

Scottish
Reformation Society
Historical Journal

VOLUME 1
2011

Published by
The Scottish Reformation Society
The Magdalen Chapel
41 Cowgate
Edinburgh EH1 1JR
info@scottishreformationsociety.org.uk

The Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal
publishes original, scholarly articles written from an evangelical
perspective, on subjects relating to Scottish Church history.
The Journal is published annually (DV).

Editor:
Rev. D. W. B. Somerset

Editorial Board:
Norman Campbell, Rev. John W. Keddie,
Roy Middleton, Rev. A. S. Wayne Pearce

© The Scottish Reformation Society 2011

ISSN 2045-4570

Printed by Lulu

Copies may be obtained either from www.lulu.com
or from the Scottish Reformation Society.

Anyone ordering through Lulu should notify the Society if they wish
to be informed of the publication of future volumes.

Preface

REV D. W. B. SOMERSET, BSC, DPHIL

The purpose of this journal is to publish “original, scholarly articles, written from an evangelical perspective, on subjects relating to Scottish Church history”. A considerable amount is already being written in this area, but comparatively little from an evangelical perspective, and still less which is overtly so. Often writers have to play down or conceal their evangelical sympathies if their work is to gain acceptance in academic circles. This is much to be regretted. Evangelical sympathies are so far from being a hindrance in the study of Church history that they are a great help in understanding the minds and motives of eminent Christians of the past.

An example of this can be seen in Thomas M’Crie’s celebrated *Life of Knox*, first published in 1812 and now fast approaching its bi-centenary. For three-quarters of that time it has been in print, and although dozens of subsequent biographies have appeared, it is M’Crie’s, we think, that remains the most widely read and the most influential. New facts have emerged, various errors have been discovered, and unexplored aspects of Knox’s life and thought have been opened up; but M’Crie’s sympathetic understanding of Knox’s character remains unsurpassed.

One thing which has given value to M’Crie’s book is the impartiality with which it was written, an impartiality flowing from a Christian love of truth. This is very different from the impartiality on which the academic world currently prides itself. The present aim of the academic world is neutrality or detachment in religion, but this is not the same thing as a love of truth. The reality is that there is no such thing as detachment in religion, and the supposed “impartiality” of present-day Church history is nothing but practical atheism enforcing its own

perspective and bias. In adopting a secular approach, academics have already implicitly rejected the main doctrines of Scripture, and in so doing they have committed themselves to a particular “religious” position – the falsity of Scripture. Thenceforth they have at least as much interest in maintaining their secular position as evangelical Christians have in maintaining their religious one.

The prevalence of secular thinking in academic Church history has a number of unfortunate consequences. One of these is a dislike for many of the principal figures in Protestant Church history. A recent collection of essays on John Knox, for instance, states in the introduction that “many of the contributors would no doubt agree that [Knox] was a vain and loud-mouthed bigot”. Such a hostile approach tends to impede the calm examination of Knox’s views. The contributors, with this attitude, are more likely to err in exaggerating or inventing faults in Knox’s life and character than they are to uncover interesting subtleties in his thinking. Examples of this kind might be multiplied, and there is a continual tendency among secular historians, as there is among non-Christians generally, to misunderstand or misrepresent the motives of evangelical Christians. Christians acting out of conscience to the Word of God are likely to be treated either as fanatics, who have no sensible explanation for their conduct, or else as somewhat dim-witted hypocrites, whose devious and worldly motives are easily detected by their modern critics.

A second unfortunate consequence is the widespread ignorance of theology in academic circles. The typical professional Church historian probably knows far less about evangelical doctrine than the man-in-pew in an evangelical church. This is a handicap because many interesting aspects of Scottish Church history involve important doctrinal points. The scholar who is hazy on Calvinism, Arminianism, Marrow doctrine, Moderatism, Socinianism, Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, and the Establishment Principle, is not well placed for the study of Scottish Church history. He may consult a theological dictionary but this is not the same thing as having a heart-interest in the truth or falsity of these positions; and his limited knowledge leaves him prone to errors which are obvious to any evangelical Christian. Take, for instance, the statement in a recent article on Highland religion that certain ministers “[saw] the light late in their career and accomplish[ed] the work of redemption”. What the author means is that they were converted. “Accomplishing the work of redemption” is what Christ

PREFACE

did, as every evangelical Christian knows. Again, such examples might be multiplied.

A third consequence is a sometimes surprising inaccuracy on purely historical points, arising from a neglect of evangelical Church history. One writer, a senior academic and holding a prominent position in a Divinity Faculty, says on the subject of fasting that it was “perceived as a ‘relic of Popish superstition’” and that it was “all in all, an embarrassing anachronism in the Scottish post-Reformation religious tradition”. It seems that neither he nor his editor, another professor of Scottish history, were aware of the references to fasting in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (chap 21) and the *Larger Catechism* (Q.108); nor of Thomas Boston’s *Memorial on Fasting* which went through at least nineteen editions in the eighteenth century and at least six in the nineteenth century and is still in print; nor had either of them read Bonar’s *Memoir and Remains of M’Cheyne*. To cap it all, the footnote to the quotation “relic of Popish superstition” shows that the writer had completely misunderstood his source: it was not fasting that was so characterized but the receiving of the Lord’s Supper fasting. One feels less inclined to overlook these blunders when the writer is so dismissive of John Knox and the Covenanters and when the blurb on the flap boasts of “the massive advances in scholarship made in recent years”.

Another unfortunate consequence of the secular dominance, from the evangelical point of view, is that a disproportionate amount of work on Scottish Church history is on subjects of marginal interest to evangelical Christians. Books and articles proliferate on Roman Catholics, liberals, Episcopalians, persecutors, aberrant Presbyterians, and every aspect of social Church history, but the great figures and incidents of Scottish Church history are comparatively neglected, or else viewed through the distorting eye of secular “impartiality”. Many countries have their Roman Catholics, liberals, Episcopalians, and so forth, but the distinguishing feature, and most interesting element, of Scotland’s Church history is that she is almost the only nation in the world (Holland being the other one) in which Presbyterianism has been the established religion for most of the last four hundred years. Yet how little, comparatively, is written on ordinary, mainstream Presbyterianism from a sympathetic point of view. The warm and profitable study of Scottish Church history is languishing.

But perhaps the most serious consequence of the secular approach to Church history is that it denies the historical fact of conversion. When

people are converted there is an objective change in them, as a result of which they think and behave differently. Saul of Tarsus is a case in point. There is no accounting for this change other than by a supernatural act of God. Any attempt to do so is historically erroneous and leads to endless worthless speculation. Secular historians are perplexed and embarrassed by conversion, but such perplexity is absurd in the study of Church history. Without conversion, there would be no Christian Church. The fundamental difference between John Knox and Mary Queen of Scots is not that one of them was a Protestant and the other a Roman Catholic, but that one of them was converted and loved Christ while the other was unconverted and did not love Christ. This is a crucial fact in the history of that period which secular historians struggle to assimilate.

Ultimately, the writing of Church history, like so many other things, is part of the conflict between light and darkness. Satan is trying to misrepresent the truths of history while the Holy Spirit is working in men's minds to bring these truths to light. In this conflict, some historians – whether evangelical, secular, or Roman Catholic – are a great deal fairer and more accurate than others. Evangelical historians ought to excel in fairness because they have nothing to lose in admitting the faults and mistakes of their heroes or in acknowledging admirable qualities in those whom they otherwise deplore. If Knox was indeed vain and loud-mouthed, let the fact be conceded – the gospel does not stand or fall with Knox; but we think, on consideration, that he was neither of these things. If James VI and Claverhouse acted in good conscience when they persecuted the people of God, this too can be conceded – “the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service” (Jn 16:2). We doubt, however, that they did.

We pray that the Lord will use this journal to advance the kingdom of light.

DOUGLAS SOMERSET

Aberdeen

December 2010

Contents

Was Knox a Royal Chaplain? D. HAY FLEMING	1-11
Samuel Rutherford and the Theology and Practice of Preaching MATTHEW VOGAN	13-37
Thomas Boston and the Authorship of “Queries to the Friendly-Adviser” DOUGLAS SOMERSET	39-58
Alexander Dyce Davidson, D.D. (1807-1872), Free Church Minister in Aberdeen JOHN SMITH	59-88
Angus of the Hills (c. 1809-c. 1854) DOUGLAS SOMERSET	89-108
Professor James MacGregor: Theological and Practical Writings, 1868-1881 JOHN KEDDIE	109-127
David Hay Fleming (1849-1931): Scottish Church Historian and Antiquarian ROY MIDDLETON	129-240
Giving Out the Line: A Cross-Atlantic Comparison of Two Presbyterian Cultures NORMAN CAMPBELL	241-265
<i>SHORT NOTE:</i> Mistress Rutherford and Ulster in the Summer of 1634 DOUGLAS SOMERSET	267-271

Was Knox a Royal Chaplain?

DAVID HAY FLEMING, LL.D

The following article first appeared in the *Bulwark*, May 1924, pp. 66-8, and was reprinted as a pamphlet (Edinburgh, 1924), 12pp.

EDITOR'S PREFACE: In December 1551 Edward VI appointed six royal chaplains and it has been a debated question whether John Knox was among their number, or at least subsequently became one of them. The elder M'Crie in his *Life of Knox* (1812) asserts that he was. This was challenged in an edition of Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, published in 1848, but was defended by the younger M'Crie in his edition of his father's works (1855); by Perry (1863); by David Laing in his biographical account appended to *Knox's Works* (1864); and by Peter Lorimer (1875). It was next assailed by Richard Dixon (1885) but answered by Hume Brown (1895) and Pollard (1904). Subsequently Gairdner (1911) argued that Knox was not a royal chaplain, but without reference to Hume Brown or Pollard.¹

¹ T. M'Crie, *Life of John Knox* (Edinburgh, 1812), pp. 67-8; John Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer* (3 vols. in 4, Ecclesiastical History Soc., Oxford, 1848-1854), vol. 2, pp. 412-3n; T. M'Crie, *Works* (ed. T. M'Crie, jr.) (Edinburgh, 1855-7), vol. 1, p. 469; T. W. Perry, *Some Historical Relating to the Declaration on Kneeling* (London, 1863), pp. 109-110n; D. Laing (ed.), *Works of John Knox* (6 vols., Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1846-1864), vol. 6 pp. xxix-xx; P. Lorimer, *John Knox and the Church of England* (London, 1875), pp. 79-80; R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England* (6 vols., London, 1884-1902), vol. 3, pp. 325-6n, 479n; P. Hume Brown, *John Knox; a Biography* (2 vols., London, 1895), vol. 1, p. 122n; A. F. Pollard, *Thomas Cranmer* (New York, 1904), p. 278; J. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (4 vols., London, 1908-13), vol. 3, pp. 340-1. A number of other writers assume without comment that Knox was a royal chaplain; e.g. G. Grubb, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland* (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1861), vol. 2, p. 43; A. J. G. Mackay, "John Knox", *Dictionary of National Biography* (1885-1900); A. F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1900), p. 87.

This was the general state of the controversy until it re-surfaced in the 1920s (see the article for details). In the article, Hay Fleming maintains that the case for Knox's royal chaplaincy had not been proven. Since Hay Fleming's time, there has been very little discussion of the subject, and no reference, that we have seen, to Hay Fleming's article. Ridley (1968) argues briefly that Knox was not a royal chaplain, but Percy (1937), Reid (1974), MacCulloch (1996), Collinson (1998), Dawson (2004), and Kyle and Johnson (2009) all assume that Knox was a royal chaplain, virtually without comment. Marshall (2000) does not mention the subject at all.²

As Hay Fleming's article seems to be little known, and as it makes some interesting points, it seems appropriate to reprint it. The editor has taken the liberty of adding a couple of notes at the end by way of comment.

.

That Knox was one of the royal chaplains of Edward the Sixth was confidently affirmed by the most eminent Scottish historical students of last century, such as, the elder M'Crie, David Laing, George Grub, Professor Mitchell, and Dr Lorimer. It never occurred to me to doubt their accuracy on this matter until I began to work very carefully over Knox's life. About a dozen years ago I wrote an account of his work in England, which is still unpublished, and from it the eight following paragraphs are extracted:

Knox has long been regarded as one of Edward the Sixth's chaplains; but this is not borne out by the evidence. It was in the spring of 1549 that Knox went to England. King Edward died on the 6th of July 1553; and Knox left England for the Continent some six or seven months later; the precise date is uncertain.

In a passage in his *History*, he thus refers to himself in the third person: "The said Johne was first appointed preacher to Berwik, then to Newcastle; last he was called to London, and to the sowth partes of England, whare he remaned to the death of King Edwart the

² J. Ridley, *John Knox* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 112-3; E. Percy, *John Knox* (1937, 2nd ed., London, 1964), p. 121; W. Stanford Reid, *Trumpeter of God* (New York, 1974), p. 83; D. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer* (London, 1996), pp. 527-8; P. Collinson, "John Knox, the Church of England and the Women of England", *John Knox and the British Reformations* (ed. R. A. Mason) (Aldershot, 1998), p. 89; J. Dawson, "John Knox", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004); R. G. Kyle and D. W. Johnson, *John Knox: an Introduction to his Life and Work* (Eugene, OR, 2009), p. 51; R. K. Marshall, *John Knox* (Edinburgh, 2000).

Sext.”³ And, in his first interview with Mary Queen of Scots, he said to her: “In England I was resident onlie the space of fyve yearis. The places war Berwick, whair I abode two yearis; so long in the New Castell; and a year in London.”⁴

An entry in King Edward’s *Journal*, as printed by Gilbert Burnet, in 1681, in his *History of the Reformation*, runs thus: “18 [December 1551.] It was appointed I should have six chaplains ordinary, of which two ever to be present, and four always absent in preaching: one year two in Wales, two in Lancashire and Darby; next year two in the Marches of Scotland, two in Yorkshire; the third year, two in Devonshire, two in Hampshire; fourth year, two in Norfolk and Essex, and two in Kent and Sussex, etc. These six to be Bill, Harle, Peme, Grindall, Bradford.” Marginal note – “The other name dasht.”⁵ In his text, Burnet says: “The name of the sixth is so dashed in the King’s *Journal* that it cannot be read.”⁶ When, however, he issued the 1715 edition of his *History of the Reformation*, he inserted Knox’s name as the sixth of the chaplains in the King’s *Journal*, and said nothing whatever about it being dashed or illegible in the original.⁷ This alteration was due to Strype, who had informed him that “the name was Knox”.⁸

In 1694, in his *Cranmer*, Strype had said that “Knox was the man whose name was so dashed in the King’s *Journal*, where the name of the King’s six chaplains were inserted, that Bishop Burnet could not read it”.⁹ But it does not appear that Strype himself was able to read the name, for, so late as 1721, in his *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, after naming five of the royal chaplains, he says: “The sixth dashed out in the *Journal*; but probably was Knox; for he was one of the preachers in the North, at Newcastle and elsewhere, and had a salary paid him out of the exchequer.”¹⁰ In 1694,

³ Laing’s *Knox*, i. 231.

⁴ *ibid.*, ii. 280.

⁵ Burnet’s *History of the Reformation*, 1681 edition, ii., records, p. 42 – Burnet omitted *Soutfolk* after *Norfolk*. It was the third name, not the sixth, that was deleted (Pocock’s edition, v. 59).

⁶ *ibid.*, 1681 edition, ii. text, p. 171.

⁷ *ibid.*, 1715 edition, ii. text, p. 162; records, p. 39.

⁸ *ibid.*, 1715 edition, iii. appendix, pp. 415, 420, 423.

⁹ Strype’s *Cranmer*, 1694, p. 292.

¹⁰ *Historical Memorials chiefly Ecclesiastical*, 1721, ii. 297 – He adds: “But the number was reduced to four (Bradford also being left out) who were styled, The King’s ordinary chaplains.”

Strype had thus referred to the payment of his salary: “Knox being sent this year [1552] into the North, one of the King’s itinerary preachers, a warrant, dated Octob. 27, was granted from the Council to four gentlemen, to pay to him his Majesty’s preacher in the North (so he is stiled) forty pounds as his Majesty’s reward.”¹¹ But in the Council Book, which Strype gives as his authority for this statement, he is not stiled “his Majesty’s preacher in the North”; but simply “Mr Knookes preacher in the North”.¹² The Acts of the Privy Council of England were not printed in Dr M’Crie’s time, and probably he had no opportunity of examining the original. Although “preacher” and “chaplain” are hardly synonyms, it is not surprising that he thought that Knox was one of the royal chaplains.¹³

In the opinion of John Gough Nichols, the name of the chaplain which was so badly dashed, or obliterated, was apparently Estcourt.¹⁴ The editor of the Ecclesiastical History Society edition of Strype’s *Cranmer*, however, with the help of Sir Frederick Madden, made it out to be Eastwicke.¹⁵ The appointment of the chaplains is not known to be recorded anywhere else than in the King’s *Journal*; and the reading of the doubtful name either as Estcourt or Eastwicke excludes Knox from the original number. His biographers, nevertheless, continue to assert that he was one of Edward’s chaplains; and some of them try to get over the difficulty by suggesting or alleging that he was appointed at a later date; but no formal minute or record of that appointment has been found.

It is quite certain that he preached before the King at Windsor, at Hampton Court, and at Westminster;¹⁶ and that he was associated with the royal chaplains in examining and reporting on Cranmer’s Articles of Religion. The six men, who were asked to examine these Articles, are usually referred to by modern writers as the royal chaplains; but they are not so designated in the relative entry of 21st October 1552, in the *Acts of the Privy Council*, which runs thus: “A lettre to Mr Harley, Mr Bill, Mr Horne, Mr Grindall, Mr Percie, and Mr Knox, to consider certaine

¹¹ Strype’s *Cranmer*, 1694, p. 292.

¹² *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, new series, iv., 154.

¹³ M’Crie’s *Life of Knox*, 1812, p. 68. He cites Edward’s *Journal*, apud. Burnet; and Strype’s *Memorials*, and Strype’s *Cranmer*, and Strype’s *Grindal*.

¹⁴ *Literary Remains of Edward the Sixth*. Roxburghe Club, p. 377 and n.

¹⁵ Strype’s *Cranmer*, Eccl. Hist. Soc. ed., ii., 413n.

¹⁶ Laing’s *Knox*, iii., 168.

Articles exhibited to the Kinges Majestie, to be subscribed by all suche as shalbe admitted to be preachers or ministres in any part of the realme, and to make report of their opinions touching the same.”¹⁷ In that official record this other entry appears on the 20th of the following month: “A lettre to the Archebushshop of Cauntorbury, with the Articles heretofore drawn and delivered by hym to the Kinges Majestie, which being sence that tyme considered be certeine of his Highnes chaplenes *and others*, ar in summe part all tried, and therefore returned to hym to be considered, so as, after the perfecting of them, ordre may be given for the putting the same in due execution.”¹⁸ These two entries refer to the same matter, and to the same men, but the second distinctly implies that they were not all chaplains. Four of them – Harley, Bill, Grindall, and Perne – are in the King’s own list of the preceding December, but Home and Knox are not. The natural inference seems to be that Harley, Bill, Grindall, and Perne are those referred to in the second entry as “his Highnes chaplenes”, and that Horne and Knox are those referred to as “others”.¹⁹

As the Privy Council had authorised the payment of £5 as a reward to Knox in April 1549, when there were no royal chaplains,²⁰ their authorisation in October 1552, of another payment to him, does not necessarily imply that he was then one of the royal chaplains, although the sum was the same as they received, and was paid as “the Kinges Majesties reward”.

Professor Pollard says: “The references in the *Privy Council Register* and Edward VI’s *Journal* show that two chaplains were to preach in 1552 on the Scottish borders; that Knox was employed in this work, receiving £40 as a reward at the end of his year’s service, on 27 October, 1552.”²¹ The chaplains, according to the King’s *Journal*, were to be sent in 1552, not to the Scottish Marches, but to Wales, Lancashire and Derby. In 1553, they were to go to the Marches of Scotland and Yorkshire, but in the early summer of that year Knox was sent to Buckinghamshire.²²

¹⁷ *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, new series, iv., 148 – *Percie* is apparently a misreading of, or misprint for, *Perne*.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, iv., 173. The copy of the Articles, in Latin, signed by Harley, Bill, Horne, Perne, Grindal, and Knox, is still preserved (Laing’s *Knox*, vi., p. xxx.).

¹⁹ [See Note A at the end.]

²⁰ *Acts of the Privy Council*, new series, ii., 274; Laing’s *Knox*, vi., p. xxvi.

²¹ Pollard’s *Cranmer*, 1904, p. 278n. In Professor Pollard’s opinion, “Knox had apparently been appointed one of the six royal chaplains”.

²² *Acts of the Privy Council*, new series, iv., 283. [See Note B at the end.]

• • • • •

In reviewing in the *British Weekly*, of 10th February 1921, the Rev Kirkwood Hewat's *Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation*, I said:

In different parts of his book, Mr Hewat refers to Knox as having been a royal chaplain in England, but he produces neither proof nor reference. No doubt he could have cited Dr M'Crie, the greatest of all Knox's biographers, and many others who have followed him. It is quite certain that Knox preached before King Edward the Sixth at Windsor, at Hampton Court, and at Westminster, and that he was associated with the royal chaplains in some work; but there is no conclusive evidence that he himself was a royal chaplain.

This evoked a letter from Mr Ernest G. Atkinson, formerly of the Record Office, which appeared in the issue of 17th March. And to my answer the following week, this note was appended: "We cannot insert any more letters on this subject. Ed. B.W." Needless to say, that note was not appended at my instigation or suggestion. I would have been very pleased to have thrashed out the matter in such an arena. In the following autumn, Mr Atkinson issued an octavo pamphlet of 32 pages, entitled "John Knox, a Royal Chaplain. A Reply to D. Hay Fleming, LL.D., 'and others'," of which he courteously sent me a copy. When it arrived, I was much too busy to read it carefully, and merely glanced over it. Had it assailed Knox's character, or detracted from his merits, I would have allowed pressing work to stand in order to reply; but, being an attempt to add to his honours, there was no call for haste on my part, and so it was temporarily laid aside, and for a time forgotten.

There are three personal charges in the pamphlet to which I must briefly reply. (1) That I have a "desire to establish a theory that Knox was not a chaplain, much less a royal chaplain". I have no desire whatever to establish a theory either on that or on any other historical question. Truth has ever been and will continue to be my object. Although my admiration of Knox is probably of longer standing than Mr Atkinson's, and at least as deeply seated, that would not justify me in affirming as certain anything regarding him the evidence for which is not conclusive. (2) That I have been indebted to "the researches of Anglican historians". Why not? In trying to get light on any obscure or difficult point, it is good

to avail one's self of the researches of other workers of any Church; and in this matter I have not confined myself to any one of them. (3) That, in my review of Mr Hewat's book, my summary of Knox's activities and influence in the crisis of the English Reformation was inadequate – "What a summary, even though casual . . . !" I was not discussing or questioning Knox's activities or influence; but merely the point whether or not he was a royal chaplain. My space was not unrestricted; and, besides, I have always tried to eschew irrelevance and diffuseness.

Burnet was misled by Strype; and M'Crie by both; and the acceptance of their statements by one of such deservedly high reputation as M'Crie gave them a weight, in Scotland at least, which otherwise they would not have possessed. A striking illustration of the results of Burnet's "emendation" of Edward's *Journal* is supplied unconsciously by T. W. Perry. Mr Atkinson correctly quotes him as saying: "Knox . . . was appointed one of the six royal chaplains in December 1551: in this character he had, in October 1552, to revise the Articles then in preparation."²³ On another page of his book, Perry says: "So far indeed as anything I can find in Burnet applies, he does not seem to have had any doubt who the chaplains were; for he says (Part ii, bk. I., p. 162, fol. 1715) 'These were *Bill, Harley, Pern, Grindal, Bradford, and Knox*'; and this list corresponds with that which he furnishes in his copy of the King's *Journal*. And though Strype says 'Burnet could not read' Knox's name because it was 'so dashed', he does not imply that Burnet was in error. It is not unlikely that Burnet's rendering may have been founded upon some contemporaneous evidence."²⁴ Here it is evident that, although Perry had looked into Strype's *Cranmer*, he had not consulted an earlier edition of Burnet's *Reformation* than the 1715 one. Had he even looked up the appendix to the third volume of that edition, he would have found conclusive proof that Strype supplied the Knox "correction" for Burnet's text and also for his print of Edward's *Journal*. Of Strype it is said – "Nor was he by any means a trustworthy decipherer of the documents he printed."²⁵ P. E. Barnes, in his edition of Strype's *Cranmer*, explains that Strype's "errors are chiefly to be attributed to the inaccuracy of the copyists" he employed.²⁶

²³ Perry's *Historical Considerations*, 1863, p. 93.

²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 110n.

²⁵ *Dictionary of National Biography*, lv., 68.

²⁶ Strype's *Cranmer*, 1853 edition, vol. i., p. vi.

Thus far I had written in April last; but was unable to complete this paper in time for the May issue of the *Bulwark*; and, when on the very point of resuming, a short paragraph announcing Mr Atkinson's death caught my eye in the *English Churchman* of 8th May. The announcement pained me, although I only knew him by correspondence.

Knox may have been appointed as one of the royal chaplains in place of Eastwick; but no proof has been produced that he was. Mr Atkinson lays stress on the fact that Knox's salary was the same as that of the royal chaplains, viz. £40 a year. That is quite certain. On the 27th of October 1552 the Privy Council issued "A warrault to the fowre gentlemen of the Privie Chamber to pay to Mr Knookes, preacher in the North, in the way of the Kinges Majesties reward the summe of xl li".²⁷ Mr Atkinson says "this was a year's salary of a royal chaplain, and not payable in advance"; and he has proved that later it was paid in quarterly instalments of £10. Dr Lorimer inferred "that the amount of stipend paid to him in October, 1552, could not have been in advance, but had reference to the preceding twelvemonth, which of course carries back his appointment to the last quarter of 1551".²⁸ But it was not until the 18th of December 1551 that it was resolved that there should be six chaplains. Mr Atkinson thinks that the "grant points to Knox as having been appointed when Eastwick dropped out of sight".

And he asks me to "suggest what the 40 l. was paid for". Knox was so full of zeal, energy and courage, that one may well accept Strype's statement, that the "annuity of forty pounds" was to be paid to him, "at the augmentation quarterly", until he was "promoted to some benefice". Strype says that he had manuscript authority for this, and dates it in December 1552.²⁹ Mr Atkinson asks, if the annuity was granted until he received promotion, why was it continued after he "had refused both the bishopric of Rochester in 1552, and the living of Allhallows, Bread Street, London, in 1553"? Knox's reasons for declining to accept either of these may have satisfied the Privy Council, and they would be loath to

²⁷ *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, new series, iv., 154.

²⁸ Lorimer's *Knox and the Church of England*, p. 80.

²⁹ *Historical Memorials*, 1721 ed., ii., p. 533. The Privy Council on the 28th of March 1549, authorised the payment of £50 to Latimer, "in respect of his attendaunce at Courte this Lent" (*Acts of Privy Council*, ii., 266); and on the 21st of July 1550, a warrant was granted to deliver £40 "to the use of Miles Coverdale, preacher, given him by the Kinges Majestie in rewarde" (*ibid.*, iii., 89). A notable man of service had a stipend of £40 a year "till he were otherwise promoted" (*ibid.*, iii., 30).

lose the services of such a preacher; but Mr Atkinson has himself shown that the last quarter's salary paid to him, five days before the King's death, was due at mid-summer 1553. That quarter began on the 25th of March, and it was on the 14th of April that he explained to the Council why he could not accept a benefice in London.³⁰

Mr Atkinson refers to Cranmer's letter, of 19th September 1552, to Cecil, intimating that he had sent the *Articles* to Mr Cheke (The King's tutor), and asking him to consider them well with him. He infers that the words "and others", in the Act of 20th November 1552, indicate Cecil and Cheke. This is the best point that he makes in his pamphlet; but it does not settle the matter.³¹ He points out that, in the printed *Acts of the Privy Council*, "Percie" is given for "Perne" in the minutes of 11th February 1551-52, and 21st October 1552; but, in quoting the latter minute, he makes a more serious error himself, by omitting the name of Horne; and in quoting Strype (p. 11), he omits the words "and Council" after "King".

He also appeals to tradition. I do not believe that any tradition can be found of an earlier date than Strype's statement in 1694. It is noteworthy that there is no reference to the alleged royal chaplainship of Knox in Beza's *Icones*, 1580; nor in Verheiden's *Effigies*, 1602; nor in the Life of Knox prefixed to the London 1644 edition of his *History*; nor in the longer life in the Edinburgh edition of that year; nor in Samuel Clark's *Lives*, 1654. Matthew Crawford, in 1732, mentions the appointment; but he avowedly takes it from Strype.

Despite Mr Atkinson's laborious and eager attempt, the proof that Knox was a royal chaplain is still, to my regret, inconclusive.

.

EDITOR'S NOTES

Note A. On 21st October 1552 a letter was sent to Harley, Bill, Horne, Perne, Grindal, and Knox instructing them to consider the draft of the Articles; and on 20th November 1552 it was reported that the Articles had been considered "be certeine of his Highnes chaplenes and others". Hay Fleming initially argues that the "certeine of his Highnes

³⁰ Calderwood's *History*, i., 280.

³¹ [See Note A at the end.]

chaplens” must be some of Harley, Bill, Grindal, and Perne; while Horne and Knox are the “others”. To this Atkinson responds that the “others” might well include Cecil and Cheke, and Hay Fleming concedes this point.

Another consideration, however, is John Knox’s *Memorial* or “Confession” to the Privy Council which dates from this time and is printed in Lorimer (pp. 267-274). The *Memorial* uses the “we” form throughout, beginning:

Commanded by your letters (most honorable) in wrytinge to reporte our judgements and opinyones in such articles as, exhibited to the kinge’s maiestie, ware dedercted to sartane learned precheres, and amonge whome we most unworthy were acompted, that the same by thame and us advisedly consedered, reporte myghte be mayde of our opiniones to your honores agayne.

The impression is that Knox is writing with at least one other person, and this is the view that is usually taken. The identity of the other person, or persons, is an open question. The *Memorial* is arguing vehemently against kneeling at communion, and Lorimer observes that none of Harley, Bill, Horne, Perne, or Grindal shared Knox’s view on this subject, so they can all be rejected as possible co-authors (although Gairdner, extraordinarily, assumes that they were, vol. 3, pp. 348-9). Lorimer suggests Thomas Becon and Roger Hutchinson as Knox’s collaborators (p. 277); but Bailey argues that Becon is not known to have held views against kneeling at communion as early as 1552, and in any case, as Cranmer’s chaplain, he was very unlikely to criticise Cranmer’s views as strongly as the *Memorial* does (D. S. Bailey, *Thomas Becon* (Edinburgh, 1952), pp. 71-6). Bailey suggests John Hooper instead, which seems plausible, and another possibility might be John à Lasco (Lorimer, p. 289).

The main point, however, is that Knox’s companion (if he had one) was a “learned preacher” other than Harley, Bill, Horne, Perne, Grindal, and Knox who had been “commanded” by letter from the Privy Council to report his judgment on the Articles. Thus the letter of 21st October to Harley, Bill, Horne, Perne, Grindal, and Knox was not the only letter that the Privy Council sent out. This makes it more significant that these six men were treated together by the Privy Council, both when they were asked to consider the Articles and when, ultimately, they signed them. In

both cases, they were distinguished from “others”, which makes it more likely that they were the people designated as “his Highnes chaplenes”.

Note B. The King’s *Journal* speaks of “one year . . . next year . . . the third year . . . fourth year . . . etc.”, which seems to imply a cycle. One would think that whatever the original intentions were in December 1551, the authorities would feel free to depart from them as circumstances developed. If they were short of a royal chaplain, and found a man (Knox) in the north who seemed suitable, they might decide to keep him there for the moment rather than uprooting him to Wales, Lancashire, or Derby.