

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.

PART V.

CHAPTER I.

FROM THE DEATH OF KING CHARLES II. TO KING JAMES II.'s DECLARATION
FOR LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

1685.

WHEN the news of king Charles's decease was spread over the city, a pensive sadness was visible in most countenances for the fate of the kingdom.¹ His brother James, who succeeded him, told the privy-council at his first meeting them, that "as he would never depart from any branch of the prerogative, so he would not invade any man's property, but would preserve the government as by law established in church and state."² Which gratified the clergy so much, that the pulpits throughout England resounded with thanksgivings; and a numerous set of addresses flattered his majesty, in the strongest expressions, with assurances of unshaken loyalty and obedience, without limitation or reserve. Among others was the humble address of the university of Oxford; in which, after expressing their sorrow for the death of the late king, they add,³ that they can never swerve from the principles of their institution, and their religion by law established, which indispensably binds them to bear faith and true obedience to their sovereign, without any limitation or restriction, and that no consideration whatever should shake their loyalty and allegiance. And the university of Cambridge add, that loy-

¹ Bishop Burnet says, that the proclamation of the king "was a heavy solemnity; few tears were shed for the former, nor were there any shouts of joy for the present king." It appears that the bishop, who was then abroad, was misinformed in this matter: for Dr. Calamy, who heard the king proclaimed, assures us, that his heart ached within him at the acclamations made upon the occasion; which, as far as he could observe, were very general: though he never saw so universal a concern as was visible in all men's countenances at that time: for great numbers had very terrifying apprehensions of what was to be expected. The doctor observes, that it however very sensibly discovered the changeableness of this world, that king James should so quietly succeed his brother without anything like a dispute or contest; when, but five years before, a majority of three houses of commons were so bent upon excluding him, that nothing could satisfy them, if this were not compassed. Calamy's Historical Account of his own Life, vol. 1. p. 95. MS.—ED.

² "This speech (bishop Burnet adds) was magnified as a security far greater than any that laws could give." The common phrase was, "We have now the word of a king, and a word never yet broken." Of this Dr. Calamy gives a confirmation on the authority of a person of character and worth, who heard Dr. Sharp, afterward archbishop of York, as he was preaching at St. Lawrence Jewry at the time, when king James gave this assurance, break out into language to this effect: "As to our religion, we have the word of the king, which (with reverence be it spoken) is as sacred as my text." This high flight was much noticed then, and often recollected afterward. The doctor had cause to reflect on it with regret: when he was, for preaching against Popery at his own parish-church of St. Giles, the first of the clergy that fell under the king's displeasure, and felt the weight and pressure of his arbitrary power. Historical Account, p. 96. Burnet, p. 620—ED.

³ Gazette, no. 2018.

alty [or unlimited obedience] is a duty flowing from the very principle of their religion, by which they have been enabled to breed up as true and steady subjects as the world can show, as well in doctrine as practice, from which they can never depart. The Quakers' address was more simple and honest;¹ "We are come," say they,² "to testify our sorrow for the death of our good friend Charles, and our joy for thy being made our governor. We are told thou art not of the persuasion of the church of England no more than we, therefore we hope thou wilt grant us the same liberty which thou allowest thyself; which doing, we wish thee all manner of happiness."³

The king began his reign with a frank and open profession of his religion; for, the first Sunday after his accession, he went publicly to mass, and obliged father Huddleston, who attended his brother in his last hours, to declare to the world that he died a Roman Catholic. His majesty acted the part of an absolute sovereign from the very first; and, though he had declared he would invade no man's property, yet he issued out a proclamation for collecting the duties of tonnage and poundage, &c., which were given to the late king only for life; and in his letter to the Scots parliament, which met March 28, he says, "I am resolved to maintain my power in its greatest lustre, that I may be better able to defend your religion against fanatics."

Before the king had been two months on his throne, he discovered severe resentments against the enemies of his religion, and of his succession to the crown.⁴ Dr. Oates was brought out of prison, and tried for perjury in the affair of the Popish plot, for which he was sentenced to stand in the pillory several times, to be whipped from Aldgate to Newgate, and from thence to Tyburn; which was exercised with a severity unknown to the English nation.⁵ And Dangerfield, who invented the Meal-tub plot, for

¹ Sewel, p. 594.

² Echard, p. 1051.

³ Mr. Neal refers, as one authority for giving this address of the Quakers, to Sewel; but it is not to be found there. A modern historian, who censures it for the "uncouthness and blunt familiarity of expression," calls it, "a fictitious address;" the members of this society, he observes, "were not in the custom of paying complimentary addresses to any man:" if the sufferings of their friends impelled them to apply to their superiors for relief, "their addresses, though expressed in their plain manner, were comprised in respectful terms; void of flattery, but not indecent; unceremonious, but not uncivil." There is no account of their being in the number of the congratulatory addresses on the accession of James. Their first application to him was to recommend their suffering friends to his clemency. At the death of Charles, notwithstanding that petition upon petition had been presented to him for relief, one thousand five hundred of this society were in prison on various prosecutions. "So that a people paying a strict regard to truth could hardly term him their good friend." The above address was first published by Echard, from whom it should seem Mr. Neal took it, trusting probably to the exactness of his reference; if he did quote Sewel for it., Hume and others have since published it. Gough's History of the Quakers, vol. 3. p. 160, 161.—ED.

⁴ Burnet, vol. 3. p. 29, Edin, edition.

⁵ Oates was whipped a second time, while his back was most miserably swelled with his first whipping, and looked as if it had been flayed. He was a man of undaunted resolu-

which he declared he had received money from the duke of York, was indicted for a libel, and was fined £500. He was also sentenced to be pilloried, and whipped from Newgate to Tyburn, and in his return home was murdered in the coach by one Frances, a barrister at law, who was afterwards hanged for it. The whigs, who went to court to pay their duty to the king, were received but coldly; some were reproached, and others denied access, especially those who had distinguished themselves for the bill of exclusion;¹ In the election of a new parliament, all methods of corruption and violence were used to get such members returned as might be supple to the king's arbitrary designs.² When the houses met, May 22, the king repeated what he had declared in council, that he would preserve the government in church and state as by law established; which, Rapin says, he never intended; for he insinuated in his speech, that he would not depend on the precarious aids of parliament, nor meet them often, if they did not use him well.³ But the parliament unanimously settled all the revenues of his late majesty upon the king for life, which amounted to more than two millions a

tion, and endured what would have killed a great many others. He was, in his religious profession, a mere Proteus, but appears to have been uniformly capable of villany. His first education was at Merchant-Tailor's school; from whence he removed to Cambridge. When he left that university he gained orders in the church of England, and after having officiated for a time as curate to his father, he held a vicarage first in Kent and then in Sussex. But previously to this, he was, in his youth, a member of a Baptist church in Virginia-street, Ratcliffe-Highway. In 1677 he reconciled himself to the church of Rome, and is reported to have entered into the society of Jesuits. After having left the whole body of dissenters for thirty years, he applied to be again admitted into the communion of the Baptists, having first returned to the church of England, and continued in it about sixteen years. The Baptists, through a prudent jealousy of him, spent almost three years in trial of his sincerity, before they received him again: so that he complained it "was keeping him on the rack; it was worse than death in his circumstances to be so long delayed." He was restored to their communion in 1698 or 1699, but in less than a year was again excluded as a disorderly person and a hypocrite. He then became a conformist again. "He was a man of some cunning (says Granger), more effrontery, and the most consummate falsehood." At one time he was a frequent auditor of Mr. Alsop at Westminster, after the Revolution: and moved for leave to come to the Lord's table, but was refused on account of his character. Crosby has detailed a long story of a villanous transaction, to ruin a gentleman, to which he was instigated by the spirit of revenge. Dr. Calamy says, "that he was but a very sorry foul-mouthed wretch, I myself can attest from what I once heard from him, when I was in his company." The parliament, after the Revolution, left him under a brand, and incapacitated him for being a witness in future. But a pension of £400 a year was given him by king William. "The era of Oates's plot (remarks Mr. Granger), was the grand era of whig and tory." Whatever infamy rests upon his name, he was, observes Dr. Calamy, the instrument of Providence of good to this nation by awakening it out of sleep, and giving a turn to the national affairs after a lethargy of some years. Calamy's *Historical Account of his own Life*, vol. 1. p. 98, 99. Granger's *History of England*, vol. 4. p. 201, 349; and Crosby's *History of the Baptists*, vol. 3. p. 166–182.—ED.

¹ Burnet, vol. 3. p. 12, 13. Edin, edition.

² Dr. Grey quotes here Echard and Carte, to prove that the new parliament consisted of as many worthy and great, rich, and wise men, as ever sat in the house. —ED.

³ Gazette, no. 2036.

year;¹ and presented an address, May 27, to desire him to issue forth his royal proclamation, to cause the penal laws to be put in execution against dissenters from the church of England.

This brought down the storm, and revived the persecution, which had slackened a little upon the late king's death. His majesty was now encouraged to pursue his brother's measures. The tories, who adhered firmly to the prerogative, were gratified with full licence to distress the dissenters, who were to be sacrificed over again to a bigoted clergy, and an incensed king, zealous for their destruction, says bishop Kennet, in order to unite and increase the strength of Popery, which he favoured without reserve. Upon this, all meeting-houses of Protestant dissenters were shut up, the old trade of informing revived and flourished; the spiritual courts were crowded with business: private conventicles were disturbed in all parts of the city and country. If they surprised the minister, he was pulled out of his pulpit by constables or soldiers, and, together with his people, carried before a confiding justice of peace, who obliged them to pay their fines, or dragged them to prison. If the minister escaped, they ransacked the house from top to bottom; tore down hangings, broke open chambers and closets; entered the rooms of those who were sick; and offered all kinds of rudeness and incivilities to the family, though they met with no manner of opposition or resistance. Shopkeepers were separated from their trades and business; and sometimes wives from their husbands and children; several families were obliged to remove to distant places, to avoid the direful effects of an excommunication from the commons; and great sums of money were levied as forfeitures, which had been earned by honest labour. Dissenting ministers could neither travel the road, nor appear in public but in disguise; nay, they were afraid to be seen in the houses of their friends, pursuivants from the spiritual courts being always abroad upon the watch.

One of the first who came into trouble was the reverend Mr. Baxter, who was committed to the King's-bench prison February 28, for some exceptionable passages in his paraphrase on the New Testament, reflecting on the order of diocesan bishops, and the lawfulness of resistance in some possible cases. The passages were in his paraphrase on Matt. v. 19. Mark ix. 39., xi. 31. and xii. 38–40. Luke x. 2. John xi. 57. and Acts xv. 2. They were collected by sir Roger l'Estrange; and a certain eminent clergyman, reported to be Dr. Sh——ck, put into the hands of his enemies some accu-

¹ "The commons, charmed with these promises, and bigoted as much to their principles of government as the king was to his religion, in about two hours voted him such an immense revenue for life, as enabled him to maintain a fleet and army without the aid of parliament, and consequently to subdue those who should dare to oppose his will. In this manner, and without any farther ceremony, did this house of commons deliver up the liberties of the nation to a Popish arbitrary prince." Warner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 631.—ED.

sations from Rom. xiii., that might touch his life, but no use was made of them. Mr. Baxter being ill, moved by his counsel for time; but Jefferies said, he would not give him a minute's time to save his life. "Yonder stands Oates in the pillory," says he, "and if Mr. Baxter stood on the other side, I would say, two of the greatest rogues in England stood there." He was brought to his trial May 30, but the chief-justice would not admit his counsel to plead for their client. When Mr. Baxter offered to speak for himself, Jefferies called him a snivelling, canting Presbyterian, and said, "Richard, Richard, don't thou think we will hear thee poison the court. Richard, thou art an old fellow, and an old knave; thou hast written books enough to load a cart, every one as full of sedition, I might say of treason, as an egg is full of meat; hadst thou been whipped out of thy writing trade forty years ago, it had been happy. Thou pretendest to be a preacher of the gospel of peace; as thou hast one foot in the grave, 'tis time for thee to begin to think what account thou intendest to give; but, leave thee to thyself, and I see thou wilt go on as thou hast begun; but, by the grace of God, I will look after thee. I know thou hast a mighty party, and I see a great many of the brotherhood in corners, waiting to see what will become of their mighty don, and a doctor of the party [doctor Bates] at your elbow, but by the grace of Almighty God, I will crush you all." The chief-justice having directed the jury, they found him guilty, without going from the bar, and fined him five hundred marks, to lay in prison till he paid it, and be bound to his good behaviour for seven years. Mr. Baxter continued in prison¹ about two years, and when the court changed its measures, his fine was remitted, and he was released.

¹ Dr. Grey has given us, with apparent approbation, what he calls a characteristical epitaph, drawn up for Mr. Baxter by the Rev. Thomas Long, prebendary of Exeter. It shows what different colours a character can receive, according to the dispositions of those who draw the picture; and how obnoxious Mr. Baxter was to some, whose calumnies and censure the reader perhaps will think was true praise. It runs thus: "Hie jacet Ricardus Baxter, theoilogus armatus, Loyolita reformatus, heresiarcha rerianus, schismaticorum antesignanus; cujus pruritus disputandi peperit, scriptandi cacoethes nutrit, prædicandi zelus intemperatus maturavit, ecclesie scabiem. Qui dissentit ab iis quibuscum consentit maximè: turn sibi, cum aliis noncouformis prseteritis, praesentibus et futuris: regum et episcoporum juratus hostis: ipsumq; rebellium solemne foedus. Qui natus erat per septuaginti annos, et octoginta libros, ad perturbandas regni respublicas, et ad bis perdendam ecclesiam Anglicanam; magnis tamen excidit ausis. Deo gratias." Grey's Examination, vol. 2. p. 281, note.—ED.*

* "These words (says the author of the article, Baxter, in the Biographia Britannica) are an allusion to sir Henry Wotton's monumental inscription in Eton chapel, 'Hie jacet hujus sententise primus author, disputandi pruritus ecclesiarum scabies;' i. e. 'Here lies the first author of this opinion, The itch of disputing is the leprosy of the churches.' "This writer has given the above epitaph in English, thus: "Here lies Richard Baxter, a militant divine, a reformed Jesuit, a brazen heresiarch, and the chief of schismatics, whose itch of disputing begat, whose humour of writing nourished, and whose intemperate zeal in preaching

The rebellion of the duke of Monmouth furnished the court with a plausible handle to carry the prosecution of the whigs and dissenters to a farther extremity. There was a considerable number of English fugitives in Holland at this time, some on political accounts, and others on the score of religion. The king, being apprehensive of danger from thence, obliged the prince of Orange to dismiss the Duke of Monmouth from his court, and to break all those officers who had waited upon him, and who were in his service: this precipitated the counsels of the malecontents, and made them resolve upon a rash and ill-concerted invasion, which proved their ruin. The earl of Argyle, imagining all the Scots Presbyterians would revolt, sailed to the north of Scotland with a very small force, and was defeated with the effusion of very little blood, before the declaration¹ which he brought with him could have any effect. After him the Duke of Monmouth, with the like precipitate rashness, landed June 11, with an inconsiderable force at Lyme in Dorsetshire; and though he was joined by great numbers in the west country, he was defeated by the king's forces, made prisoner, and executed on Tower-hill; as was the earl of Argyle at Edinburgh.

Though the body of the dissenters were not concerned in either of these invasions, they suffered considerably on this occasion. Great numbers of their chief merchants and tradesmen in the city, being taken up by warrants, and secured in jails, and in the public halls; as were many country whig gentlemen, in York-castle, Hull, and the prisons in all parts of England, which had this good effect, that it kept them out of harm's way, while many of their friends were ruined by joining the duke; some from a persuasion that the late king was married to his mother; and others in hopes of a deliverance from Popery and arbitrary power.

The king, elated with success, resolved to let both whigs and dissenters feel the weight of the arm of a conqueror: his army lived upon free-quarters

brought to its utmost height, the leprosy of the church: who dissented from those with whom he most agreed from himself, as well as all other nonconformists, past, present, and to come; the sworn enemy of kings and bishops, and in himself the very bond of rebels: who was born, through seventy years and eighty books, to disturb the peace of the kingdom, and twice to attempt the ruin of the church of England: in the endeavour of which mighty mischiefs he fell short. For which thanks be to God." *Biographia Britannica*, vol. 2. p. 18, second edition—ED.

¹ A full view of the assertions and purport of the duke of Monmouth's manifesto is given in my *History of the Town of Taunton*, p. 133—135. It was secretly printed in a private house hired for that purpose at Lambeth by W. C., a man of good sense and spirit, and a stationer in Paternoster-row; who imported the paper. His assistant at the press was apprehended and suffered: he himself escaped into Holland, and absconded into Germany, till he came over with the prince of Orange, who, when he was settled on the throne, appointed him his stationer. William Disney, esq. was tried by a special commission upon an indictment of high-treason, for printing and publishing this declaration, and was convicted, and sentenced to be drawn, hanged, and quartered. *Dr. Grey's Examination*, vol. 3. p. 403—404.—ED.

in the west, and treated all who were supposed to be disaffected with great rudeness and violence.¹ Some days after Monmouth's defeat, colonel Kirk ordered several of the prisoners to be hung up at Taunton, without any trial or form of law, while he and his company was dancing, revelling, and drinking healths, at a neighbouring window, with a variety of music, from whence they beheld, with a more than brutish triumph, the dreadful spectacle. The jails being full of prisoners, the king appointed lord-chief-justice Jefferies to go the western circuit whose cruel behaviour surpassed all that had been ever heard of in a civilized nation: he was always drunk, either with wine or vengeance. When the juries found persons not guilty, he threatened and confined them, till they brought in a verdict to his mind; as in the case of the old lady Lisle, who was beheaded, for admitting Mr. Hicks, a Nonconformist minister, into her house, though the jury brought her in three times not guilty; and she solemnly declared, that she knew not that he had been in the duke's army. He persuaded many of the prisoners to plead guilty, in hopes of favour, and then taking advantage of their confession, ordered their immediate execution, without giving them a minute's time to say their prayers. Mr. Tutchin, who wrote the *Observator*, was sentenced to be imprisoned seven years, and to be whipped once every year through all the towns in Dorsetshire; upon which he petitioned the king that he might be hanged.² Bishop Burnet says, that in several places in the west, there were executed near six hundred persons, and that the quarters of two or three hundred were fixed upon gibbets, and hung upon trees all over the country for fifty or sixty miles about, to the terror and even annoyance of travellers. The manner in which he treated the prisoners, was barbarous and inhuman; and his behaviour towards some of the nobility and gentry who were well affected, but appeared to the character of some of the criminals, would have amazed one, says bishop Burnet, if done by a bashaw in Turkey. The king had advice of his proceedings every day, and spoke of them in a style neither becoming the majesty nor mercy of a great prince.³ And Jefferies, besides satiating himself with blood, got great sums of money, by selling pardons to such as were able to purchase them, from £10 to fourteen thousand guineas apiece.⁴

After the executions in the west, the king, being in the height of his power, resolved to be revenged of his old enemies the whigs, by making examples of their chief leaders: alderman Cornish, who had signalized himself in prosecuting the Popish plot, and was frequently in company with the

¹ Burnet, vol. 3. p. 43, Edin, edition.

² Bennet's *Memoirs*, p. 374, 375, second edit

³ *Ibid.* p. 44, second edit.

⁴ The reader is referred to the *History of the Town of Taunton* for an ample account of the progress and defeat of the duke of Monmouth, and a minute detail of the subsequent severities of Kirk and Jefferies, p. 135–170.—ED.

late lord Russel, was taken off the Exchange October 13, and within little more than a week tried, condemned, and executed, in Cheapside, for high-treason, without any tolerable evidence, and his quarters set upon Guildhall. On the same day Mrs. Gaunt, a dissenter, who spent a great part of her life in acts of charity, visiting the jails, and looking after the poor of what persuasion soever, having entertained Burton, one of Monmouth's men, in her house, he, by an unheard-of baseness, while she was looking out for an opportunity to send him out of the kingdom, went out and accused her for harbouring him, and by that means saved his own life by taking away hers: she was burnt alive at Tyburn, and died with great resolution and devotion.¹ Mr. Bateman a surgeon, Mr. Rouse, Mr. Fernerley, colonel Aylofffe, Mr. Nelthorpe, and others, suffered in like manner. Lord Stamford was admitted to bail, and lord Delamere was tried by his peers, and acquitted. Many who had corresponded with the duke of Monmouth absconded, and had proclamations against them, as John Trenchard, esq. Mr. Speke, and others. But all who suffered in this cause expressed such a zeal for the Protestant religion, which they apprehended in danger, as made great impressions on the spectators. Some say the king was hurried on by Jefferies; but if his own inclinations had not run strong the same way, and if his priests had not thought it their interest to take off so many active Protestants who opposed their measures, they would not have let that butcher loose, says Burnet, to commit so many barbarous acts of cruelty, as struck a universal horror over the body of the nation. It was a bloody summer, and a dangerous time for honest men to live in.

When the king met his parliament November 9, he congratulated them on the success of his arms; but told them, that in order to prevent any new disturbances, he was determined to keep the present army together; and "let no man (says his majesty) take exceptions that some officers are not qualified, for they are most of them known to me for the loyalty of their principles and practices; and therefore to deal plainly with you, after having had the benefit of their services in a time of need and danger, I will neither expose them to disgrace, nor myself to the want of them."²—Thus we were to have a standing army under Popish officers, in defiance of the penal laws and test. The commons would have given them an act of indemnity for what was past, but the king would not accept it; and because the house was not disposed to his dispensing power, he prorogued them November 20, when they had sat only eleven days; and after many successive prorogations, in the space of two years, dissolved them.³

¹ Burnet, p. 45.

² Gazette, 2085.

³ Burnet, p. 70, 71.

The prosecution of the dissenters, which was carried on with all imaginable severity this and the last year, forced some of their ministers into the church; but it had a different and more surprising influence upon others, who had the courage in these difficult times, to renounce the church as a persecuting establishment, and to take their lot among the Nonconformists;¹ as the reverend Mr. John Spademan, M.A. of Swayton in Lincolnshire; Mr. John Rastrick, vicar of Kirton near Boston; Mr. Burroughs of Frampton; Mr. Scoffin of Brotherton; Mr. Quip of Moreton; and a few others; who could be influenced by no other principle but conscience in a cause which had nothing in this world to recommend it but truth, attended with bonds and imprisonment, and the loss of all things.

Great were the oppressions of those who frequented the separate meetings in several counties; the informers broke in upon sir John Hartoppe, Mr. Fleetwood, and others, at Stoke-Newington, to levy distresses for conventicles, to the value of £6,000 or £7,000: the like at Enfield, Hackney, and all the neighbouring villages near London.² The justices and confiding clergy were equally diligent in their several parishes. Injunctions were sent out from several of the bishops, under the seal of their offices, requiring all church-wardens to present such as did not repair to church, nor receive the sacrament at Easter; which were read publicly in the churches of Hertfordshire, Essex, &c. And the juries at the assizes gave it as their opinion, that the dissenters should be effectually prosecuted; but the scandalous villanies and perjuries of the informers made wise men abhor the trade; however, so terrible were the times, that many families and ministers removed with their effects to New-England, and other plantations in America; among whom we may reckon the reverend and worthy Mr. Samuel Lee, the ejected minister of Bishopgate, who in his return to his flock, after the Revolution, was made prisoner by the French, and carried to St. Maloes, where he perished in a dungeon, under the hands of those whose tender mercies are cruel.³ Many ministers were fined and imprisoned, and great numbers of their most substantial hearers cited into the commons, their names being fixed upon the doors of their parish-churches; and if they did not appear, an excommunication and a *capias* followed, unless they found means, by presents of wine, by gold in the fingers of a pair of gloves, or some effectual bribe, to get themselves excused; for which, among others, the name of Dr. Pinfold⁴ is famous to this day.

¹ Calamy's Abridgment, p. 460, &c.

² Calamy, p. 372, 373; or Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, vol. 2. p. 163–168.

³ Palmer's Noncon. Mem. vol. 1. p. 95, 96.

⁴ Dr. Pinfold was a gentleman of the long robe, and was the king's advocate in the prosecution of bishop Compton. But though he stood at the chancellor's elbow and took notes, while the ⁴bishop's counsel were pleading, he said nothing by way of reply. Bishop Compton's Life, p. 37.—ED.

The dissenters continued to take the most prudent measures to cover their private meetings from their adversaries. They assembled in small numbers—they frequently shifted their places of worship, and met together late in the evenings, or early in the mornings—there were friends without doors, always on the watch to give notice of approaching danger—when the dwellings of dissenters joined, they made windows or holes in the walls, that the preacher's voice might be heard in two or three houses—they had sometimes private passages from one house to another, and trap doors for the escape of the minister, who went always in disguise, except when he was discharging his office—in country-towns and villages, they were admitted through backyards and gardens into the house, to avoid the observation of neighbours and passengers—for the same reason they never sung psalms—and the minister was placed in such an inward part of the house, that his voice might not be heard in the streets—the doors were always locked, and a sentinel placed near them to give the alarm, that the preacher might escape by some private passage, with as many of the congregation as could avoid the informers. But notwithstanding all their precautions, spies and false brethren crept in among them in disguise, their assemblies were frequently interrupted, and great sums of money raised by fines or compositions, to the discouragement of trade and industry, and enriching the officers of the spiritual courts.

Thus were the Nonconformists ground between the Papists on the one hand, and the high-church clergy on the other; while the former made their advantage of the latter, concluding, that when the dissenters were destroyed, or thoroughly exasperated, and the clergy divided among themselves, they should be a match for the hierarchy, and capable of establishing that religion they had been so long aiming to introduce. With this view, swarms of Jesuits and regular priests were sent for from abroad; Jesuits' schools, and other seminaries, were opened in London and the country; mass-houses were erected in the most considerable towns; four Roman-Catholic bishops were consecrated in the royal chapel, and exercised their functions under the character of vicars apostolical; their regular clergy appeared at Whitehall and St. James's in their habits, and were unwearied in their attempts to seduce the common people. The way to preferment was to be a Catholic, or to declare for the prerogative; all state affairs being managed by such men. An open correspondence was held with Rome and many pamphlets were dispersed, to

make proselytes to the Romish faith, or at least to effect a coalition. Multitudes of the king's subjects frequented the Popish chapels; some changed their profession; and all men were forbid to speak disrespectfully of the king's religion.

At length the eyes of many of the clergy began to be opened, and they judged it necessary to preach against the Popish doctrines, that they might recover the people who were deserting in numbers, and rescue the Protestant religion from the danger into which their own follies had brought it. The king being acquainted with this, by the advice of his priests sent circular letters to the bishops, with an order, prohibiting the inferior clergy from preaching on the controverted points of religion; which many complained of, though it was no more than king James and Charles I. had done before. However, when their mouths were stopped in the pulpit, some of the most learned and zealous agreed to fight the Catholics with their own weapons, and to publish small pamphlets for the benefit of the vulgar, in defence of the Protestant doctrines. When a Popish pamphlet was in the press, they made interest with the workmen, and got the sheets as they were wrought off, so that an answer was ready as soon as the pamphlet was published. There was hardly a week in which some sermon or small treatise against Popery was not printed and dispersed among the common people; which, in the compass of a year or two, produced a valuable set of controversial writings against the errors of that church.¹ The chief writers were, Dr. Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Tenison, Patrick, Wake, Whitby, Sharp, Atterbury, Williams, Aldrich, Burnet, Fowler, &c,² men of great name and renown, who gained immortal honour, and were afterward advanced to the highest dignities in the church. Never was a bad cause more weakly managed by the Papists, nor a more complete victory obtained by the Protestants.

But the church-party, not content with their triumph, have of late censured the Nonconformists, for appearing only as spectators, and not joining them in the combat.³ But how could the clergy expect this from a set of men whom they had been persecuting for above twenty years, and who had the yoke of oppression still lying on their necks? Had not the Nonconformists been beforehand with them in their morning exercises against Popery? And did not Dr. Owen, Mr. Pool, Baxter, Clarkson, and others, write against the errors of the church of Rome, throughout the whole reign of king Charles II.? Had not the Nonconformists stood in the gap, and exposed themselves sufficiently to the resentments of the Papists, for refusing to come into their measures for a universal toleration, in which they might have been included? Besides, the poor ministers were hardly crept out of corners, their papers had been rifled, and their books sold or secreted, to

¹ A vast collection of these pieces was published about fifty years ago, in three volumes folio, under the direction of Dr. Gibson, bishop of London. But this contained only a part of the tracts written by the Protestants: and even the catalogues of them drawn up by Dr. Wake, Dr. Gee, and Mr. Francis Peck, were defective in the titles of them. Birch's *Life of Archbishop Tillotson*, p. 127.—ED.

² Burnet, vol. 3. p. 79, 80. Edin. edit.

³ Calamy, p. 373; and Peirce's *Vindication*, p. 266.

avoid seizure; they had little time to study, and therefore might not be so well prepared for the argument as those who had lived in ease and security. Farther, the church-party was most nearly concerned, the Nonconformists having nothing to lose, whereas all the emoluments of the church, were at stake; and after all, some of the dissenters did write; and, if we may believe Dr. Calamy, Mr. Baxter, and others, their tracts being thought too warm, were refused to be licensed.¹ Upon the whole, bishop Burnet wisely observes,² that as the dissenters would not engage on the side of Popery and the prerogative, nor appear for taking off the tests in the present circumstances; so, on the other hand, they were unwilling to provoke the king, who had lately given them hopes of liberty, lest he should make up matters upon any terms with the church-party, at their expense; nor would they provoke the church-party, or by any ill behaviour drive them into a reconciliation with the court; therefore they resolved to let the points of controversy alone, and leave them to the management of the clergy, who had a legal bottom to support them.

The clergy's writing thus warmly against Popery broke all measures between the king and the church of England, and made each party court that body of men for their auxiliaries, whom they had been persecuting and destroying for so many years. His majesty now resolved to introduce a universal toleration in despite of the church, and at their expense.³ The cruelty of the church of England was his common subject of discourse; he reproached them for their violent persecutions of the dissenters, and said he had intended to set on foot a toleration sooner, but that he was restrained by some of them who had treated with him, and had undertaken to show favour to the Papists, provided they might be still suffered to vex the dissenters; and he named the very men, though they thought fit afterward to deny it: how far the fact is probable must be left with the reader.

¹ A licence was refused to a discourse against the whole system of Popery, drawn up by the learned Mr. Jonathan Hanmer, who was ejected from Bishops-Tawton, in Devon. A discourse against transubstantiation, written by Mr. Henry Pendlebury, ejected from Holcomb chapel in Lancashire, and afterward published by archbishop Tillotson, met with the like refusal. An offer that Mr. Baxter would produce a piece against Popery every month, if a licence might be had, was rejected with scorn. And Mr. Jane, the bishop of London's chaplain, denied his sanction to a piece he actually drew up on the church's visibility. But in opposition to what Mr. Neal says above concerning this point, Dr. Grey, it is but justice to observe, gives us letters from Dr. Isham, Dr. Alston, Dr. Batteley, and Mr. Needham, licensers of the press, declaring that they never refused to licence a book, because written by a dissenter; and that they did not recollect that any tract, of which a dissenter was the author, was brought to them for their sanction. As to Mr. Baxter in particular, Dr. Isham avers, that he never obstructed his writing against Popery, but licensed one of his books: "and if he had prepared anything against the common enemy (says Dr. Isham), without striking obliquely at our church, I would certainly have forwarded them from the press." It is to be added, that one piece from the pen of Mr. Hanmer had the *imprimatur* of Dr. Jane. These authorities appear to contradict each other: but it is, probably, not only a candid, but just method of reconciling them, and preserving our opinion of the veracity of both parties, to suppose that the tracts to which a licence was refused, were not offered to the gentlemen whose letters Dr. Grey quotes: but to Dr. Jane or other licensers, with whose declarations we are not furnished. Bennet's Memorial, p. 399, 400, second edition. Baxter's History of his own Life, part 3, p. 183, folio. Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, vol. I. p. 342. Dr. Grey, vol. 2. p. 424—432. The matter was, I understand, discussed by Mr. Tong, in his defence of Mr. Henry's Notion of Schism.—ED.

² P. 121, 122.

³ Burnet, p. 140.

It being thought impracticable to obtain a legal toleration in the present circumstances of the nation, his majesty determined to attempt it by the dispensing power; for this purpose sir Edward Hales, a Popish gentleman of Kent, was brought to trial for breaking through the test-act, when sir Edward Herbert, lord chief-justice, gave judgment in his favour, and declared the powers of the crown to be absolute.¹ The other judges were closeted, and such displaced as were of a different sentiment; and the king being resolved to have twelve judges of his own opinion,² four had their quietus, and as many new ones were advanced, from whom the king exacted a promise to support the prerogative in all its branches. There was a new call of Serjeants, who gave rings with this motto, DEUS, REX, LEX, God, the king, and the law; the king being placed before the law. The privy-council was new modelled, and several declared Papists admitted into it; two confiding clergymen were promoted to bishoprics. Parker to Oxford, and Cartwright to Chester. Many pamphlets were written and dispersed in favour of liberty of conscience; and sir Roger L'Estrange, with other mercenary writers, were employed to maintain, that a power in the king to dispense with the laws, is law.³ But the opinion of private writers not being thought sufficient, it was resolved to have the determination of the judges, who all, except one, gave it as their opinion; 1. That the laws of England were the king's laws. 2. That it is an inseparable branch of the prerogative of the kings of England, as of all other sovereign princes, to dispense with all penal laws in particular cases, and on particular occasions. 3. That of these reasons and necessity the king is sole judge. 4. That this is not a trust now invested in, and granted to, the present king, but the ancient remains of the sovereign power of the kings of England, which was never yet taken from them, nor can be. Thus the laws of England were given up at once into the hands of the king, by a solemn determination of the judges.

This point being secured, his majesty began to caress the Nonconformists. "All on a sudden (says bishop Burnet⁴) the churchmen were disgraced, and the dissenters in high favour. Lord-chief-justice Herbert went the western circuit after Jefferies, who was now made lord-chancellor, and all was grace and favour to them: their former sufferings were much reflected upon and pitied; everything was offered that might alleviate them; their ministers were encouraged to set up their conventicles, which had been discontinued, or held very secretly, for four or five years; intimations were given every-

¹ Ibid. p. 73, 74.

² Lord-chief-justice Jones, one of the displaced judges, upon his dismissal, observed to the king, "that he was by no means sorry that he was laid aside, old and worn out as he was in his service; but concerned that his majesty should expect such a construction of the law from him as he could not honestly give; and that none but indigent, ignorant, or ambitious men would give their judgment as he expected." To this the king replied, "It was necessary his judges should be all of one mind." *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*, p. 233.—ED.

³ Welwood's *Memoirs*, p. 194.

⁴ p. 78.

where, that the king would not have them or their meetings disturbed.”¹ A dispensation or licence-office was set up, where all who applied might have an indulgence, paying only 50s. for themselves and their families. Many who had been prosecuted for conventicles, took out those licences, which not only stopped all processes that were commenced, but gave them liberty to go publicly to meetings for the future. “Upon this (says the same reverend prelate) some of the dissenters grew insolent, but wiser men among them perceived the design of the Papists was now to set on the dissenters against the church; and therefore, though they returned to their conventicles, yet they had a just jealousy of the ill designs that lay hid, under all this sudden and unexpected show of grace and kindness, and they took care not to provoke the church-party.” But where then were the understandings of the high-church clergy, during the whole reign of king Charles II., while they were pursuing the Nonconformists and their families to destruction, for a long course of years? Did they not perceive the design of the Papists? Or were they not willing rather to court them, at the expense of the whole body of dissenting Protestants? Bishop Laud’s scheme of uniting with the Papists, and meeting them half way, was never out of their sight; however, when the reader calls to mind the oppression and cruelties that the conscientious Nonconformists underwent from the high-church party for twenty-five years, he will be ready to conclude they deserved no regard, if the Protestant religion itself had not been at stake.

Thus the all-wise providence of God put a period to the prosecution of the Protestant dissenters from the penal laws; though the laws themselves were not legally repealed, or suspended, till after the revolution of king William and queen Mary. It may not therefore be improper to give the reader a summary view of their usage in this and the last reign, and of the damages they sustained in their persons, families, and fortunes.

The Quakers, in their petition to king James² the last year, inform his majesty, that of late above one thousand five hundred of their friends were in prison, both men and women; and that now there remain one thousand three hundred and eighty-three, of which two hundred are women; many under sentence of pre-munire; and more than three hundred near it, for refusing the oath of allegiance because they could not swear.³—Above three hundred and fifty have died in prison since the year 1660, near one hundred

¹ King James, previously to his adopting these conciliating measures with the dissenters, such was his art and duplicity, had tried all the methods he could think of to bring the church into his designs: and twice offered, it was said, to make a sacrifice of all the dissenters in the kingdom to them, if they would but have complied with him: but failing in this attempt, he faced about to the Nonconformists. Calamy’s History of his own Life, vol. 1. p. 170, MS.—ED.

² It was addressed not to king James only, but to both houses of parliament. They made also an application to the king alone; recommending to his princely clemency the case of their suffering friends. Sewel, p. 592. This was not so copious a state of their case as the petition to which Mr. Neal refers, and is called by Gough their first address. Vol. 3. p. 162; and the Index under the word Address.—ED.

³ Sewel, p. 588. 593.

of which since the year 1680.—In London, the jail of Newgate has been crowded within these two years, sometimes with near twenty in a room, whereby several have been suffocated, and others, who have been taken out sick, have died of malignant fevers within a few days;—great violences, outrageous distresses, and woful havoc and spoil, have been made on people’s goods and estates, by a company of idle, extravagant, and merciless informers, by prosecutions on the conventicle-act, and others, as may be seen in the margin.¹ Also on *qui tarn* writs, and on other processes, for £20 a month; and two-thirds of their estates seized for the king:—some had not a bed left to rest upon; others had no cattle to till the ground, nor corn for seed or bread, nor tools to work with: the said informers and bailiffs in some places breaking into houses, and making great waste and spoil, under pretence of serving the king and the church.—Our religious assemblies have been charged at common law with being riotous routs, and disturbances of the peace, whereby great numbers have been confined in prisons, without regard to age or sex; and many in holes and dungeons:—the seizures for £20 a month have amounted to several thousand pounds: sometimes they have seized for eleven months at once, and made sale of all goods and chattels both within doors and without, for payment;— several who have employed some hundreds of poor families in manufacture, are by those writs and seizures disabled, as well as by long imprisonment; one in particular, who employed two hundred people in the woollen manufacture.—Many informers, and especially impudent women, whose husbands are in prison, swear for their share of the profit of the seizures—the fines upon one justice’s warrant have amounted to many hundred pounds; frequently £10 a warrant, and five warrants together for £50 to one man; and for nonpayment, all his goods carried away in about ten cart-loads. They spare neither widows, nor fatherless, nor poor families; nor leave them so much as a bed to lie upon:—thus the informers are both witnesses and par-

¹ The acts or penal laws on which they suffered were these:

Some few suffered on 27 Henry VIII. cap. 20.

Others on 1 Eliz. cap. 2, for twelve-pence a Sunday.

5 Eliz. cap. 23, *de excommu. capiendo*.

23 Eliz. cap. 1, for 20l. a month.

29 Eliz. cap. 6, for more speedy and due execution of last statute.

35 Eliz. cap. 1, for abjuring the realm on pain of death.

3 King James I. cap. 4. for better discovering and suppressing Popish recusants. 13th and 14th of King Charles II. against Quakers, &c. transportation.

17 Charles II. cap. 2, against Nonconformists.

22 King Charles II. cap. 1, against seditious conventicles.

N. B. The Quakers were not much affected with the corporation and test acts, because they would not take an oath;

Nor with the Oxford five-mile act, which cut the others to pieces.

ties, to the ruin of great numbers of sober families; and justices of peace have been threatened with the forfeiture of £100, if they do not issue out warrants upon their informations.—With this petition, they presented to the king and parliament a list of their friends in prison in the several counties, amounting to one thousand four hundred and sixty.

But it is impossible to make an exact computation of the number of sufferers, or estimate of the damages his majesty's dissenting subjects of the several denominations sustained, by the prosecutions of this and the last reign; how many families were impoverished, and reduced to beggary; how many lives were lost in prisons and noisome gaols; how many ministers were divorced from their people, and forced to live as they could, five miles from a corporation: how many industrious and laborious tradesmen were cut off from their trades; and their substance and household goods plundered by soldiers, or divided among idle and infamous informers. The vexatious suits of the commons, and the expenses of those courts, were immense.

The writer of the preface of Mr. Delaune's Plea for the Nonconformists, says,¹ that Delaune was one of near eight thousand Protestant dissenters, who had perished in prison in the reign of king Charles II., and that merely for dissenting from the church in some points which they were able to give good reason for; and yet for no other cause, says he, were they stifled, I had almost said, murdered in gaols. As for the severe penalties inflicted on them, for seditious and riotous assemblies, designed only for the worship of God, he adds, that they suffered in their trades and estates, within the compass of three years, at least £2,000,000; and doubts, whether in all the times since the Reformation, including the reign of queen Mary, there can be produced anything like such a number of Christians who have suffered death; and such numbers who have lost their substance for religion. Another writer adds,² that Mr. Jeremy White had carefully collected a list of the dissenting sufferers, and of their sufferings: and had the names of sixty thousand persons who had suffered on a religious account, between the restoration of king Charles II. and the revolution of king William; five thousand of whom died in prison. That Mr. White told lord Dorset, that king James had offered him a thousand guineas for the manuscript, but that he refused all invitations and rewards, and concealed the black record, that it might not appear to the disreputation of the church of England, for which some of the clergy sent him their thanks, and offered him an acknowledgment, which he generously refused. The reader will form his own judgment of the truth of these facts. It is certain, that besides those who suffered in

¹ Preface to Delaune's Pita, p. 5,

² History of the Stuarts, p. 715.

their own country, great numbers retired to the plantations of New-England, Pennsylvania, and other parts of America. Many transported themselves and their effects into Holland,¹ and filled the English churches of Amsterdam, the Hague, Utrecht, Leyden, Rotterdam, and other parts. If we admit the dissenting families of the several denominations in England, to be one hundred and fifty thousand, and that each family suffered no more than the loss of £3 or £4 per annum, from the act of uniformity, the whole will amount to twelve or fourteen millions; a prodigious sum for those times! But these are only conjectures; the damage to the trade and property of the nation was undoubtedly immense; and the wounds that were made in the estates of private families were deep and large; many of whom, to my certain knowledge, wear the scars of them to this day.

When the Protestant dissenters rose up into public view as a distinct body, their long sufferings had not very much diminished their numbers; which, though not to be compared with those of the establishment, or the tories and Roman Catholics, were yet so considerable, as to be capable of turning the scale on either side, according as they should throw in their weight, which might possibly be owing, amongst others, to the following reasons:

1. To their firmness and constancy in a long course of suffering, which convinced the world, that they were not actuated by humour, but conscience.

2. To their doctrine and manner of preaching, which was plain and practical, accompanied with a warm and awakening address to the conscience. Their doctrines were those of the first reformers, which were grown out of fashion in the church; and their way of worship was simple and plain; without the ornament of rites and ceremonies.

3. To the severity of their morals, at a time when the nation was sunk into all kinds of vice and luxury, from which they preserved themselves in a great measure untainted. Their conversation was sober and virtuous. They observed the Lord's day with religious strictness, and had a universal reputation for justice and integrity in their dealings.

4. To the careful and strict education of their children, whom they impressed with an early sense of scriptural religion, and educated in their own way, as they had opportunity, under private schoolmasters of their own principles.

¹ Among these were Mr. Howe, Mr. Shower, Mr. Nat. Taylor, Mr. Papillon, sir John Thompson (afterward lord Haversham), sir John Guise, and sir Patience Ward. The states of Holland treated the English refugees with particular respect. But as it has been pertinently observed, it was a reproach to this nation, that, in particular, so excellent a person as Mr. Howe, whose unaffected piety, polite and profound learning, and most sweet, ingenuous, and gentle temper, entitled him to the esteem of the greatest and best men in the land of all persuasions; that such a one at that time could not have a safe and quiet habitation in his native country. Tong's Life of Shower, p. 51.—ED.

5. To a concern for a succession of able and learned ministers; for which purpose they encouraged private academies in several parts of the kingdom; and it is remarkable that many gentlemen and substantial citizens devoted their children to the ministry, at a time when they had nothing in view but worldly discouragements.

6. To the persecuting zeal of the high-church party, attended with an uncommon licentiousness of manners. If their zeal against the Nonconformists had produced a greater sanctity of life, and severity of morals, amongst themselves, it had been less offensive; but to see men destitute of common virtue signing warrants of distress upon their neighbours, only for worshipping God peaceably at a separate meeting, when they themselves hardly worshipped God at all; made some apprehend there was nothing at all in religion, and others resolve to take their lot with a more sober people.

Finally, To the spirit and principles of toryism, which began to appear ruinous to the nation. The old English constitution was in a manner lost, while the church and prerogative had been trampling on the dissenters, who had stood firm to it for twenty years, in the midst of reproaches and sufferings. This was the consequence of tory measures; and Popery being now coming in at the gap they had made, the most resolved Protestants saw their error, entertained a favourable opinion of the dissenters, and many of them joined their congregations.

To return to the history. The dissenters being now easy, it was resolved to turn the artillery of the prerogative against the church, and make them feel a little of the smart they had given others; the king and his priests were thoroughly enraged with their opposition to the court, and therefore appointed commissioners throughout England to inquire, what money had been raised; or what goods had been seized by distress on dissenters, on prosecutions for recusancy, and not brought to account in the exchequer. In the Gazette of March 5, 1687, it is advertised, that the commissioners appointed to examine into the losses of the dissenters and recusants, within the several counties of Gloucester, Worcester, and Monmouth, were to hold their sessions for the said counties at the places therein mentioned. Others were appointed for the counties of Middlesex, Essex, &c. to inquire what money or goods had been taken or received for any matters relating to religion since September 29, 1677, in any of the counties for which they were named. They were to return the names of all persons who had seized goods, or received money. The parties themselves, if alive, were obliged to appear, and give an account; and if dead, their representatives were to appear before the commissioners for them. This struck terror into the whole tribe of informers, the confiding justices, and others, who expected now to be ruined; but, says Dr. Calamy, the Protestant dissenters generously refused to appear against their enemies, upon assurances given by leading persons,

both clergy and laity, that no such methods should be used for the future. Had this inquiry proceeded, and the dissenters universally come into it, a black and fraudulent scene would have been opened, which now will be concealed. Bishop Burnet says, "The king ordered them to inquire into all vexatious suits into which the dissenters had been brought in the spiritual courts, and into all the compositions they had been forced to make to redeem themselves from farther trouble, which, as was said, would have brought to light a scandalous discovery of all the ill practices of those courts; for the use that many who belong to those courts had made of the laws with relation to dissenters, was, to draw presents from such as could make them, threatening them with a process in case they failed to do that, and upon doing it, leaving them at full liberty to neglect the laws as much as they pleased. The commission subsisted till the Revolution, and it was hoped (says his lordship) that this would have animated the dissenters to turn upon the clergy with some of that fierceness with which they themselves had been lately treated."¹ But they took no advantage of the disposition of the court, nor of the opportunity that was put into their hands of making reprisals on their adversaries; which shows the truly generous and Christian spirit of those confessors for religion; and deserved a more grateful acknowledgment.

To humble the clergy yet farther, his majesty, by the advice of Jefferies, erected a new ecclesiastical commission, though the act which took away the high-commission in 1641 had provided, that no court of that nature should be erected for the future; but the king, though a Papist, assumed the supremacy, and directed a commission to the archbishop of Canterbury, Jefferies the chancellor, the bishops of Durham and Rochester; to the earl of Sunderland, president of the council; Herbert and Wright, lord-chief-justices, and Jenner recorder of London, or any three of them, provided the chancellor was one, "to exercise all manner of jurisdiction and pre-eminence, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdictions, to visit, reform, redress, and amend, all abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, which by the spiritual or ecclesiastical laws might be corrected. They were also to inquire into all misdemeanours and contempts which might be punished by the censures of the church, and to call before them all ecclesiastical persons of what degree and dignity soever, and punish the offenders by excommunications, suspensions, deprivations, or other ecclesiastical censures, &c."² This was a terrible rod held out to the clergy, and if the commissioners had had time to proceed in their inquiries, according to the mandates sent to the chancellors and archdeacons of the several dioceses,

¹ Burnet, vol. 3. p. 140, 141, Edinb. edit.

² Burnet, p. 82.

they would have felt more of the effects of that arbitrary power which their indiscreet conduct had brought on the nation; but Providence was kinder to them than they had been to their brethren.¹ The commission was granted the beginning of April, but was not opened till the beginning of August: the archbishop of Canterbury was afraid to act in it;² Durham was so lifted up, says Burnet, that he said his name would now be recorded in history; and Sprat bishop of Rochester, in hopes of farther preferment, swam with the stream.³ Some Roman Catholics were in the commission, and consequently the enemies of the Protestant religion were to be its judges.

But his majesty, not being willing to rely altogether on the Oxford decree, nor on the fashionable doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, which had been preached up for above twenty years as the unalterable doctrines of the church of England, in order to support his extraordinary proceedings resolved to augment his standing forces to fifteen thousand men. He was apprehensive of a snake in the grass, or a secret reserve, that might break out when the church itself came to be pinched; he

therefore ordered his army to encamp on Hounslow-heath, under the command of the earl of Feversham, to awe the city, and be at hand upon any emergency; the officers and many of the soldiers were Irish Papists, and they had a public chapel in which mass was said every day, so that it was believed the king might introduce what religion he pleased.⁴ It was dangerous to speak or write against his majesty's proceedings; for when the reverend Mr. Johnson, a clergyman, ventured to publish a writing, directed to the Protestant officers of the army, to dissuade them from being tools of the court to subvert the constitution and Protestant religion; diligent search was made for him, and being apprehended, he was sentenced to stand three times in the pillory, to be degraded of his orders, to be whipped from Newgate to Tyburn, and to be fined five hundred marks; all which was executed with great severity.⁵

¹ Welwood, p. 198.

² It is said, that he took exception at the lawfulness of the commission itself. But then on its being opened, he did not appear and declare against it, as judging it to be against law: contenting himself with not going to it: and it was not at first apprehended that he made a matter of conscience of it. He was of a timorous nature, and cautious of doing anything that might eventually be prejudicial to his great object, which was to enrich his nephew. Burnet, vol. 3. p. 82, 83. Grey's Examination, vol. 3. p. 405.—ED.

³ Though the bishop of Rochester might, from views to preferment, be induced to act in a commission to which he was, without his knowledge, named; yet he is stated to have acted with integrity in this matter, through his ignorance of the laws, having no objection to the legality of it; with the purpose of doing as much good, and preventing as much evil, as the times would permit. In the execution of it he pleaded, that he had studied to moderate and restrain the violence of others, never giving his consent to any irregular and arbitrary sentence, but declaring against every extravagant decree. His opinions, he said, were always so contrary to the humours of the court, that he often thought himself to be really in as much hazard from the commission itself, by his non-compliance, as any of his brethren could be that were out of it. And at last, rather than concur in the prosecution of such as refused to read the king's declaration, he solemnly took his leave and withdrew from the court. Grey's Examination, vol. 3. p. 405, 406.—ED.

⁴ Gazette, No. 2192.

⁵ Mr. Johnson, previously to his sufferings, was degraded in the chapter-house of St. Paul's on the 22d of November, 1686. He bore the whipping on the 1st of December following with great fortitude. The Revolution

Affairs in Scotland were in equal forwardness with those of England; the parliament which met at Edinburgh in May, 1685, while the persecution continued, declared their abhorrence of all principles derogatory to the king's absolute power, and offered their lives and fortunes to defend it against all opposers. They passed an act, making it death to resort to any conventicles in houses or fields; and declared it high treason to give or take the national covenant, or to write in defence of it. They also obliged the subjects of Scotland to take an oath, when required, to maintain the king's absolute power, on pain of banishment. Popery made very considerable advances in that kingdom, and several persons of character changed their religion with the times.¹ But the populace were in the other extreme; the earl of Perth, having set up a private chapel for mass, the mob broke into it with such fury that they defaced and destroyed the whole furniture, for which one of them was apprehended and hanged. When the English court changed measures, the Scots parliament agreed to a suspension of the penal laws during the king's life; but his majesty insisting upon an entire repeal, which they declined, he dissolved them. The episcopal clergy were obsequious to the court, and in many places so sunk into sloth and ignorance, that the lower people were quite indifferent in matters of religion; but the Presbyterians, though now freed from the severities they had smarted under so many years, expressed upon all occasions an unconquerable aversion to Popery, and by degrees roused the whole nation out of their lethargy.

In Ireland things had still a more favourable aspect for the court: the king had a greater dependence on the Irish Catholics² than upon any other of his subjects. Colonel Talbot, earl of Tyrconnel, was made lord-lieutenant of that country, a vile and profligate officer, who scrupled no kind of barbarity and wickedness to serve his cause; he broke several Protestant officers in the army, and by degrees turned them all out to make room for Papists. All offices, both civil and military, were put into the hands of the vilest miscreants; there was not a Protestant sheriff left in that kingdom; the charters were taken away, and new-modelled in favour of Papists. The cor-

restored him to his liberty; the degradation was annulled; the judgment given against him was declared illegal and cruel; and a pension of £300 a year for his own and son's life was granted to him, with £1000 in money, and a place of £100 a year for his son. His temper, which was haughty, rough, and turbulent, rendered his solicitations for a bishopric, and two addresses of the lords recommending him to preferment, unsuccessful. He had been chaplain to lord Russel; and was a man of considerable learning and abilities, of great firmness and fortitude of mind. In 1683-4 he had incurred a heavy sentence in the King's-bench, being fined five hundred marks, and committed to the prison till it was paid, and sureties for his good behaviour for a year were found. This penalty was incurred by the publication of a book entitled *Julian the Apostate*, in 1682, intended to expose the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance; and to show the great difference between the case of the primitive Christians, who had the laws against them, and ours who have the laws on our side. Birch's *Life of Archbishop Tillotson*, p. 2)6, &c.—ED.

¹ Burnet, vol. 3. p. 86. 90.

² So hostile to the cause of liberty were the Irish Catholics, that, not content with oppressing it in their own kingdom, they encouraged the emigration of their own body with a view to check its spread beyond the Atlantic. For they suggested to king James to grant, in lieu of lands, money to such of their countrymen as were willing to transport themselves into New-England to advance the Catholic faith there, and check the growing independence of that country. *Life of Dr. Increase Mather*, p. 43.—ED.

porations were dissolved, and all things managed with an arbitrary hand, so that many, imagining the massacring knife to be at their throats, left the kingdom; some transporting themselves into England, and others into more remote and distant countries. Thus far the prerogative prevailed without any repulse.

Matters being now ripe for attacking the church of England in form, it was resolved to begin with making an example of some of their leading divines: Dr. Sharp, rector of St. Giles's, having disobeyed the king's order, of not preaching on the controverted points, and spoken disrespectfully of the king's religion in one of his sermons, the bishop of London was ordered to suspend him; but the bishop, with all respect and duty to his majesty, sent word that he could not proceed in such a summary way, but that when the cause was heard in the commons, he would pronounce such sentence as the canons should warrant; and in the mean time would desire the doctor to forbear preaching.¹ The court resenting the bishop's denial, cited him² before the ecclesiastical commission August 4, where he was treated by Jefferies in a manner unbecoming his character. The bishop excepted to the authority of the court, as contrary to law, and added, that he had complied in the doctor's case as far as the ecclesiastical laws would permit. However, notwithstanding all that his lordship could say in his defence, he was suspended *ab officio*,³ and the bishops of Durham, Rochester, and Peterborough were appointed commissioners, to exercise jurisdiction during his suspension. But Dr. Sharpe, after having expressed his sorrow, in a petition, for falling under the king's displeasure, was dismissed with a gentle reprimand, and suffered to return to the exercise of his function.

The king's next attempt was upon the universities; he began with Cambridge, and commanded Dr. Peachel, the vice-chancellor, to admit one Albin Francis, a benedictine monk, to the degree of M. A., without administering to him any oath or oaths whatsoever; all which, his majesty declared,

¹ Burnet, p. 83–85.

² Dr. Compton, the bishop of London, had, by a conduct worthy of his birth and station in the church, acquired the love and esteem of all the Protestant churches at home and abroad: and for that reason, was the mark of the envy and hatred of the Romish party at court. He made a distinguishing figure in the following reigns. He was the youngest son of Spencer earl of Northampton, who was killed in the civil wars. After having studied three years at the university, and made the usual tour of Europe, he became a cornet in the royal regiment of guards; which gave occasion to the following bon-mot: king James, discoursing with him on some tender point, was so little pleased with his answers, that he told him, "He talked more like a colonel than a bishop." To which he replied, "That his majesty did him honour in taking notice of his having formerly drawn his sword in defence of the constitution; and that he should do the same again, if he lived to see it necessary." Accordingly he appeared in arms again a little before the Revolution, and at the head of a fine troop of gentlemen and their attendants carried off the princess Anne, and marched into Nottingham. Welwood's Memoirs, p. 175; and Granger's History of England, vol. 4. p. 283, 284.—ED.

³ Though bishop Compton was thus deprived of his episcopal power, he still retained his other capacities, particularly as a governor of Sutton's Hospital, and preserved the intrepidity of his spirit. For when an attempt was made, by the recommendation of the king, to introduce a Papist as a pensioner, contrary to the statutes of that institution, the bishop, in conjunction with some other trustees, so firmly opposed the encroachment upon the rights of the foundation, that the court and commissioners saw fit in the end to desist from their design. Life of Bishop Compton, p. 45; where from p. 22–39, and Biographia Britannica, vol. 4, article Compton, p. 55, 56, second edition, may be seen a full account of his prosecution.—ED.

he would dispense with.¹ The vice-chancellor, having read the letter to the congregation of regents, it was agreed to petition the king to revoke his mandate; but, instead of complying with their petition, the king sent for the vice-chancellor before the ecclesiastical commission, by whom he was suspended *ab officio et beneficio*, for disobedience and contempt of the king's commands; and Dr. Balderston, master of Emanuel-college, was chosen vice-chancellor in his room.

Soon after, the king sent a *mandamus* to the vice-president of Magdalen-college, Oxford, and to the fellows, to choose Mr. Farmer, a man of ill reputation, their president, in the room of Dr. Clarke, deceased; but, in defiance of the king's mandate, they chose Dr. Hough; for which they were cited before the ecclesiastical commissioners, but having proved Farmer to be a man of bad character, the king relinquished him, and ordered them by another mandate to choose Dr. Parker, bishop of Oxford. The fellows, having agreed to abide by their first choice, refused to elect the bishop, as contrary to their statutes. Upon which the commissioners were sent to visit them, who, after sundry inquiries and examinations, deprived Dr. Hough, and installed the bishop of Oxford by proxy; and the fellows, refusing to sign a submission to their new president, twenty-five of them were deprived, and made incapable of any benefice.² Parker died soon after, and one of the Popish bishops was by *mandamus* chosen president in his place; which inflamed the church party so far, that they sent pressing messages to the prince of Orange, desiring him to espouse the cause of the church, and break with the king, if he would not redress their grievances. Thus the very first beginnings of resistance to king James came from that very university which but four years before had pronounced this doctrine damnable by a solemn decree; and from those very men who were afterward king William's most bitter enemies.³

The more desperate the war grew between the king and the church, the more necessary did both parties find it to show kindness to the dissenters; for this purpose his majesty sent agents among them, offering them the royal favour, and all manner of encouragement, if they would concur with him in abrogating the penal laws and test; he invited some of their ministers to court, and pretended to consult them in the present crisis.⁴ The clergy, at

¹ Burnet, p. 114, 115.

² It will be thought but justice to the memory of bishop Sprat to state what he himself declared was his conduct on this and the two preceding occasions. It was this: he resolutely persisted in his dissent from every vote that passed against Magdalen-college; he opposed to the utmost the violent persecution upon the university of Cambridge: and he gave his positive vote for the bishop's acquittal both times, when his suspension came in question. Dr. Grey's Examination, p. 406, 407.—ED.

³ Burnet, p. 701

⁴ Amongst other measures, which expressed the disposition of the court towards dissenters, was the power with which some gentlemen were invested to grant out licences directed to the bishops and their officers, to the judges, justices, and all others whom it may concern. The licences were to this effect: "that the king's pleasure is, that the several persons (named in a schedule annexed) be not prosecuted or molested, 1, for not taking the oaths

the same time, prayed and entreated the dissenters to appear on their side, and stand by the establishment, making large promises of favour and brotherly affection, if ever they came into power.

The king, notwithstanding the stubbornness of the clergy, called a council, in which he declared his resolution to issue out a declaration for a general liberty of conscience to all persons of what persuasion soever,¹ “which he was moved to do by having observed, that though a uniformity of worship had been endeavoured to be established within this kingdom, in the successive reigns of four of his predecessors, assisted by their respective parliaments, yet it had proved altogether ineffectual. That the restraint upon the consciences of dissenters had been very prejudicial to the nation, as was sadly experienced by the horrid rebellion in the time of his majesty’s father. That the many penal laws made against dissenters had rather increased than lessened the number of them; and that nothing could more conduce to the peace and quiet of this kingdom, and the increase of the number as well as the trade of his subjects, than an entire liberty of conscience, it having always been his opinion, as most suitable to the principles of Christianity, that no man should be persecuted for conscience’ sake; for he thought conscience could not be forced, and that it could never be the true interest of a king of England to endeavour to do it.”²

This speech meeting with no opposition in the council, his majesty on the 4th of April caused his gracious declaration for liberty of conscience to be published.³ In the preamble, to which his majesty does not scruple to say, “that he cannot but heartily wish (as it will easily be believed) that all his subjects were members of the Catholic church, yet it is his opinion, that conscience ought not to be forced, for the reasons mentioned in the foregoing speech,” which he rehearses at large; and then adds, “By virtue of his royal prerogative, he thinks fit to issue out his declaration of indulgence, making no doubt of the concurrence of his two houses of parliament, when he shall think it convenient for them to meet. And, first, he declares, that he will protect and maintain his archbishops, bishops, and clergy, and all other his subjects of the church of England, in the free exercise of their religion as by law established, and in the quiet and full enjoyment of their posses-

of allegiance and supremacy: or, 2, upon the prerogative writ for £20 a month: or, 3, upon outlawries, or *excom. capiend.* for the said causes: or, 4, for not receiving the sacrament: or, 5, by reason of their conviction for recusancy or exercise of their religion, a command to stay proceedings already begun for any of the causes aforesaid.” The price for any one of these licences was £10 for a single person: but if several joined, the price was £16, and eight persons might join in taking out one licence. There were not very many dissenters that took out these licences. Tong’s Life of Mr. Matthew Henry, p. 45, 46, 12mo.—ED.

¹ Gazette, No. 2226.

² Under all the pretences of tenderness, liberal policy, and wisdom, which gilded over the king’s speech, “it was well understood (observes sir John Reresby), that his view was to divide the Protestant churches, *divide et impetra*; that so the Papist’s might with the more ease possess themselves of the highest place.” Memoirs, p. 243.—ED.

³ Gazette, No. 2231

sions. Secondly, That it is his royal will and pleasure, that all penal laws for nonconformity to the religion established, or by reason of the exercise of religion in any manner whatsoever, be immediately suspended. And to the end that, by the liberty hereby granted, the peace and security of the government in the practice thereof may not be endangered, he strictly charges and commands all his subjects, that as he freely gives them leave to meet, and serve God after their own way, be it in private houses, or places purposely hired and built for that use, so that they take special care that nothing be preached or taught among them which may tend to alienate the hearts of his people from him or his government; and that their meetings or assemblies be peaceably, openly, and publicly held, and all persons freely admitted to them; and that they signify and make known to some one or more of the next justices of peace, what place or places they set apart for such uses. And he is desirous to have the benefit of the service of all his subjects, which by the law of nature is inseparably annexed and inherent to his royal person. And that none of his subjects may be for the future under any discouragements or disability, who are otherwise well inclined, and fit to serve him, by reason of some oaths or tests, that have usually been administered upon such occasions, he hereby farther declares, that it is his will and pleasure, that the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and the several tests and declarations mentioned in the acts of parliament made in the 25th and 30th of his brother's reign, shall not hereafter be required to be taken, declared, or subscribed, by any persons whatsoever, who are or shall be employed in any office, or place of trust, either civil or military, under him or in his government. And it is his intention from time to time hereafter to grant his royal dispensation to all his subjects, so to be employed, who shall not take the said oaths, or subscribe or declare the said tests or declarations. And he does hereby give his free and ample pardon to all Nonconformist recusants, and other his subjects, for all crimes and things by them committed, or done contrary to the penal laws formerly made relating to religion, and the profession or exercise thereof. And although the freedom and assurance he has hereby given in relation to liberty and property, might be sufficient to remove from the minds of his subjects all fears and jealousies in relation to either, yet he thinks fit to declare, that he will maintain them in all their properties and possessions, as well of church and abbey lands, as in other their estates and properties whatsoever.”¹

¹ The operation of this declaration extended beyond England or Scotland; for it proved beneficial to the people of New England, whose religious liberties as well as their civil rights were near expiring: and who had been told by some in power, “They must not think to have the privileges of Englishmen follow them to the ends of the earth: and they had no more privileges left them than to be bought and sold as slaves.” Upon the liberty which the declaration afforded them, Dr. Increase Mather was deputed to take a voyage to England, with addresses of thanks to the king, from various towns and churches; though the measure was opposed by the rulers of the province. When he presented them, he was graciously received, and was admitted to different and repeated audiences

A declaration of the same nature was sent to Scotland, in which the king, “by virtue of his prerogative royal, and absolute authority and power over all his subjects, who are bound to obey Him without reserve, repeals all the severe laws made by his grandfather king James I., and takes off all disabilities from his Roman Catholic subjects, which rendered them incapable of employments and benefices. He also slackened the laws against moderate Presbyterians, and promised never to force his subjects by any invincible necessity to change their religion. He also repealed all laws imposing tests on those who held any employments.”¹

This was strange conduct, says bishop Burnet, in a Roman Catholic monarch, at a time when his brother of France had just broke the edict of Nantes, and was dragooning his Protestant subjects out of his kingdom. But the bishop suspects the king’s sincerity in his declaration, from his promising to use no invincible necessity to force his subjects to change their religion, as if there was a reserve, and that some degrees of compulsion might be proper one time or other; which seems to have been a parallel case to the doctrine of the church concerning non-resistance. However, by another proclamation, the king granted full liberty to the Scots Presbyterians to set up conventicles in their own way, which they thankfully accepted: but when his majesty pressed them to dispose their friends to concur with him in taking off the test and penal laws, which they knew was only to serve the Papists, they answered only in cold and general terms.

In pursuance of these declarations, the dissenters of all sorts were not only set at liberty, but admitted to serve in all offices of profit and trust. November 6, the king sent an order to the lord-mayor of London to dispense with the Quakers taking oaths,² or at least, not to fine them if they refused to serve, by which means a door was opened to the Roman Catholics, and to all others, to bear offices in the state without a legal qualification. Several addresses were presented to the king upon this occasion from the companies in the city of London, from the corporations in the country, and even from the clergy themselves, thanking his majesty for his declaration for liberty of conscience, and his promise to support the church of England as by law established, assuring him of their endeavours to choose such members for the next parliament as should give it a more legal sanction.

with the king, who, on receiving the addresses, said, “You shall have magna charta for liberty of conscience:” and on its being intimated to him by two of his courtiers, at one of the audiences, that the favour shown to New-England would have a good influence on the body of dissenters in England, his reply was, “He believed so, and it should be done.” *Life of Dr. Increase Mather*, p. 37, &c.—ED.

¹ Echard, p. 1083.—Burnet, p. 136.

² Sewel informs us, that the king carried his condescension to the Quakers so far, that a countryman of that persuasion coming to him with his hat on his head, the king took off his own hat and held it under his arm: which the other seeing, said, “The king needs not keep off his hat for me.” To which his majesty replied, “You do not know the custom here, for that requires that but one hat must be on here.” *Sewel’s History*, p. 609.—ED.

The several denominations of dissenters also were no less thankful for their liberty, and addressed his majesty in higher strains than some of their elder and more cautious ministers approved; Mr. Baxter, Mr. Stretton, and a great many others, refused to join in them; and bishop Burnet admits,¹ that few concurred in those addresses,² and that the persons who presented them were mean and inconsiderable. When there was a general meeting of the ministers to consider of their behaviour in this crisis, and two messengers from court waited to carry back the result of the debate, Mr. Howe delivered his opinion against the dispensing power, and against everything that might contribute assistance to the Papists to enable them to subvert the Protestant religion.³ Another minister stood up, and declared,⁴ that he apprehended their late sufferings had been occasioned more by their firm adherence to the constitution, than their differing from the establishment; and therefore if the king expected they should give up the constitution and declare for the dispensing power, he had rather, for his part, lose his liberty, and return to his former bondage.⁵ In conclusion Mr. Howe, in summing up the whole debate, signified to the courtiers, that they were in general of the same opinion. Mr. Coke adds, that to his knowledge the dissenters did both dread and detest the dispensing power; and their steadiness in this crisis was a noble stand by a number of men who subsisted only by the royal favour, which ought not to have been so soon forgotten.

Though the court were a little disappointed in their expectations from the dissenters, they put the best face they could on the affair, and received such addresses as were presented with high commendation. The first who went up were the London Anabaptists, who say, that “the sense of this invaluable favour and benefit derived to us from your royal clemency, compels us to prostrate ourselves at your majesty’s feet with the tender of our

¹ Page 140.

² Dr. Grey controverts the above assertions of bishop Burnet: he has given at length eight addresses from different bodies of dissenters, in different parts of the kingdom, as specimens of the courtly, not to say fulsome and flattering strains, which they on this occasion adopted: and he refers to the Gazettes of the times, as furnishing about seventy other compositions of the same kind; in which this oppressed body, emancipated from their sufferings, fears, and dangers, poured forth the sentiments of loyalty and gratitude. Mr. Stretton, mentioned above, who had been ejected from Petworth in Sussex, and afterward gathered a congregation in London, which assembled at Haberdasher’s-hall, was a minister of great reputation and influence; an active and a useful character. He made use of the liberty granted by the king’s proclamation, but never did nor would join in any address of thanks for it, lest he should seem to give countenance to the king’s assuming a power above the law; and he was instrumental to prevent several addresses. *Henry’s Funeral Sermon for Stretton*, p. 45. *Grey’s Examination*, vol. 3. p. 410–416—ED.

³ *Gazette*, No. 2234.

⁴ This gentleman was Dr. Daniel Williams, who pursued the argument with such clearness and strength, that all present rejected the motion, and the court-agents went away disappointed. There was a meeting at the same time of a considerable number of the city clergy, waiting the issue of their deliberations: who were greatly animated and encouraged by the bold and patriotic resolution of the dissenting ministers. *Life of Dr. Williams*, prefixed to his *Practical Discourses*, vol. 1. p. 10. —ED.

⁵ *Howe’s Life*, p. 134.

most humble thanks for that peace and liberty which both we, and all other dissenters from the national church, now enjoy.”¹

Next came the Presbyterians,² “who acknowledge his majesty’s princely compassion in rescuing them from their long sufferings, in restoring to God the empire over conscience, and publishing to the world his royal Christian judgment, that conscience may not be forced; and his resolution that such force should not be attempted in his reign, which they pray may be long.” Then followed the Independents: “Sir, the great calamity we have been a long time under, through the severe execution of the penal laws in matters of religion, has made us deeply sensible of your majesty’s princely clemency towards us your dissenting subjects, especially since in the indulgence vouchsafed there are no limitations hindering the enjoyment of it with a good conscience, and that your majesty publisheth to the world that it has been your constant sense and opinion, that conscience ought not to be constrained, nor people forced in matters of mere religion.”³ About the same time was published the humble and thankful address of the London Quakers,⁴ to this purpose, “May it please the king! Though we are not the first in this way, yet we hope we are not the least sensible of the great favours we are come to present the king our humble, open, and hearty thanks for. We rejoice to see the day that a king of England should, from his royal seat, so universally assert this royal principle, that conscience ought not to be restrained, nor people forced for matters of religion.”⁵ The several addresses above mentioned express their humble dependance on his majesty’s royal promise to secure their rights and properties, and that he will endeavour to engage his two houses of parliament to concur with him in this good work. Here are no flights of expression, nor promises of obedience without reserve, but purely a sense of gratitude for the restoration of liberty.⁶

¹ Gazette, No. 2234.

² This address had about thirty hands to it; it was presented by Mr. Hurst, Mr. Chester, Mr. Slatter, Mr. Cox, Mr. Roswell, Mr. Turner, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Deal, and Mr. Reynolds. It is preserved at length, with the king’s answer, in the *Biographia Britannica*, vol. 1, article Alsop. It was supposed to have been drawn up by Mr. Alsop; whose feelings and gratitude, on the free pardon which the king had given to his son convicted of treasonable practices, may be reckoned to have had great influence in dictating and promoting it. After the spirited resolution mentioned above had been carried, some of the ministers were privately closeted with king James, and some few received particular and personal favours: by these fascinating arts they were brought over. And their conduct had its weight in producing similar addresses from the country. Part of the king’s answer deserves to be recorded as a monument of his insincerity, and a warning, that kings can degrade themselves by recourse to duplicity and falsehood. “Gentlemen (said James), I protest before God, and I desire you to tell all manner of people, of all persuasions,—that I have no other design than I have spoken of. And, gentlemen, I hope to live to see the day, when you shall as well have magna charta for the liberty of conscience, as you have had for your properties.” The ministers went away satisfied with the welcome which they had received from the pleasant countenances of the courtiers, and the courteous words, looks, and behaviour, of his majesty.” Palmer’s *Nonconformists’ Memorial*, vol. 2, p. 13.—ED.

³ Gazette, No. 2238.

⁴ Sewel, p. 606.

⁵ There are, it has been justly observed to the editor, some errors in the above extract: viz. the word royal instead of glorious, before principle; and the omission of mere before religion—ED.

⁶ Though Mr. Neal’s character of the addresses which he quotes be admitted as just, it will not apply to all which the dissenters presented on this occasion: “Some of them (Dr. Calamy observes) ran high.” But for the

And though it must be allowed that some few dissenters, from an excess of joy, or it may be from a strong resentment against their late persecutors, published some severe pamphlets, and gave too much countenance to the measures of the court, as Mr. Lobb, Alsop, and Penn the Quaker, yet the body of them kept at a distance, and, “as thankful as they were for their liberty (says lord Halifax), they were fearful of the issue; neither can any member of consideration among them be charged with hazarding the public safety, by falling in with the measures of the court, of which they had as great a dread as their neighbours.”¹ And the lords, in a conference with the house of commons upon the occasional bill, in the first year of queen Anne, say, “that in the last and greatest danger the church was exposed to, the dissenters joined with her, with all imaginable zeal and sincerity, against the Papists their common enemies, showing no prejudice to the church, but the utmost respect to the bishops when sent to the Tower.”

But as the king and ministry carried all before them, the church-party were in despair, and almost at their wits’ end; they saw themselves on the brink of ruin, imagining that they should be turned out of their freeholds for not reading the king’s declaration, and that the Nonconformists would be admitted into their pulpits; as Dr. Sherlock, master of the Temple, acknowledged in conversation to Mr. Howe;² and that, as the Papists had

strong language in which they were expressed, or for the numbers to which they amounted, an apology may be drawn from the excess of joy with which the royal indulgence, though an insidious measure, naturally inspired those who, for many years, had groaned under the rod of persecution. It should also be considered, that but very few, comparatively, think deeply or look far. Present, pleasing appearances mislead and captivate the generality. There is also a propensity in mankind to follow those who take the lead, and a readiness to credit and flatter royalty and greatness. The dissenters, however, not without reason, incurred censure for “a vast crowd of congratulatory addresses, complimenting the king in the highest manner, and protesting what mighty returns of loyalty they would make:” and were called “the pope’s journeymen to carry on his work.” But these censures came with an ill grace, as Dr. Calamy remarks, “from the church-party, who had set them the pattern;” who in a most luxuriant manner had thanked king Charles for dissolving one of the best parliaments; who were mighty forward in the surrender of charters; and who, in their fulsome addresses, made no other claim to their liberties and civil rights than as concessions from the crown, telling the king, “every one of his commands was stamped with God’s authority.” The university of Oxford, in particular, promised king James to obey him without limitations or restrictions. Dr. Grey and Calamy’s *Life of Howe*, p. 137, 138.—ED.

¹ “The churchmen on their side (says Dr. Warner), did all that lay in their power to establish a union, as the only possible means of their joint security. They published pamphlets from time to time, acknowledging their error in driving the Presbyterians to extremities; confessing that they were not enough upon their guard against the artifices of the court, and promising a very different behaviour on the re-establishment of their affairs. It must be owned, that this conduct was dexterous, and sensible, and just. It must be said, however (observes this author), that they had not attained this wisdom, till it was almost too late; at least, not during the space of twenty years, and till by their absurd principles of passive obedience, taught in their pulpits, and acts of parliament, they had enabled the king to become arbitrary and tyrannical. It is no less true, that an accusation lies against them of having forgotten this promise after the Revolution, as they did at the restoration of Charles II.” *Eccles. Hist.* vol. 2. p. 639, 640.—ED.

² “Who knows (said Dr. Sherlock), but Mr. Howe may be offered to be master of the Temple?” Mr. Howe replied, “that he should not balk an opportunity of more public service, if offered on terms he had no just reason to except against.” But then he added, “that he would not meddle with the emolument, otherwise than as a hand to convey it to the legal proprietor.” Upon this the doctor, not a little transported with joy, rose up from his seat and embraced him; saying, “that he had always taken him for that ingenuous honest man that he now found him to be.” Mr. Howe afterward told this passage to a dignitary of the church, to whom the doctor was well known: signifying, how little he was prepared to reply to a supposition that had not so much as once entered into his thoughts before. The gentleman answered, “Sir, you say you had not once thought of the case, or so much as supposed any thing like it; but you must give me leave to tell you, if you had studied the case seven years together, you could not have said anything more to the purpose, or more to the doctor’s satisfaction.” *Calamy’s Life of Howe*, p. 141, 142.—ED.

already invaded the universities, they would in a little time overset the whole hierarchy. In this distress they turned their eyes all around them for relief: they applied to the dissenters,

giving them the strongest assurances of a comprehension and toleration in better times, if they would but assist in delivering them out of their present troubles. Bishop Burnet says, that the clergy here in England wrote to the prince of Orange, and desired him to send over some of the dissenting preachers, whom the violence of the former times had driven into Holland, and to prevail effectually with them to oppose any false brethren, whom the court might have gained over; and that they sent over very solemn assurances, which passed through his own hands, that in case they stood firm now to the common interest, they would in a better time come into a comprehension of such as could be brought into conjunction with the church, and to a toleration of the rest. Agreeably to these assurances, when the reverend Mr. Howe, Mr. Mead, and other refugee ministers, waited on the prince of Orange, to return him thanks for the protection of the country, and to take their leave, his highness made them some presents to pay their debts and defray their charges home; and having wished them a good voyage, he advised them to be very cautious in their addresses; and not to suffer themselves to be drawn into the measures of the court so far as to open a door for the introducing of Popery, by desiring the taking off the penal laws and test, as was intended.¹ He requested them also, to use their influence with their brethren to lay them under the same restraints. His highness sent orders likewise to monsieur Dykvelt, his resident, to press the dissenters to stand off from the court; and to assure them of a full toleration and comprehension if possible, when the crown should devolve on the princess of Orange. Agents were sent among the dissenters to soften their resentments against the church, and to assure them, that for the future they would treat them as brethren, as will be seen in the next chapter. .

The dissenters had it now in their power to distress the church party, and it may be, to have made reprisals, if they would have given way to the revenge, and fallen heartily in with the king's measures. They were strongly solicited on both sides; the king preferred them to places of profit and trust, and gave them all manner of countenance and encouragement; and the churchmen loaded them with promises and assurances what great things they would do for them, as soon as it should be in their power. But, alas! no sooner was the danger over than the majority of them forgot their vows in distress; for when the convocation met the first time after the Revolution,

¹ Calamy's Life of Howe, p. 132.

they would not hear of a comprehension, nor so much as acknowledge the foreign churches for their brethren, seeming rather inclined to return to their old methods of persecution. So little dependence ought to be placed on high-church promises!

But in their present circumstances it was necessary to flatter the Non-conformists, and weaken the king's hands, by dissuading the dissenters from placing any confidence in their new friends: for this purpose a pamphlet, written by the marquis of Halifax, and published by advice of some of the most eminent dignitaries of the church, was dispersed, entitled "A Letter to a Dissenter upon occasion of his Majesty's late gracious Declaration of Indulgence." It begins with saying, "that churchmen are not surprised nor provoked at the dissenters accepting the offers of ease from the late hardships they lay under; but desired them to consider, 1. The cause they have to suspect their new friends. And, 2. Their duty in Christianity and prudence not to hazard the public safety by a desire of ease or revenge.

"With regard to the first, the church of Rome (says the author) does not only dislike your liberty, but, by its principles, cannot allow it: they are not able to make good their vows; nay, it would be a habit of sin that requires absolution; you are therefore hugged now, only that you may be the better squeezed another time. To come so quick from one extreme to another is such an unnatural motion, that you ought to be on your guard: the other day you were sons of Belial, now you are angels of light. Popery is now the only friend of liberty, and the known enemy of persecution. We have been under shameful mistakes if this can be either true or lasting."

The letter goes on to insinuate, "that some ministers had been bribed into the measures of the court; that they were under engagements, and empowered to give rewards to others, where they could not persuade. Now if these or others should preach up anger and vengeance against the church of England, ought they not rather to be suspected of corruption, than to act according to judgment? If they who thank the king for his declaration should be engaged to justify it in point of law, I am persuaded it is more than the addressers are capable of doing. There is a great difference between enjoying quietly the advantage of an act irregularly done by others, and becoming advocates for it; but frailties are to be excused. Take warning by the mistake of the church of England, when after the Restoration they preserved so long the bitter taste of your rough usage to them, that it made them forget their interest, and sacrifice it to their revenge. If you had now to do with rigid prelates, the argument might be fair on your side; but since the common danger has so laid open the mistake, that all former haughtiness towards the dissenters is for ever extinguished, and the spirit of persecution is turned into a spirit of peace, charity, and condescension, will you not be moved by such an example? If it be said, the church is only humble

when it is out of power; the answer is, that is uncharitable, and an unseasonable triumph; besides, it is not so in fact, for if she would comply with the court, she could turn all the thunder upon yourselves, and blow you off the stage with a breath; but she will not be rescued by such unjustifiable means. You have formerly very justly blamed the church of England for going too far in her compliance with the court; conclude, therefore, that you must break off your friendship, or set no bounds to it. The church is now convinced of its error, in being too severe to you; the next parliament will be gentle to you; the next heir is bred in a country famous for indulgence; there is a general agreement of thinking men, that we must no more cut ourselves off from foreign Protestants, but enlarge our foundations; so that all things conspire to give you ease and satisfaction, if you do not too much anticipate it. To conclude, the short question is, whether or no you will join with those who must in the end run the same fate with you? If the Protestants of all sorts have been to blame in their behaviour to each other, they are upon equal terms, and for that very reason ought now to be reconciled." How just soever the reasoning of this letter may be, either the author did not know the spirit of the church-party (as they were called,) or he must blush when he compared it with the facts that followed the Revolution. Twenty thousand copies were dispersed about the city and country, and had the desired effect, the honest well-meaning dissenters making no advantage of the favourable juncture; they entered into no alliance with the Papists, nor complied with the court-measures, any farther than to accept their own liberty, which they had a natural right to, and of which they ought never to have been deprived.

The war between the king and the church being now declared, each party prepared for their defence; the points in debate were, a general toleration, and the dispensing power; the latter of which the high-church party had connived at during the late reign; but when the edge of it was turned against themselves (the king having used it to break down the fences of the church, by abrogating the penal laws and tests, and making an inroad upon the two universities,) they exclaimed against it as subversive of the whole constitution; and forgetting their late addresses, contested this branch of the prerogative. The king had secured the opinion of the judges in favour of it, but this not giving satisfaction, he determined to obtain a parliamentary sanction. For this purpose he published the following order in the Gazette, "that whereas his majesty was resolved to use his utmost endeavours, that his declaration of indulgence might pass into a law, he therefore thought fit to review the lists of deputy-lieutenants, and justices of peace in the several counties, that those may be continued who would be ready to contribute what in them lies towards the accomplishment of so good and necessary a work, and such others added to them, from whom his majesty may reason-

ably expect the like concurrence and assistance.” Pursuant to this resolution the king’s first parliament was dissolved, and agents were employed to dispose the people to the choice of such new members as might facilitate the court-measures. The king himself went a progress round the country¹ to ingratiate himself with the people; and it can hardly be expressed, says Ecard, with what joyful acclamations his majesty was received, and what loyal acknowledgments were paid him in all places; but in the affair of the tests, says Burnet,² there was a visible coldness among the nobility and gentry, though the king behaved in a most obliging manner.

When the king returned from his progress, he began to change the magistracy in the several corporations in England, according to the powers reserved to the crown in the new charters; he turned out several of the aldermen of the city of London, and placed new ones in their room. He caused the lists of lord-lieutenants and deputy-lieutenants to be reviewed, and such as would not promise to employ their interests in the repeal of the penal laws were discarded. Many Protestant dissenters were put into commission on this occasion, in hopes that they would procure such members for the next parliament as should give them a legal right to what they now enjoyed only by the royal favour; but when the king pressed it upon the lord-mayor of London, and the new aldermen, who were chiefly dissenters, they made no reply.

The reason of the dissenters’ backwardness in an affair that so nearly concerned them, and in which they have since expressed so strong a desire, was their concern for the Protestant religion, and their aversion to Popery. The king was not only a Roman Catholic, but a bigot; and it was evident, that the plucking up the fences at this time must have made a breach at which Popery would enter. If the king had been a Protestant, the case had been different, because Papists could not take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to a prince who stood excommunicated by the church of Rome;

¹ When he came to Chester (it being intimated that it would be expected, and the churchmen having led the way, and divers of the Lancashire ministers coming thither on purpose to attend the king), Mr. Matthew Henry, and Mr. Harvey, minister of another dissenting congregation in that city, with the heads of their societies, joined in an address of thanks to him, not for assuming a dispensing power, but for their ease, quiet, and liberty, under his protection. They presented it to him at the bishop’s palace in the abbey court; and he told them he wished they had a magna charta for their liberty. They did not promise to assist in taking away the tests, but only to live quiet and peaceable lives. This, however, was severely censured by some of their brethren. But the expressions of thankfulness for their liberty were very different from the high flights and promises of sir Richard Lieving, the recorder of Chester at that time; who, in a speech to king James, on his entering into the city, told him, “that the corporation was his majesty’s creature, and depended on the will of its creator; and that the sole intimation of his majesty’s pleasure should have with them the force of a fundamental law.” Mr. Thompson’s MS. collections under the word “CHESTER.”—ED.

² Page 143.

but now there would be no obstacle, or, if there was, the king would dispense with the law in their favour: the dissenters therefore were afraid, that if they should give in to his majesty's measures, though they might secure their liberty for the present, it would stand on a precarious foundation; for if Popery came in triumphant, it would not only swallow up the church of England, but the whole Protestant interest. They chose therefore to trust their liberty to the mercy of their Protestant brethren, rather than receive a legal security for it under a Popish government.

According to this resolution bishop Burnet observes,¹ that sir John Shorter the new lord-mayor, and a Protestant dissenter, thought fit to qualify himself for this office, according to law, though the test was suspended, and the king had signified to the mayor that he was at liberty, and might use what form of worship he thought best in Guildhall, which was designed as an experiment to engage the Presbyterians to make the first change from the established worship, concluding, that if a Presbyterian mayor did this one year, it would be easy for a Popish mayor to do it the next; but his lordship referred the case to those clergymen who had the government of the diocese of London during the bishop's suspension, who assured his lordship it was contrary to law; so that though the lord-mayor went sometimes to the meetings of dissenters, he went frequently to church, and behaved with more decency, says his lordship, than could have been expected. This disobliged the king to a very high degree, insomuch that he said, the dissenters were an ill-natured sort of people that could not be gained.

This opposition to the king heightened his resentments, and pushed him on to rash and violent measures: if he had proceeded by slow degrees, and secured one conquest before he had attempted another, he might have succeeded, but he gave himself up to the fury of his priests, who advised him to make haste with what he intended. This was discovered by a letter from the Jesuits from Liege to those of Friburgh, which says, the king wished they could furnish him with more priests to assist him in the conversion of the nation, which his majesty was resolved to bring about, or die a martyr in the attempt. He said, he must make haste that he might accomplish it in his lifetime;² and when one of them was lamenting that his next heir was a heretic, he answered, God will provide an heir; which argued either a strong faith, or a formed design of imposing one on the nation. Father Petre was the king's chief minister, and one of his majesty's privy-council, a bold and forward man, who stuck at nothing to ruin the church. The king designed him for the archbishopric of York, now vacant, and for a cardinal's cap,³ if he could prevail with the pope; for this purpose the earl of Castle-

¹ Burnet, p. 145.

² Ibid, p. 135.

³ Ibid. p. 168.

main was sent ambassador to Rome; and a nuncio was sent from thence into England, to whom his majesty paid all possible respect, and gave an audience at Windsor, though it was contrary to law; all commerce with the court of Rome having been declared high-treason by the statute of king Henry VIII.; but the king said he was above law; and because the duke of Somerset would not officiate in his place at the ceremony, he was dismissed from all his employments.

It was strange infatuation in king James to put a slight on the ancient nobility, and turn most of his servants out of their places because they were Protestants; this weakened his interest, and threw a vast weight into the opposite scale. Indeed it was impossible to disguise his majesty's design of introducing Popery,¹ and therefore Parker, bishop of Oxford, was employed to justify it, who published a book, entitled, "Reasons for abrogating the test imposed on all members of parliament;" which must refer to the renouncing transubstantiation, and the idolatry of the church of Rome; because the members of parliament had no other qualification imposed upon them besides the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. The bishop said much to excuse the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to free the church of Rome from the charge of idolatry. His reasons were licensed by the earl of Sunderland, and the stationer was commanded not to print any answer to them; but Dr. Burnet, then in Holland, gave them a very smart and satirical reply, which quite ruined the bishop's reputation.

But his majesty's chief dependence was upon the army, which he was casting into a Popish mould; Protestant officers were cashiered; Portsmouth and Hull, the two principal sea-ports of England, were in Popish hands; and the majority of the garrisons were of the same religion. Ireland was an inexhaustible seminary, from whence England was to be supplied with a Catholic army; an Irish Roman Catholic, says Welwood, was a most welcome guest at Whitehall; and they came over in shoals. Over and above complete regiments of Papists, there was scarce a troop or company in the army wherein some of that religion were not inserted, by express orders from court. Upon the whole, the affairs of the nation were drawing to a crisis; and it was believed, that what the king could not accomplish by the gentler methods of interest and persuasion, he would establish by his sovereign power. The army at Hounslow was to awe the city and parliament; and if they proved refractory, an Irish massacre, or some other desperate attempt, might possibly decide the fate of the nation.

About this time died the Rev. David Clarkson, B. D. born at Bradford in Yorkshire, February 1621–22, and fellow of Clare-hall, Cambridge, where he was tutor to Dr. Tillotson, afterward archbishop of Canterbury.

¹ Burnet, p. 178.

Dr. Bates in his funeral sermon gives him the character of a man of sincere godliness and true holiness: humility and modesty were his distinctive characters; and his learning was superior to most of his time, as appears by his Treatise of Liturgies, his Primitive Episcopacy, his Practical Divinity of Papists destructive to Men's Souls; and his volume of Sermons, printed after his death. He was some time minister of Mortlake in Surrey, but after his ejection he gave himself up to reading and meditation, shifting from one place of obscurity to another, till the times suffered him to appear openly; he was then chosen successor to the reverend Dr. John Owen,¹ in the pastoral office to his congregation. Mr. Baxter says, he was a divine of solid judgment, of healing, moderate principles, of great acquaintance with the fathers, of great ministerial abilities, and of a godly upright life. Great was his solemnity and reverence in prayer; and the method of his sermons was clear, deep, and instructive. His death was unexpected, though, as he declared, it was no surprise to him, for he was entirely resigned to the will of God, and desired not to outlive his usefulness. This good man, says Dr. Bates, like holy Simeon, had Christ in his arms, and departed in peace, to see the salvation of God above, in the sixty-sixth year of his age.

Dr. Thomas Jacomb was born in Leicestershire, and educated first in Magdalen-hall, Oxon, and after in Emanuel-college, Cambridge, from whence he removed to Trinity-college, of which he was fellow. He came to London in 1647, and was soon after minister of Ludgate parish, where he continued till he was turned out in 1662. He met with some trouble after his ejection, but being received into the family of the countess dowager of Exeter, daughter of the earl of Bridgewater, he was covered from his enemies. This honourable and virtuous lady was a comfort and support to the Nonconformist ministers throughout the reign of king Charles II. Her respects to the doctor were peculiar, and her favours extraordinary, for which he made the best returns he was able. The doctor was a learned man, an able divine, a serious affectionate preacher, of unspotted morals, and a Nonconformist upon moderate principles. He died of a cancerous humour, that put him to the most acute pain, which he bore with invincible patience

¹ This is an inaccuracy: he was chosen co-pastor with Dr. Owen, July 1682, a year before the doctor's death. To the above account of Mr. Clarkson, it is not improper to add, that his excellent pupil, bishop Tillotson, always preserved that respect for him which he had contracted while he was under his tuition. His book on Diocesan Episcopacy shews him, says Mr. Granger, to have been a man of great reading in church history. In his conversation, a comely gravity, mixed with innocent pleasantness, were attractive of respect and love. He was of a calm temper, not ruffled with passions, but gentle, and kind, and good; his breast was the temple of peace. Palmer's Nonconformists' Memorial, vol. 2. p. 451; Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 4; and Granger's History of England, vol. 3. p. 310, 8vo.—ED.

and resignation till the 27th March 1687, when he died in the countess of Exeter's house, in the sixty-sixth year of his age.¹

Mr. John Collins was educated at Cambridge, New-England, and returned from thence in the times of the civil war, became a celebrated preacher in London, having a sweet voice, and a most affectionate manner in the pulpit. He was chaplain to general Monk when he marched out of Scotland into England, but was not an incumbent anywhere when the act of uniformity took place. Being of the Independent denomination, he succeeded Mr. Mallory as pastor of a very considerable congregation of that persuasion, and was one of the Merchant lecturers at Pinner's-hall. He was a man mighty in the Scriptures; of an excellent natural temper; very charitable to all good men, without regard to parties; and died universally lamented,² December 3, 1687.

[It seems to have escaped Mr. Neal's attention to notice, at this period, two eminent persons, who died in the year 1686, Pearson bishop of Chester, and Fell bishop of Oxford.

Dr. John Pearson, born in 1612, was successively master of Jesus and Trinity colleges, in Cambridge; and also Margaret-professor of divinity in that university. He had the living of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, and was consecrated bishop of Chester, February 9, 1672. He was a great divine, a profound and various scholar, eminently read in ecclesiastical history and antiquity, and an exact chronologist. He united with his learning, clearness of judgment and strength of reason. As a preacher, he was rather instructive than pathetic. The character of the clergyman was adorned by an excellent temper, distinguished humility, primitive piety, and spotless manners: as a bishop, he was deemed too remiss and easy in his episcopal function. "He was (says bishop Burnet) a striking instance of what a great man could fall to: for his memory went from him so entirely, that he became a child some years before he died." His late preferment to the episcopacy, and the great decay of his faculties, which it is to be supposed came on gradually, may account for his remissness in that station. His works were few, but of great reputation. The chief were, "A vindication of St. Ignatius' epistles," in Lat-

¹ It is a proof what different colouring a character derives from the dispositions and prejudices of those whose pen draws it, that Dr. Sherlock, who seems to have received some provocation from Dr. Jacomb, represents him "as the prettiest, nonsensical, trifling goose-cap, that ever set pen to paper." This description is contradicted by the nature of his library; if the choice of books indicate the turn of the mind. He left an incomparable collection of the most valuable books in all kinds of learning, and in various languages, which sold for £1300. Granger's History of England, vol. 3. p. 307.—ED.

² When, during his illness, Mr. Mead affectionately prayed for his recovery at the Pinner's-hall lecture, scarcely a dry eye was to be seen through the numerous auditory. Mr. Collins printed one sermon in the Morning Exercises, vol. 3, with the signature N. N. on this question, "How the religious of a nation are the strength of it?" Mather's History of New-England, book 4. p. 200: where may be seen a Latin epitaph for him. —ED.

in; and “An exposition of the Apostles’ creed:” esteemed one of the most finished pieces in theology in our language. The substance of it was originally delivered in sermons to his parishioners. This work has gone through twelve or thirteen editions. “It is itself (says Mr. Granger) a body of divinity, but not a body without a spirit. The style of it is just; the periods are for the most part well turned; the method is very exact; and it is in general free from those errors which are too often found in theological systems.” Burnet’s History, vol. 3. 12mo. p. 109, 110; Granger’s History of England, vol. 3. p. 251, 8vo.; and Richardson’s Godwin de Præsulibus, p. 779.

Dr. John Fell was the son of Dr. Samuel Fell, sometime the dean of Christ-church, Oxford: he received his classical education in the free-school at Thame in Oxfordshire: at eleven years of age he was made student of Christ-church, in 1636; and in 1643, graduated master of arts. About this time he took arms, within the garrison of Oxford, in the king’s cause, and was made an ensign. In 1648, when he was in holy orders, he was displaced by the parliamentary visitors; from that year, till the Restoration, he spent his time in retirement and study; observing the devotions of the church of England with other oppressed royalists. After the Restoration he was installed canon, and then dean of Christ-church, November 30, 1660, being then doctor in divinity, and one of the king’s chaplains in ordinary. In the years 1667, 1668, and 1669, he was vice-chancellor of the university; and February 6, 1675, he was consecrated bishop of Oxford. Soon after his preferment he rebuilt the palace of Cusedon, belonging to the see. He was a munificent benefactor to his college, and raised its reputation by his discipline. He settled on it no less than ten exhibitions; and the best rectories belonging to it were his purchase. He expended great sums in embellishing and adorning the university of Oxford. Learning was greatly indebted to his patronage and munificence. He liberally improved the press of the university; and the books that came from the Sheldonian theatre perpetuate, in this respect, his praise. For many years he annually published a book, generally a classic author, to which he wrote a preface and notes, and presented it to the students of his house as a new-year’s gift: amongst these was an edition of the Greek Testament, in 12mo. 1675; which Dr. Harwood pronounces to be “a very valuable and excellent edition; that does honour to the bishop, because it is upon the whole a correct book, and exhibits the various readings very faithfully.” His edition of the works of Cyprian affords also a conspicuous proof of his industry and learning. But he did not lay out his fortune in public acts of splendid munificence only: the private charities of life partook of his beneficence. To the widow he was a husband, to the orphan a father, and to poor children a tender parent, furnishing them with instruction, and placing them out in life. “He was in all respects a most exemplary man, though (says bishop Burnet) a little too much heat-

ed in the matter of our disputes with the dissenters. But, as he was among the first of our clergy that apprehended the design of bringing in Popery, so he was one of the most zealous against it." It is a deduction from the merit of his character, as the patron of learning, that he was not well affected to the Royal Society: and it is to be regretted, that he was not friendly to that excellent man archbishop Tillotson; which was probably owing to a sense of his own sufferings before the Restoration: for he was not superior to a party spirit. Wood's *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. 2. p. 602. 605. Richardson de *Præsulibus*, p. 548. Burnet's *History*, vol. 8. p. 100. Granger's *History of England*, vol. 3. p. 252. *British Biogr.* vol. 5. p. 11; and Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, p. 100.]