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CHAPTER VIII.

FROM THE BANISHMENT OF THE EARL OF CLARENDON TO THE KING’.S DECLARATION OF INDULGENCE IN THE YEAR 1672.

1667.

Upon the fall of the earl of Clarendon, the discourse of a toleration began to revive: the king in his speech to his parliament, February 10, has this passage: “One thing more I hold myself obliged to recommend to you at this present, that is, that you would seriously think of some course to beget a better union and composure in the minds of my Protestant subjects in matters of religion, whereby they may be induced not only to submit quietly to the government, but also cheerfully give their assistance to the support of it.”[[1]](#footnote-1) Sundry pamphlets were published upon this head; and the duke of Buckingham being now prime-minister, the Nonconformists about London were connived at, and people went openly and boldly to their meetings.

But the house of commons, who were yet influenced by the pernicious maxims of the late chancellor, petitioned the king to issue out his proclamation, for enforcing the laws against conventicles, and for preserving the peace of the kingdom, against unlawful assemblies of Papists and Nonconformists. Accordingly, his majesty issued out his proclamation, that “upon consideration of the late petition, and upon information that divers persons in several parts of the realm (abusing his clemency, even while it was under consideration to find out a way for the better union of his Protestant subjects), have of late frequently and openly, in great numbers, and to the great disturbance of the peace, held unlawful assemblies and conventicles, his majesty declares, that he will not suffer such notorious contempt of the laws to go unpunished, but requires, charges, and commands, all officers to be circumspect and vigilant in their several jurisdictions, to enforce and put the laws in execution against unlawful conventicles, commanding them to take particular care to preserve the peace.”

The sufferings of the dissenters began to excite compassion in the minds of the people, insomuch that their numbers visibly increased, partly through the indulgence of the court, and the want of churches since the fire of London, and partly through the poverty of the common people, who having little to lose, ventured to go publicly to meetings in defiance of the laws. The indolence of the established clergy, and the diligence of the Nonconformist ministers, contributed very much to the increase of Nonconformists. Bishop Burnet says,[[2]](#footnote-2) “The king was highly offended at the behaviour of most of the bishops; archbishop Sheldon and Morley, who kept close by lord Clarendon, the great patron of persecuting power, lost the king’s favour; the former never recovered it, and the latter was sent from court into his diocese. When complaint was made of some disorders and conventicles, the king said the clergy were chiefly to blame, for if they had lived well, and gone about their parishes, and taken pains to convince the Nonconformists, the nation might have been well settled, but they thought of nothing but to get good benefices, and keep a good table.” In another conversation with the bishop, about the ill state of the church,[[3]](#footnote-3) his majesty said, “If the clergy had done their parts, it had been easy to run down the Nonconformists, but they will do nothing (says the king), and will have me do everything; and most of them do worse than if they did nothing. I have a very honest chaplain (says he), to whom I have given a living in Suffolk, but he is a very great blockhead, and yet has brought all his parish to church; I cannot imagine what he could say to them, for he is a very silly fellow; but he has been about from house to house, and I suppose his nonsense has suited their nonsense; and in reward of his diligence I have given him a bishopric in Ireland.” About this time Ralph Wallis, a cobbler of Gloucester, published an account of a great number of scandalous Conformist ministers, and enumerated their scandals, to the great displeasure of the clergy; and I fear, says Mr. Baxter,[[4]](#footnote-4) to the temptation of many Nonconformists, who might be glad of anything to humble the Prelatists.

The learned Dr. Lazarus Seaman, the ejected minister of All-hallows, Bread-street, died this year, of whom we have given some account among the Cambridge professors; he was educated in Emanuel-college, and by his indefatigable industry rose to high reputation in the learned world for his exact acquaintance with the oriental languages; he was an able divine, an active member of the assembly at Westminster, and was taken notice of by king Charles I. at the treaty of the Isle of Wight, for his singular abilities in the debates about church-government.[[5]](#footnote-5) He was also master of Peter-house, Cambridge, but lost all at the Restoration; he underwent strong pains with admirable patience, and at length died in peace in the month of September 1667.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Mr. George Hughes, B. D. the ejected minister of Plymouth, born in Southwark,[[7]](#footnote-7) and educated in Corpus-Christi college, in Cambridge. He was called to a lecture in London, but was silenced for nonconformity by archbishop Laud. After some time he went to Tavistock, and last of all settled at Plymouth, having institution and induction from Dr. Brownrigge, bishop of Exeter, in the year 1644. Here he continued till the year 1662, whence he was ejected a week before the act of uniformity took place. He was afterward imprisoned in St. Nicholas island, where he contracted an incurable scurvy and dropsy, which at length put an end to his life. He was well read in the fathers, an acute disputant, a most faithful pastor to a large flock under his care, and a most holy, pious, and exemplary Christian. He had the greatest interest and influence of any minister in the west country, and refused a rich bishopric at the Restoration. He was both charitable and hospitable when it was in his power, and died at length in a most heavenly manner, in the month of July 1667, and in the sixty-fourth year of his age. The reverend Mr. John Howe, his son-in-law, composed a Latin epitaph for him, which is inscribed on his tomb.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The kingdom was at this time full of factions and discontents, arising from the late calamities of fire and plague, as well as the burden of the Dutch war; trade was at a stand, and great numbers of his majesty’s subjects were both dispirited and impoverished by the penal laws; but that which struck all considerate men with a panic, was the danger of the Protestant interest, and the liberties of Europe, from the formidable progress of the French armies, which this very summer overrun the Spanish Flanders, and took the strong towns of Charleroy, Bergues, Ath, Donay, Tournay, Audenard, Lisle, Courtray, Furnes, &c. which, with their dependencies, were yielded in full sovereignty to France by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. The English court seemed unconcerned at the French conquests, till they were awakened by the clamours of the whole nation; upon this sir William Temple was sent into Holland, who in a few weeks concluded a triple alliance between England, Holland, and Sweden, which strengthened the Protestant interest while it subsisted; but the French mistresses and money could dissolve the strongest bonds.

In this critical situation of affairs abroad, some attempts were made to quiet the minds of his majesty’s Protestant subjects at home, for men began to think it high time for Protestants to put a stop to the pulling down their neighbours’ houses, when the common enemy was threatening the destruction of them all; therefore lord-keeper Bridgman, lord-chief-justice Hales, bishop Wilkins, Reynolds, Dr. Burton, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and others, set on foot a comprehension of such as could be brought into the church by some abatements, and a toleration for the rest. But the project was blasted by the court-bishops, and lord Clarendon’s friends, who took the alarm, and raised a mighty outcry of the danger of the church.[[9]](#footnote-9) Nobody (say they) knows where the demands of the Presbyterians will end; the cause of the hierarchy will be given up, if any of those points are yielded which have been so much contested; besides, it is unworthy of the church to court or even treat with her enemies, when there is so little reason to apprehend that we should gain any considerable numbers thereby. But to this it was replied, that the prodigious increase of Popery and infidelity was a loud call of Providence, to attempt everything that could be done without sin for healing our divisions. That though the Nonconformists could not legally meet together to bring in their concessions in the name of the body, it was well enough known what they scrupled, and what would bring most of them into the church. That a compliance in some lesser matters of indifference would be no reproach, but an honour to the church, how superior soever she might be in argument or power.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The proposals were drawn up by bishop Wilkins and Dr. Burton, and communicated by the lord-keeper to Dr. Bates, Manton, and Baxter, and by them to their brethren, under the following particulars:

1. That such ministers who in the late times had been ordained only by presbyters, should have the imposition of the hands of a bishop, with this form of words: “Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and administer the sacraments in any congregation of the church of England, when thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.”

2. That instead of all former subscriptions, after the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, they subscribe the following declaration: I A. B. do hereby profess and declare, that I approve the doctrine, worship, and government, established in the church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any doctrine contrary to that which is so established. And I do hereby promise, that I will continue in the communion of the church of England, and will not do anything to disturb the peace thereof.

3. That the gesture of kneeling at the sacrament, the cross in baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus, be left indifferent, or taken away.

4. That if the liturgy and canons be altered in favour of dissenters, then every preacher upon his institution shall declare his assent to the lawfulness of the use of it, and promise, that it shall be constantly used at the time and place accustomed.

The alterations proposed to be made in the liturgy, were these:

To read the psalms in the new translation.

To appoint lessons out of the canonical Scripture instead of the Apocrypha.

Not to enjoin godfathers and godmothers, when either of the parents are ready to answer for the child in baptism. To omit that expression in the prayer, “By spiritual regeneration.” To change the question, “Wilt thou be baptized?” into, “Wilt thou have this child baptized? “To omit those words in the thanksgiving, “To regenerate this infant by the Holy Spirit, and to receive him for thy child by adoption.” And the first rubric after baptism, “It is certain by God’s word,” &c. In the exhortation after baptism, instead of, “regenerate and grafted into the body,” to say, “received into the church of Christ.” No part of the office of baptism to be repeated in public when the child has been lawfully baptized in private.

To omit this passage in the office of confirmation: “After the example of thy holy apostles, and to certify them by this sign of thy favour and gracious goodness towards them.” And instead of, “Vouchsafe to regenerate,” read, “Vouchsafe to receive into thy church by baptism.”

To omit the expressions in matrimony, “With my body I thee worship;” and that in the collect, “Thou hast consecrated,” &c.

In the visitation of the sick, ministers to be allowed to make use of such prayers as they judge expedient.[[11]](#footnote-11)

In the burial of the dead, instead of, “Forasmuch as it has pleased Almighty God, of his great mercy, to take unto himself,” &c. read, “Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take out of this world the soul,” &c. Instead of, “in sure and certain hope,” to read, “in a full assurance of the resurrection by our Lord Jesus Christ.” To omit the following words, “We give thee hearty thanks, for that it has pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world;” and these other, “As our hope is this our brother doth.”

In the communion-service to change, “that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, “into, “our sinful souls and bodies may be cleansed by his precious body and blood.”

The commination not to be enjoined.

The liturgy to be abbreviated, especially as to the morning service, by omitting all the responsal prayers, from, “O Lord, open thou,” &c. to the litany; and the litany, and all the prayers, from, “Son of God, we beseech thee,” &c. to, “We humbly beseech thee, O Father.”

The Lord’s prayer not to be enjoined more than once, viz. after the absolution, except after the minister’s prayer before sermon. '

The *Gloria Patri* to be used but once, after reading the Psalms.

The *Venite exultemus* to be omitted, unless it be thought fit to put any or all of the first seven among the sentences at the beginning.

The communion-service to be omitted when there are no communion-days, except the ten commandments, which may be read after the creed; and enjoining the prayer, “Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep these laws,” only once, at the end.

The collects, epistles, and gospels, to be omitted, except on particular holy days.

The prayers for the parliament to be inserted immediately after the prayer for the royal family, in this or the like form: “That it may please thee to direct and prosper all the consultations of the high court of parliament, to the advantage of thy glory, the good of the church, the safety, honour, and welfare, of our sovereign and his kingdoms.”

To omit the two hymns in the consecration of bishops, and ordination of priests.

In the catechism, after the first question, “What is thy name?” It may follow, “When was this name given thee?” After that, “What was promised for you in baptism?” Answ. “Three things were promised for me.” In the question before the commandments, it may be altered thus, “Yon said it was promised for you.” To the fourteenth question, (< How many sacraments hath Christ ordained?” the answer may be, “Two only, baptism and the Lord’s supper.'”

Mr. Baxter proposed farther, that the subscription might be only to the doctrinal articles of the church. That the power of bishops, and their courts, to suspend and silence men, might be limited. That the baptismal covenant might be explicitly owned by all who come to the sacrament. But it was replied, that more than what was above mentioned would not pass with the parliament.

The proposals for a toleration were communicated by Mr. Baxter to the Presbyterians, to the Independents by Dr. Owen, and were to the following effect:

1. That such Protestants who could not accept of the proposals for a comprehension, might have liberty for the exercise of their religion in public, and to build or to procure places for their public worship at their own charges, either within or near towns, as shall be thought most expedient.

2. That the names of all such persons who are to have this liberty to be registered, together with the congregations to which they belong; and the names of their teachers.

3. That every one admitted to this liberty be disabled from bearing any public office, but shall fine for offices of burden.

4. Upon showing a certificate of being listed among those that are indulged, they shall be freed from such legal penalties as are to be inflicted on those who do not frequent their parish-churches.

5. Such persons so indulged shall not for their meeting in conventicles be punished by confiscation of estates.

6. Provided they pay all public duties to the parish where they inhabit, under penalty of ―――.

7. This indulgence to continue three years.[[12]](#footnote-12)

According to these heads of agreement a bill was prepared for the parliament by lord-chief-justice Hales; but bishop Wilkins, an honest and opened-hearted man, having disclosed the affair to bishop Ward, in hopes of his assistance, alarmed the bishops, who, instead of promoting the design, concerted measures to defeat it; for as soon as the parliament met, notice was taken that there were rumours without doors of an act to be offered for comprehension and indulgence, upon which a vote was passed, that no man should bring such an act into the house. And, to crush the Nonconformists more effectually, archbishop Sheldon wrote a circular letter to the bishops of his province, dated June 8, to send him a particular account of the conventicles in their several dioceses, and of the numbers that frequented them; and whether they thought they might be easily suppressed by the civil magistrate.[[13]](#footnote-13) When he was provided with this information he went to the king, and obtained a proclamation to put the laws in execution against the Nonconformists, and particularly against the preachers, according to the statute of 17th king Charles II. which forbids their inhabiting corporations.

Thus the persecution was renewed; and the parliament still bent on severities, appointed a committee to inquire into the behaviour of the Nonconformists, who reported to the house that divers conventicles, and other seditious meetings, were held in their very neighbourhood, in defiance of the laws, and to the danger of the peace of the kingdom.[[14]](#footnote-14) General Monk, who was near his end, and sunk almost into contempt, was employed to disperse them, and received the thanks of the house for his zeal in that important service, wherein he was sure to meet with no opposition. They also returned his majesty thanks for his proclamation for suppressing conventicles, desiring him to take the same care for the future. By this means the private meetings of the dissenters, which had been held by connivance, were broken up again. Mr. Baxter was committed to Clerkenwell-prison, for preaching to his neighbours in his own house at Acton, and for refusing the Oxford oath; but upon demanding an habeas corpus, his mittimus was declared invalid for want of naming the witnesses.[[15]](#footnote-15) The justices would have mended their mittimus and sent him to Newgate, but Mr. Baxter, being released, wisely kept out of the way. Mr. Taverner of Uxbridge was sentenced to Newgate, for teaching a few children at Brentford. Mr. Button, late university-orator, was sent to prison for teaching two knight’s sons in his own house; and multitudes in many counties had the like usage, suffering imprisonment for six months.[[16]](#footnote-16)

But this was contrary to the king’s inclinations, who was only for playing the dissenters against the parliament for a sum of money; when the house therefore was up, his majesty ordered some of the Nonconformists to be told, that he was desirous to make them easy, and that if they would petition for relief they should be favourably heard.[[17]](#footnote-17) Sir J. Barber, secretary of state, acquainted Dr. Manton with the king’s intention, upon which an address was drawn up and presented to his majesty at the earl of Arlington's lodgings by Dr. Jacomb, Manton, and Bates; the king received them jealously, and promised to do his utmost to get them comprehended within the establishment. He wished there had been no bars at all, but that he was forced to comply for peace’s sake, and that he would endeavour to remove them, though it was a work of difficulty. He complained of the umbrage that their numerous assemblies gave to clamorous people, and advised them to use their liberty with more discretion hereafter. When the ministers promised obedience, and assured his majesty of their steady loyalty, and constant prayers for the prosperity of his person and government, he dismissed them with a smile, and told them, that he was against persecution, and hoped ere long to be able to stand upon his own legs. But his majesty’s promises were always to be bought off by a sum of money to support his pleasures.

The controversy of the reasonableness of toleration was now warmly debated without doors; many ill-natured books were written to expose the doctrine of the Presbyterians, as leading to antinomianism and licentiousness of manners.[[18]](#footnote-18) Others exposed their characters and manner of preaching. Among these must be reckoned the Friendly Debate, which, though written by a good man, says bishop Burnet,[[19]](#footnote-19) had an ill effect in sharpening people’s spirits too much against the dissenters: the author was Dr. Simon Patrick, afterward bishop of Ely, but now in the heat of his youth; who, by aggravating some weak and unguarded expressions, endeavoured to expose the whole body of Nonconformist ministers to contempt. But I must do this prelate so much justice as to inform the reader, that in his advanced age he expressed his dissatisfaction with this part of his conduct; and, in a debate in the house of lords about the occasional bill, declared, “he had been known to write against the dissenters with some warmth in his younger years, but that he had lived long enough to see reason to alter his opinion of that people, and that way of writing.” A rare instance of ingenuity and candour! We shall have occasion to mention Sir Roger L’Estrange hereafter.

But one of the most virulent writers of his time, under the form of a clergyman, was Samuel Parker, afterward bishop of Oxford, a man of considerable learning and great smartness, but of no judgment, and as little virtue; and as to religion, says bishop Burnet,[[20]](#footnote-20) rather impious than otherwise. At length Andrew Marvel, the liveliest wit of the age, attacked him in a burlesque strain, and with so peculiar and entertaining an address, that from the king down to the tradesman, his books were read with the highest pleasure. He had all the men of wit on his side, and not only humbled Parker more than the serious and grave writings of Dr. Owen, but silenced the whole party; one of whom concludes his letter to Mr. Marvel with these words: “If thou darest to print or publish any lie or libel against Dr. Parker, by the eternal God I will cut thy throat.” Subscribed J. G.

All sober men were of opinion, that it was ungenerous and cruel to treat a number of peaceable men, whom the laws had put almost out of their protection, in so ludicrous a manner.”[[21]](#footnote-21) Religion itself suffered by it. I remember, says lord-chief-justice Hales, that when Ben Jonson, in his play of the Alchymist, introduced Anartus in derision of the Puritans, with many of their phrases taken out of Scripture, in order to render that people ridiculous, the play was detested and abhorred, because it seemed to reproach religion itself; but now, when the Presbyterians were brought upon the stage in their peculiar habits, and with their distinguishing phrases of Scripture, exposed to the laughter of spectators, it met with approbation and applause.

But such was the complexion of the court, that they bid defiance to virtue, and even to decency, giving countenance to all manner of licentiousness. The play-houses were become nests of prostitution, says Burnet,[[22]](#footnote-22) and the stage was defiled beyond example; the king, queen, and courtiers, went about in masks, and came into citizens’ houses unknown, where they danced with a great deal of wild frolic, and committed indecencies not to be mentioned. They were carried about in hackney-chairs, and none could distinguish them except those who were in the secret. Once the queen’s chairman, not knowing who she was, left her to come home in a hackney-coach, some say in a cart. Buckingham, who gloried in his debaucheries, and Wilmot earl of Rochester, the greatest wit and libertine of his age, were the principal favourites. To support these extravagances the house of commons supplied the king with what money he wanted, and were themselves so mercenary, that the purchase of every man’s vote was known; for as a man rose in credit in the house, he advanced his price and expected to be treated accordingly.

The university was no less corrupt; there was a general licentiousness of manners among the students: the sermons of the younger divines were filled with encomiums upon the church, and satires against the nonconformists; the evangelical doctrines of repentance, faith, charity, and practical religion were unfashionable. The speeches and panegyrics pronounced by the orators and *terra filii,* on public occasions, were scurrilous, and little less than blasphemous; as appears by the letter in the margin from Mr. Wallis, to the honourable Robert Boyle, Esq.[[23]](#footnote-23) of the proceedings at the opening of archbishop Sheldon’s theatre, which is copied verbatim from the original under his own hand.

About this time died the reverend Mr. Matthew Newcomen, M.A., the ejected minister of Dedham, in Essex; he was educated in St. John’s college, Cambridge, and succeeded the famous Mr. John Rogers. He was a most accomplished scholar and Christian, a member of the assembly of divines, and, together with Dr. Arrowsmith and Tuckney, drew up their catechism.[[24]](#footnote-24) He was one of the commissioners of the Savoy, and had many offers of preferment in the late times, but would not desert his church at Dedham, till he was displaced by the act of uniformity; after which he retired to Holland, and became pastor of the English church at Leyden, where he died about this time, universally lamented by the professors, for his humble and pleasant conversation, as well as his universal learning and piety.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Mr. Joseph Allein, the ejected minister[[26]](#footnote-26) of Taunton, and author of the Call to the Unconverted, was born at Devizes, in Wiltshire, and educated in Lincoln-college, Oxon. He was public preacher in the church of Taunton about seven years, and was universally beloved for his great piety and devotion. After his ejectment, he preached as he had opportunity six or seven times a week. May 26, 1663, he was committed to Ilchester jail, for singing psalms in his own house, and preaching to his family, others being present: here he continued a year, but upon his enlargement he returned again to his work, which he followed with unwearied diligence. July 10, 1665, he was committed a second time to jail, with several other ministers, and forty private persons; where he contracted such distempers and weaknesses as brought him to his grave before he was thirty-six years of age.[[27]](#footnote-27) He was an awakening, lively preacher; zealous and successful in his Master’s work, and withal of a peaceable and quiet spirit. He died in the year 1668 or 1669.

The tide in the house of commons still run very strong on the side of persecution, as appears by two extraordinary clauses added to the conventicle act, which, having expired some time since, was now revived by the parliament which met October 19. The court went into it with a view of reducing the Presbyterians to the necessity of petitioning for a general toleration. “If we would have opened the door to let in Popery (says M. Baxter[[28]](#footnote-28)), that their toleration might have been charged upon us, as done for our sakes, and by our procurement, we might in all likelihood have had our part in it; but I never shall be one of them who, by any new pressures, shall consent to petition for the Papists’ liberty; no craft of Jesuits or prelates shall make me believe that it is necessary for the non-conformists to take this odium upon themselves.”[[29]](#footnote-29) The court-bishops were for the bill, but the moderate clergy were against it. Bishop Wilkins spoke against it in the house; and, when the king desired him in private to be quiet, he replied, that he thought it an ill thing both in conscience and policy; therefore, as he was an Englishman, and a bishop, he was bound to oppose it: and, since by the laws and constitution of England, and by his majesty’s favour, he had a right to debate and vote, he was neither afraid nor ashamed to own his opinion in that matter. However, the bill passed both houses, and received the royal assent April 11, 1670.[[30]](#footnote-30) It was to the following effect: “That if any persons upwards of sixteen years shall be present at any assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion, in any other manner than according to the liturgy and practice of the church of England, where there are five persons or more present, besides those of the said household, in such cases the offender shall pay five shillings for the first offence, and ten shillings for the second. And the preachers or teachers in any such meetings shall forfeit twenty pounds for the first and forty for the second offence. And lastly, those who knowingly suffer any such conventicles in their houses, barns, yards, &c. shall forfeit twenty pounds. Any justice of peace, on the oath of two witnesses, or any other sufficient proof, may record the offence under his hand and seal, which record shall be taken in law for a full and perfect conviction, and shall be certified at the next quarter sessions. The fines above mentioned may be levied by distress and sale of the offender’s goods and chattels; and, in case of the poverty of such offender, upon the goods and chattels of any other person or persons, that shall be convicted of having been present at the said conventicle, at the discretion of the justice of peace, so as the sum to be levied on any one person, in case of the poverty of others, do not amount to above ten pounds for any one meeting: the constables, headboroughs, &c. are to levy the same by warrant from the justice, and to be divided, one third for the use of the king, another third for the poor, and the other third to the informer or his assistants, regard being had to their diligence and industry in discovering, dispersing, and punishing the said conventicles. The fines upon ministers for preaching are to be levied also by distress; and, in case of poverty, upon the goods and chattels of any other present; and the like upon the house where the conventicle is held, and the money to be divided as above.

“And it is farther enacted, that the justice or justices of peace, constables, headboroughs, &c. may by warrant, with what aid, force, and assistance they shall think necessary, break open, and enter into, any house or place where they shall be informed of the conventicle, and take the persons into custody.—And the lieutenants, or other commissioned officers of the militia, may get together such force and assistance as they think necessary, to dissolve, dissipate, and disperse such unlawful meetings, and take the persons into custody.” Then follow two extraordinary clauses: “That if any justice of peace refuse to do his duty in the execution of this act, he shall forfeit five pounds.

“And be it farther enacted, that all clauses in this act shall be construed most largely and beneficially for the suppressing conventicles, and for the justification and encouragement of all persons to be employed in the execution thereof. No warrant or mittimus shall be made void, or reversed, for any default in the form; and if a person fly from one county or corporation to another, his goods and chattels shall be seizable wherever they are found. If the party offending be a wife cohabiting with her husband, the fine shall be levied on the goods and chattels of the husband, provided the prosecution be within three months.”

The wit of man could hardly invent anything, short of capital punishment, more cruel and inhuman.[[31]](#footnote-31) One would have thought a prince of so much clemency as Charles II., who had often declared against persecution, should not have consented to it, and that no Christian bishop should have concurred in the passing it. Men’s houses are to be plundered, their persons imprisoned, their goods and chattels carried away, and sold to those who would bid for them. Encouragement is given to a vile set of informers, and others, to live upon the labour and industry of their conscientious neighbours.[[32]](#footnote-32) Multitudes of these infamous wretches spent their profits in ill houses, and upon lewd women, and then went about the streets again to hunt for farther prey. The law is to be construed in their favour, and the power to be lodged in the hand of every individual justice of peace, who is to be fined £5 if he refuses his warrant. Upon this, many honest men, who would not be the instruments of such severities, quitted the bench. Mr. Echard, being ashamed to ascribe these cruelties to the influence of the bishop, says, “that this and all the penal laws made against the dissenters were the acts of parliament, and not of the church, and were made more on a civil and political, than upon a moral or religious account; and always upon some fresh provocation in reality or appearance.” This is the language by which the patrons of high-church cruelty endeavour to excuse themselves from the guilt of persecution; but it must fall somewhere; and that it may not fall too heavy upon the church, it is artfully, and with great good manners, cast entirely upon the legislature, and put upon the score of sedition, whereas it was well known the dissenters behaved peaceably, and were very far from disturbing the state. Nor does the preamble to the act charge them with disloyalty, but only says, “that for the providing speedy remedies against the practice of seditious sectaries, and others, who under pretence of tender consciences have or may at their meetings contrive insurrections,[[33]](#footnote-33) be it enacted,” &c. as if it was possible to do this in the company of women and servants, who were always present in their assemblies. It is therefore evident, that the act was levelled purely against liberty of conscience, and was so severely executed, that as sir Harry Capel observes, there was hardly a conventicle to be heard of all over England. The two houses, says our church historian,[[34]](#footnote-34) were express for the execution of these laws; the bishops and clergy were sincerely zealous in it, and the honest justices and magistrates, as he calls them, bore the more hard upon them, because they saw them so bold in despising and evading the justice of the nation.

Great numbers were prosecuted on this act, and many industrious families reduced to poverty. Many ministers were confined in jails and close prisons; and warrants were issued out against them and their hearers, whereby great sums of money were levied. In the diocess of Salisbury the persecution was hottest, by the instigation of bishop Ward; many hundreds being pursued with great industry, and driven from their families and trades.[[35]](#footnote-35) The act was executed with such severity in Starling’s mayoralty, that many of the trading men in the city were removing with their effects to Holland, till the king put a stop to it.[[36]](#footnote-36) Informers were everywhere at work, and having crept into religious assemblies in disguise, levied great sums of money upon ministers and people. Soldiers broke into the houses of honest farmers, under pretence of searching for conventicles, and, where ready money was wanting, they plundered their goods, drove away their cattle, and sold them for half-price. Many were plundered of their household furniture; the sick had their beds taken from under them, and themselves laid on the floor. Should I sum up all the particulars, and the accounts I have received, says Mr. Sewel,[[37]](#footnote-37) it would make a volume of itself. These vile creatures were not only encouraged, but pushed on vehemently by their spiritual guides: for this purpose archbishop Sheldon sent another circular letter to all the bishops in his province, dated May 7, 1670, in which he directs all ecclesiastical judges and officers, “to take notice of all Nonconformists, holders, frequenters, maintainers, and abettors, of conventicles, especially of the preachers or teachers in them, and of the places wherein they are held; ever keeping a more watchful eye over the cities and greater towns, from whence the mischief is for the most part derived unto the lesser villages and hamlets. And wheresoever they find such wilful offenders, that then with a hearty affection to the worship of God, the honour of the king and his laws, and the peace of the king and his laws, and the peace of the church and kingdom, they do address themselves to the civil magistrate, justices, and others concerned, imploring their help and assistance for preventing and suppressing the same, according to the late act in that behalf made and set forth.—And now, my lord, what the success will be we must leave to God Almighty; yet, my lord, I have this confidence under God, that if we do our parts now at first seriously, by God’s help, and the assistance of the civil power, considering the abundant care and provision the act contains for our advantage, we shall in a few months see so great an alteration in the distraction of these times, as that the seduced people returning from their seditious and self-seeking teachers to the unity of the church, and uniformity of God’s worship, it will be to the glory of God, the welfare of the church, the praise of his majesty and government, and the happiness of the whole kingdom.” Can this be the language of a Christian and Protestant bishop; or is it not more like a father of the Inquisition, or the dragooning commission of Lewis XIV. when he revoked the edict of Nantz?[[38]](#footnote-38)

Copies of this letter were sent by the archdeacons to the officers of the several parishes within their jurisdictions, earnestly exhorting them to take especial care, to perform whatsoever is therein required, and to give an account at the next visitation. Many of the bishops chose to lie behind the curtain, and throw off the odium from themselves to the civil magistrate; but some of the more zealous could not forbear appearing in person, as bishop Ward, already mentioned, and bishop Gunning,[[39]](#footnote-39) who often disturbed the meetings in person: once finding the doors shut, he ordered the constable to break them open with a sledge; another time he sat upon the bench at the quarter-sessions, upon which the chairman desired his lordship to give the charge, which he refusing received a very handsome rebuke; it being hardly consistent with one that is an ambassador of the Prince of peace, to sit in judgment upon the consciences of his poor countrymen and neighbours, in order to plunder and tear them to pieces.[[40]](#footnote-40) The bishop was so zealous in the cause, that he sunk his character by giving a public challenge to the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and Quakers, and appointed three days for the disputation; on the first of which his lordship went into the pulpit in the church, where was a considerable congregation, and charged the former with sedition and rebellion out of their books, but would hear no reply.[[41]](#footnote-41) When the day came to dispute with the Quakers, they summoned their friends, and when the bishop railed, they paid him in his own coin; and followed him to his very house with repeated shouts, “The hireling flieth.”

The Nonconformist ministers did what they could to keep themselves within the compass of the law; they preached frequently twice a day in large families, with only four strangers, and as many under the age of sixteen as would come; and at other times, in places where people might hear in several adjoining houses; but after all, infinite mischiefs ensued, families were impoverished and divided; friendship between neighbours was interrupted; there was a general distrust and jealousy of each other; and sometimes upon little quarrels, servants would betray their masters, and throw their affairs into distraction. Among others that suffered at this time was Dr. Manton, who was apprehended on a Lord’s day in the afternoon, just as he had done sermon; the door being opened to let a gentleman out, the justice and his attendants rushed in, and went up stairs; they stayed till the doctor had ended his prayer, and then wrote down the names of the principal persons present, and took the doctor’s promise to come to them at a house in the piazzas of Covent-Garden, where they tendered him the Oxford oath, upon his refusal of which, he was committed prisoner to the Gate-house; where he continued till he was released by the indulgence. At another time his meeting-house in White-Hart Yard was broken up; the place was fined £40 and the minister £20, which was paid by lord Wharton, who was then present; they also took down the names of the hearers, for the benefit of the justices of peace and spiritual courts.

The behaviour of the Quakers was very extraordinary, and had something in it that looked like the spirit of martyrdom.[[42]](#footnote-42) They met at the same place and hour as in times of liberty, and when the officers came to seize them, none of them would stir; they went all together to prison; they stayed there till they were dismissed, for they would not petition to be set at liberty, nor pay the fines set upon them, nor so much as the prison fees. When they were discharged, they went to their meeting-house again, as before; and when the doors were shut up by order, they assembled in great numbers in the street before the doors, saying, they would not be ashamed nor afraid to disown their meeting together in a peaceable manner to worship God; but in imitation of the prophet Daniel, they would do it more publicly, because they were forbid. Some called this obstinacy, others firmness, but by it they carried their point, the government being weary of contending against so much perverseness.[[43]](#footnote-43)

On the 1st of September, 1670, two of their principal speakers, Wm. Penn and Wm. Mead, were tried at the Old-Bailey, for an unlawful and tumultuous assembly in the open street, wherein they spake or preached to the people, who were assembled in Gracechurch-street, to the number of three or four hundred, in contempt of the king’s laws, and to the disturbance of the peace. The prisoners pleaded Not Guilty, but met with some of the severest usage that has been known in an English court of justice. They were fined forty marks apiece for coming into court with their hats on, though it was not done out of contempt, but from a principle of their religion. It appeared by the witnesses, that there was an assembly in Gracechurch-street, but there was neither riot, nor tumult, nor force of arms. Mr. Penn confessed they were so far from recanting, or declining to vindicate the assembling themselves to preach, pray, or worship the eternal, holy, just God, that they declared to all the world, they believed it to be their duty, and that all the powers on earth should not be able to divert them from it. When it was said, they were not arraigned for worshipping God, but for breaking the law, William Penn affirmed he had broken no law, and challenged the recorder to tell him upon what law he was prosecuted. The recorder answered, upon the common law, but could not tell where that common law was to be found. Penn insisted upon his producing the law, but the court overruled him, and called him a troublesome fellow. Penn replied, “I design no affront to the court, but if you deny to acquaint me with the law you say I have broken, you deny me the right that is due to every Englishman, and evidence to the whole world that your designs are arbitrary.” Upon which he was haled from the bar into the bail-dock. As he was going out, he said to the jury, “If these fundamental laws which relate to liberty and property must not be indispensably maintained, who can say he has a right to the coat upon his back? Certainly then our liberties are openly to be invaded, our wives to be ravished, our children enslaved, and our estates led away in triumph, by every sturdy beggar and malicious informer, as their trophies.”

William Mead, being left alone at the bar, said, “You men of the jury, I am accused of meeting by force of arms, in a tumultuous manner.—Time was when I had freedom to use a carnal weapon, and then I feared no man; but now I fear the living God and dare not make use thereof nor hurt any man. I am a peaceable man, and therefore demand to know upon what law my indictment is founded; if the recorder will not tell what makes a riot, Coke will tell him, that it is when three or more are met together to beat a man, or to enter forcibly into another man’s lands to cut his grass or wood, or break down his pales.” Upon this the recorder, having lost all patience, pulled off his hat, and said, I thank you, sir, for telling me what the law is. Mead replied, Thou mayest put on thy hat, I have no fee for thee now. The mayor Starling told him, he deserved to have his tongue cut out, and ordered him likewise to be carried to the bail-dock.

When the prisoners were gone, the recorder gave the jury their charge, upon which William Penn stood up, and with a loud voice said, “I appeal to the jury, and this great assembly, whether it be not contrary to the undoubted right of every Englishman, to give the jury their charge in the absence of the prisoners?” The recorder answered with a sneer, Ye are present, ye do hear, do ye not? Penn answered, “No thanks to the court; I have ten or twelve material points to offer in order to invalidate the indictment, but am not heard.” The recorder said, “Pull him down; pull the fellow down.” Mead replied, these were barbarous and unjust proceedings; and then they were both thrust into the hole.

After the jury had withdrawn an hour and half, the prisoners were brought to the bar to hear their verdict; eight of them came down agreed, but four remained above, to whom they used many unworthy threats, and in particular to Mr. Bushel, whom they charged with being the cause of the disagreement. At length, after withdrawing a second time, they agreed to bring them in guilty of speaking in Graeechureh-street; which the court would not accept for a verdict, but after many menaces told them they should be locked up without meat, drink, fire, or tobacco; nay, they should starve, unless they brought in a proper verdict. William Penn being at the bar, said, “My jury ought not to be thus threatened. We were by force of arms kept out of our meeting-house, and met as near it as the soldiers would give us leave. We are a peaceable people, and cannot offer violence to any man.” And looking upon the jury, he said, “You are Englishmen, mind your privilege, give not away your right.” To which some of them answered, “Nor will we ever do it.” Upon this they were shut up all night without victuals or fire, or so much as a chamber-pot, though desired. Next morning they brought in the same verdict; upon which they were threatened the utmost resentments. The mayor said, he would cut Bushel’s throat as soon as he could. The recorder said, he never knew the benefit of an inquisition till now; and that the next sessions of parliament a law would be made wherein those that would not conform should not have the benefis of the law.[[44]](#footnote-44) The court having obliged the jury to withdraw again, they were kept without meat and drink till next morning, when they brought in the prisoners not guilty; for which they were fined forty marks a man, and to be imprisoned till paid. The prisoners were also remanded to Newgate for their fines in not pulling off their hats.[[45]](#footnote-45) The jury, after some time, were discharged by habeas corpus returnable in the common-pleas, where their commitment was judged illegal. This was a noble stand for the liberty of the subject in very dangerous times, when neither law nor equity availed anything. The conventicle-act was made to encourage prosecutions; and a narrative was published next year, of the oppressions of many honest people in Devonshire, and other parts, by the informers and justices; but the courts of justice outran the law itself.

Hitherto the king and parliament had agreed pretty well by means of the large supplies of money the parliament had given to support his majesty’s pleasures; but now having assurances of large remittances from France, his majesty resolved to govern by the prerogative, and stand upon his own legs.[[46]](#footnote-46) His prime counsellors were, lord Clifford, Anthony Ashley Cooper, afterward lord Shaftesbury, the duke of Buckingham, earl of Arlington, and duke Lauderdale, who from the initial letters of their names were called the CABAL. Lord Clifford was an open Papist, and the earl of Arlington a concealed one. Buckingham was a debauchee, and reputed a downright Atheist; he was a man of great wit and parts, and of sounder principles in the interests of humanity, says Mr. Baxter, than the rest of the court. Shaftesbury had a vast genius, but, according to Burnet, at best was a Deist; he had great knowledge of men and things, but would often change sides as his interest directed. Lauderdale was a man of learning, and from an almost republican was become a perfect tool of the prerogative, and would offer at the most desperate councils. He had scarcely any traces of religion remaining, though he called himself a Presbyterian, and had an aversion to king Charles I. to the last. By these five ministers of state the king and duke of York drove on their designs of introducing1 Popery and arbitrary power; in order to which, a secret treaty was concluded with France; the triple alliance was broken, and a new war declared with the Dutch to destroy their commonwealth, as will be seen presently. By this means the king had a plausible pretence to keep up a standing army, which might secure him in the exercise of an absolute authority over his subjects, to set aside the use of parliaments, and settle the Roman Catholic religion in the three kingdoms. These were the maxims the court pursued throughout the remaining part of this reign.

In the beginning of this year died Dr. Anthony Tuckney,[[47]](#footnote-47) born in September 1599, and educated in Emanuel-college, Cambridge. He was afterward vicar of Boston in Lincolnshire, where he continued till he was called to sit in the assembly of divines at Westminster. In the year 1645, he was made master of his college, and in the year 1648, being chosen vice-chancellor, he removed to Cambridge with his family. He was afterward master of St. John’s and regius professor, which he held to the Restoration, when the king sent him a letter, desiring him to resign his professorship, which if he did, his majesty, in consideration of the great pains and diligence of the said doctor in the discharge of his duty, would oblige his successor to give him sufficient security in law, to pay him £100 a year during his natural life. Upon this notice the doctor immediately resigned, and had his annuity paid him by Dr. Gunning, who succeeded him. After the coming out of the five-mile act he shifted about in several counties, and at last died in Spittle-yard, London, February 1669, in the seventy-first year of his age, leaving behind him the character of an eminently learned and pious man, an indefatigable student, a candid disputant, and an earnest promoter of truth and godliness.[[48]](#footnote-48)

About the same time died Mr. William Bridge, M. A. the ejected minister of Yarmouth; he was student in Cambridge thirteen years, and fellow of Emanuel-college. He afterward settled in Norwich, where he was silenced by bishop Wren for nonconformity, 1637. He was afterwards excommunicated; and when the writ *de excommunicato capiendo* came out against him he withdrew to Holland, and became pastor to the English church at Rotterdam, where Mr. Jer. Burroughs was preacher. In 1642, he returned to England, and was one of the dissenting brethren in the assembly of divines. He was chosen after some time minister of Great Yarmouth, where he continued his labours till the Bartholomew act ejected him with his brethren.[[49]](#footnote-49) He was a good scholar, and had a well-furnished library, was a hard student, and rose every morning winter and summer at four of the clock. He was also a good preacher, a candid and charitable man, and did much good by his ministry.[[50]](#footnote-50) He died at Yarmouth, March 12, 1670, setat. seventy.

While the Protestant dissenters were harassed in all parts of the kingdom, the Roman Catholics were at ease under the wing of the prerogative; there were few or no processes against them, for they had the liberty of resorting to mass at the houses of foreign ambassadors, and other chapels, both in town and country: nor did the bishops complain of them in the house of lords, by which means they began in a few years to rival the Protestants both in strength and numbers. The commons represented the causes of this misfortune in an address to the king, together with the remedies, which if the reader will carefully consider, he will easily discover the different usage of Protestant Nonconformists and Popish recusants.[[51]](#footnote-51)

The causes of the increase of Popery were, 1. The great number of Jesuits who were all over the kingdom. 2. The chapels in great towns for saying mass, besides ambassadors’ houses, whither great numbers of his majesty’s subjects resorted without control. 3. The fraternities or convents of priests and Jesuits at St. James’s, and in several parts of the kingdom, besides their schools for the educating youth. 4. The public sale of Popish catechisms, &c. 5. The general remissness of magistrates, and other officers, in not convicting Papists according to law. 6. Suspected recusants enjoying offices by themselves or their deputies. 7. Presentations to livings by Popish recusants, or by others as they direct. 8. Sending youth beyond sea under tutors, to be educated in the Popish religion. 9. The few exchequer processes that have been issued forth, though many have been certified thither. 10. The great insolence of Papists in Ireland, where archbishops and bishops of the pope’s creation appear publicly, mass being said openly in Dublin, and other parts of the kingdom.

The remedies which the house proposed against these growing mischiefs were,

1. That a proclamation be issued out to banish all Popish priests and Jesuits out of the realm, except such as attend the queen and foreign ambassadors. 2. That the king’s subjects be forbid going to hear mass and other exercises of the Romish religion. 3. That no office or employment of public authority be put into the hands of Popish recusants. 4. That all fraternities, convents, and Popish schools, be abolished, and the Jesuits, priests, friars, and schoolmasters, punished. 5. That his majesty require all the officers of the exchequer, to issue out processes against Popish recusants convict, certified thither. 6. That Plummet the pretended primate of Ireland, and Talbot archbishop of Dublin, be sent for into England, to answer such matters as should be objected against them.

The king promised to consider the address, but hoped they would allow him to distinguish between new converts, and those who had been bred up in the Popish religion, and served him and his father in the late wars. After some time a proclamation was issued, in which his majesty declares, that he had always adhered to the true religion established in this kingdom against all temptations whatsoever; and that he would employ his utmost care and zeal in its defence. But the magistrates, knowing his majesty’s inclinations, took no care of the execution of it. Nay, the duke of York, the king’s brother, having lately lost his duchess, lord Clarendon’s daughter, who died a Papist,[[52]](#footnote-52) made a formal abjuration of the Protestant religion at this time before father Simon, an English Jesuit, publicly declaring himself a Roman Catholic; the reason of which was, that the present queen having no children, the Papists gave the duke to understand, that they were capable to effect his majesty’s divorce, and to set aside his succession, by providing him with another queen, which they would certaily attempt, unless he would make an open profession of the Roman-Catholic religion, which he did accordingly.

The house of commons was very lavish of the nation’s money this session, for though there was no danger of an invasion from abroad, they voted the king £2,500,000 with which his majesty maintained a standing army, and called the parliament no more together for almost two years. After the houses were up, the Cabal began to prosecute their scheme of making the king absolute; in order to which, beside the £2,500,000 granted by parliament, they received from France the sum of £700,000 in two years, which not being sufficient to embark in a war with the Dutch, the king declared in council, by the advice of Clifford, that he was resolved to shut up the exchequer, wherein the bankers of London (who had furnished the king with money on all occasions at great interest) had lodged vast sums of other people’s cash deposited in their hands. By this means the bankers were obliged to make a stop, which interrupted the course of trade, and raised a great clamour over the whole kingdom. The king endeavoured to soften the bankers, by telling them it should be only for a year, and that he would pay the arrears out of the next subsidies of parliament; but he was worse than his word; so that great numbers of families and orphans were reduced to beggary, while the king gained about £1,400,000.

A second advance of the Cabal towards arbitrary power, was to destroy the Dutch commonwealth; for this purpose the triple alliance was to be broken, and pretences to be found out for quarrelling with that trading people. The earl of Shaftesbury used this expression in his speech to the parliament for justifying the war, *Delenda est Carthago,* that is, “The Dutch commonwealth must be destroyed:” but an occasion was wanting to justify it to the world. There had been a few scurrilous prints and medals struck in Holland, reflecting on the king’s amours, below the notice of the English court, which the Dutch however caused to be destroyed. Complaints were also revived of the insolence of the Dutch in the East-Indies, and of the neglect of striking the flag in the narrow seas to the king’s yacht, passing by the Dutch fleet. The cabal managed these complaints like men who were afraid of receiving satisfaction, or of giving the adversary any umbrage to prepare for the storm. The Dutch therefore, relying on the faith of treaties, pursued their traffic without fear; but when their rich Smyrna fleet of merchantmen, consisting of seventy-two sail under convoy of six men-of-war, passed by the Isle of Wight, the English fleet fell upon them and took several of their ships, without any previous declaration of war; a breach of faith (says Burnet) which Mahometans and pirates would have been ashamed of.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Two days after the attempt upon the Smyrna fleet, the cabal made the third advance towards Popery and absolute power, by advising the king to suspend the penal laws against all sorts of Nonconformists. It was now resolved to set the dissenters against the church, and to offer them the protection of the crown to make way for a general toleration. Lord Shaftesbury first proposed it in council, which the majority readily complied with, provided the Roman Catholics might be included; but when the declaration was prepared, the lord-keeper Bridgman refused to put the seal to it, as judging it contrary to law, for which he was dismissed, and the seals given to the Earl of Shaftesbury, who maintained, that the indulgence was for the service of the church of England.[[54]](#footnote-54) “As for the church (says his lordship), I conceive the declaration is extremely for their interest; for the narrow bottom they have placed themselves upon, and the measures they have proceeded by, so contrary to the properties and liberties of the nation, must needs in a short time prove fatal to them; whereas this leads them into another way, to live peaceably with the dissenting and different Protestants, both at home and abroad;” which was true if both had not been undermined by the Papists.[[55]](#footnote-55) Archbishop Sheldon, Morley, and the rest of their party, exclaimed loudly against the indulgence, and alarmed the whole nation, insomuch that many sober and good men, who had long feared the growth of Popery, began to think their eyes were open, and that they were in good earnest; but it appeared afterward that their chief concern was for the spiritual power; for though they murmured against the dispensing power, they fell in with all their other proceedings; which, if Providence had not miraculously interposed, must have been fatal to the Protestant religion and the liberties of Europe.

At length the declaration having been communicated to the French king, and received his approbation, was published, bearing date March 15, 1671–2, to the following effect:[[56]](#footnote-56)

“Our care and endeavours for the preservation of the rights and interests of the church, have been sufficiently manifested to the world, by the whole course of our government since our happy restoration, and by the many and frequent ways of coercion that we have used for reducing all erring or dissenting persons, and for composing the unhappy differences in matters of religion, which we found among our subjects upon our return; but it being evident by the sad experience of twelve years, that there is very little fruit of all these forcible courses, we think ourselves obliged to make use of that supreme power in ecclesiastical matters, which is not only inherent in us, but hath been declared and recognised to be so, by several statues and acts of parliament; and therefore we do now accordingly issue this our declaration, as well for the quieting of our good subjects in these points, as for inviting strangers in this conjuncture to come and live under us; and for the better encouragement of all to a cheerful following of their trades and callings, from whence we hope, by the blessing of God, to have many good and happy advantages to our government; as also for preventing for the future the danger that might otherwise arise from private meetings and seditious conventicles.

“And in the first place, we declare our express resolution, meaning, and intention, to be, that the church of England be preserved, and remain entire in its doctrine, discipline, and government, as now it stands established by law; and that this be taken to be, as it is, the basis, rule, and standard, of the general and public worship of God, and that the orthodox conformable clergydo receive and enjoy the revenues belonging thereunto, and that no person, though of a different opinion and persuasion, shall be exempt from paying his tithes, or other dues whatsoever. And farther we declare, that no person shall be capable of holding any benefice, living, or ecclesiastical dignity or preferment of any kind, in this our kingdom of England, who is not exactly conformable.

“We do in the next place declare our will and pleasure to be, that the execution of all, and all manner of penal laws in matters ecclesiastical, against whatsoever sort of Nonconformists or recusants, be immediately suspended, and they are hereby suspended; and all judges, judges of assize, and jail-delivery, sheriffs, justices of peace, mayors, bailiffs, and other officers whatsoever, whether ecclesiastical or civil, are to take notice of it, and pay due obedience thereto.

“And that there may be no pretence for any of our subjects to continue their illegal meetings and conventicles, we do declare, that we shall from time to time allow a sufficient number of places, as they shall be desired, in all parts of this our kingdom, for the use of such as do not conform to the church of England, to meet and assemble in order to their public worship and devotion, which places shall be open and free to all persons.

“But to prevent such disorders and inconveniences as may happen by this our indulgence, if not duly regulated; and that they may be the better protected by the civil magistrate; our express will and pleasure is, that none of our subjects do presume to meet in any place, until such places be allowed, and the teacher of that congregation be approved, by us.

“And lest any should apprehend that this restriction should make our said allowance and approbation difficult to be obtained, we do farther declare, that this our indulgence, as to the allowance of the public places of worship, and approbation of the preachers, shall extend to all sorts of Nonconformists and recusants except the recusants of the Roman-Catholic religion, to whom we shall in nowise allow public places of worship, but only indulge them their share in the common exemption from the penal laws, and the exercise of their worship in their private houses only.

“And if, after this our clemency and indulgence, any of our subjects shall pretend to abuse this liberty, and shall preach seditiously, or to the derogation of the doctrine, discipline, or government, of the established church, or shall meet in places not allowed by us, we do hereby give them warning, and declare we will proceed against them with all imaginable severity. And we will let them see we can be as severe to punish such offenders when so justly provoked, as we are indulgent to truly tender consciences.

“Given at our court at Whitehall, this 15th day of March, in the four-and-twentieth year of our reign.”

The Protestant Nonconformists had no opinion of the dispensing power, and were not forward to accept of liberty in this way; they were sensible the indulgence was not granted out of love to them, nor would continue any longer than it would serve the interest of Popery. “The beginning of the Dutch war,” says one of their writers, “made the court think it necessary to grant them an indulgence, that there might be peace at home while there was war abroad, though much to the dissatisfaction of those who had a hand in framing all the severe laws against them.”[[57]](#footnote-57) Many pamphlets were written for and against the dissenters accepting it, because it was grafted on the dispensing power. Some maintained that it was setting up altar against altar, and that they should accept of nothing but a comprehension. Others endeavoured to prove, that it was the duty of the Presbyterians to make use of the liberty granted them by the king, because it was their natural right, which no legislative power upon earth had a right to deprive them of, as long as they remained dutiful subjects; that meeting in separate congregations, distinct from the parochial assemblies, in the present circumstances was neither schismatical nor sinful.[[58]](#footnote-58) Accordingly most of the ministers, both in London and in the country, took out licences, a copy of which I have transcribed from under the king’s own hand and seal in the margin.[[59]](#footnote-59) Great numbers of people attended the meetings, and a cautious and moderate address of thanks was presented to the king for their liberty, but all were afraid of the consequences.

It was reported farther, that the court encouraged the Nonconformists, by some small pensions of £50 and £100 to the chief of their party; that Mr. Baxter returned the money, but that Mr. Pool acknowledged he had received £50 for two years, and that the rest accepted it.[[60]](#footnote-60) This was reported to the disadvantage of the dissenters by Dr. Stillingfleet and others, with an insinuation that it was to bribe them to be silent, and join interest with the Papists; but Dr. Owen, in answer to this part of the charge, in his preface to a book entitled, An Inquiry, &c. against Dr. Stillingfleet, declares, that “it is such a frontless malicious lie as impudence itself would blush at; that, however the dissenters may be traduced, they are ready to give the highest security that can be of their stability in the Protestant cause; and for myself,” says he, “never any person in authority, dignity, or power in the nation, nor any from them, Papist or Protestant, did ever speak or advise with me about any indulgence or toleration to be granted to Papists, and I challenge the whole world to prove the contrary. From this indulgence Dr. Stillingfleet dates the beginning of the Presbyterian separation.

This year died Dr. Edmund Staunton, the ejected minister of Kingston-upon-Thames, one of the assembly of divines, and some time president of Corpns-Christi-college in Oxford. He was son of sir Francis Staunton, born at Woburn, in Bedfordshire, 1601, and educated in Wadham-college, of which he was a fellow.[[61]](#footnote-61) Upon his taking orders, he became minister of Bushy, in Hertfordshire, but changed it afterward for Kingston-upon-Thames. In 1634, he took the degrees in divinity, and in 1648 was made president of Corpus-Christi-college, which he kept till he was silenced for nonconformity. He then retired to Rickmansworth, in Hertfordshire, and afterward to a village in that county called Bovingden, where he preached as often as he had opportunity. He was a learned, pious, and peaceable divine. In his last sickness he said he neither feared death nor desired life, but was willing to be at God’s disposal. He died July 14, 1671, and was buried in the church belonging to the parish.[[62]](#footnote-62)

Mr. Vavasor Powell was born in Radnorshire, and educated in Jesus-college, Oxon. When he left the university, he preached up and down in Wales, till, being driven from thence for want of presbyterial ordination, which he scrupled, he came to London, and soon after settled at Dartford, in Kent. In the year 1646, he obtained a testimonial of his religious and blameless conversation, and of his abilities for the work of the ministry, signed by Mr. Herle and seventeen of the assembly of divines. Furnished with these testimonials, he returned to Wales, and became a most indefatigable and active instrument of propagating the gospel in those parts. There were few, if any, of the churches or chapels in Wales in which he did not preach; yea, very often he preached to the poor Welsh in the mountains, at fairs, and in marketplaces; for which he had no more than a stipend of £100 per annum, besides the advantage of some sequestered livings in North Wales (says my author), which, in those times of confusion, turned but to a very poor account. Mr. Powell was a bold man, and of republican principles, preaching against the protectorship of Cromwell, and wrote letters to him, for which he was imprisoned, to prevent his spreading disaffection in the state. At the dawn of the Restoration, being known to be a fifth-monarchy man, he was secured first at Shrewsbury, afterward in Wales, and at last in the Fleet. In the year 1662, he was shut up in Southsea-castle, near Portsmouth, where he continued five years. In 1667 he was released, but venturing to preach again in his own country, he was imprisoned at Cardiff, and in the year 1669 sent up to London, and confined a prisoner in the Fleet, where he died, and was buried in Bunhill-fields, in the presence of an innumerable crowd of dissenters, who attended him to his grave. He was of an unconquerable resolution, and of a mind unshaken under all his troubles. The inscription on his tomb calls him “a successful teacher of the past, a sincere witness of the present, and a useful example to the future age; who, in the defection of many, found mercy to be faithful, for which, being called to many prisons, he was there tried, and would not accept deliverance, expecting a better resurrection.” He died October 27, 1671, in the fifty-third year of his age, and the eleventh year of his imprisonment.[[63]](#footnote-63)

1. Calamy's Abridgment, vol. 1. p. 316. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Vol. 1. p. 371. 379. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Page 380. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Life, part 3. p. 23. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 17; and Palmer's Nonconformists’ Memorial, vol. 2. p. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. He left a very valuable library, which yielded £700 and was the first sold by auction in England—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. In 1603, when his mother, who had never had a child before, though she was now married to her fourth husband, was fifty-two years of age. She lived to her ninety-sixth year.—Ed. . [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 222; or Palmer's Nonconformists’ Memorial, vol. 1. p. 387. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Burnet, vol. 1. p. 380, &c. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Baxter’s Life, part 3. p. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Baxter’s Life, p. 34. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Baxter’s Life, part 3. p. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Burnet, vol. 1. p. 382. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Ibid. p. 139. i [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Baxter’s Life, part 3. p. 49. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Baxter’s Life, p. 36. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Baxter’s Life, part 3. p. 37. 87. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Ibid, part 3. p. 39 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Vol. l.p. 582. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Page 582. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Rapin, p. 406. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Burnet, p. 267. 386. Rapin, p. 652. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. A Letter from Mr. Jolin Wallis to the Honourable Robert Boyle, Esq. dated from Oxford, July 17, 1669.

    Sir,

    After my humble thanks for the honour of yours of July 3,1 thought it not unfit to give you some account of our late proceedings here. Friday, July 9, was the dedication of our new theatre. In the morning was held a convocation in it, for entering upon the possession of it; wherein was read, first the archbishop's instrument of donation (sealed with his archiepiscopal seal) of the theatre, with all its furniture, to the end that St. Mary’s-church may not be farther profaned by holding the act in it. Next a letter of his, declaring his intention to lay out £2,000 for a purchase to endow it. Then a letter of thanks to be sent from the university to him, wherein he is acknowledged to be both our creator and redeemer, for having not only built a theatre for the act, but, which is more, delivered the Blessed Virgin from being so profaned for the future: he doth, as the words of the letter are, “non tantum condere, hoc est creare, sed etiam redimere.’’ These words, I confess, stopped my mouth from giving a place to that letter when it was put to the vote. I have since desired Mr. Vice-chancellor to consider, whether they were not liable to a just exception. He did at first excuse it; but, upon farther thoughts, I suppose he will think fit to alter them, before the letter be sent and registered. After the voting of this letter, Dr. South, as university-orator, made a long oration; the first part of which consisted of satirical invectives against Cromwell, fanatics, the Royal Society, and new philosophy. The next, of encomiastics; in praise of the archbishop, the theatre, the vice-chancellor, the architect, and the painter. The last, of execrations; against fanatics, conventicles, comprehension, and new philosophy; damning them, *ad inferos ad gehennam.* The oration being ended, some honorary degrees were conferred, and the convocation dissolved. The afternoon was spent in panegyric orations, and reciting of poems in several sorts of verse, composed in praise of the archbishop, the theatre, &c. and crying down fanatics. The whole action began and ended with a noise of trumpets; and twice was interposed variety of music, vocal and instrumental; purposely composed for this occasion. On Saturday and Monday, those exercises appertaining to the act and vespers, which were wont to be performed in St. Mary’s church, were had in the theatre. In which, beside the number of proceeding doctors (nine in divinity, four in law, five in physic, and one in music), there was little extraordinary; but only that the *terræ filii* for both days were abominably scurrilous; and so suffered to proceed without the least check or interruption from vice-chancellor, pro-vicechancellors, proctors, curators, or any of those who were to govern the exercises; which gave so general offence to all honest spectators, that I believe the university hath thereby lost more reputation than they have gained by all the rest; all or most of the heads of houses, and eminent persons in the university, with their relations, being represented as a company of whoremasters, whores, and dunces. And, among the rest, the excellent lady, which your letter mentions, was, in the broadest language, represented as guilty of those crimes, of which (if there were occasion) you might not stick to be her compurgator; and (if it had been so) she might (yet) have been called whore in much more civil language. During this solemnity (and for some days before and since) have been constantly acted (by the vice-chancellor’s allowance) two stage-plays in a day (by those of the duke of York’s house) at a theatre erected for that purpose at the town-hall; which (for aught I hear) was much the more innocent theatre of the two. It hath been here a common fame for divers weeks (before, at, and since the act) that the vice-chancellor had given £300 bond (some say £500 bond) to the *terræ filii,* to save them harmless, whatever they should say provided it were neither blasphemy nor treason. But this I take to be a slander. A less encouragement would serve the turn with such persons. Since the act (to satisfy the common clamour) the vice-chancellor hath imprisoned .froth of them : and it is said he means to expel them. I am, Sir,

    Your honour’s very humble and affectionate servant, JOHN WALLIS. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. I have by me a copy of Mr. Neal’s History, which was formerly the property of the Rev. John Waldron, a dissenting minister in Exeter, who has written in the margin, here, this note, “I have been assured by Mr. Edward Parr, an ejected minister, who lived with Dr. Gouge, that he drew up the catechism. J. W.”— Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 594. Palmer’s Nonconformists’ Memorial, vol. 1. p. 503. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. To speak with accuracy, Mr. Allein was only assistant to Mr. George Newton, the minister of Taunton. Dr. Grey.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 574. Palmer, vol. 2. p. 377. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Part 3. p. 36. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Burnet, vol. 1. p. 400. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Rapin, p. 655, [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. This iniquitous law, by the power with which it invested a single justice, destroyed the bulwark of English liberty, the trial by jury. It punished the innocent for the guilty, by subjecting the husband to a penalty for the conduct of the wife, and the goods of any person present to fines, which other offenders were incompetent to discharge. The mode of conviction was clandestine. Its natural tendency was to influence magistrates to partiality in judgment, and to reverse the scriptural qualification for magistracy to the encouragement of evil-doers, and the punishment of those who do well; by the fines it imposed on justices and on officers, and by the sanction it gave to informers. Gough’s History of the Quakers, vol. 2. p. 298, 299.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Burnet, p. 398. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. “These words, as late experience has shewn, were slily omitted,” says Dr. Grey, who adds, “Here he (Mr. Neal) injuriously lays the blame upon the bishops, as if the king and the two houses were wholly under their direction and influence; and treats Mr. Archdeacon Echard not over-civilly for being of a contrary opinion.” The first censure in this paragraph is not very civil in Dr. Grey; nor does it appear well grounded, since Mr. Neal has inserted so much of the paragraph as charges the sectaries with having contrived insurrections. Nor does Mr. Neal lay the whole blame upon the bishops, for he says, “the two houses were for the execution of these laws;” though, it is true, indeed, he is not willing that the guilt should be cast entirely upon the legislature; for “the bishops and clergy were sincerely zealous in this business of persecution.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Page 286. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Calamy’s Abridgment, vol. 1. p. 332. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Burnet, p. 398. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Sewel, p. 493. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Calamy's Abridg. vol. 1. p. 328. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Henshaw, the bishop of Peterborough, declared publicly in the church at Rowel, after he had commanded the officers to put this act in execution, “Against all fanatics it hath done its business, except the Quakers: but when the parliament sits again, a stronger law will be made, not only to take away their lands and goods, but also to sell them for bondslaves.” On this Mr. Gough properly asks, “Who can acquit the church so called of their share in the persecution, when the rulers thereof were so intemperately warm and active in it, and still insatiate with all these severities, inhumanly planning more and greater.” History, vol. 2. p. 303. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 692. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Ibid. vol. 2. p. 334. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Burnet, p. 398. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. A respectable member of the society of Quakers has remarked, with propriety and force, on this language of bishop Burnet, “that had he concluded with the word perseverance instead of perverseness, his description had been less objectionable, as being nearer the truth. The prejudice discovered by that dignified prelate against this people tarnished his reputation as a faithful historian and as a man; as a true son of the church, it is not much to be wondered, when it is considered that they, rejecting its honours and its revenues, struck at the root of the hierarchy: whilst other dissenters, in general, contending chiefly about rites and ceremonies, manifested little or no objection to that grand support, pecuniary emolument; as their practice in common, particularly during the interregnum, incontestably proved.” A Letter to the Editor.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. The speech of the recorder, it appears by a quotation from the “State Trials” in a late publication, was fuller aud stronger than Mr. Neal’s abridged form represents it. “'Till now (said this advocate for arbitrary power), I never understood the reason of the policy and prudence of the Spaniards in suffering the Inquisition among them, and certainly it will never be well with us till something like the Spanish Inquisition be in England.” Stuart’s Peace and Reform against War and Corrupiton, p. 63, note; and Gough’s History of the Quakers, vol. 2. p. 336. —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. The prisoners excepted to this fine, as being arbitrarily imposed, in violation of the great charter of England, which saith, “No man ought to be amerced, but by the oath of good and lawful men of the vicinage.” The name of the judge, before whom the case of the jury was solemnly argued in the court of commonpleas, and by whom it was judged illegal, was Sir John Vaughan, then chief-justice: a name which deserves to be mentioned in this connexion with peculiar respect, and to be perpetuated by Englishmen with gratitude; for this adjudication confirmed in the strongest manner the rights of juries, and secured them from the attack of arbitrary and unprincipled judges. Sir John Vaughan was a man of excellent parts, and not only versed in all the knowledge requisite to make a figure in his profession, but he was also a very considerable master of the politer kinds of learning. He was the intimate friend of the great Selden, and was buried in the Temple-church, as near as possible to his remains. He died in 1674. His son published his Reports, in which is the above case. Gough, vol. 2. p. 336. British Biography, vol. 7. p. 130, 131; and Granger’s History, vol. 3. p. 369.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Echard, p. 864. Rapin, p. 655. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. To what is said concerning Dr. Tuckney by Mr. Neal, and before in the note to p. 255, vol. 2, it is proper to add two facts which are much to his honour. One is, that in his elections at St. John’s, when the president, according to the language and spirit of the times, would call upon him to have regard to the godly, his answer was, “No one should have a greater regard to the truly godly than himself; but he was determined to choose none but scholars:’’ adding very wisely, “They may deceive me in their godliness; they cannot in their scholarship.” The other fact is, that though he is said to have had a great hand in composing the confession and catechisms of the assembly at Westminster, and in particular drew up the exposition of the commandments in the larger catechism; yet he voted against subscribing or swearing to the confession, &c. set out by authority. This conduct the more deserves notice and commendation, because the instances of a consistent adherence to the principles of religious liberty among those who were struggling for liberty, were so few and rare in that age. In the year 1753, Dr. Samuel Salter, prebendary of Norwich, published a correspondence between Dr. Tuckney and Dr. Benjamin Whichcote, on several very interesting subjects. See Whichcote’s Moral and Religious Aphorisms, preface the second, p. 15. —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 77; or, Palmer’s Nonconformists’ Memorial, vol. I. p. 205. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Calamy, vol. 2. p. 478. Palmer, vol. 2. p. 208. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. In Peck’s Desiderata Curiosa is a letter of William Bridge to Henry Scobel, Esq., clerk of the council, about augmenting the income of preachers, with the names of the Independent ministers of prime note in the county of Norfolk. This shows that he was a leading man among the Independents. Granger’s History of England, vol. 3. p. 44. Dr. Grey imputes to Mr. Bridge a republican spirit, because, in a sermon before the commons, he said, “The king must not only command according to God’s law, but man’s laws; and if he don’t so command, resistance is not resistance of power but of will. To say, that such resistance must only be defensive, is nonsense; for so a man may be ever resisting, and never resist.” Grey, vol. 1. p. 187. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 658. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. This Dr. Grey is unwilling to admit, though he owns that Monsieur Mainborough published, in French, her declaration for renouncing the Protestant religion, and he quotes largely from Dr. Richard Watson, a celerated English divine, who published an answer to it. The amount of his defence of the duchess, as it appears in this quotation, is, that when on account of her illness the worship of her oratory had been deserted, it was renewed again by her order, and the doors of her chamber, which was adjoining to it, were opened that she might hear the prayers; and that the bishop of Oxford was sent for to administer the sacrament to her. In opposition to this, which rises to presumptive evidence only, and in support of Mr. Neal, it may be added, that sir John Reresby says, that she died with her last breath declaring herself a Papist.” Memoirs, p. 19.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Vol. 2. p. 16, 12mo.  [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. History of the Stuarts, p. 566. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Des Maiz. Col. p. 677, &c. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. The bishops took the alarm at this declaration: and charged their clergy to preach against Popery. The pulpits were full of a new strain: it was everywhere preached against, and the authority of the laws was magnified. The king complained to Sheldon, that controversy was preached, as if on purpose to inflame the people, and alienate them from him and his government; and Sheldon, apprehensive that the king might again press him on this subject, convened some of the clergy, to consult with them what answer to make to his majesty. Dr. Tillotson suggested this reply: “That since the king himself professed the Protestant religion, it would be a thing without a precedent, that he should forbid his clergy to preach in defence of a religion which they believed, while he himself said he was of it.” Burnet’s History, vol. 2. p. 17. 12mo. ed. and Birch’s Life of Tillotson, p. 41 —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Baxter, part 3. p. 99. Wetwood’s Mem. p. 190. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Baxter, part 3. p. 99. Welwood’s Mem. p. 102. [The editor cannot meet with these passages in Welwood's Memoirs, 6th edition.] [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Charles Rex.

    Charles, by the grace of God, king of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. to all mayors, bailiffs, constables, and others our officers and ministers, civil and military, whom it may concern, greeting. In pursuance of our declaration of the 15th of March 1671—2, we do hereby permit and license G. S. —— of the Congregational persuasion, to be a teacher of the congregation allowed by us, in a room or rooms of his house infor the use of such as do not conform to the church of England, who are of that persuasion commonly called Congregational, with farther licence and permission to him the said G. S. —— to teach in any place licensed and allowed by ns, according to our said declaration.

    Given at our court at Whitehall the second day of May, in the twenty-fourth year of our reign, 1672. By his majesty’s command,           Arlington. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Burnet, vol. 2. p. 16, 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Dr. Staunton in 1615 became a commoner of Wadham-college; on the 4th of October, in the same year, was admitted scholar of Corpus-Christi-college: and afterward fellow, and M. A. Wood’s Athen. Oxon. vol. 2. p. 352; and Dr. Grey. —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Calamy’s Abridg. vol. 2. p. 63. Palmer’s Noncon. Mem. vol. 1. p. 173. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. To Mr. Neal’s account of Mr. Vavasor Powell it may be added, that he was born in 1617, and descended from an ancient and honourable stock: on his father’s side, from the Powells of Knocklas in Radnorshire; and on his mother’s, from the Vavasors, a family of great antiquity, that came out of Yorkshire into Wales, and was related to the principal gentry in North Wales. So active and laborious was he in the duties of the ministry, that he frequently preached in two or three places in a day, and was seldom two days in the week, throughout the year, out of the pulpit. He would sometimes ride a hundred miles in the week, and preach in every place where he could gain admittance, either by night or day. He would often alight from his horse, and set on it any aged person whom he met with on the road on foot, and walk by the side for miles together. He was exceedingly hospitable and generous, and would not only entertain and lodge, but clothe the poor and aged. He was a man of great humility, very conscientious and exemplary in all relative duties, and very punctual to his word. He was a scholar, and his general deportment was that of a gentleman. His sentiments were those of a Sabbatarian Baptist. In 1642, when he left Wales, there was not then above one or two gathered churches; but before the Restoration, there were above twenty distinct societies, consisting of from two to five hundred members, chiefly planted and formed by his care and industry, in the principles of the Baptists. They were also for the ordination of elders, singing of psalms and hymns in public worship; laying on of hands on the newly baptized, and anointing the sick with oil, and did not limit their communion to an agreement with them in their sentiments on baptism. He bore his last illness with great patience, and under the acutest pains would bless God, and say, “he would not entertain one hard thought of God for all the world,” and could scarcely be restrained from acts of devotion, and from expressing his sentiments of zeal and piety.—Dr. Grey, after Wood, has vilified Mr. Powell by retailing the falsehoods of a piece entitled, Strena Vavasoriensis. Crosby's History, vol. 1. p. 373, &c. Life and Death of Vavasor Powell.— Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)