

**THE
BEGINNINGS
OF
NONCONFORMITY**

**GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL
ROGER THOMAS
H. LISMER SHORT
R. D. WHITEHORN**

The Hibbert Lectures

THE BEGINNINGS OF NONCONFORMITY

by

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL, D.D.
ROGER THOMAS, M.A.
R. D. WHITEHORN, D.D.
H. LISMER SHORT, M.A.

THE HIBBERT LECTURES

JAMES CLARKE & CO. LTD.
33 STORE STREET
LONDON, W.C.1

FIRST PUBLISHED 1964

© THE HIBBERT TRUST

CONTENTS

1. THE EMERGENCE OF NONCONFORMITY
by Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. 9
2. THE BREAK-UP OF NONCONFORMITY
by Roger Thomas, M.A. 33
3. RICHARD BAXTER — “MEER NONCON-
FORMIST” by R. D. Whitehorn, D.D. ... 61
4. WALES AND THE EJECTION
by H. Lismer Short, M.A. 78

PREFACE

A YEAR BEFORE the Tercentenary of the Great Ejection of 1662, the Hibbert Trustees made preparations for the observance of the occasion by inviting four church historians to deliver Hibbert Lectures in 1962 based on the theme of the Ejection and its significance. The four lecturers, the Rev. Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall of New College, London, the Rev. Roger Thomas, Librarian of Dr. Williams's Library, the Rev. Principal R. D. Whitehorn of Westminster College, Cambridge, and Dr. Norman Sykes, Dean of Winchester, agreed on the subject, "The Beginnings of Non-conformity", and it was arranged that the Dean of Winchester should sum up the series with reference to the present day. This programme could not be carried out in its entirety owing to the sudden and greatly lamented death of Dr. Sykes; so the three lecturers confined their attention to the prescribed subject and these lectures were delivered in the Universities of Cambridge and Nottingham and University College, Cardiff.

Later the Hibbert Trustees were invited to finance a lecture at University College, Swansea, on Wales and the Ejection by the Rev. H. L. Short of Manchester College, Oxford, the Editor of the *Hibbert Journal*.

I THE EMERGENCE OF NONCONFORMITY

by

Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D.

MR. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: may I express first my sense of the honour the Hibbert Trust confers when it invites one to lecture under its auspices? Like everyone else, I am much in debt to earlier lectures. As an undergraduate at Oxford I heard Tagore. Among lectures I have read I think specially of Charles Beard's on the Reformation. Beard's book can not only arouse a lasting regard for Erasmus as one who combined a return to the simplicities of the Gospel with a fearlessly critical spirit; it has the power to charge the reader to go and do likewise.

The present series of lectures is intended by way of commemoration of the passing, three centuries ago, of the Act of Uniformity; of the consequent ejection from their livings in the Church of England of some 1800 clergy, who on grounds of conscience could not accept the Act's terms; and of the beginnings in Britain of the organized Nonconformity which has come to be an accepted part of the religious scene. I have been asked to portray "The Emergence of Nonconformity" at that time. As I do this, I want also to show that the Nonconformity which emerged in and after 1662 was not a new phenomenon, sudden and unpredictable in its uprising. On the contrary, it was the latest expression of a movement which had persisted for many years, with its origins indeed in the sixteenth century. 1662 stands out as the

year when organized Nonconformity, as we know it, consciously and (as it has seemed) permanently took shape. We are bound to ask, however, how it was that the terms demanded by the Act of Uniformity—in particular, assent to and compliance with the ceremonies and liturgy as prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer and acceptance of episcopal ordination as necessary for the validating of ministry—could be declined by so many clergy at one time. The answer will not appear unless we realize that in their refusal and consequent deprivation they stood, and were conscious that they stood, in a tradition. These men were by no means the first to come into conflict with authority over the forms and doctrines of worship and ministry as established and settled a hundred years earlier. They represented a type of Christian piety of long standing which at these points was different and recognizably different. In the 1650's, during the Commonwealth and Protectorate, they had enjoyed freedom under Cromwell to put into practice the principles of worship and church order which they cherished. This freedom the Restoration abruptly halted.

This thesis I propose to illustrate in four ways. First, we may observe that a number of the clergy ejected at the Restoration were the sons, and sometimes also the grandsons, of ministers who had fallen foul of ecclesiastical authority in earlier generations. Secondly, we will concentrate on a particular area, namely Nottingham and the parishes adjacent to it. Here we shall see how the Nonconformity associated with 1662 (and with 1672, when temporarily, by royal indulgence, licenses for Nonconformist worship were first granted) had in fact appeared much earlier and had persisted during the preceding decades. Thirdly, we shall see that both the earlier Nonconformists and those of 1662 had often one and the same *alma mater* in the University of Cambridge. Fourthly, we shall look at a small collection of books translated from English into Welsh which between 1670 and 1688 were put out by a group of ejected ministers, both Welsh

and English. Taken together, these books point to the same conscious continuity with earlier days.

First, then, and most obviously, let us call genealogy in aid. When, forty years after 1662, Edmund Calamy appended to his *Abridgment* of Baxter's *Reliquiae* what (as enlarged) was to become the standard account of the ejected ministers generally, he proudly indicated his right to authorship through descent from two of them by writing himself on the titlepage "Edmund Calamy, Edm(undi) Fil(ius) & Nepos". Much the same sense of family piety informs the biographies of ejected ministers in one of Calamy's sources, those written by Samuel Clark, who in 1662 was ejected from the curacy of St. Bennetfinck, London. Not only had Clark himself been prosecuted by the Bishop of Chester as far back as 1627 for declining to wear the surplice; he was the son of a clergyman whom the Bishop of Lichfield & Coventry had both suspended and excommunicated; he was also the nephew of another minister ejected in 1662 who, as Calamy phrases it, "carry'd Puritanism in his very Name",¹ Sabbath Clark. Daniel Dyke, the ejected Rector of Much Hadham, Herts., came of a line something like Clark's. His father was "disaffected to the ceremonies" and submitted only "for the sake of peace" and "so far as he could do it with a good conscience";² and his grandfather was suspended in 1583 for refusing to subscribe that there was nothing in the Prayer Book contrary to the word of God and later again suspended for refusing to wear the surplice.³

Calamy records a number of cases in which an ejected minister was the son, as he says of Daniel Dyke, of a

1. Edmund Calamy, *Account* (1713), p. 130. Calamy and Clark both continued the tradition as well as inheriting it: Calamy's son Edmund became a minister and his grandson Edmund and greatgrandson Michael trained for the ministry; Clark's son, greatgrandson and greatgreatgrandson, each of them Samuel, all became ministers.
2. Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans* (1813), ii. 279.
3. *Seconde Parte of a Register* (Cambridge, 1915), ed. A. Peel, i. 225, ii. 261; William Urwick, *Nonconformity in Herts.* (1884), pp. 106-116.

“good old Puritan”.¹ In Shropshire, for instance, Andrew and Joseph Barnett, the ejected Rector of Rodington and Vicar of Wrockwardine respectively, were the sons of a clergyman who, he tells us, was “accounted” one of “the first Puritans that Shropshire afforded”.² Their neighbour ejected from the rectory of West Felton, Samuel Hildersham, whom Calamy calls “a Father to the Sons of the Prophets in and about Shropshire”,³ was son to the famous Puritan, Arthur Hildersham, who was suspended by the Court of High Commission. In Cumberland the Rector ejected from Greystoke, Richard Gilpin, was a great-nephew of the better known Bernard Gilpin, the so-called “Apostle to the North”, who, in the reign of Elizabeth I had made repeated efforts to avoid subscription. John Dod, who was among those suspended in 1604, and William Whateley, who came before the High Commission, are others among earlier Puritan leaders whose sons suffered ejection at the Restoration.

The father of Andrew and Joseph Barnett “was forc’d, for his Nonconformity”, as Calamy puts it, “to take Sanctuary . . . that he might be out of the reach of the Bishops”.⁴ This is but one of a number of cases recorded by Calamy in which the fathers of clergymen ejected at the Restoration had been prosecuted, or threatened with prosecution, before the abolition of episcopacy in 1643. The father of Richard and William Alleine, for instance, the ejected Rector of Batcombe, Som., and Vicar of Blandford Forum, Dorset, respectively, had been “a great Sufferer from the Bishop of Wells”;⁵ the father of Nathaniel and Thomas Vincent, the ejected Curate of Langley Marish, Wraysbury, Bucks., and Rector of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, London, respectively, “was so harassed, and forc’d upon so many Removes for his Nonconformity, that though he had a good Number of Children, yet he

1. E. Calamy, *Continuation* (1727), p. 532.

2. *ib.*, p. 726.

3. E. Calamy, *Account*, p. 560.

4. *ib.*, p. 566.

5. *ib.*, p. 580.

never had two of them born in one County”,¹ the father of Daniel Cawdrey, the ejected Rector of Great Billing, Northants., was, once more, “an old Nonconformist . . . who struggled hard with the Bishops upon his Deprivation for Nonconformity”.²

Some there were like the father of Joseph Hill, an ejected Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, who escaped the episcopal pursuivants resolved “to trouble him for not wearing the Surplice” only by dying but “a few Hours before the Summons came”.³ More numerous were those who escaped by going into exile. The father of John Howe, for instance, the ejected Vicar of Great Torrington, Devon, was “compell’d to remove into Ireland”.⁴ Others, like the father of John Bulkley, the ejected Rector of Fordham, Essex, the father of Isaac Chauncey, the ejected Rector of Woodborough, Wilts., or the father of Nathaniel and Samuel Mather, the ejected Vicar of Barnstaple, Devon and Curate of Burtonwood, Warrington, Lancs., respectively, went for New England.

For such men as these Nonconformity, to the ceremonies in particular, was in their blood; and whatever their views might be about the theory of episcopacy, their associations, or their fathers’ associations, with the bishop in person hardly commended episcopacy in practice to their conscience or their commonsense. If Nonconformity in 1662 were to lead them to the loss of livelihood, they knew they would not be the first to suffer shame; and this knowledge helped to give them the assurance which provided leaders among them. It may also be noticed that even the few mentioned were benefited in several different parts of the country. The list of names could, of course, be much extended; but a list quickly grows tedious. Let us leave the dry bones for a more continuous story of flesh and blood.

1. E. Calamy, *Continuation*, p. 30.

2. E. Calamy, *Account*, p. 489.

3. *ib.*, p. 81.

4. *ib.*, p. 236.

On 24 September 1672, a little more than a year after his marriage to Rebecca Spateman,¹ Gervase Disney, a young man of good family, took up residence in Nottingham. Then, as now, Nottingham had much to commend it to the discerning. "Celia Fiennes' favourite town, which she used as a standard of comparison",² it was also, a little later, held by Defoe to be "one of the most pleasant and beautiful towns in England".³ But the first of the "Reasons inclining us to Nottingham" which Disney set down in his memoirs was this:

The very good Society there to be had, and the comfortable Ordinances there to be enjoy'd, not only on Sabbath-Days, but Week-Days too. Mr. Whitlock, Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. Barrett, being the Ministers of that Society there, that I and my dear Wife entred our selves unworthy Members of.⁴

Accordingly, they "found out . . . a Religious Family to table in, viz. Mrs. Gambles' in Bridlesmith-Gate"⁵ Disney writes:

And O what cause have I to bless God to eternity, for the comfortable Enjoyments of that Place ! there, I think, my Heart was more carried out after God

1. Daughter of John Spateman, whose house (still standing) at Roadnook, Brackenfield, Derbyshire, was licensed for Presbyterian worship earlier this year (*Original Records of Nonconformity* (1911), ed. G. L. Turner, ii. 710), and whose chaplain was the ejected vicar of Cole Orton, Leics., Samuel Oldershaw (see *Calamy Revised*, ed. A. G. Matthews, Oxford, 1934).
2. Celia Fiennes, *Journeys* (1947), ed. C. Morris, p. 72, n. 17.
3. Daniel Defoe, *Tour through England and Wales* (Everyman edn.), ii. 142.
4. Gervase Disney, *Some Remarkable Passages* (1692), ed. D. Disney, p. 56.
5. *ib.*, p. 55; in 1689 Mrs. Gamble's "rooms in Bridlesmith Gate" were certificated for Protestant Dissenting worship (Benjamin Carpenter, *Some account of the original introduction of Presbyterianism in Nottingham* (n.d.), p. 104, n. *, *ad fin.* She was perhaps the widow of Thomas Gamble, mayor of Nottingham in 1645 (Duncan Gray, *Nottingham through 500 years*, 2nd edn., Nottingham 1960, pp. 83, 86).

in an Ordinance, and I did enjoy more of God in a few years, than I had done, perhaps, all my Life before.¹

If 1662 was the year of the appearance of Nonconformity as an organized but illegal and underground movement, 1672 (when Disney came to Nottingham) was the year of its emergence, by royal indulgence only but openly and in all the fifty-two counties of England and Wales except Anglesey. In few towns did it emerge with more confidence than in Nottingham, where licenses for Nonconformist worship were sought not only for eight private houses but—albeit unavailingly—for the Town Hall, the County Hall, the Spice Hall and the Free School.¹

The establishment of Nonconformity in Nottingham owes much—more, indeed, than can easily be reckoned—to the devotion and fidelity, over more than half a century, of the three men who had ministered there during the Commonwealth and Protectorate, and whose "Society" the Disneys now joined. These three were: John Whitlock, who from 1651 to 1662 was Vicar of St. Mary's, where his tombstone, now in the flags to the right of the pulpit, may still be found; his lifelong friend and fellow-labourer, William Reynolds, who during the same period was Lecturer at St. Mary's; and John Barret, who from 1656 to 1662 was Rector of St. Peter's.³ After the ejection of all three men at the Restoration, Barret lived comparatively near to Nottingham at Sandiacre, Derbyshire; but Whitlock and Reynolds, after three and a half years at Colwick Hall, outside Nottingham, and two at Shirebrook, Derbyshire, lived—together, as always—for nineteen years at Mansfield. Despite the fifteen miles be-

1. *ib.*, pp. 56-7.

2. Licenses for the Town Hall and County Hall were not approved, and for the Spice Hall and Free School ignored; one of the private houses licensed was that of Thomas Lupton, whom Disney describes as "my first Acquaintance, a holy Christian, and one useful, loving, and assisting to me in all Offices of Love whilst he lived" (p. 57): see *Original Records*, ii. 717-8, 722.

3. For all three, see *D.N.B.*; *Cal. Rev.*

tween Mansfield and Nottingham, Whitlock records that "God gave us (blessed be his Name) many opportunities of going over to our People at Nottingham, though with some intervals by Reason of Persecution sometimes breaking out"; and he recalls God's goodness both "in giving us so many free, quiet and peaceable Sabbaths with our People" and "in preserving us in our work" "in our so constant Journeys ... in all weathers and seasons", "notwithstanding the very incommodious Places and Hours, we were forced to, in times of Restraint. We usually were with them [he tells us] every fortnight's Lord's Day, as my Brother Barret was with them the other Lord's Day".¹ When 1672 came all three ministers took out licenses for Presbyterian worship; and in 1687 Whitlock and Reynolds returned to Nottingham and resumed their joint ministry, still with the help of Barret, who continued to live at Sandiacre, and now also of Whitlock's son John. Some months after the passing of the Toleration Act in 1689 land for the building of their meeting-house in High Pavement was conveyed by John Hawkins, mayor of Nottingham.² The Independents had built, and registered, their meeting-house in Castle Gate even sooner;³ and with the Independents' minister, John Ryther, a younger man, whose father had been ejected in 1660, the three Presbyterian ministers joined "Harmoniously (blessed be God)" in a constant "weekly Lecture";⁴ Whitlock's son John also preached at Castle Gate "one Lord's day in 12".⁵ Somewhat later the ministers further joined in preaching sermons to the local branch of the Society for the Reformation of Manners, an

1. John Whitlock, *Short account of the life of ... William Reynolds* (1698), pp. 42-5. In 1669 a hostile estimate of the congregation's size was still "4 or 500": *Original Records*, i. 164.
2. Benjamin Carpenter, p. 108.
3. A. R. Henderson, *History of Castle Gate Congregational Church Nottingham 1655-1905* (1905), p. 80.
4. John Whitlock, p. 56. Later Ryther fell out with the Presbyterians; see his *Defence of the glorious gospel* (1703).
5. cf. *Freedom after Ejection* (Manchester, 1917), ed. A. Gordon, p. 82.

activity in which a conforming clergyman also could unite with them.¹ But in 1698 what both Whitlock and Barret called a "Threefold Cord"² was broken by Reynolds' death; Whitlock wrote a *Short Account* of Reynolds' life and published it, together with the sermon preached by Barret at Reynolds' funeral. When Whitlock died ten years later, Barret likewise preached, and published, his *Funeral-Sermon*; and when in 1713 Barret himself died, his funeral sermon was preached, and published, by Whitlock's son, Barret's assistant and successor.

In Barret's *Funeral-Sermon* for Whitlock the effect on Nottingham of the arrival of Whitlock and Reynolds in 1651 was thus strikingly recalled:

'Tis scarce credible what a Reformation was visible in the Town within a few Years after their coming. To give you one instance, It was the Observation of a Minister of great worth (an Acquaintance of Mr. Whitlock's) when after his bestowing his pains for me one Lord's Day in the Afternoon, I took him to a Friend's House near the Church to rest a while; coming away we were to pass several streets, where he took notice, not one idle Person was to be seen sitting or standing at their Doors. And where we could hear any thing as we passed on, we might hear Families some way religiously employed, as in reading, repeating what they had heard, or singing Psalms, whereupon he said, He did not know any Town like this.³

(The speaker, we may remark, was evidently not acquainted with Kidderminster).⁴

1. cf. the *Sermon* (1698) to the Society preached at St. Mary's by the minister ejected from Tollerton, who had conformed in 1666, Daniel Chadwick, now vicar of Arnhall [Arnold]; the copy at D.W.L. is bound up with sermons preached to the Society in the following year by Whitlock, Barret and Ryther; Reynolds was now dead.
2. John Whitlock, pp. 64, 72.
3. John Barret, *Funeral-Sermon* (1709), p. 24.
4. cf. *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), ed. M. Sylvester, Bk. I, Pt. i, p. 84, sect. 136.

Now Whitlock and Reynolds certainly accomplished much; but they did not start the good work, nor did they claim to do so. "Many years before their coming" to Nottingham, Barret recalls, in fact so far back as 1617, "the Town had been signally blest in Mr. George Cotes . . . whom the Lord sent with the Fulness of the Blessing of the Gospel; when Converts came in, as Doves to their Windows"; and "after Mr. George Cotes this Town was supplied with good, sound, profitable Preachers".¹ Coates, who was rector of St. Peter's, Barret describes as "a moderate, pious Conformist"; but two or three years before his death in 1640, we now know from Dr. Marchant's researches, he was in trouble for administering the sacrament to those who would not kneel or who would not come up to the communion rail at all.² St. Peter's, indeed, "was a Puritan stronghold"; in 1638 as many as forty-three parishioners, including the mayor of Nottingham, were presented to the archdeacon's court for not communicating. They defended themselves sturdily, claiming that communicating at the altar was injurious to both visibility and audibility communally, one man adding that because of "the throng in the chancell . . . he could not have any meditacion".³ For the last eighteen months (September 1641 to April 1643) of the existence of the court, moreover, whenever the archdeacon came to St. Peter's to hold it, "he found the church doors locked in his face".⁴ Nottingham Nonconformity did not begin in 1662.

Nor in fact did it begin with George Coates, or indeed at St. Peter's. St. Mary's had a longer tradition than St.

Peter's. Whitlock's immediate predecessor, Nicholas Folkingham, "that lively Minister", as Barret calls him, was not, it is true, lively enough for the Quaker George Fox, who, on the occasion of a visit at this time to "the great steeplehouse" "on top of a hill", says "the priest" looked "like a great lump of earth"¹ Lucy Hutchinson is less vivid but more informative: "a very able minister . . . but a bitter presbyterian"² is how she describes him; he had in fact subscribed the Essex Presbyterian ministers' manifesto before coming to Nottingham.³ The two vicars prior to Folkingham were not Puritans, but "a Puritan tradition was . . . maintained by the civic preacher" or lecturer; and in 1635 the lecturer, Thomas Cranage, was summoned to court for not wearing a surplice, not reading the service, saying uncanonical prayers, and other offences.⁴ As far back as the reign of Elizabeth I, indeed, St. Mary's had been a "Puritan centre", with "a Friday preaching exercise"⁵ In 1597 the famous Puritan exorcist, John Darrell, had been elected lecturer with the approval of the vicar: earlier still a former curate of St. Mary's, now vicar of Colwick, was in trouble over the surplice.⁶

Of this tradition Whitlock shows himself well aware. "Those deceased Ministers of Christ that were before us", "were they living, would", he says, "and could not but give the same" testimony as he does himself to "the People of Nottingham": namely

That they are a People that have not had itching Ears, nor affected Novelties, new and high Notions, or quaint Expressions, and starched Discourses, but have ever liked and relished plain, sound, and prac-

1. John Barret, p. 17: naming Coates' nephews, John Goodall (cf. R. A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York 1560-1642* (1960), p. 303) and Samuel Coates (cf. *Cal. Rev.*; R. A. Marchant, p. 299), and Barret's immediate predecessor, Richard Whitchurch.

2. R. A. Marchant, p. 299.

3. *ib.*, pp. 67-8, 195, 197.

4. *ib.*, p. 201.

1. G. Fox, *Journal* (Cambridge, 1952), p. 39, with n.l.

2. L. Hutchinson, *Memoirs* (3rd edn., 1810), ii. 102.

3. cf. *Cal. Rev.*, p. 555.

4. R. A. Marchant, p. 194.

5. *ib.*, p. 186.

6. *ib.*, pp. 300, 294.

tical Preaching, and have been a people ready to good Works of piety and Charity ...¹

Certainly St. Mary's accepted the Presbyterian "Scripture-Discipline"² which Whitlock and Reynolds made a condition of their settlement in 1651; for eight parishioners were then chosen as "Ruling Elders"³ within the parish. These also attended the meetings of the Presbyterian classis for the county, when soon afterwards this was formed.⁴ At their head was the Honourable Francis Pierrepont, Colonel in the Parliamentary army and M.P. for Nottingham, who had signed the original invitation to the two ministers. When in 1658 he died, they each preached a funeral sermon in his memory⁵: Reynolds acknowledged Pierrepont's "forwardness unto, and activity about the settling of Order in the Church of God in this place; of which he was not only an useful, and honourable member, but was pleased also to act as an officer, humbly condescending herein, to joyn himself with persons far inferiour to himself, in rank, and quality"; Whitlock similarly re-

1. John Whitlock, pp. 63-4.
2. *ib.*, p. 30.
3. *ib.*, p. 33: "the Honourable Francis Pierpoint Esq.; Alderman John Fillingham [Sheriff of Nottingham in 1645], Mr. Adrian Garner [father of James Gardiner, bishop of Lincoln], Mr. Richard Hawkins [father-in-law of Robert Smalley, vicar of Greasley], Mr. William Flamsteed [Town-Clerk of Nottingham 1644-1653], Mr. Arthur Stevens, Mr. Stephen Garner, Mr. Samuel Fillingham." Later the names of four more elders appear: Alderman John James (mayor of Nottingham in 1642), Samuel Staples, Henry Pitts (master of the Free School; see *infra*) and Richard Whitby (cf. R. A. Marchant, p. 303, *s.v.* John Goodall).
4. See *Minutes of the Bury Presbyterian Classis 1647-57*, Pt. II (Chetham Soc., n.s., xli [1898]), App. I.
5. Reynolds' sermon, *The Vanitie of Man* (1658), and Whitlock's *The Upright Man and his happy end* (1658), were issued together, with a common title-page, *The Vanitie and Excellency of Man* (1658), and with epistles dedicatory signed by both, and twelve elegiac poems by ministerial members of the classis (most of them members who conformed), Fellows of Colleges at Cambridge (including Edward Stillington, the future bishop of Worcester) and others. For a modern characterization of Pierrepont, see A. C. Wood, *Nottinghamshire in the Civil War* (Oxford, 1937), p. 130.

marked that Pierrepont "accounted it no disparagement to act as a ruling officer in the Church of God; and that at such a time when all essays tending to settle order in the Church were rather discountenanced (if not scoffed at) by most, than any way encouraged"¹.

Whitlock's expression of disappointment at the slightness of interest shown in the establishment of Presbyterian order was justified. Apart from Barret and his predecessor at St. Peter's, and Whitlock and Reynolds themselves, out of all the Nottinghamshire parishes only some twenty ministers joined the classis, and of these seven or eight conformed at the Restoration. In those parishes, however, which went so far as to appoint lay elders, namely (besides those in Nottingham) Beeston, Greasley, Selston and Sneinton cum Colwick, the bonds formed doubtless helped to preserve through future years of persecution the faith and practice which the classis sought to foster. At Selston, for instance, a Congregational church was formed, which still exists; a conventicle of about 100 was reported at Greasley in 1669; while in 1672 one of the erstwhile elders, John Constable, took out a license for Presbyterian worship in his house at Beeston.²

It is also worthy of note that these parishes, again like those in Nottingham, had earlier traditions of Nonconformity. At Beeston, for example, William Westoby, vicar from 1650 till his death in 1656, had constantly been in trouble in his younger days, being charged in 1615, 1619, 1626, 1633 and 1634 with a variety of offences, such as refusal to wear the surplice, to use the sign of the cross in baptism, to administer communion privately, and to insist on kneeling at communion.³ Emmanuel Knutton, who was curate of Beeston from 1636 to 1641, later signed the Yorkshire Presbyterian ministers' *Vindiciae*;⁴ while as far back as 1584 a Beeston parishioner was among

1. *op. cit.*, pp. 4, 39.
2. *Original Records*, i. 154; ii. 719.
3. R. A. Marchant, pp. 177-8, 185, n. 6, 316.
4. *ib.*, p. 308; *Cal. Rev.*, p. 558.

those presented for not receiving communion kneeling.¹ Again, at Greasley, a parish one of the elders for which was Gilbert Millington, M.P. for Nottingham and regicide,² the vicar from 1650 to 1654 was a minister who later was ejected from the rectory of Hawton,³ the vicar from 1628 to 1640, Lemuel Tuke, was a former Separatist and “remained for a long time excommunicate, maintaining curates to serve the cure”,⁴ one of them being his brother Ephraim;⁵ back in 1607 and 1608 the churchwardens were clearly friendly disposed to the Nottinghamshire Separatists,⁶ one of the most eminent of whom, the Baptist pioneer, Thomas Helwys, lived not far away at Broxtowe Hall;⁷ while in 1574 the vicar of Greasley, Elias Okedenne, had been presented for not wearing the surplice.⁸ At Sneinton, once more, a parishioner performed penance in 1588 for refusing to come to church if the curate wore a surplice, saying that the curate “stood more lyke a dyvell than a minister”;⁹ while in the Spring of 1641 one of the Sneinton churchwardens “refused to be sworn” and was still “refractory” in the Autumn, as by then were the churchwardens of Beeston and Greasley also.¹⁰

Where did clerical Nonconformity, in Nottingham or anywhere else, or the tendency to it, spring from? Part

1. R. A. Marchant, p. 135.
2. *D.N.B.*
3. John Turner, see *Cal. Rev.*
4. R. A. Marchant, pp. 196-7, 313; see further my essay in *From Uniformity to Unity 1662-1962* (1962), ed. O. Chadwick & G. F. Nuttall, pp. 165-6.
5. R. A. Marchant, p. 313.
6. *ib.*, pp. 156, 306.
7. Although Broxtowe Hall (which still stands) was in the parish of Bilborough cum Broxtowe, it was by the churchwardens of Basford that Helwys was presented (Marchant, p. 162). See now E. A. Payne, *Thomas Helwys and the first Baptist church in England* [1962].
8. A. C. Wood, p. 188.
9. R. A. Marchant, p. 136, with n.l.
10. *ib.*, pp. 201-2.

of the answer to this question is, from the University of Cambridge. All three of the Nottingham ministers had been at Cambridge, Whitlock and Reynolds at Emmanuel College, where their life-long friendship began. So had the Master of the Nottingham Free School, Thomas Leake. When in 1657 Leake died, advice in the choice of his successor was asked of the Regius Professor of Divinity, Anthony Tuckney, Master of St. John's, who proposed three names. The name selected was that of Henry Pitts, who, after examination by the Nottingham ministers and two others, was appointed and duly became an elder for the parish of St. Mary's; and Pitts, again, was a Cambridge man.¹ In this case Tuckney's advice was sought partly, no doubt, because he was Whitlock's father-in-law; after the Restoration, moreover, Pitts conformed. The incident stands, nevertheless, as a symbol of Cambridge's part in the nurture and assistance of Puritans and Nonconformists throughout the country and throughout the century.

So far as we have gone, I have mentioned (apart from Tuckney) 27 ministers who were ejected at the Restoration. On analysis it appears that 14 of them were from Cambridge (6 from Emmanuel), as against only 6 from Oxford (3 from New Inn Hall), 4 from Harvard and 1 from Edinburgh. In so small a group this could be mere coincidence; but a similar (if smaller) preponderance appears in the figures given by Mr. Matthews² for all ejected ministers so far as known: namely, 733 from Cambridge (133 from Emmanuel), as against 513 from Oxford (66 from New Inn Hall).

Again, so far as we have gone, I have mentioned 26 earlier ministers who were in trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities in the first half of the seventeenth century or the last quarter of the sixteenth. On analysis it appears

1. cf. A. W. Thomas, *History of Nottingham High School, 1513-1953* (Nottingham, 1957), pp. 40-47; in 1675 Pitts received priest's orders and became Rector of Reepham, Norfolk (*Al. Cant.*).
2. *Cal. Rev.*, p. lxi.

that 15 of these were Cambridge men (3 from St. John's and 3 from Trinity), as against only 3 from Oxford. Now in this case there is no inclusive larger list of names, already the object of systematic study, with which to compare the figures. But there is a "Survey"¹ of 60 parishes in the Deanery of Doncaster made in 1604 by two Nonconformist ministers within it, in which 3 besides themselves are noted as Nonconformists, while 14 others are described as "weary of the Ceremonies"; and of these 19, no less than 14 were from Cambridge (4 from St. John's, 3 from Trinity), and from Oxford none. Much the same result is yielded by examination of the trials in 1615, 1617 and 1627 of Roger Brekeley, Curate of Grindleton, in the parish of Mitton, and his followers, Richard Tennant, Rector of Burnsall, and Thomas Squire, Rector of Escrick, all in Yorkshire. Altogether some 33 ministers, 3 of whom lived to be ejected at the Restoration, are known to have been involved in these trials; and of these 23 were Cambridge men (6 from St. John's), as against only 4 from Oxford.²

In providing successive generations of Nonconformists with their intellectual training, the University undoubtedly helped to form the tradition. This was recognized at the time. Archbishop Laud complained of it, and at the beginning of the eighteenth century it was still remembered, though now applauded, by Cotton Mather. I mention it again here as part evidence, part explanation, of the tradition. I also want to hint something further, with reference to Trinity College.

The Grindletonians, as Roger Brekeley's followers were nicknamed, did something, it is now known, to prepare the way for Quakerism a generation later. This is suggested first by the nature of the errors with which Brekeley was

1. This "Survey," which is described (not quite exactly) by Marchant, pp. 27-8, is reproduced as Appendix I in the unpublished London Ph.D. thesis by J. A. Newton, "Puritanism in the Diocese of York (excluding Nottinghamshire) 1603-1640."
2. cf. Marchant, pp. 233, 280, 283, with refs. there given to other ministers.

charged,¹ secondly, by the fact that one of the clergymen who supported him is known to have welcomed George Fox, as did also a member of Richard Tennant's family,² and thirdly, by the fact that a leader from among Fox's earliest converts grew up in a parish with a Grindletonian vicar.³ Links can also be established between the parishes round Grindleton and Sedbergh in North-West Yorkshire, where in 1652 organized Quakerism began, spreading fast through the rectangular area formed with Sedbergh by the three large contiguous parishes of Kirkby Lonsdale, Heversham and Kendal. Now it is noteworthy that this area was, in a special manner, a Cambridge enclave; for all four advowsons, which at the dissolution of Coverham Abbey and of St. Mary's Abbey, York, had fallen to the Crown, had been bestowed by Mary Tudor on Trinity College; while from its foundation in 1528 Sedbergh School has always been associated with St. John's. The question whether Trinity's use of its patronage fostered the growth of Nonconformity is an inviting one, especially when one observes that the living of Blyth, with its curacies of Bawtry and Austerfield, an early Separatist stronghold on the frontier of Yorkshire with Nottinghamshire, is also in its gift, as again is that of Gainford, in County Durham, another parish where Quakerism early took root; but this investigation I must leave to another occasion, or perhaps to another inquirer.

By way of conclusion let us, rather, look to Wales away. Here there was no long Puritan or Separatist tra-

1. cf. T. Sippell, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Quäkertums* (Giessen, 1920), pp. 21-4, from Bodleian Rawlinson MS. 399, 196.
2. i.e. Fox's "Mr. Boys" (*Journal*, ed. N. Penney, Cambridge, 1911), i. 28, identified by Marchant, p. 232, as William Boyes, Perpetual Curate of Goathland; and Fox's "one Tennant" (*Journal*, i. 41), identified by Penney (*ib.*, i. 403) as James Tennant, of Scarhouse, Langstrothdale, Richard Tennant being of Malham Waterhouses (Marchant, p. 283).
3. i.e. Thomas Taylor, born c. 1617 at Carlton-in-Craven (G. Fox, *Journal*, i. 410), where the Grindletonian Edward Watkin was Vicar from 1612 till his death in 1638 (Marchant, p. 290).

dition behind the Nonconformists of 1662. The resignation of William Erbury, vicar of St. Mary's, Cardiff, the suspension of his curate, Walter Cradock, and the deprivation of William Wroth, vicar of Llanvaches, Monmouthshire, in the years 1634-38, followed as this was by the founding of an Independent church at Llanvaches in 1639, are generally taken as the *terminus a quo*.

In 1653 the minister of the Independent church at Wrexham, Morgan Llwyd, was still echoing John Penry's application to Wales of Hosea's lament, "my people is destroyed for lack of knowledge", adding "neither are there many Welsh books in Wales".¹ The Act for the better propagation and preaching of the Gospel in Wales, which had come into force three years earlier, was concerned for "the education of children in piety and good literature", and as a consequence of the Act "more than sixty free schools"² were set up; but at the Restoration these automatically lapsed, and the whole body of schoolmasters "had no option but to discontinue".³ Not until the mitigation of persecution in 1672⁴ could those who were now become Nonconformists begin again to turn their energies to the evangelization of Wales, and in particular to the provision of what a few saw to be the precondition of this, namely the availability of books in Welsh.

The efforts to produce such books made by Thomas Gouge, the ejected vicar of St. Sepulchre's, High Holborn, London, and the Trust established by him in 1674, and also by Stephen Hughes and Charles Edwards, ejected

1. *nid oes chwaith fawr lyfrau cymreig ynghymru: Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd* (1899 & 1908), ed. T. E. Ellis & J. H. Davies, i. 261.
2. Thomas Richards, *History of the Puritan Movement in Wales* (1920), p. 224.
3. *id.*, *Religious Developments in Wales 1654-1662* (1923), p. 366.
4. On the association between the rise and fall of Gouge's Trust with the better and worse relations between Nonconformists and the Established Church, cf. Thomas Richards in *History of Carmarthenshire*, ed. Sir John Lloyd, ii. (1939) 183-4.

respectively from the vicarage of Mydrim, Carmarthenshire, and the rectory of Llanrhaiadr-ym-Mochnant, Denbighshire, have already been studied by a number of Welsh writers, and in particular by Professor G. J. Williams, to whose article in *Y Cofiadur*¹ I am heavily indebted. In the main, these writers' interest has been in the history of Welsh bibliography and in the share of each of the chief actors in the common enterprise. We may still look at the character of the books chosen for publication.

If we do, we see that, for the most part, the books fall into one or other of three categories. First, and inevitably, there are those which are the staple of the Christian faith or else of what, for most of the period, was the only legal form of Christian worship: the Bible, the New Testament, the Psalter and the Book of Common Prayer. Secondly, and almost as inevitably, there are some writings by the ejected ministers themselves, mainly by Thomas Gouge and Richard Baxter. But thirdly, and often between the same covers as these last works, are books by earlier Puritan writers, which had already been translated into Welsh before the Restoration.

In 1672, for instance, together with Baxter's *Winding-Sheet for Popery*, in a translation by Richard Jones, the ejected schoolmaster of Denbigh, appeared William Perkins' catechism, *The Foundation of Christian Religion*, in the Welsh version published earlier in 1649 by two Welsh Puritans, Evan Roberts, rector of Llanbadarn-fawr, Cardiganshire, and Oliver Thomas, Charles Edwards' predecessor at Llanrhaiadr. In 1677 in *Cyfarwydd-deb i'r Anghyfarwydd*, a collection published by Stephen Hughes, another work by Perkins was included, *An Exposition of*

- 1 G. J. Williams, "Stephen Hughes a'i Gyfnod," in *Y Cofiadur*, 4 (Mawrth, 1926). Though he will not always find them to be mutually consistent, the English reader can most conveniently piece the story together by reference to the articles in the *Dictionary of Welsh Biography* (1959), ed. Sir John Lloyd & R. T. Jenkins, on the various Welsh authors, translators and editors mentioned in the text.

the Lord's Prayer: while in a further anthology published by him in the same year, *Tryssor i'r Cymru*, along with a translation of Baxter's *Now or Never*, again by Richard Jones, and a reprint of a work by Oliver Thomas himself, *Drych i dri mâth o bobl*, Hughes reissued a translation of *A Sermon of Repentance* by the Essex Puritan, Arthur Dent. Dent is better known for another book, *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven*; and in his introduction to the *Tryssor* Hughes wrote that the Welsh translation of this, as also of Francis Bunny's edition of Robert Persons' *Book of . . . Resolution*, was being reprinted. Each duly appeared, in 1682 and 1684 respectively. In the publication of *The Plaine Mans Path-way*, as (it is supposed) of other works also, Hughes had the assistance of Gouge and his "Trustees for charitable works in Wales". Another book for which the Trust was responsible was a reissue of the Welsh translation of the popular work by the Puritan Lewis Bayly, bishop of Bangor, *The Practice of Piety*.

Bunny's *Resolution*, Dent's *Sermon of Repentance* and *Plaine Mans Path-way*, Perkins' *Catechism* and *Lord's Prayer*, Bayly's *Practice of Piety*: it is true, as already remarked, that Welsh versions of these books were already to hand and could be issued without securing, and waiting for, a new translator; but to the reader of Baxter all these titles have a familiar chime, so frequently does he commend them. Welsh authorities properly applaud Stephen Hughes' share in the charitable work for Wales undertaken by Gouge and his trustees; an English student may suggest that a large part in it was played by one of the trustees in particular, Richard Baxter, and this on three grounds.

In the first place, there was a close and longstanding friendship between Baxter and Gouge. This dated at least from 1664; for a letter from Baxter to his "Most Dear, and very much Honoured Brother", "Shewing What Part of our estate, we should devote to Charitable uses", was appended by Gouge to his *Sermon of Good Works*,

as reprinted in his *Christian Directions* of that year.¹ It may even have been the death of Gouge in 1681 which prompted Baxter to put out his piece *How to do good to many* in the following year; for in this he remarks that "our departed Friend, Mr. Thomas Gouge did set us an excellent Pattern for Wales".¹ It may also be observed that Baxter was personally acquainted with the minister who translated two of Gouge's own works into Welsh, William Jones, the ejected rector of Denbigh; for Jones, Calamy tells us, "made a Journey to London to confer with Mr. Baxter and others about Conformity, before the Day came that was fix'd by the Act".²

In the second place, Baxter had a deep concern for the people of Wales. In 1658, in the preface to his *Crucifying of the World*, he pleaded "in Pity to Wales, to have set up a Welch Colledge";³ more of what he intended is known since the publication a few years back in the Merioneth Historical Society's *Journal*⁴ of the correspondence between Baxter and John Lewis, of Glasgrug, near Llanbadarn-fawr. Although with the Restoration his plans for a college came to nought, Baxter's concern for Wales continued. In 1666 Philip Henry, the ejected curate of Worthenbury, Flintshire, received a hundred and twenty copies of Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted* in its Welsh translation of 1659 by Richard Jones, "to bee distributed freely, in North Wales . . . Ex Dono Authoris".⁵ This book of Baxter's is one which in its Welsh form was reissued by Gouge's Trust in 1677,⁶ and there is ground for

1. 2nd pagination, pp. 79-108; repr. by Baxter in *A Christian Directory* (1673), iv. 260 foll.

2. p. 16.

3. Edmund Calamy, *Account*, p. 713.

4. Richard Baxter, *The Certainty of the Worlds of Spirits* (1691), p. 128.

5. II. ii (1954). 120-134.

6. *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry* (1882), ed. M. H. Lee, p. 193.

7. That the Trust was responsible for its reissue seems clear from *Rel. Baxt.*, III. ii. 190, sect. 73.

thinking that the distribution was underwritten by Gouge at the earlier date also.¹

In the third place, it is noticeable that, in a passage in his autobiography written in 1674, the year when the Trust was set up, the paying of a warm tribute to Gouge by Baxter is immediately preceded by mention of the appearance in 1672 of a piece by himself, *The Poor Mans Family Book*; and that the occasion of his writing this was, as he puts it, "the remembrance of the great use of Mr. Dent's *Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* (now laid by)".² *The Poor Man's Family Book* itself carries the same reference back to Dent's *Plaine Mans Path-way*; it also contains Baxter's usual commendation of Bayly's *Practice of Piety* and of "Mr. Perkins on the Creed and the Lord's Prayer".³

All this suggests that Baxter may have had an active share in the work of Gouge's Trust and in the choice of the books reissued by the Trust. Stephen Hughes, as much as Baxter, commends Dent, Bayly and Perkins. He does so in the preface to the second part of Rhys Prichard's *Canwyll y Cymru* published by him in 1659, and again in his preface to its fourth part published in 1672. The agreement of the two men serves to illustrate our theme. The one "an apostle of Nonconformity"⁴ (as Professor Williams calls him) for Wales, the other no less a leader for England, each stood, and was conscious of standing, in one and the same tradition. It is noteworthy that the one work which Hughes himself translated into Welsh, *The Devil of Mascon* (1658), itself a translation by Peter Du Moulin from the French of Fran-

çois Perreaud, was, again, a work commended by Baxter.¹

The fact that, independently of both Hughes and Baxter, the works which both men commend had already, earlier, been chosen for translation into Welsh provides additional evidence of the tradition's integrity and vigour. Some of these works, like several of Baxters own,² had been translated into other languages also. Bayly's *Practice of Piety* was already in French, German, Dutch, Romansch and Algonquian (the language of the American Indians); Perkins' *Catechism* had been reissued by John Robinson at Leyden. The ministers who now republished them in Welsh desired to secure, or to preserve, the place of the Welsh people in the comity of Reformed nations; and it was as inheriting and continuing an internationally accepted Puritan piety that they saw their own writings also, and that they now therefore had some of these translated as well.

Of the books chosen it is fair to observe that, though Puritan in tone and temper, they were, without exception, biblical, doctrinal, devotional and evangelical; and not, directly, Nonconformist at all. Edmund Calamy observed this himself: he says of them, "there is not one that persuades People to Nonconformity, but they contain such Practical Duties as all good Christians are and must be agreed in"; adding pungently, "If the Growth of Dissenters in Wales be an effect of the Increase of Knowledge there, we can't help that".³

It is however, equally fair comment that the authors of these older books, no less than of the newer, had in fact commonly held, and suffered for, Nonconformist scruples. Lewis Bayly was in trouble with the Arch-

1. cf. *Rel. Baxt.*, III. i. 148, sect. 267, written in 1674: "He printeth many thousands of his own practical Books, and giveth them freely throughout Wales (at his own charge); and when I do something of the like by mine, he undertaketh the Distribution of them."

2. cf. *Rel. Baxt.*, III. i. 147, sect. 266.

3. Pref. to reader and p. 329.

4. *Dictionary of Welsh Biography*, s.v.

1. See his *Poor Man's Family Book*, p. 384, and his *Certainty of the Worlds of Spirits*, pp. 18-20. An additional passage by Baxter was added by Du Moulin to the second edition (1658) of *The Devil of Mascon*, from a letter to him from Baxter (D.W.L.MSS., 59.3.127).

2. Baxter's *Call* was in French, German, Romansch and Algonquian, his *Now or Never* in German.

3. E. Calamy, *Account*, P. 10.

bishop of Canterbury on various counts, Perkins likewise with the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge; while Dent was "sondrie times troubled for omitting the Crosse and surples".¹ Dent's *Plaine Mans Path-way*² is now mainly remembered as, with Bayly's *Practice of Piety*, one of the books brought by his wife to John Bunyan on their marriage in 1648-49; in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, published in 1678, it may be said to have been reborn. *The Pilgrim's Progress* was another work issued in Welsh by Stephen Hughes. Bunyan, once more, was a Nonconformist. As one studies seventeenth-century religion in this country, one can hardly fail to notice the constant association between those whom Baxter calls "Affectionate Practical English"³ writers and the Nonconformity then emerging, or to ask what the association signifies. Or, to put it another way, there is that question of Edward Dowden's:⁴ "would an Anglican Bunyan have been possible?"

1. *Seconde Parte of a Register*, ii. 164.
2. A copy of the rare first edition (1601) is preserved in the library of New College, London.
3. R. Baxter, *A Christian Directory*, iii. 194.
4. E. Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican* (1900), p. 232.

II THE BREAK-UP OF NONCONFORMITY

by

Roger Thomas, M.A.

PROPERLY speaking there can only be a break-up of what has, or has had, some sort of unity. But unity between Presbyterians, Baptists and Quakers (to mention no more) was in the seventeenth century of all improbabilities about the most improbable. I like to think of Baxter, Bunyan and George Fox meeting at the Golden Gate for I find it hard to think of them meeting on common ground anywhere else. A tendency to disintegration was a common taunt against the various sects that went to make up Nonconformity. As Thomas Tenison, the future archbishop, said of them in 1683,

"These may associate in a *Caravan*, but cannot joyn in the Communion of a Church. Such a Church would be like the *Family of Errour* and her Daughters, described in Mr. *Spencer's Fairy-Queen*, of which none were alike, unless in this, that they were all deform'd".¹

So we can say of the sects that none of them were alike except in this that they were all non-conformists.

However, in this connection, we are thinking of Non-

1. Thomas Tenison, *An argument for union*, 1683, p. 4. [*Collection of cases*, 3rd ed., 1718, iii. p. 235]. Tenison begins this passage with the question "What Communion . . . can the Presbyterians have with Arians, Socinians, Anabaptists [and so on through a long list until we end with] Quakers, Muggletonians, Sweet-Singers". Independents (or Congregationalists) are not included in the list. Doubtless he was aware of some measure of coherence between Presbyterians and Independents.

conformity in a particular context, that of the Ejection of 1662. Baptists were not ejected because they had not been in.¹ Quakers were not ejected, for the self-same reason. Two denominations shared in the Ejection, the Presbyterians and the Independents. Profound as were the differences between them, difficult as it is to define what it was that they had in common, yet they were aware of some common ground between them and sometimes had the grace to be ashamed of their quarrels. Shall we say that both parties had had their day in office as the government of their country, and that, when ousted at the Restoration, coalition might seem a natural expedient for minority parties if ever they were to restore something of their fallen fortunes? Or shall we say that they were both children of Geneva and of Calvin and that they knew their common descent from the exiles who returned after the Marian persecution, filled with fervour for Geneva and its powerful example of ecclesiastical discipline? Certainly here in this matter of discipline lay their common quarrel with the Established Church. Baxter sums it up that

“the utter neglect of Discipline by the over-hot Prelates had caused all our Perplexities and Confusions; and in this point is the chiefest part of our Difference with them indeed, and not about Ceremonies”.²

The discipline that he had in mind was the parish minister's authority to exclude the ungodly from communion

1. For the few Baptists ejected see E. A. Payne and N. S. Moon, *Baptists and 1662*, 1962.
2. *Reliquiae Baxterianae: or, Mr. Richard Baxter's narrative*, 1696, pt. ii. p. 233 (in future references *Rel.*). As so often the disputes that precipitated the Ejection were over other and subsidiary matters, assent and consent to everything in the *Book of Common Prayer*, including the nocent ceremonies alluded to by Baxter, abjuration of the Solemn League and Covenant as an unlawful oath for oneself and others, and so forth. Cf. *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, ix. p. 266.

and his duty to see that in being admitted to communion his parishioners had a reasonable understanding of the Christian Religion.¹ As we shall see, some of the Congregationalists (or Independents) carried this question of discipline to a point where anything like a parish church or an established State Church became quite impossible. But the need to take reform and discipline seriously was common to both.

If their common interest in reform and discipline had not served to bring them together, the Ejection threw them together in a common suffering. “Thus being driven together by this universal trouble”, as we read in the Broadmead records from Bristol, “endeavours were used (why should they not?) to strengthen ourselves”.² It was the report of one of a number of attempts at uniting the factions of Dissent which failed as soon as an effort was made to reach a formal agreement. This is not the place to try and recount the history of these attempts.³ Enough that the Presbyterians and Independents did succeed at long last, though not till two years after

1. Baxter welcomed Charles II's Worcester House Declaration because, though some other things were not granted, this point of discipline was conceded (*Rel.* ii. p. 279, § 114). Perhaps the one material concession made by the Bishops at the Savoy Conference was on the point of discipline. But they hedged it with a “so the Minister be obliged to give an account of it immediately after to the Ordinary” if communion was withheld. (*Accompt of all the proceedings*, 1661, p. 128, sect. 6).
2. *The records of a church of Christ, meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, 1640-1687*. Hanserd Knollys Soc., ed. E. B. Underhill, 1847, p. 240. The idea was to have one lecture instead of four “which would by conjunction be very numerous: thereby, more formidable and terrible to the adversary, if we did so unite”. The following pages give the course of the negotiations. It is of significance that one of the objections of the Presbyterians was that “they were for none to preach but them that had a scriptural call; that is, ordained by presbyters”. They were against lay preaching.
3. For long drawn out discussions issuing in the *Heads of Agreement*, see Dr. Williams's Library *Occasional Papers*, nos. 6 and 9. The Forbes Library in Gloucester Public Library has another copy of one of the attempts at union together with comments of ministers (presumably) of the West Country.

the Revolution of 1688, when in the middle of 1690, the two denominations in London agreed to pool their resources and form a Common Fund for the relief of ministers, the assistance of churches and the training of students,¹ and followed this up in the following spring with a union of the two bodies, formulated in a document printed as the *Heads of agreement assented to by the United Ministers in and about London*, in March 1691.² Great was the jubilation over this success. Matthew Mead preached a sermon for the occasion on "Two sticks made one". Another rather flamboyantly announced that "we shall no more for the future hear of those unhappy terms of distinction and separation, Presbyterian and Independent, but we shall be called as the Primitive Church of Antioch by his name who hath redeemed us . . . even Christians".³ Even the aged Baxter, for whom the agreement spelt the ruin of his often-times disappointed hopes of re-union with the Established Church, gave it his blessing.⁴

Of the agreement I must say little, except that, like the founding of the Common Fund to meet urgent needs, its aim was severely practical. Almost all the more distinctive differences between the two denominations go unmentioned, or are but lightly touched upon, on the grounds that, as most of them did not affect their mutual relations, they could be left to be settled within the individual churches.⁵ The chief exception, because it affected their

1. Alexander Gordon, *Freedom after Ejection*, 1917, pp. 158 ff.
2. Alexander Gordon, *Cheshire Classis minutes*, 1919, pp. 111-117; Dr. Williams's Library *Occasional Paper*, No. 6 "An Essay of Accommodation", 1957.
3. John Quick, *The dead prophet yet speaking*, 1691, pp. 30-31, in a funeral sermon for John Faldo, on 15 February 1691, "who had an especial hand in the healing of our Breaches".
4. Richard Baxter, *Church concord*, 1691, addition to the Preface, headed, "To the United Protestant Nonconformists in London" and dated 23 April 1691.
5. *An apology for the ministers* [by William Lorimer], 1694, p. 15. In the *Heads of agreement* there is no mention of relations with the Church of England or to the practice of

mutual relations so closely, was the delicate compromise over ordination, designed by the Presbyterians with the very practical end in view of preserving an educated ministry and preventing the intrusion of ignorant upstart preachers, against whom the provisions of the recent Toleration Act were no protection at all, and to whose incursions the Congregational system could be particularly vulnerable, because in that system the ordination of a minister was wholly a transaction between the individual congregation and the man chosen to lead them. And, as Baxter had lamented long ago, "O if you knew the weakness of poor people and how apt they are to be deceived you would not give deceivers liberty to do their worst".¹

Great as had been the rejoicings in 1691, in London they were shortlived. The making of the agreement served only to rivet attention upon the old, long-standing (and indeed insuperable) differences, which congregations up and down the country had nevertheless been learning to forget.² Three Congregational ministers in London re-

"occasional communion". The question of churches gathered out of the community on the Congregational pattern is just hinted at in reference to "parochial bounds" in I. 5. Divergent methods of admission to church membership, whether by a "credible profession of faith" or by an experience of spiritual grace is barely alluded to in I. 3; while a reference to church covenants is barely discoverable in I. 4. Cf. G. F. Nuttall, *Visible saints*, 1957, pp. 75 ff., 85 ff., 108 ff., 111 ff.

1. Richard Baxter, *The saints everlasting rest*, 2nd ed. 1651, pt. 2, end of preface.
2. We may doubt whether ordinary members in country churches took much interest in high points of difference. On another but related subject, John Locke said, appropriately, "The dissenting congregations are supposed by their teachers to be more accurately instructed in matters of faith . . . than the vulgar conformists, who are charged with great ignorance; how truly I will not determine. But I ask them to tell me seriously, whether half their people have leisure to study? Nay whether one in ten of those who come to their meetings in the country, if they had time to study, do or can understand the controversies at this time so warmly managed amongst them". (John Locke, *Reasonableness of Christianity*, ed. I. T. Ramsey, 1958, p. 76).

jected the agreement from the outset. Two of them figure largely in the subsequent story. One of these, Thomas Cole (Edmund Calamy, historian of the Ejected Ministers, spoke of him as "genteel"), rejected it because he would not associate with those who, like Baxter and many other Presbyterians, "were for sacramental communion with the Church of England".¹ The second, Nathaniel Mather (though he bears an honoured name, especially in America, he seems to have been something of a trouble maker) complained at the outset that "there is not one principle of the Congregational way secured in the whole agreement nor indeed asserted". "But the way . . . is either to suppress our principles in silence, or to speak of them so darkly and by halves as that none can know what we hold or of what persuasion we are in these matters".² With such discordant voices, ready to exclaim on the least excuse, it is perhaps not surprising that within a very few years the agreement in London lay in ruins. The very next year incurable dissensions broke out. Pass on three years and the united meetings of ministers have become two meetings, the Common Fund of recent origin has become two funds, and a joint lectureship of twenty years' standing has become two rival lectureships. Despite appeals from the country and tentatives at conciliation in London the rupture had become complete and was never healed.

1. Edmund Calamy, *An account of the . . . Ejected*, 2nd ed., 1713, vol. ii. p. 61; *Answer to the Report*, in Daniel Williams, *Works*, 1750, p. 323.

2. Letters to Thomas Jollie, of 3 April 1691 and 17 December 1690, in D.W.L. MS.12.78, pp. 243-44 and 221. Calamy, knowing that Mather had a hand in displacing Daniel Williams as minister at Lime Street, has this to say of Mather in relation to his replacing the excellent minister sequestered at Harberton in 1655 (*Continuation*, 1727, p. 258) "I suppose that I may take it for granted that he was no Way chargeable with the Hardships of his Predecessor; since [Dr. Walker] (who would not have been very likely to have overlook'd any thing of that Nature) does not mention it". For a double back-hander that takes some beating. The third, who refused to join the Union, was Richard Taylor.

Oddly enough (and conveniently from the point of view of exposition) a year before the signing of the agreement three unconnected events, all happening within the brief space of little more than a week at the end of January and the beginning of February 1690, are so closely connected with the break-up of the Union that some account of them may help to lay bare the hidden shoals on which the newly launched ship of union ultimately foundered. The first shows the fact, which later history might tend to obscure, that the Presbyterians stood far closer to the Anglicans than to any of the other Nonconformists. The second points to a growing theological divergence in which Anglicans and Presbyterians went one way and Congregationalists another. Finally the third led directly to the head-on collision between the two systems of church government that first broke the union.

On 27 January 1690 the first Parliament of William and Mary sat its last, and with it ended also the sittings of Convocation, convened the previous November.¹ This Convocation's title to fame (the first sitting Convocation since 1664 and the last in the seventeenth century) was that it did nothing and did it supremely well. But it had not been convened to do nothing; it had been convened to ratify carefully prepared measures that would have opened the way at least for Presbyterians to return to the bosom of the Church on honourable terms. The follies of James II had brought Churchmen and Presbyterians closer together than they had been since the Civil War and had raised high hopes that the long dismal outlawry of the Ejection would be brought to an end. But the Revolution, so far from promoting this reconciliation, though it put an end to fears of Roman Catholic James, put suspicions of Presbyterian Dutch William in their place, and made Churchmen regard Dissenters as less desirable allies. Nevertheless leading Presbyterians hoped against dwindling hope for a happy outcome, while Baxter

1. Parliament, and Convocation with it were dissolved on 6 February.

prayed publicly for wise counsels in Convocation. His prayers were unanswered. The Convocation of 1689, by doing nothing, killed all such hopes and prayers stone dead and set the seal more firmly on the Ejection than had been done at black Bartholomew Day in far off 1662.¹ The Presbyterians, so long as they had any lingering hopes of comprehension within the Church, had few thoughts of accommodation with the Independents. Thus it came about that efforts at accord between the two denominations waited until two years after the Revolution.² The delay was all the more remarkable in that ten years earlier an agreement for union had virtually been reached and had only been laid aside because of the danger of the times.³ We may be sure that the moral of this two years' delay was not lost on the Independents, who not only saw themselves treated as second best allies, but saw their ancient foes ready to accept a State Church, a liturgy, episcopal ordination and parish-wide admission to communion, all of which ran counter to their principles.⁴

The second event was an outburst by Richard Baxter on 28 January 1690, when he was the preacher at the Merchants' Lecture at Pinners' Hall. All his active life he had been an opponent of Antinomianism, which we may describe as an extreme (or shall we say, consistent?) form of Calvinism. In an effort to exalt the divine action in salvation it debased the part played by man so low that it assumed that nothing a man did, good or evil, could improve or jeopardise his prospects of salvation. It had been the subject of Baxter's first book forty years

1. O. Chadwick and G. F. Nuttall, eds., *From uniformity to unity*, 1962, pp. 242-253.
2. The delay was a London delay, where ministers were most in touch with the active preparations going forward for comprehension. Ministers in the country around Bristol had begun discussion on accommodation much earlier and reached agreement on 11 June 1690, on the basis of proposals of ten years before (Dr. Williams's Library *Occasional Paper*, No. 6, "An Essay of Accommodation", 1957, p. 12).
3. *History of the Union*, [by Richard Taylor], 1698, pp. 1, 4.
4. G. F. Nuttall, *Visible saints*, 1957, pp. 55-58, 64, 85-90, 108.

before.¹ And now in his last years his anxiety was still that this Antinomian force of unreason should gain no ground. The occasion of his outburst was the republication by the son of the writer, after nearly half a century, of a volume of sermons by Tobias Crisp whose Antinomianism had been a source of concern to the Westminster Assembly in its day. What made matters worse was that some of Baxter's Presbyterian colleagues had incautiously and ill-advisedly allowed their names to be associated with the republication, though all that they had signed to was a declaration that certain added sermons were genuine sermons of Crisp.² In the heat of his wrath on that 28 January Baxter accused them of hanging out "a sign to show where Jezebel dwelt".³ It was an epithet likely to cause resentment among the Congregationals from whose midst the offending publication had come. But what counted for more with them was that Baxter's well known middle way, as it was called, between Calvinism and Arminianism ("a warping toward Arminian Doctrine" one of them called it), was as hateful to them as Antinomianism was to Baxter.⁴ They were soon to find

1. *Aphorismes of justification*, 1649.
2. Baxter promptly followed up his sermon by the publication of *The Scripture Gospel defended . . . against the libertines*, 1690. By way of explanation and exculpation, John Howe published, as a single sheet, *Some considerations of a certificate*, 1690. Baxter was soon engaged upon a rejoinder, which Dr. G. F. Nuttall has pointed out to me still exists in manuscript, as D.W.L. MS. 59.11, ff. 24-26. Baxter was dissuaded from publishing this on a promise by Howe to give prominence to a disclaimer signed by himself and others of the original signatories in a forthcoming book. This was done in John Flavell's *Planelogia: a succinct and seasonable discourse*, 1691. Cf. Edmund Calamy, *Historical account*, 1830, i. p. 323. For Crisp and the Westminster Assembly, see Daniel Williams, *Works*, 1750, p. 282.
3. Samuel Crisp, *Christ made sin*, 1691, pp. 1-2.
4. A typical instance of the consternation caused can be savoured in a contemporary incident when the youthful Edmund Calamy preached to the Congregational Church at Andover and was rather taken aback to be given an invitation, immediately after the service, by an old lady, to become their minister. Calamy tried to persuade them to join with the Presbyterians

that many Presbyterians had imbibed deeply of Baxter's teaching, and, as Arminianism was prevalent in the Church of England, one of them was kind enough to insinuate that the motive of the Presbyterians who followed Baxter was "in order to ingratiate themselves with the Church, that hath the secular advantages to dispense and to make way for accommodation with them".¹ That was rather putting the cart before the horse, but be that as it may, controversy broke out in the Merchants' Lecture immediately after Baxter's outburst, his chief opponent being Thomas Cole, Thomas Cole of the "genteel spirit", the same that would be one of those to reject the Union when it came into being a year later. The controversy died down; great efforts were made (especially by John Howe who took a leading part in the formation of the Union) to calm Baxter's wrath, persuading him not to aggravate the offence by writing further in the controversy and to calm the Congregationalists by persuading them that "Jezebel" should be forgiven as no more than an old man's tantrums. It says something for these efforts at pacification that, despite all discouragements, the Union did come into being the following year. Nevertheless "Jezebel" was long remembered as the "first thunder clap at Pinners' Hall" in the storm that would see the break-up of Non-conformity.² It was the crack of doom.

Thomas Cole's name would be closely associated also with the third event. On 3 February, a week after Baxter's outburst, a member of Cole's church in London, Richard Davis, till then an obscure schoolmaster, was

under the ministrations of John Sprint. The effect of his name was electric. "The old woman seemed perfectly astonished ... and cried out 'What, Mr. Sprint! old Mr. Sprint! Alas, he is a Baxterian! he is a middle way man! he is an occasional conformist! he is neither fish nor flesh, nor good red herring!'" (Edmund Calamy, *Historical account of my own life*, 2nd ed., 1830, p. 308). The term "middle way" was not Baxter's, but was given currency by John Humfrey.

1. *A vindication of the Protestant Doctrine*, [by Robert Trail], 1692, p. 21
2. Joseph Hussey, *Glory of Christ unveil'd*, 1706, p. 209.

"dismissed", as the phrase had it, with a commendatory testimonial to membership of a Congregational church at Rothwell in Northamptonshire, there to be ordained as its minister a few weeks later.¹ In accordance with a custom which had grown up in line with Presbyterian principles and which would be enshrined in the agreement to be entered into by the two denominations a year later, neighbouring ministers offered to give Davis their support and the right hand of fellowship in his ordination. But Davis was an extreme Congregationalist, ordination was wholly a transaction between minister and members of the church.² He refused to allow the neighbouring ministers any part in the ceremony; he would have nothing to do with Presbyterian ordination or with anything that looked remotely like it. The neighbouring ministers, as they found themselves unwanted, stayed away. It was not the last of his indiscretions; nor indeed the greatest. His fiery Antinomian preaching was a heady wine that intoxicated his hearers, but it was offensive to most Presbyterians and to many Congregationalists. It was no less offensive that soon he was drawing away members from old established churches and, according to a Presbyterian denunciation of him, "sending forth Preachers unfit for the Ministry and unapprov'd by Neighbouring Ministers".³ "Gifted brethren" was the usual term for these lay ministers, endowed with gifts of the Spirit according to Congregational theory; "ignorant and rash intruders" according to the Presbyterians⁴ who in any case disapproved of lay-preaching. Certainly discretion and theological understanding were not amongst their accomplishments.

1. on 22 March 1690. Richard Davis, *Truth and innocence vindicated*, [1692], p. 28; Norman Glass, *The early history of the Independent Church at Rothwell*, 1871, pp. 33-34.
2. G. F. Nuttall, *Visible saints*, pp. 85-90.
3. Edmund Calamy, *An abridgement of Mr. Baxter's history*, 2nd ed., 1713, i. p. 514, from *The sense of the United Ministers ... concerning ... Mr. Richard Davis*, 1693, (published 31 December 1692).
4. *Heads of agreement*, 1691, II. 7.

Nevertheless a full-blooded revival was under way—and revivals observe no laws—old established churches were half empty when Davisite preachers came to town. In eleven counties there were broken churches, exasperated ministers, and an unseemly disturbance to customary decency and order.¹

Davis and his practices became notorious; the noise of them reached London soon after the Common Fund and the Union had come into being.² Davis received financial support from London and the Common Fund could not well countenance conduct that ran counter to the foundation principle of a common fund.³ Nor could the Union ignore so grave a threat to many of its terms of agreement. Davis would not compromise but he would con-

1. Daniel Williams, *Defence of Gospel truth*, 1693, "To the Reader".
2. In June 1692 Isaac Noble, a Congregational in Bristol, was writing to Thomas Jollie, a Congregational in Lancashire: that Davis "succeeding lately in Mr. Browning's church in Northamp. troubles all about him with his . . . practices. He nulls all Baptism in the Church of England; heals the sick with unction . . . He and one of his apostles, or missionaries, have vouchsafed once to appear before [the London ministers], but they are a very rash, haughty sort, and some sort of prodigies attend the doctrine, like the old quaking". (D.W.L. MS. 12.78, p. 285). Later (probably in 1696) Isaac Gilling, a Presbyterian in Devon, was drawing up new rules for the admission of ministers for the Exeter Assembly and wrote that if individual ministers acted independently of the Assembly, "a door will be opened for illiterate, conceited persons to invade the sacred office, to vent crude notions and erroneous opinions, by which means the progress of the Gospel and edification of souls will be obstructed, the peace of our churches destroyed, and great discredit is like to redound to the whole body of the United Brethren, of which Mr. Davies in Northamptonshire is a very sad instance". A. Brockett, *Exeter Assembly* (Dev. & Corn. Rec. Soc.), 1963, p. 31.
3. In the minutes of the Common (now Presbyterian) Fund the payment of a grant to Davis through Isaac Chauncy and George Cokayne is mentioned on 13 October 1690. On 8 June 1691 Matthew Mead is asked to speak to Cokayne about him. On 4 January 1692 it was ordered that no further allowance be made to Davis and that Mr. Nesbitt's people "be desired to grant noe allowance". Cf. Alexander Gordon, *Freedom after ejection*, 1917, pp. 185-187.

ciliate and he could be glib with plausible explanations. Twice he met the ministers in London. The second occasion, in May 1692, proved to be the turning point for the Union, then but a year old. Clearly Davis had flouted the principles of the Union, but clearly, too, he had friends amongst the Congregational ministers who might well argue that many of his activities were in accord with Congregational theory and not wholly at variance with the *Heads of Agreement*.¹ Moreover, with their dislike of synods exercising authority over churches, they could object to the United Ministers attempting to discipline Davis. Davis too accused them of a "design to hook away Judgment from a particular church of Christ and fix it in a Presbyterian Classis".² It was precisely upon this point that later in the year the secession of Congregationals from the Union was begun. As one of them put it, he withdrew to clear himself "of the imputation of concurring with certain ministers in exercising synodical jurisdiction".³ The greater part of that second meeting, in May 1692, was taken up with Davis' misdoings, but (as Davis himself reported it later) "in the close to this conference Mr. Williams spoke publicly that he had many things against me in matters of Faith".⁴ Mr. Williams was Daniel Williams, founder of the Library bearing his name. He became Baxter's successor alike in the Merchants' Lecture and in his antagonism to the evils of Antinomianism. Ever since that first thunder clap of Baxter's at Pinners' Hall he had been pondering a book to clarify the issues at stake over Antinomianism, and, at the time of the meeting in May, it was in the

1. The *Heads* had nothing to say of relations with the Church of England, which the Presbyterians regarded as a true church, but which Davis regarded as Antichrist, condemning any of his followers who even attended a funeral in the parish church. Though the *Heads* has much to say on ordination, it has nothing to say on lay preaching.
2. Richard Davis, *Truth and innocence*, p. 40. Cf. p. 9.
3. Isaac Chauncy, *Neonomianism unmask'd*, pt. iii, 1693, p. 98.
4. Richard Davis, *Truth and innocence*, p. 38.

press, to appear later in the month, prefaced with a goodly list of Presbyterian ministers giving their approval to its conclusions.¹ Davis spoke of these signatories as “perverters of the Gospel . . . clucking under Mr. William’s (sic) Wings as their great Patron and Defender”.² The reason Williams gave for the publication was clear. “Considering the delay of any testimony against Mr. Davies . . . this might be some antidote, till we arrived at more”.³ The book with its list of supporting names, all Presbyterian, looked like a party manifesto, and the most vociferous Congregationals treated it as such. Books and pamphlets were soon being published belabouring it with every error, real or imaginary, that could be squeezed out of its pages. One pamphlet, which circulated first in manuscript, and so perhaps was a more insidious menace, took a different line; instead of attacking Williams and his book, it chose rather to attack the Presbyterians wholesale, probing all the old wounds and making it impossible to forget the vast gulf that had separated, and still separated, the two parties. It was anonymous but it is not without significance that its known author was Robert Trail, Nathaniel Mather’s assistant, and at one time Thomas Cole’s assistant.⁴ Edmund Calamy singles out this

1. *Gospel truth stated and vindicated*, published, 18 May, with 16 signatures; 2nd ed. 27 September 1692, with 48 signatures. All the signatories were Presbyterians. There are however some significant Presbyterian absentees; one was Samuel Annesley; another was Timothy Cruso.
2. Richard Davis, *Truth and innocence*, p. 84.
3. Daniel Williams, *Defence of Gospel truth*, 1693, Preface: the unfortunate “my testimony” of the first edition is corrected to “any testimony” in the 1750 edition of Williams’s *Works*. Williams also had another reason for publication, which he states in a letter to John Humfrey (2 September 1696, British Museum, Birch MSS, 4276, 148), “The hands of several to Dr. Crisp’s book so exposed us to the Church of England, that a book was just going into the press with the charge of Antinomianism against the Dissenters in general”.
4. The title of this work was *A vindication of the Protestant doctrine concerning justification, and of its preachers and professors, from the unjust charge of Antinomianism. In a letter from a minister in the City, to a minister in the country*. 1692.

pamphlet for special mention and continues that with its publication “the hopes of a free brotherly Correspondence vanish’d away”.¹

A “free brotherly correspondence” forsooth! The quarrel soon degenerated well below the level even of mud-slinging. Williams was voted out of the Pinners’ Hall Lecture in a meeting packed by rounding up small subscribers signed on for that occasion only.² To the disappointment of his tormentors if their design was to isolate Williams, the other Presbyterian lecturers, William Bates, John Howe and Vincent Alsop, still “clucking under the wings” of “their patron and defender” left with him in a body and set up a new Lecture at Salters’ Hall, to be held on the same day and at the same hour as the old Lecture.³ Twenty years of practical co-operation had gone in a trice. Next, an attack was made on Williams’ morals. This too failed, for it was not only quite irrelevant but a complete fiasco; there was either nothing wrong with Williams’ morals or they failed to ferret anything out.⁴ The breach was now complete, and the Congregationals were left to organise on their own, fill the gaps in the Pinners’ Hall Lecture and to set up a new, Congregational, Fund, in rivalry with the older, now solely Presbyterian, Fund.⁵ In 1695 it was all over, except that

1. Edmund Calamy, *Abridgement of Mr. Baxter’s history*, 2nd ed., 1713, p. 516.
2. Letter to John Howe, 18 August 1694, (Bodleian MS. Carte 80 f.820-1). I am indebted to Mr. I. G. Philip for bringing this letter to my attention.
3. Edmund Calamy, *Memoirs of the life of . . . John Howe*, 1724, pp. 194-8.
4. Edmund Calamy, *Historical account*, 1830, i. p. 357. Williams appealed to the ministers and his character was cleared on 8 April 1695.
5. The gaps in the Pinners’ Hall Lecture were filled by Nathaniel Mather, Timothy Cruso, Stephen Lobb and Thomas Gouge. Only Cruso was a Presbyterian, but he was one of those who did not support Williams’ book with his name. The list of six lecturers at Salters’ Hall was completed by the addition of Samuel Annesley (who also did not sign Williams’ book) and Richard Mayo. Cf. *Transactions of the Congregational Hist. Soc.*, vii. 300 ff. For the foundation of the Congregational Fund see *ibid.*, v. 134ff.

the acrimonious controversy went on till the end of the century, despite all efforts at reconciliation.

The split had now become complete; it had also become largely theological. Though it affected London chiefly, it divided the whole country in the course of the following century. We must therefore endeavour to ascertain what lay at the bottom of it. It is difficult to believe that the Presbyterians' affinity to the Anglican Church, from which after all they were now effectively excluded, could have accounted for so permanent a split. Nor is it easy to believe that the ecclesiastical differences were insurmountable; after all, they had been surmounted once and, in the country, they were apt to be happily forgotten or neglected. At first sight, too, the theological differences would seem insufficient to have produced so grave a division, especially as there would always be some in either denomination more akin in theology to the prevailing theology in the other denomination. We must, however, have a closer look at the theological situation.

Ostensibly the quarrel had to do with the differences between Calvinism, Arminianism and what went by the name of the "Middle Way" between the two, or Baxterianism, as it was also called.¹ Calvinism insisted upon divine, free, unmerited, grace, with the implication that some were elected to eternal salvation while others were predestined to damnation. Arminians held that there was grace sufficient for all, if man would do his part. As the Presbyterian *Vindication* of 1650 had put it, "The Gospel [i.e. Calvinism] makes free grace put the distinction between the Elect and Reprobate; and the Arminians Free-will".² The only compromise involved in the Middle Way was a cheerful willingness to forget predestination to damnation (or absolute reprobation, as it was called). But apart from this, the Middle Way men performed with

some acrobatic dexterity the impossible feat of coming down firmly on both sides of the fence; it might have been more appropriate to call them the "Double Way" men. For example, take Milton's brief and pointed exposition:

Some I have chosen of peculiar grace
Elect above the rest; so is my will:
The rest shall hear me call, and oft be warn'd
Their sinful state, and to appease betimes
The incensed Deity, while offered grace
Invites . . .¹

By force of character Milton and Baxter might somehow contrive to hold together these two incompatibles of peculiar grace for the Elect and of universal grace for the rest, the one depending on predestination and the other on free will.² More explicitly one of Baxter's followers puts it:

"Our rigid Calvinists, tho' Calvin himself did not, take the first Scheme apart by itself, insisting chiefly upon Election, Grace *etc.* The Arminians take the second Scheme apart by itself insisting mostly upon Duty and our Power to perform it *etc.*, whereas both are true . . .

"Freewill, or Natural Power, (understand me no otherwise) and Free Grace, ought both to be asserted: For, 1. To deny Free Will destroys God's government; and to deny Free Grace destroys his Dominion and Benefactorship. 2. To deny Free Will destroys our Liberty; and to deny Free Grace destroys God's Liberty. 3. To deny Free Will destroys all Preaching; to deny Free Grace destroys all Prayer.

1. *Paradise Lost*, iii, 183-8. Cf. G. F. Nuttall, *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge*, 1951, p. 23, note 9, p. 3. Cf. also Isaac Gilling's statement, "Christ died for all, but not . . . for all alike". A. Brockett, *Exeter Assembly*, p. 124.

2. So too did Calvin on occasion, e.g. (Comm. in I John ii, 2) "Qui hanc absurditatem volebant efigere, dixerunt, sufficienter pro toto mundo passum esse Christum: sed pro electis tantum efficaciter . . . Ego . . . verum esse illud dictum fateor".

1. In this discussion too much regard must not be had to the original signification of these terms, Calvinist and Arminian.

2. *A vindication of the Presbyterian-Government*, London Provincial Assembly, 1650, p. 106.

4. To deny Free Will takes away Confession of Sin; to deny Free Grace takes away all Thanksgiving for Benefits . . . Take away Free Grace and how shall God save the World? Take away Free Will and how shall he judge the World?¹

Whatever else this version of the Middle Way is, it is a pretty far cry from absolute election and absolute reprobation, and some might say that it was pure Arminianism. What Robert Trail, Mather's assistant, said of the Middle Way men was that "usually such Men that are for middle ways in points of Doctrine, have a greater kindness for that extream they go half way to, than for that which they go half way from".² There was more than a grain of truth in the suspicion. If the Presbyterians were solidly Middle Way men, and, under the stress of controversy they tended to become so, there were some grounds for suspecting that like John Hales of Eton, and with many of the more enlightened Anglicans, they were bidding John Calvin goodnight. Bishop Burnet, arguing the point with Edmund Calamy a few years later maintained that "such as declared for the middle way, must at last, when pressed, fall into the Arminian Scheme".³ He was right, for so, in time, they did. It produced the great eighteenth-century divide.

It would all have been simpler for us if our Presbyterians at the time of the break-up had taken one clearly defined position and our Congregationals another. But this was hardly the case. The Middle Way men were anxious to claim all the virtues of Calvinism, while most of their opponents were anxious not so far to deny all connection between moral conduct and salvation as to land themselves willy nilly in the dotages (their own word) of Antinomianism which did in effect make that denial. The situation indeed was not much clearer at

the time. The philosopher, John Locke, for instance could say of the Dissenters in 1695,

I have talked with some of their teachers, who confess themselves not to understand the difference in debate between them: and yet the points they stand on, are reckoned of so great weight, so material, so fundamental in religion, that they divide communion, and separate upon them.¹

Bishop Stillingfleet, too, whose support was solicited by both sides, noted the same excessive heat over infinitesimal distinctions (though he gave Williams best in his argument with the Congregationals) and concluded that "there must be something farther in the Matter, than appear'd to an indifferent and impartial Reader; which he would not inquire into". "No more shall I" was Calamy's comment on quoting the passage, a pungent reticence depriving later historians of much valuable, and possibly spicy, information.² Both probably were referring to distressing animosities between Williams and Mather. But in truth there was something more, something very much more, and of very much greater consequence than mere personal animosities, more even than the theological niceties of Calvinism and Arminianism.

That "something more" was the place of reason in religion, or rather there were two things more, the place of reason and the place of creeds or confessions of faith, on both of which Baxter took the same stand as the hated Arminians. In the interests of Protestant unity (or of Christian concord, to use one of his own terms) Baxter wished to see the number of fundamental doctrines held obligatory on believers reduced to a minimum.³ He found his needed principle of simplification in the principle that Chillingworth had employed in controversy with Roman Catholics, "The Bible, I say, the Bible only is

1. John Rastrick, *Sermon at the ordination of Mr. Samuel Savage*, 1714, p. 67.

2. Robert Trail, *Vindication*, p. 2.

3. Edmund Calamy, *Historical account*, 1830, i. p. 471.

1. John Locke, *The reasonableness of Christianity*, ed. I. T. Ramsey, 1958, p. 76.

2. Edmund Calamy, *Abridgement*, 2nd ed., 1713, i. p. 564.

3. G. F. Nuttall, *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge*, 1951, p. 6.

the Religion of Protestants". With Baxter this was not only an answer to the Roman Catholics; ("We shall never have done with the Papists", he said "if we let go Scripture-Sufficiency"),¹ but he used it also with equal effect (as Chillingworth also did) on the home front against "over-Orthodox Doctors", who were for ever building the dogmatic bulwarks against heresy higher and higher and causing thereby endless divisions in the process.² Thus in his controversy with John Owen in 1669, Owen thought Scripture alone would not keep out heretics and his advice was that to safeguard orthodoxy against them the "Four first Councils" should be coupled with Scripture as the standard of orthodoxy. Baxter's retort, (taking Socinianism as the sample heresy, as Owen had done) was, "If there be nothing against Socinianism in Scripture, it is no Heresie: if there be (as sure there is enough, and plain enough) Judge them by that Rule and make not new ones".³ This was an admirable contribution to a much needed simplification of the tangle of conflicting creeds, but it contains the important admission that what is not contrary to Scripture is not heresy. Later Baxterians would stand by this judgment and eighteenth-century liberalism would, under Baxter's leadership, come into its own amongst Dissenters.⁴

On the place of reason Baxter's argument runs on very similar lines and was equally uncompromising. There is the same practical interest; if Scripture-sufficiency is the weapon against the Roman Catholic because he accepts the Biblical revelation, reason is the only weapon against the unbeliever because he does not. Baxter had no mind to see Christianity facing an unbelieving world with in-

1. *Rel.* iii. p. 65 (sect. 6).
2. G. F. Nuttall, *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge*, 1951, p. 10.
3. *Rel.* iii. pp. 63 (sect. 2) and 65 (sect. 6). Cf. G. F. Nuttall, *Visible Saints*, p. 59, for evidence of some variation on Owen's part in this matter.
4. Cf. R. Thomas, "The Non-Subscription Controversy", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, iv. p. 168, note 7.

adequate armour. "And what more can be done to the disgrace and ruin of Christianity", he exclaimed, "than to make the World believe we have no reason for it?"¹ As with Scripture-sufficiency, he could be accused of exposing his flank to those arch-heretics the Socinians. "We deny not", he wrote, "but some Non-conformists, and Conformists did cast out their suspicions on two very Learned rational Men, Mr. Hales, and Mr. Chillingworth, as if they had favoured Socinianisme, because they so much used, and Ascribed to Reason, in Judging of matters of Religion".² The Socinians, he admitted "reject the Doctrine of the Trinity, though found in Scripture, because they think that it is against Reason, (though in that they err)".³ But, as before, the risk of Socinianism had no terrors for him; better that than unreason. "And how could all the Wits in the World do more to advance Socinianism then . . . by making men believe, that only the Socinians have Reason for their Religion: Which if it were true, (as nothing less) who would not turn to them?"⁴ In giving paramount importance to reason, as in so much else, Baxter stood squarely with influential elements in the Church of England, especially with the Cambridge Platonists and other Anglican Rationalists such as Hales and Chillingworth, and he shared with them their abhorrence for the all too easy advice to "silence carnal reason" when divines were confronted with arguments that they could not readily answer against absolute reprobation and other unconscionable elements of current Calvinism.⁵

1. Richard Baxter, *The Saints everlasting rest*, 1651, pt. ii., Preface, §5 (4).
2. Richard Baxter, *The judgment of Nonconformists, of the interest of reason*, 1676, p. 6.
3. *ibid.*, p. 2, §1.
4. Richard Baxter, *The Saints everlasting rest*, pt. ii., Preface §5 (3).
5. Simon Patrick, *Works*; 1858, ix. p. 419, "absolute predestination . . . had always seemed to me very hard, and I could never answer the objections against it, but was advised by divines to silence carnal reason". For Anglican Rationalists, cf. Phillip Harth, *Swift and Anglican Rationalism*, 1961.

But as with Scripture-sufficiency as a means of cutting through the jungle of Protestant dogmatisms, the appeal to reason was not only for use against the enemy at the gate, the unbeliever; it had its application on the home front also, for whatever was contrary to reason was a gratuitous enthusiasm or fanaticism, of which Baxter held that too many Protestant sects were guilty. Indeed it was part of his "meer Non-conformity", as he liked to call it, that it absolved him from complicity in the fanaticism of the sects, "the question [of Nonconformity] not extending", as he put it, "to Quakers, Seekers, Papists, Antinomians, or any Sect which are more than Meer Non-conformists".¹

It is this appeal to reason on the home front that makes Baxter's outbreak at Pinners' Hall on that momentous 28 January 1690 a matter of such importance that it would rightly be remembered as the first thunder clap in a storm that broke up Nonconformity. For not the least part of Baxter's sense of outrage against the Antinomians was their unreason. In the very forefront of his attack he wrote,

It is no wonder that such men cast out Reason from Religion; for their Religion seemeth to be by meer instinct: But if it must be without Reason, it is hard that they will make it all against Reason. While Reason is essential to man, no wonder then if Religion meet with much Resistance.²

To this came the usual old dusty answer about "carnal" or "corrupt" reason when the Presbyterians took up the cudgels against Richard Davis. In the words of Robert Trail, Mather's assistant,

Natural Reason is very fertile in its Objections and Cavils against the Doctrine of the Grace of God. And especially when this corrupt Reason is polished

1. Richard Baxter, *Judgment of . . . reason*, 1676, p. 2.
2. Richard Baxter, *The Scripture Gospel defended . . . against the libertines*, 1690, sig.B 1 of *A defence of Christ*.

by learning and strong natural parts. When there are many to broach such Doctrines, and many disposed to receive it, is it any wonder that Gospel Truth makes little progress in the World.¹

You will see that it is no wonder religion makes no progress (a) when, according to Baxter, reason is flouted and (b) when, according to Trail, it has its say. I think you will agree with me that for us who come after it is no wonder if we find between the two parties a great gulf fixed.²

But we are concerned not merely with a great gulf fixed between fundamentally different theological starting points, but with the fact that the conflict tended to range on either side of that great gulf two denominational systems whose divergence hitherto had been ecclesiastical rather than theological. Towards the end of the century, in 1698, one shrewd observer assessed the point reached by this double divergence in the words,

Many Presbyterians follow'd him [Baxter] and still do, but none under that Denomination, that I know of, followed Crisp. Some unwary Independents, in as great Zeal and Fury, follow Crisp, none of them Mr. Baxter, that I know of.³

This double alignment was not just a passing phase, but something that grew in importance in the subsequent century. Was it then just the fortuitous outcome of the fact that the Presbyterians and Congregationals took sides for and against Davis, his Antinomianism and insubordination? It would not be the first occasion on which a feud persisted long after its origins were forgotten. But that would not be the whole of the story for there had all

1. *A vindication of the Protestant doctrine*, [by Robert Trail], 1692, p. 21.
2. It is not that reason and a spiritual interpretation of life are incompatible, but simply that Calvinism and reason are incompatible.
3. *An apology for Congregational divines*, [by Samuel Young], 1698, p. 50.

along been differences of practice between the two denominations which at the very least predisposed them to range themselves on either side of the great gulf.¹ It was the famous difference in the credentials required for Church membership between the credible profession of faith with the Presbyterians and the witness of the Spirit with the Congregationalists. To Baxter the giving in of an experience of the Spirit's activity in the soul smacked of fanaticism and was dangerously allied to the irrationalism of the Antinomians. For him it tended to make the Spirit usurp the place of reason. As he put it, "they mistake the meaning of the Witness of the Spirit; As if it were but an inward Inspiration and Impulse equal to a voice, saying *Thou art Elect and Justified*".² And he

1. The continuing existence of the two funds was of first importance in appropriating the denominational names for different theological and philosophical outlooks. In 1719 the Presbyterian Fund decided to ignore the side a man took in the current controversy when making grants. At about the same date (confirmed in 1738), the Congregational Fund imposed a test of orthodoxy before making a grant.
2. Richard Baxter, *The Scripture Gospel defended*, 1690 pt. ii (*A defence of Christ*) p. 26. The passage continues: "Whereas it is an Inherent Impress, and so an objective Evidencing witness, even the Divine Nature, and Image of God, and the habit of Divine filial Love, by which Gods Spirit marketh us out as adopted: As likeness of the child to the Father, and love, are an evidencing witness of true Son-ship: And as Reason is a witness that we are Men ... so Sanctity is an evidencing witness that we are children of God ... Hereby they [the Antinomians] destroy the assurance and comfort of most (if not almost all) true Christians in the world; because they have not that inspiration of certain inward word of assurance, that they are Elect and Justified. I have known very few that said they had it: And of those few, some fell to Debauchery, and some to doubting. And though Prophetic Inspiration prove it self to them that have it, its not possible for others to know, but that a counterfeit Fanatic conceit may be it". This final point that abuse of the witness of the Spirit is essentially private is an accusation of first importance, for the whole value of reason is that its findings are "public" and therefore verifiable, making the accusation of "carnal" or "corrupt" irrelevant, for a corrupt reason must be one which is private and not public. This is not to say that reason is infallible, but, being public, it is pro-

went on to find a safer alternative employment for the Spirit, and one that did not risk any sort of competition with reason.

Closely allied to this objection was another, which again emphasises the educational or intellectual aspect of the parish system as cherished by the Presbyterians. It was that the Congregationalists, by restricting church membership, according to what they claimed as a stricter method, to those who could produce a witness of the Spirit, they narrowed the church down to a small group gathered and separated out of the community, and left the rest of the parish in outer darkness. Baxter claimed that it destroyed much of the educational value of parish life and he invariably used hard words about it. "It tendeth", he said, "to extirpate Godliness out of the Land; by taking a very few that can talk more than the rest, and making them the Church, and shutting out more that are worthy, and by neglecting the Souls of all the Parish else, except as to some publick Preaching".¹

Closely allied, too, was the Congregational system of admission to the ministry, which could all too easily degenerate into anti-rationalism, and which Baxter spoke of as making "too light of Ordination".² The ground of complaint lay in throwing too much emphasis upon

gressively corrigible. It will be noted that where Baxter allows the term Spirit as appropriate, the evidence is objective, or as we might say, public. It is not without interest, as confirming the soundness of Baxter's judgment, to quote the view of J. L. Stocks in his *Reason and intuition*, 1939, p. 17 "An intuition which claims sacrosanctity and declines the test of reason is ... a moral and social offence, a mere misnomer for blind prejudice and crass superstition". "The intuition which is opposed to reason is the "private wisdom" of Heraclitus, the wilful refusal to attempt the universality which reason aims at, the defiant assertion of personal and collective particularisms as necessities of life. Such rejection of reason is a crime, not merely an error, because the striving for community and universality is the foundation of all genuine morality".

1. *Rel. iii. p. 67 (sect. 2). Cf. Rel. ii. p. 143 (§14, sect. 3). Cf. G. F. Nuttall, Visible saints, p. 137.*
2. *Rel. ii. p. 143.*

gifts of the Spirit as the qualification for preaching, and on the individual congregation's power to discern the desired qualification.¹ The *Heads of Agreement* of 1691 had sought firmly to obviate this danger by insisting upon theological education in addition to ministerial gifts and by requiring examinations by competent ministers.² It was on this, as we have seen, that the Union broke down,³ when Davis reverted to extreme Congregational principles and was supported by those who hated Baxterian tendencies amongst the Presbyterians.

It does not of course follow that all Congregationals, or indeed many of them, despised intellectual and rational understanding.⁴ Amongst their number were outstanding scholars, and the fame of some of their Academies proves that Congregationals in general did not despise theological learning.⁵ But the difference was there and the emphasis in their system, though not anti-rational, was non-rational; and, whenever it came to the point, the two bodies tended

to part company on the question of reason and of the liberty of individual judgment that reason made possible. Different answers were given to the question, shall reason stand supreme (as with Baxter) or shall it be subjected to controls which it shall not be free to criticise.

It is no part of my business in this lecture to carry the story beyond the point where Baxterianism bid fair to dominate Presbyterian developments and denominational relations, first by softening the asperities of rigid Calvinism and laying emphasis on duty and virtue, then, by seeking to promote unity, if it could be had, by the simplification of dogmatic requirements down to whatever emerged from a humble and unfettered understanding of Scripture, and, finally, by the elimination of fanaticism and enthusiasm by submission to the paramount claims of reason, to which even the establishment of Scripture as revelation is subject.¹

It could be a fascinating story to examine the working out of an expanded Baxterian liberalism² in conflict with the older more traditional Calvinism at each critical juncture in the eighteenth century, until finally all communications were broken between those who liked to call themselves Rational Christians and who for the most part were won over to the philosophy and theology of Joseph Priestley, and those who strove to follow what they took for the straight and narrow path of dogmatic rectitude, and who found strength and comfort in the Evangelical Revival, being to a great extent revived, if not transformed, thereby. But I shall not attempt anything of the sort at this late hour. Enough that Baxter's liberalism, his principle of simplification and his intellectualism, never lost its influence, and, when in the middle of the

1. G. F. Nuttall, *Visible saints*, pp. 85-6.
2. *Heads of agreement*, 1691, II. §§2, 4, 7.
3. For the disrepute of "gifted brethren" see *Apology for Congregational divines*, [by Samuel Young], 1698, p. 36:—"Many Tradesmen may be, and are such as may deserve the Name of prudent wise Christians, but yet make woful ignorant Teachers, *Who is sufficient*, saith Paul, *for these things?*"
 "Had Paul liv'd in London, he would have met with some that say, *Who is not sufficient for these things?*"
 "Obj. *But the Spirit can do this work.*"
 "Answ. But we see that he doth not do it ..."
 "Obj. *Peter was a Fisher-man, &c.*"
 "Answ. Is there no difference between a Fisher-man made wise, and that to ... Write excellent *Greek Epistles*, and ... ignorant Plowmen, Weavers, Taylors?"
4. There is evidence that by 1700 many Congregationals were seriously troubled by the damage done by Antinomians and irregular preachers. Cf. *A declaration of the Congregational ministers in and about London against Antinomian errors and ignorant ... persons intruding themselves into the ministry*, 1699, [by George Griffith, Matthew Mead, Richard Taylor, John Nesbitt and Stephen Lobb].
5. Well known examples are Isaac Watts, Philip Doddridge (and his Academy) and Daniel Neal. But the interesting fact is that such as these seem always to have been a little out of step with the rest of the denomination.

1. e.g. Richard Baxter, *Saints everlasting rest*, 1651, pt. ii, §2 (cc3).
2. "Expanded" because Baxterianism was later largely seen through the eyes of John Locke, who pursued the same aims of simplification and intelligibility with a somewhat greater consistency, and with a humbler estimate of what Scripture and Reason could achieve.

nineteenth century, the Hibbert Trust came to be founded, a dogmatic interpretation of Christianity as the foundation of the Trust was happily set aside in favour of the more elastic and evolutionary definition, "Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form".¹ The language may be Queen Victoria, but the sentiment is pure Baxter. The framers of the Trust had a very different conception from Baxter's of what it was in which "Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form" consisted. Baxter would have said of it, and did indeed say of it in his own day, that in that they erred. But both were on common ground in determining how to escape from error, which is after all what matters. Between them and their opponents there is a great gulf fixed, and no common ground—save perhaps, at the Golden Gate.

1. See *D.N.B.* under "Robert Hibbert".

III RICHARD BAXTER— "MEER NONCONFORMIST"

by

R. D. Whitehorn, D.D.

THE general subject for these three lectures is *The Beginnings of Nonconformity 1660-1700*. The first lecture traced the legitimate succession of many of the ejected ministers of 1662 from fathers, grandfathers, friends and associates, who had held the same conscientious opinions and in many instances had suffered for them from the reign of Queen Elizabeth through the coercions of Whitgift, Bancroft and Laud. Such men had held to their opinions in the main during the apparent settlement of religion enacted by the Long Parliament with the advice of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and through the somewhat incoherent years of Oliver Cromwell's recognition of selected types of Christianity and ministers without any sufficient church establishment. In 1662 they were hereditary Nonconformists again.

The second lecture dealt largely with the revived or continuing divergence of theological opinions, which prevented lasting success for attempts to maintain such a united front among Nonconformists, especially Presbyterians and Congregationalists, as might have been hoped for when the Toleration Act had been passed in 1689. How then does this third lecture fit in, under the title of *Richard Baxter, "Meer Nonconformist"?*

A sufficient reason for giving Baxter a lecture to himself, to my mind, is that his long life, from 1615 to 1691,

covers most of the century, and that there is as much to be learned about it from his own account of his life and ministry, from his debates and controversies, from his trials and troubles, from his personal contacts with men and affairs, as there is from any other single source. If Baxter was not a complete example of an English non-conformist, he was in some respects among the most influential men of his generation. Against the background of his times and his contemporaries, there is much to be studied and learned of Baxter's conception and practice of the Christian ministry, of his churchmanship and of his search for Christian unity and peace; much to be discerned, for stimulus and for rebuke, among his manifold labours and tribulations, of the content and quality of his essential faith. If Baxter was, as he called himself on the title page of one of his books, a "Meer Non-conformist", he seems to me to unite in himself the best qualities of most of the partisans.

Richard Baxter was the eldest son of "a mean freeholder, called a gentleman for his ancestors' sake",¹ of Eaton-Constantine, near Shrewsbury. His father had not been an exemplary character till about the time of Richard's birth; but about then he became a serious "searcher of the Scriptures", a changed man for the rest of his life, and a powerful influence on his son. The parson at Eaton-Constantine was a "reader" 80 years of age, who never preached, and because of bad sight employed a series of unsatisfactory "readers", who were also supposed to be teachers. Neighbouring clergy were not much better. In his 'teens Baxter was at school in Wroxeter to no great purpose; but instead of going to Oxford University he spent some months as pupil to the chaplain at Ludlow Castle, who taught him practically nothing, but gave him the run of the library of which he made good use. "My faults", he wrote years later to Anthony Wood, "are no disgrace to any university; for

I was of none. I have little but what I had out of books, and inconsiderable helps of country tutors".²

In 1633 Baxter's Ludlow tutor sent him to Whitehall with a letter of introduction to the Court; but after a few weeks his mother's illness and subsequent death brought him back and kept him at home. He now looked towards ordination to the ministry, and studied devotedly under the instruction of the parish clergyman of Wroxeter, the Rev. Francis Garbet. His family and friends were all conformists, though he came to know a few ministers who were "silenced" and deprived under Archbishop Laud's regime. In 1638, at the age of 23, Baxter was ordained by the Bishop of Worcester, and licensed to teach in a new school at Dudley. From there he went to serve as assistant minister at Bridgnorth—a "conformist" still, episcopalian and liturgist, but already questioning whether subscription in the terms of the "Et cetera" oath of 1640 was conscientiously possible; doubtful about such requirements as wearing the surplice or kneeling to receive the elements at Communion; and appalled at the laxity of Church discipline. He was constant in his studies of the vexed questions of Church order; but, he wrote, "I continued in my liberty of preaching the gospel at Bridgnorth, about a year and three-quarters, which I took to be a very great mercy in those troublesome times".³

Baxter's famous ministry at Kidderminster began in April 1641, when he was elected to be Lecturer at £60 a year paid by the parson; but two years later the Civil War began. Baxter had made his mark in Kidderminster, of course; and there will be more to say about that later; for his pastoral and preaching ministry was, among all his other activities, his central preoccupation. The "troublesome times" of Bridgnorth continued up to and after the outbreak of war. Worcestershire was pretty solidly Royalist; and though Baxter did not feel deeply

2. Dictionary of National Biography. (Dr. A. B. Grosart). (referred to hereafter as "D.N.B.").

3. A.R.B., p. 21.

1. J. M. Lloyd Thomas *Autobiography of Richard Baxter*, p. xv. (In further notes this book is referred to as "A.R.B.").

concerned politically, on the whole his opinion was on the side of the Parliament. It seemed to him to make more clearly for civil liberty, yet he was disturbed by the "headiness and rashness of the younger inexperienced sort of religious people" and believed that "much sin was committed in the dishonouring of the king, and in the uncivil language against the bishops and liturgy of the church". "But", he wrote, "I then thought, whoever was faulty, the people's liberties and safety should not be forfeited".⁴ So, as Dr. Grosart put it, "Richard Baxter, though loyal to the monarchy, sided with the Parliament".⁵ Popular feeling was against him in Kidderminster, and he retired first to Gloucester and then to Coventry, where he acted as chaplain to the garrison and came into contact with Oliver Cromwell and others of the Parliament leaders. Baxter records that while he was at Coventry he was invited by Cromwell and his officers, "when he lay at Cambridge with that famous troop which he began his army with", to become pastor of a "gathered church" in the Ironsides. He refused because his "judgment was against the lawfulness and convenience of their way"; but he soon came to regret missing an opportunity to influence "the men that afterwards headed much of the army".⁶ So with the approval of his fellow ministers in Coventry, Baxter accepted the invitation of Colonel Whalley to be chaplain to his regiment, and from 1645 to 1647 moved about with it as it served in various parts of the Western, South-western and Midland counties. Cromwell received him coldly when he first arrived and took no further notice of him during his chaplaincy. Baxter was horrified by the religious opinions which he found widely held in the parliamentary army. Indeed his army service was mainly due to his desire to protest against and prevent the spread of "Separatist", "Anabaptist", "Anti-

nomian" and other vagaries among the soldiers and their officers. "I set myself from day to day to find out the corruptions of the soldiers, and to discourse and dispute them out of their mistakes, both religious and political".⁷ It was a courageous undertaking; but one cannot help doubting that Baxter was the right man for it, though doubtless he learned much from his army experience; not least in regard to Oliver Cromwell's own attitude, which he thoroughly distrusted. But in 1647, after a long spell of illness, he "was finally separated from the army";⁸ and thanks greatly to the hospitable care of Sir Thomas and Lady Rous, with whom he had been quartered earlier in Worcestershire, he was able before the end of that year to return to his old charge in Kidderminster.

This sketchy account of Baxter's early ministry, up to his 32nd year, has had the purpose of indicating where his chief interest lay, and the problems of the war-time which exercised him, while the convictions were forming in which he remained remarkably consistent all his life. His studies and his personal experiences in these years led him to his continuing purpose "to take men off from extreams and bring them to peace". Just as it was his aim to resist the "fancy religions" and moral disorder which he found in the parliamentary army, so he grew in the conviction that there must be a way to discover which would lead to peace between diversities of ecclesiastical practice and order, if only ministers could be brought to serve the deepest religious needs of ordinary men and women, and to exercise their ministry with that end consciously in view. The twelve years in Kidderminster between 1647 and 1660, during the whole of the Protectorate, were—to use Sir James Stephen's words in his eloquent *Essay on Baxter*—"the sabbath of his life; the interval in which his mind enjoyed the only repose of which it was capable, in labours of love, prompted by a willing

4. A.R.B., p. 37.

5. D.N.B.

6. A.R.B., p. 50

7. A.R.B., p. 52

8. A.R.B., p. 59.

heart, and unimpeded by a contentious world”.⁹

He had returned to his old position of Lecturer or Preacher; and though he was appointed Vicar under the Commonwealth, it was some time before he knew of it, and when he did he made no attempt to possess himself of the vicarage. His personal faith was fully set forth in *The Saints Everlasting Rest* — written mainly during his illness in 1647, and published in 1650. His ideals for the ministry were presented in *The Reformed Pastor*, which was written in the first place in 1655 for the society of ministers known as the Worcestershire Association. Many of these ministers had, of course, been appointed to their charges by Cromwell’s committee of Triers, and had therefore been considered to be godly and capable, and trustworthy preachers and pastors, as indeed Baxter found them to be. They were of different persuasions about church government and other matters, but they were agreed on this—that they as pastors required “reformation”. Under Baxter’s guidance the purpose which they set before themselves was the adoption in all their parishes of the scheme worked out and practised by Baxter in Kidderminster. It had something in common with the “house churches” of which a great deal is heard in England today; except that Baxter called whole families to his own house for his “Family Catechising”, an hour at a time. “We spend Monday and Tuesday”, he writes in *The Reformed Pastor*, “from morning almost to night, in the work, taking about fifteen or sixteen families in a week, that we may go through the parish, in which there are upwards of eight hundred families, in a year; and I cannot say yet that one family hath refused to come to me, and but few persons excused themselves, and shifted it off. And I find more outward signs of success with most that do come, than from all my public preaching to them”.¹⁰ As to his preaching, he

9. “Richard Baxter’s Self-review and Stephen’s Essay on Baxter”: ed. Bishop of Chester, p. 86.

10. *The Reformed Pastor*, Dedication.

writes, “with the generality an applause of the preacher was most of the success of the sermon that I could hear of”. He was in favour of more teaching being done during the week—by his “Family Catechising” and otherwise—so that Sunday sermons might be shorter, and “a greater part of the service” be given to “psalms and solemn praises to our Redeemer”.¹¹ Baxter’s sermons were usually of one hour by the sand-glass: but he preached only once on Sundays, and also on Thursday evenings. The Quakers criticized him for reading his sermons: which he said was quite true—that he wrote and read them except when he happened to be too busy or too lazy! And he says that his “first and greatest success was upon youth”,¹² and with their parents and other older people through them.

As to the order of public worship and the sacraments, Baxter disliked some things in the Book of Common Prayer, but used it in his earlier ministry till Parliament forbade it in 1645. The Westminster Assembly’s rather austere *Directory for Public Worship* was then prescribed for use in all churches. Baxter adopted it as his basis, but usually retained the Prayer Book’s “Psalms in order for the day”, one of the three creeds, and the canticles as alternative to metrical psalms. He wanted more hymns, and he wrote some fine ones himself. “Why”, he asks, “should not Hymns and Psalms fitted for the state of the Gospel-Church and worship be invented by Christians?”¹³ “Let praises have a larger room in thy duties”. “Be much in the evangelical work of praise”. Surely there was nothing in Baxter’s conception and practice of public worship which could be described in the words about Puritan conventicles used by Hooker’s friend Adrian Saravia—“their odious schism and mutinous ‘hugger-mugger’”! Dr. F. J. Powicke rightly describes Baxter’s attitude thus:— “He gave a high place to the

11. F. J. Powicke: *Life of Richard Baxter*, p. 96.

12. Powicke, op. cit., p. 51.

13. Powicke, op. cit., p. 97.

'ordinances'. He made much of public prayer and praise, and the Sacraments. He thought no pains could be too great to invest them with due reverence".¹⁴

It was Baxter's belief that all the Christian people in a parish ought to be at one, one body, though not necessarily all of one mind on every point; and he wanted the minister to be such an one in his teaching and ruling and leadership as would truly be a "father in God" to all of them, old and young, and rich and poor. He was in truth far more concerned with the spiritual efficacy of any man's ministry than with the order under which he exercised it. It is from that point of view that we may consider his attitude to Church order.

It has been well said by Sir James Stephen that "Baxter was opposed to every sect, and belonged to none".¹⁵ What troubled Baxter most about *Independency* was the danger which he thought it contained to Christian unity, and to the religious life of the *whole* local community. He was afraid of its tendency to "separatism", of too great strictness in qualification for membership of a "gathered Church", of too much laxity in the ordination of ministers, and especially of the democratic power which "made the People by majority of votes to be church governors".¹⁶ That power, he said, "is the same thing in another name as separatism". So also, concerning *Baptists* and *Quakers*, Baxter's fundamental objection was that they were "sectarians" and separatists. It was also Baxter's insistence on "the church membership of children" that put him at odds with Baptists; and his insistence that a "credible profession" of belief in Christ was sufficient warrant for church membership made him object to the peculiarities—and they were sometimes very peculiar—of other sectaries. The *Quakers* of Baxter's experience, who created disturbances in his Kidderminster church, did not commend their ways to him; but he

14. Op. cit., p. 48.

15. Stephen, op. cit., p. 130.

16. Powicke, op. cit., p. 273.

wrote with admiration for their steadfastness under persecution. There is ironic humour in this sentence about them: "The poor deluded souls would sometimes meet only to sit in silence (when, as they said, the Spirit did not speak). And it was a great question whether this silence was a 'religious exercise not allowed by the liturgy'". As for the *Papists*, Englishmen (and Scotsmen) of any other religious persuasion were of one mind in abhorring the Papacy and all its works, and especially any interference by it or on its behalf with the "lawful" religion. Baxter, like Conformists and Nonconformists of every school, was always against public "toleration" for Papists. (This, of course, was the main reason for their objection to James II's *Declaration for Liberty of Conscience* in 1687, quite apart from the question of the "divine right" of the king to dispense from the law of the land). Yet, as with everyone else from whom he conscientiously disagreed, Baxter refused to deny the good in the Papists, and deprecated "a war proclaimed between professed Christians by which all the Romanists are tempted to hate and destroy us as those that would do the same by them". And it may be seemly for us all, in the "ecumenical" atmosphere of our time, to recall Baxter's words in his "Self-review". "My censures of the Papists do much differ from what they were at first . . . I doubt not but that God hath many sanctified ones among them, who have received the true doctrine of Christianity so practically that their contrary errors prevail not against them to hinder their love of God and their salvation . . . I am deeper afflicted for the disagreements of Christians than I was when I was a younger Christian. Except the case of the infidel world, nothing is so sad and grievous to my thought as the case of the divided churches. . . . The contentions between the Greek Church and the Roman, the Papists and the Protestants, the Lutherans and the Calvinists, have woefully hindered the Kingdom of Christ".¹⁷

17. A.R.B., p. 118f.

Was Baxter himself a Presbyterian? Dr. Drysdale, in his *History of the Presbyterians in England* says that Baxter is claimed as a "Presbyterian" because "he revolted from and entirely rejected the Diocesan scheme of Prelatic Episcopacy as exhibited in England". Yet Baxter habitually dissociates himself from the typically Presbyterian party in church and in politics. Certainly he wanted zealous reform in the church. The "*Root and Branch*" Bill was the outcome of the mounting indignation of Parliament, and of many of the clergy and some of the bishops themselves, against the manner and content of Archbishop Laud's "Innovations". The oath required to be taken by a new Canon of 1640 had bound the clergy *not only* to "approve the doctrine and discipline or government established in the Church of England as containing all things necessary to salvation", *but also* to promise never to give their "consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, *et cetera*". The counter-blast, passed into an Act by the House of Commons in September 1642 and four months later by the House of Lords (from which the votes of bishops had been already removed), "provided for the utter abolition of bishops and all the officers depending on them, for the taking away of deans and chapters and the whole hierarchy of the Church".¹⁸ This was to come into effect a year later. Yet there were reformers in the Commons who appear to have been prepared for a remodelling of the Episcopacy. Sir Benjamin Rudyard, for example, declared, "I am not of their opinion who believe that there is an innate ill quality in Episcopacy".¹⁹ So also Baxter held "that there are divers sorts of episcopacy lawful and desirable";²⁰ it was the claim of Bancroft, and Laud after him, for a "divine right of bishops" that Baxter found it impossible to accept. Moreover he draws a clear distinction in such a passage

18. G. G. Perry, *History of the English Church*, II, p. 445.

19. *Ibid.*

20. A.R.B., p. 98.

as this: "The old Episcopal Divines did take episcopacy to be better than Presbyterian equality, but not necessary to the Being of a church, but to the better being where it may be had. But the new Prelatical Divines . . . unchurch those churches that are not Prelatical". (One is reminded of Hooker's dictum, that the lack of episcopacy in such churches as the Swiss and the Scottish is "a defect" which he would "rather lament than exagitate").²¹ So also, Baxter continues, "the old Episcopal Divines thought that Ordination by Presbyters without Prelates was valid, and not to be done again, though irregular. But the New ones take it to be No Ordination, nor those so ordained to be any Ministers, but Laymen".²² Remember that Baxter had himself been episcopally ordained, like all but a few of the clerics in the Westminster Assembly. There appears to be no doubt that the ascendancy of the Presbyterian party, and the establishment by law of a Presbyterian system, in accordance with the Assembly's *Form of Presbyterial Church-Government*, was no cause of jubilation for Baxter, though he respected and honoured the Assembly and its members. His "Old Episcopal Divines" seem plainly to be the representatives of those views with which he and those who agreed with him, including his Episcopalian friends like Sir Matthew Hale and Archbishop Usher, would most have found themselves in harmony. And indeed in describing the events of 1662 before and after the Ejection of St. Bartholomew's Day, Baxter says: "We were called all by the name of Presbyterians (the odious name), tho' we never put up one petition for Presbytery, but pleaded for Primitive Episcopacy".²³

"Primitive Episcopacy"; what did that mean? It is curious that according to the *Eikon Basiliké*, Charles I used the phrase himself when he said "I am firm to primitive episcopacy, not to have it extirpated if I can

21. R. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. IV, xi, 16.

22. Powicke, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

23. A.R.B., p. 171.

hinder it". And in his last detention in the Isle of Wight, says Canon Perry, "he did, indeed, at length so far yield as to allow the establishment of Presbyterianism side by side with Episcopacy"²⁴—and by then it was too late. The Presbyterians as a whole, both in England and in Scotland, deplored the execution of the king, as Baxter did; but could King Charles ever have been trusted?

The idea of a combination of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy was no extravagant one in the seventeenth century. In Scotland, after the re-establishment of Episcopacy by James VI, there was a notable example of it in the diocese of Aberdeen. Patrick Forbes had been as a young man a devoted follower and friend of Andrew Melville, who was the principal architect of a full-blown Presbyterian order in the Church of Scotland. It was by Melville that Presbyteries were fully organized, to exercise corporate *episcopé* in areas generally corresponding to the former bishops' dioceses. They superseded John Knox's temporary institution of Superintendents—and what is superintendent but the Latin equivalent of the Greek *episcopos*? Patrick Forbes had since his father's death in 1598 been the Laird of Corse and had "continued assiduously to pursue his studies, not neglecting the culture and improvement of his family property". But, more than that, he had been persuaded by the clergy of the local Presbyteries to undertake the duties of lay preacher in his own parish church; he was urged repeatedly by the Bishop and Synod of Aberdeen to be ordained to the ministry; and finally he agreed and was ordained as minister of Keith in 1611 or 1612 by the Bishop of Aberdeen. It was with the hearty goodwill of all, King James, and the Scottish bishops and the presbyters and laity of the diocese, that Forbes was consecrated Bishop of Aberdeen in 1618 and held office through the troubled years of Scottish church history till his death in 1635. He regarded himself as *primus inter pares* among the clergy of his diocese. He worked "in the closest co-operation and harmony with

Synod, Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions". It was written of him: "Without [the clergy's] advice and consent he made it a rule to do nothing, in this respect carefully observing the primitive order that in the management of the diocese the Bishop should exercise no despotic sway, but in all things concede to the Presbyters their due place and honour"²⁵ Bishop Patrick Forbes is well called by his biographer, Dr. Sinclair Snow, "the Episcopalian who was also a Presbyterian"²⁶

Again, Baxter's true friend Archbishop Usher of Armagh, and Bishop of Carlisle, not only wrote learnedly *The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans briefly laid down*, but also a tract called *The Reduction of Episcopacy into the form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church*. This was a real attempt to reconcile Episcopal and Presbyterian forms of church order, to which appeal was frequently made by men who strove for peace. And another most notable example of the same sincere desire for the "accommodation" of the two systems was Archbishop Leighton's. He was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1641, became Principal of the University of Edinburgh in 1653, and after the Restoration of Charles II reluctantly accepted (with episcopal ordination) the see of Dunblane. He disapproved the policy of forcing episcopacy in Scotland; but the King dissuaded him in 1665 from resigning his see. He was made Archbishop of Glasgow in 1669, and continued unsuccessfully his efforts for "accommodation" until he retired to England in 1674, and died in London ten years later.

These three examples are given to show that among recognized and notable Episcopalianians there were those who believed, as Baxter did, that there could have been agreement, and room found in the Established Church of England for reasonable men of good will. "Primitive Episcopacy" was what Baxter believed in, not "Prelacy

25. W. G. Sinclair Snow, *Life . . . of Patrick Forbes*, p. 110.

26. *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

24. Perry, *op. cit.*, p. 472; cf. A.R.B., p. 62.

and the Diocesan Frame. He held that there should be many more bishops of *small* dioceses, on the scale of Rural Deaneries rather than Suffragan Bishoprics, so that the Bishop could have a real "father-in-God" relationship to his flock, and exercise an oversight among the ministers which would lead them to be primarily preachers and teachers of their parishioners. For Baxter the local community was the real sphere of the ministry, and the authority of the minister should be truly based upon his spiritual leadership. He had no objection therefore to Episcopacy as such. Indeed he held that the government of the church by bishops is "a thing that is commonly granted: but the controversy is about the *species of Episcopacy*: not whether bishops, but *what sort of bishops*, should be the ordinary governors of the Church of Christ".²⁷ Baxter was offered the Bishopric of Hereford at the Restoration when he had already been appointed a Royal Chaplain. He declined the offer, as Edmund Calamy did when offered Coventry or Lichfield, while Dr. Reynolds accepted the see of Norwich. Baxter's reason was that he could only accept if the King's Declaration of Breda were made law, for "my judgment was fully resolved against the lawfulness of the old diocesan frame". The "Presbyterianism" of "Meer Nonconformists", like Episcopacy and unlike Independency, stood for a nationally recognised and "established" Church: and Baxter, desiring the best features of both to be combined therein, was convinced that "Primitive Episcopacy" was the best way of combining them. So in the long and fruitless debates at the Savoy Conference and elsewhere between 1660 and 1662, Baxter (as Lloyd Thomas puts it) "often the chief spokesman of the Presbyterians, . . . was, for all that some historians and others say, never a Presbyterian. *He died as he had lived, a moderate Episcopalian*".²⁸ Baxter says himself that the "argument against diocesans is not managed by the Pres-

byterians as such, but by those that are for the primitive Episcopacy".

Baxter had come to London in 1660, hoping for the best from the Restoration, hoping that the new settlement of the Church would leave room within it for ministers of differing opinions—for that "Catholicism against all sects"²⁹ expressed in the great saying "Unity in things necessary and Liberty in things unnecessary, and Charity in all".³⁰ But the restored Episcopate had no such desire; and the Act of Uniformity was so framed and timed as to ensure that no minister could expect anything but hardship unless he "subscribed" and "conformed".

The Act of Uniformity, in much the same words as those of Edward VI and Elizabeth, describes Nonconformists in terms which are still, I suppose, the legal definition of them. Let me quote the Act: "*A great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality and living without knowledge and due fear of God, do wilfully and schismatically abstain and refuse to come to their parish churches, and other public places where common prayer, administration of the sacraments and preaching of the Word of God is used upon Sundays and other days ordained and appointed to be kept and observed as holy days*".

And this is the formula which ministers must, under the Act of Uniformity, declare and subscribe: "I, A.B., do here *declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book entitled 'The Book of Common Prayer' . . . and the form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of bishops, priests and deacons*".³¹

How could Baxter "subscribe" and "conform" in those words?

It was because of his sincere convictions, and as an

29. A.R.B., p. 95.

30. A.R.B., p. 91.

31. Act of Uniformity, quoted in F. G. Healey, *Rooted in Faith*, pp. 125 and 129.

27. A.R.B., Introduction, p. xxxv.

28. A.R.B., Introduction, p. xxvii.

example to other men, that three months before St. Bartholomew's Day 1662, Baxter made it known that he would not subscribe, that he would be a "Meer Non-conformist". As Dr. Powicke writes, "the wide extent of [Baxter's] conformity does but serve to prove how deeply grounded his Nonconformity must have been". For Baxter "loved the Church infinitely more than did thousands of easy-going Conformists".³² Hence "he conformed as far as he could". Remember that he regularly attended Morning and Evening Prayer and received Communion in Acton parish church. "He did his utmost to persuade others to do likewise . . . He deplored the persecuting Acts (the Clarendon Code) and the violent enforcement of them, not merely because of their gross injustice . . . but especially because the effect was to widen the breach and harden the Separatists in their irreconcilable attitude". And "he resented . . . the principles of the High Church party, as represented by the Bishops generally . . . which to his mind identified them with a persecuting policy, and rendered them in their own way as irreconcilable as the Separatists".³³

"I cannot be so narrow", wrote Baxter, "in my principles of Church-communion as many are; that are so much for a liturgy, or so much against it, so much for ceremonies or so much against them, that they can hold communion with no church that is not of their mind and way".³⁴ In 1672 when he applied for a licence to preach (after ten years' silence except in private houses), under King Charles' Declaration of Indulgence, Baxter did so "on condition he might have it without the title of Independent, Presbyterian, or any other party, but *only as a Nonconformist*".³⁵

This lecture is not intended to be a biography of Richard Baxter. If it had been, there would have been much

32. F. J. Powicke, *Richard Baxter under the Cross*, pp. 7 ff.

33. *Ibidem*.

34. *Self-Review*, p. 41.

35. A.R.B., p. 221.

more to add—of his life-long battle with ill health, yet indefatigable industry; of his most happy marriage and his beautiful tribute to his Margaret who died ten years before him; of his friendships as much as his controversies; of his prodigious writings; of his hardships and his trial before Judge Jeffreys, his imprisonment and fines and distrains; of his last days, when Toleration for Non-conformists had at least been recognized by the law, though Comprehension in the national church was not.

If the promise which men like Baxter believed to be contained in Charles II's Declaration of Breda had been fulfilled; if there had been a sincere attempt to give "a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted, or called in question, for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the Kingdom";³⁶ if "the passion and uncharitableness of the times" had been allowed in truth "to unite in a freedom of conversation", to "be composed", or "better understood"; if the Act of Uniformity of 1662 had not demanded too much for his honourable conscience; may we not believe that the fervent spirit of Richard Baxter would still have served the *whole* Christian church in England to the end of his life, even as it has for nearly 300 years enriched the religious heritage of his country? "I had rather", he said, "be a martyr for love than for any other article of the Christian creed".³⁷

36. Declaration of Breda. Healey, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

37. *Self-Review*, Preface, p. xvi.

IV WALES AND THE EJECTION

by

H. Lismer Short, M.A.

THE Great Ejection of 1662 was an important event in the history of England and of English Nonconformity. But was it also important for Wales?

The story is usually told entirely within an English context. Welshmen may know that Welsh conditions were different, but Englishmen do not seem to notice. In the preface to *Calamy revised* (1934), A. G. Matthews wrote that his book "does not take into consideration the ejections in the four Welsh dioceses", adding that he leaves this task to Welsh historians. Similarly, in the preface to *Walker revised* (1948) he says that economy has caused him to omit Wales. More recently a Welsh historian, Dr. R. Tudur Jones, in the preface to his *Congregationalism in England, 1662-1962*, has written: "I have adhered to my terms of reference and restricted the study to Congregationalism in England. It was my original purpose to introduce Welsh evidence in order to provide material for comparison and contrast with the developments in England. When it became evident that this would make the book too long for its purpose, I regretfully decided to omit almost all references to Wales". Such reluctance to include Wales in the story leaves English readers, at least, with a distorted view. As an Englishman I can attempting and expanding my account.

I am also interested in a topic which arises out of the general subject of Wales and the Ejection, namely the important Welsh contribution to a part of English Nonconformity, to "Rational Dissent" in England in the 18th century.

In Wales, as in England, there was from the 16th century onwards a restive Puritan element in the established church. John Penry, from Brecon, was a vigorous Puritan in England in Queen Elizabeth's reign; he was hanged in London in 1593. Most of his career, however, was in England and Scotland. He wanted very much to serve the Puritan cause in Wales, but he had no opportunity. He declared that Wales lay in spiritual darkness, and he urged Welshmen who had come to England for education and had taken orders in the English church, to go home to evangelise their native land. "Let no man do me an injury", he wrote, "to report that I deny any members of Christ to be in Wales. I protest I have no such meaning, and would die upon the persuasion that the Lord hath his chosen in my dear country, and I trust the number of them will be daily increased".

Exactly what was the spiritual condition of Wales before 1640 is disputed. One party paints an idyllic picture. A Welsh dynasty, the Tudors, on the throne of England, had made great openings for Welshmen at court and elsewhere. In 1571 Dr. Hugh Price, from Brecon, founded Jesus College at Oxford, and it became a centre of university education for Welshmen. The Bible and Prayer Book were translated into Welsh, and there was a literary revival. The Welsh bishops and clergy, according to this account, were mostly Welshmen, and served their people well. It is true that there was not a parson to every parish, for the country was poor; but there was no more pluralism than was inevitable. Some of the clergy, notably Rees Prichard, vicar of Llandovery, Carmarthenshire, were outstanding in earnestness, piety and learning, combining a Puritan temper with faithful obedience to an episcopal church. A disadvantage, which be-

came more and more serious, was that the secular administration and the law-courts were assimilated to the English system, and here the English language was imposed.

The rival party tells a quite different story, of tyrannical and absentee bishops and a scandalous clergy, ignorant, money-grubbing and debauched. It is possible that the two parties are talking about rather different periods and places, and also, of course, that the bitterness of conflict has caused exaggerations on both sides.

The trouble seems to have started in 1633, when archbishop Laud urged the bishops, in Wales as well as in England, to discipline their clergy, and compel obedience to the Laudian standards of ritual. A number of clergy who had been eminent for their piety and zeal found themselves under the lash. Men whose names later became well-known in the Puritan cause were suspended from their places for "inconformity". William Erbury, vicar of St. Mary's, Cardiff, and his curate, Walter Craddock, were dismissed; so was William Wroth, rector of Llanvaches, Monmouthshire. Marmaduke Matthews, vicar of Penmain, near Swansea, emigrated to Puritan New England to escape from the bishop's discipline. Richard Symonds, of Abergavenny, moved to Shrewsbury and opened a school, where he had Richard Baxter as a pupil.

There was much moving about. A vicar or rector suspended in one place is sometimes soon found as a curate somewhere else, often at the other end of the country. An incumbent who is dismissed from his parish gathers a few sympathisers round him and preaches to them in private, so that one classifies him as a Nonconformist, only to find him a little later in a parochial pulpit. Ambrose Mostyn, of Flint, for example, is suspended, gathers a congregation in Swansea, then is a parish minister in Wrexham. There seem to have been quite a number of unsettled Puritan clergy, harried by the bishops, but very little out-and-out separation. In fact the first avowedly Nonconformist congregation in Wales and Monmouth was

established in Llanvaches, in Monmouthshire, in 1639, just on the eve of the Civil War. It arose out of the preaching of a Puritan clergyman, William Wroth, already mentioned; but its actual foundation was due to a deputation from London. (This interaction between London and Wales became a notable feature of Welsh history; it was usually due to Welshmen who had settled in London). A few other Nonconformist congregations followed, but not many; Wales was parochial and episcopal, even though some of the parish clergy were in trouble for being Puritans. This is strange, when one remembers how strongly Nonconformist Wales became. What is even more strange is that these restive Puritan clergy did not call themselves Presbyterian, like their brethren in England, but (when it came to the actual founding of congregations) Independents. But even in England, in certain districts (for example, Cheshire), the revolt against Laudian bishops was called Independency rather than Presbyterianism, even when it was led by parish clergy. The distinction between Presbyterian and Independent, which seems so precise to us today as we look back on the 17th century, was then less definite, often indicating political alignment or local circumstances. There were men who can only be called "Presbyterian Independents", because they supported Cromwell yet became Presbyterian elders, or denounced Independency yet in 1672 were licensed as Independents. In 1727 the London Independents rejected the term "Congregational", because some of their number did not accept the Savoy Declaration. This may throw some light on the Welsh situation.

When the Civil War began, Wales was strongly royalist. The king recruited some of his best troops in that country. But except round Haverfordwest there was not much military activity in Wales. The Puritan clergy fled, to Bristol and then to London, where most of them were given pulpits; naturally they used their influence to agitate for religious changes in Wales. In 1645 the king was defeated, and the victorious parliament set about remodel-

ling the ecclesiastical system of the country. Wales, because of its royalism, was severely handled. The exiled Welsh clergy, in sermons before parliament, urged that Wales needed purging and evangelising. A parliamentary committee took in hand the religious situation in Wales. Bishops, deans and chapters were abolished, in Wales as in England; and out of the episcopal and cathedral revenues of Llandaff and St. David's a salary of £100 each was paid to three of the exiled Welsh clergy, Henry Walter, Richard Symonds and Walter Cradock, to be itinerant preachers in Wales.

But in 1648 the Second Civil War broke out, and this time Wales was a military centre. The war began with a royalist rising in South Wales. When it was over, Cromwell and his military party of Independents decided that they could no longer trust King Charles, "that man of blood". They drastically purged parliament of the more moderate and civilian Presbyterian members, reducing it to a small "Rump" of their own supporters. Then they brought the king to trial and cut off his head. They also set themselves to deal more vigorously with the church in Wales. Within a few days of the king's execution an act was passed for "the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales". A body of commissioners was set up, with 25 public preachers under their orders. John Walker, in his polemical book, *The sufferings of the clergy during the Grand Rebellion* (1714), says that Hugh Peter, the vigorous Independent minister who was a leader of the aggressive party, and who later was the only minister among those executed as regicides, urged that the Welsh clergy were so disaffected to parliament, and so scandalous in life, that nothing less than the dismissal of them all would be enough. Walker of course was prejudiced and embittered; but he gives very large numbers of ejected episcopal clergy in every Welsh county. He said that strong efforts were made, by petition to parliament, to prevent this wholesale deprivation, but without success. Some of the confiscated revenues of the parishes were set

aside to provide pensions for the deprived clergy, but according to Walker not much of it reached them. Both sides were bitterly convinced that they were right, the Anglicans in believing that they were cruelly and unjustly treated, and the Puritans that it was necessary and deserved.

The place of the ejected clergy was taken by a body of itinerant preachers—about 150 in number, according to one account; about six to a county, according to another—mostly based on the market towns, and paid out of confiscated tithes and other ecclesiastical revenue. Some were assigned to a particular parish church, but expected to travel over a wide area; and of course in the more populous areas there was still the traditional parish ministry. The leader of them all was Vavasour Powell, a young man from Radnor, born in 1617, educated at Jesus College, Oxford, and often called "the metropolitan of the itinerants", whose character is praised very highly by one side and blackened without mercy by the other. It is interesting to note that when he was appointed he refused Presbyterian ordination. The exiled Welsh clergy, who had fled from Wales to London at the outbreak of war, came back to join in this work of evangelisation. Marmaduke Matthews came back from New England. I suppose there will never be an end to controversy about these men. Their opponents, then and since, have never ceased to condemn them as fanatical and self-seeking; and their friends see them as devoted and self-sacrificing prophets. Some of them were of humble origin, ploughmen, carpenters, feltmakers, without formal education; and this is evidence either for or against their sincerity, according to the side you are on.

It is important to notice that no attempt was made to set up any kind of Presbyterian system in Wales, as there was in England. The itinerant preachers gathered groups of hearers here and there, using the parish churches as bases and preaching stations. It is not surprising that this was called *Independency*, especially as it was set

up under the authority of the Independent party in England. In fact it became more Independent than the London leaders liked. Powell himself moved further and further to the left, becoming first a Baptist and then a Fifth-Monarchy man; and William Erbury became a mystical visionary.

When Cromwell died in 1658, Wales had nothing to contribute to the struggles which led up to the Restoration; and there was no solid block of Presbyterians to cushion the blow. The whole parliamentary system in Wales just collapsed. The royalist clergy demanded back their parishes, and most of them re-entered without difficulty. Bishops were re-appointed; but from this time they were for the most part Englishmen on the first rung of the ladder of episcopal promotion. Some of the itinerant preachers conformed, and were given parishes. Of the rest, those who were merely travelling preachers lost their jobs, without formal ejection, if they would not conform. In the whole of North Wales Calamy lists only five who were ejected, and four who afterwards conformed: but of most of these he knows no more than the names. In South Wales he lists 49 who were ejected, and 14 who afterwards conformed; but 37 of these are only names. By far the longest list is of men ejected in Glamorganshire, of whom there were 20; but some of these he describes only as Anabaptists or unlearned. Of just a few he gives long and detailed accounts, similar to his entries for the English ejected; but of most of the Welshmen whom he mentions he knows very little.

Thus according to Calamy there were 64 ejected ministers in the whole of Wales; Thomas Rees, writing in 1861, increases the number to 106. In contrast, Walker says that no less than 600 of the Anglican clergy had been ejected by the parliamentary commissioners as scandalous or malignant, and that 700 parishes were left without incumbents, their places being taken by perhaps a hundred travelling preachers. Even if Walker is exaggerating, the upheaval had been great.

Vavasour Powell was not among the ejected. He had already turned to a more violent preaching. Immediately after the Restoration he was arrested and imprisoned; he died in the Fleet prison in London in 1670, after ten years of almost continuous confinement. Many of the others—Erbury, Wroth and other leaders—had died before 1660. It was a remnant which remained to be ejected in 1662.

Calamy does not say how many of his 64 were Presbyterians and how many were Independent; though he says that three, all in Glamorganshire, were Anabaptists. But we have some guidance as to the proportions from the licenses taken out in 1672, under the Declaration of Indulgence. In England the greater part of both ministers and places of worship licensed in 1672 were described as Presbyterian. In Wales the proportions were different: 32 ministers and 29 places were registered as Independent, eleven ministers and eight places as Presbyterian, and five ministers and eight places as Baptist or Anabaptist. In Wales therefore there were three times as many Independent licences as Presbyterian, and not a great many of either. The county with the largest number of licences was Glamorgan, a rich and populous agricultural district in comparison with most other Welsh counties; but even here there are fifteen Independent or Congregational licences and six Anabaptist, and only five Presbyterian. English Nonconformity at the Ejection and in 1672 was predominantly Presbyterian; of Welsh Nonconformity, three-quarters was Congregational. Welsh ministers who describe themselves as Presbyterian are to be found almost entirely along the border with England, or in a few places, in coastal towns, in Pembrokeshire and in scattered places in the North, where English influence was strong.

Since Independency was the predominant form of religious piety and organisation in Wales, I ought in justice to pay primary attention to this; though I am conscious that Welsh historians know far more about it than I do. I must mention Stephen Hughes, ejected in 1662 from

Mydrim, a parish eight miles west of Carmarthen, and licensed to preach in 1672 at his house in Llanstephan, another Carmarthenshire village. He was a disciple of Rees Pritchard, vicar of Llandoverly, in Carmarthenshire, already mentioned. Like him he preached widely up and down the country, gathering congregations of hearers; in other words, he based an itinerant ministry, of an Independent kind, on incumbency of a parish church, which seems to have been a common Welsh pattern. When ejected he merely continued the same work, and in his licence he is described as Congregational, though Henry Maurice in 1675 described him as "not much differing from Presbyterian". He published the devotional works of Rees Pritchard, and many books of his own, all in the Welsh language, and is rightly honoured as an important figure in Welsh literature and faith. But he was only one of many. They were the foundation upon which so much of Welsh Nonconformity was built; a Puritan parish ministry which grew into a wider evangelism and the gathering of churches, which the Great Ejection did not stop, but merely made for a time illegal. Developing out of this, under the stress of the Commonwealth, was a more home-spun and radical Puritanism, which took the name of Baptist or Anabaptist. From these sources many Congregational and Baptist churches in Wales can trace direct descent.

This basic Independency, rather than Presbyterianism, can be illustrated from the history of the present Unitarian congregation at High Street, Swansea. Since similar congregations in England have usually a Presbyterian origin, it is natural to expect the same here. The congregation has in the past claimed to originate in 1662, from an ejected minister, the first chapel being built in 1689, after the passing of the Toleration Act. George Eyre Evans, in *Vestiges of Protestant Dissent* (1897), says that the congregation was founded about 1689, the first chapel being opened in 1690; but he knows of no minister until a man called Higgs, first name unknown, who was

minister in 1698. But we can go a little further back than that. Daniel Higgs was ejected from Rhossili, in the Gower peninsula, in 1661. He moved to the parish of Porteynon, a few miles away, and was ejected from there in 1662. He took refuge for a time in Worcestershire, his native county; but after a little while, says Calamy, "he became pastor of a dissenting congregation at Swansea, who had a strong affection for him". It was here that he licensed his own house for worship in 1672, as a Congregationalist. He also preached once a month at a place ten miles away. Ill-health caused him to retire again into Worcestershire; but his congregation begged him to come back, which he did for a time. He died in 1691, so is not the person called Higgs listed by Evans as at Swansea in 1698; but the latter may well be his son, for he had seven children. Note that he was a Congregationalist, the usual Welsh designation.

But there is another piece of evidence, which takes the story much further back. In 1675 Henry Maurice, a minister in Brecon, made a catalogue of all the Nonconformist churches in Wales, which includes this note: "And also the church that meets at Swansea, gathered at first by Mr. Ambrose Mostyn. They are all Independent in judgment, for aught I know; Mr. Higgs being their pastor, Mr. David Jones and others their elders". If this is true, the church in High Street can trace its history to a date long before 1662. Ambrose Mostyn, already mentioned as one of the Puritan clergy who suffered under episcopal discipline, and who appeared in widely separated parts of the country, was preaching in the neighbourhood of Swansea some time before 1642, and is listed as one of the Puritan ministers in Glamorgan and Montgomery between 1633 and 1640. He was one of the itinerant preachers under the parliamentary scheme. But his native county was Flint, and his work under the Commonwealth was chiefly in that county and in Denbighshire, in the North. He was ejected in 1662 from Wrexham, and retired into England. If it is true that

the Swansea congregation was founded by him, and continued by Daniel Higgs, then its origin is probably earlier than 1640. And like many more it was founded by a Puritan parish clergyman who came to call himself an Independent. Such a man in England would probably have been a Presbyterian; but, though there were five Presbyterian licences elsewhere in the county of Glamorgan, no Presbyterian preacher or place was licensed in Swansea in 1672.

In Wales there were few Presbyterians, in comparison with the number of Independents. In England the reverse was the case: nine out of ten of the ejected ministers were known as Presbyterians. They had wanted a reformed Anglican church, but now they could do nothing about it. They were unwilling Dissenters. They tended to be moderate men, somewhat conservative in politics, in comparison with the Independents and Baptists, who were more radical in politics and theology. After the Ejection they were much influenced by Richard Baxter's moderate rationalism, and by friendship with the Latitudinarians in the church of England. This set the direction of their theological development, which was moulded by John Locke's common-sense views about politics and theology, and Isaac Newton's mathematical idea of God and the universe.

Presbyterianism in England, especially in the large towns, was an urbane and mercantile religion. When, in the early part of the 18th century, there was an increase of wealth in England, as a result of trade with the East, ambitious young men made their way into the towns from the countryside, and from Scotland, Wales and Ireland, to make their fortunes. It was to the Presbyterian chapels that they gravitated. These newcomers were not closely attached to the old Puritanism; they were men of a new age. So they tended to cut the Presbyterian churches from their Puritan roots, and to bring them into line with the rationalism of the 18th century. And when, from the 1730's, the evangelical revival spread in England and

elsewhere, the Presbyterians tended to reject it, calling themselves "Rational Dissenters"—meaning, of course, that the evangelical revival was irrational and therefore wrong. In so doing they were in fact trying to swim against the tide. They continued to play an effective part in politics, on the Whig side, and in science; but the religious temper of the age was against them. Whereas in 1662 and until the early part of the 18th century the Presbyterians were by far the most numerous and "respectable" body among the Dissenters in England, by the end of the 18th century they numbered less than a tenth of English Nonconformity.

Migrants from Wales exerted a great influence on the English Presbyterians, and on their successors the Rational Dissenters; indeed, Welshmen took a leading part in all kinds of English Dissent from the first. The process, so far as it affects Presbyterians, can best be shown through the biographies of a series of typical Welshmen who came to England.

In the first place, which Welshmen would be most likely to come? Since the 17th century Presbyterianism was the typical form of English Dissent, it would be the Welsh Presbyterians who would be tempted to move to England. In Wales they were a minority; in England they would be among friends. And this is in fact what we find.

But where were the Welsh Presbyterians? In 1672, in most Welsh counties, the licences issued were nearly all to persons described as Independents or Congregationalists, and Baptists or Anabaptists. Two Presbyterians only are found in Carnarvonshire, and one in Pembroke—no doubt there is some local reason in each case. All the remaining Presbyterian licences are in two districts only: in all the border counties (Denbigh, Flint, Montgomery, Radnor, Monmouth), and in Glamorgan. Even in these areas the Presbyterian licences are far outnumbered by those issued to Independents. In the border counties, the few Presbyterian licences are for towns very near the English

border. In Glamorgan, by contrast, they are not usually for towns, but for villages in the richer agricultural area, in and near the vale of Glamorgan, then hardly touched by manufactures and industry. When we look at the biographies which Calamy and others give of the ejected Presbyterians in Wales, we find that they are often well-connected socially—ministers who married heiresses, or were sons of gentry.

There was Philip Henry, ejected from Worthenbury, in that detached part of Flint which lies between Cheshire and Shropshire, and only a few miles from Malpas, in Cheshire. In 1672 he took out a licence at Malpas as a Presbyterian. He belonged to the gentry.

His ancestry was Welsh. His father, John Henry, came from Swansea, and like many another Welshman of the period migrated to England. He was in the service of the earl of Pembroke, one of the three rebellious earls whose opposition to the court had so much to do with the outbreak of the Civil War. From this service he became page to the young duke of York, who later was King James II. He married an English woman, and his son Philip was born at Whitehall palace, being named after Philip, earl of Pembroke. After education at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, the son became chaplain to a Puritan lady of Flintshire, and parish minister at Worthenbury, being ordained in 1653 in the Presbyterian manner in the northern part of Shropshire. He married the daughter of a Welsh landed gentleman, and thus had a means of support when he was ejected in 1662. He ministered as a Nonconformist in and about Whitchurch, in Shropshire, suffering much persecution. He died in 1696. His son Matthew Henry became Presbyterian minister at Chester and in London, and was the originator of the famous Bible-commentary which is named after him.

But the most significant thing about him for our purposes is that he became the founder of a large and important family, closely associated with the English Pres-

byterians and Rational Dissenters. At one time, in the middle of the 19th century, one might be tempted to think that almost every substantial Unitarian in England was either a descendant of Philip Henry, or married to a descendant. In 1844 a petition was presented to parliament by Lord Macaulay, pleading for legislation to prevent the Unitarians from being ejected from the chapels and endowments they had inherited from their Presbyterian ancestors; it was signed by 110 lineal descendants of Philip Henry. The family tree was published in 1844, and reprinted with additions in 1899 and 1925. So a Welsh Presbyterian, not himself very important, not a radical but the son of a gentleman of the court, became the founder of an English family which once played an important part in denominational history. His portrait, with that of his wife, is in Manchester College, Oxford.

Daniel Williams was not an ejected minister, because he was only a youth in 1662. But he belonged to Wrexham, a centre of Puritanism, and he had begun to preach when the Ejection took place. Calamy includes him among the eminent persons silenced by the Act of Uniformity. He became chaplain to a Puritan lady in Dublin, and one of the ministers of Wood Street Presbyterian chapel there. In 1672 he took out a general licence as a Presbyterian, being described as "Daniel Williams of Wrexham" and thus emphasising his Welsh origin. He married a lady of fortune. In 1687 he moved to London, and was soon the most important Presbyterian minister in the kingdom. He took a leading part in the controversies which divided the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England, which broke up the "Happy Union" of 1691. A direct consequence of this was that the Dissenting congregation in Wrexham split, and Daniel Williams's supporters there formed a new congregation, calling it Presbyterian. When his first wife died he married a wealthy widow, whose elegant portrait is at Dr. Williams's Library, in London. That library, named after him, he established in his will. A large part of his fortune, which

had come to him chiefly through his marriages, went back to North Wales, in bequests for founding schools, binding apprentices, distributing Bibles, and pensioning poor ministers and their widows. Dr. Williams' School at Dolgelly still carries his name and is endowed from his bequest.

This 18th-century practice of leaving legacies to one's native place, to build chapels or to found charities, on the part of men who had gone up to London to make a fortune, is also partly responsible for the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, with its long and honourable history now ended as a separate institution; it was maintained by the Presbyterian Fund, of London, which channelled the donations of London Welshmen back to Wales.

Another family from the same neighbourhood in North Wales, which sent migrants into leading posts in England, was that of the Kenricks of Gwersyllt, a village three miles from Wrexham; they intermarried with the Wynnes, of Wynne Hall, or Plas Gwern, in the same neighbourhood. William Wynne was an officer in the Parliamentary army. From this family came a dynasty of Presbyterian, Rational Dissenting and Unitarian ministers, including Timothy Kenrick of Exeter and John Kenrick of Manchester College, which possesses his strikingly handsome portrait. Archibald Kenrick became a buckle manufacturer in West Bromwich in 1791, and founded a notable Birmingham family, eminent in manufactures, commerce, civic affairs and the university. Both of Joseph Chamberlain's wives came from this family, which is still prominent in Birmingham today.

All these came from a small area in North Wales. Another source of Welsh Presbyterian migrants is Glamorgan, in the south. This county, like the others, was mostly Independent and Baptist in its Nonconformity. Two Presbyterian ministers took out licences in 1672. Both had been ejected in 1662, Samuel Jones from Llangynwydd, near Maesteg, and Joshua Miller from St. Andrew's, Cardiff, whom Calamy describes as a London

bookseller. Actually there were two persons called Samuel Jones, both Presbyterian, in the list, but we have details only of one, and they may be the same person.

Samuel Jones of Llangynwydd was a friend of Richard Baxter; he was a former fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, and a man of learning and substance. When he was rejected he withdrew to the house of his father-in-law, Rees Powell, who was a wealthy gentleman. From this base he preached in neighbouring villages, gathering a number of congregations, from one of which the Old Meeting House, Bridgend, is descended. He opened a school, which he called an academy (this was Calvin's name for such an establishment), from which the colleges at Brecon and Carmarthen claim descent. One of his pupils, Samuel Price, became assistant and successor to Isaac Watts in London; this man's older brother, Rees Price, became assistant and successor to Samuel Jones himself, in his academy and congregations.

A son of Rees Price was Richard Price, preacher, philosopher and financial expert in London. Richard Price was born in 1723, of a comparatively wealthy family, though his father's early death and ill-considered will left him poor. At the age of sixteen he set out on foot from South Wales to find his uncle in London. He entered Coward's Academy in London, where the principal was John Eames, a noted mathematician. It is not surprising that Richard Price became a London Presbyterian minister and a mathematical scholar. He was assistant minister at Old Jewry Presbyterian chapel in London, and then minister of the Meeting House at Newington Green. Here he published, at the age of 35, a notable philosophical work, *A review of the principal questions and difficulties in morals*. He was a friend of Priestley and Benjamin Franklin, and with them an enthusiast for civil and religious liberty. It was his sermon at Old Jewry chapel, in 1789, entitled *The love of our country*, in praise of the outbreak of revolution in France, that provoked Edmund Burke's reply called *Reflections on the French Revolution*.

Price was briefly a political hero, receiving congratulatory addresses from patriotic societies in France and constitutional societies in England. He was a pioneer in calculations for life insurance. He became actuary to the Equitable Assurance Society, whilst still pursuing his ministry at Newington Green, and was, it is said, a well-known figure as he rode each day to his office on a white horse. The English government sought his advice on finance, and the new American government wanted him to cross the Atlantic to be their financial adviser.

But he did not forget his Welsh origin. Two of his nephews, both born at Bridgend, Glamorgan, followed him to London and achieved success. One, William Morgan, succeeded him as actuary to the Equitable Assurance Society, and was a vigorous radical politician. The other, George Cadogan Morgan, also took the radical side in politics, and admired the French revolution. He became a Unitarian minister and a scientific writer in the fields of electricity and chemistry.

Abraham Rees, a descendant through his mother of the family of John Penry, was born in Llanbrynmair, in Montgomeryshire, the son of an Independent minister. He too came to London. He was educated at Coward's Academy, and became minister of Old Jewry chapel. He was a Dr. Williams's trustee, and an examiner to the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen; and he collected and distributed funds for the support of Welsh Nonconformist congregations. He is chiefly remembered as editor of an encyclopedia, or general dictionary of the arts and sciences, published between 1802 and 1820. In 1795 he joined in editing *A collection of hymns and psalms for public and private worship*, usually known as "Kippis's collection", one of the earliest hymn books intended, not for a single congregation, but for general use; of the four editors, two were London Welshmen.

Two sons of Josiah Rees (no relation to Abraham Rees), Presbyterian minister at Gellionnen, Glamorgan-shire, came to London. The elder, Owen Rees, became a

publisher, a partner in the firm of Longman & Co., retiring with sufficient wealth to purchase his family's estate in South Wales. His brother, Thomas Rees, entered the bookselling business, but then trained for the ministry at Carmarthen. He was minister at Newington Green, and later in Blackfriars, where Stamford Street chapel, a Puritan Meeting House in a classical dress, was built for him in 1823. He was a historian of the radical side of the Reformation, a Dr. Williams's trustee, and secretary of the London union of ministers of the Three Denominations. It was his failure to obtain re-election to this last office which caused the break-up of this ancient Nonconformist body, which was then re-formed with Scottish Presbyterians in place of the former English Presbyterians. A nephew of these two, George Owen Morgan, became an eminent physician in London.

By the beginning of the 19th century it might be said that entry into the English Presbyterian ministry was becoming less attractive to Welsh Presbyterian migrants. Such men now more often found secular openings, though they usually retained some links with the English Presbyterians. Such a one was Lewis Loyd, born in 1768 at a place called Court Henry, in Carmarthenshire. He became a student at the Presbyterian College, then in Swansea, and afterwards at Manchester College, then at Manchester. He was appointed minister of Dobb Lane chapel, in Manchester, and served also as classical tutor to the college, though only 22 years old. But there was in Manchester a wealthy Welsh banker, John Jones, and Lewis Loyd married his daughter Sarah. He became a partner in the bank with his brothers-in-law Samuel and William, and left the ministry. Later he opened the London office of Jones, Loyd & Co., in which he was very successful; it is one of the ancestors of the District Bank. He retained a connection with Manchester College, acting as a local treasurer; his portrait is in the college library, together with that of Samuel Jones. He died in 1838, reputedly the first man in England to die worth a million

pounds in cash. His son, Lord Overstone, born Samuel Jones Loyd, was a foremost authority in banking; his estate at death was worth £2,100,000. His only daughter became Lady Wantage, and the family still continues.

The story I have told is of course only a small part of the record of the relationship between Wales and England. During the last 450 years Wales has made a characteristic and invaluable contribution to the life of England, in religion, in politics, in the arts and in other ways. It would be interesting to work out in what respects Wales's contribution was different from that of Scotland or of Ireland, and why. I have tried to show that one link, that between Welsh Presbyterians, a minority group, and the English Presbyterians and Rational Dissenters, who were more in the centre of the community, arose from the difference between the Puritanism of the two countries. When the story of the Great Ejection of 1662 is told, it should be remembered that the events in Wales did not follow the same pattern as in England; English historians are in danger of forgetting this.

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Alsop, Vincent, 47
 Alleine, Richard, 12
 Alleine, William, 12
 Annesley, Samuel, 47
- Bancroft, Richard, 61, 70
 Barnett, Andrew, 12
 Barnett, Joseph, 12
 Barret, John, 14-19, 21, 22
 Bates, William, 47
 Baxter, Margaret, 77
 Baxter, Richard, *father of the next*, 62
 Baxter, Richard, *d.* 1691, 11, 27-77 *passim*, 80, 88, 93
 Bayly, Lewis, 28, 30, 31
 Blackburn, Peter, *Bp. of Aberdeen*, 72
 Boyes, William, 25
 Brekeley, Roger, 24
 Browning, Thomas, 44
 Bulkley, John, 13
 Bunny, Francis, 28
 Bunyan, John, 32, 33
 Burke, Edmund, 93
 Burnet, Gilbert, *Bp. of Salisbury*, 50
- Calamy, Edmund, *d.* 1666, 11, 48, 74
 Calamy, Edmund, *d.* 1685, 11
 Calamy, Edmund, *d.* 1732, 11-12, 29, 31, 41, 43, 46-47, 50, 51, 78, 84, 85, 91
 Calamy, Edmund, *d.* 1755, 11
 Calamy, Edmund, *d.* 1816, 11
 Calamy, Michael, 11
 Calvin, Jean, 34, 49, 50
 Cawdrey, Daniel, 13
 Chadwick, Daniel, 17
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 92
 Charles I, *King of England*, 72
 Charles II, *King of England*, 35, 73, 76, 77
 Chauncy, Isaac, 13, 44, 45
 Chillingworth, William, 51, 53
 Clark, Sabbath, 11
- Clark, Samuel, *d.* 1683, 11
 Clark, Samuel, *d.* 1701, 11
 Clark, Samuel, *d.* 1750, 11
 Clark, Samuel, *d.* 1769, 11
 Coates, George, 18
 Coates, Samuel, 18
 Cokayne, George, 44
 Cole, Thomas, 38, 42, 46
 Constable, John, 21
 Cradock, Walter, 26, 80, 82
 Cranage, Thomas, 19
 Crisp, Samuel, 41
 Crisp, Tobias, 41, 46, 55
 Cromwell, Oliver, 61, 64, 65, 66
 Cruso, Timothy, 47
- Darrell, John, 19
 Davis, Richard, 42-46, 54, 58
 Defoe, Daniel, 14
 Dent, Arthur, 28, 30, 31
 Disney, Gervase, 14-15
 Dod, John, 12
 Doddridge, Philip, 58
 Dowden, Edward, 32
 Drysdale, A. H., 70
 Du Moulin, Peter, 30
 Dyke, Daniel, 11
- Eames, John, 93
 Edward VI, *King of England*, 70
 Edwards, Charles, 26, 27
 Elizabeth I, *Queen of England*, 12, 19, 61, 75
 Erbery (Erbury), William, 26, 80, 84, 85
 Evans, George Eyre, 86, 87
- Faldo, John, 36
 Fiennes, Celia, 14
 Fillingham, John, 20
 Fillingham, Samuel, 20
 Flamsteed, William, 20
 Flavell, John, 41
 Folkingham, Nicholas, 19
 Forbes, Patrick, *Bp. of Aberdeen*, 72, 73
 Fox, George, 19, 25, 33

- Franklin, Benjamin, 93
- Gamble, *Mrs.*, 14
 Gamble, Thomas, 14
 Garbet, Francis, 63
 Gardiner, James, 20
 Garner, Adrian, 20
 Garner, Stephen, 20
 Gilling, Isaac, 44, 49
 Gilpin, Bernard, 12
 Gilpin, Richard, 12
 Goodall, John, 18
 Gouge, Thomas, 26-30, 47
 Griffith, George, 58
 Grosart, A. B., 64
- Hale, *Sir* Matthew, 71
 Hales, John, *of Eton*, 50, 53
 Hawkins, John, 16
 Hawkins, Richard, 20
 Helwys, Thomas, 22
 Henry, John, 90
 Henry, Matthew, 90
 Henry, Philip, 29, 90, 91
 Herbert, Philip, *4th Earl of Pembroke*, 90
 Hibbert, Robert, 60
 Higgs, Daniel, 86-87, 88
 Hildersham, Arthur, 12
 Hildersham, Samuel, 12
 Hill, Joseph, 13
 Hooker, Richard, 67, 71
 Howe, John, 13, 41, 42, 47
 Hughes, Stephen, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 85
 Humfrey, John, 42, 46
 Hussey, Joseph, 42
 Hutchinson, Lucy, 19
 Hyde, Edward, *First Earl of Clarendon*, 76
- James I, *King of England*, 72
 James II, *King of England*, 39, 69
 James, John, 20
 Jeffreys, George, *Baron of Wem*, 77
 Jollie, Thomas, 38, 44
 Jones, David, 87
 Jones, John, 95
 Jones, R. Tudur, 78
 Jones, Richard, 27-29
 Jones, Samuel, 92-93
- Jones, Samuel, 95
 Jones, William, 29
- Kenrick, Archibald, 92
 Kenrick, John, 92
 Kenrick, Timothy, 92
 Knox, John, 72
 Knutton, Emmanuel, 21
- Laud, William, *Abp. of Canterbury*, 24, 61, 63, 70, 80
 Leake, Thomas, 23
 Leighton, Robert, *Abp. of Glasgow*, 73
 Lewis, John, 29
 Llwyd, Morgan, 26
 Lobb, Stephen, 47, 58
 Locke, John, 37, 51, 59, 88
 Lorimer, William, 36
 Loyd, Lewis, 95
 Loyd, Samuel Jones, 96
 Lupton, Thomas, 15
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, *Lord*, 91
 Marchant, R. A., 18-22, 24-25
 Mary I, *Queen of England*, 25
 Mary II, *Queen of England*, 39
 Mather, Nathaniel, 13, 38, 46, 47, 50, 51, 54
 Mather, Samuel, 13
 Matthews, A. G., 23, 78
 Matthews, Marmaduke, 80, 83
 Maurice, Henry, 86, 87
 Mayo, Richard, 47
 Mead, Matthew, 36, 44, 58
 Melville, Andrew, 72
 Miller, Joshua, 92
 Millington, Gilbert, 22
 Milton, John, 49
 Morgan, George Cadogan, 94
 Morgan, George Owen, 95
 Morgan, William, 94
 Mostyn, Ambrose, 80, 87
- Neal, Daniel, 59
 Nesbitt, John, 44, 58
 Newton, *Sir* Isaac, 88
 Noble, Isaac, 44
- Okedenne, Elias, 22
- Oldershaw, Samuel, 14
 Overstone, *Lord*. See Samuel Jones Loyd
 Owen, John, 52
- Patrick, Simon, *Bp. of Chichester*, 53
 Penry, John, 26, 79, 94
 Perkins, William, 27, 30, 31-32
 Perreaud, François, 30
 Perry, G. G., 72
 Persons, Robert, 28
 Peter, Hugh, 82
 Pierrepont, Francis, 20-21
 Pitts, Henry, 20, 23
 Powell, Rees, 92
 Powell, Vavasour, 83, 84, 85
 Powicke, F. J., 67, 76
 Price, Hugh, 79
 Price, Rees, 92
 Price, Richard, 93, 94
 Price, Samuel, 93
 Prichard, Rees (Rhys), 30, 79, 86
 Priestley, Joseph, 59, 93
- Quick, John, 36
- Rastrick, John, 50
 Rees, Abraham, 94
 Rees, Josiah, 94
 Rees, Owen, 94
 Rees, Thomas, 84
 Rees, Thomas, 95
 Reynolds, Edward, *Bishop of Norwich*, 74
 Reynolds, William, 14-22
 Roberts, Evan, 27
 Robinson, John, 31
 Rous, *Sir* Thomas & *Lady*, 65
 Rudyard, *Sir* Benjamin, 70
 Ryther, John, 16
- Saravia, Adrian, 67
 Smalley, Robert, 70
 Snow, W. Sinclair, 73
 Spateman, John, 14
 Spateman, Rebecca, 14
 Spenser, Edmund, 33
 Sprint, Samuel, 42
 Squire, Thomas, 24
 Staples, Samuel, 20
- Stephen, *Sir* James, 65, 66, 68
 Stevens, Arthur, 20
 Stillingfleet, Edward, *Bp. of Worcester*, 20, 51
 Symonds, Richard, 80, 82
- Taylor, Richard, *d.* 1697, 38, 40
 Taylor, Richard, ? *d.* 1717, 58
 Taylor, Thomas, 25
 Tenison, Thomas, *Abp. of Canterbury*, 33
 Tennant, James, 25
 Tennant, Richard, 24, 25
 Thomas, J. M. Lloyd, 74
 Thomas, Oliver, 27-28
 Thornborough, John, *Bp. of Worcester*, 63
 Trail, Robert, 42, 46, 50, 54-55
 Tuckney, Anthony, 23
 Tuke, Ephraim, 22
 Tuke, Lemuel, 22
 Turner, John, 22
- Usher, James, *Abp. of Armagh*, 71, 73
- Vincent, Nathaniel, 12
 Vincent, Thomas, 12
- Walker, John, *d.* 1730?, 38, 78, 82
 Walter, Henry, 82
 Wantage, *Lady*, 96
 Watkin, Edward, 25
 Watts, Isaac, 58
 Westoby, William, 21
 Whatley, William, 12
 Whitby, Richard, 20
 Whitchurch, Richard, 18
 Whitlock, John, *d.* 1708, 14-17, 19-23
 Whitlock, John, *d.* 1723, 16-17
 William III, *King of England*, 39
 Williams, Daniel, 38, 44-47, 51, 91
 Williams, G. J., 27, 30
 Wood, Anthony, 62
 Wroth, William, 26, 80, 81, 85
 Wynne, William, 92
- Young, Samuel, 55, 58

THE BEGINNINGS OF NONCONFORMITY

Hibbert Lectures 1962

The first three lectures in this volume were delivered in the Universities of Cambridge and Nottingham and University College, Cardiff, early in 1962 to celebrate the tercentenary of the Great Ejection of 1662.

The first lecture considers trends towards nonconformity prior to the Restoration of 1660. The second considers the failure to achieve a united nonconformity after the Revolution of 1688. The third studies the dominating, would-be catholic, figure of Richard Baxter as, in his own words, a 'meer non-conformist'. The last lecture, given at the University College of Swansea, discusses Wales and the Ejection.

CONTRIBUTORS :

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL, D.D. Lecturer in Church History, New College, London. Author of *The Holy Spirit in Puritan faith and experience*, 1946; *Visible saints: the Congregational way, 1640-1660*, 1957; and other works. Joint-editor, *From uniformity to unity, 1662-1962*.

ROGER THOMAS, M.A. Librarian, Dr. Williams's Library. Contributor of "Comprehension and Indulgence" in *From uniformity to unity*, 1962; author of *Daniel Williams—Presbyterian bishop, Dr. Williams Lecture*, 1964.

R. D. WHITEHORN, D.D. Principal, Westminster College, Cambridge. Author of Church History articles in various periodicals.

H. LISMER SHORT, M.A. Tutor, Manchester College, Oxford. Editor, *Hibbert Journal*. Author of *Dissent and the community*, Essex Hall Lecture, 1962.

JAMES CLARKE & CO. LTD.

33, Store Street

London, W.C.1

5s. net