

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

## EDITORIAL

THE Editors of these *Transactions* apologize for the fact that no number has appeared since that bearing the date January 1952. Members of our Society who attended the Annual Meeting on 14 May 1952 will know that our finances were then shown to be in a parlous state and that for the time being it was not possible to issue further *Transactions*. At the Annual Meeting held on 20 May 1953 the Rev. C. E. Surman, who for twelve months had acted as Treasurer, was able to report that the considerable sum of money which had been found to be owing to the Society had been recovered. For their labours during a long period in what has been a most difficult and distressing situation, and for their eventual success in restoring to the Society the sound financial basis which it ought never to have lost, we record most grateful acknowledgement to Mr. Surman and to the Chairman of Committee, the Rev. R. F. G. Calder.

\* \* \*

The address at our Annual Meeting this year was delivered by Dr. R. Tudur Jones, Vice-Principal of Bala-Bangor Independent College. Dr. Jones is an authority on that firebrand and "metropolitan of the itinerants", Vavasor Powell, for a thesis upon whom he was awarded a D. Phil. by the University of Oxford; and from his special knowledge of the man and his interests he read the paper entitled "Vavasor Powell and the Protectorate" printed within. All present were impressed by the lecturer's learning and also charmed by the lightness with which he wore it and by his flashes of Celtic humour. Possibly not all appreciated the seriousness of his subject. To ourselves the Fifth-monarchism in which Powell and his friends believed seems a strange byway of thought; yet we are no less concerned than they with the problems arising from the relation between Christianity and government. The following passage from *Blackwood's* for January 1904 (it is quoted on p.117 of Dr. S. C. Carpenter's stimulating Pelican book, *Christianity*) is worth contemplating: "The principle of Government was constraint; the principle of Christian life was voluntary obedience; to the consistent Nonconformist Government was a *sin*". Powell's *A Word for God* was at least an effort to wrestle positively with this problem, as much so as Walter Cradock's more moderate *Humble Representation* or the still more conservative policy adumbrated by John Owen.

It was an unusual pleasure to welcome in the person of our speaker a representative of the Welsh Independents and of our sister society, Cymdeithas Hanes Annibynwyr Cymru. Dr. Jones has kindly provided the following note on the current issue of that Society's Transactions, *Y Cofiadur*: "No. 23 (March 1953) is devoted to work done by Mr. E. D. Jones, B.A., Keeper of Manuscripts at the National Library of Wales. On pp.3-10 Mr. Jones contributes a brief account of the life and work of Azariah Shadrach, a pioneer of Congregationalism in North Cardiganshire. The remainder of the issue contains a careful transcript of the Church Book of Pant-teg Church, Caermarthenshire (N.L.W. MS. 12362). This covers the period from 1690 to 1812 and, except for a few paragraphs, is written in English".

Dr. Jones also draws our attention to the magnificent Dictionary of Welsh Biography recently published by the Cymmrodorion Society at 42s., *Y Bywgraffiadur Cymreig hyd 1940*. Within a few years, it is hoped, the Dictionary will appear in English, but we understand that the English version will not be an exact translation of the original but will be still larger and more inclusive. The Cymmrodorion Society is certainly to be congratulated on the Dictionary, which has taken fifteen years to produce, as also on the high standard maintained by its *Transactions*, in which have appeared many articles on Welsh Nonconformity, often written in English. Of the Dictionary, to which he is himself a contributor, Dr. Jones writes: "That it has been edited by the late Sir John Lloyd and by Professor R. T. Jenkins is sufficient guarantee of its reliability. Since it covers the period between A.D. 400 and 1940, it includes all the most memorable leaders produced by Christian Wales. Congregationalists will find that generous space has been allotted to Independent ministers, particularly during the 18th and 19th centuries".

\* \* \*

We have all been saddened by the death of Dr. A. J. Grieve. In 1929 Dr. Grieve honoured our Society by becoming its President, and this position he held for twenty years. When, in the Society's Jubilee year, he felt it right to lay down his office, Dr. Albert Peel wrote in these pages, "The Society has had no more loyal member than Dr. Grieve"; and very many among us, ministers and laymen, whether members of the Society or not, were never left in any doubt how near to his heart lay the history of our churches, and with it the interests of our Society. A tribute by the Editor of the *Congregational Quarterly* appears in this number. Among other losses by death which the Society regrets are those of Principal E. J. Price and the Rev. T. Mardy Rees.

The news of the full rehabilitation of the Congregational Library, for which the Society pressed in May 1950, has been received with much satisfaction. This will be increased when the Library is again open. The *Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700* (Columbia Univ. Press, 1945-51, 3 vols.), by Mr. Donald Wing, of Yale University Library, which has now been completed, includes the Congregational Library in its lists of locations. This has revealed the large number of works not to be found in London, sometimes not to be found in England, except in the Congregational Library, and has thus shown the Library's great importance; it may also be expected to increase the number of applications to consult the Library made by research students, American as well as British. It is to be hoped that the Memorial Hall Trustees will not delay in working out a policy by which the Library's treasures may again become accessible, even if this requires some initial experimentation.

At Dr. Williams' Library, meanwhile, the herculean task continues of recataloguing the older works relative to the history of Nonconformity, with the result that additions to knowledge are frequently made through the discovery, or examination, of rare works. Thus *Separation yet no schisme* (1675), which is attributed by the old *British Museum Catalogue*, followed by Mr. Wing, to J.S., has been found to be a reply to a sermon by J.S. and itself to be the work (*Seperation no Schism*) attributed by Calamy, followed by Gordon in the *D.N.B.*, to Thomas Wadsworth, the ejected Curate of St. Lawrence Pountney. A commendatory epistle by John Owen not included in the list of such prefaces printed in an appendix to William Orme's *Life of Owen* has been found in a rare anonymous issue of *The Glory of Free Grace Display'd* (1680), by Stephen Lobb, soon to be minister of the Congregational church worshiping in Fetter Lane, in which Lobb defends Congregationalists from the charge of Antinomianism. Among Congregational ministers to whom no publication has been attributed hitherto is Comfort Starr, the ejected Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle; from internal evidence it may now be suggested that *The Truth and Excellence of the Christian Religion* (1685) was written by Starr. These are but three out of many examples which could be given of the discoveries which have been made.

\* \* \*

The place taken by Nonconformity in several recent topographical works may be noted with satisfaction. The Royal Commission on Historical Monuments now extends its attention to buildings erected later than 1714 and consequently includes, and illustrates, Nonconformist meeting-houses, as in the latest volume, that on West Dorset. In the more modest but informative "Buildings of England"

series (published by Penguin Books) Nonconformist churches and chapels are noticed likewise : in the volume entitled *Middlesex* (1951) Dr. Nikolaus Pevsner mentions six Congregational churches, commenting on Whetstone church, " An odd specimen of its date and of the fanciful leanings of the Congregationalists about 1900 ". The Victoria County Histories are also to give the history of Nonconformity more serious attention. In the forthcoming volume on Wiltshire the subject has been entrusted to the hands of Dr. E. A. Payne and of Dr. Marjorie Reeves, a Fellow of St. Anne's College, Oxford, who bears a name honoured for generations among Wiltshire Baptists.

\* \* \*

An event of importance in the last twelve months was the appearance of the late Bernard Manning's work, *The Protestant Dissenting Deputies* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 50s.). To comment moderately, or even fairly, on this volume, is difficult. Gratitude for the immense labour bestowed on it by Manning and, since his death, by Mr. Ormerod Greenwood is at odds with regret for the bitterness in much of Manning's writing and for the carelessness in much of Mr. Greenwood's editing. In the story of the struggle of those Presbyterians who had become Unitarian to retain their historic name, chapels and trust funds it is worth while to re-read R. W. Dale and John Stoughton : both are much calmer and more generous in their judgment than Manning. It is a pity that Manning's work was not edited by someone more " in the tradition " than Mr. Greenwood, or, if that was not possible, by someone who would have taken pains to avoid the inaccuracies over names of persons and places which mar the book throughout. Even less excusable is Mr. Greenwood's failure to indicate what is Manning's work and what his own. Honesty compels these strictures : the book must be treated with great care, if the reader is not to go astray. Yet, when all is said, it remains a vast collection of original material, largely drawn from MS. sources, on an unusual and important aspect of our history, and we are grateful.

\* \* \*

The Friends' Historical Society has shown a notable generosity in its recognition of contributions to Quaker history by one who is not himself a Friend in its election of Dr. G. F. Nuttall as President for the year 1953, the Society's Jubilee year. Invitations will gladly be sent to any members of our own Society who would care to be present at Friends House on 1 October for his Presidential Address, " James Nayler : a fresh approach ".

## Alexander James Grieve

A. J. GRIEVE passed from us as one who embarks upon a ship that draws slowly away from harbour, sets course for the open sea and gradually declines from our view until it sinks below the horizon. In 1943 he completed his term of 21 years as Principal of Lancashire College and went to be minister of the church at Cavendish, Suffolk, where he and his people were singularly happy. In 1950 he resigned that charge and passed into the more complete retirement that failing health made necessary. But his pastoral interest in men and events remained to the end and was shown in his occasional attendance at meetings and in his letters, and last of all his postcards, always written with his own hand, which went out to the ends of the earth. He left many who are his debtors until they shall have done for others something of what he did for them.

It is hoped to associate with a memorial at Lancashire College which is under consideration a Memoir for which material is being assembled by our Secretary, the Rev. Charles Surman. This will recall something of the richness of his personality and gifts to those of us who knew him well and will explain to others why we cherish his memory. But our Society owed so much to his Presidency from 1929 to 1949 that it is fitting we should add our own stone to the cairn.

Grieve was a scholar whose life-long interests were centred in and about the Bible. Was there ever a public speech he made that was not enriched by references and quotations, always apt, often unexpected, which not seldom sent his hearers back to search their English Bibles? In his student days he took brilliant degrees in English, which he taught in India, in theology and in history, at Aberystwyth, Mansfield and Berlin. Most of his professorial life he devoted to the New Testament and Church History. This was an inevitable development of his early academic work, for all through his busy life he was never less than a minister of the Gospel. He sought no ivory tower of academic seclusion, nor in hard times was he ever content to cultivate his garden. The Gospel of the grace of God in Christ was the supreme gift to the world of men, and he was its minister. So what he learned and wrote in his study was meant to proclaim the Gospel here and now; the heart of it lay in the New Testament and its ever living power was shown in the history of the Church.

Probably most of his best work was done during his principalship of Lancashire College to which he was called from Edinburgh in 1922. W. H. Bennett, his predecessor (may his name be praised!), had died

unexpectedly after seeing the College through the very difficult years of the Great War, when the building had been taken over by the military authorities for use as a nurses' hostel: the few men who remained were housed elsewhere and the remnant that returned after the exile had lost much and gained little by their experiences as detached students in the sparsely populated University of Manchester. A strong leader was needed: competent in administration and discipline to guide governors and men; of scholarly standing to maintain the high repute of the College as part of the University of Manchester and a place of theological learning; of Christian grace and human interest in the churches of the North-West whence the College drew its strength and to which it gave essential service. These diverse needs were met in Grieve as they could have been in few men at that time. Under him the College was built up again in numbers and repute, and was never more closely linked to the life of the university and city of Manchester, the churches of Lancashire and the denomination as a whole.

While this practical work of rebuilding and reorganizing was going on and Grieve was himself taking a full part in the work of the denomination and in the educational life of Manchester—he was for years a member of its Education Authority—he was busy in his study. Mr. Surman, his son-in-law, has told us that a major work for which he had accumulated material for many years was, for some reason that appeared good to him, never completed. To us, who cannot estimate the validity of his reasons, this seems only loss, for a major work must surely have revealed the real quality of his mind and heart as no lesser literary works, however numerous, can do. He himself, I think, was content to live in the hearts of his friends, the men he had trained for the ministry and the churches he had served. Indeed, his literary remains, so far as they are known to me, are meagre. Most familiar is his work on the New Testament section of *Peake's Commentary* which he edited and to which he issued the *Supplement* in 1936, and contributions to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Of his historical work curiously little seems to have survived. These include his contribution to *Essays Congregational and Catholic* (ed. A. Peel, 1931), "Congregationalism's Contribution to Theology", with its useful bibliography; a lecture delivered at Emmanuel Church, Cambridge, in celebration of its 250th anniversary, published in *Congregationalism through the Centuries* (ed. H. C. Carter, 1937); and other essays in literary and religious journals. We may hope that fuller information will be given us in the projected Memoir. Grieve's interest in individual churches is shown in his address at the Bicentenary Commemoration of Carr's Lane Church, Birmingham and published in the *Carr's Lane Journal* for 1948: in his share in the history of Congregationalism in Bury St. Edmunds, *These Three*

*Hundred Years* (1946); and in a brochure entitled *Lancashire Independent College, 1843-1943*.

His work for and with this Society, which he joined in 1903 immediately upon his return from India and of which he was a life member till his death, is in part, but only in part, illustrated by the papers and reviews which appeared in its *Transactions* between 1917 and 1952. No record remains of the encouragement he gave to many students of Congregational history, notably Albert Peel, who came under his influence and direction as a student of Yorkshire Independent College where Grieve was then teaching—it was the beginning of a rich and life-long friendship.

In his earlier years Grieve's published work was chiefly literary. He edited, with introductions, several volumes in the "Temple Classics" for Messrs. Dent, including Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution*, More's *Utopia* and Scott's *Old Mortality*: he also edited for the "Everyman" edition Macaulay's *Critical and Historical Essays*. His lecture notes, occasional papers and other manuscripts he destroyed a little while before his death.

So we are left with little in print to call to mind one who served his Lord with all his heart and soul and strength and mind. But for many years wherever those who knew him come together there will be stories of his reproofs and commendations, his wisdom and his wit, and any who thought him difficult will be surprised that among his own men all had a deep respect for his authority of mind and spirit, but all spoke of him with deep, if sometimes rueful, affection as 'Sandy'. (Once, in class, a student called his attention to what he considered an inadequate translation of a Hebrew word in the first edition of the *Commentary*—"Yes, yes, my boy", he replied, "spots on the sun, spots on the sun.")

He acknowledged that he had not the philosophic mind. He would pursue neither men nor events into speculative metaphysical regions. He was essentially a 'plain' man, though uncommonly shrewd, a wayfaring man, though very far indeed from being a fool, and the Gospel of the love of God was meant for such. So he understood it and so he proclaimed it. Of his pastoral care for his own men, for all old Lancashire men and indeed for all Congregational ministers of his wide acquaintance, much could be written. He was of Scottish descent, though born and brought up in Pembrokeshire, 'Little England beyond Wales', and educated first at home and secondly at school and college. "I was a boy of the Book", he said once to a questioner who had commented on his extraordinary facility in Biblical quotation, "a Psalm had to be learnt and repeated to my father every Sunday." Made familiar with the Bible at home: made free of English literature in College—that is a kind of education that was

typical of Wales in his day and generation. It helped to make him what he was—a Christian and a Free Churchman. There are other fields where men may gather wisdom and power. The Greeks offer their discipline to exercise the minds of men and their speculations to send them out to explore the illimitable. But the Bible and the English poets made Grieve.

J. MILLS PHILLIPS.

\* \* \*

The following have been gratefully received :—

- Cheadle Congregational Church*, by Dr. A. R. Hunter.  
*The Local Growth of Nonconformity and a Short History of the Dawlish Congregational Church*, by the Rev. Dennis R. Friend.  
*Guestwick-Briston, 1652-1952*.  
*Nether Congregational Church, Sheffield*.  
*The Mary Westby Charity*, by Mr. Bertram Hammond.

The *Baptist Quarterly* for Oct. 1952 prints articles by Dr. E. A. Payne on "Michael Sattler and the Schleithem Confession" and by Jean A. Smallbone on "Matthew Arnold and the Nonconformists".

The *Proceedings* of the Wesley Historical Society for March 1952 contains a contribution by J. Dayson Crosland on "The Bedfordshire Association: an early ecumenical movement".

The *Journal* of the Friends' Historical Society (xliv.2) includes an essay by Beatrice Saxon Snell on "The Devotional Life of Early Friends".

Dr. R. S. Paul promises for our next number a review of two further posthumous works by Dr. Albert Peel, his edition of *Tracts ascribed to Richard Bancroft* and his edition of *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*.

---

## Vavasor Powell and the Protectorate

THE Independents, whether they be considered as a political faction or as a body of religious opinion, included very diverse elements.

As is not infrequently the case with successful revolutionary movements, this diversity increased as the period of struggle drew to a close. But they were all agreed that they had supported Cromwell and taken up arms in the Civil Wars, to defend their liberty. The execution of the King was a regrettable necessity, in view of the serious threat he represented to the liberties of the nation. Similarly, the ousting of the Presbyterians from their position of superiority in Parliament was another necessary safeguard for the liberty of the people. This was the only way in which the country could be freed. It was, however, not an easy matter to decide how best to act once liberty and peace were achieved. The discordant voices, muted during the course of the great struggle, now became strident. Cromwell acceded to the demand of one wing of his supporters when he called the Nominated Parliament. This had a peculiarly close connection with the Independent churches of the country, and represented the culminating point in the campaign of the Fifth-monarchists for political control. This body may well have been a collection of excellent individuals, but it soon demonstrated its utter inefficiency as a parliament. When it became apparent to the members of this parliament that they could do nothing better than resign both their power and their authority into the hands of Cromwell, he must have realised that he would have to face bitter opposition from the Fifth-monarchists throughout the country, if he abandoned the experiment of allowing the Saints to rule.

Cromwell however, went further than that. He not only dissolved the Saints' Parliament, but he decided to accept the suggestion that he should take supreme power into his own hands. The precise title which he took was that of Lord Protector. He was installed Lord Protector on December 16, 1653, and formally proclaimed on Monday, December 19.

The reactions of the Fifth-monarchists can be studied in the career of Vavasor Powell at this point.

Powell was no newcomer to this party. He had been for the last three years a close associate of Major-General Harrison, and had

joined in the agitation in both Wales and London on behalf of the claims of the Fifth-monarchy. He believed in common with the Millenarians in the near approach of the second coming of Christ. This belief implied the urgent duty of preparing the way for the coming King. The Saints must endeavour to get the reins of government into their own hands, in addition to intensifying the work of propagating the Gospel. All earthly kingship was drawing towards its inevitable end, and the removal of Charles I was a sinister symbol of this. Hence the party with which Powell was associated were Republicans to a man.

Towards the end of November 1653 trouble was already brewing. The Fifth-monarchists held their meetings with regularity at Blackfriars. There, we are told, their preachers at this time spoke "against the present government, but especially against his excellency [*i.e.* Cromwell], calling him the man of sin, the old dragon, and many other scripture ill names".<sup>1</sup> The authorities were forced to take notice of these preachers, and after a weekly Monday lecture (possibly that of November 28), some of them, including their ring-leader, the intrepid Christopher Feake, were placed under arrest. When brought before Cromwell he explained that "it was his [*i.e.* Cromwell's] tampering with the King and his assuming exorbitant power, which made these disorders".<sup>2</sup> Cromwell remained unruffled and, after giving them a warning, he set them free.

If Cromwell was not the type of man to be alarmed by Christopher Feake, neither was Feake the type of man to take his orders from Cromwell. On Sunday, December 18, Feake joined with Powell to make a public attack on Cromwell. Their attack in its doctrinal aspect was based four-square on the Fifth-monarchy presuppositions; but on the practical side it was an attack on Cromwell's honesty. He had broken his word. "Vavasor Powell and Feake . . . called him the dissembleingst (*sic*) perjured villaine in the world . . ."<sup>3</sup>

On the Monday, December 19, Cromwell was formally proclaimed and Hugh Courtney, writing to Daniel Lloyd on the day following, says ". . . yesterday he was proclaimed with some pomp, not pleasing to many beholders, and much to my particular trouble in this whole business, Mr. Powell is very hearty, high and heavenly . . ."<sup>4</sup>

To realize exactly how hearty, high and heavenly Mr. Powell was, we must see what happened the previous night at Blackfriars. The Monday evening meeting was addressed by four people. The first, "who was very moderate", was the minister of Shoreditch. Then came Christopher Feake, who preached on the little horn from *Daniel*

<sup>1</sup> J. Thurloe, *State Papers*, i.621.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* For Feake, see *D.N.B.*

<sup>3</sup> Thurloe, i.641.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, i.639 f.

vii, and ended his argument by emphasising the failure of the little horn as described in vv.26, 27. He insisted that he was not naming anyone, but the little horn could hardly be mistaken for anyone but Cromwell, particularly when he went out of his way to correct those who thought that King Charles was the little horn.

Powell was not as delicate as Feake. He preached from *Daniel* xi.20, 21. The King of the North is taken to be Charles I; then a collector of taxes shall appear only to be destroyed in a few days; and that 'neither in anger nor in battle'—or as Powell interprets it, "a small matter should fetch him down, with little noise". "And here he took occasion to inveigh bitterly against the great commanders, as if they were the sole cause of taxes." The vile person of verse 21 "he applied in a most pernicious manner to the present time". He interprets "them that forsake the holy covenant" (v.30) as those who have gone back on their principles. The phrase "And arms shall stand on his part" (v.31) is taken to mean "the great army men and swordsmen" who support him. *Daniel*, as far as Powell could see, had prophesied only too clearly the course of events in 1653. But the particular application of the exegesis was to come. The sermon culminated in these words:—

Lord, have our army men all apostatized from their principles? What is become of all their declarations, protestations, and professions? Are they choked with lands, parks and manors? Let us go home and pray, and say Lord wilt Thou have Oliver Cromwell or Jesus Christ to reign over us? I know there are many gracious souls in the army, and of good principles, but the greater they grow, the more they are corrupted with lands and honours. I'll tell you a common proverb that we had among us of the General, that in the field he was the graciousest and most gallant man in the world, but out of the field, and when he came home to government, the worst.

Such an outburst could not hope to escape the attention of the authorities, and possibly Powell was desirous of provoking Cromwell to some action against them. In any case the next point he makes reveals his fears that they would be refused permission to meet at Blackfriars and he adds:—

but then . . . we can meet at another, and if we be driven from thence, we will meet at private houses, and if we cannot have liberty there, we will unto the fields; and if we be driven from thence, we will into corners; for we shall never give over, and God will not permit this spirit to go down, but will be the support of the spirits of his people.

<sup>1</sup> *Daniel*, xi.20.

After an interruption from the gallery Mr. Cockaine preached, and then the meeting drew to a close.<sup>1</sup>

Even Powell's apologists in Wales were at a loss to explain and justify this outburst, when they attempted to defend their hero from the calumnies of Alexander Griffith. The only thing they could say was that Cromwell preferred Powell's criticism to Griffith's friendship—a very moot point!<sup>2</sup>

On December 21, being the Wednesday, Powell and Feake were arrested on warrants signed by the Lord President of the Council,<sup>3</sup> and Thomas Harrison was also taken into custody.<sup>4</sup> After an enquiry, Powell and Feake were imprisoned and Harrison deprived of his commission. The Monday night meetings at Blackfriars were to cease, according to order issued on Thursday, December 22. Powell's imprisonment did not last long, for, together with Feake, he was released on Christmas Eve.<sup>5</sup> Powell was never disposed to hold his peace at the behest of any government, and therefore took the opportunity of addressing a congregation on Christmas Day.<sup>6</sup> On January 9, Powell preached at Christ Church, but his fellow-countryman, William Erbury, assures us that he had changed his tune, and was urging his brethren "to meddle no more with *civil matters*, but to speak of *spiritual glories*, which he held forth in the *Reign of Christ, and his Saints with him on Earth*".<sup>7</sup> However, it was too late for Powell to propound peaceable discourses, for the government informers seem to have reported unfavourably on his speech and on January 10 a warrant was issued for his arrest.<sup>8</sup> Unruffled at this threat, Powell succeeded in addressing meetings at both Christ Church and Blackfriars, before making good his escape to Wales.<sup>9</sup>

This point marks the parting of the ways between the more conservative Independents, who felt that the only way to preserve order was to support Cromwell in his assumption of the Protectorate, and those Independents who were prepared to carry the Revolution a step further. In Powell's career, it marks the end of any co-operation on his part with government authorities with a view to settling the religious problem.

In Wales, Powell was soon hard at work organizing opposition. He threw himself with his customary energy into the task. On Friday, February 10, in company with John Williams and Morris

<sup>1</sup> Condensed from *Cal. State Papers Dom.*, xlii.304 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For George Cokayn, R. of St. Pancras, Soper Lane, see *D.N.B.: Cal. Rev.*

<sup>3</sup> *Vavasoris Examen* (1654), p.29, in answer to Griffith's *Strena Vavasoriensis*, p.13.

<sup>4</sup> Council Order Books, quoted by John Stoughton, *History of Religion in England*, ii.69, n.†.

<sup>5</sup> Thurloe, i.641.

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. State Pap. Dom.*, 1653/4, p.309.

<sup>7</sup> J. H. Davies, introd. to *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd*, ii.lxxviii f.

<sup>8</sup> William Erbury, *Testimony*, pp.186 f.

<sup>9</sup> *Cal. State Pap. Dom.*, 1653/4, p.309.

<sup>9</sup> *Faithful Scout*, Jan. 27—Feb. 3, 1653/4; *Cal. State Pap. Dom.* 1653/4, p.353.

Griffiths, he was preaching at Llanddewi Brefi in Cardiganshire. Williams made no bones about his opposition to Cromwell, and he recalled that he and his fellow-members of "the last parliament made an act, that there should be no king or protector in England; and that it was treason for to name or proclaim any protector in England by reason that they had made a statute against it". Powell reiterated his determination that he would "never submit to any government but that which is according to God's word".<sup>1</sup>

By February 26, John Williams and Powell were back in New Radnor. Amongst the auditors on this occasion were the High Sheriff and four county magistrates. Williams again spoke with vehemence against the new order, but Powell was more moderate, and contented himself with urging his hearers to persevere "to the death".<sup>2</sup> Powell, after all, was by no means the hasty fanatic he is sometimes represented as being. He possessed deeply held convictions, and spared no energy in defending and propagating them. But he was sagacious. One indication of his very real power in Central Wales at this time is the interesting complaint in the intercepted letters that "noe man dare send uppe any charge against him" because the new justices of the peace were both his supporters and members of his church. The consequence was that they and the High Sheriff followed "him from place to place" on his speaking tours.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, Morgan Llwyd came down from Wrexham to assist in the campaign.<sup>4</sup>

Those who were disposed to be suspicious found material in plenty to justify their fears. If Powell and his henchmen said such wild things in public, what did they not say in the private meetings of the church? And why was Richard Powell "repairing and scouring his pistols" and setting them in order at the smithy in Ffynnongynid? It was no surprise that such a man should refuse to read the Acts sent down from London.<sup>5</sup> Others besides Richard Powell were polishing their pistols, for it was reported that people sympathetic to Vavasor were gathering at "Kingston and elsewhere", though as yet only in "small parties". And was it not known that Vavasor himself had ridden three horses to death in one night?<sup>7</sup> What was this business that demanded such haste, unless it was insurrection? But the would-be revolutionaries did not despise more democratic and peaceful means of promoting their cause, for there was a petition set on foot in the Spring of 1654. This petition was countenanced by the magistrates and the High Sheriff, and involved some corres-

<sup>1</sup> J. Phillips to John Gunter in Thurloe, ii.93.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Holle to Alexander Griffith in Thurloe, ii.128.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Lloyd to Mr. Henry (= Alexander) Griffith in Thurloe, ii.124.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Roberts to John Gunter, *ibid.*, p.129.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p.124.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, p.93.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, p.128—March 2, 1653/4.

pondence which fell into the eager hands of Vavasor Powell's adversary, Alexander Griffith.<sup>1</sup>

But the activity came to a sudden stop on April 11, for on that day fourteen people, with Powell at their head, were ordered to appear at the Montgomery assizes as signatories of a petition. We have no means of knowing what happened to them, for a year passes before we hear anything of Powell's activities. And when we see him again, he seems to have performed a surprising *volte-face*. The Spring of 1655 was the period of Royalist unrest, and in consequence a time of anxiety for the Protectorate. A party of Royalists were in North Wales under the leadership of Colonel Macowen. They moved southwards until they were almost in Welshpool, and who should repulse them there but Vavasor Powell? It appears that he had some prior information of this intended revolt, and had sent warning to the Wrexham reserves. The battle seems to have been very much in the hands of Powell, who drawing his men up for the attack, "and dividing them into three Bodies, drew forth a Forlorn Hope, charging himself in the van of them, and three times forced his passage through and through, till at last he received some small hurt . . ." After a momentary retreat, he was reinforced by the Wrexham reserve, and "he again charged with so puissant a courage and magnanimity of the spirit, that the Enemy was no way able to resist his furious onset, but immediately declined engagement, and betook themselves to flight . . ."<sup>2</sup> In the rout he took 130 prisoners.

This episode tells us something about Powell. It shows where his deepest allegiance lay. There was no question of his sympathizing with the Royalists, and there is little doubt that Cromwell knew this quite well and was prepared to deal leniently at all times with the restless Powell. But the episode also suggests why a careful eye had to be kept on Powell. He had the support of some kind of armed force, and the ready assistance of some, at least, of the inhabitants of Central Wales. The reports of the informers had not been completely misleading. And in a letter addressed to John Rogers early in 1655, there was optimistic talk of "twenty thousand saints in Wales ready to hazard their blood in defence of their cause."<sup>3</sup> This episode also probably explains why no action followed the summons sent to Powell to appear before the Council of State early in 1655.<sup>4</sup> After all, a man who had performed such signal service could not be called to book by the Protectorate he had helped to defend, whatever his past indiscretions may have been.

<sup>1</sup> *ibid.*, p.174—March 17, 1653/4.

<sup>2</sup> *A true and full Relation of The great Rising in the North and West of England For The King of Scots* (London, 1655), p.4.

<sup>3</sup> J. H. Davies, introd. to *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd*, ii.lxx.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*

It soon became apparent that Powell had not set aside his objections to the Protectorate. James Berry, the Major-General for Wales, reports to Thurloe on November 17, 1655 that Powell had been to Worcester. Sometime during the next few days Berry interviewed Powell and told him that the Protector had wind of "some design" that was afoot in Wales, and that he expected Powell to give some account of it. Powell insisted that he and his friends were not concerned in any design "that tended to put things to distraction", and that he would rather "suffer any death" than take part in any such things. He admitted that they were preparing a petition to be presented to the Protector, the purpose of which was to move the heart of the Protector and to publish their dissatisfaction with him. The latter purpose sounded ominous to Berry, but Powell warned him that, if he were imprisoned, the Royalists would rejoice, and the saints would send up a torrent of prayer against the ruling powers. Berry admitted the seriousness of displeasing the saints, but at the same time if he felt that he was doing his duty then he would trust in Providence for protection. He expected the support of such people as Powell. He granted Powell permission to preach on the Sunday following at Worcester, and the preacher delivered himself of four honest and sober sermons. That Sunday evening, Powell dined with the Major-General, and on parting assured him that "it was neither his purpose or practice to preach anything tending to factions".<sup>1</sup>

Between this Sunday and the end of the month, the petition was presented to Cromwell. Berry continued to treat the matter lightly, and (like many statesmen in subsequent generations) explained it as an example of Celtic exuberance: "Pray you beare a little with our Brittish zeale. A little more understanding would do us noe harme in those parts".<sup>2</sup> But when Berry saw a copy of the petition, he was taken aback to find "soe unhansome a thing" from Powell and his supporters.<sup>3</sup>

The document in question bore the title *A WORD for GOD, or a testimony on truth's behalf, from several churches, and diverse hundreds of Christians in Wales (and some few adjacent) against wickednesse in high places, with a letter to the lord general Cromwell.* It was, not unnaturally, greeted with joy in some circles, and it achieved a wide circulation in London,<sup>4</sup> in Ireland and throughout the Commonwealth.<sup>5</sup> It was read by Cornet Day and John Sympson to "a meeting of over 500 persons" at All Hallows the Great. In consequence Day was

<sup>1</sup> Thurloe, iv.211 and 228.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p.272.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, pp.393-4.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, p.373.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p.505.

arrested, but Sympson made good his escape.<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps no wonder that Powell was "likewise in custody concerning it,"<sup>2</sup> though we have no further information about his imprisonment.

The document opens by expressing the feeling of the petitioners that the "good things covenanted and contended for" in the great Rebellion have been betrayed. Cromwell's assumption of the Protectorate has led many of his supporters to suspect his past intentions, "and his actions for the future". They therefore urge him to consider his actions as one who will one day give answer before the judgment-seat of God, to whom all our intentions are known. The petition proper contains two sections. The first is an apologia on behalf of the petitioners. Just as the War was a witnessing against the superstitions of prelacy, so is this petition a witnessing on behalf of conscience. Already the Acts passed against "Kingly government" are being forgotten, and those who were eager to pass such Acts in times gone by are equally eager now to betray them. The second section gives a list of grievances. The Old Cause is betrayed and in consequence many of God's people are in prison. Heavy taxes are continued, and many of the vices which were condemned under the monarchy such as "the receiving of honours, profits, customs, benefits, tenths" and the "exalting of sons, servants, friends and favourites" continue unabated. All this means that the people have overthrown one unrighteous government in order to exalt another equally unrighteous one, which, certainly, was not their intention. The petitioners, in conclusion, disclaim any participation in the works of the present rulers. Then follow their names—322 in all.

This petition provides us with an indication of the nature and extent of Powell's following. The bulk of the signatories come from Central Wales, from Montgomery, Brecon and Radnor. In addition there is a substantial section from Wrexham, though the supposition<sup>3</sup> that the great Morgan Llwyd was a signatory must now be abandoned in the face of newly-discovered evidence.<sup>4</sup> Some of the subscribers came from Monmouthshire, and Jeffrey Parry of Rhydolion in Caernarvonshire appended his name. It is possible that the John Williams who signed is Parry's neighbour of Tyncoed, Caernarvonshire.<sup>5</sup> The most striking name amongst the signatories is that of Richard Baxter. But the supposition that the great Kidderminster pastor supported Vavasor Powell at this juncture will hardly bear examination. True enough, Richard Baxter was Catholic in his

<sup>1</sup> *The Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth, iii.62—December 22, 1655.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> e.g. by T. Richards, *Religious Developments in Wales*, p.219; J. H. Davies, introd. to *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd*, ii.lxxx.

<sup>4</sup> National Library of Wales, MS. 11, 436D.

<sup>5</sup> For these and the other Welshmen named in this paper reference may now be made to the authoritative *Bywgraffiadau Cynreig* (1953).

sympathies, and was not above criticizing the Protector's policy. But there is no corroborating evidence of Baxter's sympathy with Powell, and there is definite evidence that he considered Powell and his itinerant preachers to be "certainly worse than False Prophets".<sup>1</sup> Moreover, there was a Richard Baxter amongst the conventiclers of Llanllwchaearn and Llandyssil in 1668-9<sup>2</sup> who had listened to Powell preaching at Manafon<sup>3</sup> and who would be far more likely to sign a petition of this kind than the Puritan of Kidderminster. So, it may be concluded that Powell had no widespread support, except in the area where his ministry was most felt. On the other hand, since his supporters numbered many Congregationalists, Miss L. F. Brown's belief that the Fifth-monarchy Movement in Wales "was generally considered a Baptist one"<sup>4</sup> finds no support in the evidence.

In fact, the Puritans of Wales were firmly behind the Protector. Their loyalty was demonstrated in a counter-petition, whose main inspirer was Walter Cradock, the leader of the moderate Independents in Wales. This bore the title, *The Humble REPRESENTATION and ADDRESS to His Highness of several Churches and Christians in SOUTH-WALES, and MONMOUTH-Shire*. A study of the 762 signatures reveals the strength of the wing opposed to Powell. Besides Cradock, Richard Charnock, Henry Walter, Rice Williams, Edmund Ellis, Henry Nichols, Marmaduke Matthews and Peregrine Phillips were amongst the distinguished leaders of Welsh Puritanism who added their names. They held sway mostly in the counties of Caermarthen, Glamorgan and Monmouth, where Powell had very little influence.

Although Powell never wavered in his faith in the Millenarian creed, *A Word for God* marks the beginning of the end as regards any hope he may have had of organizing opposition to Cromwell in Wales. We hear from a letter which was written by Sir Richard Pryse from Gogerddan to his father-in-law Bulstrode Whitelocke that Powell addressed a meeting of "at least four hundred persons out of seven or eight severall countyes of Wales" in the neighbourhood of Llanbadarnfawr, Cards., in June 1656;<sup>5</sup> but this was the last appearance of the movement as an organized campaign.

This attempt to organize opposition to Oliver Cromwell tells us much about the religious life of Wales at this period, and even more about its central character, Vavasor Powell. We see a lively Independency in the border country of Central Wales, and we may note also that the peculiar tenets of the Fifth-monarchists had received a welcome

<sup>1</sup> Anon., *A Winding-Sheet for Mr. Baxter's Dead*, p.9.

<sup>2</sup> *Original Records*, ed. G. Lyon Turner, i.3, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *v. Examen*, p.20.

<sup>4</sup> L. F. Brown, *Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men*, p.203.

<sup>5</sup> Thurloe, v.112.

amongst them. The profound interest in public affairs, a feature which Independency has never lost, is seen at its keenest. But at the same time, we can discern a lack of staying power in the agitators. It can be shown that many of the leading supporters of *A Word for God* were soon prepared to accept ecclesiastical appointments at the hands of the authority they had protested so much against. Powell himself stands out clearly in the drama. His restless energy and uncompromising religious idealism are evident in the ceaseless wandering to and fro and in the pages of *A Word for God*. His unreadiness to acquiesce in the deeds of any government authority which he did not approve is obvious. At the same time, he shows a lack of diplomacy and moderation, which is the very antithesis of the spirit shown by Cradock. He pursued his objective, even at the cost of splitting the Puritan movement in Wales. Neither treasured friendships nor awe for constituted authority nor the welfare of the churches deterred him from serving the cause to which he felt himself drawn. This was one of the factors which put him in the front rank of the first generation of Welsh Independents. And Independency will be lost, if ever the day dawns when it fails to produce men who are prepared to put the demands of conscience above all others.

R. TUDUR JONES.

---

## The Controversy concerning Kneeling in the Lord's Supper—after 1604.

THE code of Canons framed by Convocation in 1604, and given royal authority in the same year, brought to a head the Puritan opposition to the imposition of human ceremonies in worship, and gave rise to a small but significant Nonconformist movement among certain sections of the Anglican clergy—a movement which had increasingly close links with those who had already adopted the Separatist way. The Canons, which still form the basis of Anglican ecclesiastical law, although in the main based on previous enactments—being drawn from the old canon law, the medieval English contribution thereto, and more general legislation of the Western Church—contained much which was new, much that bore the distinctive marks of the age. It was certain of these latter additions which gave rise to the revolt referred to.

Even before 1604 certain ceremonies in worship had occasioned considerable debate, *viz.*, kneeling in the act of receiving the Holy Communion,<sup>1</sup> the wearing of the cope and surplice, and the use of the Cross in Baptism; but these ceremonies had been accorded no formal canonical sanction. When the Canons demanded subscription, some of the Puritan clergy rebelled, and the result was a bitter pamphlet war waged both within the establishment and also between Anglican apologists and those who had already taken the Separatist position.

The battle began in the diocese of Lincoln, with the submission to the King by a group of clergy of an apology for their refusal to subscribe (this work will be considered below), and was taken up later in the dioceses of Exeter and Chester. Meanwhile, there came from Amsterdam pamphlets written by such men as William Bradshaw and William Ames. Most of the contestants dealt with the ceremonies in general. In this paper attention is confined to that part of the controversy which dealt with the posture in receiving the elements at the Holy Communion. (In passing it may be noted that the number of

<sup>1</sup> cf. *A Parte of a Register* (1593), p.410: "But kneeling at the Communion is voide either of commandment or example out of the worde: so let them shew either the one or the other out of it if they can, and then we will yeeld; nay rather in the celebration of the sacraments of the old and new Testament, wee shall never see this gesture either comanded by God himself, or enjoyned or used by the godlie ones . . . Therefore this kneeling is not to be used at the receiving of the Communion."

clergy deposed as a result of this controversy is variously estimated as about 50 by the Laudian historian Peter Heylyn, and as about 300—400 by the Puritan writer John Burgess.)

William Bradshaw,<sup>2</sup> one of the most vigorous pamphleteers of the age, was soon in the field with a brief work.<sup>3</sup> Bradshaw had been much influenced by Cartwright during his years at Cambridge, and had frequently been in trouble during the days of Whitgift and Bancroft for his refusal to subscribe to the ceremonies. Although not technically a Separatist, he yet insisted on the autonomy of individual congregations. His attack on the ceremonies was short: "a certaine printed libell, of not above two sheetes of paper", as an opponent describes it, "published I wot not by whom, and printed I know not where, but doubtlesse beyond the sea (for the printer wanted an English corrector)".<sup>4</sup>

Bradshaw deals briefly but comprehensively with several of the main Puritan objections to kneeling at Holy Communion. In the first place he argues, and here he is at one with almost all who opposed the Canons, that, "kneeling is contrarie to the example of Christ, and his Apostles, who ministred and received sitting, or in such a gesture, as in those countryes was most used at eating. From which example to differ, without warrant from Gods word cannot be without fault".<sup>5</sup> This kind of argument is typical of the controversial literature of the 17th century, with its appeal to the letter of Scripture for guidance for both the form and the content of Christian life and worship. As it is clearly stated in Scripture that Christ and his disciples sat (or, at least, reclined) at the Last Supper, it appeared self-evident to the Puritan mind that it must be a sin not to follow that example. Furthermore, Bradshaw asserts later that, as Christ sat down after rising to wash the Apostles' feet, it was clear that the sitting was *intentional*, it was an explicit example.

Consequently, kneeling at the Communion must be a mere human institution. "It is to be understood, that, howsoever Kneeling may (in itself considered) be esteemed a naturall gesture of the body, as standing, sitting etc., yet in this case, it is by Institution of man. For neither nature nor custome, doth teach us ordinarily to knele when we eate and drinke neither doth the word require Kneeling in this case".<sup>6</sup> The practice of the Separatists, as of the more radical Puritans, was to sit as they received the Elements, which were carried from one to another. Some supporters of kneeling argued that it was a matter of indifference whether the receivers knelt or sat, but in

<sup>2</sup> 1571—1618: cf. *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s.v.

<sup>3</sup> *A Proposition concerning Kneeling in the very act of receiving* (1605).

<sup>4</sup> T. Rogers, *Two Dialogues*, Preface.

<sup>5</sup> *A Proposition* . . . , p.7.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, p. 5.

reply to this Bradshaw falls back upon the example of Christ, asking why he sat, if kneeling was equally, or more, fitting.

Turning from the Gospels to the letters of St. Paul, Bradshaw finds in the apostle's objection to the misuse of the Agape at Corinth (*cf. 1 Cor. xi.22 f.*) another argument against kneeling: "—if the Apostle banished Love feastes from the Lords Supper, because of the abuse, and brought the Church to the simplicities of the first institution, Is it not a tempting sinne to retaine the Idolatrous kneeling of Papistes, and reject the exemplary sitting of our Master Christ?" The word *tempting* here points to one of the strongest underlying reasons for the Puritan opposition to kneeling. It was a temptation to idolatry, for it was too much like the adoration of the host at the Roman Mass. "How can wee imagine, that Christ hath any honor by our kneeling?" Bradshaw continues, "Seeing that it swarveth from the practice of all reformed Churches except in England, which the Papistes themselves call Puritan—papistically".<sup>7</sup> The reforming zeal of earlier days was not dead, Papacy was still a real enemy to be countered at every turn, and any trace of Popery gave rise to violent reactions. To dub a ceremony Papist was to damn it out of hand.

Bradshaw puts the position with clarity and with point. "if kneeling be instituted for reverence in regard of bread and wine, it must be either because they represent the body and bloud of Christ, . . . or, because Christ is really, bodily and locally, though invisibly, present in them, either by Transubstantiation . . . or by consubstantiation . . . but in regard of a reall, and bodily presence, a sound protestant should infer, But I detest your reall presence, therefore I abhorre your Idolatrous kneeling. We are to abhorre kneeling . . . because it is the shew of the greatest evils that ever were, viz. Idolatry in worshipping a god made of a piece of bread".<sup>8</sup> As kneeling had come to be associated with the adoration of the sacramental elements on Roman altars, it could hardly be used without danger; for it was a standing temptation to idolatry. In fact, the writer concludes, "It may be averred, that kneeling in the very acte of Taking, eating, and drinking the sacramentall bread and wine, in the Holy Communion, cannot be without sinne."<sup>10</sup>

This brief pamphlet, full of much sound sense (a feature not always evident in many other works of the battle of words), was answered by Thomas Rogers,<sup>11</sup> Rector of Horningsheath (or Horringer) in Suffolk, who is better known as the author of a work entitled *The English Creed*, and as a pamphleteer in the Sabbatarian controversy.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*, pp.8/9.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, pp.20/1.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*, p.29.

<sup>11</sup> d. 1616 : *cf. D.N.B.*, s.v.

He was an Oxford man who became chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft. His reply,<sup>12</sup> from the preface of which a comment concerning Bradshaw's book has already been quoted, contains in the first dialogue his persuasion of Master Seffray of the county of Suffolk as to the error of his ways, and in the second his attempt to convince Bradshaw of his error. It is a repetitious work and cannot be reckoned among the best of the Anglican defences, but it illustrates a few of the arguments employed. In reply to Bradshaw's contention that Christ's example at the Last Supper must be followed, Rogers asserts: "Nay rather to bind us necessarily to the example of Christ in all ceremoniall matters, without warrant from Gods word, cannot be without great offence . . . what hee instituted is alwayes and necessarily to bee done, but not what he did. For his actions serve for our instruction alwayes, but not for imitation ever".<sup>13</sup> This sounds modern, and suggests a 20th century theologian rather than a 17th century controversialist. It is a reminder of the fact that the Anglican scholars of the time laid great stress on the authority of the Church in such matters; the Church had power to order the ceremonies of the Church, and was not necessarily bound by New Testament practice. Jesus may well have sat, but as he did not actually institute sitting as the essential mode of receiving, the Church had every right to enjoin kneeling as being the appropriate posture for participants in the Sacrament. Further, Rogers argues, "our kneeling . . . is from the word of God originally, though instituted by man, inasmuch as God is the fountaine of all decent orders in His Church . . ." <sup>14</sup>

The most attractive aspect of Rogers' work lies not in his specific replies to Bradshaw's argument, but in his honest and open-minded admission that, "Sitting and kneeling are but outward ceremonies, nothing to the substance of Religion, concerning the true communion with Christ and his Church at all, and of themselves indifferent, did not the godly magistrate enjoin the one and prohibit the other".<sup>15</sup> "We condemne not other churches for their not Kneeling; neither doth any church, nor should you Schismatikes condemne ours for our Kneeling";<sup>16</sup> he remarks. He thus defended kneeling in England not from the point of view of orthodoxy but on the score of Church order, and from a somewhat Erastian point of view.

Rogers indignantly denies the accusation of Idolatry. He writes, "as therefore it is not the Kneeling, but the impious conceits wherewith their hearts bee proffessed and replenished, when they approach to the Sacrament, that maketh the Papists to be Idolaters: so neither

<sup>12</sup> *Two dialogues or Conferences* (1608).

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.*, Sect. 4. (N.B. all quotations are from the Second Dialogue).

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*, Sect. 1.

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*, Sect. 5.

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*

doth our Kneeling exclude us from all Communion with Christ, and his Church; nor your Sitting, that joyneth you in fellowship with the same. As grosse Idolatrie may you commit in not Kneeling, as any persons ever did, or as the Papists now doe in Kneeling".<sup>17</sup> To this the reply might well be that though in theory this is true, men are frail mortals and are easily influenced by outward ceremonies for good or ill. Many opponents of kneeling were in effect saying that the very participation in the ceremony might well influence the hearts of the worshippers by reason of the obvious association of the posture.

In the South-West a number of the Devon and Cornwall clergy had submitted to William Cotton, Bishop of Exeter, a work entitled *Reasons for Refusal of Subscription to the Booke of Common Prayer* (1606). The task of replying to the objections was entrusted to Thomas Hutton, Rector of Northlew, Devon.<sup>18</sup> Hutton was a Londoner by birth and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford. He was instituted to the living of St. Kew, Cornwall, in 1600, and, partly as a reward for his zealous defence of the Prayer Book, was made a Prebendary of Exeter in 1616. The ministers' *Reasons for Refusall* are included in Hutton's reply.<sup>19</sup> They had argued that "To receive the sacrament kneeling is dangerous for minister, and people, in respect of law, in respect of God, religion, and conscience. Of law for the minister is charged by a statute Elizabeth 13 to subscribe to the articles of religion etc. upon paine of deprivation. But the 28 article commaundes that the sacrament must not be worshipt. Ergo to minister to the people kneeling is to be in danger of the law".<sup>20</sup> They argued further that "This kneeling to the Sacrament was brought into the Sacrament by Antichrist, the man of sinne, Pope Honorius the third An.1220 teaching the people thereby to worshippe the bread, and all to be-god it".<sup>21</sup> (This point appears again and again in later Puritan works). Further, "The Papists would not kneele, if their Idols were not there, no more would men kneele, if the bread, and sacraments were not there."<sup>22</sup> In this the Devon and Cornwall ministers appear to have been too blunt, and by no means fair to their opponents. In any case, Hutton can reply with point that kneeling at prayer is a posture acceptable to all—we kneel when there is no Sacrament present.

In 1608 another writer entered the lists, Samuel Hieron, vicar of Modbury in Devon.<sup>23</sup> Like so many other Puritans, Hieron was a Cambridge man (King's College). "... although he was upon Scripture-

<sup>17</sup> *ibid.*,

<sup>18</sup> 1566—1639: *cf. D.N.B., s.v.*

<sup>19</sup> *The Second and Last Parts . . . with an answeere . . .* (1606).

<sup>20</sup> *ibid.*, p.51.

<sup>21</sup> *ibid.*, p.52.

<sup>22</sup> *ibid.*, p.53.

<sup>23</sup> 1576?—1617: *cf. D.N.B., s.v.*

grounds a conscientious Nonconformist, and disaffected to ye ceremonyes and Liturgy, yet he was no Brownist. He was for a Reformation of, not a Separation from ye Church of England."<sup>24</sup> After his presentation to the living of Modbury in 1600, he soon showed the typically Puritan attitude to preaching. "No sooner was He come unto his cure, but he preached twice on ye Lord's Day. Preaching was at that time a very great rarity, and his most excellent and elaborate sermons were heard with astonishment and admiration".<sup>25</sup> He proved a vigorous opponent of the Ceremonies, being suspended five times for his refusal to subscribe, though he was never deprived of his living.<sup>26</sup>

Hieron, in addition to being a vigorous preacher, was also a voluminous writer.<sup>27</sup> Besides the books subscribed with his name, there are also two other anonymous works which are ascribed to him by John Quick in his *Icones*.<sup>28</sup> Concerning *A Dispute upon the question of Kneeling*, Quick records; "Nor indeed was that Work printed in England. The Bishops at that time would not suffer it. Wherefore he sent ye copy into ye Netherlands, got it printed there; and was sent over packt up in ye goods of an eminent Merchant of Plymouth, old Mr. T. Sherwill. And being arrived no Bookseller durst vend it. So that ye copys were dispersed abroad in ye Kingdome after this manner. Some were sent superscribed to ye 26 Bishops, and unto other of his antagonists, and to sundry Persons in ye City and Universitys. Some copys were dropt on purpose in ye very streets, others left at ye doors of Schollars and learned Ministers. Some were hung upon hedges in ye high way. And thus ye whole impression was freely and generously given away".<sup>29</sup>

Hieron's book is one of the most interesting and most valuable contributions to this controversy, revealing a keen mind and a devout spirit. It attempts to give a reply not only to Thomas Hutton's book against the ministers of Devon and Cornwall, but also to Thomas Rogers' *Two Dialogues*,<sup>30</sup> to Dr. Sparke,<sup>31</sup> and to Dr. Covell.<sup>32</sup> Hieron stresses one aspect of the Lord's Supper which many modern Free

<sup>24</sup> J. Quick, *Icones Sacrae Anglicanae* (1697) i.57 (MS. in Dr. Williams' Library.)

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, i.58.

<sup>26</sup> His grandson, Samuel, was ejected from Feniton, Devon, in 1662 (*Ibid.*, i.97; *Cal. Rev.*).

<sup>27</sup> Thomas Fuller called him "a powerful preacher in his printed works".

<sup>28</sup> *Icones*, i.85. The books referred to are:—*A Dispute upon the Question of kneeling in the Acte of Receiving the Sacramentall Bread and Wine* (1608) and *A Short Dialogue betwixt a Formalist and Minister* (1605).

<sup>29</sup> *Icones*, i.85. Quick further relates that his information was derived from Hieron's grandson, Samuel, and from William Pearse the ejected vicar of Dunsford, Devon, "whose Father was intrusted with ye scattering and disposeall".

<sup>30</sup> *cf. supra.*

<sup>31</sup> Thomas Sparke (1548—1616), Rector of Bletchley, Bucks., had been Chaplain to Bishop Cooper of Lincoln. He had long been a representative of the Puritans, and appeared at the Hampton Court Conference of 1603 in that rôle. Thereafter he became an apologist for conformity and wrote *A Brotherly Persuasion to Unite and Uniformity* (1607). *cf. D.N.B.*, s.v.

<sup>32</sup> William Covell (d.1614?), Vicar of Sittingbourne, Kent, and later sub-dean of Lincoln: *cf. D.N.B.*, s.v. His work was entitled *A briefe Answer unto Certaine Reasons . . . by Mr. John Burgess* (1606).

Churchmen would wish to stress, the fact that it is a banquet at which partakers are invited to sit as guests with Christ himself as the host. The Communion aspect of the Sacrament (communion with each other and with the Lord) was vital to Hieron, and it was in defence of this that he attacked the posture of kneeling to partake of the bread and wine. Here in fact it is possible to detect a difference between the Anglican and Puritan viewpoints which goes much deeper than mere outward ceremony. Whereas to the former the Sacrament was primarily a sacrifice at which the worshippers humbly and gratefully accepted the benefits of Christ's passion, to the latter it was essentially an act of fellowship with the Risen Lord. It might be put in this way: to the Anglican apologist the Passion and Death were uppermost, to the Puritan it was the Resurrection which was the starting point of devotion.<sup>33</sup> The Sacrament was a foretaste of the heavenly Banquet spread for those who are invited to partake. "None bearing the person of a coheir and guest with Christ at his table, ought to Kneele in the act of receiving the Sacrament thereat",<sup>34</sup> Hieron affirms. "Kneeling to receive the Sacrament, is an action that crosseth a special end for which Christ instituted his Supper",<sup>35</sup> he continues (*i.e.* the assurance to us of our coheirship with Christ). "Kneeling is an action, whereby we are debarred, from partaking with Christ the invitant, in the liberties and prerogatives of his Table",<sup>36</sup> The banquet of the Lord being spread, it is the privilege of those who are invited to it to sit down with him as honoured guests, and it would be improper not to use the appropriate "table gesture". "Kneeling in the act of our banketing at the Lords Table, is a personal carriage repugnant to the law of nature".<sup>37</sup> Hieron adds that kneeling is, in addition, an act of private worship, which is clearly out of place at public worship.

Like others before him, the writer regarded Pope Honorius as the introducer of kneeling, "about the year 1220", and was sure that it was introduced, "for the worshipping of a forged and breaden Messiah, first brought into practise in the Church by that Antichrist of Rome".<sup>38</sup> He who kneels, Hieron continues, "imparteth to a creature some honor onely due unto God and so breaketh the second commandement".<sup>39</sup> In reply to an assertion by Dr. Covell that the best Reformed Churches permit kneeling, Hieron replies with some vigour that this was true only of the Lutherans, who, like Anglicans and Papists, believed in a Real Presence. In other words, for them, as for Rome, the

<sup>33</sup> *cf.* John Buckeridge, *infra*.

<sup>34</sup> *A dispute upon the question of Kneeling*, p.6.

<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>36</sup> *ibid.*, p.22.

<sup>37</sup> *ibid.*, p.36.

<sup>38</sup> *ibid.*, p.67.

<sup>39</sup> *ibid.*, p.51.

Sacrament was essentially worship of a "broaden God". For the true Reformed Churches, however, it was a banquet spread for all who believe, a foretaste of the Heavenly Feast. Thus, without pride, yet with confidence and hope, believers ought to accept the gracious invitation and sit down with their Lord, not to transgress his command.

Some ten years after the appearance of Hieron's book, John Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester,<sup>40</sup> wrote a reply.<sup>41</sup> Buckeridge belonged to Lancelot Andrewes' school, which was firmly opposed to both Popery and Puritanism; and as one of King James' favourites he was influential in opposing attacks from both those quarters. In the course of his *Discourse* he points out that there were other aspects of the Sacrament which opponents of kneeling had neglected. In particular the Sacrament involves petition, and kneeling is the right posture for petitioners. Furthermore, it involves the offering of royal gifts, and it is right to kneel when accepting such gifts. It is a sacrifice which calls for humility in the offering, and humility is best shown by kneeling. Buckeridge appeals to the practice of the Early Church as negative proof that sitting is not essential. "Standing at prayer, and at the Lords Supper was in use in the Primitive Church, by the testimonies of Fathers, and the decrees of Councils: Therefore, Sitting is not the gesture of the Communicants at the Lords Supper".<sup>42</sup> He puts into words something which, as referred to above, seems to have been at the root of the controversy. "Wee come to this Sacrament, not to celebrate the memorie of Christs Resurrection, nor our confidence of rising together with him, but in remembrance of his death, and Passion; . . . Therefore, though we stand at Prayer to celebrate Christs Resurrection, yet we ought to kneel in all humilitie, at the receiving of this Sacrament, in remembrance of his death, and Passion".<sup>43</sup> May this not be an accurate summary of the real issue at stake in the controversy? The differences in outward observance reflected actual differences in theology. The controversy was not just barren logomachy, something vital was at stake.

Reference has already been made to the fact that it was among the ministers of the diocese of Lincoln that objections to the Prayer Book ceremonies first arose. An abridgement of the book which was delivered to King James I in December 1604 was issued in 1605, giving in summary form the main objections. It provides a convenient outline of the moderate Puritan position, and at the same time is

<sup>40</sup> 1562?—1631. Buckeridge was Laud's predecessor as President of St. John's College, Oxford, and had been his tutor. He became Bishop of Rochester in 1611, and was translated to Ely in 1628. *cf. D.N.B., s.v.*

<sup>41</sup> *A Sermon preached before His Majestie at Whitehall, March 22, 1617 . . . to which is added a Discourse concerning kneeling at the Communion* (1618).

<sup>42</sup> *ibid.*, p.141.

<sup>43</sup> *ibid.*, p.145.

interesting as giving rise to one of the most detailed of all the apologies for the practice of kneeling.<sup>44</sup>

The general Puritan view is summed up in this way: "It is contrary to Gods Word to use (much more to command the use of) such ceremonies in the worship of God as man hath devised if they be notoriously known to have been of old and still to be abused unto Idolatry or Superstition of the Papists specially if the same be now of noe necessary use in the church".<sup>45</sup> ". . . the retainyng of the Popish Ceremonies will certainly be a meanes to indaunger the doctrine that we professe, and to bring the people back againe to Popery".<sup>46</sup> The danger of Idolatry is stressed in connection with the Papists' belief in Transubstantiation. "Kneeling . . . is dayly used by the papists in the worship of their breaden God, and that as an act of Idolatry, with a most idolatrous intent and meanyng, even upon this ground that the bread is become god. Yea, the practise of the Church in the use of this gesture is made by the learndest papists (even: Aquinas: Harding: Bellarmyne: Bish. Watson and others) one of their strongest arguments to iustifie that their Idolatrous concept of transubstantiation, because else (saith they) the Church should commit Idolatry in kneeling before the elements . . . Thus also have our learned Divines judged of the original and abuse of the gesture, and by this reason have condemned it . . ." <sup>47</sup> In support of their contention, the Lincoln Ministers refer among others to Calvin.<sup>48</sup>

Like other opponents, these Puritans opposed kneeling on the grounds that it breaks the second commandment<sup>49</sup>; that, being a human ceremony, it is unlawful<sup>50</sup>; and that it is inexpedient.<sup>51</sup> In regard to the danger that the imposition of the ceremony would encourage superstition and the apologists' reply that this could be avoided by right teaching, the ministers retort: "It is neither safe nor lawfull for a man (as D. Fulk in one place saith well) wilfully to digg a pitt, breake a bridge, or laye a logg in the way, and then cry out and saye, O take heed you fall not. We must stop holes and not make them, take away stumbling blocks, not laye them, and then bid men beware of them".<sup>52</sup> This work is full of sound sense and sober argument, and reveals a fine appreciation of the dangers of the age for the faith of the ordinary folk. Ceremonies, though indifferent in themselves, do illustrate attitudes of heart and mind and may well

<sup>44</sup> *A Defence of the Innocencie of the three Ceremonies of the Church of England*, by Thomas Morton, Bishop of Chester (2nd. imp. 1619).

<sup>45</sup> *An Abridgement* . . . , p.17.

<sup>46</sup> *ibid.*, p.24.

<sup>47</sup> *ibid.*, pp.30/1.

<sup>48</sup> *Institutes*, Book 4 (Chapter 17, Section 36).

<sup>49</sup> *An Abridgement* . . . , pp.31ff.

<sup>50</sup> *ibid.*, pp.42/3.

<sup>51</sup> *ibid.*, pp.55/6.

<sup>52</sup> *ibid.*, p.68.

influence them. Roman practices and Roman superstitions were too recent to warrant risks being taken. The Mass and its "broaden God" might well be the picture suggested by the imposition of kneeling as the only right posture for receiving the consecrated elements.

Thomas Morton, Bishop in turn of Chester, Lichfield, and Durham,<sup>53</sup> like Laud and Buckeridge had been a member of St. John's College, Oxford, and like them was a vigorous though not a bigoted opponent of Puritanism. His *A Defence of the Innocencie of the three Ceremonies*, though long and detailed, does little more than reiterate and elaborate the type of argument already noted. On the basis of *I Corinthians* xiv ("Let all things be done decently and in order") he argues, "By vertue of which permission, the Apostle doth grant a generall licence and authoritie to all churches, to ordaine any ceremonies that may bee fit for the better serving of God."<sup>54</sup> ". . . . we are . . . authorized to call some ceremonies of our church, in a kind of generality, *Divine*, so farre as they have any dependance upon that generall direction of *Scripture*, which commandeth that *things be done in order, decency* and to *edification* . . ." <sup>55</sup> He gives a very weak answer to the objection that some ceremonies are too suggestive of Idolatry. "What act is there of gesture, or any circumstance of worship, which hath not bene some way abused by Pagans, Heretikes, or some other superstitious worshippers?" <sup>56</sup> Though in theory his implication was no doubt true, he ignored the fact that, whereas some practices were of only historical significance, others were live issues during his own day. In reply to the argument that the Sacrament is a banquet, he answers that it is not a material but a spiritual feast, and thus, "You are not to require, or expect therein the very forme and fashion of an ordinarie Banquet" <sup>57</sup>

Morton then raises the problem of what was to be done when there were too many present to sit at the Table. For answer to this, reference may be made to the works of Jeremiah Burroughes, one of the Independents who attended the Westminster Assembly of Divines.<sup>58</sup> After urging the need to follow carefully Christ's words and actions at the Table, Burroughes says, "those that do communicate must come to the Table as neer as they can; as many as can sit about it, and all to come as neer as they can, and the reason is, because that otherwise you will not be able to attain the end why God would have you come to receive . . ." <sup>59</sup> (*i.e.* to see the actions as well as to hear the words).

<sup>53</sup> 1564—1659, *cf.* *D.N.B.*, s.v.

<sup>54</sup> *A Defence* . . . , p.19.

<sup>55</sup> *ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>56</sup> *ibid.*, p.125.

<sup>57</sup> *ibid.*, pp.251/2.

<sup>58</sup> *cf.* *Gospel Worship*, published in 1648 by Thomas Goodwin, William Greenhill and five other Independents.

<sup>59</sup> *ibid.*, p.261.

Morton is ready to admit that, "the gesture of kneeling is not prescribed, as a necessarie forme of receiving the communion", but, he goes on, it is "necessarie for the reforming of the prophane, and irreligious behaviour of many in these wretched dayes wherein we live".<sup>60</sup>

It is unnecessary to do anything more than refer to the contribution of William Ames<sup>61</sup> to the controversy. His books<sup>62</sup> consist in the main of an elaboration of the arguments of the Lincoln ministers: he goes over all the old ground and has nothing new to add. The same may be said of John Burgess,<sup>63</sup> Ames' father-in-law, who, after having been a supporter of the Lincoln ministers in the early stages, became in later years an active opponent of the Nonconformist position.<sup>64</sup>

By this time the controversy was virtually over, at least so far as the pamphlet war was concerned. Two longer quotations from works of a later period will help to illustrate the direction in which the Puritans of the Jacobean age were tending in regard to the Lord's Supper, and at the same time will indicate the actual mode of observance common among their Separatist brethren. The first comes from John Cotton's *The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England*, published in 1645. "The Lords Supper we administer for the time, once a month at least, and for the *gesture*, to the people *sitting*; according as Christ administred it to his Disciples (Mat. 26. 20,26) who also made a Symbolicall use of it, to teach the Church their majoritie over their Ministers in some cases, and their judiciable authority, as co-fessors with him at the last Judgement (Luk. 22. 27 to 30) which maketh us looke at kneeling at the Lords Supper, not only as an adoration devised by man but also as a violation by man of the institution of Christ, diminishing part of the Counsell of God, and of the honour and comfort of the Church held forth in it.

"In time of solemnization of the Supper, the Minister having taken, blessed and broken the bread, and commanded all the people to take and eate it, as the body of Christ broken for them, he taketh it himselfe, and giveth it to all that sit at Table with him, and from the Table it is reached by the Deacons to the people sitting in the next seats about them, the minister sitting in his place at the Table".<sup>65</sup>

Reference has been made above to Jeremiah Burroughes' directions in regard to sitting at or near the Table. In the same work, *Gospel Worship*, this further passage occurs: ". . . not only the eating the

<sup>60</sup> *A Defence* . . . , p.271.

<sup>61</sup> 1576—1633: cf. *D.N.B.*, s.v.

<sup>62</sup> *A reply to Dr. Morton's General Defence* (1622).

*A reply to Dr. Morton's Particular Defence* (1623).

<sup>63</sup> 1563—1635 cf. *D.N.B.*, s.v.

<sup>64</sup> e.g. *An Answer rejoyned* . . . (1631).

<sup>65</sup> *op. cit.*, p.68.

bread and drinking the wine is significative, but the gesture whereby we have fellowship with Jesus Christ here, to signifie the fellowship we shall have with him in the Kingdome of Heaven; so that the people of God were deprived of a great deal of comfort, and of one special benefit of this holy Sacrament, whereas they might not receive it sitting; when Christ saith that you sitting with me here is a signification of you sitting with me when I come into the Kingdome of heaven".<sup>66</sup>

When all the special pleading is dismissed, and when the New Testament is interpreted according to the Spirit, and not according to the mere letter, one argument seems to stand out with more permanent validity. Which gesture best befits the Lord's Supper when it is regarded as an act of Communion with the Risen Lord? No doubt, as Richard Baxter asserts, "sitting or standing . . . it is lawful in itself".<sup>67</sup> But Bradshaw, Hieron, and the Lincoln and Devon Puritan ministers were defending a precious truth when they held that it was right to sit at the Lord's Supper, for to them that posture was symbolical of the fact that the Sacrament was primarily a banquet at which Christ was the host. Not all their arguments would be regarded now as equally valid: neither those directed against the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive the Elements, nor those designed to defend their own practice of sitting to partake of the Sacrament. But at least they did have a clear and definite reason for using the latter posture, which they were able to justify on theological grounds. This is perhaps more than could be said of many of their Nonconformist successors.

WILFRED W. BIGGS.



<sup>66</sup> p.263.

<sup>67</sup> *Practical Works*, ed. W. Orme, iv.331.

# Ordination Sermons

## 1697-1849

IN working through the older books in the library of New College, London, I have noticed a number of ordination sermons, occasionally bound together but more often bound with other pamphlets of a miscellaneous nature, and it occurred to me that a list of them might be useful for historical purposes. They provide names and dates which are a necessary part of any account of local churches and of the succession of ministers. It would also be instructive to read successively the charges, exhortations and confessions of faith and experience which they contain, and to observe the changes of emphasis in theology and piety as the decades pass. The works listed below are inevitably only the selection of the total material available which happens to have found its way into a single college library; but they include a number of pamphlets printed locally and therefore likely to be scarce, and they comprise a collection large enough to form the basis of a completer list. It is a question how most properly to arrange the items of information in a brief but intelligible form. In that adopted below the date of ordination is followed by the name of the minister(s) ordained and of the church over (or occasionally only at) which he was ordained; the name(s) of the minister(s) whose charge and/or exhortation is printed is then given, with the title (abbreviated) of the pamphlet where there is a title. The place of publication is added when other than London, and the year date of publication when other than that of ordination. It will be seen that a few items have not admitted of this treatment. It should be added that many, though not all, of the pamphlets contain also the confession of the minister ordained; and that some of them provide additional names of ministers taking part in the ordination. Information in brackets is from other sources.

- (1697.) Anon. *A Sermon Preach't at a Publick Ordination, in a Country Congregation on Acts xiii.2,3. Together With an Exhortation to the Minister and People, By another Brother.* 1697.
1703. Sept. 15. Daniel Wilcox. Confession only. *The Sum of Christianity.* 1706.
- (1704. July 11.) Benjamin Gravenor. *vide sub* 1708. Apr. 15.
1707. July 10. Thomas Bradbury. London. John Shower. *A Confession of Faith, at the Publick Ordination.* (2 copies).

1708. Apr. 15. Samuel Wright. (London : Meeting House Court, Knighttrider Street). also (1704. July 11.) Benjamin Gravenor. (London : Crosby Square). Daniel Williams. *The Ministerial Office*. (2 separate sermons.)
1708. July 20. John Greene. Winburn (Wimborne), Dorset. Theophilus Lobb.
- (1709.) *The Office of a Scriptural Bishop Describ'd and Recommended. An Ordination Sermon*. By J(oseph) B(oyse). Dublin 1709. (burned by order of Irish House of Lords, 1711).
1712. Sept. 17. Samuel Clark. St. Albans. Jeremiah Smith, Matthew Henry. Preface shewing the Method & Solemnity of Presbyterian Ordinations, by Daniel Williams. 1713. (3 copies.)
- 1712/13. Jan. 7. Benjamin Andrews Atkinson. London. Matthew Henry, Jeremiah Smith.
- (1715. Oct. 19.). (John Lavington, Joseph Hallett III). (Exeter : Bow Meeting). James Peirce. *Presbyterian Ordination prov'd regular*. 2nd. edn., 1716. also in Peirce's *Fifteen Sermons*, ed. Benjamin Avery, 1728.
1722. Aug. 21.<sup>1</sup> Micajah Towgood. Moreton Hampstead, Devon. John Withers. 1723.
1724. Oct. 21. Peter Jilleard. Crediton, Devon. John Withers. *A Stated Ministry, and Presbyterian Ordination, Vindicated*. John Enty. *St. Paul's Love to Souls Considered & recommended*. 1725.
1726. Oct. 19. Thomas Hadfield. Peckham, Surrey. Joseph Hill, Thomas Reynolds. *Ordination to the Ministry, an entrusting Men with the Gospel*. 1727. (2 copies.)
1730. June 24. Richard Rawlin. London : Fetter Lane. Daniel Neal. *The Duty of Praying for Ministers*.
- 1730/31. Jan. 1. Abraham Taylor. Deptford, Kent. John Hurrion. *Of the Work of Ministers*.
- 1730/31.<sup>2</sup> Jan. 11. Obadiah Hughes, Clerk Oldisworth, Thomas Newman, John Smith. at London : Old-Jewry. S. Wright, Edmund Calamy. *The Duty of holding fast the Form of Sound Words*.
1733. July 18. William Henry Hallam, Jonathan Mercer. Long Melford, Suffolk. Thomas Steward. included in his *Fifteen Sermons*, 1734.
1733. Nov. 8. Farnham Haskoll. Taunton. Henry Grove. *A Short & Easy Rule of Conduct, for Ministers of the Gospel*. 1734.

<sup>1</sup> Not Aug. 22, as *D.N.B.*, s.v. Towgood.

<sup>2</sup> Not 1721, as *D.N.B.*, s.v. Newman

1734. Mar. 28. George Braithwaite. London: Meeting-House, near Devonshire Square. John Gill, Samuel Wilson. *The Mutual Duty of Pastor & People*.
1734. Oct. 24. John Halford. Southwark: Horselydown. John Guyse. *The Minister's Plea for the People's Prayers*. (2 copies.) also in Guyse's *Collection of Seventeen Practical Sermons*, 1756.
1735. July 22. John Notcutt. Cambridge: Green Street. William Ford, Tobias Wildboar.
1736. Oct. 6. William Johnson. Reigate (Reigate), Surrey. John Guyse, Abraham Taylor. Guyse's sermon, *The Character of Gospel Ministers*, also in his *Collection of Seventeen Practical Sermons*, 1756.
1737. Oct. 27. James Howe, James Murray. London: Nightingale Lane. Thomas Hadfield.
- 1739/40. Feb. 13.<sup>1</sup> William King. London: Hare Court, Aldersgate Street. Peter Goodwin.
1743. Oct. 27. Thomas Gibbons. London: Haberdasher's Hall. John Guyse. *The Excellency of a Judicious Love*. In Guyse's *Collection of Seventeen Practical Sermons*, 1756.
1746. Aug. 5. Joseph Barber. *vide sub* 1748. Apr. 20. (1747). Moses Alway. B. Stevenson, D.D. *The Validity and Regularity of the Ministry exercis'd amongst the English Protestant Dissenters, briefly prov'd*. 1747.
- 1747/8. Mar. 24. Thomas Towle. London: Rope-Maker's Alley. Zephaniah Marryat, Thomas Hall, John Guyse. *cf.* next entry.
1748. Apr. 20. Moses Gregson. Rowel (Rothwell), Northants. also 1747/8. Mar. 24. Thomas Towle. London: Rope-maker's Alley. (MS. addition: also 1746. Aug. 5. Joseph Barber. Basingstoke.) John Guyse. also in Guyse's *Collection of Seventeen Practical Sermons*, 1756.
1748. Oct. 26. John Angus. Bishop's Stortford. John Guyse, Thomas Gibbons, Samuel Price. Guyse's sermon also in his *Collection of Seventeen Practical Sermons*, 1756.
1750. June 6. Thomas Williams. Gosport. John Cumming, Samuel Hayward, Nicholas Pearson.
1750. July 26. John (Collett) Ryland. Warwick. John Haydon, John Brine.
1751. Oct. 16. James Rooker. Bridport. John Lavington junior, Richard Pearsall.
1755. Oct. 15. (? Benjamin) Hewson, Thomas Hiron, (Nathaniel) White. Hinckley, Leics. Hugh Worthington (senior). *The Duty of Ministers & People*.

<sup>1</sup> Not Feb. 14, as *D.N.B.*, *s.v.*, King.

1755. Nov. 11. (Isaac) Smithson. Harleston, Norfolk. (Ralph) Milner, (John) Taylor, (Thomas) Stanton.
1756. July 7. William Porter. London : Miles's Lane. John Conder, Timothy Jollie (junior), Thomas Hall.
1758. May 11. John Stafford. London : New Broad Street. Thomas Gibbons, Thomas Hall.
1759. June 14. Richard Winter. London : New-Court, near Lincoln's-Inn-Fields. John Olding, Thomas Hall, Thomas Bradbury, John Conder.
1766. Oct. 2. John Reynolds. London : Cripplegate. Benjamin Wallin. *The Constitution of a Gospel-Church.*
1769. Aug. 17. George Waters, William Youat. Bridport, Dorset. Andrew Kippis, Philip Furneaux. *The Character of Jesus Christ as a Public Speaker Considered.*
1770. Oct. 24. John Fell. Thaxted, Essex. John Angus, Thomas Davidson, Thomas Towle.
1773. Oct. 7. Job David. Frome, Som. Daniel Turner, Caleb Evans. Bristol, *s.a.* (2 copies.)
1775. Sept. 13. (Rochemont) Barbauld, (John Matthews) Beynon, (Robert) Alderson, (James) Pilkington. Palgrave, Suffolk. John Whiteside, Edward Pickard. *The Duty of Hearers.* (On the peculiarity of this occasion, cf. Browne, *Hist. of Congreg. . . . in Norfolk & Suffolk*, p.479n.).
1777. Apr. 9. John Heslop. Sunderland : Ropery Lane. John Knipe, James Brownfield. Newcastle.
1777. Apr. 22. Sir Harry Trelawny, Bt. at Southampton for West Looe, Cornwall. Edward Ashburner, William Kingsbury, John Crisp.
1778. June 24. Isaac Smith. Sidmouth, Devon. Joshua Toulmin. *The Watchfulness incumbent on Ministers.* Taunton, 2nd. edn., (1779).
1778. Aug. 5. John Prior Estlin. Bristol : Lewin's Mead. William Enfield, Thomas Wright, Nathaniel White. *The Principles & Duty of Protestant Dissenters considered.*
- (1783. May 21.) James Lindsay. London : Monkwell Street. Henry Hunter, James Fordyce, 1783.
1785. July 28. Timothy Kenrick. Exeter : New Meeting. also 1785. Aug. 24. William Browne. Wrexham. Thomas Jervis, Thomas Belsham.
1785. Aug. 24. William Browne. *vide sub* 1785. July 28.
1786. Oct. 18. George Birley. St. Ives. Daniel Taylor, Robert Robertson. *The Service of God, in the Gospel of his Son.*
1790. July 12. William Field. Warwick. Joseph Priestley, Thomas Belsham. *A View of Revealed Religion.*

1791. June 29. James Knight. the church of which the late John Rogers was pastor. John Clayton (senior), Benjamin Davies, Thomas Towle.
1796. Dec. 7. W. Belsher. Worcester: at Angel Street, for Silver Street. John Ryland, S(amuel) Pearce, G. Osborn. *The Duty of Ministers to be nursing Fathers.* (1797).
1797. Apr. 18. Samuel Wydown. York: Jubber-gate. Joseph Cockin, Edward Parsons, Samuel Bottomley. Leeds, *s.a.*
1797. Aug. 23. William Chaplin. Bishop's Stortford. John Jennings, Nathaniel Jennings, Samuel Palmer.
1799. Apr. 17. Frederick Hamilton. Brighton. John Humphrys, Robert Winter, James Steven.
1800. Apr. 10. T. Williams. *vide sub* 1801. Apr. 8.
1800. Sept. 17. Samuel Bradley. Doncaster. M. Phillips, E(dward) Williams, E(dward) Parsons.
1801. Apr. 8. William Harris. Kingston upon Thames. also 1800. Apr. 10. T. Williams. Shaftesbury. J(ames) Bowden. *The Christian a Chosen Vessel.*
1801. May 28. Charles Dewhirst. Bury, Suffolk: Whiting Street. Robert Stevenson, Joseph Cockin, John Mead Ray. St. Ives.
1801. Nov. 17. Thomas Coles. Bourton-on-the-Water, Glos. John Ryland, James Hinton. *The Difficulties & Supports of a Gospel Minister.*
1802. June 23. Thomas Morgan. Birmingham: Cannon-street. John Ryland, A(ndrew) Fuller, J. Sutcliff.
1802. Sept. 29. John Rogers. Eynsford, Kent. Joseph Jenkins, James Upton, John Stanger.
1802. Oct. 12. Thomas Craig. Bocking, Essex. Samuel Newton, Robert Stevenson, William Parry, John Pye Smith. (2 copies.)
1804. Oct. 24. John Jerard. Coventry. James Moody, George Burder, Thomas Stollery. Coventry.
1808. May 25. John Bruce. Newport, I.o.W.: St. James Street. John Pye Smith, Samuel Bruce, James Bennett, Robert Winter. (2 copies.)
1808. Oct. 5. Robert Stodhart. London: Mulberry-Garden Chapel, Pell Street, Ratcliffe Highway. Thomas Young.
1809. June 22. Thomas Raffles. Hammersmith. John Humphrys, W(illiam) B(engo) Collyer, Robert Winter.
1811. Nov. 27. Andrew Reed. London: New Road, St. George's in the East. Robert Winter, George Collison, John Clayton (senior), 1812. also 2nd. edn., 1821.
1813. Oct. 6. James Tait. Maldon, Essex. S(tephen) Morell, (John Pye) Smith, S(amuel) Newton.

1814. March 2. H(enry) F(orster) Burder. London : Hackney, St. Thomas's Square. (John Pye) Smith, George Burder, (Robert) Winter.
- (1814.) John Whitridge. Carlisle : Annetwell Street. Joseph Gilbert, John Whitridge (uncle of the minister ordained), Thomas Gritten. 1814.
- (1815). Richard Winter Hamilton. Leeds : Albion Chapel. Joseph Fletcher, Robert Winter, James Boden. Leeds, 1815.
1815. Feb. 17. John Morison. London : New Road, Sloane Street, Chelsea. H. F. Burder, John Hooper, John Clayton junior.
1815. Nov. John Yockney. London : Lower Street, Islington. William Walford, W. B. Collyer, Robert Winter. 1816.
- (1816.) Thomas James. London : City Chapel. J. A. James. *Ministerial Duties Stated & Expressed*. 1816.
1821. Nov. 7. J. S. Brooksbank. Edmonton & Tottenham. (Robert) Winter, Joseph Brooksbank senior, (W. B.) Collyer. 1822. (2 copies.)
1832. Sept. 27. N(un) M(organ) Harry. London : New Broad Street Meeting-House. H. F. Burder, J. Pye Smith, Joseph Berry.
1833. May 1. J(ohn) Stoughton. Windsor : William Street Chapel. Robert Halley, John Boutet Innes, George Redford.
1841. March 2. Andrew Reed. Norwich : Old Meeting-House. John Alexander, Andrew Reed (father of the minister ordained), J. H. Godwin.
1849. Nov. 22. J. H. Hutton. Gloucester : Barton Street. Dr. Hutton, J. H. Thom.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

