

THE
HISTORY OF THE PURITANS;

OR,

PROTESTANT NONCONFORMISTS;

FROM

THE REFORMATION IN 1517, TO THE REVOLUTION IN 1688;

COMPRISING

An Account of their Principles;

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

BY. DANIEL NEAL, M.A.

A NEW EDITION, IN THREE VOLUMES.

REPRINTED FROM

THE TEXT OF DR. TOULMIN'S EDITION;

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

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG AND SON, 73, CHEAPSIDE ;

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

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

1837.

CHAPTER II.

FROM KING JAMES'S DECLARATION FOR LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, TO THE ACT OF TOLERATION IN THE REIGN OF KING WILLIAM AND QUEEN MARY.

1668.

THOUGH the projects of the Roman Catholics were ripe for execution, there was one circumstance which spread a black cloud over all their attempts, which was the near prospect of a Protestant successor to the crown: this was the only hope of the Protestant cause, and the terror of the Papists. To remove this impediment, his majesty first attempted to convert his eldest daughter Mary, princess of Orange, to the Roman Catholic religion, or at least to consent to the making way for it, by taking off the penal laws. To accomplish this, his majesty wrote an obliging letter to his daughter, reciting the motives of his own conversion; which were, the "great devotion of the church of Rome; the adorning their churches; their acts of charity, which were greater than the Protestants could boast of; the numbers who retired from the world, and devoted themselves to a religious life."¹ He was convinced that Christ had left an infallibility in the church, which the apostles acknowledged to be in St. Peter. Acts xv. It was the authority of the church (says he) that declared the Scriptures to be canonical; and certainly, they who declared them could only interpret them, and, wherever this infallibility was, there must be a clear succession, which could be nowhere but in the church of Rome, the church of England not pretending to infallibility, though she acted as if she did, by persecuting those who differed from her, as well Protestant dissenters as Papists; but he could see no reason why dissenters might not separate from the church of England, as well as the church of England had done from that of Rome."

The princess answered the king's letter with great respect; "she affirmed the right of private judgment, according to the apostle's rule, of proving all things, and holding fast that which is good. She saw clearly from the Scriptures that she must not believe by the faith of another, but according as things appeared to herself. She confessed, if there was an infallibility in the church, all other controversies must fall before it, but that it was not yet agreed where it was lodged, whether in a pope, or a general council, or both; and she desired to know in whom the infallibility rested when there were two or three popes at a time, acting one against another; for certainly the succession must then be disordered. She maintained the lawfulness and necessity of reading the Holy Scriptures; for, though faith was above reason, it proposed nothing contradictory to it. St. Paul ordered

¹ Burnet, p. 149. 155. vol. 3. Edin. ed.

his epistles to be read in all the churches; and he says in one place, 'I write as to wise men, judge ye what I say:' and if they might judge an apostle, much more any other teacher. She excused the church of England's persecuting the dissenters in the best manner she could; and said the reformers had brought things to as great perfection as those corrupt ages were capable of; and she did not see how the church was to blame, because the laws were made by the state, and for civil crimes, and that the grounds of the dissenters leaving the church were different from those for which they had separated from the church of Rome." It was impossible for the princess to clear up this objection. But bishop Burnet¹ adds very justly, that the severities of the church against the dissenters were urged with a very ill grace, by one of the church of Rome, that has delighted herself so often by being, as it were, bathed with the blood of those they call heretics. Upon the whole it appeared that her highness was immoveably fixed in her religion, and that there was not the least prospect of her departing from it.

At the same time his majesty attempted the prince of Orange, for which purpose he employed one Mr. James Steward, a Scotch lawyer, who wrote several letters upon this argument to pensionary Fagel, in whom the prince placed an entire confidence.² The pensionary neglected his letters for some time; but at length, it being industriously reported that the silence of the prince was a tacit consent, the pensionary laid all his letters before his highness, who commissioned the pensionary to draw up such an answer as might discover his true intentions and sense of things.

The answer was dated from the Hague, November 4, 1687, and begins with assurances of the prince and princess's duty to the king; and, since Mr. Steward had given him to understand that his letters were written with the king's knowledge and allowance,³ the pensionary assures him, in the name of their highnesses, that it was their opinion that "no Christian ought to be persecuted for his conscience, or be ill used because he differs from the established religion; and therefore they agreed that the Papists in Scotland and Ireland should have the free exercise of their religion in private as they had in Holland; and as to Protestant dissenters, they heartily approved of their having an entire liberty of their religion, without any trouble or hindrance; and their highnesses were ready to concur in the settling it, and giving their guarantee to protect and defend it. If his majesty desired their concurrence in repealing the penal laws, they were ready to give it, provided the laws by which Roman Catholics were excluded from sitting in both houses of parliament, and from all employments, ecclesiastical, civil, and military, remained in force; and likewise those other laws which secure the

¹ Page 156.

² Burnet, p. 165, 166.

³ Welwood's Memoirs, p. 218.

Protestant religion against all attempts of the Roman Catholics; but they could not consent to the repeal of those laws which tended only to secure the Protestant religion, such as the tests, because they imported no more than a deprivation from public employments, which could do them no great harm. If the number of the Papists were inconsiderable, it was not reasonable to insist upon it; and if those few that pretend to public employments would do their party so much injury as not to be content with the repeal of the penal laws, unless they could get into offices of trust, their ambition only was to be blamed.”¹ This letter was carried by Mr. Steward to the king, and read in the cabinet council, but it had no effect; only the king ordered Mr. Steward to write back, that he would have all or nothing. However, the church-party were satisfied with the prince’s resolution to maintain the tests; the Protestant dissenters were pleased with their highnesses’ declaration for the repeal of the penal laws, so far as concerned themselves, and they placed an entire confidence in their word. The lay-Papists and seculars pressed the king to accept of the repeal of so much of the penal laws as was offered, and blamed the ambition of the Jesuits and courtiers, who, rather than abate anything, would leave them exposed to the severity of the law when a freedom was offered. At length the pensionary’s letter was printed by allowance of the prince, and dispersed over England, which provoked the king to such a degree, that he spoke indecently of his highness to all the foreign ministers, and resolved to show him the severest marks of his displeasure.

The first project of gaining the prince having failed, his majesty went upon another, which, had it succeeded, must effectually have defeated the Protestant succession; and that was, providing the nation with an heir of his own body by the present queen, though for many years she had been reckoned incapable of having children. This was first whispered among the courtiers, but was soon after confirmed by proclamation in the Gazette of January 2 and 26, 1687–88, in words to this effect, “That it had pleased Almighty God to give his majesty apparent hopes, and good assurance, of having issue by his royal consort the queen, who, through God’s great goodness, was now with child;”² wherefore his majesty appoints, that on the 15th of January, in the cities of London and Westminster; and on the 29th in all other places of England; and on the 29th of January and 19th of February in all places in Scotland, public thanksgiving and solemn prayer be offered up to God on this occasion; and a form of prayer was drawn up accordingly by the bishops of Durham, Rochester, and Peterborough; in which were these expressions: “Blessed be that good Providence that has

¹ Burnet, p 167.

² Gazette, no. 2306, and 2316.

vouchsafed us fresh hopes of royal issue by our gracious queen Mary; strengthen her, we beseech thee, and perfect what thou hast begun. Command thy holy angels to watch over her continually, and defend her from all dangers and evil accidents; that what she hath conceived may be happily brought forth, to the joy of our sovereign lord the king, the farther establishment of his crown, the happiness and welfare of the whole kingdom, and the glory of thy great name,” &c.¹ This struck all the Protestant part of the nation with consternation, except a few ranting Tories, whose religion was at the service of the king, whensoever he should call for it. The conception was looked upon by the Jesuits as miraculous, and as the effect of a vow the queen had made to the Lady of Loretto; they prophesied it would certainly be a prince; while the Protestants sighed in secret, and suspected a fraud; the grounds of which suspicion the historians of these times have related at large.

The king, emboldened with the prospect of a Popish successor, instead of venturing first upon a parliament, published another declaration for liberty of conscience, April 27, in higher strains, and more advantageous to the Papists, than the former: the substance of it was as follows:

“JAMES REX.

“Our conduct has been such in all times as ought to have persuaded the world, that we are firm and constant to our resolutions; yet, that easy people may not be abused by the malice of crafty wicked men, we think fit to declare that our intentions are not changed since the 4th of April, 1687, when we issued our declaration for liberty of conscience in the following terms;”² [Here the declaration is recited at large, and then it follows] “Ever since we granted the indulgence, we have made it our care to see it preserved without distinction, as we are encouraged to do daily by multitudes of addresses, and many other assurances we receive from our subjects of all persuasions, as testimonies of their satisfaction and duty; the effects of which we doubt not but the next parliament will show, and that it will not be in vain that we have resolved to use our utmost endeavours to establish liberty of conscience on such just and equal foundations as will render it unalterable, and secure to all people the free exercise of their religion for ever, by which future ages may reap the benefit of what is so undoubtedly for the general good of the whole kingdom. It is such a security we desire, without the burden and constraint of oaths and tests, which have unhappily been made by some governments, but could never support any. Nor could men be advanced by such means to offices and employments, which ought to be the reward of services, fidelity, and merit. We must conclude, that not only

¹ Calamy's Abridgments, p. 382.

² Gazette, no. 2342.

good Christians will join in this, but whoever is concerned for the wealth and power of the nation. It would, perhaps, prejudice some of our neighbours, who might lose part of those vast advantages they now enjoy, if liberty of conscience were settled in these kingdoms, which are above all others most capable of improvements, and of commanding the trade of the world. In pursuance of this great work, we have been forced to make many changes, both of civil and military officers, throughout our dominions, not thinking any ought to be employed in our service who will not contribute towards the establishing the peace and greatness of their country, which we most earnestly desire, as unbiassed men may see by the whole conduct of our government, and by the condition of our fleet and of our armies, which, with good management, shall constantly be the same, and greater, if the safety or honour of the nation require it. We recommend these considerations to all our subjects, and that they will reflect on their ease and happiness, now that above three years it has pleased God to permit us to reign over these kingdoms, we have not appeared to be that prince our enemies would make the world afraid of; our chief aim having been, not to be the oppressor but father of our people; of which we can give no better evidence, than by conjuring them to lay aside private animosities, as well as groundless jealousies, and to choose such members of parliament as may do their parts to finish what we have begun, for the advantage of the monarchy over which Almighty God has placed us, being resolved to call a parliament that shall meet in November next at farthest.”

This declaration was published in the usual manner, and ordered to be read in time of divine service in all churches and chapels in and about London, May 20th and 27th; and in all the rest of England and Wales on the 3d and 10th of June following, upon penalty of being prosecuted in the ecclesiastical commission.¹ For this purpose the bishops were required to cause it to be distributed throughout their respective dioceses: some of them, says Burnet, carried their compliance to a shameful pitch, offering up their allegiance to the king without limitation or reserve. Dr. Crew, bishop of Durham, Barlow of Lincoln,² Cartwright of Chester, Wood of Litchfield

¹ Gazette, no. 2344.

² Dr. Grey thinks that bishop Barlow could not be so forward a promoter of such addresses, because that in a letter to one of his clergy, dated May 29th, he informed him, that the clergy in London generally refused to read the declaration: and added, “As to myself, I shall neither persuade nor dissuade you, but leave it to your prudence and conscience, whether you will or not read it. But only this I shall advise, that if, after serious consideration, you find that you cannot read it but *reluctaiite vel dubitante conscientiá*, in that case to read it will be your sin, and you to blame for doing it.” Notwithstanding bishop Barlow wrote so candidly on the matter, in this instance, he sent up a letter of thanks to king James for his first declaration, published reasons for reading the second, and asserted and vindicated, in an elaborate tract, the regal power of dispensing with penal laws. This bishop was not a consistent character; he was timid and complying, accommodating himself to the

and Coventry, Watson of St. David's, Sprat of Rochester, and Parker of Oxford, went all the lengths of the court, and promoted addresses of thanks to his majesty in the most exalted language, for the promise he had made in his late declaration, to maintain the church of England as by law established;¹ though nothing was more evident than his design to subvert it. An address came from the clergy of Chester, justifying the declaration, as issuing from the prerogative of the king's supremacy, and insisting that the clergy were obliged by what is called statute law, the rubric of their liberty, to publish what was required by the king, or their bishop, and therefore they were troubled to hear of the disobedience of some of that bench, who, though they tenderly promised the dissenters something, yet refused to do their part about the declaration, lest they should be parties to it; which reason we with due modesty esteem insufficient. Herbert Croft, bishop of Hereford, published his reasons for reading the declaration, from that passage of Scripture, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme," &c. "Now the king commanding it to be read, without requiring our assent, consent, or allowance, I cannot see," says the bishop, "how it can be refused. If it be said, this is to admit of a dispensing power, yet it is not contrary to the word of God. If the king should aver his dispensing power to be inherent in the crown, and will use it as he pleases, I should beseech him not to exert it in so high a manner; but after this, what have bishops to do but submit, since here is no doctrine affirmed, but only a declaration of matter of fact?"

However, the majority of the clergy were of different sentiments; eighteen bishops, and the chief of their clergy, refused to publish the declaration, so that it was read, says Burnet,² only in seven churches in London, and in about two hundred all over England.³ The commissioners for ecclesiastical affairs sent out citations by the king's order,⁴ requiring the chancellors and archdeacons to send in lists of all who had obeyed, and of those who had not obeyed, the order of council; together with the places where it had been neglected.⁵ Most of the bishops disobeyed, and generously undertook to stand in the gap, and screen the inferior clergy from prosecution: seven of

times, and ready to side with the strongest. At one time he was a seeming friend to the Papists, then a distinguished writer against Popery. Now an enemy to the duke of York; then ever expressing his submission to king James; and afterward taking the oaths to his successors. *Biographia Britannica*, vol. 1, article Barlow. Godwin de Præsulibus, p. 305.—ED.

¹ Gazette, no. 2374.

² Page 178.

³ Some who read it on the first Sunday, changed their minds before the second. Others declared in their sermons, that, though they obeyed the order, they did not approve the declaration. And one, more pleasantly than gravely, told his people, that though he was obliged to read it, they were not obliged to hear it; and stopped till they all went out, and then read it to the walls. Burnet's History, vol. 3. p. 178.—ED.

⁴ Burnet, p. 184.

⁵ Gazette, no. 2364.

them met at Lambeth, and after consultation signed an address, in behalf of themselves and several of their absent brethren, setting forth, “that they were not averse to the publishing his majesty’s declaration for want of duty to his majesty, or due tenderness towards dissenters, in relation to whom (say they) we are willing to come to such a temper as shall be thought fit, when the matter comes to be considered and settled in parliament; but the declaration, being founded on such a dispensing power as may at present set aside all laws ecclesiastical and civil, appears to us illegal, and did so to the parliament in 1672; and it is a point of such great consequence, that we cannot make ourselves party to it, so far as the reading of it in the church in time of divine service will amount to, and distributing it all over the kingdom.”¹ Signed by Sancroft archbishop of Canterbury,² Lloyd bishop of St. Asaph, Kenn of Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, White of Peterborough, and Trelawny of Bristol.

The king was startled at the address, and answered in a very angry tone, “I have heard of this before, but did not believe it; I did not expect this from the church of England, especially from some of you. If I change my mind you shall hear from me; if not, I expect my commands shall be obeyed.”³ And added, that they should be made to feel what it was to disobey him. The six bishops who brought the address replied, “The will of God be done.”

Let the reader now judge, whether the slavish doctrine of nonresistance and unlimited obedience, which the high-church party had been preaching up for above twenty years as the doctrine of the church of England, had not brought the nation to the very verge of ruin. A doctrine destructive of all law, and of the safety of society, and which has been fatal to many crowned heads. If the king had not relied on the flattering addresses of these men,

¹ Burnet, p. 176. Welwood’s *Memoirs*, p. 184, sixth edition.

² Archbishop Sancroft, in this instance, acted contrary to what had been his conduct and avowed principle in the former reign. For when, in 1681, Charles II. published his declaration to satisfy his people about dissolving his parliament, Sancroft moved that an order should be added to it, requiring the clergy to publish it in all the churches in England. This was looked on, says Burnet, as a most pernicious precedent, by which the clergy were made the heralds to publish the king’s declarations, that might, in some instances, come to be not only indecent, but mischievous. But this, whatever was now his judgment, had been his decided opinion. For, on the present occasion, Dr. Cartwright, the bishop of Chester, who had been one of the prebendaries of Durham, it appears, from a paper among the MSS. of Mr. Talents of Shrewsbury, which fell into the hands of Mr. Archer of Tunbridge, could produce, and did show to the king, a revised copy of the liturgy in 1661, given by bishop Cosins to the library at Durham; in which Sancroft had added to the rubric, where it was said, “Nothing is to be read in churches but by the bishop’s order, or the king’s order.” Yet, when king James commanded a declaration in favour of the dissenters to be read, this archbishop was amongst the first to oppose it, in contradiction to the clause which he had dictated, and the example he had given. *Calamy’s History of his own Life*, vol. 1. p. 173. 176.—ED.

³ Burnet, p. 177.

under which it seems there was a reserve, he would have stopped short, and taken other measures; but he did not perceive the mine till it was sprung, and blew up his whole government at once. This was the crisis upon which the fate of the nation depended.

While the king was deliberating what to do with the bishops, he was for some time in great perplexity; several of the Popish nobility pressed him to retreat; but at length, at the instigation of father Petre, Mr. Lob, and some others, he ordered the bishops to be prosecuted; and they, refusing to enter into bonds for their appearance at the King's-bench bar, on account of their peerage, were sent to the Tower by water,¹ June 8, but were discharged within a week, upon entering into bonds for small sums to answer to the information that day fortnight. On the 29th of June they were brought to the King's-bench bar in Westminster-hall, attended by several of the nobility, and a vast crowd of common people; and, after a long trial of ten hours, were acquitted:² upon which there was a general joy, and such loud acclamations as resounded not only in the city, but even in the army at Hounslow.³

¹ The bishops, as they took boat, looked all very cheerfully: and the people flocked round them in great numbers, to condole with them, and ask their blessing. When they were confined, ten Nonconformist ministers visited them. Which the king took very heinously, and sent for four of them, and reprimanded them. Their answer was, "that they could not but adhere to the bishops, as men constant and firm to the Protestant faith." Even the soldiers that kept guard would frequently drink health to the bishops; and when an order was sent to the captain of the guard, to see it was done no more, the reply was, "that the soldiers were doing it at the very instant, and would, during the imprisonment of the bishops, drink no other health." So that in an early stage of this prosecution, one of the privy-council owned, "that had the king known how far the thing would have gone, he had never enjoined the reading of the declaration in the churches." Resesby's Memoirs, p. 267, 262.—ED.

² "There were (Dr. Welwood observes), two remarkable things in this trial. King James saw the illegality of his new-assumed prerogative exposed on one of the most solemn causes, in Westminster-hall, before one of the greatest auditories, by the counsel of the bishops: who boldly and learnedly argued against the dispensing power, and proved it, by invincible arguments, to be an open violation of the laws and constitution of the kingdom." Another remarkable circumstance was, "that they, who had contributed to enslave their country by false notions of law, now changed their opinion; and others who through two successive parliaments had, at the expense of their own sufferings, stood up for the liberty of their country, did now endeavour to stretch the prerogative beyond its just limits, as they had before opposed it. So hard is it for mankind to be, at all times, and upon all turns, constant to themselves." Welwood's Memoirs, p. 185, 186.—ED.

³ The bishops were complimented on their victory, in the highest manner, by all orders of men. They were ranked with the primitive confessors, and loaded with praises: they were compared to the seven golden candlesticks, and to the seven stars in Christ's right hand. Their pictures were publicly sold in all printsellers' shops, and bought up in vast numbers, as guardians of the laws, liberties, and religion, of their country. Their conduct affected king James more than any other opposition he met with. Dr. Grey's Examination, vol. 3. p. 420, 421. And, on the day after the trial, he was observed to labour under a very great disturbance of mind. Sir John Resesby's Memoirs, p. 264.—ED.

The bishops' address was printed by authority, with a satirical paraphrase, setting forth, that though the bishops had, without any bowels of tenderness, exercised many inhuman cruelties upon the dissenters, they promise now to come to a temper, but it is only such a one as they themselves should settle in convocation; and though they had all along vigorously endeavoured to advance above all law that arbitrary power upon which they suppose his majesty's declaration was founded, when it could be strained to the oppression of dissenters, yet now they oppose it, and are desirous in this juncture (as in the year 1672), that the laws for persecution should retain their force, and the dispensing power not to be countenanced, though designed for a general good.

But this was too late; the controversy between the court and the church was now no longer to be decided by the pen; and it was apparent beyond contradiction, that the hearts of the people were alienated from the king; even the dissenters (says Echard) showed an unusual readiness to join the church against their common enemy; and whatever might be in the hearts of some, the church-party continued to discover an equal willingness to coalesce with the dissenters. When Dr. Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph, passed through Oswestry, in Shropshire, he sent for Mr. James Owen, the dissenting minister, and ventured to acquaint him with the secret of the prince of Orange's invitation by some great persons, in which he had joined; and added, he hoped the Protestant dissenters would concur in promoting the common interest, for you and we are brethren (says he); we have indeed been angry brethren, but we have seen our folly, and are resolved, if ever we have it in our power, to show that we will treat you as brethren.

Even archbishop Sancroft, in the circular letter which he sent to the clergy of his province, exhorted them to cultivate a good correspondence with the dissenters.¹ The eleventh article of his letter,² dated July 16, has these words, "that they (viz. the clergy) should walk in wisdom towards them who are not of our communion; and if there be in their parishes any such, that they neglect not frequently to converse with them in the spirit of meekness, seeking by all good ways and means to gain and win them over to our communion; more especially that they have a tender regard to our brethren the Protestant dissenters; that upon occasion offered they visit

¹ Calamy's Abridgments, vol. 1. p. 385.

² One of the articles of this letter enjoined the clergy, four times at least in the year, to teach the people, in their sermons, "that the king's power being in his dominions highest under God, all priests should, upon all occasions, persuade the people to loyalty and obedience to his majesty, in all things lawful, and to patient submission in the rest, promoting, as far as in them lies, the public peace and quiet of the world." This was a renewal of certain orders, issued out to the several bishops of their provinces, with the king's consent, by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, August 4th, 1622, and repeated in the reign of Charles II. High-Church Politics, p. 84—ED.

them at their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, persuading them (if it may be) to a full compliance with our church; or at least, that whereunto we have already attained, we may all walk by the same rule, and mind the same things; and in order thereunto that they take opportunities of assuring and convincing them, that the bishops of this church are really and sincerely irreconcilable enemies to the errors, superstitions, idolatries, and tyrannies, of the church of Rome; and that the very unkind jealousies which some have had of us to the contrary were altogether groundless. And in the last place, that they warmly and affectionately join us in daily fervent prayer to the God of peace, for a universal blessed union of all reformed churches at home and abroad against our common enemy.” Such was the language of the church in distress!

It was often said, that if ever God should deliver them out of their present distress, they would keep up their domestic quarrels no more;¹ which were so visibly and yet artfully managed by our adversaries, as to make us devour one another. Again, “I do assure you, and I am certain I have the best grounds in the world for my assurance (says one), that the bishops, when the happy opportunity shall offer itself, will let the Protestant dissenters find that they will be better than their word given in their famous petition.”² Remarkable are the words of another reverend divine on the same occasion: “The bishops have under their hands declared their dispositions to come to a temper in matters of conformity, and there seems to be no doubt of their sincerity. If ever God brings us into a settled state out of the storms into which our passions and folly, as well as the treachery of others, have led us, it cannot be imagined that the bishops will go off from those moderate resolutions which they have now declared; and they continuing firm, the weak and indiscreet passions of any of the inferior clergy must needs vanish. And I will boldly say, that if the church of England, after she has got out of this storm, will return to hearken to the peevishness of some sour men, she will be abandoned both of God and man, and will set heaven and earth against her. The nation sees too clearly, how dear the dispute about conformity has cost us, to stand upon such punctilios; and those in whom our deliverance is wrapped up judge too right, that ever they will be priest-ridden in this point. And if any argument was wanting to conclude the certainty of this point, the wise and generous behaviour of the main body of the dissenters in this present juncture has given them so just a title to our friendship, that we must resolve to set all the world against us if we

¹ Burnet, p. 142.

² Calamy's Abridgment, vol. 1. p. 336.

can ever forget it; and if we do not make them all the returns of ease and favour when it is in our power to do it.”¹

The reader has now seen the various and strong assurances of favour, given by the church-party in distress, to the Nonconformists, all which, in a few months, entirely evaporated. Nevertheless, I am fully of opinion, that the low-church clergy meant honestly, and designed to be as good as their word; for which purpose a scheme was proposed to review and amend the liturgy by corrections and additions, and leaving some few ceremonies indifferent; but there was another party which lay behind the curtain, and meant no more by their protestations and promises, than to deliver themselves out of trouble; who, as they renounced the doctrine of nonresistance only to serve their turn, when that was effected they seemed willing to forget what they had done, and were desirous of becoming as cruel persecutors as ever; they were enemies to revolution principles; and when the prince of Orange had rescued them, they would have sent him back from whence he came; these men were afterward distinguished by the names of nonjurors, jacobites, and highfliers, whose numbers were greater than the low-church clergy imagined. They prevailed in convocation, intimidated the friends of liberty and moderation, and put an effectual stop to all farther attempts of a general comprehension.²

While the bishops were in the Tower, and the princess Anne at Bath, the queen was declared to be delivered of a prince on Sunday, June 10, between the hours of nine and ten in the morning. This mysterious birth was conducted with great artifice or great imprudence; no care had been taken to satisfy the Protestant part of the nation that the queen was with child, though it was ridiculed in pamphlets dispersed about Whitehall. None of the Protestant ladies were admitted to be with her when she changed her linen; nor to see the milk in her breasts, nor to feel the child move within her; but all about her were Italian women. The place where her majesty was to lie in, was unknown till a few days before her delivery; and it was oddly circumstanced as to time, most of the Protestant ladies being out of the way, and preparing for church; the Dutch ambassador, then in town, was not called to be a witness, on behalf of the princess of Orange, the presumptive heir; all being finished in about two hours. The birth was attended with great rejoicings of the Popish party; a day of public thanksgiving was appointed, on which occasion a form of thanksgiving was prepared by the bishop of Rochester; and a new set of congratulations sent up from all parts of the kingdom.

¹ Calamy's Abridgment, vol. 1. p. 426.

² Calamy's Abridgment, p. 384, note.

Bishop Burnet, Mr. Echard, and others, have examined into the legitimacy of this birth with all possible exactness, but they have left the matter under great uncertainties.—Some have pronounced it supposititious, and no better than the last desperate effort of the Popish party to perpetuate their religion. Others, who credited the birth, have assigned very plausible reasons to suspect, that the present pretender was not the queen's child, but another's clandestinely substituted. Bishop Burnet is of opinion, that the proofs of its legitimacy were defective. However, all the hopes of a Protestant successor seemed now at an end, and the joys of the Papists consummated, the English reformation was expiring, and nothing short of a total subversion of the civil and ecclesiastical establishment to be expected.

The princess of Orange being thus cut off from the succession, his highness gave greater attention to the advices he received from England, of the queen's having miscarried some months before, and that therefore the present child must be supposititious. The church-party, being driven to distress from their favourite doctrine of nonresistance, fled with others to the prince of Orange as their last refuge, and prayed him to come over to their rescue; with this view admiral Russel, and several eminent persons, repaired to the Hague on various plausible pretences, but in reality to invite the prince, and concert measures with him for his expedition to England; who received them favourably, and discovered a good disposition to espouse their cause, considering that his own right to the crown was now lost, and that if Popery was established in England, Holland, and the rest of the reformed interests, must be exposed to the utmost hazard. Little persuasion was wanting to prevail with the States-general to assist the English Protestants; but all the difficulty was to keep it secret while they were preparing for so difficult an undertaking. The States made use of the differences about the election of an archbishop of Cologne as a reason to form an army for the security of their own borders; and the prince, who had the administration in his hands, set himself under this cover to prepare all necessaries for his intended embarkation, while Mr. Zuylestein brought him from time to time the strongest assurances of the disposition of the body of the English Protestants to appear for him at his landing, which fully fixed him in his purpose.

But the French ambassador at the Hague kept a watchful eye upon the prince's motions, and gave timely notice of the extraordinary preparations for war that were making in Holland, to his master Louis XIV., from whom king James had the first intelligence. Mr. Skelton, the English envoy at Paris, also wrote five or six letters to court on the same head, but king James gave little heed to his advices, because the prince of Orange carried it in a most courteous and respectful manner, complimenting his majesty on the birth of the prince of Wales, and causing his name to be added to the rest of

the princes of the royal family to be prayed for in his chapel. However, the French king continued to alarm the court of England with the intended invasion, and offered to send over fifteen thousand men, or as many more as should be wanted, to his assistance; but the earl of Sunderland, who had lately complimented the king with his religion, prevailed with his majesty not to transport an army of French Papists into his dominions, lest it should confirm the suspicions of the Protestants, that he designed the overthrow of their religion and liberties.¹

The king, being at length convinced of the prince of Orange's design, ordered the fleet to be fitted out, and the army to be augmented; and dispatched orders to Tyrconnel to send hither several regiments from Ireland, which put the people under terrible apprehensions of an Irish massacre.

September 21, his majesty issued out his proclamation for the meeting of a new parliament, "intimating his royal purpose to endeavour a legal establishment of a universal toleration, and inviolably to preserve the church of England in possession of the several acts of uniformity, as far as they were consistent with such a toleration."² And farther to quiet the minds of his Protestant subjects, he was content that the Roman Catholics should remain incapable of being members of the house of commons, that so the legislature might continue in the hands of the Protestants." September 23, the king was farther assured by letters from the marquis of Abbeville at the Hague, that pensionary Fagel had owned the design of the prince of Orange to invade England.³ Upon which the king turned pale and speechless for a while, and like a distracted man looked round every way for relief, but was resolute in nothing. He postponed the meeting of the parliament, and by advice of his council applied to the bishops then in town for advice what was necessary to be done to make the church easy. The bishops moved him to annul the ecclesiastical commission, and the dispensing power: to recall all licences and faculties for Papists to keep schools, to prohibit the four pretended vicars apostolical invading the ecclesiastical jurisdiction; to fill the vacant bishoprics; to restore the charters, and to call a free and regular parliament, by which the church of England might be secured according to the act of uniformity; and provision made for a due liberty of conscience. Pursuant to this advice the king and court began to tread backward, concluding, that if they could satisfy the bishops and recover the affection of the church, all would do well. The bishop of London's suspension was taken off, the ecclesiastical commission dissolved, the city charter and the fellows of Magdalen-college were restored, and other illegal practices re-

¹ Burnet, p. 217

² Gazette, No. 2384.

³ Gazette, No. 2386.

nounced;¹ but upon the news of the prince of Orange's fleet being dispersed by a storm, and that they would hardly be able to put to sea again till next spring, his majesty withdrew his hand from any farther redress of grievances.

But the prince having repaired the damages of the storm, sailed a second time, November 1, and after a remarkable passage, in which the wind chopped about almost miraculously in his favour,² landed at Torbay, November 5, with about fourteen thousand men, without meeting the king's fleet, which was at sea in order to intercept them. The prince brought over with him a declaration, dated October 10, divided into twenty-six articles, but reducible to three principal heads; 1. An enumeration of the public grievances, with regard to religion and civil government. 2. The fruitless attempts which had been made to redress those grievances: under which mention is made of the suspicious birth of the pretended prince of Wales. 3. A protestation that the present expedition was intended for no other purpose than to procure a free and lawful parliament; to which the prince would refer the redress of all the grievances complained of; and for the obtaining such a parliament, his highness declares, he had been most earnestly solicited by a great many lords both spiritual³ and temporal, and by many

¹ Ibid. No. 2388. 2391.

² Bishop Burnet, who minutely describes the circumstances of the prince of Orange's landing, says, that though he was never inclined to superstition, but rather to be philosophical on all occasions, yet, the strange ordering of the winds and seasons to change, just as their affairs required it, made a deep impression on himself, and on all who observed it. The famous verses of Claudian seemed to be more applicable to the prince, than to him on whom they were made:

“O nimium dilecte Deo, cui militat aether,
Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti.”

“Heaven's favourite, for whom the skies do fight,
And all the winds conspire to guide thee right.”

Burnet's History, vol. 3. p. 252. Edin. edit. 12mo.—Ed.

³ Dr. Grey, though he cannot deny that the prince of Orange averred, in his declaration, that he was invited over by lords spiritual, yet is not inclined to admit the fact. He quotes, with a view to invalidate it, some letters from sir Jonathan Trelawney, bishop of Winchester, written to Mr. Echard in the years 1716. and 1718—19, in which this concurrence of the bishops, and of themselves, in the invitation to the prince of Orange, is absolutely denied. To these assertions is added a memorandum, made by sir Jonathan Trelawney, of a conversation which he had with Mr. Francis Robarts, son to the earl of Radnor, shortly after the king's coronation, on this point: who said, that he had asked commissary William Harbord, that came over with the prince, whether it was true that the bishops had taken a part in that invitation? To which Harbord answered with a curse, “No, they were not so honest. But I caused it to be put in to raise a jealousy and hatred on both sides, that king James believing it, might never forgive them; and they, fearing he did believe it, might be provoked, for their own safety, to wish and help on his ruin.” Against these authorities, it is to be observed that bishop Burnet asserts, that the earl of Danby drew in the bishop of London to join in the design of bringing over the prince of Orange: and that Trelawney, besides going into it, engaged also his brother, the bishop of Bristol, into it. Grey's Examination, vol. 3. p. 422; and Burnet, vol. 3. p. 214, 215.—ED.

gentlemen, and other subjects of all ranks, to come over to England; and to encourage the Protestant dissenters his highness adds, that he would recommend to the parliament the making such new laws, as might establish a good agreement between the church of England and all Protestant Nonconformists, and in the meantime would suffer such as would live peaceably to enjoy all due freedom in their consciences.

The king, who had relied too much on the clergy's professions of unlimited obedience, being surprised at the expressions in the prince's declaration, that he had been invited by the lords spiritual, sent for the bishops then in town, and insisted not only upon their disowning the fact, but upon their signing a paper, expressing their abhorrence of the intended invasion; but they excused themselves only with a general profession of their allegiance and duty. The church-party, says Burnet,¹ now showed their approbation of the prince's expedition in such terms that many were surprised at it, both then and since that time; they spoke openly in favour of it; they expressed their grief to see the wind so cross, and wished for a Protestant wind that might bring the prince over. His majesty, therefore, finding himself deceived in the church-party, and that he had no other reliance but his army, used all imaginable diligence to strengthen it. In obedience to the orders already given, two thousand five hundred men [chiefly Papists] were landed at Chester from Ireland. Commissions were given out for raising ten new regiments of horse and foot. Three thousand Scots were ordered from that country. All the militia were commanded to be in readiness to march on the first summons; and a proclamation was issued out, requiring all horses and cattle to be removed twenty miles from those parts of the sea-coast, where it was apprehended the prince would land; but so great was the people's disaffection that they paid little regard to his majesty's orders.

Soon after his highness's landing, the body of the nation discovered their inclinations so evidently, that the king lost both head and heart at once. The city of London was in confusion; reports were spread that the Irish would cut the throats of the Protestants throughout the nation in one and the same night, which awakened the people's fears, and kept them all night on their guard. When this fright was allayed, the mob rose and pulled down the mass-houses, and burnt the materials in the streets: father Petre, with the swarms of priests and Jesuits who had flocked about the court, disappeared, and retired into foreign parts: and several of the king's arbitrary ministers, who had brought him under these difficulties, forsook him and absconded. Jefferies was taken in Wapping in a sailor's habit, and would have been torn in pieces by the mob if he had not been conducted by a strong guard to the Tower, where he died before he came to his trial. The

¹ Burnet, p. 24.3, 244.

unhappy king, being left in a manner alone, retired with a small retinue to his army at Salisbury.

The prince of Orange, having refreshed his forces, marched from Torbay to Exeter, where the nobility and gentry signed an association to support and assist his highness in pursuing the ends of his declaration, and that if any attempt was made on his person, it should be revenged on all by whom or from whom it should be made. Great numbers of common people came in to the prince at Exeter; and as soon as he marched forward towards London, prince George of Denmark, the dukes of Ormond, Grafton, lord Wharton, Churchill, and others of the first distinction, deserted the army at Salisbury, and joined the prince, with a great many Protestant officers and soldiers: so that his majesty perceived, that even the army, which was his last refuge, was not to be relied on; and to complete his unhappiness, princess Anne, his younger daughter, withdrew privately from court, with the bishop of London, who put on his buff coat and sword, and commanded a little army for her highness's defence.

Dr. Finch, son to the earl of Winchelsea, and warden of All-Souls college in Oxford, was sent to the prince from some of the heads of colleges, to invite him to Oxford, and to assure him they were ready to declare for him, and that their plate should be at his service. The prince intended to have accepted their invitation, but all things being in a ferment at London, he was advised to make all the haste thither that he could.¹ So he sent to Oxford to excuse his visit, and to offer them the association, which was signed by almost all the heads and the chief men of the university; even by those who being disappointed in the preferments they aspired to, became afterward his most implacable enemies.² Archbishop Sancroft also sent his compliments to the prince, and with seven or eight other bishops, signed the association, having changed the word revenge into that of punishment. This was a sudden turn, says the bishop, from those principles which they had carried a few years before. The dissenters went cheerfully into all the prince's measures, and were ready to sign the "association:" there were few or no jacobites or nonjurors among them; and throughout the whole course of king William's reign, they were among his most loyal and zealous subjects.

In this critical juncture, the queen and the young prince of Wales were sent to France, December 9, the king himself following, the latter end of the month, having first caused the writs for calling a new parliament to be burnt, and the great seal to be thrown into the Thames.³ After his majesty's

¹ Burnet, p. 257, 258.

² Echard, 1138.

³ Burnet, p. 260. 263.

first attempt to leave the kingdom he was seized at Feversham,¹ and prevailed with to return back to London; but when the prince resolved to come to Whitehall, and sent his majesty a message, that he thought it not consistent with the peace of the city, and of the kingdom, for both of them to be there together; his majesty retired a second time to Rochester with the prince's consent, and after a week's stay in that place went away privately in a vessel to France, leaving a paper behind him, in which he declared, that though he was going to seek foreign assistance, he would not make use of it to overthrow the established religion or the law's of his country. Thus ended the short and unhappy reign of James II., and with him the male line of the royal house of Stuarts, a race of princes raised up by Providence to be the scourge of these nations, for they were all chargeable with tyranny and oppression, favourers of Popery, and invaders of the legal constitution of their country in church and state. They enfeebled the nation by encouraging licentiousness of manners, and sunk a bold and brave people into contempt among foreign powers.

Nothing could have been more fortunate for the prince of Orange, than the king's flight from Rochester to France, which furnished a plausible occasion for the convention parliament to pass a vote, that the king had abdicated the crown, and that the throne was vacant; though it would have looked more like a voluntary desertion, if his majesty had gone off the first time from Feversham, and had not declared in the paper he left behind him, that he was going to seek for foreign assistance; it is certain the king was frightened away by his priests, who possessed him with an apprehension that he was already a prisoner; and by his queen, who prevailed with him to consult his own and family's safety, by leaving the kingdom for the present. Thus a great and powerful monarch was in a few weeks reduced to a condition little better than that of a wandering pilgrim.²

The prince of Orange arrived at St. James's December 18, and on the 21st following the bishop of London, with several of the clergy, and some dissenting ministers, waited upon his highness to congratulate him on the happy success of his glorious expedition; when his lordship acquainted his highness in the name of the clergy, that there were some of their dissenting brethren present, who were herein entirely of the same sentiments with themselves.³ But on the 2d of January about ninety of the Nonconformist ministers attended the prince at St. James's in a distinct body, being intro-

¹ He was seized by Mr. Hunt, at that time a custom-house officer, who died so lately as the 24th of July, 1752, at Feversham. He boarded the ship in which the king was, by virtue of his office; and taking his majesty for a suspicious person, brought him ashore without knowing his quality; but was greatly terrified when he found it was the king. Gentleman's Magazine for July 1752, p. 337—ED.

² Burnet, p. 274.

³ Calamy, p. 387.

duced by the earl of Devonshire, and the lords Wharton and Wiltshire: when the reverend Mr. Howe, in the name of the rest, assured his highness “of their grateful sense of his hazardous and heroical expedition, which the favour of Heaven had made so surprisingly prosperous. That they esteemed it a common felicity, that the worthy patriots of the nobility and gentry of this kingdom had unanimously concurred with his highness’s designs, by whose most prudent advice the administration of public affairs was devolved, in this difficult conjuncture, into hands which the nation and the world knew to be apt for the greatest undertakings, and so suitable to the present exigency of our case. They promised their utmost endeavours, in their several stations, to promote the excellent and most desirable ends for which his highness had declared. They added their continual fervent prayers to the Almighty, for the preservation of his highness’s person, and the success of his future endeavours for the defence and propagation of the Protestant interest throughout the Christian world; that they should all most willingly have chosen that time for the season of paying their duty to his highness, when the lord-bishop and the clergy of London attended his highness for the same purpose (which some of them did, and which his lordship was pleased condescendingly to make mention of to his highness), had their notice of that intended application been so early as to make their more general attendance possible at that time. Therefore, though they did now appear in a distinct company, it was not on a distinct account, but on that only which was common to them, and to all Protestants; and though there were some of their brethren of eminent note, whom age or present infirmities hindered from coming with them, yet they concurred in the same grateful sense of their common deliverance.”¹ His highness received them very favourably, and returned them the following answer: “My great end was the preservation of the Protestant religion; and with the Almighty’s assistance and permission, so to defend and support the same, as may give it strength and reputation throughout the world, sufficient to preserve it from the insults and oppression of its most implacable enemies; and that more immediately in these kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and I will use my utmost endeavours, so to settle and cement all different persuasions of Protestants in such a bond of love and community, as may contribute to the lasting security and enjoyment of spirituals and temporals to all sincere professors of that holy religion.”

In order to settle the government, the prince published an order, desiring all persons who had served as knights, citizens, or burgesses, in any of the parliaments in the reign of king Charles II. to meet him at St. James’s on Wednesday, the 26th of December, at ten in the morning; and that the

¹ Howe’s Life, p. 112.

lord-mayor and court of aldermen of the city of London would be present, and fifty of the common-council.¹ This assembly desired the prince to take upon himself the administration of the government for the present; and a convention parliament was chosen with all expedition, in which various methods were proposed of settling the government: some were for compromising matters with king James, and others for a regency; but after long and warm debates the throne was declared vacant, king James having abdicated the government, and broken the original contract with his people. When the question was put, whether to fill the throne with a king, or to appoint a regent, it was carried for the former only by two voices, fifty-one being for a king, and forty-nine for a regent, among which latter were twelve or thirteen bishops, two only, viz. the bishops of London and Bristol, being for a king; the reason of which was, their reluctance to contradict the doctrine they had been so long preaching, viz. that the regal power was *jure divino*, and his majesty's character indelible. They had indeed concurred in inviting the prince of Orange to come to the relief of their religion; but, the storm being appeased, they thought it not incumbent on them wholly to depart from their old principles, and therefore voted for a regency; but, the question being carried (says bishop Burnet), nature was so strong in them, that it was too hard for their doctrine.² And a declaration being prepared for asserting and vindicating the ancient rights and liberties of the subject, the crown was offered to the prince and princess of Orange, the latter of whom arrived from Holland the day before; and, both having declared their acceptance, were proclaimed king and queen of England, &c. February 13, 1688–89, and crowned at Westminster April 11 following, amidst the joyful acclamations of all the friends of the Protestant religion and liberties of their country.³

Thus a wonderful revolution was effected with little or no effusion of blood; and it is surprising to reflect on the remarkable appearances of Divine Providence in the rise, progress, and consummation of this important event; how the court of England and the Roman Catholic powers were all

¹ Gazette, No, 2114.

² Burnet, p. 282.

³ The Scotch also, in 1689, sent up commissioners to their majesties at Whitehall, to make a tender of their crown. On being introduced, they presented, according to the powers on which they acted, an address from the estates, the instrument of government, a recital of grievances, and a request that the convention might be converted into a parliament. The king having promised to concur with them in all just measures for the interest of the kingdom, the coronation-oath was tendered to their majesties. His conduct on this occasion deserves particular notice: it was cautious and liberal. The oath contained a clause by which they should engage to root out heresy: the king demurred on this, and declared he would not oblige himself to act as a persecutor. The commissioners replying that such was not the meaning or import of the oath, he desired them and others present to bear witness to the exception he made. Burnet's History, vol. 4. p. 34. 12mo.; and Lindsey's Historical View of the State of Unitarianism, p. 303, note.—ED.

infatuated or asleep while the design was forming; and when it was carrying into execution, how the winds were subservient, and the hearts of the people united till it was brought to maturity: and it will amaze all posterity to read the inconsistent and dishonourable part which the high-church clergy and their friends acted on this occasion; for, after they had preached their hereditary prince into a belief of their unlimited loyalty, and assured him in numberless addresses that their lives and fortunes were absolutely at his service; and after the university of Oxford, by a solemn decree, had declared all manner of resistance damnable and infamous to the Christian religion, they appeared among the first who resisted him; and, by opening a reserve which lay hid under their unbounded professions of duty and allegiance, let him fall into that pit out of which he could never escape. As soon as the *jure divino* king invaded the properties of the universities, and threatened to take down the fences of their ecclesiastical preferments, they invited the prince of Orange with an armed force to their rescue; they signed an association to support and assist him; they offered him their plate, and declared for him in a body, even while their sovereign was on the throne. Nevertheless, the moment they thought their power and preferments secure, they would have retracted, and made up matters again with king James; they opposed the motion in the convention parliament for declaring the throne vacant; and when the government came to be settled upon king William and queen Mary, great numbers of them would not submit, and those who did acted a treacherous and dishonourable part to their great deliverer, throughout the course of his reign. What inconsistencies are these! What oaths and declarations can hold men who burst such bands, and cut such sacred cords asunder? The like must be observed as to their vows and promises to the Nonconformists, all which were forgot or broken as soon as the church was delivered. The dissenters acted a more consistent part; for, not being entangled with the same fetters, they went heartily into the revolution, and were among king William's best and steadiest friends, when others forsook and opposed him.

No sooner were king William and queen Mary settled on the throne, than the dissenting ministers in and about the city of London waited on their majesties with an address of congratulation, when Dr. Bates, at their head, made the two following speeches:

“To the King.

“May it please your majesty,

“The series of successful events which have attended your glorious enterprise for the saving of these kingdoms from so imminent and destructive evils, has been so eminent and extraordinary, that it may force an acknowledgment of the divine providence from those who deny it, and cause admiri-

ration in all who believe and reverence it. The beauty and speed of this happy work are the bright signatures of His hand, who creates deliverance for his people: the less of human power, the more of divine wisdom and goodness has been conspicuous in it. If the deliverance had been obtained by fierce and bloody battles, victory itself had been dejected and sad, and our joy had been mixed with afflicting bitterness; but as the sun, ascending the horizon, dispels without noise the darkness of the night, so your serene presence has, without tumults and disorders, chased away the darkness that invaded us. In the sense of this astonishing deliverance, we desire with all possible ardency of affection to magnify the glorious name of God, the author of it, by whose entire efficacy the means have been successful; and we cannot without a warm rapture of thankfulness recount our obligations to your majesty, the happy instrument of it. Your illustrious greatness of mind, in an undertaking of such vast expense, your heroic zeal in exposing your most precious life in such an adventurous expedition, your wise conduct and unshaken resolution in prosecuting your great ends, are above the loftiest flights of language, exceed all praise. We owe to your majesty the two greatest and most valuable blessings that we can enjoy, the preservation of the true religion, our most sacred treasure; and the recovery of the falling state, and the establishing it upon just foundations. According to our duty, we promise unfeigned fidelity and true allegiance to your majesty's person and government. We are encouraged by your gracious promise, upon our first address, humbly to desire and hope, that your majesty will be pleased, by your wisdom and authority, to establish a firm union of your Protestant subjects in matters of religion, by making the rule of Christianity to be the rule of conformity. Our blessed union, in the purity and peace of the gospel, will make this church a fair and lovely type of heaven, and terrible to our antichristian enemies: this will make England the steady centre from whence a powerful influence will be derived for the support of reformed Christianity abroad. This will bring immortal honour to your name, above the trophies and triumphs of the most renowned conquerors. We do assure your majesty, that we shall cordially embrace the terms of union which the ruling wisdom of our Saviour has prescribed in his word. We shall not trespass farther on your royal patience, but shall offer up our fervent prayers to the King of kings, that he will please to direct your majesty by his unerring wisdom, and always incline your heart to his glory, and encompass your sacred person with his favour as with a shield, and make your government a universal blessing to these kingdoms."

To which his majesty was graciously pleased to make the following answer:

“I take kindly your good wishes; and whatever is in my power shall be employed for obtaining such a union among you. I do assure you of my protection and kindness.”

“To the Queen.

“May it please your majesty,

“Your happy arrival into your native country, and accession to the crown, has diffused a universal joy through this kingdom. It is an auspicious sign of public felicity, when supreme virtue and supreme dignity meet in the same person. Your inviolable firmness in the profession of the truth, and exemplary piety, are the most radiant jewels in your crown. The lustre of your conversation, unstained in the midst of tempting vanities, and adorned with every grace, recommends religion as the most honourable and amiable quality, even to those who are averse from hearing sermons, and apt to despise serious instructions and excitations to be religious. We humbly desire, that your majesty would be pleased, by your wisdom and goodness, to compose the differences between your Protestant subjects in things of less moment concerning religion.—We hope those reverend persons who conspire with us in the main end, the glory of God and the public good, will consent to the terms of union wherein all the reformed

churches agree. We shall sincerely address our requests to God, that he will please to pour down in a rich abundance his blessings upon your majesty’s person and government, and preserve you to his heavenly kingdom.”

Her majesty was graciously pleased to answer,

“I will use all endeavours for the obtaining a union that is necessary for the edifying of the church.¹ I desire your prayers.”

Though the joy that accompanied the revolution had a considerable influence on the choice of representatives in parliament, yet there being no court to make interest among the people, it appeared that the late king had a party in both houses sufficient to perplex the government, who first proposed the choice of a new parliament, in order to throw the nation into a ferment;² but this being overruled, a bill was brought in, and passed, January 23, to turn the present convention into a parliament, it being wisely

¹ This was in the spirit of a noble answer, which her majesty made to Dr. Increase Mather, who was introduced to her to solicit a new charter for New-England. He represented that her subjects in that country were generally Nonconformists, but carried it with all due respect to others: and added, that this nation had cause to bless God for the indulgence it now enjoyed under the king and her majesty. The queen answered, “It is what I am for. It is not in the power of men to believe what they please; and therefore, I think, they should not be forced in matters of religion, contrary to their persuasions and their consciences. I wish all good men were of one mind; however, in the mean time, I would have them live peaceably, and love one another.” Increase Mather’s Life, p. 19.—ED.

² Burnet, vol. 1. p. 7, 8. Edin. cd. 12mo.

concluded, that those who had set the king on the throne, would be most zealous to maintain him there: but when the house was called over, and the members required to take the oaths, eight bishops absented, viz. Dr. Sancroft archbishop of Canterbury, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, Kenn of Bath and Wells, White of Peterborough, Thomas of Worcester, Lloyd of Norwich, and Frampton of Gloucester; however, that they might recommend themselves by a show of moderation, before they withdrew they moved the house of lords for a bill of toleration, and another of comprehension, which were drawn up accordingly by the earl of Nottingham, and were much the same with those prepared for the house of commons in king Charles II.'s time, during the debates about the bill of exclusion.

The clergy in general took the oaths, but it became visible that many among them took them only as oaths of submission to usurpers, with this reserve, that it was still lawful to assist king James, if he should attempt to recover the crown, and that he was still their king *de jure*, though the prince of Orange was king *de facto*, contrary to the plain meaning of the words; but the clergy broke through all these fetters, says the bishop,¹ to the reproach of their profession: and the prevarication of so many in so sacred a matter, contributed not a little to the atheism of the age. Indeed, they had embarked so far in their doctrines of absolute submission, and the divine right of monarchy, that they knew not how to disengage themselves with honour or conscience.

Many suffered the time limited for taking the oaths to elapse, and yet officiated afterward contrary to law.—They threatened the church with a new separation, which terrified the moderate clergy, and put a stop to all amendments of the liturgy for the ease of dissenters, lest the nonjurors should gain over great numbers of the laity, by pretending to abide by the old liturgy, in opposition to the reformed one. Thus the Nonconformists were sold to the jacobites, by the timidity of their real friends; for the high-church party discovered an irreconcilable enmity to an accommodation, and seemed only to wish for an occasion to renew old severities. Those who had moved for a comprehension, and brought the bill into the house of lords, acted a very disingenuous part, says Burnet,² for while they studied to recommend themselves, by seeming to countenance the bill, they set on their friends to oppose it, representing the favourers of it as enemies to the church.

When the king came to the house, March 16, he made the following speech:³

“My lords and gentlemen,

¹ Ibid. vol. 3. p. 303.

² Burnet, vol. 3. p. 303.

³ Gazette, No. 2436.

“Now I have occasion of coming hither to pass these bills, I shall put you in mind of one thing which will conduce much to our settlement, as a settlement will to the disappointment of our enemies. I am, with all the expedition I can, filling up the vacancies that are in the offices and places of trust by this late revolution. I hope you are sensible there is a necessity of some law to settle the oaths to be taken by all persons to be admitted to such places. I recommend it to your care to make a speedy provision for it; and as I doubt not but you will sufficiently provide against Papists, so I hope you will leave room for the admission of all Protestants that are willing and able to serve. This conjunction in my service will tend to the better uniting you among yourselves, and the strengthening you against your common enemies.” It appears by this, that king William was for taking off the test, and abrogating the penal laws, as far as related to dissenting Protestants, though the parliament were of another mind.

When a bill was brought into the house of lords, for abrogating the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and framing other oaths in their stead, a committee was appointed to insert a clause to take away the necessity of receiving the sacrament in order to make a man capable of enjoying any office, employment or place of trust; but when the clause was reported to the house, it was rejected by a considerable majority, the earls of Stamford and Chesterfield, the lords Lovelace, Delamcre, North and Grey, Wharton, and Vaughan, entering their protests.¹

After this another clause was offered, by which it was provided, that such should be sufficiently qualified for any office, who, within a year before or after their admission, did receive the sacrament, either according to the usage of the church of England, or in any other Protestant congregation, and could produce a certificate under the hands of the minister, and two other creditable persons, members of such a congregation. The question being put, whether this clause should be a part of the bill, it passed in the negative; the lords Oxford, Lovelace, Wharton, Mordaunt, Montague, and Paget, entering their protests.²

¹ The protests of the dissentient peers were grounded on the following reasons: “that a hearty union amongst Protestants is a greater security to the church and state, than any test that could be invented: that this obligation to receive the sacrament is a test on Protestants rather than on Papists: that so long as it continued, there could not be that hearty and thorough union amongst Protestants as has always been wished, and is at this time indispensably necessary: and lastly, that a greater caution ought not to be required from such as were admitted into offices, than from the members of the two houses of parliament, who were not obliged to receive the sacrament to enable them to sit in either house.” *A Complete Collection of Protests*, p. 62, 63; and *Birch’s Life of Tillotson*, p. 170, 171.—ED.

² One reason on which the lords protested, was, “that mysteries of religion and divine worship are of divine original, and of a nature so wholly distinct from the secular affairs of public society, that they cannot be applied to those ends: and therefore the church, by the law of the gospel, as well as common prudence, ought to take care not to offend either

It was proposed farther, in a committee of the house of lords, to dispense with kneeling at the sacrament; but when the question was put, whether to agree with the committee in leaving out the clause, the votes were equal, and so according to the usage of the house it passed in the negative.¹ The like fate attended the motion about the cross in baptism, and explaining the words assent and consent in subscription. Thus the several attempts for alterations in the church-service, at a time when the legislature was in a temper for accommodating lesser differences, were frustrated by a rising party of jacobites and tories, who threatened the new government with a revolt unless they were humoured; and, for fear of them, all promises of accommodation with the dissenters were of no avail.

Soon after a bill for toleration² of Protestant dissenters was brought into the house, and had an easy passage; though some proposed that the act should be only temporary, as a necessary restraint, that the dissenters might so demean themselves as to merit the continuance of it, when the term of years first granted should expire; but this was rejected.—Bishop Burnet³ says, that his zeal for this act lost him his credit with the church-party, by which it appears they did not much like it. It is entitled, “An act for exempting their majesties’ Protestant subjects dissenting from the church of England, from the penalties therein mentioned.” But the corporation and test acts were not inserted in this act, and therefore remain in full force: there is an exception likewise of such as deny the doctrine of the Trinity; and Quakers are excused taking the oaths to the government, upon their making a solemn declaration therein mentioned. This act excuses all Protestant dissenters from the penalties of the laws therein mentioned, for not coming to church, provided they take the oaths, and subscribe the declarations therein

tender consciences within itself, or give offence to those without, by mixing their sacred mysteries with secular interests.” A Complete Collection of Protests, p. 64, 65.—ED.

¹ Burnet, p. 155.

² “The act of toleration (remarks a late writer) was another interference of the state to check the power of ecclesiastics, but without altering the constitution of the church. Laymen had before declared what should be deemed heresy in the spiritual courts; they now exempted some descriptions of dissenters wholly from their jurisdiction, while all others, and oppugners of the Trinity by name, were expressly reserved for the persecuting spirit of the church to operate upon.” How truly then might Mr. Locke, writing to Limborch (Locke’s Works, vol. 4. p. 406), soon after the passing of this act, say, “Tolerantiam apud nos jam tandem lege stabilitatem, te ante hæc audiisse, nullus dubito. Non ea forsitan latitudine quâ tu et tui similes veri, et siue ambitione vel invidia, Christiani optarent. Sed aliquid est prodire teus. His initiis jacta spero sunt libertatis et pacis fundamenta, quibus stabilienda olim erat Christi ecclesia.” High-Church Politics, p. 66. In English thus: “I doubt not before this you have heard, that toleration is at last established here by law. Not indeed with that latitude that you, and other Christians like you, unambitious and unprejudiced, and lovers of truth, might wish. But it is a great point to proceed so far. In these beginnings, I hope, are laid those foundations of liberty and peace, on which the church of Christ will be finally established.”—ED.

³ History, p. 14

mentioned. And dissenting ministers are tolerated on the like conditions, and on their subscribing the doctrinal articles of the church of England. But this being the basis and boundary of their present liberty, I have inserted the act in the Appendix, No. XIII.

While the bill for a toleration was depending, a motion was made in the house of lords for a comprehension, which was received, and some progress made towards effecting it; but a proviso being offered, and pressed with great earnestness by some temporal lords, that in imitation of the acts passed in the reigns of king Henry VIII. and Edward VI. a number of persons, both of clergy and laity, might be empowered to prepare materials for such a reformation of the church as might be fit to offer the king and parliament, it was warmly debated, and at length rejected by a small majority. Bishop Burnet¹ was against the proviso, for fear of offending the clergy, who would look upon it as taking the reformation out of their hands; but adds, “I was convinced soon after that I had taken wrong measures, and that the method proposed by the lords was the only one like to prove effectual.” Dr. Tillotson, being of the same mind with Burnet, advised the king to refer the affair to a synod of divines, whose determinations he apprehended would stop the mouths of Papists, who reproached our reformation as built chiefly on parliamentary authority, and would be better received by the body of the clergy.²

Accordingly it was agreed in council, that a select number of learned divines should be appointed by the royal mandate, to meet and consult about the most proper methods of healing the wounds of the church; that their determinations should be laid before the convocation, and from thence receive the sanction of parliament. Agreeably to this resolution the king issued out a commission to thirty divines, of which ten were bishops, whose names were, Dr. Lamplugh, archbishop of York, Compton, bishop of London, Mew, bishop of Winchester, Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph, Sprat, bishop of Rochester, Smith, bishop of Carlisle, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, bishop of Exeter, Dr. Burnet, bishop of Sarum, Humphreys, bishop of Bangor, Stratford, bishop of Chester.

To these were added the following divines,

Dr. Stillingfleet,	Dr. Montague,	Dr. Patrick,	Dr. Goodman,
Tillotson,	Beveridge,	Maggot,	Battely,
Sharp,	Alston	Kidder,	Tennison,
Aldridge,	Scot,	Jane,	Fowler,
Hall,	Grove,	Beaumont,	Williams.

¹ Burnet, vol. 4. p. 14.

² Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 179.

Their commission was as follows:

“Whereas the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place and authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient.

“And whereas the book of canons is fit to be reviewed, and made more suitable to the state of the church; and whereas there are defects and abuses in the ecclesiastical courts and jurisdictions; and particularly, there is not sufficient provision made for the removing of scandalous ministers, and for the reforming of manners, either in ministers or people; and whereas it is most fit that there should be a strict method prescribed for the examination of such persons as desire to be admitted into holy orders, both as to their learning and manners

“We therefore, out of our pious and princely care for the good order, edification and unity of the church of England, committed to our charge and care, and for the reconciling as much as is possible of all differences among our good subjects, and to take away all occasion of the like for the future, have thought fit to authorise you, &c. or any nine of you, whereof three to be bishops, to meet from time to time as often as shall be needful, and to prepare such alterations of the liturgy and canons, and such proposals for the reformation of the ecclesiastical courts, and to consider of such other matters, as in your judgments may most conduce to the ends above mentioned.”¹

The committee having assembled in the Jerusalem-chamber, a dispute arose about the legality of their commission; Sprat bishop of Rochester, one of king James’s ecclesiastical commissioners, being of the number, they pretended to fear a premunire, though there was not so much as a shadow for such a pretence, the king’s supremacy, if it means anything, empowering him to appoint proper persons to prepare matters for the legislature: however, upon this debate, Mew bishop of Winchester, Sprat of Rochester, with Dr. Jane and Dr. Aldridge, withdrew. Some of them declared plainly they were against all alterations whatsoever; they thought too much would be done for the dissenters, in granting them an act of toleration, and they would do nothing to make conformity easier. They said farther, that altering the customs and constitutions of the church, to gratify a peevish and obstinate party, was likely to have no other effect than to make them more inso-

¹ Life of Archbishop Tennison, p. 10, &c.

lent.¹ But was it ever tried? Did the convocation or parliament make a single abatement from the year 1662 to this time? If the experiment had been tried, and proved ineffectual, the blame might have been cast upon the dissenters; but to call them peevish and obstinate, without offering them any even the smallest concessions, deserves no better a name than unjust calumny. Was there no obstinacy and peevishness on the side of the church in retreating from so many promises without a single offer? But it was said farther, that the church, by proposing these alterations, seemed to confess that she had hitherto been in the wrong, and that the attempt would divide them among themselves, and lessen people's esteem for the liturgy, if it appeared that it wanted correction. Such were the reasonings of these high divines, if they deserve the name, some of whom but a few months before had made the warmest pretences to a spirit of moderation!

It was alleged on the other side, that if a few corrections or explanations were allowed, there was reason to hope it would bring over many of the people, if not the teachers themselves; at least, if the prejudices of the present dissenters were too strong, it might have a good effect on the next generation; nor could it be any reproach to the church, since the offers were made only in regard to their weakness. Ritual matters were of an indifferent nature, and became necessary in virtue only of the authority that enjoined them, therefore it was an unreasonable stiffness to deny any abatements, in order to heal the church's divisions. Great changes had been made by the church of Rome in her rituals; and among ourselves since the Reformation, in the reigns of king Edward VI., queen Elizabeth, king James, and king Charles II., and it seemed necessary at this time to make the terms of communion as large as might be, that so a greater number might be brought over, since, by the act of toleration, they might dissent with safety.

But while these matters were debating, the jacobite party took hold of the occasion to inflame men's minds against the government. It was pretended the church was to be pulled down, and presbytery established: the universities took fire, and declared against alterations, and against all who promoted them, as men who intended to undermine the hierarchy. Severe reflections were cast on the king himself, as not being in the interest of the episcopacy, for the cry of the church's danger was raised by the enemies of the government, as that under which they thought they might safely shelter their evil designs. Great interest was made in the choice of convocation men, to whom the determinations of the committee were to be referred, so that it was quickly visible that the laudable designs of the king and the ecclesiastical commissioners would prove abortive.

¹ Burnet, vol. 4. p. 44.

However, the committee continued their work till they had finished it; they had before them all the “exceptions that either the Puritans before the war, or the Nonconformists since the Restoration, had made to the church-service.¹ They had also many propositions and advices that had been suggested at several times, by many of our bishops and divines, upon these heads; matters were well considered, and freely and calmly debated, and all was digested into an entire correction of everything that seemed liable to any just exception. Dr. Nichols says, they began with reviewing the liturgy, and first in examining the calendar; they ordered, in the room of the Apocryphal lessons, certain chapters of canonical Scripture to be read, that were more to the people’s advantage; Athanasius’s creed being disliked, by reason of the damnatory clauses, it was left to the minister’s choice to use it, or change it for the Apostles’ creed.² New collects were drawn up, more agreeable to the Epistles and Gospels, for the whole course of the year, with that elegance and brightness of expression, says the doctor, and such a flame of devotion, that nothing could more affect and excite the hearts of the hearers, and raise up their minds towards God; they were first prepared by Dr. Patrick; Dr. Burnet added to them farther force and spirit; Dr. Stillingfleet afterward examined them with great judgment, carefully weighing every word in them; and Dr. Tillotson had the last hand, giving them some free and masterly strokes of his sweet and flowing eloquence. Dr. Kidder made a new version of the psalms, more agreeable to the original. Dr. Tennison made a collection of the words and expressions throughout the liturgy which had been excepted against, and proposed others in their room that were clear and plain, and less liable to exception—singing in cathedrals was to be laid aside—the Apocryphal lessons were to be omitted, together with the legendary saints’ days—the cross in baptism to be left to the choice of the parent—and kneeling at the sacrament to be indifferent—the intention of Lent fasts was declared to consist only in extraordinary acts of devotion, not in distinction of meats—the word priest was to be changed for minister—the use of the surplice is left to the discretion of the bishop, who may dispense with it, or appoint another to read the service—godfathers and godmothers in baptism may be omitted if desired, and children presented in their parents’ names—re-ordination of those who had been ordained by presbyters was to be only conditional;—but these, with some other useful alterations in the litany, communion-service, and canons, will not be known till the papers themselves are made public.

¹ Burnet, p. 44,

² Apparatus, p. 95, 96.

However, these concessions and amendments would, in all probability, have brought in three parts in four of the dissenters.¹

While these things were debating in parliament, and among the commissioners, an address was presented, April 19, praying, that according to the ancient custom and usage of the kingdom in time of parliament, his majesty would issue out his writ for calling a convocation of the clergy to be advised with in ecclesiastical matters, assuring his majesty that it was their intention forthwith to proceed to the consideration of giving ease to the Protestant dissenters; but when they met, it quickly appeared that the high-church party were superior to the moderate, by their choosing Dr. Jane,² who drew up the Oxford decree, prolocutor, in preference to Dr. Tillotson.³ His majesty sent a letter, or message, by the earl of Nottingham, assuring them of his constant favour and protection, and that he had summoned them, not only because it was usual upon holding parliaments, but out of a pious zeal to do everything that might tend to the best establishment of the church of England, and desiring them to consider of such things as by his order should be laid before them, with a due and impartial zeal for the peace and good of the church. But there was no room for his majesty's interposition, the lower house of convocation quickly coming to a resolution not to enter into any debates with relation to alterations; and it was not without difficulty carried to make a decent address to the king, thanking him for his promise of protection. And the address which the bishops sent down, acknowledging the protection which the Protestant religion in gen-

¹ Calamy's Abridgment, vol. 1. p. 452. 464. See also Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 182. 196.

² The election of Dr. Jane to be prolocutor, as it showed the sentiments and spirit of a great majority, so it was the principal occasion that nothing succeeded. For as soon as he got into the chair, he addressed the lower house in a speech, which, besides extolling the church of England above all other Christian communities, he concluded with these words, "*Nolumus leges Anglice mutare;*" i. e. "We will not change the laws of England;" and, in the progress of the session, he opposed everything that was intended or proposed by the royal commission. Bishop Compton's Life, p. 52; and Life of Dr. Prideaux, p. 54. The conclusion of the prolocutor's speech, it is excellently observed in a late valuable publication, was "to be admired from the mouth of an old English baron; consistent, perhaps, with the declaration of a conclave, if matters of faith and worship were in agitation there; but ill suited, to the greatest degree, on such an occasion, to the character of a Protestant divine." Hints, &c. by a Layman, p. 27, fourth edition.—ED.

³ It is disgraceful to human nature, and painful to the generous mind, that the most liberal and excellent designs are defeated by revenge, and disappointed ambition. This was the case in the affair before us. The election of Dr. Jane was effected by the intrigues of two noble lords, who being disappointed in their expectations of advancement to some of the higher employments, after the Revolution, on account of their relation to the queen, out of resentment contrived to have Dr. Jane called to the chair, that they might baffle what was intended by the convocation, and so embarrass government. He was also, on the like principles, a man fit for their purpose. For having been refused the see of Exeter, before promised to bishop Trelawney, which he asked when he was sent from the university of Oxford to make an offer of their plate to the prince of Orange, he was so disgusted, that he became a professed enemy to king William. Life of Dr. Prideaux, p. 54, 55.—ED.

eral, and the church of England in particular, had received from his majesty, the lower house would not agree to it, because it imported their owning some common union with the foreign churches.¹ They would thank his majesty for his care to establish the church of England, whereby the interest of the Protestant churches abroad would be better secured, but would not insert the words, “this and all other Protestant churches,” as the bishop had desired.

The bishop of London, in his answer to the prolocutor’s speech, told them, that they ought to endeavour a temper of things not essential to religion; and that it was their duty to show the same indulgence and charity to the dissenters under king William, which some of the bishops and clergy had promised in their addresses to king James.² But all these promises, says bishop Burnet, were entirely forgotten. It was in vain, therefore, to refer the amendments of the ecclesiastical commissioners to a number of men, who had resolved to admit of no alterations; and it is thought that if the act of toleration had been left to their decision, it would have miscarried.³ The king, observing such a want of temper, broke up the sessions; and seeing they were in no disposition to do good, they were kept from doing mischief by prorogations for a course of ten years.

This was the last fruitless attempt⁴ for a comprehension of dissenters

¹ This was the first foundation of the differences in the convocation, which have ever since been kept up, to the grief of pious minds, and to the disgrace of the clergy. For the inferior clergy not agreeing to this address, another address was drawn up and presented to the king by the bishop of London, six of his brethren, and several doctors in divinity: who were solemnly introduced to his majesty, sitting on his throne in the Banqueting-house, by the lord-chamberlain. Bishop Compton’s Life, p. 54, 55.—ED. .

² Bishop Compton closed his speech, which breathed a different spirit from that of Dr. Jane, with these words of Joseph’s to his brethren, “*Ne multi animi in consulis vestris;*” thereby exhorting them to unanimity and concord. Bishop Compton’s Life, p. 53.—ED.

³ It marks the mischief and the evil of the spirit of opposition, that amongst the other instances in which the design of holding this convocation miscarried, was the failure of an attempt to restore family-devotion. For a book, containing directions and forms for family-worship, was provided to be authorized by this convocation. It was left in the hands of Dr. Williams, bishop of Chichester, but has been since lost. Dr. Prideaux’s Life, p. 61. 65.—ED.

⁴ I am tempted to give here the reflections of an admirable piece, which report ascribes to a *noble* pen. “The prolocutor’s veto has hitherto proved triumphant; and we have too much reason to apprehend, that, on one pretence or other, these laws, binding the consciences of men, will become, in effect, as unalterable as those of the Medes and Persians ever were; though probably, in these days, few will venture to hold a doctrine so thoroughly repugnant to all religions liberty. Such, however, was the fate of this attempt to render the service of the established church as pure as possible, and to clear away those parts, which, from that day to the present, continue to offend so many respectable and conscientious persons. Considering the character and abilities of those who undertook the task, it can never be sufficiently lamented that their endeavours proved so unsuccessful.” For archbishop Wake, speaking of them before the lords, while he was bishop of Lincoln, thus expresses himself: “They were a set of men, than which this church was never, at any one time, blessed with either wiser or better, since it was a church; and a design that, I am persuaded, would have been for the interest and peace of our church and state, had it been

within the establishment; and such was the ungrateful return that these stubborn churchmen made to those who had assisted them in their distress! For it ought to stand upon record, that the church of England had been twice rescued from the most imminent danger, by men for whose satisfaction they would not move a pin, nor abate a ceremony; first in the year 1660, when the Presbyterians restored the king and constitution without making any terms for themselves; and now again at the Revolution, when the church fled for succour to a Presbyterian prince, and was delivered by an army of fourteen thousand Hollanders, of the same principles with the English dissenters; and how uncivilly those troops were afterward used, is too ungrateful a piece of history to remember.

But besides the strong disposition of the high-church clergy and their friends, to return to their allegiance to king James, there was another incident that sharpened their resentments against the king and the dissenters, which was his majesty's consenting to the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland, which could not be prevented without putting all his affairs into the utmost confusion; the bias of that people was strong to presbytery, and the more so, because the episcopal party went almost universally into king James's interests, so that the Presbyterians were the only friends the king had in that kingdom.¹ There was a convention called in Scotland like that in England, who on the 11th of April, the day on which king William and queen Mary were crowned in England, passed judgment of forfeiture on king James, and voted the crown of Scotland to king William and queen Mary. They drew up a claim of rights, by one article of which it was declared, that the reformation in Scotland having been begun by a party among the clergy, prelacy in the church was a great and insupportable grievance to the kingdom. The bishops and their adherents, having left the convention, because not summoned by writ from king James, the Presbyterians had a majority of voices; whereupon the abolishing episcopacy in Scotland was made a necessary article of the new settlement. The episcopal party sent the dean of Glasgow to king William, to know his intentions concerning them, who answered he would do all he could to preserve them

accomplished." And when we find among them names whose memory we revere, Compton, Lloyd, Burnet, among the bishops; with Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Sharp, Kidder, &c. among the others; it is clear, that posterity has confirmed the testimony of this learned and sagacious prelate, and regrets the more the loss of their beneficent intentions.—Hints, &c. by a Layman, p. 27–29. To the names mentioned by this writer we would particularly add Dr. Humphrey Prideaux; as he was not only a great friend to the scheme then on foot for a comprehension with the dissenters, but published a piece in favour of that design, under the title of "A Letter to a Friend relating to the present Convocation at Westminster;" which was highly applauded by moderate and candid men, and of which several thousands were sold within a fortnight after its publication. British Biography, vol. 7. p. 224, 225.—ED.

¹ Burnet, vol. 4. p. 32.

consistent with a full toleration to the Presbyterians, provided they concurred in the new establishment; but if they opposed it, he should not enter into a war for their sakes. The bishops, instead of submitting to the Revolution, resolved unanimously to adhere firmly to king James, and declared in a body with so much zeal against the new settlement, that it was not possible for the king to support them. The clergy sent for king James into Scotland, and the earl of Dundee collected some thousands of Highlanders to make a stand; but general Mackay, who was sent with a body of forces to disperse them, routed them at a place called Killicranky, and killed the earl of Dundee upon the spot. So that episcopacy in Scotland fell a sacrifice to the interest of king James.

But though it was impossible to stop the torrent of the Scots people's zeal for presbytery, and though the king had only Presbyterians on his side in that kingdom, yet the suffering it to take place increased the disaffection of the English clergy. Reports of the king's dislike of the hierarchy were spread with great industry; the leading men of both universities were possessed with it, says Burnet,¹ though the king had joined in communion with the church, and taken the sacrament according to law; but it was given out, that men zealous for the church were neglected, and that those who were indifferent to the ceremonies were promoted.—His majesty promised the Scots clergy to moderate matters in their favour, and lord Melvil, secretary of state, engaged very solemnly for the same purpose; but when the Presbyterians threatened to desert the court if they were deserted by them, Melvil thought it the king's interest to secure them in all events, which could not be done but by abandoning the ministers of the episcopal persuasion. Such therefore as refused to read the proclamation of king William and queen Mary by the prefixed day were deprived of their livings; which being published up and down England, and much aggravated, raised the aversion of the friends of the church against the Presbyterians so high, says bishop Burnet,² that they began to repent their having granted a toleration to a party, who, where they prevailed, showed so much fury against those of the episcopal persuasion. It ought, however, to be remembered, that this was a government case, that the fate of the Revolution in that kingdom depended upon it; and that the bishops and episcopal clergy, almost to a man, were determined jacobites, and refused to take the oaths to king William and queen Mary. Besides, what reason had the Scots Presbyterians to trust the episcopal clergy, when it was in their power to do themselves justice? Had they not deceived them out of their discipline in 1662, and persecuted them cruelly ever since? Whoever peruses the dreadful sufferings of the kirk in

¹ Burnet, p. 40.

² Ibid. p. 42.

the reign of Charles II. will judge how far they had reason to replace them in the saddle, and deliver the reins into their hands.

But the disaffection of the high-church clergy stopped not short of the king himself, who was made uneasy by their malignant spirit, and restless endeavours to clog the wheels of his government;¹ insomuch that his majesty sometimes declared, with more than ordinary vehemence, that he would not stay in England and hold an empty name; that it was not easy to determine which was best, a commonwealth or kingly government; but he was sure the worst of all governments was, a king without treasure, and without power. He once resolved to return to Holland, and leave the government in the queen's hands, imagining they would treat her better;² and he communicated his design to the marquis of Carmarthen, the earl of Shrewsbury, and others, who besought him with tears to change his resolution, and at last prevailed: but had his majesty declared this from the throne, the nation was in a temper to have done him justice on the incendiaries; for notwithstanding their clamours, they knew their desperate situation if the king should desert them, having renounced their allegiance to king James, and gone such lengths as he could never forgive. But king William, having a generous mind, imagined they might be gained by gentleness and kindness, and therefore took up with a motley ministry, which distressed him to the last. Thus the tories and high-church clergy enjoyed the advantages of this glorious revolution, while they acted a most ungrateful part towards their deliverer, and a most unkind and ungenerous one to their dissenting brethren.

Nor have these gentlemen ceased to discover their enmity to the dissenters since that time, as often as the power has been in their hands. It was impossible to injure them while king William lived, but no sooner was queen Anne advanced to the throne, than they endeavoured to cramp the toleration by the bill against occasional conformity, which was brought into the house one session after another, till at length it obtained the royal assent in the latter end of the year 1711, under the specious title of "An act to preserve the Protestant religion, and to confirm the toleration, and farther to secure the Protestant succession." It makes some few concessions in support of the toleration, but then it enacts, "that if any persons in office, who by the laws are obliged to qualify themselves by receiving the sacrament, or test, shall ever resort to a conventicle or meeting of dissenters for religious worship, during the time of their continuance in such office, they shall forfeit twenty pounds for every such offence, and be disqualified for any office for the future, till they have made oath that they have entirely con-

¹ Burnet, p. 49

² Ibid. p. 55, 56.

formed to the church, and not been at any conventicle for the space of a whole year." So that no person in the least office in the customs, excise, or common-council, &c. could ever enter the doors of a meeting-house. But the reader may peruse the act at large in the Appendix, Number XIV.

In the last year of queen Anne the toleration was farther straitened by an act to prevent the growth of schism; for with these gentlemen all dissenters are schismatics: and in order to prevent their increase, the education of their children was taken out of the hands of their friends, and intrusted only with such who were full and entire conformists.

And if any schoolmaster or tutor should be willingly present at any conventicle of dissenters for religious worship, he shall suffer three months' imprisonment, and be disqualified, as above, from teaching school for the future. The act was to take place August 1, 1714, the very day the queen died; but his late majesty king George I. being fully satisfied that these hardships were brought upon the dissenters for their steady adherence to the Protestant succession in his illustrious house, against a tory and jacobite ministry, who were paving the way for a Popish pretender, procured the repeal of them in the fifth year of his reign. The last-mentioned act, with the repeal, is inserted in the Appendix, Numbers XV. and XVI., together with a clause which forbids the mayor, or other magistrate, to go into any meeting for religious worship with the ensigns of his office.

Many of the ejected ministers of 1662, and others, survived the Revolution, and made a considerable figure in the reigns of king William and queen Mary. As,

Rev. William Bates, D.D.	Rev. Tho. Gilbert, B.D.	Rev. Matt. Sylvester
Obad. Grew, D.D.	Jos. Hill, B.D.	Christ. Nesse, M.A.
Sam. Annesly, D.D.	Robert Bragge	John Humphrys, M.A.
John Collings, D.D.	Matth. Mead	Richard Mayo
Richard Baxter	Jas. Forbes, M.A.	Matth. Clarke, sen.
Vincent Alsop, M.A.	Tho. Cole, M.A.	Isaac Chauncey, M.D.
John Howe, M.A.	Geo. Griffith, M.A.	Sam. Slater, M.A.
Tho. Doolittle, M.A.	Nath. Mather	Daniel Williams, D.D.
Phil. and Matth. Henry,	Edward Veal	John Spademan, M.A.
M.A.	John Quick	Robert Billio
John Flavel	Nath. Vincent, M.A.	Rich. Steele, M.A.
Matthew Barker, M.A.	Rd. Stretton, M.A.	Nath. Taylor
George Cockayne	Geo. Hammond, M.A.	R. Flemming, M.A.
John Faldo	Richard Kentish	Daniel Burgess
W. Lorimer, M. A.	H. Newcome, M.A.	James Owen, &c.

These, and others who deserve an honourable mention, were learned and useful men, and most of them popular preachers, serviceable to the societies for reformation of manners, and eminent confessors in the cause of liberty and scriptural religion; but their deaths not happening within the

compass of this work, I must leave them to be remembered by the historians of aftertimes.

END OF MR. NEAL'S HISTORY.