greater obstacles among the lords, who offered several amendments, which occasioned conferences between the two houses. The lords would have exempted schoolmasters, tutors, and those who had the education of youth; and in the disabling clause, would have included only livings with cure.[[67]](#footnote-67) But the commons being supported by the court, would abate nothing,[[68]](#footnote-68) nor consent to any provision for such as should be ejected. They would indulge no latitude in the surplice or cross in baptism, for fear of establishing a schism, and weakening the authority of the church, as to her right of imposing indifferent rites and ceremonies.[[69]](#footnote-69) And the court were willing to shut out as many as they could from the establishment, to make a general toleration more necessary. When the lords urged the king’s declaration from Breda, the commons replied, that it would be strange to call a schismatical conscience a tender one; but suppose this had been meant (say they), his majesty can be guilty of no breach of promise, because the declaration had these two limitations, a reference to parliament,—and so far as was consistent with the peace of the kingdom. May 8, the result of the conference with the house of commons, being reported to the lords, the house laid aside their objections, and concurred with the commons, and the bill passed; but, as bishop Burnet observes, with no great majority. May 19, it received the royal assent, and was to take place from the 24th of August following. This act being prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer, and lying open to public view, I shall only give the reader an abstract of it. It is entitled,

“An act for the uniformity of public prayers, and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, and for establishing the forms of making, ordaining, and consecrating, bishops, priests, and deacons, in the church of England.”

The preamble sets forth, “That from the first of queen Elizabeth, there had been one uniform order of common service and prayer enjoined to be used by act of parliament, which had been very comfortable to all good people, until a great number of people in divers parts of the realm, living without knowledge and the due fear of God, did wilfully and schismatically refuse to come to their parish-churches, upon Sundays, and other days appointed to be kept as holy days. And whereas, by the scandalous neglect of ministers in using the liturgy during the late unhappy troubles, many people have been led into factions and schisms, to the decay of religion, and the hazard of many souls; therefore, for preventing the like for time to come, the king had granted a commission, to review the Book of Common Prayer, to those bishops and divines, who met at the Savoy; and afterward his majesty required the clergy in convocation to revise it again; which alterations and amendments having been approved by his majesty, and both houses of parliament; therefore, for settling the peace, of the nation, for the honour of religion, and to the intent that every person may know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship, it is enacted by the king’s most excellent majesty, &c.

“That all and singular ministers shall be bound to say and use the morning prayer, evening prayer, and all other common prayers, in such order and form as is mentioned in the book; and that every parson, vicar, or other minister whatsoever, shall before the feast of St. Bartholomew, which shall be in the year of our Lord 1662, openly and publicly, before the congregation assembled for religious worship, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things contained and prescribed in the said book, in these words, and no other:

“I, A. B. do declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in and by the book, entitled, ‘The book of common prayer and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church, according to the use of the church of England, together with the psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches:’ and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons.”[[70]](#footnote-70)

The penalty for neglecting or refusing to make this declaration is deprivation, *ipso facto,* of all his spiritual promotions.

“And it is farther enacted, that every dean, canon, and prebendary; all masters, heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors, in any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital; all public professors, readers in either university, and in every college and elsewhere; and all parsons, vicars, curates, lecturers; and every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school; and every person instructing youth in any private family, shall before the feast of St. Bartholomew, 1662, subscribe the following declaration, viz.

“I, A. B. do declare, 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; and that I will conform to the liturgy of the church of England, as it is now by law established. And I do hold, that there lies no obligation upon me, or on any other person, from the oath commonly called the solemn league and covenant, to endeavour any change or alteration of government, either in church or state, and that the same was in itself an unlawful oath, and imposed upon the subjects of this realm, against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom.”

This declaration is to be subscribed by the persons above mentioned, before the archbishop, bishop, or ordinary of the diocese, on pain of deprivation, for those who were possessed of livings; and for schoolmasters or tutors, three months’ imprisonment for the first offence: and for every other offence, three months’ imprisonment, and the forfeiture of five pounds to his majesty. Provided, that after the 25th of March 1682, the renouncing of the solemn league and covenant shall be omitted.

“It is farther enacted, that no person shall be capable of any benefice, or presume to consecrate and administer the holy sacrament of the Lord’s supper, before he be ordained a priest by episcopal ordination, on pain of forfeiting for every offence one hundred pounds.[[71]](#footnote-71)

“No form, or order of common prayer, shall be used in any church, chapel, or other place of public worship, or in either of the universities, than is here prescribed and appointed.

“None shall be received as lecturers, or be permitted to preach, or read any sermon or lecture in any church or chapel, unless he be approved and licensed by the archbishop or bishop, and shall read the thirty-nine articles of religion, with a declaration of his unfeigned assent and consent to the same: and unless the first time he preaches any lecture or sermon, he shall openly read the Common Prayer, and declare his assent to it; and shall on the first lecture-day of every month afterward, before lecture or sermon, read the Common Prayer and service, under pain of beingdisabled to preach; and if he preach while so disabled, to suffer three months’ imprisonment for every offence.

“The several laws and statutes formerly made for uniformity of prayer, &c. shall be in force for confirming the present Book of Common Prayer, and shall be applied for punishing all offences contrary to the said laws, with relation to the said book, and no other.

“A true printed copy of the said book is to be provided in every parish-church, chapel,'college, and hall, at the cost and charge of the parishioners or society, before the feast of St. Bartholomew, on pain of forfeiting three pounds a month for so long as they shall be unprovided of it.”[[72]](#footnote-72)

It was certainly unreasonable in the legislature to limit the time of subscription to so short a period,[[73]](#footnote-73) it being next to impossible that the clergy in all parts of the kingdom should read and examine the alterations within that time. The dean and prebendaries of Peterborough declared, that they could not obtain copies before August 17, the Sunday immediately preceding the feast of St. Bartholomew; so that all the members of that cathedral did not and could not read the service in manner and form as the act directs, and therefore they were obliged to have recourse to the favour of their ordinary to dispense with their default; however, their preferments were then legally forfeited, as appears by the act of the 15th of Charles II. cap. 6, entitled, “An act for the relief of such as by sickness, or other impediments, were disabled from subscribing the declaration of the act of uniformity;” which says, that those who did not subscribe within the time limited were utterly disabled, and *ipso facto* deprived, and their benefices void, as if they were naturally dead. And if this was the case at Peterborough, what must be the condition of the clergy in the more northern counties? in fact, there was not one divine in ten, that lived at any considerable distance from London, who did peruse it within that time; but the matter was driven on with so much precipitancy, says bishop Burnet, that it seems implied, that the clergy should subscribe implicitly to a book they had never seen; and this was done by too many, as by the bishops themselves confessed.

The terms of conformity now were,

(1.) Re-ordination, if they had not been episcopally ordained before.

(2.) A declaration of their unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing prescribed and contained in “The book of common prayer, and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church of England, together with the psalter,” and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating, of bishops, priests, and deacons.

(3.) To take the oath of canonical obedience.

(4.) To abjure the solemn league and covenant, which many conscientious ministers could not disentangle themselves from.

(5.) To abjure the lawfulness of taking arms against the king, or any commissioned by him, on any pretence whatsoever.

It appears from hence, that the terms of conformity were higher than before the civil wars; and the Common Prayer-book more exceptionable; for, instead of striking out the Apocryphal lessons, more were inserted, as the story of Bel and the Dragon; and some new holidays were added, as St. Barnabas, and the conversion of St. Paul; a few alterations and new collects were made by the bishops themselves, but care was taken, says Burnet, that nothing should be altered, as was moved by the Presbyterians.— The validity of Presbyterian ordination was renounced, by which the ministrations of the foreign churches were disowned.—Lecturers and schoolmasters were put upon the same foot with incumbents as to oaths and subscriptions.—A new declaration was invented, which none who understood the constitution of England could safely subscribe—and to terrify the clergy into a compliance, no settled provision was made for those who should be deprived of their livings, but all were referred to the royal clemency.[[74]](#footnote-74)—A severity, says bishop Burnet, neither practised by queen Elizabeth in enacting the liturgy, nor by Cromwell in ejecting the Royalists; in both which a fifth of the benefice was reserved for their subsistence.

Mr. Rapin has several remarks on this act: if we compare it with the king’s declaration from Breda, says he,[[75]](#footnote-75) it will easily be seen what care the ministers about the king, who were the real authors or promoters of this act, had for his honour and promise; though some therefore may look upon this act as the great support and bulwark of the church, others, no less attached to its interests, will perhaps look upon it as her disgrace and scandal.—His second remark is, for the reader to take notice of the amount of the promises made to the Presbyterians by the king’s party, upon the assurance of which they had so cheerfully laboured for his restoration, and followed the directions transmitted by his friends.—His third remark is, that by an artifice, the most gross conspiracies were invented, which had no manner of reality; or supposing they had, could no ways be charged on the Presbyterians, who were not to answer for the crimes of other sects.

On the other hand, bishop Kennet says,[[76]](#footnote-76) “The world has reason to admire, not only the wisdom of this act, but even the moderation of it, as being effectually made for ministerial conformity alone, and leaving the people unable to complain of any imposition. And it would certainly have had the desired and most happy effect, of unity and peace (says his lordship), if the government had been in earnest in the execution of it.” Must the blessings of unity and peace then be built on the foundation of persecution, plunder, perfidy, and the wastes of conscience? If his Majesty’s declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs breathed the spirit of true wisdom and charity, and ought to stand for a pattern to posterity, whenever they are disposed to heal the breaches of the church, as the bishop has elsewhere declared,[[77]](#footnote-77) where could be the wisdom and moderation of this act, which turned out two thousand ministers into the world to beg their bread upon such severe terms? And whereas the bishop says, the people had no reason to complain of imposition, was it no hardship to be obliged to go to church, and join in a form of worship that went against their consciences? Does not the act revive and confirm all the penal laws of queen Elizabeth and king James, in these words, “Be it farther enacted, that the several good laws and statutes of this realm, which have been formerly made, and are now in force for the uniformity of prayers and administration of the sacraments within this realm of England and places aforesaid, shall stand in full force and strength to all intents and purposes whatsoever, and shall be applied, practised, and be put in use, for the punishing all offences contrary to the said law.”Surely this must affect the laity! it is more to be admired, in my opinion, that the clergy of England, and all officers both civil and military, could subscribe a declaration which gave up the whole constitution into the hands of an arbitrary prince; for if the king had abolished the use of parliaments, and commanded his subjects to embrace the Popish religion, which way could they have relieved themselves, when they had sworn, that it was not lawful to take up arms against the king, or any commissioned by him, on any pretence whatsoever, on pain of high treason? It is hard to reconcile this doctrine with the revolution of king William and queen Mary. I shall only add, that many of the most learned and judicious divines of the church have wished, for their own sakes, that the act might be amended and altered.

Mr. Collyer, a nonjuring clergyman who suffered for his principles, speaks more like a gentleman and a Christian than the bishop: “The misfortune of the Presbyterians (says he) cannot be remembered without regret; those who quit their interest are certainly in earnest, and deserve a charitable construction. Mistakes in religion arc to be tenderly used, and conscience ought to be pitied when it cannot be relieved.”

It is fit the authors and promoters of this memorable act, which broke the peace of the church, and established a separation, should stand upon record. Among these the Earl of Clarendon deserves the first place, who was once for moderate measures, but afterward altered his conduct, says bishop Burnet,[[78]](#footnote-78) out of respect to bishops. “The rhetoric and interest of this great minister (says Collyer[[79]](#footnote-79) might possibly make an impression upon both houses, and occasion the passing the act of uniformity in the condition it now stands.” He entertained the Presbyterians with hopes, while he was cutting away the ground from under their feet. Strange! that one and the same hand could, consistently with conscience and honour, draw up the king’s declaration from Breda, and his late declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs, and this severe act of uniformity.

Next to chancellor Hyde was Dr. Sheldon, bishop of London, and afterward archbishop of Canterbury, of whom notice has been already taken; he was a facetious man, says Burnet,[[80]](#footnote-80) but of no great religion. When the earl of Manchester told the king, he was afraid the terms of conformity were so hard that many ministers would not comply, the bishop replied he was afraid they would, but now we know their minds, says he, we will make them all knaves if they conform. And when Dr. Allen said, “It is pity the door is so strait;” he answered, “It is no pity at all; if we had thought so many of them would have conformed, we would have made it straiter.”[[81]](#footnote-81) And Mr. Baxter adds, that as far as he could perceive, it was by some designed it should be so.

Next to bishop Sheldon was bishop Morley, a pious man, says Burnet, but extremely passionate and very obstinate. Morley was thought the honester man, but Sheldon the abler statesman. To these may be added. Dr. Gunning bishop of Ely: Henchman of London; Dolbert of Rochester; Stern of York; Dr. Pierce, Sparrow, and Barwick, all creatures of the court, and tools of the prerogative.

But neither the courtiers nor bishops could have accomplished their designs without tampering with the parliament. Care was therefore taken of the best speakers, and men of influence among the commons. The parliament was undoubtedly actuated by a spirit of revenge, says Rapin,[[82]](#footnote-82) and being of principles directly opposite to the Presbyterians, who were for reducing the royal power within certain limits, they resolved to put it out of their power for ever to restrain the prerogative, or alter the government of the church; and the king, being in continual want of money, was content to sacrifice the Presbyterians for a large supply of the nation’s money, especially when he knew he was serving the cause of Popery at the same time, by making way for a general toleration.

The Presbyterian ministers had only three months to consider what to do with themselves, and their families. There were several consultations both in city and country to know each other’s sentiments; and it happened here, as it did afterward, about taking the oaths to king William and queen Mary; some, who persuaded their brethren to dissent, complied themselves and got the others’ livings. It is not to be supposed they had all the same scruples.—Bishop Kennet says,[[83]](#footnote-83) that renouncing the covenant was the greatest obstacle of conformity to the Presbyterians. But his Lordship is mistaken; for if abjuring the covenant had been omitted, they could not have taken the corporation-oath. Some could not in conscience comply with the very form of the hierarchy. Great numbers scrupled the business of re-ordination, which implied a renouncing the validity of their former ministrations. But that which the dissenters of all denominations refused, was giving their assent and consent to all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer. This they apprehended to be more than was due to any human composure.

Mr Echard represents them as under great difficulties; “Some (says he) were positive against any compliance, but great numbers were doubtful and uncertain, and had great struggles between the attractions of conscience and honour, interest and humour. The act was strictly penned, and pressed hard upon late principles and practices. A continual intercourse of letters passed between those in the city, and the rest in the countries, how to proceed in this nice affair. Sometimes the chief of them were for compliance, as I have been assured (says he) by the best hands, and then upon farther consideration they changed their minds. They were under considerable temptations on both sides; on one side their livings and preferments were no small inducement towards their compliance; on the other side, besides their consciences, they were much encouraged by the greatness of their numbers, and were made to believe, that if they unanimously stood out, the church must come to them, since the people would never bear so shocking a change. Besides, they had great expectations from several friends at court, and particularly the Popish party, who gave them great encouragement, not only by a promise of pensions to some, but also by a toleration, and a suspension of the act itself, which not long after was partly made good. No doubt but the noncompliance of several proceeded purely from a tender conscience, and in that case ought not only to be pitied, but rather applauded than condemned.” Bishop Burnet adds, that the leaders of the Presbyterian party took great pains to have them all stick together: they said, that if great numbers stood out, it was more likely to produce new laws in their favour; so it was thought, says his lordship, that many went out in the crowd to keep their friends company.

It is possible some noblemen, and others who were in the interest of the Presbyterians, might advise them to adhere to each other; but it is hardly credible that men of abilities and good sense should throw up their livings, sacrifice their usefulness, and beggar their families, for the sake of good company.

Some of the Nonconformists quitted their stations in the church before the 24th of August, as Mr. Baxter and others, with an intent to let all the ministers in England know their resolution beforehand.[[84]](#footnote-84) Others about London preached their farewell sermons the Sunday before Bartholomew-day; several of which were afterward collected into a volume, and printed with their effigies in the title-page; as the reverend Dr. Manton, Bates, Jacomb, Calamy, Matth. Mead, and others. The like was done in several counties of England: and such a passionate zeal for the welfare of their people ran through their sermons as dissolved their audiences into tears.

At length the fatal St. Bartholomew came, when about two thousand relinquished their preferments in the church, or refused to accept of any upon the terms of the act of uniformity; an example hardly to be paralleled in the Christian world! It raised a grievous cry over the nation, for here were many men much valued, says bishop Burnet,[[85]](#footnote-85) and distinguished by their abilities and zeal, now cast out ignominiously, reduced to great poverty, provoked by such spiteful usage, and cast upon those popular practices, which both their principles and their circumstances seemed to justify, of forming separate congregations, and of diverting men from the public worship. This begot esteem, and raised compassion, as having a fair appearance of suffering persecution for conscience. Mr. Locke calls them worthy, learned, pious, orthodox divines, who did not throw themselves out of service, but were forcibly ejected. Nor were they cast out because there was a supply of ministers to carry on the work of religion, for there was room for the employment of more hands, if they were to be found.

At the reformation from Popery by queen Elizabeth, there were not above two hundred deprived of their livings; besides, they were treated with great mildness, and had some allowances out of their livings; whereas these were treated with the utmost severity, and cast entirely upon Providence for a supply. They were driven from their houses, from the society of their friends; and, what was yet more affecting, from all their usefulness, though they had merited much from the king, and laboured indefatigably for his restoration. The former were men of another faith, and owned a foreign head of the church; whereas these were of the same faith with the established church, and differed only about rites and ceremonies. It had been said, that greater numbers were ejected in the late times upon the foot of the covenant;[[86]](#footnote-86) but if this were true, it was in a time of war, when the civil and religious differences between the king and parliament were so intermixed that it was impossible to separate one from the other; the whole nation was in confusion, and those who suffered by the covenant, suffered more for their loyalty than their religion; for when the war was ended, the covenant was relaxed, and such as would live peaceably returned to their vacant cures, or were admitted to others.

Besides, the ingratitude of the high-churchmen upon this occasion ought to be taken notice of. “Who can answer for the violence and injustice of actions in a civil war?” says a divine of the church of England. “Those sufferings were in a time of general calamity, but these were ejected not only in a time of peace, but a time of joy to all the land, and after an act of oblivion, when all pretended to be reconciled and made friends, and to whose common rejoicings these suffering ministers had contributed their earnest prayers and great endeavours.”[[87]](#footnote-87) Another divine of the same church writes, “I must own, that in my judgment, however both sides have been excessively to blame, yet that the severities used by the church to the dissenters are less excusable than those used by the dissenters to the church. My reason is, that the former were used in times of peace and a settled government, whereas the latter were inflicted in a time of tumult and confusion; so that the plunderings and ravagings endured by the church-ministers were owing (many of them at least) to the rudeness of the soldiers, and the chances of war; they were plundered, not because they were conformists, but cavaliers, and of the king’s party. The allowing of the sequestered ministers a fifth part of their livings was a Christian act,[[88]](#footnote-88) and what, I confess, I should have been glad to have seen imitated at the Restoration. But no mercy was to be shown to these unhappy sufferers, though it was impossible on a sudden to fill up the gap that was made by their removal.”

Bishop Burnet says, the old clergy, now much enriched, were despised, but the young clergy who came from the university did good service. But, though all the striplings in both universities were employed, a great many poor livings in the country had no incumbents for a considerable time. The author of The Five Groans of the Church, a very strict conformist, complains with great warmth of above three thousand ministers admitted into the church, who were unfit to teach because of their youth; of fifteen hundred debauched men ordained; of the ordination of many illiterate men; of one thousand three hundred forty-two factious ministers, a little before ordained; and that, of twelve thousand church livings, or thereabouts, three thousand or more being impropriate, and four thousand one hundred sixty-five sinecures, there was but a poor remainder left for a painful and honest ministry.

Such were the spoils of uniformity! and, though Mr. Echard says there was more sense and sound doctrine preached in one twelvemonth after the Presbyterian ministers were turned out, than in nigh twenty years before; yet another church-writer, who knew them better, calls the young clergy “florid and genteel preachers, of a more romantic than true majestic and divine style, who tickled and captivated people at first, but did little service to the souls of men, and in process of time had fewer admirers and friends than at first.” He adds, that “in the late times they all spake the same things, and carried on the same work, which was the instruction, conversion, consolation, and edification of souls; not biting one another, nor grudging at one another. I never heard,” says he, “in many hundreds of sermons, diversities of opinions either set up by some, or pulled down by others; we heard, indeed, that some were Independents, others Presbyterians, and others Episcopal, but we heard no such things from the pulpits. Some men think that the preaching of those days was mere fanaticism, blessing the usurpation, railing against bishops, or deifying Calvin with an infallibility; but Calvin was preached no farther than Christ spake in him; ‘Non Calvinum sed Christum prædicabant.’”[[89]](#footnote-89)

The truth of this observation will appear farther, by mentioning the names of some of those ministers, whose learning and piety were universally acknowledged, and who were capable of preaching and writing as good sense, and to as good purpose, as most of their successors; as Dr. Gilpin, Bates, Manton, Jacomb, Owen, Goodwin, Collins, Conant, Grew, Burgess, and Annesly; Mr. Bowles, Baxter, Clarkson, Woodbridge, Newcomen, Calamy, Jackson, Pool, Caryl, Charnock, Gouge, Jenkins, Gale, Corbet, Cradock, Matth. Mead, Howe, Kentish, Alsop, Vincent, Greenhill, S. Clark, Flavel, Phil. Henry, and others of like character, “whom I have heard vilified, and represented according to the fancies, passions, or interests of men," says a learned conformist, but I dare not but be just to them, as to eminent professors of the Christian faith, and think that common Christianity has suffered much by their silencing and disparagement. A great part of the world is made to believe that the Nonconformists are not fit to be employed in the church, nor trusted by the state; but what they are- God knows, and the world may know, if they please to consult their writings. They are not to them that know them, what they are reported by them that know them not. I know them sufficiently to make me bewail their condition, and the vast damage to thousands of souls by their exclusion, not only in the outskirts, but in the very heart of England, who are committed in many parts to them that neither can nor will promote their everlasting interests.”[[90]](#footnote-90) Upon the whole, though I do not pretend that all the ejected ministers were equally learned, pious,[[91]](#footnote-91) and deserving, yet upon a calm and sedate view of things, I cannot help concluding, that in the main they were a body of as eminent confessors for truth and liberty as this or any other nation has produced.

Many complied with the terms of conformity, not because they approved them, but for the sake of their families, or because they were unwilling to be buried in silence, as bishop Reynolds, Wilkins, Hopkins, Fowler, &c. Several young students, who were designed for the pulpit, applied themselves to law or physic, or diverted to some secular employment. Bishop Kennet, in order to extenuate their calamities,[[92]](#footnote-92) has taken pains to point out the favours the ejected ministers received from private persons.[[93]](#footnote-93) Some (says he) found friends among the nobility and gentry, who relieved their necessities; some were taken as chaplains into good families, or officiated in hospitals, prisons, or chapels of ease; some became tutors, or schoolmasters; some who went beyond sea were well received in foreign parts; some became eminent physicians and lawyers; some had good estates of their own, and others married great fortunes: but how does this extenuate the guilt of the church or legislature, who would have deprived them of these retreats if it had been in their power?

The bishop adds, “Therefore we do ill to charge the church with persecution, when the laws were made by the civil government with a view to the peace and safety of the state, rather than to any honour or interest of the church.” It seems therefore the load of persecution must lie wholly upon the legislature: but had the bishops and clergy no hand in this affair? did they not push the civil government upon these extremities, and not only concur, but prosecute, the penal laws with unrelenting rigour throughout the greatest part of this reign? The church and state are said to be so incorporated as to make but one constitution, and the penal laws are shifted from one to the other till they are quite lost; the church cannot be charged with persecution, because it makes no laws; nor can the civil government be charged with it, because it makes them not against conscience, but with a view to the safety of the state; with such idle sophisms are men to be amused, when it is to cover a reproach!

Dr. Bates says, “they (the ministers) fell a sacrifice to the wrath and revenge of the old clergy, and to the servile compliance of the young gentry with the court, and their distaste of serious religion.[[94]](#footnote-94) That this is no rash imputation upon the ruling clergy is evident (says the doctor), not only from their concurrence in passing these laws (for actions have a language as convincing as those of words), but from Dr. Sheldon, their great leader, who expressed his fears to the earl of Manchester, lest the Presbyterians should comply. The act was passed after the king had engaged his faith and honour in his declaration from Breda to preserve liberty of conscience inviolable; which promise opened the way for his restoration; and after the royalists had given public assurance, that all former animosities should be laid aside as rubbish, under the foundation of universal concord.”

Sad were the calamities of far the greater part of these unhappy sufferers, who with their families must have perished, if private collections in London, and divers places in the country, had not been made for their subsistence.[[95]](#footnote-95) Bishop Burnet says, they cast themselves on the providence of God, and the charity of friends. The reverend and pious Mr. Thomas Gouge, late of St. Sepulchre’s, was their advocate, who, with two or three of his brethren, made frequent application to several worthy citizens, of whom they received considerable sums of money for some years, till that charity was diverted into another channel; but nevertheless “many hundreds of them (according to Mr. Baxter[[96]](#footnote-96)) with their wives and children, had neither house nor bread;[[97]](#footnote-97) the people they left were not able to relieve them, nor durst they if they had been able, because it would have been called a maintenance of schism or faction. Many of the ministers, being afraid to lay down their ministry after they had been ordained to it, preached to such as would hear them, in fields and private houses, till they were apprehended and cast into jails, where many of them perished.—The people were no less divided, some conformed, and others were driven to a greater distance from the church, and resolved to abide by their faithful pastors at all events: they murmured at the government, and called the bishops and conforming clergy cruel persecutors; for which, and for their frequenting the private assemblies of their ministers, they were fined and imprisoned, till many families left their native country, and settled in the plantations.”

The Presbyterian ministers, though men of gravity, and far advanced in years, were rallied in the pulpits under the opprobrious names of Schismatics and Fanatics; they were exposed in the playhouse, and insulted by the mob, insomuch that they were obliged to lay aside their habits, and walk in disguise. “Such magistrates were put into commission as executed the penal laws with severity. Informers were encouraged and rewarded. It is impossible (says the Conformist Plea for the Nonconformist[[98]](#footnote-98)) to relate the number of the sufferings both of ministers and people; the great trials, with hardships upon their persons, estates, and families, by uncomfortable separations, dispersions, unsettlements, and removes; disgraces, reproaches, imprisonments, chargeable journeys, expenses in law, tedious sicknesses, and incurable diseases ending in death; great disquietments and frights to the wives and families, and their doleful effects upon them. Their congregations had enough to do, besides a small maintenance, to help them out of prisons, or maintain them there. Though they were as frugal as possible they could hardly live: some lived on little more than brown bread and water; many had but £8 or £10 a year to maintain a family, so that a piece of flesh has not come to one of their tables in six weeks’ time; their allowance could scarcely afford them bread and cheese. One went to plough six days and preached on the Lord’s day. Another was forced to cut tobacco for a livelihood. The zealous justices of peace knew the calamities of the ministers, when they issued out warrants upon some of the hearers, because of the poverty of the preachers. Out of respect to the worth and modesty of some of them (says my author[[99]](#footnote-99)) I forbear their names.” Upon these foundations, and with these triumphs, was the present constitution of the church of England restored. I shall make no farther remarks upon it, but leave it to the censure of the reader.

Among the Presbyterian divines who died this year, was Mr. John Ley, M.A., born at Warwick, February 4, 1583, and educated in Christ-church, Oxford, where he took the degrees in arts, and was presented to the living of Great Budworth in Cheshire. He was afterward prebendary of Chester, and subdean, and clerk of the convocation once or twice. In the year 1641, he took part with the parliament, was one of the assembly of divines, chairman of the committee for examination of ministers, and president of Sion-college. In the year 1645, he succeeded Dr. Hyde in the rich parsonage of Brightwell, Berks. In 1653, he was one of the triers, and at length obtained the rectory of Solihull in Warwickshire, but having broken a vein by overstraining himself in speaking, he resigned his living, and retired to Sutton-Coldfield, where he died, May 16, 1662, in the seventy-ninth year of his age. He was a very learned person, well read in the fathers and councils, a popular preacher, a pious and devout Christian, and one of the main pillars (says Mr. Wood[[100]](#footnote-100)) of the Presbyterian cause.

Mr. Henry Jeanes, M.A., was born in Somersetshire about the year 1611, and educated in New-inn, and afterward in Hart-hall, Oxon, where he took the degrees in arts, and entered into holy orders. He was an admired preacher in the university, and was quickly preferred to the rectory of Beercrocomb, and the vicarage of Kingston in Somersetshire. In the year 1641, he closed with the parliament, and became rector of Chedsoy near Bridgwater. Here he took into his family several young persons, and instructed them in the liberal arts and sciences; he was a most excellent philosopher, a noted metaphysician, and well versed in polemical divinity. With all these qualifications (says Mr. Wood[[101]](#footnote-101)) he was a contemner of the world, generous, free-hearted, jolly, witty, and facetious. He wrote many books, and died in the city of Wells a little before the fatal day of St. Bartholomew, and was buried in the cathedral church there, ætatis fifty-two.

Dr. Humphrey Chambers was born in Somersetshire, and educated in University college, Oxon. In the year 1623, he was made rector of Claverton in Somersetshire, but was afterward silenced by his diocesan, bishop Piers, for preaching up the morality of the sabbath, and imprisoned for two years. He was one of the assembly of divines. In the year 1648, he was created D.D., and had the rich rectory of Pewsey given him by the earl of Pembroke. After the king’s restoration he kept his living till the very day the act of uniformity took place, when having preached his farewell sermon on Psal. cxxvi. 6, he went home, fell sick and died, and was buried in his church at Pewsey, September 8, without the service of the church, which had just then taken place.[[102]](#footnote-102)

Mr. Simeon Ash was educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge. His first station in the church was in Staffordshire, where he contracted an acquaintance with the most eminent Puritans. He was displaced from his living for refusing to read the book of sports, and not conforming to the ceremonies. After some time he got liberty to preach in an exempt church at Wroxhall, under the protection of sir John Burgoign; and elsewhere, under the lord Brook, in Warwickshire. Upon the breaking out of the civil war he became chaplain to the earl of Manchester, and had a considerable part in the Cambridge visitation. After the king’s death he vigorously opposed the new commonwealth, and declaimed publicly against the engagement. He was concerned in all the designs for bringing in the king, and went with other London divines to congratulate his majesty at Breda. He was a Christian of primitive simplicity, and a Nonconformist of the old stamp, being eminently sincere, charitable, holy, and of a cheerful spirit. He had a good paternal estate, and was very hospitable, his house being much frequented by his brethren, by whom he was highly esteemed. He died in an advanced age on the very evening before Bartholomew-day, in a cheerful and firm expectation of a future happiness.[[103]](#footnote-103)

Mr. Edward Bowles, M. A., born 1613, and educated in Katherine-hall, Cambridge, under Dr. Sibbes and Dr. Brownrigge. He was first chaplain to the earl of Manchester, and upon the reduction of York to the parliament settled in that city. He was a wise and prudent man, having a clear head and a warm heart; an excellent scholar, and a useful preacher. He attended lord Fairfax when general Monk passed through Yorkshire, and presented an address to the general for a free parliament. He was very zealous and active in promoting the king’s restoration, and waited on his majesty with lord Fairfax at Breda. It is credibly reported that the deanery of York was offered to him, but not being satisfied with conformity, he was excluded the minster, though he continued preaching at Allhallows, and afterward at St. Martin’s, as he had opportunity.[[104]](#footnote-104) When the fatal Bartholomew-day approached he grew sick of the times, and died in the flower of his life, aged forty-nine, and was buried on the eve of St. Bartholomew, 1662.

[In the preceding year there passed an act for regulating the press, enacting “that no private person or persons should print, or cause to be printed, any book or pamphlet whatsoever, unless the same was first lawfully licensed and authorised to be printed by certain persons appointed by the act to license the same; viz. law-books by the lord-chancellor, or one of the chief-justices, or by the chief baron: books of history, or concerning state-affairs, by one of the principal secretaries of state; on heraldry, by the earl-marshal; and all other books, i. e. to say all novels, romances, and fairy tales, and all books about philosophy, mathematics, physic, divinity, or love, by the lord-archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of London for the time being.” “The framers of this curious act (observes lord Stanhope), no doubt, supposing that these right reverend prelates were, of all men in the kingdom, most conversant with all these subjects.” This act commenced in June 1662, and passed only for two years. It was continued by an act of the 16th of Charles II., and by another act of the 17th of the same reign; and in a few months afterward it expired. We may form some idea of the private instructions given to the licenser, as well as of his excessive caution and ignorant zeal, when we are assured, that on his taking exception to the following lines in Milton’s Paradise Lost, that admirable poem had like to have been suppressed.

“As when the sun, new risen,

Looks through the horizontal misty air

Shorn of his beams; or from behind the moon

In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds

On half the nations, and with fear of change

Perplexes monarchs.”

Stanhope on the Rights of Juries, p. 64, &c. Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles IL vol. 1. p. 441, note; and Dr. Harris’s Life of Charles II. vol. 2. p. 263–274.—Ed.)

1. Dr. Nichols reckons twelve bishops, but has left out the bishop of Chichester, and named Edward bishop of Norwich. Dr. Kennet names thirteen bishops, amongst whom are the bishops of Chichester and Norwich. Dr. Grey’s Examina­tion, vol. 3. p. 308.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “Though the Baptists in England were at this time very numerous, and as famous men amongst them for learning and piety as most in'the commission; yet no regard was had to their case, nor any one of that persuasion appointed to have any share in it. They did not design to reform so far; for if they could but bring the Presbyterian party in, which was the most numerous of the dissenters, that might be sufficient to secure their power; though, by the consequence of this proceeding, it seems probable there was no design of reformation; but only to quiet ..the minds of the people, till they could gain time.” Crosby, vol. 2. p. 84, 85.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 305. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Ibid. p. 306. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. P. 262. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. “This (observes a late writer) was precisely what the advocates for persecution desired: they could say, that the king had taken every step, which the best policy and the tenderest concern for the happiness of all his subjects could suggest, to gain over and compose the jarring sects into a system of perfect harmony, but that all his wise and benevolent endeavours were defeated by the wilful obstinacy and perverseness of the Nonconformists; and that he must therefore now pursue such measures as the safety both of the church and state required.” Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II. vol. 1. p. 349, 350.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. N. B. All the papers relating to the conference at the Savoy are collected in a book, entitled, “The History of the Nonconformity,” as it was argued and stated by commissioners on both sides appointed by his majesty king Charles II. in the year 1661. Octavo, second edit. 1708. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In the course of this controversy many points, connected with the doctrine and manner of baptism, came into discussion: such as, the right of the children of Heathens, or of the excommunicated, to baptism; the efficacy of children’s bap­tism; the qualifications for this ordinance; the use of godfathers and godmothers, and of the sign of the cross, and other questions: the debate on which, it is said, contributed much to encourage and promote what was called Anabaptism. Crosby’s History of the Baptists, vol. 2. p. 85, 8G.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 337. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Kennet’s Chronicle, p. 504. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 341. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Kennet’s Chronicle, p. 506. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Kennet’s Chronicle, p. 505. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Vol. 1. p. 264. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Mr. Crosby says, “he had been informed, that when the Presbyterians were pleading hard for such concessions from his majesty as they thought would bring about a union, the lord-chancellor told them, his majesty had received petitions from the Anabaptists, who desired nothing more than to have liberty to worship God according to their consciences. At which they were all struck dumb, and remained in a long silence.” Mr. Baxter places this matter in another light: that petitions having been received from the Independents and Anabaptists, the chancellor proposed to add a clause to the king’s declaration, permitting others, besides the Presbyterians, to meet, if they did it peaceably, for religious worship, secure from molestation by any civil officer. On this the bishops and the Presbyte­rians, seeing it would operate in favour of the Papists, were silent: till Mr. Baxter, judging that consenting to it would bring on them the charge of speaking for the toleration of Papists and sectaries, and that opposing it would draw on them the resentment of all sects and parties as the causes of their sufferings, said “that as they humbly thanked his majesty for his indulgence to themselves, so they must distinguish the tolerable parties from the intolerable: that for the former they craved favour and lenity; but that they could not request the tolera­tion of the latter, such as the Papists and Socinians, whom Dr. Gunning, speaking against the sects, had then named.” To this his majesty said, “that there were laws enough against the Papists.” Mr. Baxter replied, “they understood the question to be, whether those laws should be executed on them or not.” And so his majesty broke up the meeting of that day. Crosby’s History of the Baptists/ vol. 2. p. 87—89. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 277—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 366. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 307. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 363. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Kennet’s Chronicle, p. 507. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Page 263, 264. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Baxter’s Life, p. 337. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Athen. Oxon. p. 968. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Page 265. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Page 265. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Answer to Bennet, of Liturgies, p. 382. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Page 35. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. It was required, “that all proposed alterations should be exhibited and presented for his majesty’s farther allowance and confirmation:” this was accordingly done. He was finally to pronounce on the propriety and truth of the proposed alterations. All the debates, investigations, and decisions, of the clergy and bishops, had no efficacy without the sanction of the king. They might be mistaken: but he could not. There is an absurdity in ascribing infallibility to any human being, necessarily liable to imperfect views, to prejudices, and to error. “But, if possible, the absurdity is greater in attributing it to the sceptred rather than to the mitred sovereign. The former is not educated to a religious profession; aud his time, from the moment he fills the throne, that is, from the moment he becomes infallible, must be constantly employed in civil concerns: but yet, as the head of the church, to him all truth is known; to him all appeals from the ecclesiastical courts must be made.” A Treatise on Heresy, p. 73, 74.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Kennet’s Chron. p. 574. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Ibid. p. 585. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. The rubric in king James's Review directed also the two lessons to be distinctly read, but added; “To the end the people may better hear, in such places where they do sing, there shall the lessons be sung in a plain tune, after the manner of distinct reading, and likewise the epistle and gospel.” Grey’s Examination, p. 308.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. “So indeed says bishop Kennet (remarks Dr. Grey); but they are both mistaken. The commandments were not in king Edward’s first liturgy, but in king Edward’s 1552, and in the Reviews of queen Elizabeth and king James.” Grey’s Examination, p. 309.―Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Compl. Hist. p. 252, in marg. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Besides the new forms specified by Mr. Neal, there were also added, Dr. Grey says, the prayer for the high court of parliament, the prayer for all conditions of men, and the general thanksgiving. Examination, p. 310.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. This service was added, because on account of the spread of Baptistical sentiments, there were now many grown up too old to be baptized as infants, whose duty it was to make a profession of their own faith. Wall’s Hist, of Infant Baptism, vol. 2. p. 215.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. These two holidays, though then first appointed by act of parliament, were not now added to the calendar; for they stand in the liturgy of Edward VI. by Whitchurch, 1549; in his Review, 1552; in queen Elizabeth’s Review, 4to. 1601 in king James’s Review, 1609; and in the Scotch liturgy at Edinburgh, folio, 1637. Grey’s Examination, p. 311. It may be added, they are, with suitable collects, in the liturgy printed by Bonham Norton and John Bill, 1629, *penes me.*—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. There is one alteration not mentioned by Mr. Neal. In the second collect, in the visitation of the sick, these words are omitted: “Visite him, O Lord, as thou didst Peter’s wive’s mother, and the captain’s servant:” which were in king Edward’s, queen Elizabeth’s and king James’s Review. Id. p. 311.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Kennet’s Chronicle, p. 633. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Id. p. 642, 643. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Id. p. 647. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Burnet, vol. 1. p. 161. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Burnet, p. 166. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Ibid. p. 133, 134. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Ibid. p. 191, 192. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. It is here, as Dr. Grey remarks, that Mr. Neal has strangely confounded two characters: ascribing to bishop Hamilton what Bishop Burnet has applied to. bishop Fairfoul. It is singular that Dr. Grey has, in the next paragraph, committed a similar mistake; for quoting Mr. Neal’s account of the death of Mr.James Guthrie, who, on the authority of Burnet, he says, “spoke an hour before his execution with great composedness,” he admits the correctness of this passage: but adds, that Burnet, but two pages before, said, that Mr. Guthrie spoke for half an hour with great appearance of serenity; and observes, “so consistent was this great man with himself in the compass of two pages.” Now the inconsistency is in Dr. Grey, and not bishop Burnet, who speaks in the first place not of Mr. Guthrie, but of the marquis of Argyle, vol 1. p. 179.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Hist. p. 130, 131. Kennet's Chron. p. 577. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Hist. of the Stuarts, p. 144. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Kennet’s Chron. p. 459. Burnet, p. 181. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Burnet, p. 152, 153. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Burnet, p. 226, 227. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Kennet’s Chron. p. 440, 441. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Ibid. p. 449. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Ibid. p. 462. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Ibid. p. 475. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 628, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Compl. Hist. p. 252. Kennet’s Chron. p. 482. 498. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Kennet’s Chron. p. 498. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Among the following names, the reader will find some who have not been noticed in the preceding history, or in the notes. The mother of Oliver Cromwell was by no means deserving of the malevolence and indignity with which her memory was treated. For, though she lavished the greatest fondness on her only son, she was averse to his protectorate, seldom troubled him with her advice, and with reluctance partook of the pageantry of sovereignty. She was an amiable and prudent woman: who, to make up the deficiency of a narrow income, undertook and managed the brewing trade on her own account, and from the profits of it provided fortunes for her daughters, sufficient to marry them into good families. \* Her anxiety for her son’s safety kept her in such constant alarm, that she was discontented if she did not see him twice a day. The report of a gun was never heard by her, without her crying out, “My son is shot.”—It ought to have softened the resentment of the royalists against Mrs. Claypole, though the daughter of Cromwell, that she had importunately interceded for the life of Dr. Hewett; and the denial of her suit had so afflicted her, that it was reported to have been one cause of her death, and was the subject of her exclamations to her father on her dying bed.―Thomas May, esq. whose name appears in the following list, was a polite and classical scholar, the intimate friend of the greatest wits of his time, and ranked in the first class of them. He was the author of several dramatic pieces; and of two historical poems of the reigns of Henry II. and Edward III. But his principal work was a “Translation of Lucan’s Pharsalia,” and a continuation of it.—Colonel, or Sir John Meldrum, a Scotsman, displayed his military prowess in the west, defeated the earl of Newcastle before Hull, with the assistance of sir Thomas Fairfax took the strong town of Gainsborough and the isle of Axholm, conquered the forces of the lords Byron and Molyneux, near Ormskirk, and took the town and castle of Scarborough. Biogr. Britan, vol. 4. p. 517. Ludlow’s Memoirs, Ito. p. 257. Granger's History of England, vol. 3. p. 94, and vol. 2. p. 265.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Some of the society, getting early intelligence of this bill, interfered to stop its progress. Edward Burrough, Richard Hubberthorn, and George Whitehead, attended the parliament to solicit against passing it into an act: and were admitted, but without success, to offer their reasons against it, at the bar of the house. “But political considerations, party animosity, and bigoted exasperated zeal for the church (so called), were the moving causes of action with the majority. Appeals to their reason and humanity were vain.” It aggravated the injustice and severity of this act, that it was framed, notwithstanding a paper, containing the sentiments of the Quakers respecting oaths, had been lately presented to the king and council by Edward Burrough, entitled “A Just and Righteous Plea:” which stated their conscientious scruples, expressed in strong terms their loyalty, and declared, “that it had ever been with them an established principle, confirmed by a consonant practice, to enter into no plots, combinations, or rebellions, against government, nor to seek deliverance from injustice or oppression by any such means.” Gough’s History of the Quakers, vol. 1. p. 499, &c.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Sewel, p. 346. Kennet’s Chron. p. 651.

    “Some were put into such noisome prisons, as were owned not fit for dogs. Some prisons so crowded that the prisoners had not room to sit down altogether. In Cheshire, sixty-eight persons were thus locked up in a small room. No age or sex found any commiseration. Men of sixty, seventy, or more years of age, were, without pity or remorse, subjected to all the rigours of such imprisonments under the infirmities of a natural decline; many times they were forced to lie on the cold ground, without being permitted the use of straw, and kept many days without victuals. No wonder that many grew sick and died by such barbarous imprisonments as these.” Gough, vol. 1. p. 538―Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. In the preceding year died, on the 22d of December, aged seventy-two years, Mr. Thomas Lushington, a scholar of eminence, and a favourer of the sentiments of Socinus; who translated into English and published, Crellius’s Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, and a commentary on that to the Hebrews from the Latin of the same author, or some other Unitarian writer. He published, among other works, two sermons on Matt, xxviii. 13,"and Acts ii. 1, entitled, “ The resurrection rescued from the Soldier’s Calumnies.” He was reckoned more ingenious than prudent, and was more apt to display his fancy than to proceed upon solid reason. At one time he personated in his sermon a Jewish Pharisee and persecutor of Christ, descanting on the whole life of our Saviour in a way suited to draw scorn and aversion on him and his attendants: he then changed his character, and speaking as a disciple of Christ he answered the cavils and invectives before thrown out with such dexterity, that his hearers broke into such loud and repeated applauses, as hindered him for a good space from proceeding in his sermon. He was a native of Sandwich, and matriculated at Broadgate’s Hall, in Oxford, when he was seventeen, in 1606–7. He graduated, as master of arts, in Lincoln-college, in 1618. In 1631, bishop Corbet gave him the prebendal stall of Bemister Secunda in the church of Salisbury; and afterward bestowed on him the rectory of Burnham Westgate, in Norfolk. In the rebellion he lost his spiritualities, but on the return of Charles II. was restored to them. He died and was buried at Sittingbourne, near Milton, in Kent. Wood’s Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 71, 72.—Ed.

    In the year 1661, or soon after the Restoration, died also Mr. Henry Denne, whom we have mentioned before, vol. 2. p. 387, note. He began his ministry in the church of England, and in 1641 drew great attention by a sermon which he preached at Baldock, in Hertfordshire; in this discourse he freely exposed the sin of persecution, and inveighed against the pride and covetousness of the clergy, their pluralities and nonresidences, and the corrupt practices of the spiritual courts. He was reckoned by one, who had a great hand in the public affairs of the age, “to be the ablest man in the kingdom for prayer, expounding, and preaching.” When the government declared their design to reform religion, Mr. Denne and many others were led to extend their inquiries, after religious truth, to points which before they had only taken for granted: and, it appearing to him, in his researches, that the practice of baptizing children was without any foundation in Scripture, or the writings of the Christians for the two first ages, he publicly professed himself a Baptist, and was baptized by immersion at London in 1643. This exposed him to the resentment of those who sat at the helm of ecclesiastical affairs: but notwithstanding this he obtained the parish of Elsly in Cambridgeshire. Meeting with opposition and persecution, he quitted his living and went into the army, and gained reputation in the military line. In 1658, he held a public disputation, concerning infant baptism, with Dr. Gunning, in St. Clement’s church, Temple-bar; in which he is said to have afforded strong proofs of his abilities and learning, as a good scholar and complete disputant. Mr. Edwards gives him the character of “a very affecting preacher.” A clergyman put on his grave this epitaph :

    “To tell his wisdom, learning, goodness, unto men,

    I need say no more, but here lies Henry Denne.”

    Crosby’s History of the English Baptists, vol. 1. p. 297, &c.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. It was the grand argument with the duke of York, for his adherence to the tenets of Popery, that his mother had, upon her last blessing, commanded him to be firm and steadfast thereto. Reresby’s Memoirs, p. 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Dr. Grey is much displeased with Mr. Neal for imputing the sale of Dunkirk to lord Clarendon: and remarks on it, that “had the count D’Estrades declared positively that the lord Clarendon had no concern therein, it is probable that his authority would have been rejected or passed over in silence. But lord Clarendon was a great friend to monarchy and episcopacy; and therefore lord Clarendon’s character must at all adventures be run down.” The reader will determine concerning the candour and fairness of this censure. The passages in which D’Estrades ascribes this transaction to lord Clarendon are to be seen in Rapin, and in Dr. Harris’s Life of Charles II. vol. 2. p. 192–198. Dr. Grey, on the other hand, refers to Kennet and Roger Coke, esq. as acquitting his lordship from advising the sale of Dunkirk. Bishop Burnet, it may be added, says, on the information of his lordship’s son, “that he kept himself out of that affair entirely.” To reconcile the nation to the sale of Dunkirk, the king promised to lay up all the money in the Tower, and that it should not be touched but upon extraordinary occasions. But in violation of his word and of decency, it was immediately squandered away among the creatures of his mistress, Barbara Villiers. Burnet’s History of his Own Times, vol. l.p. 251.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Rapin, p. 630, 631. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Burnet, p. 237, 238. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Dr. Grey is at a loss to understand how the act of uniformity could come into the convocation, and continue there for three or four months: for the two houses never send their bills thither for their perusal and approbation. He thinks, therefore, that Mr. Neal’s mistake must be owing to their review of the Common Prayer. Examination, vol. 3. p. 320.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Kennet’s Chron. p. 604. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Ibid..p. 677. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. The reason for extending it to schoolmasters was, we are told, to guard against the influence and force of education. Exam. p. 321.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Kennet’s Chron. p. 679*.* [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. This form of subscription and solemn declaration was inserted by the lords, with whom this act of uniformity began.—Ed.This clause was also inserted by the lords.―Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. This clause was also inserted by the lords.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. “The act of uniformity and the corporation-act (Mr. Gough observes) did not in themselves materially affect the Quakers, who aspired to no places of honour or profit, and who testified against preaching for hire, and sought for no more than a toleration and protection in their religious and civil rights, to lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty; yet the corporation-act in its consequences did affect them, by filling the city and country with persecuting magistrates.” Hist, of the Quakers, vol. 1. p. 469.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Dr. Grey argues that this objection is taken off by a clause, exempting from the penalties of the act those who were prevented subscribing within the limited time by some lawful impediment allowed and approved by the ordinary of the place, and complying with its requisition within a month after such impediment was removed; and the doctor adds, that, in pursuance of this clause, Dr. Laney, the bishop of Peterborough, dispensed with the dean and chapter of that church. He farther alleges a public advertisement given in London, 6th of August, 1662, declaring that the Book of Common Prayer was then perfectly and exactly printed, and books in folio were provided for all churches and chapels in the kingdom; which left a space of eighteen days for conveying them through the country. But the doctor did not calculate, how many of these days would be run out before this notice had circulated through the nation, and had reached the remoter parts and country parishes lying at a distance from the great post-roads. Bishop Burnet says, “the vast number of copies, being many thousands, that were to be wrought off for all the parish-churches of England, made the impression go on so slowly, that there were few books set out to sale when the day came.” Burnet, vol. 1. p. 269. Examination, vol. 1. p. 420—423; and vol. 3. p. 322, 323.—Ed [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. This was done by a proviso, drawn up by the lords, “that such persons as have been put out of their livings, by virtue of the act of uniformity, may have such allowances out of their livings for their subsistence as his majesty shall think fit.’’ Grey’s Examination, vol. 1. p. 423. A feeble, inefficient proviso, permitting the king to be kind, but leaving it to his option to be unjust and cruel; tantalizing distress, rather than relieving it—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Vol. 2. p. 629, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. The references are, I apprehend, to the bishop’s Complete History. There is a passage correspondent to the first in the Chronicle, p. 712.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. Kennet’s Chron. p. 246. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Page 270. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Page 88. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. Page 257. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. It reflects some honour on the name of bishop Saunderson that he spoke of this act in a milder strain. To a worthy clergyman, who was with him the evening after the king passed it, he said, “that more was imposed on ministers than he wished had been.” On passing the act he sent to Mr. Matthew Sylvester, whose living was in his diocese, and treating him with great civility, earnestly pressed him not to quit his living, and patiently heard him state his difficulties: and when he found, that he could not obviate them to his satisfaction, he lamented it, and at last signified a concern, that some things were carried so high in the ecclesiastical settlement; which, he said, should not have been if he could have prevented it. Calamy’s History of his own Life, vol. 2. p. 111. MS.; and Church and Dissenters Compared, p. 81.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. Page 632, &c [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. Page 171. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Baxter’s Life, part 2. p. 384. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Page 270. 280. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. Dr. Grey asserts this; and there was a laboured attempt by Dr. Walker to prove, that the clergy, ejected or suffering in the civil wars, exceeded in numbers those whom the act of uniformity ejected or silenced; and that the sufferings of the former surpassed in nature and severity those of the latter. The publication, which endeavoured to establish these points, was a folio, in small print, entitled, “An attempt towards recovering an account of the numbers and sufferings of the clergy of the church of England, heads of colleges, fellows, scholars, &c. who were sequestered, harassed, &c. in the late times of the grand rebellion: occasioned by the ninth chapter (now the second volume) of Dr. Calamy’s Abridgment of the Life of Mr. Baxter; together with an examination of that chapter.” The public was at first amused with so large a work, but by degrees began to speak freely of it in conversation, where it had the fate of other performances. It received from the press two able replies: one by Mr. John Withers, a judicious and worthy dissenting minister in Exeter; the other by Dr. Calamy, in a tract entitled, “The Church and Dissenters Compared as to Persecution.” On this subject we would refer the reader back to Mr. Neal, vol. 2. p. 262.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. Conf. Plea for Nonconformity, p. 12, 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
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