

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

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

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

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

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

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

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

1837.

CHAPTER X.

FROM THE POPIISH PLOT TO THE DEATH OF KING CHARLES II. IN THE YEAR 1684–5.

1678.

THE king having concluded a peace with the Dutch, became mediator between the French and the confederates, at the treaty of Nimeguen; where the former managed the English court so dexterously, that the emperor and Spaniards were obliged to buy their peace, at the expense of the best part of Flanders.

From this time to the end of the king's reign, we meet with little else but domestic quarrels between the king and his parliament; sham plots, and furious sallies of rage and revenge, between the court and country parties. The Nonconformists were very great sufferers by these contests; the penal laws being in full force, and the execution of them in the hands of their avowed enemies.

No sooner was the nation at peace abroad, but a formidable plot broke out at home, to take away the king's life, to subvert the constitution, to introduce Popery, and to extirpate the Protestant religion root and branch. It was called the Popish plot, from the nature of the design, and the quality of the conspirators, who were no less than pope Innocent XI., cardinal Howard his legate, and the generals of the Jesuits in Spain and at Rome.¹ When the king was taken off, the duke of York was to receive the crown as a gift from the pope, and hold it in fee. If there happened any disturbance, the city of London was to be fired, and the infamy of the whole affair to be laid upon the Presbyterians and fanatics, in hopes that the churchmen, in the heat of their fury would cut them in pieces, which would make way for the more easy subversion of the Protestant religion. Thus an insurrection, and perhaps a second massacre of the Protestants was intended; for this purpose they had great numbers of Popish officers in pay, and some thousands of men secretly listed to appear as occasion required; as was deposed by the oaths of Bedloe, Tongue, Dr. Oates, and others.

The discovery of this plot spread a prodigious alarm over the nation, and awakened the fears of those who had been lulled into a fatal security. The king's life was the more valuable, as the Popish successor was willing to run all risks for the introducing of his religion. The murder of sir Edmundbury Godfrey² at this juncture, a zealous and active Protestant justice

¹ Echard, p. 934.

² The death of this gentleman, an able magistrate and of a fair character, was deemed a much stronger evidence of the reality of the plot, than the oath of Oates. The foolish circumstance of his name being anagramatized to "I find murdered by rogues," helped to confirm the opinion of his being murdered by Papists. His funeral was celebrated with the

of peace, increased men's suspicions of a plot, and the depositions upon oath of the above-mentioned witnesses, seemed to put it beyond all doubt; for upon their impeachment, sir G. Wakeman the queen's physician, Mr. Ed. Coleman the duke of York's secretary, Mr. Richard Langhorne, and eight other Romish priests and Jesuits, were apprehended and secured. When the parliament met, they voted that there was a damnable and hellish plot contrived and carried on by Popish recusants against the life of the king and the Protestant religion. Five Popish lords were ordered into custody, viz. lord Stafford, Powis, Arundel, Petre, and Bellasys. A proclamation was issued against Papists; and the king was addressed to remove the duke of York from his person and councils.

Though the king gave himself no credit to the plot, yet finding it impracticable to stem the tide of the people's zeal, he consented to the execution of the law upon several of the condemned criminals: Mr. Coleman, and five of the Jesuits, were executed at Tyburn, who protested their innocence to the last; and a year or two forward lord Stafford was beheaded on Tower-hill. But the court party turned the plot into ridicule; the king told lord Halifax, "that it was not probable that the Papists should conspire to kill him, for have I not been kind enough to them?" says his majesty. "Yes (says his lordship), you have been too kind indeed to them; but they know you will only trot, and they want a prince that will gallop." The court em-

most solemn pomp. Seventy-two clergymen preceded the corpse, which was followed by a thousand persons, most of whom were of eminence and rank. Granger's History of England, vol. 3. p. 400. 8vo.

This shows the interest which the public took in this event. So great was the alarm this plot raised, that posts and chains were put up in all parts of the city, and a considerable number of the trained-bands drawn out night after night, well-armed, and watching with as much care as if a great insurrection were expected before the morning. The general topics of conversation were designed massacres, to be perpetrated by assassins ready for the purpose, and by recruits from abroad. A sudden darkness at eleven o'clock, on the Sunday after the murder of sir Edmundbury Godfrey, so that the ministers could not read their notes in the pulpit without candles, was looked upon as awfully ominous. The minds of people were kept in agitation and terror by dismal stories and frequent executions. Young and old quaked with fear. Not a house was unprovided with arms. No one went to rest at night without the apprehension of some tragical event to happen before the morning. This state of alarm and terror lasted not for a few weeks only, but months. The pageantry of mock-processions, employed on this occasion, heightened the aversion to Popery, and inflamed resentment against the conspirators. In one of these, amidst a vast crowd of spectators, who filled the air with their acclamations, and expressed great satisfaction in the show, there were carried on men's shoulders, through the principal streets, the effigies of the pope and the representative of the devil behind him, whispering in his ear and caressing him (though he afterward deserted him, before he was committed to the flames), together with the likeness of the dead body of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey, carried before him by a man on horseback, to remind the people of his execrable murder. A great number of dignitaries in their copes, with crosses of monks, friars, Jesuits, and Popish bishops with their mitres, trinkets, and appurtenances, formed the rest of the procession. Dr. Calamy's own Life, MSS. p. 67, 68.—ED.

ployed their tool sir Roger L'Estrange,¹ to write a weekly paper against the plot; and the country party encouraged Mr. Car to write a weekly packet of advice from Rome, discovering the frauds and superstitions of that court; for which he was arraigned, convicted, and fined in the court of King's-bench, and his papers forbid to be printed. An admirable order for a Protestant court of judicature!

But it was impossible to allay the fears of the parliament, who had a quick sense of the dangers of Popery, and therefore passed a bill, to disable all persons of that religion from sitting in either house of parliament, which is still in force, being excepted out of the act of toleration.² The act requires all members of parliament to renounce by oath the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to declare the worship of the Virgin Mary, and of the saints, practised in the church of Rome, to be idolatrous. Bishop Gunning argued against charging the church of Rome with idolatry; but the house paid him little regard; and when the bill was passed, he took the oath in common with the rest.

The duke of York got himself excepted out of the bill,³ but the fears of his accession to the crown were so great, that there was a loud talk of bringing a bill into the house, to exclude him from the succession as a Papist; upon which the king came to the house November 9, and assured them, that he would consent to any bills for securing the Protestant religion, provided they did not impeach the right of succession, nor the descent of the crown in the true line, nor the just rights of any Protestant successor. But this not giving satisfaction, his majesty, towards the end of December, first prorogued, and then dissolved the parliament, after they had been chosen almost eighteen years.

It may be proper to observe concerning the Popish plot,⁴ that though the king's life might not be immediately struck at, yet there was such strong evidence to prove the reality of a plot to subvert the constitution and intro-

¹ This person, of whom we have already spoken, formerly called "Oliver's Fiddler," was now the admired "Buffoon of High-church." He called the shows, mentioned in our last note, "hobby-horsing processions." Calamy's MSS. p. 67.—ED.

² Burnet, vol. 2. p. 211.

³ This point was carried in favour of the duke by no more than two votes. Had it been negatived, he would, in the next place, have been voted away from the king's presence. Sir John Resesby's Memoirs, p. 72.—ED.

⁴ It was a happy effect of the discovery of this plot, that while it raised in the whole body of the English Protestants alarming apprehensions of the dangers to which their civil and religious liberties were exposed, it united them against their common enemy. Mutual prejudices were softened: animosities subsided: the dissenters were regarded as the true friends of their country, and their assemblies began to be more public and numerous. At this time an evening lecture was set up in a large room of a coffee-house, in Exchange-alley: it was conducted by Mr. John Shower, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Dorrington, and Mr. Thomas Goodwin; and it was supported and attended by some of the principal merchants, and by several who afterward filled the most eminent posts in the city of London. Tong's Life of Shower, p. 17, 18.—ED.

duce Popery, that no disinterested person can doubt it. Mr. Rapin, who had carefully considered the evidence, concludes that there was a meditated design, supported by the king and the duke of York, to render the king absolute, and introduce the Popish religion; for this is precisely what was meant by the plot: the design of killing the king was only an appendage to it, and an effect of the zeal of some private persons, who thought the plot would be crowned with the surer success, by speedily setting the duke of York upon the throne. Bishop Burnet adds,¹ that though the king and he agreed in private conversation, that the greatest part of the evidence was a contrivance, yet he confesses it appeared by Coleman's letters, that the design of converting the nation, and of rooting out the northern heresy, was very near being executed. To which I beg leave to add, that though the design of killing the king did not take place at this time, his majesty felt the effects of it, in his violent death, four or five years afterward.

This year died Mr. Thomas Vincent, M. A. the ejected minister of Milk-street, born at Hertford May 1634, and educated in Christ-church, Oxford.² He was chaplain to Robert earl of Leicester, and afterward minister of Milk-street, London, till the act of uniformity took place. He was a humble and a zealous preacher, of moderate principles, and an unspotted life. He continued in the city throughout the whole plague, the awfulness of which gave him a peculiar fervency and zeal in his ministerial work. On this occasion he published some very awakening treatises; as, "A spiritual antidote for a dying soul;" and, "God's terrible voice in the city."³ He not only preached in public, but visited all the sick who sent for him in their infected houses, being void of all fear of death. He continued in health during the whole of that dreadful calamity, and was afterward useful, as the times would permit, to a numerous congregation, being generally respected by men of all persuasions; but his excessive labours put an end to his life October 15, 1678, in the forty-fifth year of his age.⁴

¹ This corresponds with his declarations to sir John Reresby; whom at one time he told, in the presence of the lord-treasurer, at the duchess of Portsmouth's lodgings, "he took it to be some artifice, and that he did not believe one word of the whole story." At another time his majesty said to him, "Bedloe was a rogue, and that he was satisfied he had given some false evidence concerning the death of sir Edmundbury Godfrey." *Memoirs*, p. 67. 72. Dr. Grey refers to Echard and bishop Burnet, as fully discrediting Mr. Neal's account of this plot; and with this view gives a long passage from Carte's *History of the Duke of Ormond*, vol. 2. p. 517.

The reader may see the evidence both for and against it fully and fairly stated by Dr. Harris, *Life of Charles II.* vol. 2. p. 137—157.—ED.

² *Cal. cont.* p. 30.

³ *Calamy*, vol. 2. p. 32. *Palmer's Noncon. Mem.* vol. 1. p. 125.

⁴ Mr. Thomas Vincent had the whole New Testament and Psalms by heart. He took this pains, as he often said, "not knowing but they who took from him his pulpit, might in time demand his Bible also." *Calamy*. Besides his publications enumerated by this writer, Mr.

Mr. Theophilus Gale, M. A. and fellow of Magdalen college, Oxford, was ejected from Winchester, where he had been stated preacher for some time; after which he travelled abroad as tutor to the son of Philip lord Wharton. Upon his return, he settled with Mr. John Rowe as an assistant, in which station he died. The Oxford historian allows, that he was a man of great reading, an exact philologist and philosopher, a learned and industrious divine, as appears by his *Court of the Gentiles*, and the *Vanity of Pagan Philosophy*. He kept a little academy, for the instruction of youth, and was well versed in the fathers, being at the same time a good metaphysician and school divine.¹ He died of a consumption this year [1678], in the forty-ninth year of his age.²

The king having summoned a new parliament to meet in March, all parties exerted themselves in the elections; the Nonconformists appeared generally for those who were for prosecuting the Popish plot, and securing a Protestant succession: these being esteemed patriots and friends of liberty, in opposition to those who made a loud cry for the church, and favoured the arbitrary measures of the court, and the personal interest of the duke of York. The elections in many places were the occasion of great heat, but were carried almost everywhere against the court. Mr. Rapin says, that the Presbyterians, though long oppressed, were still numerous in corporations. The semiconformists, as Mr. Echard calls the moderate churchmen, and the dissenters were on one side, and the high churchmen and Papists on the other. Before the parliament assembled, the duke of York was sent out of the way to Flanders, but with this positive assurance, that his majesty would consent to nothing in prejudice of his right of succession. And farther to ingratiate himself with the people, and make a show of moderation, a new privy-council was chosen out of the low church party; but this not satisfying as long as the duke's succession was in view, the commons, soon after the opening the sessions, ordered in a bill to disable the duke of York from inheriting the imperial crown of England, and carried it through the house with a high hand. Upon which his majesty came to the house, and dissolved them, before they had sat three months. This threw the nation into

Vincent, on occasion of an eruption of mount Ætna, published a book, entitled, "Fire and Brimstone: 1. From heaven in the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah formerly. 2. From earth, in the burning of Mount Ætna lately. 3. From hell, in burning of the wicked eternally." 1670, 8vo. Granger's History, vol. 3. p. 329, note.—ED.

¹ Mr. Gale was a frequent preacher in the university and a considerable tutor: bishop Hopkins was one of his pupils. He left all his real and personal estate for the education and benefit of poor students, and his library to the college in New-England, except the philosophical part, which he reserved for the use of students in England. The world had like to have lost his great and learned work, *The Court of the Gentiles*, in the fire of London. A friend, to whose care he left his desk while he was travelling, threw it into the cart merely to make the load, when he was removing his own goods. Palmer, p. 190. *British Biography*, vol. 5. p. 182–186.—ED.

² Calamy, vol. 2. p. 64, Palmer, vol. 1. p. 189.

new convulsions, and produced a great number of pamphlets against the government, the act for restraining the press being lately expired.

The Popish plot having fixed a brand of infamy and ingratitude on the whole body of Roman Catholics, the courtiers attempted to relieve them, by setting on foot a sham Protestant plot, and fathering it upon the Presbyterians:¹ for this purpose spies and other mercenaries were employed, to bring news from all parts of the town, which was then full of cabals. At length a plot was formed by one Dangerfield, a subtle and dangerous Papist, but a very villain, who had been lately got out of jail by the assistance of one Mrs. Cellier, a midwife, a lewd woman, who carried him to the countess of Powis, whose husband was in the Tower for the Popish plot; with her he formed his scheme, and having got a list of the names of the chief Protestant nobility and gentry, he wrote treasonable letters to them, to be left at the houses of the Nonconformists and other active Protestants in several parts of England, that search being made upon some other pretences, when the letters were found, they might be apprehended for treason. At the same time, he intruded into the company of some of the most zealous enemies of Popery about town, and informed the king and the duke of York, that he had been invited to accept of a commission; that a new form of government was to be set up; and that the king and royal family were to be banished. The story was received with pleasure, and Dangerfield had a present, and a pension of £3 a week, to carry on his correspondence. Having got some little acquaintance with colonel Mansel in Westminster, he made up a bundle of seditious letters, with the assistance of Mrs. Cellier, and having laid them in a dark corner of Mansel's room behind the bed, he sent for officers from the custom-house, to search for prohibited goods while he was out of town; but none were found, except the bundle of letters, which, upon examination of the parties concerned, before the king and council, were proved to be counterfeit; upon which the court disowned the plot, and having taken away Dangerfield's pension, sent him to Newgate. Search being made into Mrs. Cellier's house, there was found a little book in a meal-tub, written very fair, and tied up with ribands, which contained the whole scheme of the fiction. It was dictated by lady Powis, and proved by her maid to be laid there by her order, from whence it obtained the name of the Meal-tub plot. Dangerfield, who was a notorious liar, finding himself undone if he persisted in what he could not support, made an ample confession, and published a narrative, wherein he declared that he was employed by the Popish party; and chiefly by the Popish lords in the Tower, with the countess of Powis, to invent the Meal-tub plot, which was to have thrown the Popish plot wholly upon the Presbyterians. It was printed by order of

¹ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 272. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 741.

the house of commons in the year 1680. Dangerfield being pardoned, went out of the way into Flanders; but returning to England in king James's reign, he was tried for it, and sentenced to be whipped at the cart's tail from Newgate to Tyburn; in his return from whence he was murdered by one Frances in the coach. Mrs. Cellier was tried June 11, 1680, before lord-chief-justice Scroggs, and acquitted for want of evidence. But the discovery, instead of relieving the Papists from the charge of the Popish plot, turned very much to their disadvantage; for when the next parliament met, the house of commons resolved, that sir Robert Car be expelled the house, and sent to the Tower, for declaring publicly in the city of Bristol, that there was no Popish but a Presbyterian plot.¹ Sir Robert Yeomans was sent into custody on the same account; and Mr. Richard Thompson, a clergyman, was impeached for decrying the Popish plot in his sermon, January 30, 1679, and for turning the same upon the Protestants; for which, and for preaching against the liberty and property of the subject, and the privileges of parliament, the house declared him a scandal and reproach to his profession.

This year [1679] died the reverend and learned Mr. Matt. Pool, M. A. the ejected minister of St. Michael's Querne: he was born in the city of York, and educated in Emanuel college, Cambridge, a divine of great piety, charity, and literature. He was indefatigable in his labours, and left behind him (says the Oxford historian) the character of a most celebrated critic and casuist. After ten years' close application, he published his *Synopsis Criticorum*,² in five folios. He afterward entered on a commentary upon the

¹ State Tracts, vol. 2, p. 217.

² "The plan of this work (says Mr. Granger) was judicious, and the execution more free from errors than seems consistent with so great a work, finished in so short a time, by one man." It includes not only an abridgment of the "Critici Sacri," and other expositors, but extracts from a great number of treatises and pamphlets, that would have been otherwise lost. It was undertaken by the advice of the learned bishop Lloyd; it was encouraged and patronized by Tillotson, and the king granted a patent for the privilege of printing it. Mr. Pool formed and completed a scheme for maintaining young men of eminent parts at the university of Cambridge, for the study of divinity: and by his solicitations, in a short time raised £900 a year for that purpose. The scheme sunk at the Restoration; but to it the world is said, in some measure, to owe Dr. Sherlock, afterwards dean of St. Paul's. While he was drawing up his Synopsis, it was his custom to rise at three or four o'clock, and take a raw egg about eight or nine, and another about twelve; then to continue his studies till the afternoon was far advanced. He spent the evening at some friend's house, particularly alderman Ashurst's, and would be exceedingly but innocently merry: when it was nearly time to go home, he would give the conversation a serious turn, saying, "Let us now call for a reckoning." His "Annotations" were completed by other hands; the fifty-ninth and sixtieth chapters of Isaiah by Mr. Jackson of Moulsey. Dr. Collinges wrote the notes on the remainder of that prophet, on Jeremiah, Lamentations, the four Evangelists, the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, and on the book of Revelations. The annotations on Ezekiel, and the minor prophets were drawn up by Mr. Hurst, and on Daniel, by Mr. William Cooper. Mr. Vinke commented on the Acts, Mr. Mayo on the Romans. The notes on the Ephesians, and the Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, were

whole Bible, but proceeded no farther than the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah: however, the design, being valuable, was carried on, and completed by other hands. Mr. Pool published several excellent treatises, as *The Nullity of the Romish Faith, &c.* for which he was threatened to be assassinated;¹ his name being in Dr. Oates's list: he therefore retired to Holland, but died, as it is thought, by poison at Amsterdam, in the month of October, 1679, *ætat.* fifty-six.

Dr. Thomas Goodwin, born at Rolisby in Norfolk, and educated in Catherine-hall, Cambridge. He was a great admirer of Dr. Preston, and afterward himself a famous preacher in Cambridge. In 1634, he left the university, being dissatisfied with the terms of conformity. In 1639, he went into Holland, and became pastor of an Independent congregation at Arnhem. He returned to London about the beginning of the long-parliament, and was one of the dissenting brethren in the assembly of divines. After the king's death, he was made president of Magdalen-college, and one of the triers of ministers. He was in high esteem with Oliver Cromwell, and attended him on his death-bed.² In the common register of the university he is said to be, "*in scriptis theologicis quam plnrimis orbi notus,*" i. e. well known to the world by many theological writings. After the Restoration he resigned his presidentship, and retired to London, where he continued the exercise of his ministry till his death, which happened February 23, 1679–80, in the eightieth year of his age. He was a good scholar, an eminent divine and textuary. His works are since printed in five folios.³

The last parliament being dissolved abruptly, a new one was convened for October 17, 1680, in which the elections went pretty much as in the last, the cry of the people being, No Popery, no pensioners, no arbitrary government. But the king prorogued them from time to time for above a twelvemonth, without permitting them to finish any business. His majesty falling sick in the summer, the duke of York returned immediately to court

composed by Mr. Viel; on Philippians and Colossians, by Mr. Thomas Adams; on the Thessalonians by Mr. Barker; on the Hebrews by Mr. Obad. Hughes. Mr. Howe undertook the three Epistles of John. Calamy and Palmer, *ut supra*. Granger's History, vol. 3. p. 311; and Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 36.—ED.

¹ Calamy, vol. 2. p. 14. Palmer's Noncon. Mem. vol. 1. p. 133.

² On which occasion he was overheard by Dr. Tillotson to express himself, boldly and enthusiastically confident of the protector's recovery; and when he found himself mistaken, to exclaim, in a subsequent address to God, "Thou hast deceived us, and we were deceived." He was a man much addicted to retirement and deep contemplation, which dispose the mind to enthusiastical confidence. He and Dr. Owen are called by Wood, "the two Atlases and Patriarchs of Independency." In the fire of London he lost half of his library, to the value of £500 but he was thankful that the loss fell on the books of human learning only, those on divinity being preserved. He is supposed to be the Independent minister and head of a college described by the "Spectator," no. 494. Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 16. Grey, vol. 1. p. 185. Granger, vol. 3. p. 303.—ED.

³ Calamy's Account, vol. 2. p. 61. Palmer's Non. Mem. vol. 1. p. 183.

without the king's leave,¹ which alarmed the people, and made them eager for the sitting of the parliament to regulate the succession.² This gave rise to sundry petitions,³ signed by a great number of hands both in city and country, which the king received with the utmost displeasure, telling the petitioners, that he was sole judge of what was fit to be done: "You would not take it well (says he) if I should meddle with your affairs, and I desire you will not meddle with mine." After this the king issued out his proclamation, declaring them to be illegal, and forbidding his subjects to promote any subscriptions, or to join in any petitions of this kind, upon peril of the utmost rigour of the law. Warrants were issued against several of the petitioners, and indictments preferred against others. But at the next sessions of the common-council of London, January 21, the court agreed that no such petition should be presented from them; and the king returned them thanks for it.⁴ Upon which addresses were procured from divers parts of the nation, expressing their detestation and abhorrence of the seditious practice of the late petitioners, and referring the sitting of the parliament absolutely to the king's sovereign pleasure, from whence they obtained the name of abhorrrers. In these addresses, they offer their lives and fortunes for the preservation of his majesty's person and government, and for the succession of the duke of York. They renounce the right of the subject's petitioning, or intermeddling in affairs of state, and lay their liberties at the feet of the prerogative, promising to stand by it, and to be obedient without reserve to his majesty's commands; which addresses were printed in the Gazettes, and dispersed over the kingdom. These proceedings threw the people into a ferment; several of the privy-council deserted their stations, and desired to be excused their attendance at council; some in the admiralty resigned, and because they might not petition, an association was formed by sundry persons, and copied after the example of that in queen Elizabeth's time, for the defence of his majesty's person, and the security of the Protestant religion, and to revenge his majesty's death upon the Papists, if he should come to

¹ If we may credit sir John Reresby, who says he had the whole story from Feversham, to whose intervention the revocation of the duke was principally owing; the king's illness was pretended, and the duke was sent for with his privy, though not above four persons knew any thing of the matter. The duke of Monmouth, who thought he had the king to himself, knew nothing of it, till his highness actually arrived at Windsor: "So close and reserved (says sir John), could the king be, when he conceived it to be necessary." *Memoirs*, p. 97, 98.—ED.

² Echard, p. 982. 987.

³ Dr. Grey, by a quotation from Hornby's "Caveat against the Whigs," brings a charge against these petitions, that the signatures were obtained by bribes and impositions. Such practices, if truly stated in this instance, have not been confined to that occasion, or those times; but it is not easy to conceive, that a man of integrity, in any party, can have recourse to them. The proposal of adopting them ought to be rejected with contempt and indignation.—ED.

⁴ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 276.

any violent death. A model of which was said to be found among the earl of Shaftesbury's papers. This was resented very highly at court, as done without the royal authority, and produced the next year another set of ranting addresses from all parts of the kingdom, in which their lives and fortunes were given up to the king, and the associations branded with the names of damnable, cursed, execrable, traitorous, seditious, and a bond of rebellion, which they detest and abhor from their very souls; in most of which the Nonconformists are marked as enemies of the king and his government, and their conventicles as the encouragement and life of the associations. They promise to stand by the duke's succession, and to choose such members for the next parliament as shall do the king's business according to his mind. But notwithstanding the utmost efforts of the court, the near approach of a Popish successor awakened men's fears, and kept them upon their guard.

The petitioners for the sitting of the parliament, and their adversaries, the abhorers of such petitions, gave rise to the two grand parties which have since divided the nation, under the distinguishing names of Whig and Tory.

The whigs or low churchmen were the more zealous Protestants, declared enemies of Popery, and willing to remove to a farther distance from their superstitions; they were firm to the constitution and liberties of their country; and for a union, or at least a toleration, of dissenting Protestants. The clergy of this persuasion were generally men of larger principles, and therefore were distinguished by the name of Latitudinarian divines; their laity were remarkable for their zeal in promoting the bill of exclusion, as the only expedient to secure the Protestant establishment in this kingdom. They were for confining the royal prerogative within the limits of the law, for which reason their adversaries charged them with republican principles, and gave them the reproachful name of whigs, or sour milk, a name first given to the most rigid Scots covenanters.

The tories or high churchmen stood on the side of the prerogative, and were for advancing the king above law; they went into all the arbitrary court-measures, and adopted into our religion, says Dr. Welwood.¹ a Mahometan principle, under the names of passive obedience and non-resistance, which, since the times of that impostor who first broached it, has been the means to enslave a great part of the world. These gentlemen leaned more to a coalition with the Papists, than with the Presbyterians.² They cried up the name and authority of the church, were for forcing the dissenters to conformity, by all kinds of coercive methods: but with all their

¹ Memoirs, p. 125.

² Burnet, Collect. Debates, p. 163.

zeal, they were many of them persons of lax and dissolute morals, and would risk the whole Protestant religion rather than go into any measures of exclusion, or limitation of a Popish successor. Most of the clergy, says a member of parliament, are infected with the Lau-dean principles of raising money without parliament; one or two bishops give measures to the rest, and they to their clergy, so that all derive their politics from one or two, and are under the influence of an overawing power. No men did more to enslave the nation, and introduce Popery into the establishment, than they: their adversaries therefore gave them the name of tories, a title first given to Irish robbers, who lived upon plunder, and were prepared for any daring or villanous enterprise.

The Nonconformists fell in unanimously with the whigs or low churchmen, in all points relating to liberty and the civil constitution, as they must always do if they are consistent with themselves; but these with their allies were not a sufficient balance for the tories, the road to preferment lying through the territories of power; but they were kept in heart with some secret hopes, that by a steady adherence to the constitution they should one time or other obtain a legal toleration. But the superior influence of the tories above the whigs, was the occasion of the severities which befell the Nonconformists in the latter part of this reign.

When parliament met October 21, 1680, the commons were very warm in maintaining the Protestant religion and the privileges of parliament.¹ They asserted the rights of the people to petition for the sitting of parliaments, and voted the abhorers betrayers of the liberties of the nation. Among other grievances they complained, that the edge of the penal laws was turned against Protestant dissenters, while the Papists remained in a manner untouched.—That the test-act had little effect, because the Papists, either by dispensation obtained from Rome, submitted to those tests, and held their offices themselves; or those put in their places were so favourable to the same interest, that Popery itself had rather gained than lost ground by that act. They declared for that very association, to revenge the king's death upon the Papists, if his majesty should happen to be assassinated, which the tories had abhorred: and in the month of November revived the bill to disable the duke of York from inheriting the imperial crown of these realms. It was introduced by lord Russel, and passed the commons by a great majority, but was thrown out of the house of lords by a majority of thirty voices,² noes 63, yeas 33, the bench of bishops being in

¹ Rapin, vol. 2. p. 714. Echard, p. 995.

² Lord Halifax, a man of the clearest head, finest wit, and fairest eloquence, who was in judgment against the bill, appeared as leader in opposition to it, and made so powerful a defence, that he alone, by the confession of all, influenced the house, and persuaded them to throw out the bill. "One would have thought (says sir John Reresby), that so signal a

the negative, and the king present during the whole debate. It has been said, king Charles came into the bill at first, the favourite mistress having prevailed with him to abandon his brother, for a large sum of money, and for an act of parliament to enable him to dispose of the crown by will, under certain restrictions; but a foreign Popish court offering more money, he opposed it to the last.¹

The parliament being inclined to relieve the Nonconformists, appointed a committee November 18, who agreed upon a comprehension with the dissenters, upon much the same terms with those already mentioned; they were to subscribe the doctrinal articles of the church; the surplice was to be omitted, except in cathedrals and the king's chapel; the ceremonies to be left indifferent. And as for such Protestants as could not be comprehended within these terms, they were to have a toleration, and freedom from the penal statutes, upon condition of subscribing a declaration of allegiance, &c. and of assembling with open doors. Bishop Burnet says, the bill for a comprehension was offered by the episcopal party in the house of commons, but that the friends of the dissenters did not seem forward to promote it, because, as Mr. Baxter observes, they found the bill would not go; or if it had passed the commons, it would have been thrown out by the bishops in the house of lords; the clergy, says Kennet, being no farther in earnest than as they apprehended the knife of the Papists at their throats.

When the above-mentioned bill was brought into the house December 21, entitled, An act for uniting his majesty's Protestant subjects, the first gentleman of the court party who spoke against it observed, "that there were a sort of men who would neither be advised nor overruled, but under the pretence of conscience break violently through all laws whatsoever, to the great disturbance both of church and state; therefore he thought it more convenient to have a law for forcing the dissenters to yield to the church, and not to force the church to yield to them—." Another said, "he was afraid, that if once the government should begin to yield to the dissenters, it would be as in *forty-one*, nothing would serve but an utter subversion: the receiving of one thing would give occasion for demanding more; and it would be impossible to give them any satisfaction, without laying all open, and running into confusion."² This was the common language of the tories. And there has been a loud cry against the dissenters, for their obstinacy and perverseness, though not a single concession had been offered since the Restoration, to let the world see how far they would yield; or by receiving a

piece of service had been of a degree and nature never to be forgotten." But when the duke afterward came to be king, he removed lord Halifax from the privy seal to the presidency of the council, purely to make room for another, and in the end quite laid him aside. Memoirs, p. 104, 105.—ED.

¹ Wetwood's Memoirs, p. 127.

² Echard, p. 999.

denial, to get an opportunity to reproach them with greater advantage. But in favour of the bill it was urged by others, “that it was intended for the preservation of the church, and the best bill that could be made in order thereto, all circumstances considered—If we are to deal with a stubborn sort of people, who in many things prefer their humour before reason, or their own safety, or the public good, this is a very good time to see whether they will be drawn by the cords of love or no. The bill will be very agreeable to the Christian charity which our church professes; and it may be hoped, that in the time of this imminent danger, they will consider their own safety, and the safety of the Protestant religion, and no longer keep afoot the unhappy divisions among us, on which the Papists ground their hopes; but when they see the church so far condescend, as to dispense with the surplice, and those other things they scruple, that they will submit to the rest which are enjoined by law, that so we may unite against the common enemy. But if this bill should not have the desired effect, but on the contrary, the dissenters should continue their animosities and disobedience to the church, I think still the church will gain very much hereby, and leave the party without excuse—.” This seems agreeable to reason.

Although the bill for a comprehension was committed, it did not pass the house, being changed for another, entitled, “An act to exempt his majesty’s Protestant subjects, dissenting from the church of England, from the penalties imposed upon the Papists by the act of 35th Eliz.”¹ By which act Nonconformists were adjudged to perpetual imprisonment, or obliged to abjure, that is, depart the realm never to return. This terrible law had lain dormant almost eighty years, but was now revived, and threatened to be put in execution by the tories. The repeal passed the house of commons with a high hand, but went heavily through the house of lords; the bishops apprehending that the terror of the law might be of some use; but when it should have been offered to the king for the royal assent at the close of the session, it was missing, and never heard of any more, the clerk of the crown having withdrawn it from the table by the king’s particular order. The king (says Burnet²) had no mind openly to deny the bill, but less mind to pass it; and therefore this illegal method was taken, which was a high offence in the officer of the house, and would have been severely punished in the next session, if the parliament had not been abruptly dissolved. Thus the Nonconformists were sawn to pieces between the king, the bishops, and the parliament; when one party was willing to give them relief, the other always stood in the way. The parliament was their enemy for about twelve years, and now they are softened, the king and the court-bishops are inflexible;

¹ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 300.

² Ibid.

and his majesty will rather sacrifice the constitution to his despotic will, than exempt them from an old law, which subjected them to banishment and death.

However, the morning before the house was prorogued, January 10, two votes were passed of a very extraordinary nature, “1. Resolved *nemine contradicente*, That it is the opinion of this house, that the acts of parliament made in the reigns of queen Elizabeth and king James against Popish recusants ought not to be extended against Protestant dissenters. 2. Resolved, That it is the opinion of this house, that the prosecution of Protestant dissenters upon the penal laws is at this time grievous to the subject, a weakening of the Protestant interest, an encouragement to Popery, and dangerous to the peace of the kingdom.” Bishop Burnet¹ says, these resolutions were thought an invasion of the legislature, when one house pretended to suspend the execution of the laws, which was to act like dictators in the state. But with all due submission I should think that this cannot be construed a suspension of those laws, and that a house of commons, which is not suffered to sit and repeal laws, or when they have repealed them have their bills withdrawn illegally by the crown, may have liberty to declare their judgment that the continuance of those laws is burdensome to the state. They must do so, says Mr. Coke,² in order to a repeal. If the bill for the repeal of the old Popish act *de hæretico comburendo*, for burning heretics, which the parliament were afraid might be revived in a Popish reign, had been lost in this manner, might not the parliament have declared the execution of that law a weakening to the Protestant interest, or dangerous to the peace of the kingdom?

While the parliament was endeavouring to relieve the dissenters, and charging the miseries of the kingdom upon the Papists, many of the bishops and clergy of the church of England were pleased to see the court inclined to prosecute the Nonconformists. The clergy in general, says Rapin,³ were attached to the court; men of doubtful religion were promoted, and there was reason to charge them with leaning to Popery. Even some able champions against Popery went so far into the court-measures as to impute the calamities of the times to the Nonconformists, and to raise the cry of the populace against them. Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, who had written an *Irenicum* in favour of liberty, and against impositions, in his sermon before the lord-mayor, May 2, this year, entitled, “The mischief of separation,” condemned all the dissenters as schismatics; and very gravely advised them not to complain of persecution. When the sermon was published it brought upon the doctor several learned adversaries, as, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Alsop, Mr.

¹ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 301.

² Page 561.

³ Page 711.

Howe, Mr. Barret, and Dr. Owen; from which last divine, who wrote with great temper and seriousness, I will venture to transcribe the following passage, without entering into the argument:¹ “After so many of the Nonconformists have died in common jails (says the doctor), so many have endured long imprisonments, not a few being at this day in the same durance; so many driven from their habitations into a wandering condition, to preserve for a while the liberty of their persons; so many have been reduced to want and penury, by the taking away their goods, and from some the very instruments of their livelihood. After the prosecution that has been against them in all courts of justice in this nation, on informations, indictments, and suits, to the great charge of all who have been so persecuted, and the ruin of some. After so many ministers and their families have been brought into the utmost outward straits which nature can subsist under; after all their perpetual fears and dangers wherewith they have been exercised and disquieted, they think it hard to be censured for complaining, by them who are at ease.” The doctor endeavoured to support his charge by the suffrage of the French Presbyterians; and Compton, bishop of London, applied to Monsieur Le Moyne, and several others,² for their opinions; as if truth were to be determined by numbers; or as if the English Presbyterians could pay a vast deference to their judgments, who had so deceived them at the Restoration. The ministers, bred up in French complaisance and under French slavery, after high strains of compliment to the English bishops, declared, that they were of opinion, their brethren might comply;³ and that they were not for pushing things to extremity only for a different form of government. Which the doctor and his friends interpreted as a decision in their favour. But did not the bishops exasperate the spirits of their dissenting brethren, by enforcing the sanguinary laws? Were these Protestant methods of conversion, or likely to bring them to temper? The French ministers com-

¹ Page 53, 54.

² Collyer, p. 900.

³ Mr. Neal, it seems, has fallen into a mistake, by supposing that the French Presbyterians favoured English episcopacy. Their answers were complaisant, but wary. Yet Stillingfleet published their letters as suffrages for episcopacy, and annexed them to his Treatise on Schism. Mr. Claude, one of those written to, complained of this treatment: but the letters which contained these complaints were concealed till his death, when his son printed them. In one of them to bishop Compton, April 16’81, he freely told him, that the bishops were blamed for their eagerness to persecute others by penal laws, for their arbitrary and despotic government; for their rigid attachment to offensive ceremonies; for requiring foreign Protestant ministers to be reordained; and for not admitting any to the ministry without making an oath that episcopacy is of divine right, which Mr. Claude called a cruel rack for conscience. He solemnly called on the bishops, in the name of God, to remove these grounds of complaint, to give no cause, no pretext, for separation, to do all in their power to prevent it, and instead of chafing and irritating people’s minds, by all gentle methods to conciliate them. This was excellent advice: but the public were not informed, that it had been given by those to whom it was addressed. Robinson’s Life of Claude, prefixed to his translation of an Essay on the Composition of Sermons, p. 65–67.—ED.

plained sufficiently of this about five years after, at the revocation of the edict of Nantz. Bishop Burnet remarks of Dr. Stillingfleet on this occasion,¹ that he not only retracted his *Irenicum*, but went into the humours of the high sort of people beyond what became him, perhaps beyond his own sense of things.

This year [1680] died Mr. Stephen Charnock, B. D. first of Emanuel-college, Cambridge; and afterward fellow of New-college, Oxford. He was chaplain to Henry Cromwell, lieutenant of Ireland, and was much respected by persons of the best quality in the city of Dublin for his polite behaviour. After the Restoration he returned into England, and became pastor of a separate congregation in London, where he was admired by the more judicious part of his hearers, though not popular, because of his disadvantageous way of reading with a glass: he was an eminent divine, and had a good judgment, a curious imagination, and a strong manner of reasoning, as appears by his works printed since his death in two volumes folio, which were no other than his common sermons transcribed from his notes;² his style is manly and lofty, and his thoughts sublime: his love and charity were very extensive, and there was no part of learning to which he was a stranger.³ He died July 26, 1680, aged fifty-two.

[On December 26, 1680, died at London, where he came to be cut for the stone, with which he was many years afflicted, Mr. John Corbet, ejected from Bramshot in Hants; a man every way great. He was a native of the city of Gloucester, and a student in Magdalen-hall, Oxon. He began his ministry in the place of his nativity, and lived many years there, and during the civil wars, of which he was a spectator. He wrote the history of the siege of the city, and is thought to have given as good an insight into the rise and springs of the civil war, as can be met with in so narrow a compass. He removed from thence to Chichester, and then to the living from which he was ejected. After this he lived privately in and about London, till king Charles's indulgence in 1671, when part of his flock invited him to return to Chichester, where he continued his ministrations with great assiduity and success. It was during his residence there that bishop Gunning gave a public challenge to the Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Quakers. (See Chapter VIII. Part IV.) Mr. Corbet accepted it on behalf of the first; but, after the bishop had fired his own volley of invectives, Mr. Corbet was not permitted to enter into a defence; nor, though he proposed to do it at any other time and waited on the bishop at his palace, could he

¹ Vol. 1. p. 276.

² Calamy, vol. 2. p. 56. Palmer's Non. Mem. vol. 1. p. 159.

³ Mr. Johnson, who preached his funeral sermon, says, "he never knew a man in all his life, who had attained near to that skill Mr. Charnock had, in the originals of the Old and New Testament, except Mr. Thomas Cawton." Granger, vol. 3. p. 308.—ED.

afterward obtain a hearing. He was a man of great moderation, a lover of peace, an advocate for catholic communion and union of saints, and of blameless conversation. He saw some things to approve and some things to dislike in all parties, and valued not the interest of a party or faction. True to his conscience, he had no worldly designs to carry on, but was eminent in self-denial, and managed his ministry with faithfulness and prudence. He was tender of the reputation of his brethren, and rejoiced in the success of their labours as well as of his own. Nor was he apt to speak against those by whom he suffered. He was very free in acknowledging by whom he profited, and preferring others before himself. He was much in the study of his own heart, had the comfort of sensible improvements in faith and holiness, humility and heavenly mindedness, and died at last in great serenity and peace. He had a considerable hand in compiling Mr. Rushworth's first volume of Collections, which is reckoned by good judges a masterpiece of the kind. His *Self-employment in Secret*, an excellent small piece, recommended lately by Mr. Bulkley in his *Christian Minister*, has gone through various editions. Mr. Howe wrote a preface to it. Dr. Wright reprinted it in 1741, and the Rev. William Unwin, rector of Stock cum Ramsden-Belhouse, Essex, published it again in 1773, with the encomiums of a celebrated minister of the church of England upon it, as "the best manual he knew for a Christian or a minister, furnishing excellent materials for addressing conscience, and directing men to judge of their spiritual state." Calamy, vol. 2. p. 333. Palmer's *Noncon. Mem.* vol. 2. p. 4.—ED.]

The king having parted with his last parliament in displeasure, without being able to obtain any money, resolved once more to try a new one;¹ and apprehending that the malecontents were encouraged by the neighbourhood of the city of London, he summoned them to meet at Oxford: the same representatives being rechosen for London, had a paper put into their hands by four merchants, in the name of all the citizens then assembled in the common-hall, containing a return of their most hearty thanks for their faithful and unwearied endeavours in the two last parliaments, to search into the depth of the Popish plot, to preserve the Protestant religion, to promote a union among his majesty's Protestant subjects, to repeal the 35th of Eliz. and the corporation-act, and to promote the bill of exclusion, and to request their continuance of the same. The members being afraid of violence, were attended to Oxford with a numerous body of horse, having ribands in their hats with this motto, "No Popery; no slavery;" the citizens having promised to stand by them with their lives and fortunes. Many other papers of the like nature were presented to the members in the several counties. The king, in his speech at the opening the session, March 21, reflected severely

¹ Echard, p. 1002. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 720.

on the last parliament, and said, He was resolved to maintain the succession of the crown in the right line, and for quieting people's fears, he was willing to put the administration into the hands of a Protestant regent; but the commons rejected the proposal, to the inexpressible joy of the duke's party, and ordered the bill of exclusion to be brought in again. In the mean time a motion was made to consider of the loss of the bill in favour of the dissenters last parliament. Sir William Jones said, "The bill was of great moment and service to the country, and might be to their lives, in the time of a Popish successor; but be the bill what it will, the precedent was of the highest consequence; the king has a negative to all bills, but surely the clerk of the parliament has not.— If this way be found out, that bills shall be thrown by, it may hereafter be said, they were forgot and laid by, and so we shall never know whether the king passed them or no: if this be suffered, 'tis in vain to spend time here."—In conclusion, this affair was referred to a conference with the house of lords, which was frustrated by the hasty dissolution of the parliaments

The next went upon the libel of one Fitz-Harris, an Irish Papist, which was a second meal-tub plot, promoted in the name of the Nonconformists;¹ the libel was to be sent by penny-post letters to the lords, who had protested in favour of the bill of exclusion, and to the leading men in the house of commons, who were immediately to be apprehended and searched. Everard, who was Fitz-Harris's confidant, and betrayed the secret, affirmed that the king himself was privy to it, as Fitz-Harris's wife averred to a person of worth many years after; that his majesty had given Fitz-Harris money, and promised him more if it met with success. The libel was, to traduce the king and the royal family as Papists, and arbitrarily affected from the beginning, and says, that king Charles I. had a hand in the Irish rebellion; that the act forbidding to call the king a Papist was only to stop men's mouths, and that it was as much in the power of the people to depose a Popish possessor as a Popish successor. It was entitled, *The True Englishman speaking plain English*; and adds, "If James be conscious and guilty, Charles is so too; believe me, these two brothers in iniquity are in confederacy with the Pope and the French, to introduce Popery and arbitrary government, and to cast off parliaments, magna charta, and the liberty of the subject, as heavy yokes, and to be as arbitrary as the king of France—Let the English move and rise as one man to self-defence; blow the trumpet, stand on your guard, and withstand them as bears and tigers—Trust to your swords in defence of your lives, liberties, and religion, like the stout earl of old, who told his king, if he could not be defended by magna charta, he would be relieved by *longa spada*." He goes on to reproach the king with the breach of his Scots

¹ Burnet, p. 303, 304.

oaths, Breda promises, Protestant profession, liberty of conscience; as designed only to delude Protestants; and puts him in mind of all his political and moral vices, as intended to debauch the nation, to promote the Popish religion and arbitrary government, &c. Thus were the Nonconformists to be exposed again to the resentments of the nation; but when the sham was discovered to the house of commons by sir William Waller, he received the thanks of the house, and Fitz-Harris, though impeached in parliament, was tried by a jury, and executed with Dr. Plunket, the titular primate of Ireland. The whigs would have saved Fitz-Harris, though a Papist, in hopes of his being an evidence in the Popish plot; but the court was resolved to dispatch him out of the way, that he might tell no more tales.

His majesty, hearing that the bill of exclusion was to be brought into the house again, went suddenly, and not very decently, says Burnet,¹ to the house of lords in a sedan, with the crown between his feet, and having put on his robes in haste, called up the commons, and dissolved his fifth and last parliament, after they had sat only seven days. As soon as his majesty got out of the house, he posted away in all haste to Windsor, as one that was glad he had got rid of his parliament, which was the last that he ever convened, though he lived three or four years after. And here was an end of the constitution and liberties of England for the present; all that followed, to the king's death, was no more than the convulsions and struggles of a dying man. The king raised what money he wanted without parliaments; he took away all the charters of England, and governed absolutely by dint of prerogative. April the 8th, the king published a declaration² to all his loving subjects, touching the causes and reasons that moved him to dissolve the two last parliaments; and ordered it to be read in all the churches and chapels throughout England. It contains a recital of his majesty's condescensions for the security of the Protestant religion, as far as was consistent with the succession of the crown in the lineal descent: and a large rehearsal of the unsuitable returns of the commons. But notwithstanding all this, says his majesty, let not those men who are labouring to poison our people with commonwealth principles, persuade any of our subjects that we intend to lay aside the use of parliaments, for we still declare, that no irregularities in parliaments shall make us out of love with them; and we are resolved, by the blessing of God, to have frequent parliaments:" although he never called another. Several anonymous remarks were made upon this declaration, to weaken its influence. But the court used all its interest among the

¹ Burnet, p. 306.

² It was observed, Dr. Calamy says, that "this declaration was known by M. Barillon, the French ambassador, and by the the dutchess of Mazarine, sooner than by the king's council, and that it was evidenced to be of French extraction by the Gallicisms in it; and withal it had no broad seal to it, and was signed only by a clerk of the council." Own Life, MS. p. 74.—ED.

people to support its credit: addresses were sent from all parts, thanking his majesty for his declaration, promising to support his person and government with their lives and fortunes. Most of them declared against the bill of exclusion, and for the duke's succession,¹ as has been observed. Some ventured to arraign the late parliament as guilty of sedition and treason, and to pray his majesty to put in execution the statute of 35 Eliz. against the Nonconformists. The grand juries, the justices at their sessions, divers boroughs and corporations, the companies in towns, and at last the very apprentices, sent up addresses. Those who presented or procured them were well treated at court, and some of them knighted. Many zealous healths were drank, and in their cups the swaggerings of the old cavaliers seemed to be revived. One of the most celebrated addresses was from the university of Cambridge, presented by Dr. Gower, master of St. John's, which I shall give the reader as a specimen of the rest. It begins thus: "Sacred sir! We your majesty's most faithful and obedient subjects have long, with the greatest and sincerest joy, beheld the generous emulation of our fellow-subjects, contending who should best express their duty to their sovereign at this time, when the seditious endeavours of unreasonable men have made it necessary to assert the ancient loyalty of the English nation.—It is at present the great honour of this your university, not only to be steadfast and constant in our duty, but to be eminently so, and to suffer for it as much as the calumnies and reproaches of factious and malicious men can inflict upon us. And that they have not proceeded to sequestration and plunder, as heretofore, next to the overruling providence of Almighty God, is only due to the royal care and prudence of your most sacred majesty, who gave so seasonable a check to their arbitrary and insolent undertakings.—We still believe and maintain, that our kings derive not their power from the people but from God; that to him only they are accountable; that it belongs not to subjects either to create or censure, but to honour and obey their sovereign, who comes to be so by a fundamental, hereditary right of succession, which no religion, no law, no fault or forfeiture, can alter or diminish; nor will we abate of our well instructed zeal for the church of England as by law established.—Thus we have learned our own, and thus we teach others their duty to God and the king."—His majesty discovered an unusual satisfaction on this occasion; and, having returned them thanks, was pleased to add, that no other church in the world taught and practised loyalty so conscientiously as they did.

As such abject and servile flattery could not fail of pleasing the king, it must necessarily draw down vengeance on the Nonconformists, who joined in none of their addresses, but were doomed to suffer under a double char-

¹ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 308, 309.

acter, as whigs and as dissenters. “This,” says bishop Burnet,¹ “was set on by the Papists, and it was wisely done of them, for they knew how much the Nonconformists were set against them. They made use, also, of the indiscreet zeal of the high-church clergymen to ruin them, which they knew would render the clergy odious, and give the Papist great advantage when opportunity offered.” The times were boisterous and stormy; sham plots were contrived, and warrants issued against the leaders of the whig party for seditious language; Shaftesbury, now called the Protestant earl, was sent to the Tower, and Stephen Colledge, the Protestant joiner, was carried to Oxford, and hanged, after the grand jury in London had brought in a bill of indictment against him *ignoramus*. Witnesses were imported from Ireland, and employed to swear away men’s lives. “The court intended to set them to swear against all the hot party, which was plainly murder in them who believed them false witnesses,” says Burnet.² “and yet made use of them to destroy others.” Spies were planted in all coffee-houses, to furnish out evidence for the witnesses. Mercenary justices were put into commission all over the kingdom; juries were packed; and, with regard to the Nonconformists, informers of the vilest of the people were countenanced to a shameful degree, insomuch that the jails were quickly filled with prisoners, and large sums of money extorted from the industrious and conscientious, and played into the hands of the most profligate wretches in the nation.

The justices of Middlesex showed great forwardness, and represented to his majesty in December, “that an intimation of his pleasure was necessary at this time, to the putting the laws in execution against conventicles, because when a charge was lately given at the council-board to put the laws in execution against Popish recusants, no mention was made of suppressing conventicles.” Upon this his majesty commanded the lord-mayor, aldermen, and justices, to use their utmost endeavour to suppress all conventicles and unlawful meetings, upon pretence of religious worship; for it was his express pleasure, that the laws be effectually put in execution against them, both in city and country. Accordingly the justices of peace at their sessions at Hicke’s-hall, January 13, ordered, “that whereas the constables and churchwardens, &c. of every parish and precinct within the said county, had been enjoined last sessions to make a return the first of this, of the names of the preachers in conventicles, and the most considerable frequenters of the same within their several limits; which order not being obeyed, but contemned by some, it was therefore by the justices then assembled desired, that the lord-bishop of London will please to direct those officers which are under his jurisdiction, to use their utmost diligence, that all such

¹ Page 306.

² Page 315.

persons may be excommunicated, who commit crimes deserving the ecclesiastical censure; and that the said excommunications may be published in the parishes where the persons live, that they may be taken notice of, and be obvious to the penalties that belong to persons excommunicate, viz. not to be admitted for a witness, or returned upon juries, or capable of suing for any debt." They farther ordered at the same time, "that the statute of the first of Eliz. and third of king James, be put in due execution, for the levying of twelve-pence per Sunday upon such persons who repaired not to divine service and sermons at their parish or some other public church." All which, says Mr. Echard, made way for all sorts of prosecutions both in city and country, which in many places were carried on with great spite and severity, where there never wanted busy agents and informers, of which a few were sufficient to put the laws in execution; so that the dissenters this year and much longer, says he, met with cruel and unchristian usage; which occasioned great complaints among the people, and some severe reflections on the king himself.

It was not in the power of the church-whigs to relieve the Nonconformists, nor screen them from the edge of the penal laws, which were in the hands of their enemies. All that could be done was to encourage their constancy, and to write some compassionate treatises to move the people in their favour, by showing them, that while they were plundering and destroying their Protestant dissenting neighbours, they were cutting the throat of the reformed religion, and making way for the triumphs of Popery upon its ruins. Among other writings of this sort, the most famous was, *The Conformists' Plea for the Nonconformists*, in four parts, by a beneficed minister and a regular son of the church of England, in which the author undertakes to show, 1. The greatness of their sufferings. 2. The hardships of their case. 3. The reasonableness and equity of their proposals for union. 4. The qualifications and worth of their ministers. 5. Their peaceable behaviour. 6. Their agreement with the church of England in the articles of her faith. 7. The prejudice to the church by their exclusion; and then concludes, with the infamous lives, and lamentable deaths, of several of the informers. It was a sensible and moving performance, but had no influence on the tory justices, and tribe of informers. There was no stemming the tide; every one who was not a furious tory, says Rapin, was reputed a Presbyterian.

Most of the clergy were with the court, and distinguished themselves on the side of persecution. The pulpits everywhere resounded with the doctrines of passive obedience and nonresistance, which were carried to all the heights of king Charles I. No eastern monarch, according to them, was more absolute than the king of England.¹ They expressed such a zeal for the

¹ Rapin, p. 725. Burnet, p. 309.

duke's succession, as if a Popish king over a Protestant country had been a special blessing from heaven. They likewise gave themselves such a loose against Protestant Nonconformists, as if nothing was so formidable as that party. In all their sermons, Popery was quite forgot, says Burnet, and the force of their zeal was turned almost wholly against Protestant dissenters. In many country places the parson of the parish, who could bully, and drink, and swear, was put into the commission of the peace, and made a confiding justice, by which means he was both judge and party in his own cause. If any of his sober parishioners did not appear at church, they were sure to be summoned, and instead of the mildness and gentleness of a Christian clergyman, they usually met with haughty and abusive language, and the utmost rigour the law could inflict. There was also a great change made in the commissions throughout England. A set of confiding magistrates was appointed; and none were left on the bench, or in the militia, that did not declare for the arbitrary measures of the court; and such of the clergy as were averse to this fury, were declaimed against as betrayers of the church, and secret favourers of the dissenters; but the truth is, says the bishop, the number of sober honest clergymen was not great, for where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together. The scent of preferment will draw aspiring men after it. Upon the whole, the present times were very lowering, and the prospect under a Popish successor still more threatening.

It would fill a volume, to enter into all the particulars of these unchristian proceedings, which even the black registers of the spiritual courts cannot fully unfold. The reverend Mr. Edward Bury, assisting at a private fast, on account of the extraordinary drought, was apprehended June 14, and fined £20; and refusing to pay it, because he did not preach, they took away his goods, books, and even the bed he lay upon. The reverend Mr. Philip Henry was apprehended at the same time, and fined £40 and for nonpayment they carried away thirty-three loads of corn which lay cut upon the ground, together with hay, coals, and other chattels. The informers took the names of one hundred and fifty more, who were at the meeting: they fined the master of the house £20 and £5 more as being constable that year, and exacted 5s. a head from all who were present. Examples of this usage in London, Middlesex, and most of the counties of England, are innumerable.

The Quakers published a narrative of the sufferings of their friends since the Restoration, by which it appeared that great numbers had been fined by the bishops' courts, robbed of their substance, and perished in prison.¹ Many had been so beaten and wounded for attending their meetings, that they died of their wounds. An account was also published, of the

¹ Sewel, p. 574. 581.

unjust proceedings of the informers, showing, that at their instance many had been plundered without a juridical process; that seven hundred of them were now in prison in several parts of England, and especially about Bristol; but remonstrances and complaints availed nothing.

In the midst of this furious persecution, the famous Mr. Thomas Gouge, son of Dr. Gouge of Blackfriars, and the ejected minister of St. Sepulchre's, was taken out of this world: he was born at Bow near Stratford 1605, bred at Eton school, and educated in King's-college, Cambridge.¹ He settled at St. Sepulchre's in the year 1638, and for twenty-four years discharged all the parts of a vigilant and faithful pastor. He was a wonder of piety, charity, humility, and moderation, making it his study to keep a conscience void of offence towards God and man. Mr. Baxter says, he never heard any man speak to his dishonour, except that he did not conform. He was possessed of a good estate, and devoted the chief of it to charity. He settled schools to the number of three or four hundred, and gave money to teach children to read in the mountainous parts of Wales, where he travelled annually, and preached, till he was forbid by the bishops, and excommunicated, though he still went as a hearer to the parish churches. He printed eight thousand Welsh Bibles,² a thousand of which were given to the poor, and the rest sent to the principal towns of Wales, to be sold at an under rate. He printed five hundred of the Whole Duty of Man in Welsh, and gave them away; two hundred and forty New Testaments; and kept almost two thousand Welsh children at school to learn English. Archbishop Tillotson, in his funeral sermon, says, that, all things considered, there has not since the primitive times of Christianity been any among the sons of men, to whom that glorious character of the Son of God might be better applied, that he went about doing good.³ He was a divine of a cheerful spirit, and went away quietly in his sleep, October 29, 1681, in the seventy-seventh year of his age.⁴

¹ Tillotson's Works, vol. 1. p. 265.

² In these charitable works, as we have seen before, he was assisted by his friends. The great business of his life was to do good. He annually travelled over Wales, inspecting the schools and instructing the people both in public and private, till he was between sixty and seventy years of age. He sustained great loss by the fire of London, and after the death of his wife and the settlement of his children, his fortune was reduced to £150. per annum; out of which he constantly expended £100. in works of charity. He had a singular sagacity and prudence in devising the most effectual ways of doing good: and his example gave the first hint to Mr. T. Firmin of that plan of furnishing the poor with employment, which he so extensively and so generously pursued. His funeral sermon was preached by doctor, afterward archbishop, Tillotson. Palmer.—ED.

³ Calamy, vol. 2. p. 8.

⁴ The learned and excellent Dr. William Lloyd, then bishop of St. Asaph, who endeavoured by argument to remove the scruples of the dissenters, and to bring them back into the church by mild and Christian methods, after some private conferences, called on Mr. James Owen to produce his reasons for preaching without ordination by diocesan bishops, at the public hall of Oswestiy, on the 27th of September of the year 1681. The bishop was attended by the learned Mr. Henry Dodwell; Mr. Owen's supporters were, Mr. Philip Hen-

While the tories and high-church clergy were ravaging the dissenters, the court was intent upon subverting the constitution, and getting the government of the city into their hands. June 24, 1682, there was a contest about the election of sheriffs, which occasioned a considerable tumult. And when the election of a lord-mayor came on at Michaelmas, the citizens were again in an uproar, the lord-mayor pretending a right to adjourn the court, while the sheriffs, to whom the right belonged, continued the poll till night; when the books were cast up, each party claimed the majority according to their respective books. The contest rose so high, that sir William Pritchard, lord-mayor, was afterward arrested at the suit of Mr. Papillon and Dubois, and detained prisoner in Skinners'-hall till midnight. But when the affair came to a trial, the election was vacated, Papillon and Dubois were imprisoned, and the leading men of the whig party, who had distinguished themselves in the contest, were fined in large sums of money, which made way for the loss of the charter.

The court would have persuaded the common-council to make a voluntary surrender of it to the crown, to put an end to all contests for the future;¹ but not being able to prevail, they resolved to condemn it by law; accordingly a *quo warranto* was issued out of the court of King's bench, to see whether its charter had been duly observed, because the common-council, in one of their addresses, had petitioned for the sitting of the parliament, and had taxed the prorogation as a delay of justice; and because they had laid taxes on their wharfs and markets contrary to law. After trial upon these two points, the chief-justice delivered it as the unanimous opinion of the court, that the liberties and franchises of the city of London had been forfeited, and might be seized into the king's hands, but judgment was not to be entered till the king's pleasure was farther known. In the mean time the lord-mayor and common-council, who are the representatives of the city, agreed to submit to the king's mercy, and sent a deputation to Windsor, June 18, 1683, to beg pardon; which the king was pleased to grant on condition that his majesty might have a negative in the choice of all the chief magistrates—that if his majesty disapproved of their choice of a lord-mayor they should choose another within a week—and that if his majesty disapproved their second choice he should himself nominate a mayor for

ry, Mr. Jonathan Roberts of Slainvair, in Denbighshire, an excellent scholar and warm disputant. The dispute began at two in the afternoon, and ended between eight and nine. Several points, connected with the main question, "concerning the necessity of ordination by diocesan bishops, in uninterrupted succession from the apostles," were debated. The effects of this discussion were various: but no converts were made by it. The bishop procured respect by his exemplary candour; and Mr. Philip Henry, by his prudent and primitive temper, and the mildness of his manner, recommended himself to the high esteem of the prelate and the company. Mr. James Owen's Life, p. 29—35.—Ed.

¹ Burnet, p. 354—357. Rapin, p. 722.

the year ensuing; and the like as to sheriffs, aidermen, &c.¹ When this was reported to the common-council, it was put to the vote, and upon a division, one hundred and four were for accepting the king's regulation, and eighty-six against it; but even these concessions continued no longer than a year. The charter of London being lost, the cities and corporations in general were prevailed with to deliver up their charters, and accept of such new ones as the court would grant, which was the highest degree of perfidy and baseness in those who were intrusted with them, especially when they knew, that the design was to pack a parliament, in order to make way for a Popish successor.

Thus the liberties of England were delivered up to the crown; and though the forms of law remained, men's lives and estates were at the mercy of a set of profligate creatures, who would swear anything for hire. Juries, says Burnet,² were a shame to the nation, and a reproach to religion, for they were packed and prepared to bring in verdicts as they were directed, and not as matters appeared upon the evidence. Zeal against Popery was decried as the voice of a faction, who were enemies to the king and his government. All rejoicings on the 5th of November were forbid, and strict orders given to all constables and other officers to keep the peace; but the populace not being so orderly as they should have been, several London apprentices were fined twenty marks for a riot, and set in the pillory. These were the triumphs of a tory and Popish administration.

A little before this died old Mr. Thomas Case, M.A., educated in Christ-church, Oxford, and one of the assembly of divines: he was peculiarly zealous in promoting the morning exercises, but was turned out of his living at St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-street, for refusing the engagement, and imprisoned for Mr. Love's plot; he was afterward rector of St. Giles's, and waited on the king at Breda.³ He was one of the commissioners at the Savoy, and silenced with his brethren in 1662. He was an open plain-hearted man, an excellent preacher, of a warm spirit, and a hearty lover of all good men. He died May 30, 1682, aged eighty-four.⁴

¹ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 403. Gazette, no. 1835.

² Page 359.

³ Calamy, vol. 2. p. 13. Palmer's Non. Mem. vol. 1. p. 124.

⁴ He survived every one of the dissenters that sat in the assembly of divines. Mr. Baxter styles him "a holy faithful servant of God." It is painful, however, to reflect, that a man whose character appears in general to have been venerable and amiable, should be so transported by the heat of the times, as, in a sermon preached before the court-martial in 1644, to say, "Noble sirs, imitate God, and be merciful to none that have sinned of malicious wickedness;" meaning the royalists, who were frequently styled malignants. This, as Mr. Granger observes, is sanguinary. It may be added, that it conveyed also a false idea of the divine clemency, which extends its exercise, on repentance, to all characters; to sins of malignity as well as of infirmity. Granger's History of England, vol. 3. p. 317, 318. —Ed.

Mr. Samuel Clarke, the ejected minister of St. Bene't Fink, was an indefatigable student, as appears by his Martyrology, his Lives of eminent Divines, and other historical works: he was a good scholar, and had been a useful preacher in Cheshire and Warwickshire, before he came to London; he was one of the commissioners at the Savoy, and presented the Presbyterian ministers' address of thanks to the king for his declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs; and though he could not conform as a preacher, he frequently attended the service of the church as a hearer and communicant. He died December 25, 1682, æt. eighty.¹

While the liberties of England lay bleeding, the fury of the court raged higher than ever against the Nonconformists, as inflexible enemies of their arbitrary measures.² Mr. Baxter was surprised in his own house by a company of constables and other peace-officers, who arrested him for coming within five miles of a corporation, and brought warrants to distrain upon him for five sermons, amounting to £195. They took him out of his bed, to which he had been confined for some time, and were carrying him to jail; but Dr. Cox the physician, meeting him in the way, went and made oath before a justice of peace, that he could not be removed to prison without danger of his life, so he was permitted to go home again to bed; but the officers rifled his house, took away such books as he had, and sold even the bed from under him. Dr. Annesley, and several other ministers, had their goods distrained for latent convictions; that is, upon the oaths of persons they never saw, nor received summons to answer for themselves before a justice of peace. This was stabbing men in the dark. Some were imprisoned on the corporation-act. The reverend Mr. Vincent was tried and convicted at the Surrey-assizes on the 35th of queen Elizabeth, already mentioned: he lay in prison many months, but was at last released by the intercession of some great men. The dissenting laity were harassed everywhere in the spir-

¹ When Mr. Clarke was ejected, he had been forty years in the ministry, during which time he had been seven or eight years a governor, and two years a president of Sion-college. The most valuable of his numerous works are reckoned to be "Lives of the Puritan divines and other persons of note." "The author and the bookseller (says Mr. Granger) seem to have been thoroughly informed of this secret, that a taking title-page becomes much more taking, with an engraved frontispiece before it; and that little pictures, in the body of the book, are great embellishments to style and matter." He was more a compiler than an author. His name was anagrammatised to *Su(c)kall Cream*, alluding to his taking the best parts of those books from which he collected. One is sorry to find, in the list of his publications, A discourse against Toleration. He enjoyed about nine years the living of Alcester in Warwickshire, where his preaching was very useful, and the town became exemplary for sobriety, which had borne the character of "drunken Alcester." He met death with a lively sense of eternity upon his mind, and a comfortable assurance of his own title to future blessedness. Palmer's Noncon. Mem. vol. 1. p. 88, &c. Granger's History, vol. 3. p. 321.—ED.

Mr. Clarke was the great grandfather of Dr. Samuel Clarke of St. Alban's, the patron of Dr. Doddridge's youthful studies.—ED.

² Part 3. p. 191.

itual courts, warrants were signed for distresses, in the village of Hackney alone, to the sum of £1400, one of which was £500. The reader will then judge what must have been the case of the interest in general.¹ But in the midst of this oppression and violence, the court found that the spirit of English liberty was not easily to be subdued: there were a set of patriots who stood in their way, and were determined to hazard their lives and fortunes for the constitution; these were therefore to be removed or cut off, by bringing them within the compass of some pretended plot against the government. Some, who were more zealous than prudent, met together in clubs at the taverns and other places, to talk over the common danger, and what might be done to secure their religion and liberties in case of the king's death; but there was no formed design in any of them against the king or the present government. The court however laid hold of this occasion, and, as Mr. Coke says, set on foot three plots, one to assassinate the king and duke as they came from Newmarket; another to seize the guards: and a third was called the Blackheath plot; in all which, for aught I can find, says he, the fox was the finder. Dr. Welwood adds,² that the shattered remains of English liberty were attacked on every side, and some of the noblest blood in the nation offered up a sacrifice to the manes of Popish martyrs. Swearing came into fashion, and an evidence office was set up at Whitehall; the witnesses were highly encouraged, and, instead of judges and juries that might boggle at half evidence, care was taken to pick out such as should stick at nothing to serve a turn. The plot which the court made use of was called the Ryehouse plot,³ from the name of the house where the two royal brothers were to be shot; it was within two miles of Hodsdon in Hertfordshire, and was first discovered by one Keeling an Anabaptist; after him Goodenough, Rumsey, and West, made themselves witnesses, and framed a story out of their own heads, of lopping off the two brothers as they came from Newmarket; and having heard of conferences between the duke of Monmouth, lord Russel, and others, concerning securing the Protestant religion upon the king's decease, they impeached them to the council, upon which lord Russel, Algernon Sidney, the earl of Essex, and Mr. Houblon,

¹ The temper of the court and church at this time inclined Mr. John Shower to attend the nephew of sir Samuel Barnardiston on his travels, in compliance with the earnest request of his uncle, in company with several other gentlemen, which we mention here to introduce the following passage. When they were at Geneva, where they continued for some time, they contracted an acquaintance with Turretin the younger. On their first conversation they found this learned divine and the rest of the city possessed with very unfavourable sentiments concerning the English Nonconformists. But when Mr. Shower and his companions had stated their case, and the terms required of them, Turretin and the others declared themselves well satisfied with the grounds of their dissent, and treated them, during the remainder of their residence in the city, with a very particular respect. Tong's Life of Shower, p. 48.—ED.

² Memoirs, p. 132.

³ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 368–373.

were apprehended and sent to the Tower. Warrants were issued out for several others, who, knowing that innocence was no protection, absconded, and went out of the way; but several were tried, and executed upon the court-evidence; as Mr. Rumbold, the master of the house where the plot was to take place, who declared at his execution in king James's reign, that he never knew of any design against the king; as did captain Walcot and Sir Thomas Armstrong, Rouse, and the rest. Lord Russel was condemned, and beheaded, for being within the hearing of some treasonable words at Mr. Shepherd's, a wine-cooper in Abchurch-lane.¹ The earl of Essex's throat was cut in the Tower² during lord Russel's trial;³ and Algernon Sidney was executed for having a seditious libel in his study;⁴ of the injustice of which the parliament at the Revolution was so sensible, that they reversed the judgments. A proclamation was issued out against the duke of Monmouth, though the king knew where he was; and after the ferment brought him to court. Mr. Echard observes, that some have called this the Fanatic, the Protestant, the Whiggish, or Presbyterian plot; others have called it, with more justice, a piece of state policy, and no better than an imposture, for it had no other foundation than the rash and imprudent discourse of some warm whigs, which, in so critical a conjuncture, was very hazardous; but no scheme of a plot had been agreed upon, no preparations made, no arms nor horses purchased, nor persons appointed to execute any design against the

¹ P. 382.

² Dr. Grey censures Mr. Neal's account of the Ryehouse plot as very faulty, if not false; "as appears (he says) from the very best of our historians, and the confession of several that suffered for it." The historians to whom the doctor refers are Echard, Kennet, &c. and principally bishop Sprat's History of the Ryehouse Plot. As to this work, the most partial to it must own it detracts greatly from its credit; that it was drawn up to please the court, by one that was wholly in that interest, and the author, it seems, acknowledges, "that king James II. called for his papers, and having read them, altered divers passages, and caused them to be printed by his own authority." Calamy's Letter to Archdeacon Echard, p. 55. Dr. Grey ironically calls Mr. Neal's account of the earl of Essex's death, a candid remark; and then refers to, and quotes largely, Carte's and Echard's representations of that event, to show that the earl was *felo de se*. This is not the place to discuss the question concerning his lordship's death, whether he committed an act of suicide, or was murdered by others. Dr. Harris has fully and impartially stated the arguments on both sides. History of Charles II. vol. 2. p. 371–376. The same judicious writer has also investigated the evidence concerning the Ryehouse plot, p. 355–370.—ED.

³ Welwood's Memoirs, p. 161.

⁴ This was an answer to Filmer's book, written to prove the absolute and unlimited power of kings. The leading principle of this MS. was, "that power is delegated from the people to the prince, and that he is accountable to them for the abuse of it." It was urged, that he was not proved to have written the piece; that if he were the author, it contained only his private speculations; that it could not be admitted as a proof of the plot, for it was written years before; and that, as it was not a finished piece, it could not be known how it would end; and no general conclusion ought to be drawn from any particular chapter of a work. The book was, however, considered by Jefferies as an overt-act, on this principle, *Scribere est agere*. It is remarkable, that within a few years, the energy and truth of the above principle removed James II. from the throne, and placed on it the prince of Orange. So vain is it to fight against just principles!—ED.

king or government.¹ However, the court had their ends, in striking terror into the whole party.

Great industry was used by the court to bring the body of Nonconformists into this plot; it was given out that Dr. Owen, Mr. Mead, and Mr. Griffith, were acquainted with it;² Mr. Mead was summoned before the council, and gave such satisfactory answers to all questions, that the king himself ordered him to be discharged. The reverend Mr. Carstairs, a Scots divine, was put to the torture of the thummikins in Scotland, to extort a confession; both his thumbs being bruised between two irons till the marrow was almost forced out of the bones: this he bore for an hour and a half without making any confession. Next day they brought him to undergo the torture of the boot, but his arms being swelled with the late torture, and he already in a fever, made a declaration of all that he knew, which amounted to no more than some loose discourse of what might be fit to be done, to preserve their liberties and the Protestant religion, if there should be a crisis;³ but he vindicated himself and his brethern in England from all assassinating de-

¹ “Mr. Neal must think his readers (says Dr. Grey) very easy of belief to swallow down such gross untruths as these, which the smallest dabbler in the history of those times can easily confute.” The reader, who is not a dabbler in the history those times, is referred to Dr. Harris, as before quoted, for materials on which to form his judgment of the truth of this remark. In the mean time he may not be displeased with the following plain lines on the death of Sidney.

“Algernon Sidney fills this tomb,
An Atheist for disclaiming Rome;
A rebel bold for striving still
To keep the laws above the will:
Crimes damn’d by church and government,
Alas! where must his ghost be sent?
Of heav’n it cannot but despair,
If holy pope be turnkey there;
And hell it ne’er must entertain,
For there is all tyrannic reign.
Where goes it then? Where’t ought to go,
Where pope nor devil have to do.”
Bennet’s Memorial, p. 359.—ED.

² Dr. Grey refers to “copies of informations,” in the appendix to Sprat’s account for a deposition signed by Mr. Carstairs, saying, “The deponent did communicate the design on foot to Dr. Owen, Mr. Griffith, and Mr. Mead, at Stepney, who all concurred in promoting of it, and desired it might take effect.”—Dr. Grey, by this quotation, means to implicate those gentlemen in the most atrocious part of this plot. But the question returns, what was the design on foot? what were the nature and extent of it?—Mr. Neal immediately informs us, in his report of the amount of Carstaire’s confession, that it did not go to any assassination, but only to preserving their liberties and the Protestant religion. As to Mr. Mead, in particular, he went into Holland on this occasion: and after his return to England, he was summoned, to appear before king Charles at the privy-council, where he fully vindicated his innocence, and was perfectly discharged. Pierce’s Vindication of the Dissenters, part 1. p. 258. Mr. Mead carried with him into Holland the son (the eleventh of thirteen children), whom he placed under an excellent master, who afterward rose to the first eminence as a scholar and physician. Granger’s History, vol. 3. p. 333.—ED.

³ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 426–430.

signs, which, he said, they abhorred. Dr. South was desired to write the history of this plot; but Dr. Sprat, afterward bishop of Rochester, performed it, though at the Revolution he disowned it so far as to declare, that king James had altered several passages in it before it was published. Bishop Burnet adds, that when the congratulatory addresses for the discovery of this plot had gone all round England, the grand juries made high presentments against all who were accounted whigs and Nonconformists. Great pains were taken to find out more witnesses; pardons and rewards were offered very freely to the guilty, but none came in, which made it evident, says his lordship, that nothing was so well laid, or brought so near execution, as the witnesses had deposed, otherwise the people would have crowded in for pardons. Bishop Kennet says,¹ that the dissenters bore all the odium, and were not only branded for express rebels and villains, in multitudes of congratulatory and tory addresses from all parts of the kingdom, but were severally arraigned by the king himself, in a declaration to all his loving subjects, read in all the churches on Sunday September 9, which was appointed as a day of thanksgiving, and solemnized, after an extraordinary manner, with mighty pomp and magnificence. There was hardly a parish in England that was not at a considerable expense to testify their joy and satisfaction: nay, the Papists celebrated in all their chapels in London an extraordinary service on that account; so that these had their places of public worship, though the Protestant dissenters were denied them.

The Quakers avowed their innocence of the plot in an address to the king at Windsor,² presented by G. Whitehead, Parker, and two more, wherein they appeal to the Searcher of all hearts, that “their principles do not allow them to take up defensive arms, much less to avenge themselves for the injuries they receive from others. That they continually pray for the king’s safety and preservation, and therefore take this occasion humbly to beseech his majesty, to compassionate their suffering friends, with whom the jails are so filled, that they want air, to the apparent hazard of their lives, and to the endangering an infection in divers places. Besides, many houses, shops, barns, and fields, are ransacked, and the goods, corn, and cattle, swept away, to the discouraging of trade and husbandry, and impoverishing great numbers of quiet and industrious people; and this for no other cause but for the exercise of a tender conscience, in the worship of Almighty God, who is sovereign Lord and King in men’s consciences——.”

But this address made no impression:³ all things proceeding trium-

¹ Page 402.

² Sewel, p. 585.

³ The king was touched, for the moment, with the exhibition it gave of the unreasonable and unmerited sufferings of the Quakers, and said to one of his courtiers standing by,

phantly on the side of the prerogative;¹ the court did what they pleased; the king assumed the government of the city of London into his own hands, and appointed a mayor, sheriffs, and aldermen, without the election of the people; sermons were filled with the principles of absolute obedience and non-resistance, which were carried higher than ever their forefathers had thought of or practised. The university of Oxford passed a decree² in full convocation, July 21, 1683, against certain pernicious books and damnable doctrines, destructive to the sacred persons of princes, their state and government, and all human society.³ It consists of twenty-seven propositions, extracted from the writings of Buchanan, Baxter, Owen, Milton, J. Goodwin, Hobbs, Cartwright, Travers, and others, who had maintained that there was an original contract between king and people; and that when kings subvert the constitution of their country, and become absolute tyrants, they forfeit their right to the government, and may be resisted: these and other propositions of a like nature, they declare to be impious, seditious, scandalous, damnable, heretical, blasphemous, and infamous to the Christian religion. They forbid their students to read those writers, and ordered their

“What shall we do for this people? the prisons are full of them.” The party to whom this query was put, to divert his attention, drew him into conversation upon some other topic, so that little or no relaxation of the oppressive measures resulted from this address, nor during the remainder of the king’s reign. Gough’s *History of the Quakers*, vol. 3. p. 8, 9.—ED.

¹ Kennet, p. 410.

² This decree was drawn up by Dr. Jane, dean of Gloucester, and the king’s professor of divinity, and subscribed by the whole convocation. It was presented to the king with great solemnity on the 24th of July following, and very graciously received. It was ordered, in perpetual memory of it, to be entered in the registry of the convocation, and to be stuck up in the different colleges and halls. Farther to counteract the spread and influence of the propositions against which it was levelled, all readers, tutors, catechists, and others, to whom the instruction and care of youth were committed, were commanded, to instruct and ground their scholars in “that most necessary doctrine, which in a manner is the badge and character of the church of England, of submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well; teaching that this submission is to be clear, absolute, and without any exception of any state or order of men.” *High-church Politics*, p. 89.

³ Another proof of the intolerant spirit which dictated the decrees of the university at this time, offers in its treatment of Dr. Whitby, precentor of the church of Sarum. This learned writer published in this year, 1683, without his name, his “*Protestant Reconciler*,” humbly pleading for condescension to dissenting brethren, in things indifferent and unnecessary, for the sake of peace; and showing how unreasonable it is to make such things the necessary conditions of communion. This book gave such high offence, that it was condemned by the university on the above-mentioned day, and burnt by the hands of the marshal in the schools’ quadrangle. The author was also obliged by Dr. Seth Ward, to whom he was chaplain, to make a public retraction of it on the 9th of the ensuing October. And in the same year, to remove the clamour his piece had raised, he published a second part, “earnestly persuading the dissenting laity to join in full communion with the church of England, and answering all the objections of the Nonconformists against the lawfulness of the submission to the rites and constitutions of that church.” *Birch’s Life of Archbishop Tillotson*, p. 103—105—ED.

books to be burnt. But how well they practised their own doctrines at the Revolution, will be seen in its proper place; and one of queen Anne's parliaments ordered the decree itself to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman.¹

Dr. Benjamin Calamy, rector of St. Lawrence Jewry, in one of his printed sermons entitled "A Scrupulous Conscience," invited the Nonconformists to examine what each party had to say for themselves with respect to the ceremonies imposed by the church, and enforced by the penal laws, calling upon them modestly to propose their doubts, and meekly to hearken to and receive instruction. In compliance with this invitation, Mr. Thomas De-laune, an Anabaptist schoolmaster, and a learned man,² printed a Plea for the Nonconformists, showing the true state of their case, and justifying their separation. But before it was published, he was apprehended by a messenger from the press, and shut up close prisoner in Newgate, by warrant from the recorder Jenner, dated November 30, 1683. Mr. Delaune wrote to Dr. Calamy to endeavour his enlargement: "My confinement (says he) is for accepting your invitation; I look upon you obliged in honour to procure my sheets, yet unfinished, a public passport,³ and to me my liberty—there is nothing in them but a fair examination of those things your sermon invited to, and I cannot find that Christ and his disciples ever forced scrupulous consciences to conformity, by such methods as sending them to Newgate; I beseech you, therefore, in the fear of God, as you will answer it to our great Lord and Master Jesus Christ, that you would endeavour to convince a stranger by something more like reason and divinity, than a prison." The doctor at first said, he would do him all the kindness that be-

¹ Collyer, 902.

² Mr. Delaune was born at Brini in Ireland, about three miles from Riggsdale. His parents were Papists and very poor, and rented part of the estate of — Riggs, esq. This gentleman, observing the early and forward parts of the young Delaune, placed him in a friary at Kilcrash, seven miles from Cork, where he received his education; when he was about fifteen or sixteen years of age, he removed to Kinsale, and met with Mr. Bampfield, who, discovering his genius and learning, made him clerk of his pilchard fishery there, and was the means of giving his mind a pious and virtuous turn. After some years, during which he enjoyed the high esteem and friendship of major Riggs and Mr. Bampfield, persecution and troubles induced him to leave Ireland, and come over into England, where he married the daughter of Mr. Edward Hutchinson, who had been pastor of a congregation at Ormond, but was also come to England on account of the troubles of the times. After this Mr. Delaune went to London, kept a grammar-school there, and fell into an intimacy and strict friendship with Mr. Benjamin Keach, and translated the *Philologia Sacra*, prefixed to his celebrated work, entitled, "A Key to open Scripture Metaphors." The narrative published with the subsequent editions of his "Plea for the Nonconformists," fully represents the series of sufferings under which he sunk, and the process of the iniquitous prosecution to which he, his wife and children, became a sacrifice.—ED.

³ It is to be observed, that notwithstanding all the attempts used to suppress Mr. Delaune's tract, to obstruct its reception, and to prevent its effect on the public mind, by severities against its author, and by committing the piece itself to the flames, there was a great demand for it, and before the year 1733, there had been seventeen impressions of it—ED.

came him.¹ But in answer to a second letter, he said, he looked upon himself as unconcerned, because he was not mentioned in that sheet he saw with the recorder. Mr. Delaune insisted that his honour was at stake for his deliverance, and prayed him at least to perform the office of a divine, in visiting him in prison, to argue him out of his doubts; but the doctor, like an ungenerous adversary, deserted him. Mr. Delaune therefore was to be convinced by an indictment at law; for that on November 30, he did by force of arms, &c. unlawfully, seditiously, and maliciously, write, print, and publish, a certain false, seditious, and scandalous libel, of and concerning our lord the king, and the Book of Common Prayer, entitled, “A Plea for the Nonconformists.” For which offence he was fined one hundred marks, and to be kept prisoner till he paid it; to find security for his good behaviour for one year, and his books to be burnt before the Royal Exchange. The court told him, that in respect of his being a scholar, he should not be pilloried, though he deserved it. Mr. Delaune, not being able to pay his fine, lay in prison fifteen months, and suffered great hardships by extreme poverty, having no subsistence but on charity. He had a wife and two small children with him, who all died in the jail, through the length and closeness of the confinement, and other inconveniences they endured;² and at length Mr.

¹ Mr. Neal’s account of Dr. Calamy’s conduct towards Mr. Delaune, is drawn from the injured sufferer’s narrative; and it must be allowed, that it reflects on the doctor’s character and memory. But though by not replying to his book, nor visiting him, he appeared to desert him; yet it appears that the behaviour which Mr. Delaune, in his afflicted situation, felt as a severe neglect, was tempered with more attention to his case and kindness than he seems to have known of. For Dr. Edmund Calamy says, “that his uncle took pains with Jefferies to get him released, but could not prevail, which was no small trouble to him.” Dr. Calamy was a man greatly respected; and, though a true son of the church, averse to persecution. He was a man of great humanity, courteous and affable in his deportment, and exemplary in his life. His sermons were reckoned to possess great merit. No books in his study appeared to have been as much used as Mr. Perkin’s works, especially his “Cases of Conscience,” which were full of marks and scores. He died when a little turned of forty years of age. The treatment which his neighbour and particular friend alderman Cornish received, greatly affected him, and is thought to have hastened his end. Dr. Calamy’s own *Life*, MS. and *Eiographia Britannica*, vol. 3. second edit.—ED.

² The story of Mr. Delaune is very affecting, and cannot but, at this distance of time, move pity and resentment. “The fate of himself and family, perishing in Newgate for want of £70 (observes the candid editor of the *Biographia Britannica*, 2d edit.) is not only a disgrace to the general spirit of the times, but casts peculiar dishonour on the Nonconformists of that period. Though there was probably something in his disposition which occasioned his having but few friends, a man of his knowledge, learning, and integrity, ought not to have been so fatally neglected. Perhaps the only apology which can be made for the dissenters of king Charles II.’s reign is, that whilst so many of their ministers were in a persecuted state, it was impossible for every case of distress to be duly regarded.” To this may be added the great number of cases of distress, arising from the prosecution and sufferings of the lay-dissenters. Mr. Jeremy White told Mr. John Waldron of Exeter, that the computation of those who suffered for nonconformity, between the Restoration and the Revolution, amounted to seventy thousand families ruined, and eight thousand persons destroyed; and the computation was not finished, when this number was ascertained. The sources of beneficence were also diminished by the effect of the measures pursued on trade. For the

Delaune himself sunk under his sufferings, and died in Newgate, a martyr to the challenge of this high-church champion.

Mr. Francis Bampffield suffered the like, or greater hardships; he had been educated in Wadham-college, Oxford, and was minister of Sherborne in Dorsetshire.¹ After the act of uniformity, he continued preaching as he had opportunity in private, till he was imprisoned for five days and nights, with twenty-five of his hearers in one room, with only one bed, where they spent their time in religious exercises; but after some time he was released.² Soon after he was apprehended again, and lay nine years in Dorchester jail, though he was a person of unshaken loyalty to the king, and against the parliament war; but this availed nothing to his being a Nonconformist. He afterward retired to London, where, being again apprehended, he was shut up in Newgate, and there died February 16, 1683–4. He was for the seventh day sabbath, but a person of unquestionable seriousness and piety.

With him might be mentioned Mr. Ralphson, a learned man, and a fellow-sufferer with Mr. Delaune in Newgate. On the 10th of December, a bill was found against him by the grand jury of London; on the 13th of the same month he pleaded Not guilty at the Old Bailey. On the 16th of January he was called to the sessions-house, but other trials proving tedious, his did not come on. The next day he was brought to the outer bar; and after an attendance of divers hours in a place not very agreeable, and in the sharpest winter that had been known, he contracted a violent cold, which issued in a fever, that carried him as well as Mr. Bampffield beyond the reach of tyrants, or the restraint of bail-docks and press-yards, to the mansions of everlasting rest.³ Mr. Philips, partner with Mr. Bampffield, suffered eleven months' imprisonment in Ilchester jail, in a nasty stinking hole, to the great

customs paid in Bristol only arose, in Charles's persecution, not to £30,000 per annum; but in king William's reign they advanced to near £100,000. Waldron's copy of Neal, *penes me*.—ED.

¹ Mr. Bampffield was descended from an ancient and honourable family in Devonshire. The first living he held was more valuable than that of Sherborne, being about 100Z. per annum; and having an annuity of 80Z. per annum settled on him for life, he spent all the income of his place in acts of charity, by employing the poor that could work, relieving the necessities of those who were incapable of any labour, and distributing Bibles and practical books. Soon after his ejection he was imprisoned for worshipping God in his own family; and it is remarkable, that notwithstanding he was prosecuted with severity, he had been zealous against the parliament's army and Oliver's usurpation, and always a strenuous advocate for the royal cause. When he resided in London he formed a church on the principles of the Sabbatarian Baptists at Pinners'-hall, of which principles he was a zealous asserter. He was a celebrated preacher, and a man of serious piety. He bore his long imprisonment with great courage and patience, and gathered a church even in the place of confinement. His fellow-prisoners lamented him, as well as his acquaintance and friends. Palmer's Noncon. Mem. vol. 1. p. 468–472. Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. 1. p. 363–368; vol. 2. p. 355–361 ED.

² Calamy, vol. 2. p. 260.

³ Calamy's Abridg. vol. 2. p. 259–377.

hazard of his life. Mr. French, of Town-Maulin, was confined six months in Maidstone common jail, in a hard winter, without fire or candle, or any private apartment.

Mr. Salkeld, the ejected minister of Worlington in Suffolk, was fined £100. and committed to the common jail of St. Edmundsbury,¹ for saying, Popery was coming into the nation apace, and no care taken to prevent it. He lay in prison three years, and was not discharged till the year 1686.

Mr. Richard Stretton suffered six months' imprisonment this year, for refusing the Oxford oath, in company with ten ministers more, who were also his fellow-prisoners.² Most of the dissenting ministers were forced to shift their places of abode to avoid discovery, and travel in long nights and cold weather, from one village to another, to preach to their people. If at any time they ventured to visit their families in a dark night, they durst not stir abroad, but went away before morning. Some spent their time in woods and solitary places; others, being excommunicated, removed with their effects into other dioceses—great numbers of the common people, taken at private meetings, were convicted as rioters, and fined £10 a piece; and not being able to pay, were obliged to remove into other counties, by which they lost their business, and their families were reduced to want. I forbear to mention the rudeness offered to young women, some of whom were sent to Bridewell, to beat hemp among rogues and thieves: others, that were married and with child, received irreparable damages; even children were terrified with constables and halberdeers breaking open houses, of whom I myself, says Mr. Peirce, being very young, was one example; and the writer of this history could mention others.

In the midst of these violent proceedings, the divines of the church of England published the London Cases against the Nonconformists, as if the danger of religion arose from that quarter; they were twenty-three in number, and have since been abridged by Dr. Bennet. These champions of the church were very secure from being answered, after Mr. Delaune had so lately lost his life for accepting such a challenge.³ They must therefore have the field to themselves, for if their adversaries wrote, they were sure to be rewarded with fines, and a prison; but since the return of liberty, they have

¹ It aggravated the iniquity as well as severity of this sentence, that many hundreds of Dr. Salkeld's hearers could testify that what he said was not said as his own language, but that of the parliament. During his confinement he was helpful to his fellow-prisoners, both as a minister and a cheerful Christian. His table was furnished by his friends at Bury, and his fine afterward remitted by king William. But his estate was much weakened, and his health almost ruined by his imprisonment. After his liberation he continued his ministry at Walsham in the Willows, and died December 20, 1699, aged seventy-seven. Palmer's Non-Mem. vol. 2. p. 442, 443.—ED.

² Calamy, vol. 2. p. 676.

³ Peirce, p. 259

been answered separately by Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, Mr. James Peirce, and others.

This year [1683] died Dr. John Owen, one of the most learned of the Independent divines; he was educated in Queen's college, Oxford, but left the university in 1637, being dissatisfied with Laud's innovations.¹ He was a strict Calvinist, and published his *Display of Arminianism* in 1642, for which the committee of religion presented him to the living of Fordham in Essex. In 1643 he removed to Coggeshall in the same county, where he first declared himself an Independent, and gathered a church according to the discipline of that people. He often preached before the long-parliament, even about the time the king was beheaded, but always kept his sentiments in reserve upon such a subject. Soon after, lieutenant-general Cromwell took him into his service as a chaplain in his expedition to Ireland; and when the general marched to Scotland, he obtained an order of parliament for the doctor to attend him thither. Upon his return, he was preferred to the deanery of Christchurch, and next year to the vice-chancellorship of Oxford, where he presided with great reputation and prudence for five years. He always behaved like a gentleman and scholar, and maintained the dignity of his character. The writer of his life says, that though he was an Independent himself, he gave most of the vacant livings in his disposal among the Presbyterians, and obliged the episcopal party, by conniving at an assembly of about three hundred of them, almost over against his own doors. The Oxford historian,² after having treated his memory with the most opprobrious language, confesses, that he was well skilled in the tongues, in

¹ Calamy, vol. 2. p. 58. Palmer's Non. Mem. vol. 1. p. 152–158.

² Mr. Wood represents Dr. Owen as a perjured person, a time-server, a hypocrite, whose godliness was gain, and a blasphemer; and, as if this were not sufficient, he has also made him a fop. "All which (observes Mr. Granger, with equal judgment and candour) means no more than this; that when Dr. Owen entered himself a member of the university of Oxford, he was of the established church, and took the usual oaths; that he turned Independent, preached and acted as Independents did, took the oath called the engagement, and accepted of preferment from Cromwell; that he was a man of good person and behaviour, and liked to go well dressed."—"We must be extremely cautious (adds this author), how we form our judgments of characters at this period; the difference of a few modes or ceremonies in religious worship, has been the source of infinite prejudice and misrepresentation. The practice of some of the splenetic writers of this period, reminds me of the painter, well known by the appellation of Hellish Brueghell, who so accustomed himself to painting of witches, imps, and devils, that he sometimes made but little difference between his human and infernal figures." To Mr. Neal's delineation of Dr. Owen's character may be added, that he was hospitable in his house, generous in his favours, and charitable to the poor, especially to poor scholars, some of whom he took into his own family, maintained at his own charge, and educated in an academical learning. When he was at Tunbridge, the duke of York, several times, sent for him, and conversed with him concerning the dissenters. On his return to London king Charles himself sent for him, and discoursed with him two hours; assuring him of his favour and respect, expressing himself a friend to liberty of conscience, and his sense of the wrong done to the dissenters. At the same time he gave him a thousand guineas to distribute among those who had suffered most. Granger's *History of England*, vol. 3. p. 301, 302, note; and Palmer's *Noncon. Mem.* vol. 1. p. 154, 155.—ED.

rabbinical learning, and in the Jewish rites and customs, and that he was one of the most genteel and fairest writers that appeared against the church of England. The doctor had a great reputation among foreign Protestants: and when he was ejected by the act of uniformity, was invited to a professorship in the United Provinces. He was once also determined to settle in New-England, but was stopped by express order from the council. He was pastor of a considerable congregation in London, and died with great calmness and composure of mind, on Bartholomew-day 1683. His works are very numerous, and still in esteem among the dissenters; though his style is a little intricate and perplexed.

[In this year died, aged seventy-two, Dr. Benjamin Whichcote, the friend of Tillotson. He was of an ancient and honourable family in the county of Salop, and was born at Whichcote-hall in the parish of Stoke, March 11, 1609. He was admitted in Emanuel-college, Cambridge, 1626, and graduated bachelor of arts 1629, master of arts 1633, and bachelor in divinity 1640. In the same year that he took his second degree, he was elected fellow of the college, and his tutor, Mr. Thomas Hill, leaving the university the year after, Mr. Whichcote took pupils, and became very considerable for his learning and worth, his prudence and temper, his wisdom and moderation, in those times of trial; nor was he less famous for the number, rank, and character, of his pupils, and the care he took of them. Wallis, Smith, Worthington, Cradock, &c. studied under him. In 1626, he set up an afternoon lecture in Trinity-church at Cambridge, which he served twenty years. In 1643, the master and fellows of his college presented him to the living of North Cadbury, in Somersetshire. But he was soon called back to Cambridge, and admitted provost of King's college, March 19, 1644.¹ In 1649, he was created doctor in divinity. Here he employed his credit, weight, and influence, to advance and spread a free and generous way of thinking, and to promote a spirit of sober piety and rational religion. Many, whose talents and learning raised them to great eminence as divines, after the Restoration, were formed by him. To his predecessor in the provostship he was generous. His spirit was too noble, servilely to follow a party. At the Restoration he was removed from his post, on accepting of which he had resigned the living of Cadbury, and he was elected and licensed to the cure of St. Anne's Blackfriars, November 1662. This church was burnt down in the fire of 1665, and he retired for a while to Milton, a living given to him by his college. He was after this presented, by the crown, to the vicarage of St. Lawrence Jury, which was his last stage. Here he continued, in high and general esteem, preaching twice every week, till his death in 1683.

¹ See before, vol. 2. p. 253, text and note, where we have already made respectful mention of Dr. Whichcote.

One volume of his sermons, entitled “Select Discourses,” was published after his death by the earl of Shaftesbury, author of the “Characteristics,” in 1698. Three others by Dr. John Jeffery, archdeacon of Norwich, in 1701 and 1702, and a fourth by Dr. Samuel Clarke. A collection of his “Aphorisms,” was printed by Dr. S. Salter, in 1753. See the second preface to which, p. 16–27.—ED.]

This year the king, by the assistance of the tories and Roman Catholics, completed the ruin of the constitution, and assumed the whole government into his own hands. The whigs and Nonconformists were struck with terror, by the severe prosecutions of the heads of their party.¹ Mr. Hampden was fined £40,000, sir Samuel Barnardiston £10,000 for defaming the evidence in the Ryehouse plot. Mr. Speke £2000 and Mr. Braddon £1000 for reporting that the earl of Essex had been murdered in the Tower. Mr. John Duttoncolt £100,000 for *scandalum magnatum* against the duke of York, who now ruled all at court. Oates was fined for the same crime £100,000. and never released till after the Revolution. Thirty-two others were fined or pilloried for libelling the king or the duke of York. In short, the greatest part of the history of this year consists of prosecutions, penalties, and punishments, says Mr. Echard. At the same time the earl of Danby and the Popish lords were released out of the Tower on bail, the garrison of Tangier was brought over into England, and augmented to a standing army of four or five thousand resolute men, fit for any service the court should employ them in. And the corporations throughout England, having been prevailed with, by promises or threatenings, to surrender their charters,² after the example of London, the whole kingdom was divested of its privileges, and

¹ Rapin, p. 733, and note. Echard, p. 1043, 1044.

² Among others, the charter of the city of Chester was surrendered, and a new one joyfully accepted, by which a power was reserved to the crown to put out magistrates and put in at pleasure. This is mentioned to introduce an instance of the conduct of the dissenters of that day, which reflects honour on their integrity, and shews how far they were from the affectation of power; as it was also a proof of a disinterested and inviolable attachment to the rights and liberties of their country. About August 1688, one Mr. Trinder was sent to Chester to new-model the corporation according to the power above mentioned. He applied to Mr. Henry, in the king's name, and told him, that “his majesty thought the government of the city needed reformation, and if he would say who should be put out, it should be done.” Mr. Henry said, “he begged his pardon, but it was none of his business, nor would he in the least intermeddle in a thing of that nature.” Trinder, however, got instructions from others. The charter was cancelled, and another of the same import was made out and sent down, nominating to the government all the dissenters of note in the city, the seniors to be aldermen, and the juniors common-council-men. When the persons named in it were called together to have notice of it, and to have the time fixed for their being sworn, like true Englishmen, they refused it, and desired that the ancient charter might be re-established, though they knew that none of them would come into powder by that, but many of those who were their bitter enemies would be restored. Accordingly the old charter was renewed in the same state wherein it was when the tories surrendered it. Mr. Thompson's MS. collections, under the word Chester.—ED.

reduced to an absolute monarchy.¹ Whole peals of anathemas were rung out against those patriots, who stood in the way against this inundation of power. The Scriptures were wrested to prove the divine right of tyrants. The absolute government of the Jewish kings was preached up as a pattern for ours.² And Heaven itself was ranked on that side, by some who pretended to expound its will. Instead of dropping a tear over our expiring laws, liberties, and parliaments, fulsome panegyrics were made upon their murderers, and curses denounced on those who would have saved them from destruction.

In this melancholy situation of public affairs the prosecution of the Nonconformists was continued, and egged on with an infatuation hardly to be paralleled in any Protestant nation. Dr. Barlow, bishop of Lincoln, published a letter for spiriting up the magistrates against the dissenters, in concurrence with another drawn up by the justices of peace of Bedford, bearing date January 14, 1684. Many were cited into the spiritual courts, excommunicated, and ruined. Two hundred warrants of distress were issued out upon private persons and families, in the town and neighbourhood of Uxbridge, for frequenting conventicles, or not resorting to church.³ An order was made by the justices of Exeter, promising a reward of 40s. to any one who should apprehend a Nonconformist minister, which the bishop of the diocese, Dr. Lamplugh, commanded to be published in all the churches, by his clergy, on the following Sunday. The reverend Dr. Bates, Dr. Annesley, and many of their brethren in the ministry, had their goods seized and confiscated. Mr. ——— Mayor of Oxford, a moderate Conformist, having left Mr. Baxter £600 to distribute among sixty poor ejected ministers; the lord-keeper North took it from him, as given to a superstitious use; but it lying unappropriated in the court of chancery till after the Revolution, it was restored by the commissioners of the great seal under king William. Soon after the justices sent warrants to apprehend Mr. Baxter, as being one in a list of a thousand names, who were to be bound to their good behaviour upon latent convictions, that is, without seeing their accusers, or being made acquainted with their charge.⁴ Mr. Baxter refusing to open his doors, the officers forced into his house, and finding him locked up in his study, they resolved to starve him from thence, by setting six men at the door, to whom he was obliged next day to surrender. They then carried him to the sessions-house two or three times, and bound him in a bond of £400 so that

¹ Welwood's Memoirs, p. 130.

² Mr. Waldron, of Exeter, has written here in his copy of Mr. Neal's work the following note: "The public orator of Cambridge, in a speech to the king at Newmarket, told him, that they hoped to see the king of England as absolute as the kings of Israel: as Thomas Quicks, Esq. told me, who stood behind him. J. W."-

³ Howe's Life, p. 80.

⁴ Baxter, part 3. p. 198.

if his friends had not been sureties for him, contrary to his desire, he must have died in prison, as many excellent persons did about this time.

Jefferies, now lord-chief-justice of England, who was scandalously vicious, and drunk every day, besides a drunkenness of fury in his temper that looked like madness, was prepared for any dirty work the court should put him upon.¹ September 23, 1684, Mr. Thomas Rosewel, the dissenting minister at Rotherhithe, was imprisoned in the Gate-house Westminster, for high treason; and a bill was found against him at the quarter-sessions, upon which he was tried November 8, at the King's-bench-bar, by a Surrey jury, before lord-chief-justice Jefferies, and his brethren, viz. Withins, Holloway, and Walcot. He was indicted for the following expressions in his sermon, September 14. That the king could not cure the king's evil, but that priests and prophets by their prayers could heal the griefs of the people—That we had had two wicked kings (meaning the present king and his father), whom we can resemble to no other person but to the most wicked Jeroboam; and that if they (meaning his hearers) would stand to their principles, he did not doubt but they should overcome their enemies (meaning the king), as in former times, with rams' horns, broken platters, and a stone in a sling. The witnesses were three infamous women, who swore to the words without the *innuendoes*; they were laden with the guilt of many perjuries already, and such of them as could be found afterward were convicted, and the chief of them pilloried before the Exchange. The trial lasted seven hours, and Mr. Rosewel behaved with all the decency and respect to the court that could be expected, and made a defence that was applauded by most of the hearers. He said it was impossible the witnesses should remember, and be able to pronounce so long a period, when they could not so much as tell the text, nor anything else in the sermon, besides the words they had sworn: several who heard the sermon, and wrote it in short hand, declared they heard no such words. Mr. Rosewel offered his own notes to prove it, but no regard was had to them. The women could not prove, says Burnet, by any one circumstance, that they were at the meeting; or that any person saw them there on that day: the words they swore were so gross, that it was not to be imagined that any man in his wits would express himself so, before a mixed assembly; yet Jefferies urged the matter with his usual vehemence. He laid it for a foundation, that all preaching at conventicles was treasonable, and that this ought to dispose the jury to believe any evidence upon that head, so the jury brought him in guilty;² upon which, says the bishop,¹ there was a

¹ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 444, 445.

² As soon as Mr. Rosewel was convicted, sir John Talbot, who was present at the trial, went to the king, and urged on his majesty, that if such evidence as had appeared against Mr. Rosewel were admitted, no one of his subjects would be safe. Upon this, when Jefferies soon after came into the royal presence, with an air of exultation and triumph to con-

shameful rejoicing; and it was now thought, all conventicles must be suppressed, when such evidence could be received against such a defence. But when the words came to be examined by men learned in the law, they were found not to be treason by any statute. So Mr. Rosewel moved an arrest of judgment till counsel should be heard; and though it was doubtful, whether the motion was proper on this foundation after the verdict, yet the king was so out of countenance at the accounts he heard of the witnesses, that he gave orders to yield to it; and in the end he was pardoned.² The court lost a great deal of reputation by this trial; for besides that Rosewel made a strong defence, he proved that he had always been a loyal man even in Cromwell's days, that he prayed constantly for the king in his family, and that in his sermons he often insisted upon the obligations to loyalty.

Among other sufferers for nonconformity, we must not forget the reverend Mr. William Jenkins, M. A. the ejected minister of Christ-church, who died this year in Newgate: he was educated in St. John's-college, Cambridge; and about the year 1641 was chosen minister of this place, and lecturer of Blackfriars, both which pulpits he filled with great acceptance till the destruction of monarchy, after which he was sequestered, for refusing to comply with the orders of parliament.³ He was sent to the Tower for Love's plot, but upon his humble petition, and promise of submission to the powers in being, he was pardoned, and his sequestration taken off, but he carefully avoided meddling in politics afterward. He was summoned before the council January 2, 1661, and reprimanded, because he forgot to pray for the

gratulate his majesty on the conviction of a traitor, the king gave him a cold reception, which damped his ardour in the business. When the court met to hear Mr. Rosewel's counsel, this corrupt judge, who on the trial had intermingled with the examination of the witnesses virulent invectives against him, and with his usual vehemence had endeavoured to prejudice and inflame the jury, now assumed a tone of moderation, and strongly recommended to the king's counsel caution and deliberation, where the life of a man was depending. See the Trial.—ED. N.B. This trial has been reprinted in the Protestant Dissenters' Magazine.

¹ Page 446.

² Calamy, vol. 2. p. 756. Palmer's Non. Mem. vol. 2. p. 512.

³ Mr. Jenkyns was, by his mother, the grandson of Mr. John Rogers, the protomartyr in the reign of queen Mary. The order of parliament, to which he refused obedience, was one that enjoined a public thanksgiving. The brethren, with whom he was keeping a fast, when he was apprehended in 1684, were Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Keeling, and Mr. Flavel, who made their escape, which Mr. Jenkyns might have done, had it not been for a piece of vanity in a lady, whose long train hindered his going down stairs; Mr. Jenkyns, in his great civility, having let her pass before him. At his funeral, which was attended by many eminent persons, and some scores of mourning coaches, his son gave rings with this motto, "William Jenkyns murdered in Newgate." Upon his death, a nobleman said to the king, "May it please your majesty, Jenkyns has got his liberty." On which he asked with eagerness, "Aye! who gave it him?" The nobleman replied, "A greater than your majesty, the King of kings;" with which the king seemed greatly struck, and remained silent. Granger, vol. 3. p. 317. Palmer, vol. 1. p. 98-100; and History of the Town of Taunton, p. 157. —ED.

king;¹ and being ejected with his brethren in 1662, he retired into the country; but upon the indulgence in 1671, he had a new meeting-house erected for him in Jewin-street, where he preached to a crowded audience. He was one of the merchant's lecturers at Pinners'-hall. And when the indulgence was revoked, he continued preaching as he could till this year; but September 2, 1684, being at a private fast with some of his brethren, the soldiers broke in, and carried Mr. Jenkyn before two aldermen, who treated him very rudely, and, upon his refusing the Oxford oath, committed him to Newgate: while he was there, he petitioned the king for a release, his physicians declaring, that his life was in danger from his close confinement; but no security would be accepted. So that he soon declined in his health, and died in Newgate in the seventy-third year of his age, January 19, 1684-5, having been a prisoner four months and one week. A little before his death he said, a man might be as effectually murdered in Newgate as at Tyburn. He was buried by his friends in Bunhill-fields with great honour, many eminent persons, and some scores of coaches, attending his funeral.

This was the usage the dissenters met with from the church of England at this time, which has hardly a parallel in the Christian world: remarkable are the words of the earl of Castlemain, a Roman Catholic, on this occasion: "'Twas never known (says he) that Rome persecuted, as the bishops do, those who adhere to the same faith with themselves; and established an inquisition against the professors of the strictest piety among themselves; and, however the prelates complain of the bloody persecution of queen Mary, it is manifest that their persecution exceeds it; for under her there were not more than two or three hundred put to death, whereas, under their persecution, above treble that number have been rifled, destroyed, and ruined in their estates, lives, and liberties, being (as is most remarkable) men for the most part of the same spirit with those Protestants who suffered under the prelates in queen Mary's time."²

This year died Mr. Benjamin Woodbridge, M. A., the ejected minister of Newbury. He was bred up in Magdalen-hall, Oxford; from thence he went to New England, and was the first graduate of the college there. On his return to England, he succeeded Dr. Twisse at Newbury, where he had a mighty reputation as a scholar, a preacher, a casuist, and a Christian. He was a great instrument of reducing the whole town to sobriety, and to family as well as public religion. Upon the Restoration, he was made one of the king's chaplains in ordinary, and preached once before him. He was one of the commissioners at the Savoy, and very desirous of an accommodation with the church-party. He was offered a canonry of Windsor, but refused it,

¹ Kennet's Chron. p. 601.

² Peirce, p. 259.

and afterward suffered many ways for his nonconformity, though he was generally respected and beloved by all who were judges of real worth. He had a sound judgment, and was a fine preacher, having a commanding voice and aspect. His temper was cheerful, and his behaviour obliging; he was exemplary for his moderation, and of considerable learning. When the five-mile act took place, he removed from Newbury to a small distance, where he preached as he had opportunity.¹ He was liberal to the poor, and in all respects a good and great man. He died at Inglefield, November 1, 1684, in a good old age, after he had been a minister in those parts almost forty years.

The sufferings of the Presbyterians in Scotland run parallel with those of England, during the whole course of this reign, but the people were not quite so tame and submissive;² the same or greater acts of severity, than those which were made against the Nonconformists in England, were enacted in Scotland. Episcopacy was restored May 8, 1662, and the covenant declared to be an unlawful oath. All persons in office were to sign a declaration of the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the king, or any commissioned by him, on any pretence whatsoever. The English act against conventicles was copied, and passed almost in the same terms in Scotland. The bishops were some of the worst of men, and hated by the people as they deserved, for their deportment was unbecoming their function, says bishop Burnet;³ some did not live within their dioceses, and those who did, seemed to take no care of them: they showed no zeal against vice; the most eminently vicious in the country were their peculiar confidants: nor had they any concern to keep their clergy to their duty, but were themselves guilty of levity, and great sensuality.

The people were generally of the Presbyterian persuasion, and stood firm by each other. In many places they were fierce and untractable, and generally forsook the churches; the whole country complained of the new episcopal clergy, as immoral, stupid, ignorant, and greedy of gain; and treated them with an aversion that sometimes proceeded to violence. Many were brought before the council, and ecclesiastical commission, for not coming to church; but the proofs were generally defective, for the people would not give evidence one against another. However, great numbers were cast into prison, and ill-used; some were fined; and the younger sort whipped publicly about the streets; so that great numbers transported their families to Ulster in Ireland, where they were well received.

The government observed no measures with this people, they exacted exorbitant fines for their not coming to church, and quartered soldiers upon

¹ Calamy, vol. 2. p. 956. Palmer's Non. Mem. vol. 1. p. 229.

² Burnet, vol. 1. p. 206–211.

³ Page 307. 309, 310.

them till they were ruined. The truth is, says Burnet,¹ the whole face of the government looked more like the proceedings of an inquisition, than of legal courts. At length, in the year 1666, sir James Turner being sent into the west to levy fines at discretion, the people rose up in arms, and published a manifesto, that they did not take arms against the king, but only that they might be delivered from the tyranny of the bishops, and that presbytery and the covenant might be set up, and their old ministers restored. Turner and all his soldiers were made prisoners, but marching out of their own country, they were dispersed by the king's forces, about forty being killed, and one hundred and thirty taken; many of whom were hanged before their own doors, and died with great firmness and joy.² Mr. Maccail their minister underwent the torture, and died with great constancy; his last words were, "Farewell sun, moon, and stars; farewell kindred and friends, world and time, and this weak and frail body; and welcome eternity, welcome angels and saints, welcome Saviour of the world, and God the judge of all!" which he spoke in such a manner as struck all who heard him. The commander of the king's forces killed some in cold blood, and threatened to spit others and roast them alive.

When the indulgence was published in England the Scots had the benefit of it, but when it was taken away the persecution revived, with inexpressible severity, under the administration of duke Lauderdale. Conventicles abounded in all parts of the country; the Presbyterian ministers preached in their own houses, to numbers of people that stood without doors to hear them; and when they were dispersed by the magistrates, they retreated into the fields with their ministers to hear the word of God; and to prevent being disturbed, carried arms sufficient for their defence. Upon which a very severe act was passed against house conventicles and field conventicles, declaring them treasonable; and the landlords, in whose grounds they were held, were to be severely fined, unless they discovered the persons present. But still this did not terrify the people, who met together in defiance of the law.³ Writs were issued against many who were called Cameronians, who were outlawed, and therefore left their houses, and travelled about the country, till at length they collected into a body, and declared that the king had forfeited the crown of that kingdom by renouncing the covenant; but the duke of Monmouth, being sent to disperse them, routed them at Bothwell-bridge, killing four hundred, and taking twelve hundred prisoners; two ministers were hanged, and two hundred banished to the plantations, who were all lost at sea.⁴ Cameron their preacher fell in

¹ Page 317.

² Burnet, vol. 1. p. 348.

³ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 64. 155. 182. 266. 268, 269.

⁴ P. 223, 224..

battle, but Hackston and Cargill, the two other preachers, died with invincible courage; as did all the rest, who were offered their lives if they would say, God bless the king! Hackston had both his hands cut off, which he suffered with a constancy and rapture that were truly amazing. When both his hands were cut off, he asked whether they would cut off his feet too? And notwithstanding all his loss of blood, after he was hanged, and his heart taken out of his body, it was alive upon the hangman's knife.

At length, says bishop Burnet,¹ things came to that extremity, that the people saw they must come to church or be undone: but they came in so awkward a manner, that it was visible they did not come to serve God, but to save their substance, for they were talking or sleeping during the whole service. This introduced a sort of atheism among the younger people. But the inquisition was so terrible, that numbers fled from their native country, and

settled in the plantations. These methods of conversion were subversive of Christianity, and a reproach to a Protestant church and nation; but oppression and tyranny had overspread the English dominions; the hearts of all good men failed them for fear, and for looking after those things that were coming on the land; the clouds were gathering thick over their heads, and there was no other defence against an inundation of Popery and slavery, but the thin security of the king's life.

To return to England: when the king had made way for a Popish successor, by introducing an arbitrary and tyrannical government, his majesty began to think himself neglected, all the court being made to the rising sun; upon which he was heard to say in some passion, that if he lived a month longer he would find a way to make himself easy for the remainder of his life.² This was interpreted as a design to change hands, by sending abroad the duke of York, and recalling the duke of Monmouth; which struck terror into the Popish party, and is thought to have hastened his death, for he was seized with a kind of apoplexy February 2, and died on the Friday following, February 6, 1684–5, in the fifty-fourth year of his age, not without violent suspicion of poison, either by snuff, or an infusion in broth, as bishop Burnet and others of undoubted credit have assured us, the body not being suffered to be thoroughly examined.³

King Charles II. was a gentleman of wit and good-nature,⁴ till his temper was soured in the latter part of his life by his Popish counsellors. His

¹ P. 341

² Wetwood's Mem. p. 123, sixth ed.

³ Burnet, vol. 2. p. 460.

⁴ Charles the Second, "as a gentleman (says Dr. Warner), was liked by everybody, but beloved by nobody, and as a prince, though he might be respected for his station, yet his death could not be lamented by a lover of his country, upon any other motive, but that it introduced a much worse monarch on the throne than he was himself." There was ground,

court was a scene of luxury and all kinds of lewdness, and his profuse expenses upon unlawful pleasures, reduced him to the necessity of becoming a pensioner of France. If he had any religion, it was that of a disguised Papist, or rather a Deist; but he was strangely entangled, during his whole life, with the obligations he had been brought under by the Roman Catholics. He aimed at being an absolute monarch, but would be at no farther trouble to accomplish it, than to give his corrupt ministry liberty to do what they pleased. The king had a great many vices, says Burnet,¹ but few virtues to correct them.²

Religion was with him no more than an engine of state. He hated the Nonconformists, because they appeared against the prerogative, and received the fire of all the enemies of the constitution and of the Protestant religion with an unshaken firmness. His majesty's chief concern at last was for his brother's succession; and when he came to die, he spoke not a word of religion, nor showed any remorse for his ill-spent life: he expressed no tenderness for his subjects, nor any concern for his queen, but only recommended his mistresses and their children to his brother's regard. So that no Englishman, or friend of his country, could weep at his death, from any other motive, than his keeping out a successor who was worse than himself.

in this view, for the remark of Dr. Gregory Sharpe; "that if the English were in tears, when the king died in 1685, it was more to lament the succession, than the funeral." *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 2. p. 929. Sharpe's *Introduction to Universal History*, p. 256. second ed.

To this it may be added, that Charles II. was characterised, as having never said a foolish thing nor done a wise one. A late writer of dramatical history, Mr. Thomas Davis, is supposed to have contradicted this by an anecdote he has given. Mrs. Marshall, the first actress on the king's theatre, and a woman of virtue, having been tricked into a sham marriage by a nobleman, king Charles II. obliged him to settle an annual income on her. This indicated equity of mind as well as wisdom. *Roscius Anglicanus*, p. 19. 24, in the *Literary Museum*, 8vo. printed 1792—Ed.

¹ Vol. 2. p. 165.

² Long since Mr. Neal's history was published, it has appeared that there was a design in the reign of Charles II. to place a bishop in Virginia; and that the letters patent for that purpose were actually made out, and are extant. The design failed, because the whole endowment was fixed on the customs. *Seeker's Letter to Mr. Horatio Walpole*, p. 17.—Ed.