
A table of contents for the *Transactions of Congregational Historical Society* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_congregational-historical-society-1.php

EDITORIAL.

THE Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the Memorial Hall on Wednesday, May 9th. The officers were duly re-elected for another year. Mr. R. H. Muddiman, the Treasurer, presented the Statement which is printed within. He reported that the total membership to date was 168, 8 new members having been added during 1933, and 14 through an appeal he had recently sent out. Hearty congratulations were given to the Rev. A. G. Matthews on the publication of his *Calamy Revised*. Dr. Peel read a paper on "Co-operation of Presbyterians and Congregationalists: Some Previous Attempts."

* * * *

As we go to press news comes that Dr. S. W. Carruthers, who was to have spoken at our autumnal meeting, is unable to keep the engagement through illness. At short notice, the Rev. A. G. Matthews, M.A., has stepped into the breach, and will speak on "Puritan Worship." The meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 25th, at 4 p.m., at George Street Church, Croydon.

* * * *

Congregationalism treats its history in a very careless fashion, and its records are often dealt with in the same way. In recent years we have had occasion to examine with some care the Congregational Library at the Memorial Hall, and the Libraries of Hackney and New Colleges, London, and in each instance we have been struck by the lack of attention of the authorities concerned to the precious and rare books and MSS. in their charge. Occasionally in the history of the denomination a scholar like Dr. Newth has emerged, prepared to give his time and energy and substance to the strenuous, often dirty, and always unrewarded, task of caring for a library. Both at the Memorial Hall and at New College, Dr. Newth did splendid work a couple of generations ago. In both places, however, there were rooms full of books which had not been examined for decades; in both treasures of which the trustees concerned were unaware. How many Congregationalists know that the Memorial Hall Library has a first edition

(third title-page) of *Paradise Lost*? Probably no Congregationalist knew that at New College was the inscribed copy of Isaac Watts's *Psalms and Hymns*, which he presented to Lady Abney, for it was recently discovered in a drawer of miscellaneous books and papers.

In the near future we hope to write descriptive accounts of these libraries, and of steps that should be taken to make their contents known and available for students. It is encouraging to know that a new spirit is evident among those responsible, and it may be possible to make the library at the Memorial Hall and the combined Hackney and New Libraries together a collection comparable to that of the Congregational Library at 14 Beacon Street, Boston.

Our experience in these libraries makes us wonder, however, what is the treatment meted out to books and documents in our colleges and churches generally. Are the church books always carefully cherished? Are documents handed down from the 17th century in good hands and safe keeping? Members of the Society could do good work in giving an eye to these things.

CONGREGATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS, 1933.

Receipts.	£	s.	d.	*Expenditure.*	£	s.	d.
To Balance brought forward, 1932 ..	18	7	7	By Printing *Transactions*	38	4	6
,, Subscriptions, 1933	31	7	10	,, Postage & Receipts	1	16	9
,, Subscriptions Arrears	2	0	0	,, Hire Hall, Annual Meeting	1	1	0
,, Subscriptions Advance		10	0	,, Expenses, Annual Meeting		10	0
				,, Cash Book ..		3	0
				,, Cheque Book ..		5	0
				,, Bank charge stamp on cheque ..			2
				,, Balance in hand 31/12/33.. ..	10	5	0
	£52	5	5		£52	5	5

Audited and found correct,

C. LEE DAVIS,

Hon. Auditor.

26/2/34.

Co-operation of Presbyterians and Congregationalists: Some Previous Attempts.

IN a few weeks a group of representative Presbyterians and Congregationalists will meet in the College presided over by our Chairman to discuss possibilities of union or co-operation between the two denominations. This will be far from the first attempt of the kind that has been made, and it might be timely and advisable to look at what has happened on some previous occasions. I will endeavour to be as impartial as possible, though you will allow me to confess that it was with unalloyed delight that the other day I read the words of the translator of Erastus's *Theses* (1659), which is full of mistakes :

> Pardon the errors of the press in this edition, for my amanuensis and corrector are Presbyterians.

The story is a long one, and I can only take from it for detailed narration two episodes, one in our own country and the other in the United States.

Even before the Elizabethan Settlement there had been indications among the exiles at Frankfort that there were very divergent views among Protestants about the organization of the Church, and in England soon after the nature of the Settlement dawned on those who were largely influenced by Geneva, differences were plainly manifest. Some of the Protestants were merely Puritan, whose desire it was, while remaining in the Church, to purify it from all the " dregges of Papistie " ; others, also remaining in the Church and desiring reform of worship, wanted to remould the Church on Presbyterian lines, with ecclesiastical discipline administered by appropriate Courts ; others separated from the Church and formed their own fellowships, binding themselves together by a Covenant, and electing their own officers. After some years the principles guiding such Separatist groups found expression in the writings of that strange and eccentric genius, Robert Browne. I do not propose to-day to dwell on the relationships between Presbyterians and Congregationalists at this period save to point out that Browne and Harrison, Barrow and Greenwood, were soon engaged in controversy with the Presbyterian

leaders. The title of Browne's *A Treatise of Reformation without tarying for anie* was in itself a criticism of the attitude of Cartwright and other Presbyterians. Returning from Scotland Browne said that if England became Presbyterian

> then instead of one Pope we should have a thousand and [instead] of some lord bishops in name a thousand lordly tyrants in deed, which now do disdain the names.

In the same connexion he gives an interesting piece of autobiography when he declares :

> In England also I have found much more wrong done me by the preachers of discipline than by any of the bishops, and more lordly usurping by them than by the other, so that as in Scotland, the preachers having no names of bishops, did imprison me more wrongfully than any bishop would have done, so these having neither the name nor the power have yet usurped more than the bishops which have power. For before my first voyage beyond sea and since my last return I have been in more than twenty prisons. And for once imprisonment by the bishops I have been more than thrice imprisoned by the preachers of their procuring.

The Presbyterians then, as always, were extremely respectable, and were very anxious to disabuse those who thought they had anything in common with Brownism, which was "suspected of popularity," and maybe even of being tainted with sedition. Alike in England, Scotland, and the Low Countries the two did not mix.

In the next century Charles I and Laud succeeded in driving Presbyterians and Independents together where all other means had failed. Even then, however, the two proved restless and uncongenial bedfellows. While the Westminster Assembly unanimously accepted three proposals it split when it proceeded to define them.

They were :

1. Christ hath instituted a Government, and Governors Ecclesiastical in the Church.
2. Christ hath furnished some in His Church with gifts for government and with commission to exercise the same when called thereto.
3. It is agreeable to and warranted by the Word of God, that some others beside ministers of the Word should join with them in the Government of the Church.

Furious controversy ensued, and the situation is perhaps adequately represented by Milton's dictum that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large," and by the attitude of Baxter to Cromwell, the evidence for which was collected by Dr. Powicke in the *Transactions* some time ago.[1] Baxter, though of no party, accurately reflects the general Presbyterian attitude to Cromwell and Independency.

Presbyterians and Congregationalists found themselves in the same boat after the Act of Uniformity; as Prof. Sanders well said in his paper read to the Society at its last meeting, Presbyterians equally with Congregationalists made their witness for freedom and paid the price of ejectment. Indeed so much was this the case that it is not always easy during Charles II's reign to discover whether particular ministers were Presbyterians or Congregationalists.

With the accession of William III and the Toleration Act comes the attempt at co-operation which I propose to describe in more detail—the "Happy Union."

One thing that must always be borne in mind is that, largely by necessity, the Presbyterian churches in England were in great measure Independent. Indeed, apart from the attempt during the Civil War to impose the Scottish type of Presbyterianism on England, there never was a time when Presbyteries and a General Assembly functioned, and in Charles II's reign the individual Presbyterian congregation was independent in the sense of being autonomous. Alexander Gordon has well said, and it needs to be remembered in the present as in considering the past[2]:

> In a tractate of 21st May 1645, *Independency Not Gods Ordinance*, the author, John Bastwick, M.D., discriminates between "the Presbyterian Government Dependent" and "the Presbyterian Government Independent." The former, or Dependent, type may be illustrated by the Presbyterianism of Scotland, and by the kindred and derivative (though not identical) Presbyterianism of Ireland. The latter, or Independent, type belongs to England. A strict autonomy of "particular churches" associated only for mutual counsel and advice, was the basis of the Presbyterianism of Thomas Cartwright and William Bradshaw. Cartwright might have liked to invest the associations with juris-

[1] Vol. X. 122, 167, 212, 250.

[2] *Freedom After Ejection*, 151. This volume is the authority for all matters relating to the Common Fund established by Congregationalists and Presbyterians in 1690.

diction, if authorised to do so by law; in fact they never were so invested. Bradshaw maintained, in theory as well as practice, the independence of congregations, while organising them internally on the Presbyterian plan, the worshippers delegating their spiritual government to an oligarchy of pastor and elders. This independence, indeed, has constantly been the characteristic of English Presbyterianism, save during the short-lived and imperfectly achieved Parliamentary experiment, 1646–1660; an experiment which has no exact reproduction in any modern organism. The modern and admirable organisation (primarily of the Scottish element) under the name of the Presbyterian Church of England bears little resemblance to it.

Dale[1] thus describes the situation.

> In practice they became Independents. Each minister, with his congregation, stood apart; there were relations of friendly sympathy between ministers and congregations in the same town and in the same country; but the Presbyterian minister and his people were just as free as the Congregational minister and his people from the control of any external authority. They were Independents—but not Congregationalists.
>
> 1. It is of the essence of Congregationalism that the Church—an organized Society of persons professing personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ—should receive members into its fellowship, should exercise discipline, should elect and depose its ministers and other church officers. But among the Presbyterians such a Society was very rarely organized; and when it was organized, its powers were extremely restricted.

The Presbyterian Classes, then, had disappeared by the Restoration, and they were never revived. To quote Gordon again[2]:

> Hence, after Ejection (1662) there was Presbyterian organisation only in particular congregations; never anything in the nature of Classical or Synodical courts. All congregations were now autonomous, all were non-parochial. Presbyterians could no longer object to the Congregational polity of "gathered churches," being themselves reduced to this expedient. Some specialities of internal organisation remained. Having, in their

[1] *History of English Congregationalism*, 482.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 153. Gordon goes on to show that the term Presbyterian was preferred by those who had no Synodical organization because of the political connotation of the word Independency. Calamy admitted that his own ecclesiastical ideal could be deemed "a meer Independent scheme," but he never uses the term, not even for Congregationalists.

congregations, " presbyteries " (*i.e.*, elderships, according to the English, which is also, as a rule, the Continental, acceptation of the term) they were entitled to describe themselves as Presbyterians, if they chose to do so. The points of difference were not enough to preclude plans of co-operation between Presbyterians and Congregationals, in view of their common distress, and in pursuit of the evangelical aims which all alike held supreme.

Co-operation began before the formation of the " Happy Union." The Episcopal returns of 1669 report a Lecture at Hackney, the lecturers being three Presbyterians (Peter Sterry, Thomas Watson, and William Bates) and four Congregationalists (Philip Nye, George Griffith, Thomas Brookes, and John Owen). On the Indulgence of 1672 London merchants established a Lecture at Pinners' Hall, the meeting-place of a Congregational church. Three Presbyterians (Thomas Manton, William Bates, and William Jenkyn), two Congregationalists (John Collins and John Owen), and Richard Baxter were to lecture in turn. This Lecture represented co-operation between the two denominations until the breakdown of the " Happy Union," when it became Congregational.

In other ways London ministers of the two denominations began to act together, while in many parts of the country co-operation was also taking place. Indeed, the manuscript which is our chief authority in regard to the " Happy Union " has this entry in 1690 :

> The ministers of Somersetshire, Wiltshire and Glocestershire haue of late Sett up an association, and if it be desired the minutes of what hath beene and what shall be from time to time transacted among them will be Sent[.] they haue already agreed upon an accommodation betweene Presb: and Congr: Ministers and there haue beene talks of raising a fund among them. but trading Soe dead, taxes so high, and ye poverty of professors soe great that it greatly discourages.

Possibly the memory of the association of ministers of varying views gathered by Baxter in Worcestershire during the Commonwealth played its part. Be that as it may, in 1690 a definite attempt was made at the formation of a union of ministers of the two denominations ; it is worthy of note that the ministers themselves took action ; their churches do not seem to have entered into the Agreement. This " Happy Union " was defined by the *Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers in and about London, formerly called*

Presbyterian and Congregational, drawn up apparently by John Howe, and accepted by about 80 ministers. Apparently all the ministers in and near London entered, except three Congregationalists, who objected to union with any Nonconformists who were "for Sacramental Communion with the Church of England." On 6th April, 1691, at Stepney Meeting, the Union was inaugurated, Matthew Mead, its minister, preaching on "Two Sticks made One" (*Ezek.* 37^{19}). The Preamble of the Agreement declares:

> It's incumbent on us, to forbear condemning, and disputing those different sentiments and practices we have expressly allowed for: to reduce all distinguishing Names to that of UNITED BRETHREN; to admit no uncharitable jealousies, or censorious speeches; much less any debates whether Party seems most favoured by this Agreement.

Dale[1] gives an admirable summary of the Agreement, showing where and how it favours the one denomination or the other. To this we refer readers, and merely indicate one or two points. The idea of the "gathered Church" is accepted:

> None shall be admitted as Members . . . but such persons as are knowing and sound in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, without Scandal in their lives . . . Particular Societies of Visible Saints, who under Christ their Head, are statedly joined together for ordinary Communion with one another, in the ordinances of Christ, are particular Churches, and are to be owned by each other, as Instituted Churches of Christ, though differing in apprehensions and practice in some lesser things.

The individual Church has the right to choose its officers, though

> In the administration of Church power, it belongs to the Pastors and other Elders of every particular Church (if such there be) to rule and govern; and to the Brotherhood to Consent, according to the Rule of the Gospel.

Not only so, but

> In so great and weighty a matter, as the calling and choosing a Pastor, we judge it ordinarily requisite that every such Church consult and advise with the Pastors of neighbouring congregations,

and it is also "ordinarily requisite" that such pastors should

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 475 ff.

not only concur in the ordination of the minister called, but should be first satisfied that he has the necessary qualifications.

The question of "Ruling Elders" in a congregation was left open, while no church was to be subordinate to another, "each being endued with equality of power from Jesus Christ." There should, however, be occasional synods, of ministers only,

> in order to concord, and in any other weighty and difficult cases, it is needful, and according to the mind of Christ, that the Ministers of several Churches be consulted and advised with . . . particular Churches, their respective Elders, and Members, ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment so given, and not dissent therefrom, without apparent grounds from the Word of God.

The doctrinal basis made it sufficient for a Church to

> acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only Rule of Faith and Practice ; and own either the Doctrinal part of these commonly called the Articles of the Church of England, or the Confession, or Catechisms, Shorter or Longer, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or the Confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said Rule.

Dale's summary reads :

> On the whole, the *Heads of Agreement* are strongly in favour of the Congregational Polity ; but the Congregationalists who accepted them could hardly have had the glowing vision of a society of saints, one with Christ, filled with His Spirit, the organ of His will, which had kindled the imagination of their ecclesiastical ancestors. It is still more certain that the Presbyterians who accepted it must long have surrendered, if any of them had ever held, the theory of the divine right of Presbytery.

Many on both sides did accept the Agreement with great thankfulness and rejoicing, not only in London, but in many parts of the country, where regular meetings of ministers were established. In Devon and Cornwall, Hants, Norfolk, Nottinghamshire, Manchester, and the West Riding there is evidence of co-operation. Before this short-lived union was broken, however, the two parties to it had combined in a most effective piece of work. Prior to its formal inauguration they they had determined to establish a Common Fund, which would make more thorough and systematic the support of the Dissenting interest. Here is the document :

The occasion and beginning of this vndertaking.

When it pleased God to encline the hearts of our Rulers to permit ye religious Liberty of Dissenters by a Law, some persons (concern'd in this present worke) laid to heart ye great disadvantages which the Ministry of the Gospell was attended with in England and Wales, both by ye Poverty of Dissenting Ministers and the inability and backwardness of many places to afford them a meere Subsistance.

They considered alsoe that many of the present Ministers (wonderfully preserved to this time) are aged, and therefore it was necessary to provide for a succession of fitt persons to propogate the Gospell when others were removed.

By the importance of these considerations they were lead, to invite a considerable number of Ministers in and about the City of London to advise of some methods to obviate these difficulties, and as farr as the Law allowed to improve this Liberty to the best purposes.

These Ministers judging a select number of Ministers might best contribute to these designs, did choose seven Ministers of the Presbiterian perswasion and ye Ministers commonly called Congregationall fixed on an equall number to assist in an affaire thus common to all, who desire the advancement of the Interest of our Blessed Lord.

The Ministers thus appointed mett together and after seeking Councell of God, and many serious thoughts and Debates among themselves att last concluded.

1—That some due course should be taken by way of Benevolence to relieve and assist such Ministers in more settled worke, as could not subsist without some addition to what their hearers contributed.

2 ly—That Provision might be made for the preaching of the Gospell in some most convenient places where there are not as yett any fixed Ministers.

3 ly—That what is thus contributed should be impartially applyed according to the Indigent circumstances and work of every such Minister.

4 ly—That none might be admitted to a share in this supply as Ministers but such as are devoted to and exercised in the Ministry as their fixed and only Imployment with the approbation of other Ministers.

5 ly—That some hopefull young men might be incouraged for ye Ministry, and ye sons of poor Dissenting Ministers (if equally capeable) might be preferred to all others.

6 ly—That a number of private Gentlemen should be desired to concurr with the foreappointed Ministers in the procuring and disposall of the said Supply to the above described uses ; wch Gentlemen were fixed on.

By these steps this happy work was begunn, wch 'tis hoped God will soe inlarge ye hearts of the well-disposed to contribute to and attend with such a blessing, as may greatly advance the Kingdom of Christ, and give Posterity occasion to adore the goodness of God in thus directing the minds of such as are ingaged therein.

The management was to be in the hands of " 14 ministers and 30 gentlemen," who were to meet monthly. The laymen seem to have played a very minor part, both in the management and by their contributions. The first fourteen ministers were :

Presbyterian	*Congregational*
Vincent Alsop	Matthew Barker
Samuel Annesley	Isaac Chauncy
William Bates	George Cokayne
John Howe	John Faldo
Richard Mayo	George Griffith
Richard Stretton	Nathanael Mather
Daniel Williams	Matthew Mead

All these had been ejected in 1662, except Faldo, who was then unbeneficed, and Williams, who was then a minor. Most of these men contributed very liberally to the Fund : in the first month we have Mead, £100 ; Alsop, £100 ; Howe, £160 ; Annesley, £100 ; Mayo, £100 ; Williams, £50 ; Bates, £50.

It is impossible here to relate the important and interesting results of the survey made by the Fund of :

1. Names of survivors of the Ejected divines remaining Nonconformist ; and of all others " under ye like Circumstances," whether Ministers or " disposed for ye Ministry."

2. List of settled Congregations ; by what Ministers supplied ; how maintained.

3. List of Religious assemblies discontinued ; also of places where there might be opportunities of public service.

Readers will find for themselves in the manuscript printed by Gordon much information about the poverty of the ejected ministers and the extent of their activity, about the size of

congregations and places of meeting, about the Academies and the way men were trained with Mr. Frankland, Mr. Jollie, and other ministers, about grants to ministers, congregations, and students. There are glorious entries like that for Wivenhoe :

> Kept up their meeting almost constantly in ye worst of times, a small but zealous people, their allowance is but 6 or 7^{s} pr day.

The whole of the entries on that page 42 of Gordon may be quoted as typical :

Tiptry, or Messing	Where is one Crab a baptist an Ignorant fellow does much hurt if any maintenance could be had a minister might doe much good is likely to be a very large meeting and a very dark corner
Bures Stebbing and Hedingham	A large Village noe meeting neere
Att Withamstow	Is a meeting kept up by combination by some from Lond
Witham	Where m^{r} ffoxton is about to Settle, auditors about 4 or 500 of the poorer sort, are not able to raise much if anything aboue 20£ pr anū
Onger	A dark corner. m^{r} Paget through m^{r} Rowes meanes was prevailed wth to come among them, whose labours are well approved, they promised him 30£ per annum, but ye performance less than 20£
Ministers qualifyed for ye Min^{r}y and not fixed	Sibbe Hedinghame. Much pestered wth Quakers and Arminian Anabaptists, desire a minister, and some present maintenance
M^{r} ffelsted M^{r} Porter of ffelstead	In this County a very worthy young man is willing to go to Reyleigh if any thing considerable will be allowed for his maintenance. The people have giuen him a call to Settle among them, hee is willing to comply if hee may be incouraged

Why did the Union, started so happily, break down so soon ? It was on account of doctrinal disputes. Richard Davis, of Rothwell, in Northamptonshire, drew upon himself the censure of ministers in his own neighbourhood and in London[1], not

[1] *The Sense of the United Nonconforming Ministers, In and about London, Concerning some of the Erroneous Doctrines, and Irregular Practises of Mr. Richard Davis, of Rothwell, in Northamptonshire.*

merely for "Irregular Practices," "abominable Assertions," and "Arrogancy and Insolence," but for "Erroneous Doctrines," and the "United Brethren" disowned him. Immediately, of course, some Independents began to ask "Who *are* these United Brethren?" and championed Davis, irrespective of the merits of the case. On them Davis worked, saying:

> We evidently perceived their design was to hook away Judgment from a particular Church of Christ, and fix it in a Presbyterian Classis.

Davis was a Welshman and an Independent, so Independent that when he was "installed in the office of pastor or bishop," he was installed by the church itself, and neighbouring pastors who had come to assist withdrew, finding nothing to do. He preached throughout Northamptonshire, using lay helpers, and winning converts who would walk 20 miles on dark Sunday mornings to hear him preach. It may be that jealousy at his success played its part in the complaints made against him. When the excitement about him was at its height, and his doctrinal views were under discussion, fuel was added to the flame by the republication of the sermons of Dr. Tobias Crisp, with a preface by John Howe and others merely stating that the sermons were genuine, but suggesting, people thought, approval of their high Calvinism, especially in regard to Predestination, Election, and the Atonement. Daniel Williams took the lead in attacking Crisp's position, his own Calvinism being much more moderate. The controversy was a bitter one, the Presbyterians generally ranging themselves on the side of Williams, the Independents against him, with the result that Williams was driven from his Pinners' Hall Lectureship, and a new Presbyterian Lectureship was set up at Salters' Hall. Another result was the break-up of the "Happy Union," which left one important result, however, in the Congregational Fund Board,[1] founded in 1695 by 19 churches in and about London to carry on in Congregational Churches the work done by the Common Fund.

We now turn to the second episode, and travel across the Atlantic—this example of contact between Presbyterians and

[1] The proceedings of the Board during the first year of its existence were transcribed by Mr. Crippen, and printed in the *Transactions*, *V.* 134–148. See also *Transactions*, *VI.* 209–213.

Congregationalists being deliberately chosen because of its relationship to the previous one. I choose it, too, not only to remind you how large a place controversy in regard to Presbyterianism played in the story of our churches across the seas —a mere glance at Dexter[1] will remind you if you have forgotten—but in order to bring to your notice a very important book which is in danger of being overlooked on this side of the water, if not in the United States itself. I refer to the massive life[2] of Leonard Bacon, the outstanding leader of Congregationalism in America in the 19th century, the Dale of United States Congregationalism. Leonard Bacon died in 1881; his son and daughter began work on a biography; his grandson, Theodore Davenport Bacon, did most of the work, but died before its completion, leaving it to be seen through the Press by his brother, the B. W. Bacon whose work on the New Testament we all know.

In 1705 an Association of Ministers in Massachusetts, and in 1708 a Synod in Connecticut, took steps which showed willingness to develop Congregationalism on Presbyterian lines. I will concentrate on the Connecticut experiment because of its connexion with the "Happy Union." The Synod met at Saybrook. It re-adopted the Savoy Conference as a statement of the beliefs generally held; it agreed that the *Heads of Agreement* drawn up when the "Happy Union" was formed "be observed by the churches throughout this colony," and then it added 15 propositions, of which the chief enacted that

> the churches which are neighbouring to each other shall *consociate*, for mutual affording to each other such assistance as may be requisite, upon all occasions ecclesiastical.

Other articles showed how these "Consociations" would function, and, as Dexter said, while in themselves they would satisfy the most thoroughgoing Congregationalist, read in the light of the *Heads of Agreement*, they could easily be patient of a Presbyterian interpretation. So it happened: New Haven County made "the Platform a purely and thoroughly Congregational confederation of Congregational churches,"

---

[1] *The Congregationalism of the last three hundred years, as seen in its Literature, passim.*

[2] *Leonard Bacon: A Statesman in the Church.* Yale and Oxford University Presses, 30s. I am indebted to the Yale University Press, and to the Oxford University Press, their publishers in England, for permission to quote from this volume.

Fairfield County placed "an extended ultra Presbyterian interpretation and construction on the Articles."

Round the nature and value of these Consociations controversy ranged for many decades. Some held with Dr. Benjamin Colman, who said, in 1735:

> The *Consociation of Churches* is the very Soul and Life of the Congregational Scheme, necessary to the very *Esse* as well as *Bene* of it; without which we must be Independent and with which all the Good of *Presbyterianism* is attainable.

Others were represented by Dr. Emmons, who 80 years later could say:

> All the present disputes about councils mutual, and *ex-parte* councils, in respect to their authority, are vain and useless; because *they have no divine authority at all.* And all the present disputes about the power of ordination, and the power of ordained ministers, are equally vain and absurd. For there is no power of ordination but what is lodged in every church of Christ; and no church of Christ can give any power to their officers but what Christ has given to every one of his ministers. The disputes about ecclesiastical power never will be, nor can be settled, until the churches will return to the platform of ecclesiastical power contained in our text (*Matt.* xviii: 15–17), from which not only Papists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, but even Congregationalists, have too far departed.

When Congregationalism was, shall we say, flirting with some parts of the Presbyterian polity, it was not difficult for co-operation between the denominations to be established. In 1801 a "Plan of Union" was drawn up between the Presbyterian General Assembly and the General Association of Connecticut to facilitate Home Missionary work. Churches of one denomination were to be free to employ ministers of the other, and in mixed congregations what seemed a fair arrangement was made. With what result? Here is how Dr. Bacon's biography sums up the situation:

> Yet the arrangement worked overwhelmingly in favor of the Presbyterians. In the half-century of its duration something like two thousand churches, Congregational in origin and usage, became Presbyterian, principally in Western New York, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois, and this notwithstanding the fact that the Plan was repudiated by the Old School section of the Presbyterians, at the time of their disruption. It was said at the time that Congregationalism was a stream which rose in New England, flowed West, and emptied into Presbyterianism.

To Dr. Bacon this was deplorable. The effort of the Congregationalists to be unsectarian was causing them to be absorbed by a denomination ready to exclude Christians not of its own type. The nonsectarian spirit was defeating its own purpose in following such a course, and the democratic principle in religious affairs was suffering a severe setback. Protestants, instead of drawing nearer to union by this policy, were getting farther away from it. As Bacon wrote a few years later, in 1859, "The only visible union attainable, or really desirable, is to be found, not in the Presbyterian idea of government over churches, but in the Congregational idea of the communion of churches."

In reality the influx of Congregationalists into Presbyterianism had not resulted in greater unity, but the contrary. It had been the chief cause for the break between the Old School and the New, which had split the Presbyterian body into two nearly equal parts. . .

Then came the disruption and the repudiation, on the part of the Old School, of the Plan of Union. This was a definite rebuff to all Congregationalists. It was also a clear indication that any hope of uniting evangelical Protestants under the banner of Presbyterianism was futile. Not even the Presbyterians themselves had this aim ; for, in the agreement entered into to form the Synod of New York and Philadelphia it had been declared that when any matter which the body should judge to be indispensable in doctrine and Presbyterian government should be determined by major vote, those conscientiously unable to submit should peaceably withdraw, without attempting to make any schism. The spirit of the provision is kindly, but it implies that there might be good Christians whom the Presbyterian church would prefer not to have in its ranks. This was not the catholic purpose to include all Christians which was fundamental to the Congregational conception. It was distinctively sectarian, and militated against a general union among Protestants, however vigorous the growth of Presbyterianism might be.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that Congregationalists began to be more doubtful of the wisdom of the Plan of Union, and to ask themselves whether their democratic system was not, after all, to be preferred to the seemingly more efficient Presbyterian polity. The embodiment of the Westminster Confession in the fundamental articles of the Presbyterian church was seen to have disadvantages great enough to offset any good which it might seem to have possessed. The old principle of the right of the individual church to administer its own affairs, including standards of orthodoxy, with the advice, but not the dictation, of neighboring churches was visibly endangered. . . .

The Westminster Confession was held in high respect by most Congregationalists, but they were not disposed to regard it as the final word in religious thought. They felt that the contributions of their own religious thinkers were improvements on the older Calvinism, of vital importance in enabling it to bring men to repentance, and in preventing religion from becoming a dead formalism. And they were not disposed to bind themselves to adherence, even in a somewhat general sense, to this formula, already in some measure outgrown. In a word, they stood for progressive orthodoxy, though that expression was not yet coined.

How the Union worked out may be seen by an example early in Bacon's life. We quote the biography again:

Strangely enough it was primarily a contest within the Presbyterian church, his connection with it arising from the fact that the Congregational churches, especially of Connecticut, were then ecclesiastically affiliated with the Presbyterians. The Connecticut "consociations" were recognized by the Presbyterians as equivalent to presbyteries, delegates from presbytery to consociation and vice versa were sent and received as "corresponding members," and delegates were also invited and sent from the consociations to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in which they sat as fully accredited. These "consociations" were a product of the Saybrook platform of 1708, which had authorized the Connecticut churches to form such groupings in the interest of greater efficiency, and had conferred upon the bodies thus formed somewhat ambiguous authority. Most of the churches had thus grouped themselves, and several of the consociations had come to act very much like presbyteries, while the churches had come to call themselves indifferently either Presbyterian or Congregational. The principle of democracy, on which the churches of New England had been founded, was being gradually relinquished for the sake of a supposedly greater efficiency. That it meant also a relinquishment of religious liberty had not yet been realized.

Outside of New England Presbyterianism was regarded as the equivalent of Congregationalism. Many of the churches of the Middle Atlantic States had been founded by Scotch or Scotch-Irish immigrants, but they had been largely recruited by New Englanders who had gone West or South. The two denominations were supposedly at one in matters of doctrine, the Westminster Confession being regarded as a standard by both, and the question of church government was not regarded as a bar. Congregationalism was in a fair way to disappear.

> But this tendency was checked in an unexpected way. The supposition of identity of religious belief proved to be not altogether justified. The Presbyterians in the West, especially those of Scotch antecedents, grew alarmed at the type of religious teaching that was set forth by many of the ministers who came to them from New England.

The Associate Reformed Presbytery, Philadelphia, gave to John Chambers a licence to preach as candidate for the ministry. He preached with acceptance to a church in Philadelphia, but when he applied for ordination he was rejected because he held the New England theology. This strained the relationship between the New England Churches and the Presbyterians. Mr. Chambers, eager to preach, came to New Haven with high credentials as to his preaching, and asked for ordination from the New Haven West Consociation. The Consociation agreed to act as a council for the purpose, and, after examination, ordained him, Leonard Bacon taking part in the Ordination Service. Mr. Chambers was then received with open arms by the Church in Philadelphia, which withdrew from the Presbytery, constituted itself an Independent Church, and prospered greatly under the young minister. The Presbytery of Philadelphia was greatly concerned and protested to the Consociation, which defended its action. From the Congregational point of view, says Bacon's biography, the action was indefensible :

> A council can act in such matters only on behalf of a church of its own order, within its vicinage, to which it gives advice and assistance. There was nothing of the kind in this case. But the Consociation, as a quasi-presbytery, affiliated with, but not subject to the General Assembly, might be considered free to ordain whom it pleased.

Ultimately the Assembly appointed a Committee to confer with a Committee of the Consociation. The Committees met, but nothing could be done. This conflict was preliminary to the breaking up of the Presbyterian Church, ten years later, into Old and New Schools, and to the return of the Connecticut Churches to the more democratic principles on which they had been founded, thus breaking off their anomalous relation with Presbyterianism.

So ended this American experiment, and the churches of our faith and order turned their attention to develop fellowship between themselves. In 1853 the American Congregational

Union came into being; in 1865 the delegates from the churches of 25 States

> Resolved, that this Council recognizes as distinctive of the Congregational polity;
>
> *First*, The principle that the local or Congregational church derives its power and authority directly from Christ, and is not subjected to any ecclesiastical government exterior, or superior, to itself.
>
> *Second*, That every local or Congregational church is bound to observe the duties of mutual respect and charity which are included in the communion of churches one with another; and that every church which refuses to give an account of its proceedings, when kindly and orderly desired to do so by neighbouring churches, violates the law of Christ.
>
> *Third*, That the ministry of the gospel by members of the churches who have been duly called and set apart to that work, implies in itself no power of government, and that ministers of the gospel not elected to office in any church are not a hierarchy, nor are they invested with any official power in, or over, the churches.

In 1871 the National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States was formed, incorporating into its charter this statement concerning church polity, which bears traces of the long experience of the Presbyterian system:

> They (the Congregational churches of the United States, by delegation assembled) agree in belief that the right of government resides in local churches, or congregations of believers, who are responsible directly to the Lord Jesus Christ, the One Head of the Church Universal, and of all particular churches; but that all churches, being in communion one with another as parts of Christ's Catholic Church, have mutual duties subsisting in the obligations of fellowship.
>
> The churches, therefore, while establishing this National Council for the furtherance of the common interests and work of all the churches, do maintain the Scriptural and inalienable right of each church to self-government and administration; and this National Council shall never exercise legislative or judicial authority, nor consent to act as a Council of Reference.

ALBERT PEEL.

The Chronicles of a Book Society.

CONNECTED WITH THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, CLAVERING, 1787–1933.

PICTURE a yellowed tome, once white, now ink-stained and thumbed with the fingers of three centuries. A sturdy volume that has withstood the flight of years, the copyhand of the early entries still decipherable. A worthy monument to the high ideals and aims that started it on its career. Intact, every leaf still secure, I found it amongst the possessions of the last Secretary and Treasurer, the late B. C. Custerson, J.P., C.C., who with the help of his wife carried on the best traditions of the Society from 1914 to 1933.

The Clavering (Essex) Book Society, of which the book is the earliest known record, was rejuvenated in the year 1787. This book is the story of the rejuvenation. It contains a minute made at the house of Mr. Bailey of Clavering, 6th March, 1787, which reads as follows :

> Those which are signed in this book are a revision of the old laws and extracts from former minutes.

A definite lack of reading material in middle-class families in the 18th and the early 19th century led to the formation of these societies for the circulation of books and periodicals. Gradually, as the 19th century advanced, libraries, newspapers and magazines became easy of access and the book societies died out. This one at Clavering must have been one of the last survivals.

The high ideals of these early high-brows who formed the Clavering Book Society were recorded in a preface to the minute book :

> The improvement of the human mind is on all hands allowed to be important and necessary, and happiness, of which every rational creature must desire and which all are seeking after, cannot otherwise be obtained. As the mind can only be improved by the increase of true knowledge or by the obtaining

of just views of these things which nearly concern us, whatever has a tendency to produce this effect has likewise a most friendly influence upon real enjoyments.

We advance in knowledge by duly considering those objects duly presented to us. As those from which improvement is to be desired are innumerable and each person's own particular circle of observation is small, it is the part of wisdom to avail itself of these advantages that may be derived from attending to the ideals which others have acquired or collected. To accomplish this, reading, conversation, and serious thought appear to be necessary, the two first tending to derive improvement from the last. A society of persons formed for the purpose of reading and conversation and serious thought appears evidently calculated to enlighten, enlarge, and improve the mind, consequently to bring about that happiness which is true and lasting. Convinced of this we at Clavering and its neighbourhood do agree to form ourselves into a society for reading, and as order is absolutely necessary for the well being of every society, we unanimously agree to the following rules :

1. That the society do always hold its meetings on the Tuesday upon or next before the full moon in every month at half past five o'clock in the evening. These meetings shall be held in rotation at the houses of those members to whom it may be convenient. That at whose house the society shall meet shall be chairman for the evening and shall regulate the time.

2. That each member shall subscribe 10s. 6d. towards a fund for buying books and after the first subscription 5s. by the year. When any member shall subscribe on admission in future he is to pay 5s. besides the annual subscription.

3. That a treasurer shall be appointed whose office it shall be to produce books voted in by the society, pay for them out of the common stock, at the same time keeping a regular account for the inspection of the society ; he shall also fix the time to be allowed for the reading of each book, order the rotation in which it is to be sent, and collect for the use of the society those forfeitures which may be incurred.

4. That every member shall have a right to propose any book at the monthly meetings of the society. Each book in order to its being admitted, shall when proposed be seconded by another member of the society, then balloted for and if there be a majority, admitted. If it is not seconded it shall immediately be considered as rejected.

5. The review for the preceding month be always produced at meetings of the society for the purpose of more readily determining what books are suitable.

6. That the treasurer shall fix to each paper a slip called the forfeit paper. This shall contain the title and number of the book, the time that it is to be kept by each member and the names of the subscribers in the order of rotation in which it is to be sent.

7. That every member shall enter on the forfeiture paper the day of the month and the hour on which he received every book with the condition it is in at the time, and likewise the day and the hour on which he sends it away. The last person on the rotation shall after keeping the book the appointed time, immediately send it to the treasurer, who shall take charge of the book till the next annual meeting.

8. That on the first Tuesday in the new year upon or next before the full moon all the books belonging to the society which shall be in the treasurer's possession shall be sold by auction and the money thence arising be added to the stock. At that time also the accounts for the preceding year shall be audited and a treasurer appointed.

9. That every member of the society shall at each monthly meeting contribute three pence to be added to the stock.

10. The forfeiture incurred by the breach of the above laws shall be as follows: not being present at the monthly meeting by half past five o'clock three pence, not producing a review for the preceding month three pence. Each book kept beyond the time appointed in the forfeit paper shall cause the person keeping it to pay a half penny each hour up to the price of the book; N.B.—the hours to be reckoned from 8 o'clock in the morning to 8 o'clock at night, the Lord's Day not included. Improper entries in the forfeit paper three pence.

11. That a person who damages any book belonging to the society shall pay such damage as the majority shall determine, And he who loses any book shall produce another and forfeit sixpence; but he who lends to a person not of the society any book shall forfeit the whole price.

12. Whoever shall alter the order of rotation fixed by the treasurer in the forfeit paper or entry which another person has made shall, unless such alterations be agreed upon by the majority of members met together, forfeit 1s.

13. Whoever sends a book forward sooner than the time allowed on the forfeit paper shall enter it as if it were kept

full time, and the member next in rotation is allowed to keep the remainder of the time and also his own, as settled by the treasurer. He who does not enter as above incurs the forfeiture of improper entry.

14. That all questions relative to the Society shall be unalterably determined by the majority of votes; and whosoever does not submit to that determination or refuses to act in an orderly manner according to the designs of these rules shall no longer be regarded as a member.

All forfeitures incurred shall be paid to the treasurer on demand.

16. That these rules be publickly read four times in each year.

Much of the reading was of the magazine type, and the magazines were passed on from week to week with books of more solid character. Many partnerships were thus formed between magazines and the Society that were only broken by the death of one or the other. As the years advanced the matter changed, as did the tastes of the Society. Amongst the early favourites were the *Evangelical* and the *Sunday at Home*. *Great Thoughts*, the *Review of Reviews*, the *Quiver*, the *Windsor*, and *Chambers's* became popular in their turn, but it was not until hectic old age that the *Grand*, *Nash's*, the *Cornhill*, the *London*, and the various women's magazines appeared on the rota. The number of magazines varied, but was sometimes as many as fifteen. They were bound in cartridge paper, and bore the inscription "Clavering Book Society." The back of the covering was used as the "forfeit paper," and in the early days the forfeits were well and truly paid.

Here are some of the items:

1788. By forfeiture 11s. 8½d.
1790. By Forfeits £1 2s. 8½d.
1792. By Forfeits £2 5s. 0½d.

Did the gradual increase in amount mean that the members were getting careless? At any rate, by 1814 forfeits were less again, amounting only to £1 12s. 6d., and by 1844 the tale of the forfeits was told. From now on they are designated as "fines," until in 1864 they disappear altogether. Indeed, latterly the rules relating to fines were more honoured in the breach than the observance.

Amongst the Chronicles are many interesting items about income and expenditure. The accounts were most meticulously

kept. In 1788 the expenditure is recorded as amounting to £6 4s. 2½d., but by 1886 it had amounted to the grand total of £20 8s. 1d.; from that period it slowly declined until in 1929 it had descended to the low level of £13 1s. 1d., leaving a debit balance of 1s. 4d., the first on record.

The Society was generous and some of the records of amounts given away are worthy of note.

1828. The Postman for books to Newport 1s. 3d.
1830. Donation to Clavering School £2 2s.
1834. Benevolent Society £2 3s.; Essex Congregational Union 2s. 6d.
1889. For egg and toast rack presented to Mr. Beard £1 12s.
1906. For Waitresses 2s.

Some of the payments made to the Society make equally interesting reading.

1846. Sale of History of Herts £1.
Mr. Pavill for Queen of England 6s.
A "*Life of Mahammed*" [*sic*] was bought for 6s.

As these were among the heavier works put forward for the perusal of the good people of Essex, it is illuminating to note that at this time the lightest form of literature known to the Society was perhaps the *Evangelical Magazine*. The following is, therefore, a surprise from such a serious-minded and thoughtful people. In 1854 £1 7s. was paid for the use of a room at the sign of "The Fox and Hounds at Clavering." This was the yearly custom, and absent members were requested to pay 2s. 6d. towards the "dinner." Was this of a more substantial character than those monthly suppers that were to be neither "hot" nor of "flesh" meat? The epicures may believe that in 1896 when James Gurson "declined" he did so in despair at the frugality of the suppers.

An important feature of the annual gathering was the sale of the books that had been in circulation during the year.

> Friday, Jan. 4th, 1789. Annual Meeting of the Society at Mr. Cripp's the Fox and Hounds at Clavering. The gentlemen dined together and the books were sold by auction as usual.

The Annual Meeting was a refreshing season; there was dinner, books to be sold and purchased at little cost, and a lively debate which was recorded in the minute book in the

form of question and answer. But these early high-brows were feminists and it was not for long that the " gentlemen " kept these good things to themselves.

At the Annual Meeting on 17th Jan., 1791, it is recorded that

> a respectable number of ladies honoured the Society with their attendance and much pleasure was apparently enjoyed during the discussion that followed.

Who were these ladies ? We get the answer in the earlier entry of 4th May, 1789.

> It was proposed that for the encouragement of the female members they should be admitted upon paying five shillings only instead of half a guinea.

This suggests that at no time did these good folks exclude women from the Society but rather encouraged them. One wonders if the hospitality of the " Fox and Hounds " lacked anything and they were chary of attending. Anyway, records of debate show that as far as subject matter went, certain subjects were a definite draw.

Most frequently the " question " of debate was a religious one. On July 26th this is recorded as

> How ought a Christian to conduct himself, merely as a member of civil society ?

And the conclusion solemnly recorded is

> Keep from bad example in himself, prevent quarrels, offend none, be benevolent to all.

The answer to " When does mental error become sinful ? " is

> When it arises from negligence, from prejudice, from the desire to live in any sin or when it leads to the indulgence of anything that is immoral.

By 1791 the Society had shed some of the religious tendency in debate, and at their Annual Meeting when ladies were present the debate was on the question,

> Is there any just ground for the censures usually cast upon old maids and batchelors ?

Curiously the answer is recorded as " Comments " :

> It was judged to consider the sexes distinctly. The old maids might generally be considered as not continuing single

out of choice and in that case were objects of pity. As to the old batchelors it was judged that generally speaking they had the opportunity of finding agreeable partners.

It was possible for individuals of either sex to be amiable and worthy. But from the various bad dispositions of old maids, there appears a just reason for censuring them, while the old batchelors on these accounts and on others not generally known deserve even severer censures than those which are generally cast upon them.

One more record—that of 14th Feb., 1791 :

Which is the most injurious to character, the Spendthrift or the Miser ?

the answer reading :

If the Miser be rapacious as he generally is and the Spendthrift thoroughly dissipated only, which is commonly the fact, the Miser is the worst ; but if the Spendthrift be also rapacious his vileness exceeds.

This was almost the last of the debates, and apparently the monthly meetings ceased about this time. Accounts given after are of Annual Meetings only. Again and again one reads : " The Secretary received no minutes of that meeting." One wonders if bad weather in February may have accounted for this, or were the attractions of the Society becoming less ?

Some of the accounts of Annual Meetings give interesting side-lights on the personnel of the Society. One held at the " Fox and Hounds " on 5th Dec., 1827, gives a list of the members. They include: Debden Wright of Dudenhoe Grange, Isaac Hodges of Berden Hall, James Mumford of Colchester Hall, Thos. Seabrook of Berden Priory.

There is no need to read between the lines of the old accounts for sidelights on the personalities that touch these pages. Students, reverend gentlemen, farmers, and shopkeepers appear on the pages and go.

On 5th April, 1887, the Rev. — Ault gave a review of the history of the Society, and on that occasion there were two other members of the cloth present. But here and there a record leaves one guessing. Who and what was the John Portway who, joining in 1795, " declined " in 1807 ; why did Thomas Clark, whose name was mentioned in 1795, " decline " entering ? There may, of course, have been difficulties, but was one glance at the intelligentsia of North Essex enough ?

On 25th Jan., 1790, we read :

> The usual business of the day was compleated in harmony.

Was this an expression of congratulation or of verbosity ? Or was it an implication, that matters were not always so ? It is puzzling.

And there are other puzzles. The Treasurer of 1870 draws what might have been a cyclone in infancy, in the margin of the accounts. Was he a budding Phil May or a farmer obsessed by the weather ?

Then there follows a cryptic entry : " Spare moments, 1s."

And what of the Treasurer to whom they presented a time-piece at the surprising cost of £6 15s. ? Why were his services so much esteemed ? We are not told. Certainly the Society was most generous, and gifts in the early days were frequent.

From 1914 there were few meetings. The books were purchased and circulated by Mr. and Mrs. Custerson with a regularity and despatch that complied with the strictest rules, but the Society rarely met. After the War there was some attempt at reviving the Annual Meeting, but the day of the Book Society was over, and in 1933 it was decided to abandon an enterprise that for a century and a half had fulfilled the need which modern facilities had so gloriously put within the reach of all.

DAISY SANDERS.

Private Schools, 1660-1689.

A study based on Matthews's *Calamy Revised.*

WHEN hundreds of university men were ejected from their livings in 1660 and 1662 the problem of their daily bread was serious. Very few were possessed of private means, and very few were competent to practise physic or law. Farming land attracted only a handful, and commerce was strange to all. One obvious occupation was teaching, for which Oxford or Cambridge had in some measure fitted them. Three difficulties stood in the way, civil and ecclesiastical and university. The new Act of Uniformity which caused half of these men to retire from their parishes equally forbade them to keep any public or private school, or teach in a private family as tutor: and the Parliament of 1665, at Oxford, varied this only that if they would not take certain oaths they must remove five miles from every corporate town and any place where they had been beneficed. To hold any post in a public school necessitated a licence from the bishop, who was often inclined to stretch that prerogative further. And every university graduate had sworn not to give any such higher teaching as might rival that of his university.

Nevertheless, scores of men did devote themselves to education, which therefore received a considerable impetus. It is interesting to survey the country and see what new opportunities were offered for boys and girls to learn from university graduates.

Berwick introduces us at once to a case that shows the difficulties of the situation. Nicholas Wressel, of Magdalene at Cambridge, had been Lecturer in the town since 1652, but ten years later was presented by the churchwardens for not coming to worship. He took to teaching, which he supplemented by preaching, and fortified himself by the king's licence in 1672. But six years later the king sent to the mayor to enforce the Conventicle Act, and especially named Wressel, " an unlicensed schoolmaster." He therefore left, and with considerable astuteness and courage, went to London, near which we shall meet him again teaching.

In Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Durham, not a single man is known who betook himself to teaching. But in the North Riding of Yorkshire, within the diocese of Chester, we find one man of great pertinacity, Richard Frankland, whose home was at *Rathmell*, near Settle. Here he began taking pupils, and taught from 1670 till his death in 1698, though he moved to Natland in

1674, and under persecution 1683–9 to Kirby Meltham, Crosthwaite, Hartbarrow, and Attercliffe. At first he had fewer than a dozen boys, but they were able to win Edinburgh degrees; and latterly he had eighty boarding with or near him, so that he was helped successively by three former pupils. In all, more than three hundred are known to have studied under Frankland, of whom more than two score graduated at seven universities. Abundant information is available about the teaching, and about the careers of the pupils. On Frankland's death, no one bought the goodwill, and the "sheep without a shepherd" drifted into other folds. Some of his pupils established schools of their own.

Across in Lancashire three men of very different types were doing the same work. Charles Sagar of Burnley had been appointed Master of the *Blackburn* Grammar School in 1655–6, and with considerable courage began lay-preaching in 1660. He held his post at the school after the Restoration, supported by local opinion, and felt strong enough to marry, begetting a son Joshua, whom he sent to Frankland for his schooling. But the Five Mile Act of 1665 exacted an oath from every teacher of a public school that he would not at any time endeavour any alteration of government, either in Church or State. This seems to have been too much for Sagar, and on 28th May, 1666, he was paid out from his place. Soon he opened a private school, in Blackburn, which was clearly illegal if he would not take the oath; but many gentlemen supported him and sent their sons. He continued preaching also, for which he was imprisoned six months; but he was not ordained till James issued his Declaration of Indulgence in 1687. Even then, his chief occupation seems to have been his private school, till he died in Blackburn, 1697–8.

Zachary Taylor, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, had been chaplain in the king's armies, and had settled down as incumbent of Grappenhall and Gorton successively till he became schoolmaster at Bolton, and in 1654 schoolmaster at *Rochdale*, where also he acted as assistant minister. He did not hesitate to comply in 1660 and 1662, but refused the Oxford Oath of 1665, like Sagar. Again the parish sympathized and desired him to continue, but the new vicar urged another appointment. He may have kept a private school for a few years, but in 1673 he was appointed to the Grammar School at *Kirkham*. When persecution was renewed, he fortified himself by a licence from the Archbishop of York, and was further supported by the Drapers' Company of London against the vicar of Kirkham. He lived until 1692.

Adam Martindale does not seem to have received a university education, but won fame as a mathematician. He was deprived in 1662 of the vicarage of Rostherne and forbidden to preach in the diocese; so he settled in *Warrington* to teach, being protected

by Lord Delamere. When the Five-Mile Act came out, he moved to *Manchester*, and presently became chaplain to Lord Delamere at Dunham. In this later period he can hardly have done much teaching, except as a tutor. And in all Cheshire there was no other man of his type.

These four men were all within the diocese of Chester. Within Yorkshire there were others, under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. *Walkington*, near Beverley, belonged to Peter Clark, who had been rector of Kirby Underdale; he came to his estate, took boarders, and conducted school till 1685, apparently unmolested. At *Wetwang* the late vicar, Thomas Wait, took to farming; his wife taught scholars, to whom he gave two daily lessons. This was an ingenious construction of the law—that the school was hers; though he was sometimes disturbed by the constable for preaching, there seems to have been no interference with the school.

The West Riding had four centres for parents to choose between. Thomas Robinson of *Rastrick* was ejected from the curacy, but taught school; he was not a university man, and seems to have encountered no opposition; when he died in 1670–1 he was openly registered as *Ludimagister*. The situation may have been eased, since his son John conformed and became the schoolmaster of Rastrick. At *Clayton West*, a township of Hoyland, the ejected rector kept school till his death in 1689, again without trouble. To *Heckmondwike* came John Holdsworth, whose father Josiah, rector of Sutton till 1662, sent John to Frankland to be educated; funds cut short his training, but as Josiah had gathered a Congregational church, John came and started a school there; again no difficulty arose, although the father as an ex-clergyman did get into trouble. Near Wakefield, Gamaliel Marsden married a rich widow at *Topcliffe*; though he was a poor preacher, he became "extremely useful in training up young men in academical learning, in which he was much employed." When he died in 1681, this work evidently ended.

The archbishop had Nottingham within his diocese, and three more men here conducted schools without trouble. Josiah Rock, a Cambridge undergraduate, had built up a school at Ashbourne, then had held three successive livings; when ejected in 1662 he started another school at *Saundby*, which he gave up when offered a "priviledg'd place" as a preacher. John Billingsley had to leave Chesterfield as he would not take the Oxford Oath; he crossed the border to *Mansfield* and kept a school, where he had a pupil, Jonathan Sonyer, who himself became a helper to Joseph Dawson. This we gather from Heywood's diaries (4. 130), and the casual entry suggests that Dawson had a school at *Morley*, which otherwise might pass unnoticed. John Jackson, ejected from Bleasby, moved to *Morton* near Southwell and opened a school. He was

cited and excommunicated, then moved to *Kneesall*, continuing his school. At his death in 1696 the work evidently ceased.

In the Southern Province we meet many more schools, even more than would be due to the larger population. The diocese of Lichfield covered Derby and Staffs, with parts of Salop and Warwick.

In the remote *Edale*, the ejected curate, Robert Wright, opened school; but the churchwardens of Castleton presented him, and he was excommunicated in 1665; this probably ended his effort. Very different was the lot of Samuel Ogden, who established a school at *Mackworth* in 1658; as he was also vicar, the Five-Mile Act obliged him to quit in 1665, when he had the boldness to move into *Derby* with his school. The Master of the Free School there prosecuted him and won after twenty years; whereupon he simply moved to *Wirksworth*, where he carried on until his death in 1697. His usher, Merrill, left a long account of his forty years' career, and of his method of school teaching. Much less able was Samuel Beresford of *Derby*, who tried to teach but could not keep order, and laid down his private academy. John Bingham had been Master of Derby School in 1640, and when forced to move by the Five-Mile Act, opened *Bradley Hall* as a boarding school for the sons of gentlemen; thence he moved to *Brailsford*, but being excommunicated he moved away about 1675. It is interesting that though he was intimate with Archbishop Sheldon, this did not shield him from persecution. Before he ended, John Bennet came into the county, settling at *Littleover*, where he began teaching, and may have continued from 1672 to 1693, despite many troubles. Samuel Shaw, who had been usher at Tamworth Grammar School, became Master of the Grammar School at *Ashby-de-la-Zouch* in 1668, and on partial conformity obtained the licence of Sheldon two years later; he ended in 1695. He had been preceded by Noah Ward, once usher at Derby, who made way for him on obtaining a private chaplaincy.

No man kept school in Staffordshire, except on the extreme edge. John Woodhouse had married an heiress, and considered it his duty to use his opportunity. He took the manor house of *Sheriff Hales*, adjoining Salop, and in 1675 opened a school which won great fame; family papers and the enquiries of Josiah Thompson enabled Toulmin to publish a full account in 1814. Lectures were given in logic, anatomy, mathematics, physics, ethics, rhetoric, law, natural theology; the work was practical—surveying land, making sun-dials, dissecting animals. Among his pupils were three who became peers, Thomas Foley, Robert Harley, and Henry St. John. It is remarkable that the two latter strongly promoted the Schism Bill, which would have crushed all such schools. Woodhouse himself met some difficulties and had to move; but one of his pupils at once followed on and kept up the tradition, while others

transplanted it to Dudley, Newbury, Findern and Hungerford; and Woodhouse himself after 1696 was in London, but now perhaps training only ministers.

Francis Keeling, of *Cockshutt* and Wallasey, is another instance where the wife took young gentlewomen in her house for education; but she "was not suffer'd." John Malden from Newport opened a private academy near *Whitchurch*, attended by many young men of great promise. With his death in 1681 the school faded out.

The diocese of Worcester is remarkable for the opposition shown. Luke Milbourne, from Wroxhall, came to *Coventry*; "first he could not be suffer'd to teach a school; then he was not allow'd to board young gentlemen that went to the free school there." John Bryan, formerly of Coventry, was ground down by poverty, till he took the Oxford Oath "to the heart-breaking of many of his disciples" and returned to Coventry. Baxter considered him eminently fit to teach, but does not mention that he gave a general education, only for the ministry: his career ended in 1676. James Wright had to leave Wootton Wawen, but found protection at *Knowle*, where he presently took a house, kept boarders, and taught school; but was imprisoned in 1685.

Ambrose Sparry had once been the Master of *Stourbridge* School. As he was a friend of the Foleys, it was connived at when he opened a private school there, till his death in 1679. Henry Hickman, a benefactor of the Grammar School, opened another at Dusthorp near *Bromsgrove*, where he was trusted with several boys; but he went to Holland within three years. In *Worcester* city Thomas Juice was forced to cease in 1665: Woolley of Salwarpe tried again there, but was presented and excommunicated in 1673. William Westmacot, formerly of Cropthorne, had a school at *Defford* near Pershore, and got the vicar into trouble for permitting it. After his death in 1686, his son was sent to Woodhouse at Sheriff Hales.

In Hereford matters were worse, and no one had a school in the county. But while the bishop of *Gloucester* was keen against dissent, he had to reckon with very pertinacious men. The career of James Forbes was heroic, and he used his knowledge of the law to confuse both mayor and bishop; in his latter days he educated many students for the ministry, but his frequent removals in the days of persecution suggest that he was not teaching then. At *Oddington*, the ejected rector, William Tray, set up a school, which he may have continued when harried to Leonard Stanley, Horsley, Chipping Norton; in any case it died out by 1676. At *Great Witcombe*, Alexander Gretorix taught a little school without being disturbed. Jonathan Smith, once of Hempstead, settled at *Ross* and taught till 1678. *Bristol* had other sturdy men. John Weeks was in constant trouble, and was constantly defiant, with good

legal advice; he was presented for keeping school in 1682, but held on till death in 1698. William Thomas had been the Schoolmaster, and despite many offers if he would conform, steadily refused, and continued teaching till 1693. Samuel Winney from Glastonbury had such a capital school that even Hellier upheld him; "the best Schoolmaster they had."

On the east coast, Lincolnshire gave only three opportunities. Theophilus Brittaine from Brattleby opened school at *Swinderby*, for which he was imprisoned in 1672; afterwards he tried again at *Roxholm* on a farm. John Birket, ejected from Swinderby, had been Master of Grantham Grammar School; he was soon engaged as tutor, and when his pupils had gone to Cambridge, he set up school at his birthplace, *Billingborough*, where many sons of the gentry were prepared for the university. Ill-health obliged him to break up before 1685. It is worth noting that Thomas Willerby, a native of Spalding, who had settled near Stourbridge, endowed a new school at Spalding. In Leicestershire no school is known; but a justice, when fining Richard Adams for preaching, said he would raise no objection to his keeping one: Adams, however, had received no university training, and did not take the hint. Nor was any school opened in Rutland.

Northamptonshire had three men at work. John Seaton from Twywell was first at *Islip* then at *Thrapston*, with many sons of the neighbouring gentry, quite unmolested in any way. The former rector of Thrapston, Thomas Tavey, was actually invited to the Free School at *Higham Ferrers*, and took so many boarders that he grew rich: the position was singular, and some trouble arose so that he left for the neighbourhood of London. At *Northampton*, Richard Hooke from Creaton opened school in his own house, till his death in 1679.

Oxfordshire presented special difficulties, yet four men were found to face them. Owen Price had been Master of Magdalen College School, and after trying to work in Devon, he returned and taught near the *city* till 1671. Thomas Gilbert, ex-chaplain of Magdalen, took boarders whom he sent to Magdalen School; overtures were made to take the presidency of Harvard, but he deliberately framed himself to suffer in *Old*, than to reign in *New*, England. He actually held on, despite frequent trouble, lectured to undergraduates of Pembroke, and lived into the time of freedom. He was protected to some extent by Lord Wharton, who was equally a patron of Samuel Birch. The courage of this man was equalled by his knowledge of law and by the number of his supporters. At *Bampton Shilton*, *Cote*, he had a very full school; fourteen of his scholars sat in Parliament in one session, some being ministers of Queen Anne. John Troughton, despite his blindness, took pupils at *Bicester* and at *Witney*. Buckingham again had no schools.

In Bedfordshire a clever device was tried. Isaac Bedford took a farm at *Clifton*, entertained boarders, and engaged a conformist to teach them. Richard Kennett did the same at *Sutton*, and when the teacher died, his stepson took a licence and continued, while Kennett himself really taught and managed. Huntingdon had no school; the bishop lived much at Buckden.

At *Cambridge* there was a music-master of some note, Robert Wilson. He had no official position to forfeit, but fewer scholars resorted to him after 1660. Yet he flourished well enough to be a great channel for helping those who were in distress. William Hunt of Eton and King's, when ejected from *Sutton* in Cambridgeshire, bought a small farm. While his wife kept a dairy he was diligent in teaching school.

In *Norwich*, John Cory taught a private school for 36 years: he was born in the city, and the bishop was a Puritan leader. It is rather surprising that we hear of no other school in the county; and that at *Ipswich* there was none till John Langston, after being driven from pillar to post, settled in 1686 and took pupils sent by the Congregational Fund Board. *Woodbridge* offers a curious problem, for the former Lecturer, who had founded a Congregational church in 1652, was Master of the School in 1669, and presumably till his death in 1681, though he was "a considerable Sufferer after his Ejectment." Less fortunate was the Lecturer at *Stowmarket*, John Storer, who was prosecuted for keeping school, and forced to stop. On the western side of the county there were two remarkable men. Jonathan Jephcot, who had been Master of Boston School, 1660–1662, settled at *Ousden*, perhaps at the invitation of Mr. Mosley; here he took pupils till his death in 1673, leaving a fine reputation for learning and character. Just previously, Samuel Cradock inherited an estate at *Wickhambrook*; he was rich and well connected, and opened an academy, whence he had the courage to dismiss the son of Lord Wharton for misbehaviour. It flourished so that he took his nephew to aid him. He rendered great service by facing the question of the university oath, and arguing that it did not forbid graduates taking into their own families any pupils to learn logic and philosophy. As Edmund Calamy was one of his pupils, information is abundant. Cradock moved to Bishop's Stortford in 1696; after his death in 1706 there was apparently no successor. And no one else taught in Herts.

Essex fell under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, and only five cases are known. John Argor was driven from the Grammar School at *Braintree* by the Five-Mile Act. John Sams at *Coggeshall* tried a private school, which was stopped in the same way; and Joseph Brown at *Nazeing* fared exactly the same. But John Benson, though driven from Little Leighs, was befriended by the Earl of Warwick and Lord FitzWalter, so that he kept a school

at *Writtle*. Philip Anderton kept a school at *Leyton*, where he had been ejected; but not for long, as he died in 1669 at Kingsland.

But Middlesex was most popular for schoolmasters. *Hackney* was the home of three, though each was exceptional. Thomas Cruttendon helped in the great boarding-school kept by his mother-in-law. John Hutchinson, a physician, settled here in 1705 at the age of 67, and opened a boarding-school which he conducted till his death, nine years later. Benjamin Morland, F.R.S., son of Martin, an ejected minister, kept a school here, helped by a brother, till he was appointed High Master of St. Paul's in 1721. At Newington two tried their fortunes. Charles Morton came to *Stoke Newington* in 1675 with a high reputation, and opened a school which attained high fame. He was attacked often, and in ten years gave up the struggle, sailing to New England, where Harvard eagerly welcomed him. Of his work we know much from two pupils; Defoe praised him for being the first to give his instruction in English; Wesley blamed him for breaking his university oath. At one time he had fifty pupils, and some hundreds went in the ten years, from homes of good estate. It is not clear whether Jonathan Grew was an assistant, or had an independent school; in either case, he left to become a pastor at St. Albans by 1682. John Chishull taught at *Enfield*, his native place, till his death in 1672. Richard Swift opened a boarding-school at *Mill Hill*, which survived a wreckage by smallpox; and it may have lasted till his death in 1701. Thomas Pakeman, ejected from *Harrow*, started a good boarding-school there, but presently moved to *Brentford*, where he joined forces with Ralph Button. This was stopped under the Five-Mile-Act, and Button migrated to *Islington*, where he kept school till his death in 1680. Philip Taverner also was convicted at Brentford in 1668. At Islington, John Mitchell, once usher at Sherborne, seems to have had boarders in 1669; and John Burgess also took some, who certainly attended a famous school kept by Thomas Singleton, first at *Clerkenwell*, then at *Hoxton Wells*. Singleton had been Master successively at St. Mary Axe, Eton and Reading, and his reputation drew together nearly 300 at one time, so it is no wonder if other men kept houses to board his boys. Yet in his old age he was poor, and one of his old pupils, Richard Mead, a physician, came to his rescue. Tobias Ellis apparently taught at *Kensington*, and certainly earned Baxter's commendation; he published a spelling-book before 1686.

London itself might seem a storm centre; yet as at Bristol and Norwich, there was enough popular support to warrant several men teaching. Most of them were on the northern and eastern margin. Thomas Carter had been a schoolmaster before 1663, but it is not said that he resumed this work. Edward Veal from Ireland tried at *Wapping*, but perhaps only to train for the ministry;

persecution made him stop by 1680. In *East Smithfield*, Zachary Crofton had a hundred pupils between 1669 and 1672, when he died. Richard Dyer, after doing some private tuition, kept a grammar school *near the Tower* for about seven years. His brother Samuel kept another at *Mile End* for 25 years. At *Bethnal Green*, Samuel Morland, F.R.S., son of an ejected minister, had a rather famous school in later days. William Angel became Master of *Houndsditch* Grammar School, which implies that he took the Oxford Oath, at least. John Langston tried twice near *Spitalfields*, but as has been noted, moved to Ipswich. In *Moorfields* there was at one time Thomas Doolittle, who was so persecuted that he had to move all round London, but persisted in teaching till 1707; his great reputation is illustrated by the number of pupils who carried on his tradition and kept schools. The Congregational Fund Board founded an Academy in *Tenter Alley*, to train ministers, and engaged Isaac Chauncey as its head in 1701; this was a new departure, an example followed to the present day; it differed considerably from the private ventures of the previous century, which are our chief theme here. A few other men are known to have taught in London, though their homes are not always known: John Osborne was at *Smithfield* till his death in 1665: Josiah Bassett was perhaps near *Cripplegate*, and was certainly bled by an apparitor to prevent prosecution: Robert Tatnall kept school in *Winchester Street*, attended for a short time by Calamy; he won royal favour, and the king ordered Cambridge to give him a D.D., but "some peevish men" found he had not subscribed the Articles, and stopped his admission: Richard Dowley, after being driven from county to county, tried to teach in London, but was stopped after four years, in 1683/4.

Surrey had many pleasant villages which invited trial. Thomas Lye, who had been Master of Bury St. Edmunds School, opened school at *Clapham* about 1665, but was imprisoned. Thomas Horrockes, who had been Schoolmaster of Romford, was much harassed in Essex; he settled in *Battersea* where he boarded and taught young gentlemen, some of well-known city families. To *Stockwell* came Nicholas Wressel from Berwick, and kept a private school; but this may have been after 1689. At *Egham*, Richard Wavel lost his curacy, tried to teach in the Grammar School and was stopped. At *Ewell* on the contrary, Joseph Hayhurst, from Iping, qualified in 1662. In *Dorking*, James Fisher from Fetcham opened school, and seems to have had no trouble. Similarly in *Ockley*, Robert Fish took refuge from Sussex, and "sometimes taught school."

In Kent, two men settled near London. Caleb Trenchfield had an estate at *Eltham*, to which he returned from Chipstead, and kept school till 1671. A more singular case was Thomas Ireland,

once Master of Wallingford, then teaching in Cholsey, then Master of Reading, and ending in 1689 as teaching in a grammar school at *Westerham*: evidently he took the Oxford Oath. Farther east, Thomas Sherwell, ejected from the curacy at *Leeds*, kept a private school there, but being imprisoned for other reasons, returned to his birthplace, Coventry. In *Canterbury* itself, though Thomas Ventress was dismissed and excommunicated, he found protectors and instructed several gentlemen's sons, until his death in 1683. Less fortunate was Charles Nicholls, pastor of the Congregational church at *Adisham*, who acted as schoolmaster and was repeatedly punished. At *Sandwich*, the ejected rector, Robert Webber, became Master of the Free School in 1666, evidently taking the Oxford Oath. The ex-vicar of *St. Lawrence*, Peter Johnson, had many sympathizers, and taught some scholars.

Sussex saw nine places where schools were established. Joseph Bennet settled at *Brightling* for twenty years, but his school was broken up by the Five-Mile Act; in old age, after toleration, he began again at *Burwash*. Perhaps here he was helping Thomas Goldham, the vicar ejected thence, who in 1690 was keeping a Grammar school. At *Sedlescombe*, the ejected rector, Edmund Thorpe, opened a boarding-school to which many gentry sent their sons; even three conforming ministers sent their sons; one of these was Samuel Oates, the ex-Baptist, and his son Titus hardly reflected glory on the school. A similar establishment was at *Lewes*, under John Brett, a native, who moved in society at Tunbridge Wells. He died 1678, and some years later, James Bricknal repeated the experiment, with little encouragement. Meanwhile, Richard Turner had kept a capital boarding-school at *Plumpton* from 1662 to 1680; and Edward Beecher certainly began at *Kingston* in 1661, though it is not certain he carried on till his death in 1681. William Corderoy had several scholars boarding with him at *Steyning*, but was forced to stop in 1666; and the same fate befel William Wilson at *Billinghurst*. More compliant was Thomas Jackson at *East Ashling*, for he took the Oxford Oath.

In Hampshire, a Harvard graduate, Urian Oakes, opened school at *Southwick*, near Fareham; but he returned by 1671, to become President of Harvard later on. This left only a father and son, both named John Goldwire, the elder of whom had been Drake's Schoolmaster at Walton. They kept a school first at *Broadlands*, near Romsey, then at *Baddesley*; it does not seem to have survived the death of the younger in 1713.

Berkshire saw an attempt by John Woodbridge at *Newbury* from 1660 to 1662, while his brother was vicar; but he gave up and returned to New England. More serious was the work of Henry Langley, ejected Master of Pembroke; he took pupils at *Tubney*, perhaps till his death in 1679.

Wiltshire was always a Puritan stronghold, and six schools are known here. At *Devizes* indeed, it was the wife of Timothy Sacheverell, who kept a boarding-school for young gentlemen. The former Master of Shaftesbury, Matthew Toogood, returned to *Semley* where he had been rector, and opened a school. Thomas Jones, from the vicarage of Calne, kept school at *West Lavington* till 1690/1. Nathaniel Webb, when ejected from Yatesbury, returned to his family estate at *Bromham*, where he took boarders and kept school till death in 1678, unmolested. Henry Dent of *Ramsbury* was less fortunate, having three bitter enemies; yet though they harassed him as a preacher, his boarding-school does not seem to have been interfered with, and it was his main support; after 1689 he moved to London. So also with William Hughes; when ejected at *Marlborough* he bought a house in the town and opened a flourishing boarding-school; though he was much interfered with in other ways, and excommunicated, the school seems to have lasted till his death in 1687/8. We must surmise that the goodwill of gentry, and some juggling as to the nominal head of the school, served as protection.

Dorset was in the diocese of Bristol, so it is not surprising that only one man tried a school—Ames Short of *Lyme Regis*. The bishop of Exeter also complained of him, with some reason, as among his pupils were several sons of leading people in that city: yet though he was in constant trouble and even outlawed, he held on till 1697. Such a case makes us marvel what continuity there can have been in the schooling.

Somerset had nine towns where education was offered. Three men got into serious trouble. William Hunt had been turned out from his Mastership of Salisbury Free School; he tried a private school at *Ilminster*, but was obliged to stop. William Hopkins tried at *Milborne Port*, but was cited and excommunicated, though his wife was the bishop's niece. George Hammond, ejected at Dorchester, had many friends there who urged him to qualify and become Master of the School; but there was also opposition, and he declined; about 1677 he moved to *Taunton* and opened a boarding-school which was wrecked in Monmouth's time. At *Batcombe*, Henry Albin had four or five pupils, but was informed upon in 1665. So also at *Stoke Trister*, where John Bolster, with no university degree was Master of the Grammar School, yet keeping conventicles. At *Staplegrove* was George Bindon from Bathealton, a great linguist and mathematician. Charles Darby had fifty scholars, many of them boarders at *Martock*, and was said to have secured a licence without subscribing; but he did sign articles before the Five-Mile Act. Matthew Warren began teaching about 1670, and before 1687 moved to *Taunton*, where he built up a fine school of the first rank, about which full particulars are available. At *Bridgwater*,

John Moore, who resigned the vicarage of Long Burton only in 1667, opened a school in 1688, with the help of two sons, under whom it flourished till 1747, with seventy-four students to its credit.

Devon had six men. But Thomas Palke, ejected from *Ipplepen*, was obliged to stop, and died excommunicated. And Owen Price, once Master of Magdalen College School, who cannot really be placed here, soon returned to Oxford. Zachary Mayne, from the same college, opened school at *Dalwood*; he conformed, and in 1689 became Master of Exeter Grammar School. At *Dartmouth*, William Ball was reported in 1665 as keeping an English school, unlicensed; he was probably stopped. At *Plympton* the same report was made as to the ejected vicar, John Williams, who had no university training. Near *Ugborough* the ejected vicar did private tuition, but kept no school.

Cornwall saw only two attempts. John Herring came to *Marystow* as usher in the great private school of the vicar. He succeeded to the vicarage, whence he was ejected, and apparently continued the school under local protection; then he bought an estate at *South Ketherwin*, whither he transferred the school till he was eighty years old; he suffered no molestation at any time. Joseph Halsey from Penkivel was driven by the Five-Mile Act to *Merther*, where he soon developed a capital boarding-school, used even by conforming gentry. He lived to the age of eighty-four.

The distribution of these schools shows how important was the attitude of the bishops, and of the local people. A few of the bishops, like Reynolds, of Norwich, were Puritan, with considerable sympathy for the men who had obeyed their conscience and left their parishes; at the other extreme was Ward, of Exeter, who made careful enquiry, in 1665, which led to the Five-Mile Act and the Oxford Oath. In lower ranks there were the parish clergy and the Masters of Grammar Schools; they would certainly not welcome the establishment of private schools by ex-clergy. On the other hand there was a great body of laity, not only in the towns, but including nobility and gentry, which in 1640 had stood for liberty, and in 1643 had fought for it. Charles in 1660 was very uncertain of the strength of this party, and he employed some of its members as his ministers. The local power of country gentlemen was great, as may still be realized. Now the attitude of the Country Party in this generation is very disappointing. Not fifty men are known to have taken ejected men as domestic chaplains, who might act as tutors to their children; and to find another fifty who actively protected non-conforming schoolmasters would be very difficult. The possibilities are shown by the work of Birch; though he lived at Shilton, near Oxford, where bishop and university opposed, he was effectively shielded by local gentry—Lord Wharton, and the

Earl of Clare. The Earl of Shaftesbury did recognize this aspect, and suggested that Wharton's chaplain was well fitted to follow Birch, but nothing came of the idea. Neither gentry nor clergy were wide awake to the gradual extinction of Puritan principles in the upper classes by the steady stifling of these schools, and the failure to provide successors. Had there been a score of men like Birch, they would have trained half a Parliament and half a Cabinet; had Puritan peers ensured that graduates from Scotland and Holland should carry on the work, then Oxford and Cambridge would have been reopened to all comers. The intellectual and the political life of England in the eighteenth century would have been very different.

When we consider the actual private schoolmasters of this generation, we note that, on the most liberal computation, not 160 graduates tried to use their knowledge in this way; it is remarkable that twenty-two who had held official posts at Grammar Schools and similar places never attempted to conduct private schools. If it be demurred that such teaching was illegal, the response is that it was equally illegal for them to preach, as they did. Although a school conducted six days a week is more conspicuous than a conventicle held once, we might have expected much more private enterprise.

Those who did teach naturally followed the style of education that had produced them. They came from such places as Emmanuel at Cambridge, New Inn Hall and Magdalen Hall at Oxford. The medium of instruction was Latin. While this fitted them for foreign intercourse—Walpole and George I could converse only in that tongue—it gave a curious bias to the past, and was of little help for facing the problems of their own day. If here and there we find a man mentioned as teaching an English school, it is the exception, which proves that the rule was a Latin or Grammar school. It was left to a later generation, in whom the university tradition was weak or non-existent, frankly to adopt English as the medium for instruction in all subjects. Even Samuel Jones of Pennsylvania used Latin at Tewkesbury, as did John Jennings, son of an ejected minister, at Kibworth; but his pupil Philip Doddridge abandoned Latin, and thus adapted his school more closely to the actual conditions of life.

The continuity of these schools was slight or none. They were purely private ventures, whose existence was illegal, so that there was no goodwill to sell. Scarcely ever do we hear of an assistant or usher, though it seems heroic for one man, however well trained, to deal with one or two score of pupils in all subjects. Here and there a son took up the work of his father, but a new supply of university men was impossible, except from abroad.

The coming of toleration made a difference. In 1688 there were

few left of the men ejected in 1660 or 1662 ; but teaching now became legal to some extent. Strange to say, Baptists were the first to realize the possibilities, and in 1689 established a fund for education, though they contemplated only education for the ministry. Their plan was apparently to give bursaries to approved candidates, and send them to approved teachers. The idea was promptly taken up, and the same year there was a Common Fund for Presbyterians and Independents, then in 1695 a Congregational Fund Board. Very soon the " managers " began to concern themselves with the schoolmasters to whom they sent their bursars, and to make suggestions. Thus in 1695 the United Brethren of Devon and Cornwall resolved " that private tutors among us be cautioned " what students they should take, and persisted in this attitude. At Taunton, Matthew Warren ignored their representations, but on his death in 1706 they leaped at the opportunity and persuaded three men to open the Taunton Academy. In one sense it was a continuation of Warren's work ; in another it was a revolution from private tuition to a controlled academy. Under their auspices, it ended in 1759. And inasmuch as the control was by ministers, it was an important step in the evolution of education ; private men had taught all subjects to all comers ; henceforth much stress was laid on education for the ministry. One unfortunate result has been to obscure the part played even by the 18th-century academies in general education. Even modern students have not entirely escaped this narrow view.

W. T. Whitley.

Congregationalism in Ashburton

[*This article was written by the Rev. T. G. Crippen some years ago. The Rev. A. G. Matthews has been good enough to add two footnotes and the Rev. H. F. Hawkes has written the last paragraph, bringing the story up to date.*—EDITOR.]

THE Congregational Church at Ashburton is one of the oldest in the county of Devon; it owes its origin to the labours of several ministers who were ejected from neighbouring benefices in 1660 and 1662; and occupies a building of which part is believed to have served the same purpose before the end of the seventeenth century.

Walker tells us, on somewhat doubtful testimony, that Samuel Tidball, vicar of Ashburton, was sequestrated, and died before the Restoration. Whether sequestrated or not, he died in 1647; and was succeeded by Alexander Grosse, an undoubted Puritan. It is not unlikely that the germs of Nonconformity in Ashburton were implanted during his seven years' ministry. He died in 1654, and was followed by the Rev. Joshua Bowden. In the *Nonconformists' Memorial* Bowden figures as an ejected minister who afterwards conformed. No particulars are given; but it seems likely that he may have been ousted for defect of title under the legislation of October, 1660. In any case there is no evidence[1] that he was among the very few Bartholomew men who earned the reproach of being "New Conformists."

In the Episcopal Return of Nonconformists residing in the diocese of Exeter in 1665, we find the name of

> John Nosworthy, a Nonconformist liveing at Manaton, formerly Rector of that place.

He had been ousted in 1660, and afterwards silenced at Ipplepen in 1662; these places are both six or seven miles from Ashburton.

---

[1] *Joshua Bowden.* Mr. Crippen is mistaken here. There is no doubt that Bowden was a "New Conformist." Deprived of Ashburton by bishop's sentence 23 Sept., 1662: ordained deacon (Bristol) 25 Sept., 1664: Vicar of Frampton, Dorset, 1664–86, when died.—A.G.M.

In the Episcopal Return of Conventicles in 1669 (Tenison MS., 639, p. 185b) this entry appears :

> Ashberton, at y^e^ house of y^e^ old John Syms : 100 : y^e^ said John Syms a Nonconformist minister. This Conventicle is lately suppresst.

Sims was the Puritan minister of Dean Prior, four miles from Ashburton; placed there on the sequestration of Robert Herrick, the poet, and ousted at the Restoration in order to Herrick's reinstatement.

On the publication of the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 an address of thanks was presented to the king from seventy-two Nonconformist ministers in Devon. The date was 22 March; of the signatures the eighteenth was that of William Pearse, ejected from Dunsford (about eleven miles from Ashburton); the twentieth was John Sims; and the forty-first John Nosworthy. On 11 April a licence was granted to "John Sims, near Ashburton, Devon" as "a Grall. Pr. Teacher"; that is, a general licence as a Presbyterian to preach in any allowed place. On 18 April a similar licence was granted to John Nosworthy, M.A. About the same time a licence was requested for "The Schoolhouse at Ashburton in Devon"; but no such licence appears to have been issued. Licences were freely granted for private houses; but there was a general unwillingness to grant them for public buildings, of which the number licensed was very small.

On 25 July a licence was granted for "the house of Richard Sappers at Ashburton in Devon," as a Presbyterian meeting-place. The name was evidently misspelled; for on 10 August another licence was issued, no doubt by way of correction, for "the house of Richard Tapper." There is nothing in the licence documents to support the assertion that Mr. Nosworthy had a meeting-house at Ashburton; it is most likely that his ministry was usually exercised in the house of R. Tapper. It is likely—though we have no certain proof—that Sims would occasionally minister at the same place. Sims also had his own house at Ogwell (about four miles from Ashburton) licensed as a Presbyterian meeting-place. A brief memoir of him in the *Nonconformists' Memorial* contains a number of interesting particulars, but the date of his death is not stated. A fuller account is given of Nosworthy, who laboured in the face of much persecution, especially by a Mr. Stawell, who was M.P. for the borough. On one occasion he was fined £20 under

the Conventicle Act, and a further fine of £20 was levied on the house. Mr. Nosworthy was a man of considerable learning, and was generally respected. He died in his sixty-sixth year, on 19 November, 1677.

On 28 October, 1672 a licence was issued to "Thomas Egbeare of y^e^ Congl. way to be Teach^r^ at the house of Gregory Millard of Ashburton in Devon." We know nothing of either Egbeare or Millard; but it is evident that there were two dissenting meetings in the town toward the end of 1672; and there are indications of both existing side by side in 1690.

Between the death of Nosworthy in 1677 and the Revolution in 1688 we find no definite mention of Nonconformity in Ashburton. But in 1690 John Fabyan[1] made his will, in which he bequeathed 30s. to "the poor of Mr Pearse his meeting in Ashburton," and 20s. to "the poor of Mr Palk his meeting in Ashburton." It is a fair presumption that these two meetings represented those which, eighteen years earlier, met in the houses of Richard Tapper and Gregory Millard. Of the two ministers mentioned in the will, Thomas Palk, M.A., was a graduate of New Inn Hall, Oxford, and was silenced by the Act of Uniformity at Woodland, a village only two or three miles from Ashburton. He afterwards ministered at Ogwell, about six or seven miles distant. He was a hard student, and a very laborious man. For keeping a school he was persecuted by the Ecclesiastical Court, and finally excommunicated; but he made no submission, and continued a Nonconformist pastor to the end of his life. He died on 10 June, 1693, aged fifty-five. Beside some other writings he published a reply to a treatise written by a neighbouring minister, who maintained the sinfulness of lending money on interest.

William Pearse was vicar of Dunsford, and was ejected under the Act of 1660. He removed to his former home in the neighbourhood of Tavistock, in which town he preached privately as he was able, and under the Indulgence took out licences for himself and his house. After the revocation of the Indulgence he was much persecuted, and was compelled to seek concealment in London. Once he was imprisoned, and many times narrowly escaped arrest. After the Revolution "he set up a public meeting at Ashburton, where he continued for the remainder of his days." His sole publication was a

[1] Palk married Joan Fabyan of Ashburton, 1651—John must have been some relation of hers.—A.G.M.

memoir of his daughter, Damaris Pearse, which he entitled *A Present for Youth, and an Example for the Aged.* He died on 17 March, 1691, aged sixty-five. His tombstone remains in Ashburton churchyard.

It is believed that under Mr. Pearse's direction a substantially-built barn was converted into a meeting-house, and that at least one wall of that building constitutes a part of the still existing "Great Meeting." Mr. Windeatt, who has devoted much attention to the *Origines* of Devonian Nonconformity, thinks that the conversion took place as far back as the time of the Indulgence. Whether "converted" during the Indulgence or after the Revolution, there seems no reason to doubt the tradition that in this building the saintly confessor, John Flavel of Dartmouth, preached his last sermon, on 21 June, 1691. He died at Topsham only five days later.

After the death of Mr. Pearse we find no mention of two congregations. It is, therefore, a fair presumption that they coalesced, under the ministry of Mr. Palk, in the converted barn which gradually became "The Great Meeting."

Of the three ministers who followed Mr. Palk we have no record except their names, and dates, which presumably mark the close of their ministry, whether by death or removal. The first is "Mead, 1697." Next comes "John Taylor, 1702"; he may have been a son of John Taylor, ejected from Combe Raleigh, or of Michael Taylor, ejected from Pyeworthy. Then follows "Samuel Staddon (or Stoden), 1712"; he may have been a son of Samuel Stoddon, ejected from West Buckland, Somerset. Was he the Samuel Stoddon who was ordained on 26 December, 1706, who in 1719 was at Budleigh, and who died in 1755?

Cornelius Bond was ordained on 17 July, 1711. This may have been as colleague with Staddon, an arrangement which was quite usual in the old Presbyterian Churches, in which case he would in due course succeed to the full pastorate. A deed is extant whereby on 15 November, 1712, Thomas Glasvill and Thomas Sainthill conveyed to John Comyn the barn then used as a meeting-house. In the Evans MS. in Dr. Williams's Library, we find that about 1717 Mr. Bond had £5 a year from the Presbyterian Fund; that the congregation numbered 350, and that of these forty-one were voters for the county and thirty-seven for the borough.

On 16 December, 1717, Mr. Bond baptized Robert Palk—presumably of the same family as the former pastor, the Rev.

Thomas Palk. This child afterwards became Sir Robert Palk of Headborough, Bart., and was an ancestor of Lord Halden. In 1719 we find the name of Mr. Bond as attending a meeting of the Exeter Assembly, where he was one of the majority who on 5 or 6 May signed

> a voluntary declaration of their faith concerning the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity as revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

In November, 1729, the meeting-house was conveyed by John Comyn to Andrew Quick. Ten years later the daughter of A. Quick conveyed it to John Enty and Aaron Tozer. Mr. Enty was minister at Exeter (previously at Plymouth), and was the recognized leader of the Orthodox party in the Assembly. Messrs. Enty and Tozer put the meeting-house in trust on 15 May, 1739. The trustees were thirteen in number; and it was provided that, in case the meetings of Protestant Dissenters for worship should ever become illegal, the building should be let, and the rent "given to poor Christians as the trustees might think fit."

About the time when this deed was executed the converted barn was enlarged to about double its former size. There was an adjacent barn, the two running side by side, each having a door into Cad Lane. The partition wall was taken down, two pillars being placed to sustain the roof; the two doors gave place to two large windows, the pulpit being between two windows on the north side. The building was square, having no gallery; the centre was occupied by four large family pews. Three of the walls of this edifice are still standing. An adjacent garden was taken into use as a burial ground.

The minister, at the time of this reconstruction, was Nathaniel Cock. Statements respecting him are inconsistent and there is probably some confusion of names. Mr. Cock is said to have been ordained in March, 1721; to have ministered at Ashburton from 1722 to 1742; and to have died 9 February, 1742. Yet it is elsewhere stated that he "went to Bideford," and that he was "afterwards at Bideford many years."[1]

Of the next three ministers we know but little. Samuel Wrayford was ordained—it does not appear where—on 10 June, 1741; he may have been assistant to Mr. Cock. His

[1] J. Wilson, MSS.: Possibly a different person is meant, as the memoranda about Bideford are much confused.

pastorate is reckoned from 1742, and he died in April, 1760. He published a sermon on "The Immortality of the Soul, proved from moral arguments"—occasioned by the death of Mr. Solomon Tozer, aged seventy-five, on 23 April, 1753. He was followed by Thomas Clarke, who was here only a short time in 1761 and 1762. A son of his was baptized by the Rev. Peter Fabyan on 25th March, 1761, and the following year he removed to Lympstone. About midsummer, 1763, George Waters (or Walters) came from Falmouth, where he had been ordained on 20 June, 1750. He was one of the ministers who in 1772 signed a petition to Parliament for Relief in the matter of Subscription to Articles of Belief as required by the Toleration Act. His ministry at Ashburton ended—whether by death or removal—in 1785.

Reference was made above to the Rev. Peter Fabyan. He was a native of Ashburton, a kinsman—probably a grandson—of the John Fabyan who died in 1690. He was minister at Newton Bushell from 1763 to 1780, and at Bridport from 1780 to 1786; in the year last named he removed to Ashburton, but not as pastor, and died soon afterwards.

Jas. Stoat was a student of the Western College, the first of those who were trained under Thos. Reader at Taunton. He settled at Ashburton in 1785, and held the pastorate nearly thirty years. In 1787 Mr. Colton presented the communion plate which is still in use. In 1791 the meeting-house was completely remodelled. The walls were raised two feet and a half, the two pillars removed and a new roof constructed; stone arches were turned over the windows on the outside; a new pulpit and clerk's desk were placed in the old situation on the north side, and a semi-circular gallery was erected opposite. These alterations cost £218. About the same time Sir Robert Palk, on his return from India, presented a clock, gilt-brass chandelier, and candle sconces for the pulpit.

At a meeting of the Western Calvinistic Association on 21st June, 1797, a Society was formed "for promoting the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ in the Counties of Devon and Cornwall." Mr. Stoat was appointed secretary, and Mr. William Fabyan, also of Ashburton, treasurer, of the new society. Mr. Stoat resigned the pastorate in 1814, but remained in the town and conducted a school. Subsequently he entered into business in partnership with his son; but the results were financially disastrous. Mr. Stoat left Ashburton, and we have not been able to learn the date or place of his death.

David Parker, an American, was a student at the Academy at Gosport, under Dr. Bogue, whose daughter he married. As Dr. Bogue did not wish the young couple to return to America at once, Mr. Parker accepted an invitation to supply Ashburton for a year. His preaching was effective, and he was much esteemed, so that he was desired to continue, but did not see fit to comply. On 16 November, 1815, at the suggestion of Mrs. Bogue, he commenced a Sunday School—the first in the town. He was not ordained until the end of his ministry at Ashburton; the record is

> 1816, May 14: Mr. David Parker, late student at Gosport, was ordained to Pastoral Office for work in North America with a view to Pastoral Office there. Ordained at Dr. Waugh's Meeting, London: Dr Bogue gave the Charge.

Mr. Parker was followed by John Kelly, another student from Gosport. His ordination took place on 10 April, 1817; Mr. Rooker of Tavistock offered the ordination prayer; Dr. Bogue delivered the Charge, from 1 *Peter* 4[11]; the Revs. Windeatt of Totnes, Mends of Plymouth, Griffin of Portsea, and Doney of Plymouth took part in the service.

In 1818 the meeting-house was further enlarged and entirely remodelled. The building was extended about twenty feet into the burial ground, the present worked limestone front was erected, the old gallery was taken down and the present front and side galleries constructed, and the pulpit and pews were re-arranged very much as they are at present. During his stay at Ashburton Mr. Kelly published two sermons; *Christianity Superior to Deism* (1819); and *The grave an asylum from oppression*, on the death of Queen Caroline, preached 21 August, 1821. In 1827 he removed to Ringwood, and thence to Wakefield, where he, some time afterward, "took orders" in the Episcopal Church.

Mr. Kelly left in 1827; there was a vacancy of two years in the pastorate. About this time further improvements were made, if not in the meeting-house, at least in its surroundings. Originally a block of cottages stood in front, and access to the meeting was through a passage connected with a public-house called "The North Star." In 1829 the trustees acquired a lease of these buildings; "the cottages were let in tenements and a room reserved for meetings."

T. G. Crippen.

(*To be concluded.*)