



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# HOW DID THEY GET THERE?

OR, THE

NON-CONFORMING MINISTERS OF 1662.

A QUESTION FOR THOSE WHO WOULD CELEBRATE  
THE BI-CENTENARY OF  
ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY, 1662.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE VENABLES, S.C.L., F.R.A.S.

*Incumbent of Christ Church, Friesland, Yorkshire.*

---

Second Edition.—With Additions and Notes.

---

LONDON:  
WERTHEIM, MACINTOSH, AND HUNT,  
24, PATERNOSTER ROW,  
AND 23, HOLLES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

---

*Price Twopence.*

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

At the present time, when Satan appears to be leading men away from the practice of religion, by tempting them to dispute about it, we who are members of the Church of England need be very wary lest we become entangled in controversy.

In this matter of the bi-centenary of St. Bartholomew's day, we are not attacking, or wishing to attack; but are only defending the Church against an effort which savours much of bad taste, of political hostility, and of secularism.

Churchmen have been quite contented as long as Dissenters were willing to do all the good they were able; but we must not permit them to do all the harm they can. We have been silent as long as they sought to rival the Church in works of piety; yea, the Church has patiently borne many a calumny which reflected no credit on the originators; but we must be silent no longer. Many pious Dissenters have joined with men of varied moods; ["Gabal, and Ammon, and Amalek, the Philistines, with them that dwell at Tyre,"] and are in league against the Church of their forefathers; and, therefore, we must be, and we will be stirring!

Churchmen must cease from *coquetting* with dissent,<sup>1</sup> while they endeavour, in all sincerity and kindness, to win Dissenters.

Churchmen should acquaint themselves with the history of the Church. Half a dozen lectures on the subject, in every parish in England, would effect great good on the minds of many.

Dissenters are reported to have raised at least £60,000 to commemorate this bi-centenary. If this be all, or even if the amount be double this sum, if regarded as an aggregate result of a general effort, I think it must be considered as a failure, since individual instances of liberality for Church purposes have, in many cases, nearly equalled this.

<sup>1</sup> Is it not time to do so when such terms as the following (which are only a very few specimens) are used against the Church by leading Dissenters?—

"The Established Church destroys more souls than it saves."—*Mr. Binney*.

"The Church of England is an impious pretence."—*Mr. Miall*.

"I wish to God that I had this evening to preach the funeral sermon of that hoary harlot Mother Church, which is a blast and nuisance upon the earth—both black, bloody, and useless."—*Vide "Refutation of Nonconformity,"* p. 402.

"The National Church, as a means of supporting religion, is destitute even of the semblance of fitness."—*Mr. Miall*.

"Democracy is a reality. A State Church is a mere conventionalism."—*Mr. Miall*.

"The separation of Church and State, as it is their" [*i.e.*, Dissenting ministers] "real object, so, in my judgment, it is their proper, their right noble mission."—*Mr. Miall*.

I ask, how is it possible to work with such men?

But, be this as it may, such an effort ought to stir up the laity of the Church to do far more! Let them come forward, and by a noble effort this year, give such an impulse to Church extension as shall render 1862 memorable for something worthy of being commemorated. The whole question is more one for the laity than the clergy. *The Church will last our time*; but it is for the laity to resolve that it shall continue to their posterity.<sup>1</sup> Above all, let us endeavour to prove ourselves to be the Church of Christ by doing the work in Christ's way which He has given His Church to do. It is an unspeakable honour to belong to a Church which had existence in England, probably even before the sacred canon of the New Testament was completed; and which, through many troubles, has been preserved in safety until the present hour.

For six centuries and upwards did she battle it out against heathendom, until heathendom fell before the cross of Christ. For nine centuries more did she encounter the subtle entanglements of Rome; and, although for a while caught in the lap of this Delilah, and thereby shorn of her strength, she at length tore the foul net which discomfited, and at one time nearly destroyed her, and sprang to her feet in all the pristine vigour of her primeval purity.

And now, in these latter days, when, more than ever, she is watching for her Saviour's second Advent, she is hemmed round by enemies who ought to be her dutiful children, and amongst her warmest supporters. Still she looks with sorrow on the many divisions existing amongst those whom she would gladly welcome back to worship God in Christ in the Church of their ancestors; but, whatever their estrangement, and whatever their determination, she is strong in Christ. Through every age she heard it, more or less distinctly, and now, in her time of trouble, the voice seems to speak with unusual power and sweetness, assuring her of far greater triumphs, and saying, as when first it sounded forth on Olivet:—

“Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end” (not of the nineteenth century only, but) “of the world.”

---

“GOD IS IN THE MIDST OF HER; SHE SHALL NOT BE MOVED: GOD SHALL HELP HER, AND THAT RIGHT EARLY. THE LORD OF HOSTS IS WITH US; THE GOD OF JACOB IS OUR REFUGE.”

---

<sup>1</sup> The Report of the Education Commission, made to Parliament last year, shows that in supporting schools, out of 1028 subscribers—

	£	s.	d.	
169 clergymen gave	10	10	0	each.
399 landowners „	5	6	0	„
217 occupiers „	0	18	6	„
102 householders „	1	15	6	„
141 other persons „	1	13	0	„

Why should the clergy be so heavily burdened in this and similar efforts? Yet, adds the Report, “the heaviness of the burden borne by the clergy is imperfectly indicated even by such figures as these.”

## HOW DID THEY GET THERE ?

---

MANY persons of influence amongst Dissenters have determined to render 1862 a celebrated year in their community. Sermons, orations, speeches, lectures, and historical sketches are to be trumpeted throughout England. Enormous funds are to be raised, putting utterly to shame the more niggardly doings of the rich Church of England laity, and from these funds meeting-houses are to be built in all directions, and at least one gigantic edifice is to be erected to commemorate the mighty achievements of Dissent in 1862, and of its endurance in 1662!

And what is the energizing principle which is to give life to all this organization? What is the tremendous discovery which is to rouse England into indignation at the mere recital of it, and to hurl down (only it is impossible) the poor old Church of England, after eighteen centuries of usefulness?

The leaders in this mighty movement have told us in their speeches and proposals. It is, that two hundred years ago, on the next 24th day of August (*i.e.*, the festival of St. Bartholomew), an Act of Parliament (an Act, be it remembered, passed by the House of Commons, as well as by the House of Lords, and which the Commons, by special message, urged the House of Lords to hurry on),<sup>1</sup> known as "The Act of Uniformity," came into operation.

In consequence, a large number of ministers, and some laymen,<sup>2</sup> of various sects and parties, left the livings of the Church of England, which they had held for several years; and some of these in consequence suffered very great privations, a few almost perishing through hunger, and those who had families enduring of course the yet more agonizing trial of witnessing the sufferings of their children as they pined away in want.

Doubtless the Dissenters will not forget to describe, with all possible effect, the sufferings of men who left the Church livings rather than agree to the Act of Uniformity. They will find, without difficulty, some cases of distress; and these, well worked up, will ring through the meeting-houses with exasperating effect, and the

<sup>1</sup> "The Lords vainly attempted to soften some of its clauses."—*Pict. Hist. of England*, p. 685.

"There was no division in the House of Commons on this Bill itself, but a proposal to allow fifths to Nonconforming ministers was lost, in the Commons, by 94 against 87."—*Vide Hallam*, vol. ii., p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> "The silencing so many clergy at once made it very difficult to find persons qualified to take their place."—*Neal*, vol. iii., p. 35.

Church of England will be roundly abused, in a style with which Dissenters are already very much at home.

But then, one part of the question will probably remain untouched; or, if touched upon, may be but obscurely related. I will waive the point as to whether the number of Nonconforming ministers was two thousand (as Dissenters assert) or not.<sup>1</sup> I will not enter into arguments tending to shew that the number was smaller by hundreds than this statement declares. I will only remark, that, at most, but three hundred and thirty-one meeting-houses were built for them, almost every one of which has since become a place of meeting for Socinians.<sup>2</sup> Let the number, however, be taken at two thousand, and let it be granted also, and with very deep sorrow, too, that many of them suffered, and some few of them severely. I distinctly state here, my very sincere regret that these men were treated in all respects, as they were treated. I lament that some arrangement was not made, whereby their services could have been continued within the Church of England. But still, while candidly owning this, I say the *whole truth* ought to be known; and as these (so-called) two thousand ministers are to be the subject of high laudation (Dissenters, I believe, never canonize, though they do something very similar in Funeral Sermons), so I must beg to say a few words on this matter as well as Dissenters.

I plainly grant, then, that by an Act of Parliament, taking effect August 24, 1662, two thousand ministers, of various persuasions—Anabaptists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Puritans,—were turned out from the rectories, vicarages, and parsonages of the Church of England, which they had for some years dwelt in, and were also deprived of the enjoyment of the tithes, endowments, offerings, and fees, which modern Dissenters inform us are such very wicked things, but which these holy men felt no compunction whatever in receiving and enjoying!

Now, before any honest Dissenter lays the charge of cruelty, or injustice in this matter at the door of the Church of England, I want him fairly to enquire about two questions. I want him to ascertain a true verdict on the question—"How did this medley of so-called Dissenters, not a few of whom had not been ordained in any way whatever, come into possession of the emoluments, and par-

<sup>1</sup> "Near two thousand."—*Neal's Purit.*, vol. iii., p. 35. "About one thousand eight hundred, or two thousand."—*Barter's Life*, p. 385. Small folio edition, 1696. He elsewhere uses the *figures* 1800 *only*.—p. 286—7. Probably (as Hallam hints, "England," vol. ii., p. 38), in the collection of numbers *on either side*, there are abundant errors.

<sup>2</sup> A very few are still called "Presbyterian," but are in the hands of Independents or Baptists. Thus, *e.g.*, there is one at Chinley, in Glossop, built for Bagshawe, who was one of the "ejected." His descendant is Incumbent of a parish  $\frac{1}{2}$  many miles from Glossop!

onages, of this horrible thing—the Church?” And then I want him to fairly ascertain a true answer to a second question, namely, “Why *not more* than two thousand of them became sufferers under the Act?”<sup>1</sup>

To aid the enquiry—and it is one every Dissenter ought in justice fairly to master before he supports this “movement,” which his leaders propose—I will endeavour to write a few pages on the real state of the case.

In plain, blunt English then, these two thousand sufferers by ejection from church livings, had no right to them (*unless might give right*), and were turned out because they would not conform to the Church whose bread they were eating! If a man came to you and said, ‘You are not living in the right way within your house, and you do not spend your money correctly, I shall turn you out and enjoy your property myself, and use it as I think best,’ should you consider that to be just? And suppose that after he had lived in your house ten years you succeeded in turning him out, and that a few weeks afterwards he was found to be a great sufferer by the losses he had sustained, and was starving in an hovel! you might pity him, and you might relieve him; but whether you did or not, would there be any justice in holding you up to contempt, and in accusing you of barbarity, because the invader of your house became a great sufferer by being driven out of it? And yet, in strict truth, there is little difference betwixt such a proceeding and that which we are now told is so cruel.

Secularists, political adventurers, and infidels may find delight in proclaiming a partial story, but every conscientious man, who acquaints himself with the whole history, will see that these two thousand Nonconformists, who after two centuries are to be raised up to aid a cause, which in its present phase I think most of them would be ashamed of, had no right whatever to that which they gave up on St. Bartholomew’s Day.

Here, too, another observation should be made. Many modern Dissenters seem to claim the Nonconformists of 1662, as though they were of similar opinions with themselves. This was by no means the case. No inconsiderable number of them had been Episcopally ordained, many of them were Presbyterians; and of those who were not Presbyterians, a considerable portion were not opposed to Liturgies,<sup>2</sup> and many by no means objected to Episcopacy, and

<sup>1</sup> “Many complied with the terms of Conformity.”—*Neal. His. Pur. Toulmin’s Edit.*, vol. iv., p. 339.

<sup>2</sup> “Having already given you our judgement of several things in the Book of Common Prayer, and our desires for the altering of some parts of it, leaving the rest unaltered.”—“*A Petition for Peace, of the year 1661, presented to the Bishops,*” and printed 1661, p. 22.

Notice the following expressions taken from “The Reformation of the Liturgy,”



none of them were unwilling to enforce the payment of tithes, and all of them were in favour of an establishment. Richard Baxter<sup>1</sup> (who was ordained by one of our bishops) for many years after the Act of Uniformity had silenced his ministry in church, regularly attended his parish church of Acton, though it was alleged the minister was very inefficient. Philip Henry did so at Worthenbury, and persuaded others to do the same. Thomas Gouge, after his ejection, diligently employed himself in printing and distributing

being the book for "Ordinary Public Worship on the Lord's Day," prepared by the Nonconformists of 1661, and to which the petition above quoted is attached :

*"At the Lord's Supper.*

"Into this blessed, pardoning, saving Covenant, we are first entred by baptism."  
 "[Here let the bread be brought to the Minister, and received by him and set upon the table, and then the wine in like manner (or if it be set there before) however let him bless them, praying in these or like words] : \* \* \* \* Thy creatures of bread and wine which according to Thy Institution and Communion we set apart to this holy use, that they may be sacramentally the Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ. Amen."

\* \* \* \* \*

*"Then let the Minister say,*

"This Bread and Wine being set apart, and consecrated to this holy use by God's appointment, are now no common bread and wine, but sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Dear brethren, we have been feasted with the Son of God at His table, upon His Flesh and Blood."

*"In the Service of Baptisme.*

"Is it a small mercy for this child to be accepted into the covenant of God, and washed from its original sin in the Blood of Christ, which is signified and sealed by this sacramental washing in water?"

"And you must know," (addressing the parents, proparents, or owners of the child) that your faith, and covenant, and dedication will suffice for your children no longer than till they come of age themselves, and then they must own their Baptismal covenant, and personally renew it."

\* \* \* \* \*

"We thank Thee that . . . Thou hast now received this child into Thy covenant and Church, as a member of Christ by this sacrament of Regeneration."

\* \* \* \* \*

*"To the People.*

"You have heard, beloved, how great a dignity we were advanced to in our Baptism, to how great duty we are all engaged.

"Search and try, whether you have kept or broken the covenant which you made. . . . And if any of you be atheists, unbelieving, or ungodly, . . . as you love your souls, bewail your perfidious covenant-breaking with God. Trust not the water of Baptism alone. . . . Baptism will not save you, if you have not the answer of a good conscience unto God. If any have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of His. Much less those wretches that hate sanctification. . . . when they were by Baptism engaged to the Holy Ghost the Sanctifier. Can you think to be saved by the covenant, which you keep not?"

"And if Confirmation be continued, let his Majesty's declaration be observed," (i.e., that it be rightly performed.)

<sup>1</sup> Life, Part iii., Sect. 79, 80, p. 196.

copies of the Bible, the Common Prayer Book, and the Church Catechism, and was a regular attendant at church.<sup>1</sup> Many of the ejected ministers brought up their sons to be ministers in the Church of England, which they themselves refused to minister in, only because, having taken the solemn league and covenant, they did not like to "eat their own words," by renouncing it. Bishop Fowler of Gloucester, Dean Massey of Christ Church, Benjamin Calamy, and many others, whose names could be given, were sons of the ejected "martyrs," who, nevertheless, encouraged their own sons to conform. Now modern Dissenters are quite welcome to claim these men if they please. I give them all they can get out of the matter. Only, if these Nonconformists of 1662 be a specimen of modern Dissenters, why do not modern Dissenters imitate them, and bring up their sons to minister at the Church, and attend there themselves? And if they act so very differently from them, why do they so anxiously claim them? Query—Is not Dissent an ever-shifting, ever-splitting, ever-changing thing? It is difficult to write upon a subject whereon the Dissenters are constantly shifting their ground of argument. At one time they are upholding the Non-conformists as their own originators. Finding themselves driven from this position, they now shelter themselves under the defence that they commemorate the sufferings of men who were persecuted for Non-conformity. The object in writing these pages is to show that the Non-conforming, or Dissenting party of the rebellion, persecuted the Church party most bitterly whenever they could. If this be true, then it is asked, "Why are they to be commemorated more than the sufferers of the Church party?" The cause is altogether a rotten one.

The brief history of the Act of Uniformity is as follows; for, in order to comprehend the case, we must go back about twenty years.

The great rebellion had reached its height in 1649, when Charles the First, King of England, was executed on the scaffold as a traitor, through the stratagem and counsel of Presbyterians, Puritans, Independents, and other Dissenters. One universal groan of sorrow rose from the multitude as the bloody deed was performed.<sup>2</sup> Probably some of those who urged on the execution of the king believed they were doing right, and the wild fanaticism of his enemies is pretty well attested by the numerous anecdotes told of

<sup>1</sup> Neal mentions that Archbishop Tillotson preached a funeral sermon at his death in 1681.—*Vide Purit.*, vol. iv., p. 475.

<sup>2</sup> "Though the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, the Earls of Southampton and Lindsay, and the Bishop of London, sought permission to bury the body of the King with the Service of the Church, they were absolutely refused this toleration!!"—*Works of Charles I.*, small folio edition, 1687, p. 210.

the Dissenting preachers then. Thus, *e.g.*, Hugh Peters, an Independent minister, preached in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, on the perverted text, "Bind your king with chains, and your nobles with fetters of iron;" and called Charles, "the great Barabbas, a murderer, a tyrant, and traitor." [Notice here St. Jude 8, 9, 10; and also 2 St. Peter ii. 10, 11, and 13.] Hear the language used in sermons preached before Parliament, and published by its authority. Alluding to the men who opposed the rebellion, they cried, "Curse ye Meroz, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." "Turn your ploughshares into swords to fight the Lord's battles." "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood." "Vex the Midianites. Abolish the Amalekites. Leave not a rag that belongs to Popery. Away with it, head and tail, hip and thigh. It is better to see the people lie wallowing in their blood" (just the argument of Papists for burning heretics!) "rather than embracing idolatry and superstition." Such is but a small specimen of the blasphemous handling of the Word of God, by which men were excited to deeds of cruelty and bloodshed, which had better been forgotten.<sup>1</sup>

Some of the "*advanced liberals*" of the period were known by the term of "Root and Branch" men. They stirred up a great excitement in the House of Commons against the Church and Bishops, and determined, if possible, to pluck down the Church "root and branch." Accordingly, on the 10th Dec., 1641 (about seven years before the death of Charles I.), ten bishops were sent to the tower: early the next year a bill for driving all the bishops out of Parliament was passed, and the ruin of the Church was, as its enemies hoped, secure. Soon after this, a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to enquire into the "scandalous immoralities" of the clergy. No doubt that some among the clergy were evil livers, though it does not appear that the number was, by any means, great. We cannot expect a perfect Church in this sinful world. The story of the times of Eli and Samuel might convince us of this; and the wickedness of some of the followers of Christ and of His

<sup>1</sup> General Fairfax sought to persuade Cromwell to spare the life of the king. "And Cromwell kept him (it was said) in praying and consulting till the stroke was given, and it was too late to make resistance."—*Baxter's Life*, pp. 63, 64.

It would be easy to add here, only space forbids, many instructive records of these periods, which show that while many Puritans supported the rebellion by preaching, praying, and fasting, and by every influence they could use, they *regretted the king's murder*. Yet surely, men who urge others on to deeds of much violence, must not claim to be wholly innocent, if the enactors of these deeds go a *little further* than they expected or desired. The murder of Charles was no more than this.

The diary of Isaac Ambrose, in his "*Prima, Media, et Ultima*," 1650, is peculiarly illustrative of this.

apostles confirms this painful admission. It may well be doubted, however, whether the assigned cause for forming this committee of the whole House of Commons were the true cause of their proceedings.<sup>1</sup> One thing, at all events, is very certain, *viz.*, that within two years the Church was cleared, not only of the "immoral" clergy, but also of all those who were not of the same way of thinking on political matters as the committee!!! Scandalous immoralities attach also to some of their successors. Many of the Royalist clergy (*i.e.* the regularly, episcopally ordained Church of England clergy) were ejected summarily by the Parliament soldiers, who were in open opposition to the King and his army. Multitudes of the clergy, left their cures and took sanctuary in the King's armies or garrisons. Others were put in confinement in Lambeth, Winchester, and Ely, and for want of room, twenty, according to Dr. Walker, were imprisoned on board ships in the river Thames, and shut down under decks, no friend being allowed to come near them. One hundred and ten clergymen were turned out in the diocese of London alone, in 1642 and 1643, and as many fled to avoid punishment. A scheme was seriously entertained of selling a vast number of the clergy to the Turks as slaves! and though this plan was not openly carried into effect, there are suspicions whether some were not so got rid of. Several were murdered by the *pretended* sword of justice, or by the common barbarities of the times.

But, perhaps, a few particulars may be useful to Dissenters, for I suspect they are not quite aware of the cruelties they have accomplished in their day. It would not be a difficult matter to supply them with authentic accounts of some hundreds of sufferers under the bitter persecutions of their originators in the middle of the seventeenth century; but this would be a very lengthy affair, and I must try to be brief. However, there is no doubt of this, that the number of rightly ordained clergy who were driven out of their parishes by the cruelty and excesses of the Dissenting party was very great, even from the evidence of those committees of the House of Commons who expelled them. The whole body of the Cathedral clergy, eminent for learning, was at once swept away; and, it is firmly believed, that "more men were outed of their livings by the Presbyterians, in the space of three years, than were deprived by the Papists in the reign of Queen Mary, or had been silenced, suspended, or deprived by the bishops, from the first year of Elizabeth to those very times."<sup>2</sup> There appears to be no doubt

<sup>1</sup> In the "Ordinance" of Parliament it is confessed that "*it is found by experience parishioners are not forward to complain of their ministers*"!!!

<sup>2</sup> Walker, Part i., p. 198; Part ii., p. 180. Pict. Hist. England, p. 491. Neal, vol. iii., p. 22.

"In London all the bishops' houses were turned to be prisons, and were filled.

that six to seven thousand persons, *at the least*, were cruelly ejected from their livings, and some make the number much larger.<sup>1</sup> Some calculate the number, including the Fellows of Colleges, to have been ten thousand. Amongst others who were driven out and plundered may be mentioned John Owen, D.D., bishop of St. Asaph, William Roberts, D.D., bishop of Bangor, and, indeed, all the bishops.

Thomas Howell, D.D., bishop of Bristol, met with much barbarous treatment. The rebels took the lead off the roof of his palace, and he was exposed to the weather day and night. After other indignities they pulled and hauled him violently out of the palace, which they turned into a malthouse. Their usage to him was such that he died not long after. Take another specimen,—that of James Usher, D.D., bishop of Carlisle. His residence was pillaged, and the bishop deprived of all his possessions. His extraordinary learning made him superior to all his enemies, and there is reason to believe that when he died, a victim to the trials he endured, in 1655, he was buried at the expense of the Protector Cromwell, who could not but respect his character. Dean Reeves and his wife and four children were taken out of their beds at midnight, and turned out of doors, and lay all night under a hedge in the wet and cold. John Gregory, one of the most learned men of those times, who spent sixteen hours every day in study, was reduced to such poverty that he was obliged to retire to an obscure alehouse at Kidlington Green, near Oxford, and after some years died in that obscurity. George Benson, being turned out of his rectory, was succeeded by a mere layman, *who never paid him fifths for the subsistence of his wife and family.*

If ever a good man lived, Joseph Hall,<sup>2</sup> bishop of Norwich was one. It was eight o'clock at night, very cold and frosty, when he was seized and sent to prison. After some time he was released on £5000 bail, and returning to Norwich, was harassed, sequestered, and abused in the vilest manner, all his property was seized, and an inventory of his goods taken, except the clothes of his children, which were exempted through special interference! After many gross insults, he was turned out of his palace, and would have been in the street, but that a worthy man lent his house for himself and family. Some maintenance was voted for himself and family, but before one quarter was due, the payment was prohibited, and he only had the promise of the fifths, of which he never had the full

with divines that would not take the covenant, or forbear reading Common Prayer, or that were accused for some fault like these."—*Ecel. Biography, Bishop Sanderson*, p. 491.

<sup>1</sup> Gauden, 6,000 to 7,000; Walker, 8,000 to 10,000; White, the Chairman of the Committee, 8,000; Dr. Hook's "Church Dictionary," Article *Puritans*, 7000.

<sup>2</sup> See his "*Hard measure.*"

amount. Dr. John Cosin, dean of Peterborough, was imprisoned, fined, degraded, deprived, and excommunicated, upon charges which were proved false, and all of which were connected with his religious opinions. The celebrated champion of Protestantism, Chillingworth, was cruelly treated; and at his burial a certain minister (Dissenter), Francis Cheynell, of those times, throwing the works of the deceased into the grave after him, said, "Get thee gone, thou cursed book; get thee into the place of rottenness, that thou mayest rot with thy author." Dr. Robert Sanderson was seized by soldiers, his living taken, and he, his wife and children reduced to poverty for some years. Henry Fowler, rector of Minchin Hampton, was seized, a sword held to his throat, beaten with poleaxes, railed at for reading Common Prayer, and, though sixty-two years of age, was so beaten as to be unable to move; then the son was attacked, and then the daughter, who was knocked down again and again with a poleaxe, and then the aged mother was kicked, knocked down, and trampled upon, after which the house was plundered. John Heslehead was turned out of his Church on Sunday while officiating, and a pistol held to his breast, with a threat of death if he did not comply. Then all the family were driven out of the house, including a married daughter, who was not allowed to remain, though in a critical condition, and died in child-birth shortly afterwards. Dr. Hammond was another sufferer, being cast into prison for several months; and the celebrated Jeremy Taylor, one of the greatest divines of that or any other age, was driven from his parish, took refuge for a time in Wales, and afterwards in Ireland.

These cases are not by any means selected, but have been taken almost promiscuously from very many hundred cases.<sup>2</sup>

These are the ways by which vacancies were violently made in the livings of the Church. Into these vacancies Nonconformists were placed, who, after enjoying them for several years, were, in 1660 and 1662, put out of them, and the original ministers of the Church restored, or other ordained Church ministers put in their place! And yet, two centuries afterwards, these men, who had held these places without any right, are to be held up to the world as martyrs, because they were turned out of what they never had a right to hold. Hear the testimony of one of the Puritan writers as to the sufferings of some of the Church of England clergy. "It is to be lamented, that several worthy and pious bishops and other clergymen, who withdrew from the world, and were desirous to live

<sup>1</sup> Walker, Part ii., p. 63. Chillingworth's Life, p. 16. Also, Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of W. Chillingworth, 1725, p. 361, where Cheynell's speech is given, and an account of his doings, in his own words.

<sup>2</sup> One of the six articles against scandalous clergy was their malignancy and disaffection to Parliament, discovered by their assisting the King with money, . . . and by not observing the Parliament fasts, etc."—*vide Neal*, vol. iii., p. 24.

“peaceably without joining either side, suffered afterwards in common with the rest of their brethren; their estates and livings being sequestrated, their houses and goods being plundered by ungovernable soldiers, and themselves reduced to live on the fifts” (of which I will speak presently), “or a small pension from Parliament, either *because they could not take the covenant*” [which pledged them to endeavour the extirpation of popery and prelacy, (*i.e.*, Church government by archbishops, bishops, deans, deans and chapters, etc.)] “*or comply with the new Directory for public worship.*”<sup>1</sup>

Now, I beg all to remember these two causes why the rightful Church ministers were driven into starvation, bondage, imprisonment, and bitter sufferings. They would not agree to a covenant which forced all who took it to declare opposition to the only form of Church government they believed to be scriptural, or comply with a Directory which set the old Prayer Book at naught, established republicanism, and was contrary, as they considered, to the Word of God.<sup>2</sup>

Why then are these things to be forgotten, while contemporaneous events are made much of? We hear of the endurances of the noble John Bunyan, and of other men who suffered for conscience sake, and a very sad story these things tell of human nature; but I say, let us know all about it; and do not let the people of England be blinded by a dazzle thrown suddenly in their face, instead of the general light of impartial truth. The committee of which I made mention, and which in fact drove out all, or nearly all, the clergy from their livings, obtained the name of the “*Plundering Committee*,” for in fact they plundered nearly all the clergy of their livings, and put other men in them who were opposed to the Church!

Yet though the Church was thus persecuted and brought low, no one was bettered by the change; and, to endeavour to end the fear-

<sup>1</sup> Neal's “*Purit.*,” vol. iii., pp. 22, 23. Toulmin's Edition, 1822:

<sup>2</sup> C. “There were orders in the late times, that no man should pray publicly for King Charles, and they obeyed them. They were required also to keep a Thanksgiving for the victories at Dunbar and Worcester. That thanksgiving was repeated every year, at Whitehall. . . . Why may not the 29th of September as well be observed as the 3rd sometime was?”

N. C. “That day is observed for superstitious purposes, to remember the victory of Michael over the Dragon.”

C. “Suppose it were. Is not that a great deal better than to remember the victory of Cromwell over the king?”

\* \* \* \* \*

N. C. “You love to rip up old things, which had better be forgotten.”

C. “Not I, but you force me to it.” . . . . . *Friendly Dialogue between a Conformist and a Nonconformist*, A.D. 1669, pp. 72, 73.

Jeremy Taylor, [Works, 1657, p. 59,] speaking of the Directory, says, “I shall have no other character of the whole, but that the public disrelish which I find amongst persons of great piety, of all qualities, not only of great, but even of common understandings, is to me some argument, . . . I shall decline to speak of the *efficient cause* of this *Directory*, nor quarrel at it, that it was composed against the laws both of England and of all Christendome.”

ful confusion which ensued, an assembly, called the "Assembly of Divines," met in 1643, at Westminster, to draw up a new ecclesiastical polity. Here great difficulties arose. The Presbyterians were throughout vigorously opposed by two other parties, who, though they formed but a minority, yet since they acted very much together, rendered their opposition very powerful. These were the Independents and the Erastians, with a host of minor sects, who found the Presbyterians as anxious to hold the sway as ever the Church party had been, although they had helped to pull her down! Those who hoped their own sect was strong enough to supplant the rest wished to establish it instead of The Church; while the weaker parties, who had no hope of this for themselves, vociferated for equality to all.

After a severe struggle, although the Presbyterian party held the sway, still the Independent and other sectaries gained great ascendancy in Parliament and in the army; so much so, that by about the time of the king's death on the scaffold, they were more powerful in the army than the Presbyterians. On the 5th Sept., 1646, the name, style, and dignity of archbishops and bishops had been taken away; and in June of the same year the Presbyterian form of worship was partially established by way of experiment, and in the year of the king's death (1649) it was declared by the House of Commons that Presbytery should be the established religion. Observe, this was done at a time of open rebellion in England, not in a regular, national, constitutional way, but amid general excitement, by one estate of the realm alone, who had a powerful army at command, and who had just brought their rightful king to the scaffold!!! These are the men who when they had, as they hoped, pulled down the Church, *established Presbytery instead of it!* And yet, be it remembered, that the Confession of Faith drawn up by the Westminster Divines, though received by the Scottish Kirk, was never sanctioned by any act of English legislature.

In truth, no one who reads the history of these times but will perceive that, had it not been for Cromwell's determined mode of proceeding, the various sects and parties of Dissenters would have persecuted one another as bitterly as ever the Church of Rome had persecuted the Church of England. Nay, so vigorously were the clergy of the Church persecuted, that at a council, where even Cromwell presided, they were forbidden to earn a living by keeping a school, public or private.<sup>1</sup> Nor does it want any great insight into the practices of dissent in 1862 to perceive the same intolerant spirit wherever it *can* show itself now.

The treatment which Dissenting teachers often meet with at the

<sup>1</sup> "Yea many of them were denied to make use of any such plank or rafter, which might serve to buoy them up from utter sinking and starving, though it were but *teaching school in a belfry*"!—Gauden. *Tears, Sighs, and Prayers*. 1659.



hands of the people to whom they preach is nothing short of cruelty and persecution, such as men of superior mind and education cannot submit to *long*. I have seen cases of a refinement of cruelty towards Dissenting teachers from the congregation, which would make one tremble if there were any prospect of such men getting the upper hand in England. Indeed, the cruelties practised by Dissenters on Dissenters at the time of the Rebellion are so numerous as to make me wonder that living in such glass houses as they certainly do, they should venture to pitch stones at the Church! Probably they have been led away by the garbled stories of their own party, and know not that persecution was far more practised by themselves than by the Church, and would have been carried by their religionists to enormous extravagances but for the inflexible conduct of Cromwell, whom many of them hated.

Thus, as early as 1646, the Rev. Thos. Edwards, a zealous Presbyterian minister of London, published a work entitled "Gangrena, or a Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, and Blasphemies Vented and Acted in England during the last Four Years." And what were these? Why a list of sixteen various heretical sects: Independents, Millenarics, Seekers, Socinians, and others, all of whom were antagonistic to one another, and who regarded with dislike the Presbyterian party, not because it had pulled down the Church, but because it had set itself up over the other sectaries, as any other of them would have done had it been able.

Now, really, before accusing the Church of England of persecuting the two thousand sufferers in 1662, it would have been well for Dissenters to have considered whether they ought not to lament over the persecutions inflicted by Nonconformists, during the period when these "two thousand" and many other Nonconformists held the Church livings. Why, what can they allege against us worse than they themselves enacted on the poor Quakers? In spite of all Cromwell could do, these poor creatures received treatment at the hands of pious Dissenters which is a disgrace to humanity, and all, too, under the semblance of religion. George Fox himself was frequently cast into prison. On one occasion, after nine weeks' confinement, though nothing illegal could be proved against them, he and two friends were fined twenty marks a piece for coming into court with their hats on, and refusing to pay, were committed to a loathsome dungeon for thirty weeks, and were then set free only through Cromwell's interference! (Pretty doings for men who when any of their party suffered would make martyrs of them.) Many others were fined, imprisoned, whipped, or set in the stocks; and in 1657 (eight years after Charles's death) one hundred and forty Quakers were found in prison, and nineteen hundred had been apprehended and punished during the last six years, of whom twenty-one had died in prison.

Some were most cruelly treated, and in those days when Nonconformists occupied the Church, and Nonconformity ruled the House of Commons, it was urged in the Commons that it was necessary for the preservation of England that James Naylor (a notable Quaker) should be put to death. Well, though he was not put to death, Dissenters who commemorate 1662 should recollect that only six years before, and when their own people held the sway entirely throughout England, when there was no king in England (he having been killed by them), no House of Lords or Bishops (these having been put down by them), and only a House of Commons of their own sort; James Naylor was set in the pillory, in the Palace Yard, Westminster, for two hours, then whipped by the hangman through the streets from Westminster to the old Exchange, placed in the pillory two hours more two days after, then taken to the old Exchange, where his tongue was bored through with an hot iron, and his forehead marked with the letter B; then he was sent to Bristol, through the said city on horseback with his face backward, baredridged, and publicly whipped; then sent to labour hard in prison, till released by Parliament, (*Happy days of Democracy and of Dissenters' liberty!*) to be debarred the use of pen, ink, and paper, and to have no relief but what he earned by his daily labours. An eye-witness remarks, "He put out his tongue very willingly, but shrank a little when the iron came upon his forehead. He was pale when he came out of the pillory, but high-coloured after tongue boring." Dissenters! you would have been wise to have kept silence about 1662, for from 1646 to 1660 history proves you to have been willing to persecute with greater severity and cruelty than any other men, wherever you had the power. You must not think to persuade England that you are better than other people when such atrocities can be told in vast number of yourselves.<sup>1</sup>

"Great spoiling there was (in 1655) of Friends' goods," writes a poor Quaker, "for tithes, by the Independents and Presbyterian priests, and some Baptist priests, that had got the steeple houses." Ho! ho! What is this? I thought tithes were "an abomination"

<sup>1</sup> The pious Nonconformist, Oliver Heywood, (born at Little Lever, near Bolton, in Lancashire) suffered persecution at the hands of the Cromwellians; for, refusing to give thanks to God for the defeat of the Royalists at Preston, he was apprehended by some of Cromwell's men, and *fined* for refusing to do this. I am sorry to know that after the Restoration he was severely persecuted (and the persecution was as impolitic as it was disgraceful), but yet the clergy of Penistone and Holmfirth sometimes invited him to preach in their churches, which he did. I do not know what *all* his descendants may be, but I can testify of *some* of them, that they are sound Churchmen, Church builders, Church endowers, and Church supporters upon a scale which deserves to be followed more than it is. As the Independents are fond of claiming Oliver Heywood as the founder of Lancashire Independency, and Oliver Cromwell as one of their great men, it may be well to remember that Oliver Heywood had no sympathy with Oliver Cromwell, but was a Royalist.—*Vide Universal Biography*, p. 894.

to Dissenters? I fancied I had seen pictures of men being seized in dstraint for non-payment of these things to Churchmen! I fancied Dissenting ministers, weary of preaching the Gospel, indulged their flagging congregations with tales of woe about tithe-collectors.

Celebrators of 1662, do dig a little deeper, and see what you did when you had opportunity in 1655. Are you aware that in the days of Puritan ascendancy an Act was passed to enforce payment of the Church-rate? Do you know that during your reign of godliness and terror combined (the strangest mixture the world ever endured) three thousand one hundred and seventy-three persons were imprisoned for Quakerism, of whom thirty-two died in dungeons?

I do not accuse you of being the *only* persecutors in those days. Persecution was of the spirit of the age. But I tell you that you quite equalled all others, and showed by your violence that you would have exceeded them in persecution, if the power had been yours but a little longer. Three thousand one hundred and seventy-three persons were imprisoned by you. Six thousand to seven thousand clergymen, with bishops and archbishops,<sup>1</sup> were driven out from their livings by you, to starve and pine away in misery. You beheaded your king, you drove Archbishop Laud (I defend not all his doings) to the scaffold. Never would I have penned these things against you but for your own proposed proceedings on next St. Bartholomew's Day. You would have been wise to have left the subject untouched. The truth of the matter is, a persecuting spirit was abroad, and you exhibited it as much as any, if not more.<sup>2</sup> You should not have raked this matter out of the ashes of oblivion.

Hear the sentiments of the Independents declared to Richard Cromwell by Dr. Thomas Goodwin on their behalf:—"And we now present to your highness what we have done, and commit to your trust the common faith once delivered to the saints. The Gospel and the saving truths of it being a national endowment bequeathed by Christ Himself at His ascension, and committed to the trust of

<sup>1</sup> Neal endeavours to show that the numbers were far less; but I do not think successfully. And I doubt if he includes in his calculation the Bishops, Deans, and Chapters, and "divers clergymen of considerable learning and blameless lives, sound Protestants and good preachers," (vol. iii., p. 34) turned out, 1643, by "The Ordinance." But I am not sure of this.

<sup>2</sup> "When Oliver Cromwell was dead, and his son almost as soon pulled down as set up, the Anabaptists grew insolent in England and Ireland; and joining with their brethren in the army, were everywhere put in power; and those of them that before lived in some seeming friendliness near me, at Bewdley, began now to show that they remembered all their former provocations (by my public disputation with Mr. Tombes, and writing against them, and hindering their increase in those parts). And when Sir Henry Vane was in power . . . they laid wait on the road for my letters, and intercepting one to Major Blake . . . sent for him to London, but after many threatenings, dismissed him. This was the Anabaptist's fidelity."—*Baxter's Life*, Part II. pp. 206, 207.

"The extremities on both sides."—*Neal*, vol. iii., p. 35.

some in the nation's behalf, (committed to my trust, saith Paul, in the name of ministers,) and we look at the magistrate as *custos utriusque tabulæ*, and so commit it to your trust, as our chief magistrate, to countenance and propagate."

After Richard's abdication, the ministers and delegates met in London, and passed a series of resolutions of which some are as follows:—"As touching the magistrate's power in matters of faith and worship, we have declared our judgment in our late confession; and though we greatly prize *our* Christian liberties, yet we *profess our utter dislike and abhorrence of an universal toleration as being contrary to the mind of God in His word.*"

The italics are not in the original; but I entreat attention to the self-complacency of the whole thing. We can enjoy *our* liberty, but *universal toleration* is not to be *tolerated*. Why, really, what right have they or their successors to complain of the Act of Uniformity? It did not forbid universal toleration, as these men would have done. It only said, "WE WILL HAVE CHURCHMEN IN THE CHURCH."

Hear a little more about these famous resolutions. They say, "We protest against the taking away of tithes, until as full a maintenance be equally secured, and legally settled on the ministry." In other words, *we stick to the tithes until you can give us something easier to collect, and equally productive*. Now, mark the next declaration, "*It is our desire that countenance be not given or trust reposed in the hand of Quakers, they being persons of such principles as are destructive to the Gospel, and inconsistent with the peace of civil societies.*"<sup>1</sup>

I now hand over these gentlemen to our Dissenters of 1862, and wish them to make any use they can of them.

But a time of restoration was at hand, and England was delivered from a period of anarchy, which we trust dissent will not succeed in throwing her into any more. If anything could attest more fully than another, the hearty sickening the people felt of the democratic rule in matters civil and religious after the rebellion began, it is the fact that they joyfully endured such a court, and such a rule as that of Charles II; and that when James II. was found to be a Papist and tyrant, they thought no more about democracy or dissent, but sought only for a legitimate Protestant Church of England monarch in his stead.

<sup>1</sup> Collings, (one of the ejected, and a Presbyterian) says, "If the devil were to ask a courtesy of the State, he would ask no more than (1) Universal Toleration, and (2) Uncontrolled Liberty in every one to preach and expound Scripture." He denies the right in private persons to preach, and asks, "Had we not more Christians when we had fewer preachers?" I cannot give the reference, but have no doubt of the genuineness of the quotation.

For the quotations in inverted commas see Marsden's "History of Christian Churches and Sects," Article "Independents," pp. 15, 16, vol. ii.

In 1660 Charles II. returned to England, and the Restoration was completed. It was an anxious time to know how to proceed in regard to those, who though Nonconformists, and though having unjustly obtained them, were holding the livings of Churchmen. Dr. Reynolds, a distinguished Presbyterian minister, accepted the bishopric of Norwich. Others declined the honours offered them, partly from suspicious fears, amongst whom were Calamy, Baxter, and Dr. Bates. I regret they did not accept the offers made to them, but at all events, it cannot be said they were not treated with some manifestation of respect for the sake of their personal character. Meantime a new parliament was returned, which, partaking of the re-action of the day, was a parliament rather inclined to rush to an extreme, the opposite of what had been pervading England since the beginning of the rebellion. Hence, there was not the disposition to conciliate which ought to have marked their deliberations, particularly those of the House of Commons, but rather to hasten those extreme measures which led to injury to the Church, where the breaches should rather have been healed. But all was done by Parliament, by a House of Commons, and of Lords, and by the King.

One Act was speedily passed, however, which surely no one will denounce as unjust. It enacted, That every minister of the Church of England who had been turned out of his living, who had not justified the king's murder, or declared against infant baptism, should be restored to his living by December 25th. The result was, that several hundreds,<sup>1</sup> who for many years had pined away in misery and want, who had been thrust out of their parishes, imprisoned, maligned, and persecuted, were restored back to their original cures. *Was there any injustice in this?* Yet the result was, that Richard Baxter was obliged to resign Kidderminster to the old vicar, who had been ejected eighteen or twenty years before to make way for Baxter. Now, very likely Baxter was a far more useful and excellent man than the other. Let it be granted, for the sake of argument, that the one was a very extraordinary man, and the old vicar a very inferior man! That alters not the question in the least, which is one of simple, plain justice between man and man.

Nor let it be forgotten, Baxter had been offered the bishopric of Hereford, but scrupled to take it. I can honour his scruples, but not those who say he was persecuted or hardly dealt by. I lament his loss, and think he was wrong, but I cannot see that the

<sup>1</sup> "Seeing some hundreds of able, holy, faithful ministers are of late cast out."—*A Petition for Peace*, printed 1661, p. 2, sect. 2.

"The ejecting of 1,800 ministers at once, and many hundreds before."—*Baxter's Life*, Part II., p. 286. Baxter here refers to 1,800 as ejected in 1662, and to "many hundreds" in 1660 under the circumstances above described.

Church could in fairness have done much more. Nothing but perversity can say that Baxter was ill treated thus far.

Very soon after an attempt was made so to revise the Liturgy, as to make it suitable to all parties of orthodox Christians, in the hope of securing thereby that unity which many longed for, and which we of the Church often pray for and hope for still. It may be questioned how far there was much sincerity of purpose on either side, and the conduct of some Churchmen on the occasion was disastrous, and I think disgraceful: and after much jangling, disputing, and heart-burning, nothing was agreed upon, and the commission was withdrawn.

I ought, however, to add here, that a conceited act on the part of Richard Baxter did much towards rendering any revision disagreeable to the Church party; for in fourteen days did this one man draw up a Prayer-book of his own designing, which was to be preferred, in his opinion, to one which was a compilation of all ancient Liturgies, and which had been in use nearly in its present state for upwards of a century. This gave great offence, and certainly exhibited an amount of self-complacency which does not add to the character of the noble and pious Richard Baxter, *though our Dissenting* friends may add that since Baxter was in favour of a Liturgy, and was episcopally ordained, he was *not one of their party!*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Baxter (*writing in favour of Liturgies*) says:—"Some young ministers do wrong both Baptism and the Lord's Supper, by many miscarriages, for want of further help. Wales, and many parts of England, must be supplied with Forms, or be without, which is worse."—*Five Disputations of Church Government and Worship*. By Richard Baxter. From a Copy sent by him as a Gift to Lord Lauderdale.

"We are for Bishops in every Church" (probably meaning our "*Priests* ;") "and, for order sake, would have one to be the chief."—*Third Disputation*.

"An Episcopacy desirable for the Reformation, Preservation and Peace of the Churches."—*Title of Third Disputation*.

"If it be not our lawful Governors that command us, but usurpers, we are not formally bound to obey them, though the things be lawful which they command."—*Disputations*, p. 454.

Baxter writes to "Associated Ministers" of County Cumberland:—"I dare not refuse to baptize the child of a stranger, as such; but I will first speak with one of the parents, and be more fully satisfied of their knowledge, and reasons of Dissent, and enquire of their lives; and on the same terms I admit Dissenters also to the Lord's Supper, viz., if there be no charge against their lives, and they come to me beforehand and satisfy me of their fitness. Still letting them know it is a dangerous case to live from under order and discipline, and that I do this to them but for a time, till they be satisfied, as I would do it to a stranger." This is in reply to a letter, signed by Richard Gilpin and others in 1653, the time when the *Church of England* was broken down, "so that all they that went by did pluck off her grapes, the wild boar out of the woods did root it up, and the wild beast of the field did devour it." And what is the testimony of these, afterwards Nonconforming Ministers? They write to Baxter and others:—"You are not willing to look upon the gasping condition of the Church here." (*i.e. The Cromwellian Church*) "or as mere witnesses of her funeral, without trying any remedy at all. . . . Her sons, while

I have already stated, that by the "Act for the Confirming and Restoring of Ministers," (1660) many of the ejected clergy had been restored to their rights, but still some thousands of Nonconforming ministers remained in those livings, whose old ejected possessors were dead, (for many of them had sunk beneath the cruelties they had endured) or did not ask to return; and thus no claim had been made under the Act, to remove these Nonconforming ministers from such livings. It became a question, therefore, what was to be done with these ministers and the parishes they held. The Church of England believed then, and still believes, Episcopacy to be *essential* to at least the well-being of a Church.<sup>1</sup> Some men think it the *best form* of Church orders; some regard it as *absolutely essential*; and the Church of England holds it to be *decidedly apostolical*. Therefore, she must put out the Nonconformist ministers from the livings they had been thrust into, or she must allow them to hold livings in her communion, in defiance of her declared opinion touching Holy Scripture's teaching on the subject; or she must make provisions for the ordination of those men, who, though not episcopally ordained, were (under an act of rebellion, be it remembered), labouring within the Church, and did not scruple to receive her tithes. Some of these men were of undoubted piety, even as a few of them were of extraordinary ability and of the highest religious character. And, when I regard the mischief which ensued upon their removal, I wish that many of them had been permitted to remain in their livings as they were, to be succeeded on their demise, by episcopally ordained men. I grant it would have been a yielding of principle, but possibly the peculiar circumstances would have justified a temporary

"they have been consulting to relieve her, have fallen out about the cure; and because they have not been admitted to administer the physick according to their minds, have neglected to administer any at all; because they could not be suffered to do what they would, they have forgotten that it was their duty to do what they might."—p. 162. Such, by these men's testimony, was the state of religion when the Church of England was pushed aside, in the days of Cromwell and Dis-sent! May England profit by the perusal!

Matthew Henry's "Commentary on Judges xvii." is to the purpose; and the oft-repeated sarcasm of the inspired penman of that book yet more so, which says:—"In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." (Judges xvii. 6; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xxi. 25.) The "*right doing*" consisted of—(a) The introduction of idolatry. (b) Such a fearful state of immorality as led to atrocities and murders, and nearly to the destruction of a tribe. (c) The recourse to such connivance on the part of the other tribes to supply the Benjamites with wives as put all modesty to shame. But hear Matthew Henry, (xvii. 6)—"When they were without a king, to keep good order among them, God's house was forsaken, His priests neglected, and all went to ruin among them." "Nothing contributes more, under God, to the support of religion in the world, than the due administration of those two great ordinances, magistracy and ministry."

<sup>1</sup> See the "Preface to the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," in the Book of Common Prayer.

departure from strict conformity. Another plan, however, was (I think unhappily) adopted. The Act of Uniformity was passed by Lords and Commons, which offered to every Nonconformist minister within the Church of England, that if on or before August 24th, 1662, (S. Bartholomew's Day) he received episcopal ordination, declared his assent and consent to all and every thing prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and abjured the league and covenant, he might continue to hold his living, but otherwise, he must depart from it. They had three months for deliberation.<sup>1</sup> Be it remembered, that many of their clerical predecessors had not three hours' notice before they were turned out of their livings by Puritan fanatical elders! And now then, what happened? Consultations between these Nonconformist ministers took place, both in town and country, to know each other's sentiments; some of them persuaded others not to conform, but conformed themselves, and got the other's livings. A large number conformed;<sup>2</sup> others refused to conform, and of course had to give up their livings. Some few, not many, of these, refused to conform, owing to their objections to Episcopacy; others scrupled the declaration renouncing the covenant, because they did not like to unsay what they had said, even though they might regret having taken it; many could not sign the declaration concerning the Prayer-book; while not a few believed that if only they kept true to their objections, these objections would be removed. Such, however, was not the case, and two thousand men (*or less*<sup>3</sup>) some of whom had never received any sort of ordination, left the houses where they had lived many years, and the livings they had enjoyed, and the parishes in which they had laboured. It was a lamentable business.

<sup>1</sup> Some endeavour to prove that a very short notice was given. The truth seems to be, that in some few instances a copy of the proposed alterations in the Book of Common Prayer was not put into their hands so soon as it ought to have been. But then, they all knew pretty certainly what was the nature of the proposed alterations, so that practically there was no hardship here; and Baxter, who held two lectureships in London after he was obliged to resign Kidderminster (see p. 19) resigned these, May 25th, amongst other reasons, 'to let all ministers in England understand in time, whether I intended to conform or not.'—*Life*, p. 384. Philip Henry "used all possible means to satisfy himself, whether to conform or no, by reading and discourse."—See *Life*, p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> "I. The Conformists were of three sorts. Some of the old ministry, called Presbyterians formerly, that conformed at Bartholomewtide, or after." (The word "after," probably reduces the number of the "ejected," therefore, still more, because it intimates that some of these returned and Conformed).

"II. A second sort were called Latitudinarians, mostly Cambridge men, Platonists, . . . ingenious men and scholars. These two forementioned parties were laudable preachers."

"III. The third sort, such as were heartily such throughout."

<sup>3</sup> Calamy reckons many as silenced who never occupied any Church. He seems also to forget that many who were silenced would have been equally silenced under Presbyterianism, and even by himself.



It was a calamity to all parties, and much I regret it. The sufferings of the men were great and bitter, but I honour them much more in their nonconformity than in their quietly taking tithe, fees, and offerings for several years, from a church to which many of them did not belong.

But while I thus acknowledge in all candour, my regret at the transaction, and heartily wish that milder measures had been adopted, it shall not go forth to the public that these two thousand sufferers were the only sufferers by the fearful troubles of those times, and of the preceding period of rebellion!<sup>1</sup>

Let it be borne in mind that six to seven thousand English clergymen, refusing to take the covenant, had been ejected with greater cruelty and with gross injustice, from their livings. Let it be remembered, that their places were filled by Dissenting ministers, who had no right there, and that of these, some were turned out by the Act of 1660; but a very large number conformed to the Act of Uniformity, and less than two thousand refused to do so. Now, Dissenters may take which view of the case they please; but if a large number of their own men could conform to the Act, either the Act was not so very unjust, or else the great majority of their own ministers cannot have been the admirable characters which Dissenters represent them to be.<sup>2</sup>

Many of those who withdrew had been episcopally ordained, but preferred to leave the Church livings, rather than renounce the covenant, which (though they might regret it) they had taken. But

<sup>1</sup> This is the unfair and ridiculous thing. These men alone are to be represented as the only sufferers in that age of intolerance, whose chief sufferings consist in being ejected from that which never belonged to them!

<sup>2</sup> "The Nonconformists were of Divers Sorts.

"I. Some few (of my acquaintance) who are for the old Conformity: for Bishops, Common Prayer Book, . . . ; but could not assent and consent to all things now imposed. II. A greater number, of no sect or party, who like Ignatius's Episcopacy, but not the English Diocesan frauge; but cannot assent or consent to all things required by the Act. III. Presbyterians. IV. The Independents, for the most part a serious, Godly people; others more raw, and self-conceited, and addicted to separations and divisions, their zeal being greater than their knowledge; who have opened the door to Anabaptists first, and then to all the other sects. These sects are numerous;" (*Mark how divisions had multiplied in those fearful eighteen years!*) "some tolerable, and some intolerable."—*Baxter's Life*, p. 387.

An anecdote is told of one man, who misinterpreting the words of the Saviour, "Fear not *little* flock," was ever and again shifting to a new party as the older one became too *large* for this text! I cannot give the reference, but the story exists in Baxter's "True Catholic," date, 1660.

Yet Baxter declares (p. 36, part iii.) that 1400 of the Nonconformable would have yielded to more moderate terms joyfully! I lament those terms were not offered; but I honestly believe that if the 2000 Nonconforming ministers of 1662 were now obliged to choose between the Church and any of the existing Dissenting bodies, nine tenths of them would be Churehmen.

Gauden, in "Tears and Sighs," p. 35, describes professing Christians as divided into *fragments, chips, and fractions* !!!

how did they act? They attended the ministrations of their successors; friendships often sprung up between the present and the ejected minister, they sometimes lodged at the rectory for the remainder of their days, they were in some instances allowed pensions by the free bounty of their (rightful) successors, and even officiated in the Church!<sup>1</sup> Contrast this against the "hard measure" dealt out by the Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent party, towards the bishops and clergy of the Church, in the beginning of the rebellion, and then ponder whether or not, this bi-centenary celebration is just, wise, or pious? When, therefore, Dissenters declaim about the cruel persecution of 1662, let them not forget that the majority of their own men conformed, and remained in their livings, and that instead of the six to seven thousand English clergymen, who twenty years before had been driven into misery by the Puritan party, only two thousand, at the most, of their Dissenting ministers were so served! Do not let them omit this when descanting on the sufferings of the one, that the other party suffered far more unjustly, far more severely, and far more numerously.

I will here add a few extracts from the Pictorial History of England. I prefer this history on account of its known leaning to the liberal side. It is not, then, likely to speak too favourably of the Church party, though far more fairly than more amusing and fascinating historians (so called) of a later period. It remarks of Baxter, that though ejected from Kidderminster by the Act which preceded that of Uniformity, he was allowed to remain a lecturer there at a small stipend, and so continued until 1662, when he left in common with the two thousand. "It must be confessed that the case was "surrounded with difficulties. The different measure dealt out "to the Episcopalian clergymen ejected in the time of the Common- "wealth, to whom Parliament made a show of allowing a fifth part "of their former livings for their support, has often been contrasted "with the conduct of the opposite party at the Restoration, but not "much can be founded on the matter. In the first place, the right "acquired by the Presbyterian clergy from a possession of a few "years, cannot in fairness be considered the same with those that "belonged to the ancient clergy. Then," (this is what I hinted at before about 'fifths') "it is admitted on all hands, that the allow- "ances which Parliament had professed to make to the ejected "Episcopal ministers were in many, perhaps in most cases, rather "nominal than real. Walker asserts that scarcely one in ten ever "had them without trouble, and to the full value, and nothing is "better attested than the severe suffering and oppression which "many of those sequestered clergymen underwent. The commis- "sioners were only empowered, not directed, to suffer them to

<sup>1</sup> "The Annals of England," pp. 359—365. J. H. and J. Parker, Oxford.

“retain a portion of their incomes, and that portion was not to be  
 “in all cases a fifth, but never to exceed a fifth. When we think,  
 “too, of the ejection of the Presbyterian ministers in 1662, by the  
 “Act of Uniformity, we ought not to forget that, even if themselves  
 “had had the framing of the Act, they would most certainly have  
 “made it such as to exclude Independents and the Sectaries.  
 “They could, in truth, expect little forbearance from those to whom  
 “they would have shown none in the same circumstances, whom in  
 “other times they had denounced as unfit to be suffered to live in  
 “the land, and had refused to tolerate in the most modest public  
 “observance of their form of worship, although now so willing and  
 “anxious, if they could have done so with decency, to remain asso-  
 “ciated with them in the same national Church establishment, and  
 “to divide with them its loaves and fishes.”

Perhaps some Dissenters may try to argue that the law under which the Puritans held the Church livings, was as good law as that of the Reformation. Well, if it were so, then surely there was as much justice in driving out the Puritans in 1662, as in driving out the Church clergy some twenty years before. But I distinctly answer, there is not only a difference, but an *essential* difference betwixt the two events. The Reformation was a gradual work, occupying several years, and was a regular, constitutional, authoritative proceeding, in which King, Lords, and Commons participated. It was the reforming and restoring of a Church in accordance with its own ancient model. It was restoration to ancient orthodoxy. Far different the way by which Dissenters obtained the Church livings. This was an act of rebellion, during a time when their King was in prison, and just after his murder, and when an army of fanatics and a House of Commons alone ruled the land.

And so, again, the Act of 1662 was the act of the majority of the nation, constitutionally assembled, and not of the Church alone, but of the King, and of the three estates of the realm, *viz.*, the Lords spiritual, the Lords temporal, and the Commons.<sup>1</sup>

I must remind the Dissenters yet further, that they ought to be the last men in England to talk about toleration or persecution. They are fond of pictures and lectures about “THE PILGRIM FATHERS,” but really, are they aware how they proceeded, when, having landed in America, they were enabled to develop their own notions about religion in all its full-blown force? Are they aware of the despotic bigotry which accompanied their doings in America? Do they know that the wearing of uncropped hair was held to be an offence against God, and to put a pipe of tobacco to the lips was regarded as spiritual destruction? Have they forgotten the Ordinance, which deprived any man of all civil fran-

<sup>1</sup> Blackstone's “Commentaries.” Rights of Power. Book I., c. iii., s. 2.

chises who did not communicate with the State Church, which was a species of Independency? Do they recollect that the Pilgrim Fathers, in 1656 (six years before St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662), persecuted the poor Quakers who landed from England and Barbadoes, and enacted that after the first conviction a man should lose one ear—if a woman, be severely whipped; that for the second offence a man should lose the other ear, and the woman have a second whipping; and for the third offence, man or woman, should have the tongue bored through with a red hot iron? *Do they recollect how many poor Indians they ensnared and burned to death because they would not become such Christians as themselves?* or, have they forgotten the mournful remark of John Robinson, when they sent with glee the news of this atrocity to their faithful pastor at Leyden?<sup>1</sup>

I have no pleasure in writing these things. I am truly sorry to do so. I had rather hoped that Churchmen and Dissenters would have gone on, each doing all the good they could, until in mercy unity should again prevail amongst us in all sincerity and love. But since Dissenters will fight, we must prepare for war. "I am for peace, but when I speak to them thereof, they make them ready for battle." Yet why rake up from oblivion, *after two hundred years*, the account of the two thousand Non-Conformists in 1662? If you tell that part of the story, we will have all the story told, and not allow you to bolster up your (religiously speaking) crazy cause by a distorted chapter of a whole history. If you accuse us of persecuting these two thousand men, we reply, We are sorry milder measures were not used; but that you cannot with justice allude to the matter, for you were far greater persecutors than we were, and you proved this whenever opportunity was given. We are not ashamed to say, we regret losing two thousand men from the ranks of our ministers; but we will not have it said, This was an act of persecution. We confess a regret that other measures were not tried; but we assert that, in strict justice, they met with nothing contrary to justice. We remind you of your own persecuting spirit wherever the opportunity was in your power. You are chiefly responsible for the murder of Charles.<sup>2</sup> You drove six thousand to seven thousand clergy and bishops into ruin, hunger, death, to make way for your own ministers. When the hour of

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix.

<sup>2</sup> "And thus when the two parts of the House were ejected and imprisoned, this third party, composed of the *Fanatics*, the Independents, and other sects, with the democratical party, was left by Cromwell to do his business under the name of the Parliament of England; but by the people in scorn commonly called, *The Rump of the Parliament*."—*Baxter's Life*, p. 63.

"It will not be asked of ministers of the Gospel at the last account, Who fought and slew and spoiled; but, Who fasted and prayed and mourned for the sins and judgments on the nation."—*Gawden. Hieraspistes*, p. 30.

retribution returned, the country endured even the cruelties of a Jeffreys, with all his atrocious doings, rather than return to the tender mercies of your unscriptural and impossible system. Of your six to seven thousand ministers the great<sup>1</sup> majority conformed; and the others left after *much* had been done to meet their wishes. Hold not that up to the country as an act of self-sacrifice and of martyrdom, which was rather (much as I regret it), but an act of recompense and retribution<sup>2</sup> for the cruelties you had inflicted. Two wrongs never make one right; and the fact of your many and cruel persecutions do not justify our fewer and far less severe punishments on your sufferers; but how you can dare, in the face of history, to come forth and declare this affair of 1662 as an act of persecution distinct from your own doings beforehand, is to me as mysterious as many of the wonders of the Romish religion! And why thus press upon us *now*? What has the Church been doing of late to call forth this bitterness and opposition? Is she so much worse than she used to be? Are her bishops, priests, and deacons become so idle? Is the fact of her building and endowing one hundred to two hundred Churches a year not fast enough for you? Or are you envious at her raising for Missions about half a million a year? Is your ire excited because the rather unscrupulous method you adopted in the Census of 1851 is now recoiling upon you, as it comes out that the numerous meeting-houses you then professed to possess cannot have one minister among three of them? Does it annoy you to have such dishonesty exposed as that whereby you count every new meeting house an *additional* one, whether the old one be pulled down or not? Does your mode of using the voluntary principle distress you, as you find that while by *investing* all our voluntary offerings of every age we have seventeen thousand three hundred and twenty ministers to labour *in the parish*, as well as in the Church, your system sustains but six thousand four hundred and five men, most of whom are always passing through the three rapid stages of—the new pastorate and prosperity—the miserable quarrels and adversity—and the looking out for another call? Our system provides for posterity; yours secures preaching and quarrelling for your own generation. You are become a violent political body: religion is not the object of your contention; and if you succeed in your endeavours religion will die out in England.

And now, one word to the pious portion of the Dissenters, who, I hope will listen to reason.<sup>3</sup> Are you not falling into the snare,

<sup>1</sup> "Five Thousand Conformed."—*Dr. Hook's "Dict. Puritans."* I do not think the number was so great, though it must have been large.

<sup>2</sup> "If the Puritan powers bore hard on the loyalists, in imposing the covenant, the King's clergy were even with them at the Restoration."—*Neal's Purit.*, vol. iii., p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> "I am much more sensible of the evil of schism, and of the separating humour,

and into the pit of the politician? Are you not lending an helping hand to Secularism and all its evils?

Beware how you aid the political Dissenter. Take care, lest you really thereby aid the Secularist, the Socinian, and the Infidel. Where is the primitive personal piety which once won for the Dissenter the respect of those who heartily differed from his opinions? Is it not rapidly wasting? Is it not almost gone? Is true religion the great thing sought and practised in your community? *You find fault with our patronage.* Is your own plan of appointment (to say nothing of the fallacy<sup>1</sup> of your so-called "ordinations") half as good? Are not your men practically appointed by persons who are not even "members," if only they chance to be "rich supporters?" You talk of persecution—Are not your ministers bullied and persecuted if haply they turn out (as in time is almost always the case) to be "unpopular?" Take heed what you are doing. The political Dissenter and the Secularist are powerless without your influence, small though your number be! These other men would obtain no moral hold on the people if there was no religious support granted to them. You are giving this. You, unconsciously, are affording them that very influence they are too irreligious to possess, and by which great harm may ensue. Pause, and reflect! Consider, with eternity before you, whether your duty be not rather to return to the Old Church of your forefathers, the ancient, Scriptural, Apostolical Church of England. Anyhow, mind how you give support to political Dissenters, Secularists, and Infidels. And when the orators pour forth their bitter invectives against the Church of England in reference to the ejected sufferers of 1662, recollect how many Nonconformists ceased their Nonconformity, and remained in the Church? what was done to encourage all to remain? and HOW THEY AT FIRST GOT THERE?

and of gathering parties, and making several sects in the Church, than I was heretofore, for the effects have shown us more of the mischiefs.

"I am dearlier afflicted for the disagreements of Christians than when I was a younger Christian."—*Barter's Life*, pp. 130, 132.

<sup>1</sup> Nonconformists attest this. In Leigh's "Body of Divinity," published in the time of Puritan triumph, 1654, and bearing the significant "*Imprimatur, Edmund Calamy, June, 15th, 1653,*" I read, p. 457, "They of the separation, and if not all, yet sure some Independents place the whole essentiality of a Minister's calling in election." "We say the power and commission by which he is made of no Minister to be a Minister, is not from the Church electing him, but from the lawful ordaining him." "The Brownists" (*i. e.*, Congregationalists) "fail in the main, which is the imposition of hands by the Presbytery." And at p. 466, "God hath established two distinct powers on earth, the one of the keys committed to the Church. . . . That of the keys is ordained to work on the inward man, having immediate relation to the remitting or retaining of sin." "There is a twofold ministerial power. 1. *Potestas ordinis*, which consists merely in preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments. 2. *Jurisdictionis*, whereby they govern in the Church, by binding the Impenitent, and losing (loosing) the Penitent."

## APPENDIX.

I have alluded (p. 27) to "*the Pilgrim Fathers.*" The bad taste which Dissenters have shown in raking up this matter at all is entirely responsible for obliging us to display the dark side of the character of men, many of whom were men of personal piety! The story (to tell it as briefly as possible) is as follows:—Even in the time of Edward VI., a few men were found "who were<sup>1</sup> willing to "risk the advantages already secured, for the sake of further "changes of inferior moment." They continued to promote their opinions, and, after Mary died and Elizabeth was queen, they became a large and active body of men. During Elizabeth's reign, while showing sincerity of purpose, they displayed withal much obstinacy, and a disposition to run into great extravagance of opinion; and no one acquainted with their temper at that period, but will confess that it was extremely difficult to know how best to treat them.

For a considerable period their objections applied to vestments, and hence the term the "Vestibarian controversy." Of course Dissenters of the *present day* can feel no sympathy with men who objected to surplices and other robes as "popish," since they have a remarkable love for such things, and even clothe boys in surplices, to sing a few hymns; and since their ministers seldom appear, even in "*photograph,*" except in "full costume!"

During Elizabeth's reign, many Puritans were imprisoned, and some few were cruelly and unjustly put to death. I am sorry for it, and regard the act as deplorable, but so it was. At the same time let it be remembered, they were punished for offences which were regarded as against the State, rather than for any wrong done to the Church. Indeed, Grindal, Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, did all in his power to persuade the Queen to tolerate them, and was even suspended by her for his leniency, and up to 1572, not one of them (with all their extravagancies) had taken the important step of leaving the Church.

<sup>1</sup> Marsden's "History of the Puritans," p. 2.

After Grindal's death, Whitgift became archbishop, and he unhappily, acquiesced too readily in the queen's desire to crush Puritanism by persecution. In 1602, when James I., of England (and VI. of Scotland) began his reign, great hopes were entertained by either party. James, taught in Presbyterian Scotland, however, disappointed all; and, undoubtedly, treated the Puritans with contempt. In a few years many of them emigrated to the Continent, having a learned and pious man, John Robinson, for their minister.

It now becomes us to watch the proceedings of these persecuted men when they had left the shores of England. *They had complained of the want of toleration; did they show true toleration themselves?* If they did, they deserve all the celebration they meet with from Dissenters; if otherwise, why are they so often forced before our notice? Settling at Amsterdam they found some followers of one Robert Brown (the first of the Independents, but who afterwards "conformed," himself) already there; and a *quarrel speedily ensuing*,<sup>1</sup> Robinson and a portion of the Puritans retired to Leyden. Not liking their circumstances, they resolved, like some Huguenots before them, to emigrate to America. Robinson's parting address was very beautiful and touching. A number of them embarked in the *Mayflower*, and *Speedwell*, but soon put into Plymouth for repairs, when the *Speedwell* was dismissed, and above one hundred persons crowding into the *Mayflower*, crossed the ocean, and landed at "Plymouth" in North America. Their sufferings were great for some months; but as success began to promise itself, so too as fierce a spirit of persecution arose as ever marked the doings of any men. The native Indians opposed them. Some of them were beguiled into an apartment, and speedily murdered by the Pilgrim Fathers, and the head of one of them placed on a pike outside their enclosure. With great joy they celebrated the achievement, and sent word to pious John Robinson at Leyden! He, hearing of the atrocity, mournfully remarked, "How happy a thing had been if you had *converted some*, before you had *killed any*."

But such murderous work did not end here. The Pilgrim Fathers also determined on the massacre of the whole tribe. The thing itself is horrible; how much more dreadful when we know they did this as *a religious people!* Religion was mingled in all their actions. Prayer and fasting preceded this shameful proceeding, and thanksgiving followed its consummation. The scheme was arranged—the attack was made. The poor Indians were shot down, and the whole neighbourhood suddenly set on fire. Men, women,



and children perished by the sword and in the flames, and the whole Pequod Race, six hundred in number, were destroyed by men who believed themselves to be establishing the kingdom of Christ on earth.

After this, John and Samuel Brown were banished for *using the Book of Common Prayer!* And yet at that very period did one of these Pilgrim Fathers (Cotton) write home that their state was such that it brought to mind the "new heavens and new earth in which righteousness dwelleth." Intolerance never was more severe in any Protestant land (except in England during the rule of Cromwell and Independency). All were thrust out who did not conform to the religious views of the Pilgrim Fathers; and amongst others one Roger Williams was driven out (he settled at Rhode Island), for maintaining that "the doctrine of persecution for causes of conscience, is contrary to the doctrine of Christ." Such was the toleration of the Pilgrim Fathers, whose doings and whose names are so often held up to admiration!!!

But Quakerism had reached America, and we must see how these Independents, or Congregationalist Dissenters, treated Quakers. Fines and banishment were the first and second remedies; and the final measure, if any banished Quaker returned to the State, and continued a Quaker, was DEATH!

Mary Dyer, an interesting young married woman, mother of two children, was banished to Rhode Island. Persuaded, however, that she had a "call" from God to return and preach "*the truth*," she returned to the land where professing Christians, who had left England because they could not find toleration, were now in a position to show the true specimen of it themselves! But how did they proceed? Mary Dyer, and two companion Quaker teachers, were condemned to death. The scaffold was prepared. They ascended with a firm step, and calmly awaited their fate. *The two men (Robinson and Sterenson) were executed!!!* Mary Dyer was again banished to Rhode Island; again the "*spirit called her*" (as she believed, and no doubt *sincerely* believed) to return, and at all risks to preach the truth, even upon forbidden land. Again she returned, and again placidly heard the sentence of death. Vainly did her husband plead for her life. She was strangled on the gallows, the minister, Wilson, again preaching at her on the scaffold, after the manner of the Romish preachers when they burnt *heretics* at the stake!!!!

It is most painful to write these things. It is sad to be obliged to show that good men are "compassed with infirmities."

But since Dissenters try to "*make stock*" out of the sufferings of certain persons two centuries ago, it becomes absolutely necessary

to show the world that they have no right in so doing. I repeat it again, we do not deny that Churchmen of that age were too often possessed with a spirit of persecution, and we lament it deeply: but it is not fair, and scarcely honest in Dissenters, to allude to a *portion* of a subject, which, when the other half is added, proves that the faults on each side were great, and such as Christian charity ought to have committed to a common grave of forgetfulness. Nothing, in all the history of the Church of England exceeds the atrocious cruelties of these exhibitors of Christian toleration in America. I do not think anything can be found to equal it, and for this reason: that whereas many of the persecuting acts committed in England by Churchmen, were for crimes regarded rather by the *civil* power than the *ecclesiastical*, whatever was done in America, was done *as a religious deed*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "We shall seek in vain for a parallel to the massacre of the Pequod Indians. It brought out the worst point in the Puritan character. When their passions were once inflamed, their religion itself was cruelty. It is horrible to read, when cities are stormed, of children thrown into the flames, etc. But this was worse. Here all was deliberately calm; all was sanctioned by religion. . . . The intolerance with which the Puritans had been treated at home might at least have taught them a lesson of forbearance to each other. But it had no such effect."—Marsden's "*History of the Puritans*," pp. 304, 305. A work leaning rather to the Puritan side than otherwise, but which, for purity of diction, and for impartiality, appears to me without an equal in the English language.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 564 011 5



1840