

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

## EDITORIAL

**O**UR usual Autumnal Meeting was held at Southampton on 29th September, 1920, the School-room of Portland Street Baptist Church being kindly lent for the occasion. The attendance was exceptionally numerous, and visitors were well rewarded by the paper read by Rev. W. Camfield, M.A., which we have pleasure in reproducing in our present issue. We were then favoured with a familiar talk by W. Dale, Esq., F.S.A., on "Southampton and the *Mayflower*"; after which, under Mr. Dale's guidance, a tour was made to the most notable points of historic interest in the town, terminating at the birthplace of Dr. Isaac Watts, where the proceedings were concluded by a brief devotional service in the garden.

\* \* \* \*

"The Story of Old Halifax" is an admirable little book from the pen of Mr. T. W. Hanson, who is a prominent worker in connection with the Square Congregational Church in that town, and a member of our Society. He is a keen antiquarian, and has more than once contributed to our "Transactions." Local History is now finding a place in our educational system, and the local educational authority has sanctioned the use of Mr. Hanson's book in their schools. The book is well written, beautifully illustrated, and attractively got up; and we are glad to know that the author is doing such excellent work.

\* \* \* \*

The Annual Meeting of our Society will be held at the Memorial Hall on Wednesday, 11th May, 1921. It is earnestly desired that all our members should strive to increase the number of our subscribers; the more so as the arrangement by which members of the Baptist Historical Society were regarded as Associate Members has been discontinued.

**ASINUS ONUSTUS.** | THE | *ASSE* | OVERLADEN. |  
 TO | HIS LOVING, AND | DEARE | MISTRESSE |  
*ELIZABETH* | THE BLESSED QUEEN | OF | ENGLAND.

This Booke was delivered to Queene | *ELIZ* : being  
 at *None Such*, Jul. 27th | *Anno* 1589. | *LONDON* |  
 Printed for *John Williams*, and are to be sold at his  
 Shop, | at the *Crowne* in *Paul's Church-yard*, 1642.

---

The above is the title of a pamphlet of vi. + 69 pp., in the British Museum, press-mark 873. g. 33. It is a remonstrance against sundry ecclesiastical abuses, from the point of view of a cleric who has a grievance, but is altogether hostile to every form of Puritanism or Separatism. He begins with an apologetic preface, from which the following are some extracts :—

“The Effect of the Book, and the Asses intent, to the Reader. The poore Asse to his Mistresse complains of three injuries; That he is Despised; That he is Overladen; That his Provender is taken from him. This Asse is the Ministerie and Clergie of England, compared to an Asse for strength, and for patience, and clemencie, etc. . . . For as the one, so is the other strong to beare burdens, patient to endure reproches; gentle, not seeking revenge, not envying others better fortune, but only desirous to relieve his owne. . . .

“This Asse speaketh but in the Name of poore Ministers of the Meaner sort, whereof this Asse is one of the Meanest. The great Masters of the Clergie feele

not yet this extreame misery. This Asse was bred on the backe side of the hill *Atlas* in *Affrica*. And being a Barbarian by nature, beare with his barbarous phrase, and uneloquent braying. The worst that you can say is but this: It was an Asse that did it. He confesseth it. So find him, So take him. Let your wisdome overreach an Asses capacity. A dull constitution breeds a dull conceit. If any list to gather captious and far-reaching conceits, or constructions, their own fault it is, and their blame be it. Philosophy fits not an Asses braine."

The treatise is in three parts. The first remonstrates against the light esteem in which the clergy are held, the unwillingness of many to pay those charges which provide their legal maintenance, and the diversion of church property to private uses. "Martin Marprelate" is denounced as "a ringleader to the Raskall sort, to bring the Gospell of Christ, all Religion, and the Messengers thereof into utter contempt." The second part complains that "The Ministry is overladen of late with taxes"; and strongly denounces the abuse of ecclesiastical patronage. The third part affirms that "The Church is robbed by such as beg away her livings"; and cautiously alludes to abuses in appointments to bishoprics, etc. "The wise Admonitors," says the Ass, "would have Bishops' lands taken away, and given to preachers. But the Brownists, ungrateful Scholars to these Admonitors, would have all lands, and what livings else soever belong any way to any minister, to be taken cleane away: but they define not, who should have them, very earnest are they that Ministers and preachers should have none, secretly insinuating, belike, that they ought to bee divided amongst Noble Men, and Gentlemen. And as for the Ministers of what degree soever, these gentle Brownists will allow them to have no certainty at all, No, not to make any conditions for any thing, in any sort, but to

live *ex mera eleemosyna* of mere Alms : that is in plain English, their will is to set them all on begging." "They say they cannot find in the Scripture any certaine allowance for the Minister, nor yet Lord Bishops : Alas the while : these wise men, these diligent wise men, cannot find that which they never sought, and that which they will not find. What they find it availeth not. But I am assured that I find in the New Testament such Schism, Rebellion, and Division, and such manifest descriptions thereof, that lacking but only their names, the very natures of our Admonitors, Brownists, Precisians, Anabaptists, Familists, Mar-all Martinists, and such like Heretikes, are most lively deciphered." In the margin the Ass refers to II. Tim. iii. 1, II. Peter iii., I. Tim iv., Jud. viii.

He concludes with some doubtless very acceptable flattery to "his loving and deare Mistresse," to whom "the Lord hath given most singular gifts, above the capacity of women," and "hath so miraculously thus long preserved her for defending his Gospel"; in whose mercy "the hope of my life, the stay of my estate, and the only key of my comfort remaineth"; and for whom he prays "That the Church and Commonwealth in your days may flourish, as in the days of Solomon, and that the poor Ministry may no more complaine in our streets, of her Miserable Captivity."

### Myles Standish

**I**T is scarcely open to question that the movement which culminated in the ever-memorable voyage of the *Mayflower* had its origin in the quiet old-fashioned village of Scrooby, on the northern border of Nottinghamshire. From the little company of Separatists who met in the old Manor-house there came several of the pilgrims; while others were from the Midlands, from Essex and the Eastern counties, from London and the South, and from the West. So far as can be ascertained the expedition was purely English; that is, neither Scotland, Wales, nor Ireland was represented.

It has been alleged that the *Mayflower* pilgrims "leave no impression of personality on the mind"; that they were "not remarkable"; that not one of them "had compelling personal genius or marked talent for the work in hand." Another writer will have it that the persecution which drove them out of the country was all too small and trivial in scale to be worthy of the name; that it was a bit of local trouble for which neither Church nor State was responsible. Yet a third says that they were simple uneducated peasants, without any social position. I confess that I cannot understand statements of this kind. There is a type of writer who appears to be obsessed by the idea that his special duty is to belittle the great characters of history, and we seem to have an unusually large number of them at the present time. Indeed I think the one thing from which the world is suffering, our own country as much as any, is lack of reverence—reverence for the historic past, for great historic personalities, respect and reverence for a just authority that can both restrain and compel. Writers of the type just described are not to be taken as trustworthy

guides, seeing that John Robinson and William Brewster were graduates of Cambridge University; with Edward Winslow as a young gentleman from Droitwich, and Myles Standish as the representative of one of the great ruling families of Lancashire, it cannot truthfully be said that the pilgrims were simple and ignorant peasants. Again, if history has anything at all to say to us it is that the religious repressions of Mary, Elizabeth and James were of far too serious a character to be made light of as some seem inclined to do. Moreover, to say that those outgoing pilgrims were "not remarkable," that they "lacked compelling genius," is to use language not easily understood. Those are the people who make history, who indeed have made it, some of the greatest and most wonderful history. And we of Lancashire may well feel pride in the thought that our county was represented in that movement; that in the person of Myles Standish it contributed to the little company in the *Mayflower* one of its most useful and illustrious members.

There is a Myles Standish problem, one of the most interesting and difficult of all those relating to the pilgrims. The Standish country is that part of southwest Lancashire which lies about Wigan, Chorley and Ormskirk. Because it is one of the great colliery centres of England we are apt to think of it as a sort of "Black Country"; in reality, however, it is anything but that. It is richly wooded, abounds in ancient halls and parks, and is as charming a bit of country as will be found almost anywhere in England. The Standish family, though no longer represented in the district, had their abode there at least from the time of the Conquest, and were one of the ruling families of Lancashire. Their home was Standish Hall, near the village of the same name. It still exists, though shorn of much of its ancient glory. An important branch of the family had its centre at Duxbury; and Duxbury Hall, which time has also greatly modernized, was their home.

Other branches were at Ormskirk, Eccleston, and even the Isle of Man. The original stock at Standish Hall were devoted adherents of the Roman Catholic faith, to which they remained loyal: but at the time of the Reformation the Duxbury branch became Protestant, and it is to this branch that Myles Standish is said to have belonged. It is claimed that he was born at Duxbury Hall in 1584 or 1585. His will is dated 7th March, 1655; and in it he bequeaths to his son and heir, Alexander Standish, "All my lands as heir apparent by lawful descent in Ormskirk, Burscough, Wrightington, Mawdsley, Newburgh, Croxton and the Isle of Man, given to me as right heir by lawful descent, but surreptitiously detained from me, my grandfather being a second or younger brother from the house of Standish of Standish." Whether any effort to recover these lost lands was made by the son, Alexander Standish, does not appear; but in Alexander's will, which was proved on 10th August, 1702, the matter is referred to in the following terms—"Whatsoever estate either in New England or in Old, which I have committed into the hands of Robert Orchard to recover in England by letters of Attorney from under my hand and seal, my will is that my wife have her third part."

In 1846 an effort was made by descendants of Myles Standish to recover the lost estate, and a Mr. Bromley was sent over to England to look into the matter. An inspection was made of the Chorley Parish Registers for the purpose of copying the birth entry of Myles Standish; but the years 1584 and 1585 were found to be defective and the condition of the pages, it is said, suggested that several entries had been erased by the use of pumice-stone. It was my privilege a few months ago to see this register, and my hope was that the state of the page might give some indication whether pumice-stone had been used upon it, or the entries had been made to disappear in some other way. But I was disappointed to find that the top part of the pages had been torn off,



## Myles Standish

how long ago I do not know ; but the result is that such evidence as the page might have given is gone for ever.

Thus far we have dealt with what may be called the traditional view of Myles Standish, to which Longfellow gives expression in the familiar lines :—

“ He was a gentleman born, and could trace his pedigree  
plainly  
Back to Hugh Standish of Duxbury Hall, in Lancashire,  
England,  
Who was the son of Ralph, and the grandson of Thurston  
de Standish,  
Heir unto vast estates, of which he was basely defrauded.”

This traditional view, at least so far as it relates to Myles's connection with Duxbury Hall, has been accepted without question until quite recently ; but a few months ago it was challenged in a book published by Rev. T. C. Porteus, vicar of Coppull, on “ Myles Standish, his lost lands and Lancashire Connections.” This writer maintains that the tradition is quite at fault ; and that if Myles is related to any branch of the Standish family in Lancashire it must be the Ormskirk branch. No one can read the book without being greatly impressed with its value as a bit of earnest and serious research-work ; but in reference to the main point in the problem, the relation of Myles Standish to Duxbury Hall, the matter is left unsettled. It is not difficult to detect a too great eagerness to upset the traditional view—a temptation to which the researcher is always exposed, while the arguments never advance beyond the stage of possibility, and probability. The parentage and birthplace of Myles Standish still remain a perfect riddle. Morton, writing only a few years after his death, says he was “ born in Lancashire, heir unto a great estate, surreptitiously detained from him ; his great-grandfather being a second or younger brother from the house of Standish.” There is an irritating vagueness about all this, which so far has not

been removed. I have examined the registers of Eccleston, Croxton, Ormskirk, Standish, Chorley, and elsewhere in this district, and have not been able to find a single Myles in the Standish family of that or any other period. What research may do it is impossible to say; but I confess to some hankering after the traditional view. At any rate that view by no means stands discredited, and is as much entitled to respect as any other. Mr. Porteus's explanation of the defect in the Chorley Parish Register in the years 1584 and 1585 is not in the least satisfactory. The defect is there, and it is a very real one; and, coupled with the fact that no trace of the name can be found in any other register, there is some significance in the occurrence of the defect in the very register and at the very period where, if there were a disposition to destroy the birth entry, we might expect it to be. Then it is not without significance that, when Myles Standish removed to the other side of Plymouth harbour, the name of Duxbury was given to his new abode. An attempt has been made to evade the force of this by falling back on the etymology of the name; Dux-bury, it is said, is Dux-burrow, "the town of the Leader." But this is mere trifling. It was the habit of those early colonists to transfer to their new homes the names that had become very sacred to them in the old country.

Bearing on this matter is a letter which I lately received from a friend who is keenly interested in the subject. "About thirty years ago (he says), I had a letter from some descendant of the Standishes in America, asking if there was any hill at Duxbury called Birchfield; because he said, there is a letter of Myles Standish which stated that the American Duxbury reminded him of the English Duxbury on account of a hill which he could see from his house. I replied that there was a hill, visible from Duxbury, called Birkacre, which is practically the same as Birchfield. It is the same name now, and goes back to early times." I have tried to

## Myles Standish

get in touch with the writer in America, but so far have not succeeded. If any such original letter of Myles Standish exists its evidence for the traditional view will be considerable. Enough has been said to show the difficult nature of the problem which still awaits solution; and that there is yet opportunity for the researcher who is in quest of an interesting bit of work.

Though in relation to the birth, parentage, and early life of Myles Standish, there is so much uncertainty, there are some things about him, and these perhaps really the most important, which are quite clear. We first meet with him in the city of Leyden. He was one of the soldier adventurers sent over by Queen Elizabeth to assist the Dutch in their struggle against Spain—then aiming at world-wide power. He held the commission of lieutenant; and it was at Leyden that he came into contact with the pilgrim band. He had their full confidence, attended their religious services, and was on terms of close friendship with John Robinson, the minister, who refers to him as a man whom he loved, sent among them he believed by the Lord for their good. How long he was with them in Leyden we have no means of knowing.

Why did he leave Holland and accompany them in the *Mayflower*? Usher, who claims to be an American historical scholar and of some repute, says that he was sent by the Merchant Adventurers as their salaried servant; and Mr. Porteus inclines to this view. "They paid his stipend (it is said), that he might defend the emigrants and teach them to defend themselves." The evidence for this is not forthcoming, and Usher's book, in which the statement is made, is absolutely unreliable. A friend of mine, a distinguished historical expert, is of opinion that it is a mistake to speak of Myles Standish as the military leader of the pilgrims at this stage; and I am inclined to think that he is right. Doubtless his knowledge of military affairs would be of real service to them from the beginning;

but his appointment as Captain does not seem to have been definitely made until 17th February, 1621, some three months after the landing had been effected. In like manner an article in the *Manchester Guardian* a few months ago, by some writer entirely unknown to me, says:—"No pale-faced puritan this, but—one imagines—something of a swash-buckler, looking in the New World for Adventure rather than freedom to worship. He caused the brethren some perturbation, and seems not always to have been an easy man to get on with." Nothing could be further from the truth than this statement, which is typical of the whole article. It is long indeed since one read a contribution which so completely misrepresents the case with which it is concerned as that does. Myles Standish was as truly a pilgrim as any of the *Mayflower* adventurers. Their moral and religious ideals were his. He signed the "Compact" in the cabin of the *Mayflower* along with John Carver, William Bradford, Edward Winslow, William Brewster, and Isaac Allerton, being the sixth to do so. He attended their religious services in the new home as he did in the old. He watched all their interests with the care of one who was neither a mercenary, nor an adventurer, nor an outsider, in those terrible days when disease was sweeping away numbers of the little community. Bradford's testimony in relation to this matter is worth quoting:—"In the time of most distress there was but six or seven sound persons, who, to their great commendation be it spoken, spared no pains, night nor day, but with abundance of love, and hazard of their own health, fetched them wood, made them fires, drest their meat, made their beds, washed their cloaks, cloathed and uncloathed them, in a word did all the homely and necessarie offices for them, and all this willingly and cheerfully, without any growling in the least, showing therein their true love unto their friends and brethren; a rare example and worthy to be remembered. Two of these seven were named,

William Brewster the revered Elder, and Myles Standish, the captain and military commander, unto whom mysef and many others were much beholden in our low and sicke condition." It was also Standish's unceasing vigilance, courage, and skill that saved the colony from extinction at the hands of the Indians. He lived and died in their midst. His character is further attested by the books which he read; for a man is at least somewhat known by the literary company which he keeps. Some forty books of his are known, which he left at his death, from which it would appear that History, Travel, and Theology were among his favourites. In particular Cæsar's Commentaries seem to have had considerable fascination for him, while his theological books indicate a distinctly Puritan type of mind. With regard to his religious position Mr. Porteus says:—"On the whole we incline to the opinion that he was neither—Separatist nor Romanist, but, like the great majority of his fellow country people, an English Churchman content with the compromise represented by the Reformed Church." I doubt if such a claim can be maintained. Apart from all else—and there is much that might be advanced to the contrary—his library points in the opposite direction. There is a large preponderance of books of a distinct Puritan character, and of the type that is not conformist. In their new home the Indian peril was with them from the first, and in 1623, about three years after the settlement, a great plot was hatched by the Indians which, had it been successful, would have wiped out all the white settlers. Partly, however, through the help of one or two friendly Indians, whose confidence he had won, Standish discovered the plot; and he forestalled the enemy by striking the first blow and killing the ringleaders. It was this which brought from the old pastor in Holland, John Robinson, the letter in which he says, "It is necessary to bear in mind the disposition of your Captain, whom I love,

who is of a warm temper. I had hoped that the Lord had sent him among you for good, if you used him right. He is a man humble and meek among you and towards all in ordinary course. But I doubt whether there is not wanting that tenderness of the life of man, made after God's image, which is meet. O how happy a thing had it been that you had converted some before you had killed any." There is nothing here that really reflects on the character of Standish; on the contrary the testimony in his favour is distinctly high, and it is not in the least difficult to understand why the aged pastor in his quiet retreat in Holland should have written in this strain. But the stern realities of the situation made necessary what we may well believe would be somewhat repugnant to the feeling of all the Plymouth colonists; and the peace and security afterwards enjoyed go far to justify the Puritan Captain's action.

In 1625, Standish paid a brief visit to England to arrange some matters for the Colony. And about 1632, he removed to the other side of Plymouth harbour, and made his home at the place to which the name of Duxbury was given. He was repeatedly elected to be the Treasurer and Assistant Governor of the Colony. He died on 3rd October, 1655, at the age of seventy-two years, and was buried on what came to be called Captain's Hill, the exact spot being unknown.

Among the victims of the epidemic which during the first six months swept away half the colonists was Rose, the wife of Myles Standish, who sailed with him in the *Mayflower*. She died on 29th January, 1621. Reference has already been made to Longfellow's poem, in which he represents Standish as seeking to win Priscilla Mullens, and in trusting the business of love-making to his friend and comrade John Alden, not knowing that John and Priscilla were in love with each other. I confess that poem has never greatly impressed me. That Longfellow had a very real admiration for Standish

is beyond question; but in the poem he makes him appear exceedingly unreal, foolish, and painfully weak, forgetting his own maxim where if anywhere it should have been followed:—"Serve yourself if you would be well served." Nor is he any more successful with Priscilla, when he makes her say to John, pressing his friend's suit, "Why don't you speak for yourself, John?" I very much doubt whether any Puritan maiden could have been found so forgetful of modesty as to ask that question. The poem is said to be simply the embodiment of an old tradition. But there are certain facts which cast very serious suspicion upon the story. It has already been stated that Rose Standish died on 29th January, 1621; and Myles's second wife, Barbara, came over in the ship *Anne* in August, 1623. In the allotment of lands at that date she appears as Mrs. Standish. Within the space of a little over two years we must put the death of Rose, the period of mourning, the Priscilla episode, communication with Barbara in England, his courtship, her voyage and marriage. I suppose all this is possible, but there is a considerable element of doubt in it. Barbara (with whom tradition has been busy, making her sister or cousin to Rose, and claiming both as members of some branch of the Standish family) survived Myles a few years; the children, all by her, being Alexander, Myles, Josias, Charles, and Lora. On Captain's Hill, as near the place where Myles Standish lies as could be ascertained, there was erected in 1872 a monument with a granite shaft 110 feet high, crowned with a bronze figure of the captain—"the man of men whom the pilgrims most needed."

One could linger long with profit over the result of that *Mayflower* adventure of three centuries ago, but two or three sentences must suffice. A distinguished American writer says, "It has been well said that 'the three most famous ships in history are *Noah's Ark*, the *Argo*, and the *Mayflower*.' The last is the

most illustrious of them all ; for she bore those who, hardly conscious of it themselves, carried within them the beginning of a great nation with ideas of loyalty to the truth revealed by God, of liberty indiscovering it and of energy in putting it into practice, ideas which were to make it one of the most important factors in modern history." The fact which needs always to be remembered is that America is, above all else, British. There have poured into it immense streams of human life from almost every country in the world ; there is a larger proportion of foreign elements in it than will be found in any other land ; yet its English cast persists and outstands. It may at times have entertained a feeling of estrangement toward this country ; but this is always for it the Mother-land. It has given to America its people, its language, its love of liberty, its passion for freedom, its civic ideals, its religion ; and we may well take pride in the thought that this county of Lancashire furnished one of the most distinguished and notable members of that pilgrim band, out of which has grown that great Democracy across the sea which, uniting with ourselves in new bonds of affection and service, will make the future of the world radiant with fresh promise and hope.

B. NIGHTINGALE, M.A., D.LITT.



THE | ABOLISHING | OF THE BOOKE | OF | COMMON PRAYER, |  
 By reason of above fifty grosse COR | RUPTIONS in it, |  
 As also for that it commands the use of such cere | monies  
 in the WORSHIP OF GOD (namely *Sur | plice, Crosse, and Kneeling,*  
 which man hath devised, | and which are notoriously  
 knowne to have beene | of old, and still to be abused to  
 Superstition | and Idolatry, and are of no necessary  
 use | in the CHURCH. |

Being the Substance of a Booke which the *Ministers* |  
 of *Lincoln* Diocese delivered to King JAMES, the |  
 First of *December, 1605* |

*Well worthy of the serious consideration of the High* |  
 COURT of PARLIAMENT. |

Reprinted, and are to be sold by SAMUEL —  
 SATTERTHWAITTE in *Warwicke.* | *Lane, 1641.*

---

The above is the title of a Pamphlet in the British Museum. [Press-mark E 178 (2).] It is interesting as a very Comprehensive list of the matters which the Puritans of 1605 deemed objectionable; and it must be owned that not a few of them were things quite indifferent, had they not been unduly insisted on. We give in a condensed form the various points to which exception was taken.

## Abolishing of the Book of Common Prayer 129

1. Parts of the Canonical Scriptures are omitted in the course of public reading, as (*e.g.*), the Titles of the Psalms, and the name of the Lord many times; yet Apocryphal Lessons are appointed, as Susanna, part of which is certainly untrue.

2. Many ceremonies of human device are enjoined; as Romish usages associated with the Mass and other superstitions: especially The Surplice, Sign of the Cross, and kneeling at Communion.

The following are declared "contrary to the Word of God":

1. The whole matter and form of the Liturgy which too much resembles the Mass-Book.
2. The Service is so long as to leave little or no time for preaching.
3. It approves the ministry of men unable to preach.
4. It contains things tending to the maintenance of Romish superstitions, as:
  1. It constantly calls the Minister a Priest.
  2. Commands observance of sundry Holy days.
  3. Appoints Saints' Eves to be kept as fasting days.
  4. Perverts Scripture to find sanction for fasting in Lent.
  5. Has full prescript service only in the Week before Easter.
  6. Has three Special Collects for Good Friday, and for no other day in the year.
  7. Every parishioner is required to communicate at Easter.
  8. Prays "that God would give that which their prayers dare not presume to ask."
  9. The Catechism is ambiguous as to the number of Sacraments, of which "two only as generally necessary to Salvation."
  10. Private Baptism is allowed "as if Baptism were of absolute necessity."
  11. Private Communion of the sick is allowed.
  12. Interrogatories are ministered to infants before Baptism.
  13. Every baptized child is said to be Regenerate.
  14. None are to be admitted to Communion until confirmed, and that by a Bishop—wherein confirmation is dignified above Christ's Sacraments.
  15. Objectionable ceremonies in Marriage are specified.
  16. Priestly Absolution is to be granted to the sick, if desired.
  17. Burial is made a Ministerial Duty.

## 130 **Abolishing of the Book of Common Prayer**

18. Needless Ceremonial is prescribed at "Churching" of Women.
19. Offertory and Offering Days are allowed.
20. In the Catechism it is affirmed that Christ has redeemed "all Mankind"—not only the Elect.
21. Sundry things tend to profanation of the Sacraments as :
  1. All priests and deacons in Collegiate churches are to communicate every Sunday.
  2. Discretion is allowed as to giving notice beforehand of intention to communicate.
  3. All New Married persons are to receive on the day of their marriage.
  4. Private Baptism is allowed without Prayer or Teaching.
  5. Several Statements are either untrue or doubtful as :
    - (a) That nothing is ordained to be read but the Word of God, or what is grounded on the same.
    - (b) That all the Ceremonies pertain to Edification.
    - (c) That the children murdered by Herod were Innocents.
    - (d) That there are Archangels.
    - (e) That every one who is buried is a brother.

Sundry things are appointed which bring disorder into the public Worship, as :

Repetitions after the Minister, and responsive prayers.

Directions are given about positions and attitudes in prayer.

Numerous vain repetitions are prescribed, as of the Lord's Prayer, the Gloria Patri, etc.

"Holy Scriptures are mangled into shreds and patches in the Epistles and Gospels."

The Churchwardens are to collect Alms in the midst of the service.

Several statements are denounced as absurd, others as contradictory ; and albeit the two books of Homilies are sanctioned as "agreeable to the Word of God," many things in them are indicated as doubtful or positively untrue.

Very severe censure is passed by the Authors upon the Ordinal ; this in particular :

"That the Lord's Supper is dignified above Baptism, and Confirmation above both, when the Deacon is permitted to baptize and not to administer the Lord's Supper, the Priest to minister both Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the Bishops only to confirm."

## Abolishing of the Book of Common Prayer 131

Several absurdities, and contradictions between the spoken words of the Ordinal and the established practice, are pointed out ; concluding with this :—

“The Priest is asked whether he will give his faithful diligence always to Minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded ; whereas it is well known that no Minister is allowed to exercise the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded.”

## Edward Winslow, 1595—1655

### I. THE FAMILY.

**T**HE road from Worcester to Leominster passes just north of a hamlet named Winslow, commemorating the great bishop, Wini, better known from his see-town of Winchester. In the middle ages, peasants who wandered from their birth-place were often known by its name, and so there were husbandmen at Suckley and Mathon called Winslow. By the fifteenth century they had drifted further, to Hanley Castle and Upton. By the sixteenth there was a large colony across the Severn, at Earl's Croome, eight miles below Worcester. All seem to have been agricultural labourers, though one who went up the Avon became a mason and one a barber.

One branch moved nearer the city to the parish of Kempsey, containing the hamlets of Draycot and Kerswell. Here Richard throve so that in 1543 he was important enough to be assessed towards a subsidy, and the same standing was retained by John of Draycot in 1550, 1571, 1576.

Kenelm took a better position still in 1559, buying from Sir John Newport the property of Newport's Place, in Kerswell. On 17th November, 1560, he had a son and heir, Edward, who seems to have been born in Worcester, the parish of St. Andrew. But it probably cost him his wife, for the will of Agnes Winslow was proved that year. Kenelm also owned the farm of Clerkenleap, half-way between Newport's Place and the city; so although he never described himself as more than a yeoman, he was well-to-do. He sold Newport's Place to Sir John Bucke, and retired to spend his latter years in the city, where he died in 1607 leaving a widow Katherine.

Edward apparently followed him at Clerkenleap, and is said to have married Eleanor Pelham, who is erroneously said to have been daughter of Sir Herbert Pelham of Droitwich, a person who did not exist there. Edward, however, did have a son and heir Richard, who after his father's second marriage, which will interest us presently, lived with his grandfather Kenelm in 1601. About 1605 he married a widow, Alice (Hay) Hurdman, whose father was of Kempsey, a gentleman entitled to coat-armour. He lived till 1659, and she survived him ten years, each leaving 40s. to the poor. Their son and heir was John, who in 1717 gave 20s. yearly to pay the master

of the free school at Kempsey, and died two years later. With him the name of Winslow died out in and around Kempsey, as he left only three daughters, who all married.

Edward, son of Kenelm and father of Richard, after the death of his wife Eleanor, married a second time, his bride being Magdalen Oliver. Who she was is rather a puzzle, for her Christian name has not yet been identified anywhere. In the neighbourhood many families bore the name of Oliver. Those at Evesham, Bromyard and Suckley were somewhat distant, but there were others at Hagley, Agbarrow, Chaddesley Corbett, besides relations at Upton. Most probable is the family in Droitwich itself; whereof Joan, William and Henry died in 1583, 1590, 1592. Harry bound himself to marry Anne Barrett in 1576, Anna bound herself to marry John Gerse in 1593. A Margery Oliver, widow, paid 4s. subsidy at Droitwich in 1603.

But against this local family is the absence of any name Magdalen in the St. Andrew's registers, and the remarkable fact that Magdalen was married in London, at St. Bride's off Fleet Street, where the original register may still be seen, given the date as 4th November. As those registers only begin seven years earlier, they throw no light on her family; but the place invites attention to London. It is conceivable that she came of Huguenot stock; Isaac Ollivier from Rouen was a famous miniature-painter till 1617; but the Huguenot registers do not record a Magdalen.

Whoever she was, Edward brought her to Droitwich, beneath which still flows an inexhaustible subterranean river of brine. Pumping this and evaporating it, had for centuries supplied many parts of England with salt; the Salt Ways radiate straight from the town of Worcester, to Alcester, and to the Roman capital of York. Five hundred loads of poles were needed each month to supply the 350 salt-furnaces with fuel, so that the forests had well-nigh disappeared, and the Malvern hills stand out bare. As Edward could hope only that his heir Richard would be provided for at Kempsey when Kenelm passed away, he was bound both to support himself and to provide for his second family; and for this, salt-boiling seemed a promising method. It needed to be so, for within eleven years he had eight children, though indeed one died young.

All the registrations referring to these are to be seen at St. Peter's. The nine entries have much interest, being unlike any other of that place and time. The first four originally ran, like any others:—

1595 Christened.

October 20. Edward Wynsloe sune of Edward Wynsloe was baptized.

## Edward Winslow

1597 Christened.

April 15. John Wynsloe sonne of Edward Wynsloe was baptized.

1598.

April 24. Elynr wynsloe daughter of Edward Wynsloe was baptized.

1599.

Maye 3. Kenelme wynsloe sune of Edward wynsloe (was baptized).

So far the only remarkable point is that the daughter was called not after her mother, but after the former wife, Eleanor. The fifth entry is in a new form.

1600.

October 29. Gilbert Wynslove sonne of Edward wynslove baptized and borne the Sunday next before.

And it would seem to be about this time that the vicar was persuaded to add to his previous entries some similar information, even at the cost of erasing two words relating to Kenelme in order to make room. We thus learn that Edward was "borne ye xviiiith of October being Saterdag," that John was "borne on Saterdag next before," 15th April; that Elynor was "borne on the Saterdag next before," 24th April; that Kenelme "was baptized and borne on ye Sundaye next before," 3rd May. The vicar was also induced to take the highly improper step of inserting in his register of marriages in Droitwich during 1594, the statement that on "Nov. 3, Edward Wynsowe and Magdalen married at London," a statement wrong by one day. The births of the next three children were all recorded in the same fashion, standing out conspicuously, different from all others:—

1601/2.

March, 8. Elizabeth Wynslove daughter of Edward Wynslove baptized and borne ye Saterdag before.

1604.

December 30. magdalen ye daughter of Edward wynslove was baptized and borne uppon ye xxvi daye of ye same.

1605/6.

February, 16. Josias wynslove ye sonne of Edward wynslove was baptized and borne on the xv of the same being Tuesday. But thirteen months earlier had been written:—

1604/5.

January 20. Elizabeth Wynslove daughter of Edward wynslove was buried.

In 1603 there was a new sovereign, and a subsidy was levied;

Winslow's holding was valued at only twenty shillings, and he had to pay only thirty-two pence, the lowest sum taken. But in 1606 he was important enough to be consulted as to the affairs of Hartlebury Grammar School. And next year he was put on a commission to investigate it. In each case it is worthy of note that while some of his colleagues were described as gentlemen, he was not. Even when, in 1607, his father Kenelm had passed away in Worcester, and Edward removed to his inheritance of Clerkenleap in Kempsey, he was at best only a yeoman, not bearing arms, nor even an esquire.

By 1608 Richard the eldest son was married, and as there were eight of the second family to provide for, it was getting nearly time for a lad of thirteen to consider his future. A chance allusion of later life suggests that he did not like the prospect of settling down as a salt-boiler, and so he broke away from all local ties, and sought another opening. As it was in London, it was perhaps due to his mother's family, but details are lacking for nine years; the only sure fact is that he became a journeyman printer.

## 2. PRINTER AND SEPARATIST.

At London there was more variety of religious experience than at Droitwich. The diocese of Worcester has seldom been in the van. Catholicism died hardly, and half-way between Droitwich and Worcester, at Hindlip Hall, when Edward was ten years old, there was an explosion of Catholic disappointment, and attempted revenge. The Gunpowder Plot showed how violent were the forces of reaction.

Now London was the stronghold of the Puritan party. From the theological standpoint there were only two parties, Catholic and Puritan; but there was a very practical division of opinion as to church government. Religion has never interested any but a small minority for any length of time, but every man is concerned as to the payments he has to make to support the ministers of religion, and every minister is concerned, not merely as to the type of service he has to conduct, but as to the people who enforce discipline upon him, and the opportunities offered him of joining the ranks of this governing body. Elizabeth had elected to continue the episcopal system, though at first she found few who really favoured it, and she had to govern even her bishops by High Commissions composed chiefly of laymen. Those who had imbibed the doctrines of Calvin, whether at Geneva or through the "Genevan Bible" which was in every religious home, soon came to favour his system of church-government as elaborated in his country of France, and adopted in Scotland. If Catholics were disappointed at the attitude of Mary Stuart's son when he became King of England, Puritans were equally disillusioned. After the Hampton Court Conference



had made it clear that bishops were to stay, and that very few concessions would be made to Puritan ideals, Separation began afresh. Some scores of people emigrated from the borders of Nottingham, Yorks and Lincoln to Amsterdam, where under John Smyth they formed the first modern Baptist church in 1609. A few of them united with the disciples of John Robinson from Norwich and formed another church which migrated to Leyden, where it was steadily augmented from East Anglia and Kent.

Now the difficulties of printing in England anything distasteful to authority were great. And as there was now a large colony of English in Leyden, anxious to find work, and some of them able to find capital, the idea was obvious that Puritan works might be printed there. Robinson had joined the university and obtained some credit by publicly supporting Calvinism in a debate against Episcopius, in which he was backed by Professor Polyander. William Brewster also was a member of the University, and as such had the right to print; Thomas Brewer had money. Therefore during 1616 type was bought, and two journeymen printers were brought from London, John Reynolds and Edward Winslow.

Among the motives that induced young Edward to go abroad, we may probably guess at one. Jean de l'Ecluse of Rouen had settled in Amsterdam, with his wife Catherine de l'Epine. He was a printer. In 1604 he married (2) Alice (Lewis) Thickins, a widow from Somerset. In 1609 he married (3) Jacqueline May of Wisbech. On 12th November, 1616, he married (4) Anne Harris of Hanbury, a hamlet two miles from Droitwich, who had other Worcestershire friends in Amsterdam. Now Jean de l'Ecluse was on good terms with the Leyden group, and Dorothy May, one of his sisters-in-law, was married to William Bradford, one of the Leyden leaders. Also Randall Thickens was a Londoner, now making looking-glasses at Leyden, whose wife's sister was married to John Robinson. Another member of the community was a Huguenot, Isaac Chilton, also making looking-glasses, who married a daughter of de l'Ecluse. Here then were people among whom Edward Winslow would readily feel at home, by whom perhaps his name had been suggested to Brewer and Brewster. So about the end of 1616, when he was just of age, he left for Leyden.

For three years he was busy setting up type, which was probably machined on a Dutch press. To a quarto Latin commentary on Proverbs by the late Thomas Cartwright, once a professor at Cambridge, Polyander furnished a preface, and so the new venture started auspiciously. It was very ingenious, but hardly ingenuous, for Cartwright had declared himself against Brownism, which was essentially the practice of this Leyden church. And another issue of 1617 was of the same kind, a short Latin pamphlet by William Ames against the Arminian minister of Rotterdam. Without any

imprint, there were re-issued at the same period Puritan programmes of reform first put forth under Elizabeth or at the accession of James. This was playing with fire. Brewster continued to hedge during 1618, setting up Cartwright's criticism of the Catholic New Testament executed at Rheims, in a fine folio, and a small exposition by Chaderton, Master of Emmanuel College at Cambridge: these, however, were balanced by a new Puritan objection to the liturgy, a reprint of a Brownist exposition, and a book by Robinson on the liberty of preaching.

The sky seemed clear, and on 27th April, 1618, Edward Winslow was betrothed to Elizabeth Barker from Chattisham; within a fortnight they were married.

The marriage records of the city illustrated what a cosmopolitan church this had become. The homes of 123 members have been traced; thirty-two were from Norfolk, seventeen from London, eleven from Essex, nine from Nottingham, six from South Yorks, five from East Yorks, five from Somerset, three from Cambridge, three from Suffolk, three from Sussex, three from Scotland, the others from Berks, Lincoln, Durham, Leicester, Hants, Wilts, Dorset.

It was a Scotchman who brought the match which fired the train. David Calderwood was prominent in upholding the Presbyterian system against James' attempt to convert it into an Episcopacy. He got Brewster to publish another edition of his Latin book on the point, and an English account of the proceedings of the Perth assembly. This excited King James, and his ambassador set to work to ferret out the printers. By September Brewer was in prison, his library was being examined, and the garret containing his type was sealed up by joint authority of town and university. Before this catastrophe, three smaller works had been issued, a Latin manifesto by Robinson, with English Puritan tracts.

By January, 1620, the States General issued an edict which forbade any such printing in future, while Polyander certified the ambassador that the type was all in the custody of the university. Thus Winslow's occupation was gone, and his reputation too, so that England was unsafe.

### 3. COLONIST AND AUTHOR.

Even in 1618, the church at Leyden had begun negotiating for leave to go to Virginia, whither in that year part of the sister church at Amsterdam did migrate. On 9th June, 1619, Brewster and Cushman secured from the Virginia Company a patent. But Brewster being now an impossible agent, negotiations fell into the hands of Samuel Fuller, from North Ockendon in Essex, a say-weaver with a knowledge of medicine, William Bradford the

fustian-weaver from Austerfield, Isaac Allerton, the tailor from London, and Edward Winslow, now twenty-five years old.

The books of Captain John Smith were bought, and his charts, including one of the New England coast, marking sites fit for towns. A pilot was engaged, John Clark, who had repeatedly been to Virginia. A small ship was chartered to sail from Holland; and by selling houses, money was raised to invest in stores.

Over in England even larger preparations were made. Many more decided to emigrate, and many financiers put a stake in the enterprise. A rickety old vessel, employed alternately in whaling and bringing from the Bay of Biscay bay-salt and wine, was chartered from Thomas Horth of Yarmouth, who had relations at Leyden.

The Leydeners agreed to send first their sturdiest, to prepare the way for more. The Winslows were of course in this contingent, and Gilbert Winslow, now aged twenty, joined at an English port. After repeated delays, some withdrew from the enterprise, the *Speedwell* was abandoned, and the *Mayflower* finally left on 6th September with 102 colonists, men, women, children, and hired servants. She was driven out of her course by severe storms, and reached not Virginia but Cape Cod in New England, behind which they anchored on 11th November.

Though they had the map of John Smith, recommending a site twenty-four miles westward for a town to be called Plymouth, and though the mate advised the same from previous knowledge, they explored for themselves, and let five precious weeks pass before they agreed on it, and by the end of the year they had simply staked out nineteen plots. By the end of January they had a few houses up, and their goods ashore under a shed. By the end of February they were in touch with the natives, and had landed their guns. By the end of March, Winslow had negotiated a treaty with Massasoit, the sagamore of the natives. Five days later the *Mayflower* set sail eastward.

Meantime there had been an epidemic which, even in an unusually mild winter, had wrought grievous havoc both on the ship among the crew and on the shore among the colonists. There had been two dozen households, of which four were utterly destroyed. Winslow's case is a good average. His wife died, also one of his two men-servants, and a little girl put in their care; leaving only himself and a man-servant. Another average case was where William White died, leaving a widow Susanna, sister of Samuel Fuller from Essex, with her boy Resolved and a baby born aboard the ship in the harbour; both their men-servants died too. This suggested an easy remedy, and in May the households united, Edward being married to Susanna by William Bradford the new governor. Only three other wives survived, with seven marriageable girls, as

against twenty-six other men, five men-servants, one maidservant ; five boys and two girls made up the total of fifty-one.

On this handful devolved the task of preparing homes and food for next autumn's ship. They had planted twenty acres with Indian corn, and built seven substantial houses besides four store houses. In November reinforcements of thirty-five young men and others arrived, including John Winslow. The little ship returned next month with timber and furs valued at £500 ; it also took letters for publication, with a sermon by one of themselves. The ship was plundered by a French privateer, but the papers were thrown into shape and printed. This step was apparently due to Winslow, from whose pen came most of the information ; and by the later testimony of Bradford, he might justly have said, *Quorum pars magna fui*. The advertisement did the colony good, though like most advertisements it laid on the colours thick, and ignored the shadows. Next year arrived the third great contingent for Plymouth, completing the Forefathers or Old Comers, as they came to be affectionately called ; and the return ships took home Winslow with a long manuscript which he published in 1624 as " Good News from New England."

It is not possible to trace the homes of all these pioneers, but the towns whence thirty-three families came can be identified. Duxbury in Lancashire provided one, York two, Scrooby and Austerfield two, Norwich two, Suffolk two, Cambridge one, Rayleigh, Colchester, Chelmsford and Ockendon one each, London six, Sandwich and Canterbury three, Dorking one, Budleigh one, Sherborne one, Barnstable one, Wrigton one, Droitwich one, Shipton in Salop one, while three Netherlanders leavened the English. Of the English whom we can trace, only forty men, women and children, had ever seen Leyden or John Robinson. Elaborate lists in Dexter's " England and Holland of the Pilgrims " cover fifty pages, and deserve close study on these points ; a few more facts have been discovered since.

Bradford and Brewster stayed at Plymouth the rest of their lives, and did their best to keep all the colonists there. But Winslow was a great explorer, and very soon expressed his opinion that they ought to have settled on Massachusetts Bay. This was acted upon by other settlers within four years, and he was justified by their far greater success.

His visit home in 1623-4 was largely to negotiate with the Adventurers, in which he was only partially successful. He brought over supplies of many kinds, and cattle ; but the Adventurers hampered him by their choice of exports both material and personal. He pointed out that as there were great fisheries along the coast, it would be well if the colonists had a shipwright to build vessels that could share in this, and had a salter who could provide salt to sell to other ships. Yet whereas he had grown up in the salt district,

he allowed an incompetent man to be foisted on him, who burned down the house and ruined the works. And the shipwright seems to have been not very energetic, for after four years the total fleet consisted of "the pinnace, bass-boat, and shallop at Manomet."

Winslow was hardly more successful in his ecclesiastical negotiations. The Adventurers flatly refused to send Robinson over, and did send instead a clergyman from Ireland. But the Colonists would not accept him as their pastor, and when he was found to be intriguing for the subversion of their colony, they shipped him back, and Winslow proved to the Adventurers his general bad character. As Robinson had died meanwhile, the result was that they had no minister till Ralph Smith arrived in Massachusetts during 1629.

Winslow, however, was abundantly successful as an emigration agent. His sister Magdalen had married William Ware, clergyman at Wareham near Dorchester; with 1623, a company of merchants from this district sent an annual fleet to the trading post at Kennebec, in charge of his brother. They even settled men, first at Cape Ann, then at Naumkeak. In 1628, several knights and gentlemen about Dorchester bought from the Council of New England that part of New England lying north of the Old Colony as far as the Merrimac, including the two experimental settlements. The first reinforcement reached Naumkeak in September, when Winslow soon visited them, and Fuller was able to check a sickness that had broken out. The reports sent back were so encouraging that the enterprise enlarged vastly, more partners came in, a royal charter was obtained, and five ships came over in 1629, including a new *Mayflower* replacing the former. This little fleet brought not only colonists for the new towns to be planted where Winslow had recommended, on Massachusetts Bay, but also the last of the Leyden emigrants for Plymouth.

As the new company was not settling in the Old Colony, but was settling in between this and its outposts at Kennebec, it was clearly desirable to obtain some English title to the occupied territory. Application was made to the "Council established at Plymouth in the county of Devon" in old England, which readily granted a patent for the territory from the Cohasset rivulet on the north to the Narraganset river on the south and the Pacanokit or Sawamset country on the west; also a strip fifteen miles wide on either side of the Kennebec. But no royal charter was ever obtained.

The successful settlement at Salem, as Naumkeak was re-named, and then at Charlestown and Boston, broke down the policy of centering all the resources of the Old Colony at Plymouth. Myles Standish had a farm about nine miles northward, which he named after his father's village of Duxbury. Edward Winslow had another three miles further, which he in turn called after his father's home of Kerswell. Apparently the father died about this time,

though the parish registers are not extant to give the exact date, and no will is in the natural place, the Worcester registry. As the farm devolved on the half-brother Richard, Edward's full brothers Josiah and Kenelm emigrated in 1631.

It was in these circumstances that new churches were incorporated in 1632, at both Duxbury and Kerswell. And speedily a fourth was added by the settlement of a church from London under its pastor John Lathrop, at Scituate, yet further to the north. The establishment of these new churches, as we shall see, led to the incorporation of new townships by Edward Winslow. The estate of Kerswell was developed soon. Edward took up more land in 1636, and whereas the natural river communication was with the sheltered waters of Duxbury Bay, he cut a canal a mile and a half long, giving direct access to the ocean at Green's Harbour. When a township was laid off in 1641, including the estate of Kerswell, it was named Rexhame for a short time, then Marshfield.

#### 4. GOVERNOR AND COMMISSIONER.

Edward Winslow was a good man of business, and was constantly chosen to office. Thrice he was made Governor, and when four colonies confederated, he was one of the two commissioners from the Old Colony. While commercially he won some success, this is ecclesiastically the turning period of his life, as we see the tolerant policy of John Robinson reversed under the influence of Massachusetts, and a stain fixed on the character not of a man alone, but of the state he ruled, though it never wholly lost the savour of its early days.

In 1631 there arrived at Boston a young minister, named Roger Williams, who in April was installed over the church at Salem, and in May qualified as a freeman of Massachusetts. But the prevailing temper of the new colonists was such that opposition was made at Boston to his being minister at Salem, and he preferred to come to Plymouth. Here he was welcomed, was invited to preach, was admitted a member of the church, and presently was appointed assistant preacher or "Teacher" under Ralph Smith. For two years all went well; Smith was nearly a nonentity, and Bradford saw well how Williams had the very spirit of Robinson, their late pastor. Brewster the elder was less satisfied, and detected the spirit of John Smyth. He feared that Williams would run the same course of rigid separation and anabaptistry, and advised that he be got rid of so that abler men on the Bay might deal with him. Some intrigues took place, a law was passed that a man who had served as governor two years might be exempt, that any one else elected must serve under heavy penalties, and then Winslow was appointed in 1633. The situation became very strained, and as the

church at Salem still desired Williams, he asked for his dismissal. Brewster urged it, and he with many adherents left Plymouth, returning to the premier church on the Bay. This move is plainly attributed in the Massachusetts History to Winslow being of one accord with the Massachusetts authorities against a full toleration in religious matters.

He had a keen eye, however, to what some would consider the main chance. In his year of office he opened a new trading post on the Connecticut river, and so negotiated with Massachusetts that the outposts on the Kennebec to the north was acknowledged as being within the Old Colony jurisdiction. And it is to his credit that he introduced more system into the government. Hitherto there were no official documents, beyond two town plans and a record of the division of the cattle; for minutes, Bradford had simply kept a private note-book. It was Winslow who, in 1633, instituted a Journal of Proceedings, and thus began the official records of the colony.

Beyond seas Charles and Laud were taking steps that might have recalled Winslow not only to a sense of the precarious status of the colonies, but to the noble principles he was loosing. Englishmen were now settled not only in Virginia and in Maryland, but in the Bermudas and on Providence Island off the Mosquito coast, besides around Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. In the general reorganization of government undertaken under the inspiration of Wentworth and Laud, a commission was issued to six peers, one knight, two archbishops and two secretaries, to supervise all colonies, present and future. Express power was given to the commissioners, with the advice of two or three bishops, to regulate ecclesiastical matters and establish ecclesiastical courts.

When news of this reached the Bay, the General Assembly devised a new oath, which evaded all reference to the laws of England, and vowed allegiance only to the local commonweal. This was at first intended only for freemen, but in 1635 was imposed on every resident male aged sixteen and upwards, under penalty of punishment at the discretion of the court. And at the same time the churches were asked to consult as to a uniform order or discipline, and as to the power of the magistrate to enforce such. Williams preached against both these proposals, was tried by the court and condemned to be banished. As they prepared to ship him back to England, he fled in January, and after fourteen weeks steered into Narragansett Bay. It is at first sight remarkable that he had not simply gone twenty miles to Scituate, out of the Massachusetts jurisdiction, where he would have found a church lately arrived from London, with its pastor, John Lathrop, much akin to him in thought. It is to be feared that Winslow was the obstacle, as will appear from his doings meanwhile.

Massachusetts had not been content with local measures, but had sent Winslow home as agent to try and uphold their charter against the new powers conferred on the Commission. Laud elicited that he had taught publicly in the church, and had celebrated marriages as a magistrate. For these breaches of English law he was committed to the Fleet prison. Winslow was fortunate in having one friend at court, the lord keeper. Thomas Coventry, was son of Margaret Jeffreys of Earls Croome, the village whence the Winslows sprang. He had been M.P. for Droitwich, where a memorial of his son remains yet in the Coventry Hospital founded and endowed for poor old people. As Coventry was lenient by nature, and influential with Laud at the moment, he supported Winslow's petition to the Privy Council in November, and secured his release.

Winslow had learned little as to toleration. On his return to the Old Colony, he was chosen governor for 1636. He soon heard that Roger Williams had ascended Narragansett Bay, and had landed at Seekonk within his jurisdiction. He thereupon sent and asked him to cross the river and so save any trouble with Massachusetts. Williams did so, and Winslow in relief called on him, and gave his wife a piece of gold.

Massachusetts was disturbed by the party desiring uniformity. In 1636 the party of liberty carried the elections and put in Henry Vane. Intolerance, however, was so strong that several emigrations took place, and new towns were founded west of Williams' settlement of Providence, named Hartford, Windsor, and Weathersfield. It is significant that these emigrants from the Bay did not attempt to settle within the Old Colony; Winslow's subservience had been too discouraging. Then came a natural result; the narrow party was left strong enough to carry next elections on the Bay, whereupon Vane returned to England to spend his energy on a wider field, and the victorious bigots consolidated their position by banishing all the other leaders. These considered two sites, one in the Old Colony, and the island of Aquidneck. They went to Plymouth to negotiate, and for the second time the authorities urged them to move on further. So they appealed to Williams, who arranged with the Indian owners for their peaceable acquisition of the island, which they re-named Rhode Island. The pace was forced by Samuel Gorton, who, when he left Boston, came to Plymouth and began publishing his opinions; they proved quite as unpopular in the Old Colony so that Smith the minister complained of him to the court, which in December, 1638, fined him and banished him.

W. T. WHITLEY, LL.D.

*(To be continued.)*



## State Prayers—from the Niblock Collection.

(Continued from Vol. VIII ; p. 37.)

(XIII) *A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for having made his highness the Prince of Orange the Glorious Instrument of the Great Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power : to be used in the City of London and ten miles distant thereof on the 31st of January instant, and throughout the whole kingdom on the 14th of February next, 1688/9.*

*Proper Psalms*—46, 115, 124.

*Proper Lessons*—Zech. 8c. and Romans 12.

*First Collect*—O God, the Defender and Saviour of all that trust in thee ; we give glory to thy holy name for the blessed Reformation of this Church, in the days of our forefathers, from the detestable Superstitions and Corruptions of Popery, and for our deliverance from the intolerable yoke of the Romish church. We praise thee for that light of the Gospel, that purity of doctrine and worship, thou hast ever since vouchsafed unto us ; and for the many wonderful preservations by which thou hast manifested thy fatherly care of us, and presence with us. More especially at this time we magnifie thy goodness for our late great and happy deliverance, whereby we trust thou hast established to us all thy former mercies. Give us grace, O Lord, to walk worthy of this thy marvellous loving kindness ; that thou mayest still delight to dwell among us, and to do us good ; that the same temporal and spiritual blessings we now enjoy may, by thy mighty protection, be continued to us and our posterity for ever, and this we beg for Jesus Christ his sake. Amen.

*After the General Thanksgiving*—O Almighty and everliving God, who art glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders; we most humbly present ourselves this day at the throne of thy Grace, to bless and adore the unspeakable wisdom and goodness of thy late gracious providence towards us. We acknowledge it was thy infinite mercy alone that hath raised this church and nation from their low estate, and caused light to spring out of darkness unto us. It was because thy compassions fail not that our holy Reformed Religion was not overwhelmed with Popish Superstition and Idolatry, that our laws and liberties are rescued from the hands of violence and oppression. We confess, our sins had justly provoked thee to pour down these fearful judgments upon us. This was the portion due to our unthankfulness and manifold backslidings. Yet thou hast not dealt with us according to our deservings, but in the midst of judgment hast remembered mercy. Blessed be thy name who hast raised up for us a mighty Deliverer, by whom thou hast wrought this great salvation without the effusion of Blood. It is thy doing, O Lord, and it is marvellous in our eyes. Wherefore not unto us, not unto us but to thy name be the glory, for thy loving mercy and for thy truth's sake, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

*After the Prayer "for the Church Militant" :—*

O Eternal God, the blessed and only Potentate, the Prince of Peace; accept, we beseech thee, the praises and thanksgiving of thy servants for our deliverance from those great and apparent dangers wherewith we were encompassed. It is of thy mercy, O Lord, that we were not utterly consumed, that our religion was not destroyed, nor our liberty subverted; but that we still freely profess thy sacred truth, and joyn thy most holy worship, and possess the rights and inheritances of our fathers. Go on to perfect, O gracious God, the work that thou hast begun among us, Bless and prosper

## 146 State Prayers—from the Niblock Collection

the hands by which thou hast conveyed this mercy to us. Direct our Governors with the Spirit of Wisdom and Righteousness, Rule thou in the midst of our Public Councils, for the advancement of thy glory and the lasting welfare of this great people. Dispose the hearts of the whole nation to all lowliness and meekness and forbearance of one another in love ; that no seditions may disturb the State, no schism distract the Church ; but that as members of one body, professors of one faith, sons of one Father, and called to one hope, we may earnestly endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and with one heart and one mouth glorifie God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: to whom be ascribed all honour and praise now and for ever. Amen.

[It is worthy of note that this service was compiled by a committee of eleven bishops, appointed by the Convention on the first day of its assembling, and before the question of the Throne was settled. The committee consisted of Barlow, bp. of Lincoln, Compton of London, Frampton \* of Gloucester, Ken\* of Bath and Wells, Lake of Chichester, Lloyd of St. Asaph, Lloyd\* of Norwich, Spratt of Rochester, Turner\* of Ely, Trelawney of Bristol, and White\* of Peterborough.]

---

\*Five of these were afterwards Nonjurors.

**Religious Life in the Seventeenth Century as  
Illustrated by the Southampton Documents.**

THE most outstanding feature of the seventeenth century is, beyond question, its dominantly religious character. Especially is this true of the earlier portion of the Stuart regime. Constitutional questions, and questions which arose from commercial enterprise occupied men's attention greatly at that time; but it was religion which most profoundly moved them and urged them on to the most arduous enterprises. Religious zeal sent some of England's noblest sons away from their ancestral homes across the great ocean, into the "land of fevers and scalping-knives." It was religious zeal which kindled the flames of civil war; for although constitutional questions entered largely into the struggle between Charles I. and the Parliament, yet that struggle would hardly have developed into such a war as ravaged the land had it not been for the influence of religious ideals and fanaticisms. And yet the common people do not appear to have been greatly or universally affected by this wave of religious activity. They were certainly—speaking very generally—not Puritans. The generality of men and women were too ignorant to enter into a comprehension of deep religious problems, and too much obsessed with the present to care deeply for a system which so largely disregarded the passing and temporary.

(a) *Hatred of Popery.*—Among the sentiments which had relation to religion was one which appears to have been shared by nearly all; and that was, a deep and almost universal hatred towards the Roman Catholic faith, and towards all who professed that faith. During

almost the whole of the century men had an undefined dread of a gigantic Popish plot. The great idea which possessed the minds of Pym and his allies during the early years of the long Parliament was that there was in existence a far-reaching scheme to subvert the Protestant religion. Historians have charged Pym with designedly making a bogey of this idea in order further to widen the breach between the King and the Parliament ; but Professor Gardiner dismisses the notion and shows how natural such fears as these were. Charles's relations with Papal emissaries, the many conversions to the Roman Catholic Faith which took place, the indiscretions of the Roman Catholic Queen, the readiness to accept help from any quarter which characterised the king ; all these deepened men's suspicions—and made them put the most sinister explanations on his actions. Later on in the reign of Charles II. men regarded with grave suspicion—and, as it finally transpired, with the very best of reasons—the king's fidelity to Protestantism ; and their pent-up hate and foreboding broke out in savage frenzy in the notorious Popish plot of 1678. His brother James made open and wanton attack on the religion of the great majority of Englishmen, and worked them up to a perfect fever of panic and wrath by his ill-judged project of bringing over Irishmen to hold his subjects in check. These things will account for—if they do not excuse—the intense dislike felt by the majority of people against Roman Catholics. Several extracts from the Southampton documents will show how this sentiment influenced men's minds. Southampton during the seventeenth century was the chief place for fishing expeditions to Newfoundland. In 1621 Sir G. Calvert (created Lord Baltimore by James I.) attempted to colonise the island, but was obliged to abandon the attempt. Lord Baltimore was a Roman Catholic, and this fact is in itself sufficient to explain the reason of his non-success. The fishermen who pursued their avocation round the

shores of Newfoundland were violently anti-papistical and not in the least likely to endure with equanimity the rule of a Roman Catholic Lord. A story taken from the town records is of interest in this connection. Stephen Day on September 14th, 1629, before the Southampton magistrates deposed that "on the 20th of April last past this relator set forth from Studland Bay in a fishing voyage to the Newfoundland in a shipp called the St. Claude this relator being master thereof, and he saith they carried outwards provisions to the Lord Baltimore at the Newfoundland aforesaid." At Newfoundland he came into contact with a gentleman belonging to Lord Baltimore's acquaintance named Mr. Gascoyne, who, wishing to embark for England, sent his clothes, as Stephen Day believed, on board a vessel named the "Sith" of Poole. Poole was for long the rival of Southampton in the fishing trade, and in the middle of the eighteenth century succeeded in making itself the principal starting place for expeditions to Newfoundland. Stephen Day was mortified that Mr. Gascoyne did not elect the St. Claude for his journey. "This relator said unto him that he this relator had heard that the said Mr. Gascoyne had sent his clothes aboard thother ship called the Sith of Poole, to which the said Mr. Gascoyne replied and said that they were none of his clothes which were sent aboard the Sith aforesaid, but that they were one Smithe's clothes, which Smith this relator saith is a seminary priest and hath exercised that office as this relator hath heard."

William Huntresse, boatswain of the same ship, "saith that there came one Gascoyne in the said voyage, from the Newfoundland in the said shipp, and that he heard the Mr. of the said shipp report that one Smith came in another shipp called the Sith of Poole, which Smith named himself Gascoyne—And he further saith that he know the said Smith to bee a popish priest for that hee saw him bury a dead corps with burning tapers." So evidently Stephen Day got his passenger after all.

A certain Mr. Walker is implicated in this story. He went out as a passenger in the *St. Claude*, and on reaching Newfoundland paid daily visits to Lord Baltimore, returning to the vessel every evening. "The report was commonly given forth that the said Mr. Walker was heretofore a Minister of the Church of England and that he was now become a Popish priest.—In the voyage outwards while the companie of the said shipp were at prayers the said Mr. Walker did whoope and make a noyse to the greate disturbance of the said companie of the said shipp." Mr. Walker, put on examination, gave an interesting account of his life, wherein he stated that he was an Anglican clergyman, and denied the charge of popery in the most emphatic terms: "he saith that hee is noe priest neither secular, nor regular, nor Jesuite, nor semynarie nor of anie other order or degree whatsoever by any authoritye derived or pretended to be derived from the Pope or from the Church or See of Rome." Further he gave some interesting information about Mr. Smith; "he saith that hee knoweth one Smith that came lately from the Newfoundland who was a secular priest, but of what order he was he this examine knoweth not—. And he further saith that the said Smith that came from the Newfoundland was out of the new prison in London about two years since released by Monnsieur Bassompierre."\*

Two or three more instances may be summarised which will throw light on the way in which the common people regarded the Roman Catholics. In 1642 Robert Coop was heard to say that he "wished the papists would rise for hee would be the first that would helpe cutt their throates." James Warton was of opinion "that the book of common prayer was most

---

\* Francis Maréchal de Barsompierre, extraordinary ambassador, October, 1626—December 2nd, 1626. Cf. "Diplomatic Relations of England and France," by Firth and Lomas, p. 33.

parte of it Poperie and—he would maintaine it.” A certain John Wheat came to the magistrates with a story about some Roman Catholics whom he had met, in particular Mr. Breed and Mr. Musgrave. “In discourse upon the way between this Informant and the said Breed hee this Informant heard him say that hee had preached a hundred and a hundred tymes. And said that it was not a fitt thinge that every man should know what hee was. And further upon the way hee this Informant heard one Mr. Musgrave and the saide Breade (a greate p<sup>te</sup> of the way) discourse in lattine together. And rideing ov. Alseford downe the said Bread mett with a Papist and tould him that some papists in Yorke from whence this Bread came did desire to remember their loves to the said papists Master and Mistresse.”

(b) *Sabbatarianism*.—A notable feature about seventeenth century religious life was the growth of Sabbatarian sentiment. Whereas Sunday was previously regarded as a festival day of the church, the spirit of Puritanism tended to make it approximate to the old Jewish sabbath. James I. and Charles I. both attempted to arrest this tendency. In the year 1617 James I. issued a “book of sports,” inviting his subjects after service to indulge in out-door games. The outcry raised, however, was so great that he prudently withdrew his declaration. Charles I. in 1633 republished his father’s book, heedless of the angry protests of the Puritan section of Religious England. The book was publicly burned in 1643, and all games on the Lord’s day were strictly forbidden. In the year 1608 order was given to and accepted by the barbers of Southampton “that none of them shall hereafter tryme anie person or persons uppon the Sabothe daye unlesse it be such gentlemen stranger as shall at such dayes be in the Town or resort to the Town and desierous to be trymmed by them. And this they and ev<sup>ie</sup> of them are duelye to performe and keep without breakinge the same upon



## 152 Religious Life in the Seventeenth Century

paine of forfeiture of VIIs VIIIId the piece." In the year 1612 a barber named John Steptoe was complained of by other barbers of the town because "he hath and doth usually tryme p.sons upon the Sabbath day, and therefore he hath forfeited VIIs VIIIId—he hath now paid the said forfeite of VIIs VIIIId." The authorities were not hard hearted and gave him back  $\frac{3}{4}$  of his fine. Several other extracts will illustrate the growing Sabbatarian feeling. In 1609 it was resolved that the watch at Trinity fair should not be set on Trinity Sunday "in that it is the Saboath daye and therefore not to be prophaned." In the same year John Jourdain "for sufferinge XII p.sons inhabitants of this Towne to continew a drinckinge inordinatlye in his house upon Sondaye last in the afternoone at sermon time contrarie to the Statut is ordered to pay XXShillings and not to be pardoned." The next year a man named Thomas Northye was ordered to pay five shillings as a fine for permitting two men to remain in his house drinking on the Sabbath day. In the year 1613 three men, "Isaak Tudd, Ezeckieall Allies and Nichollas Harvye," were presented by the beadle "for there common drunckenes and espetially uppon the Sabboah dayes at Shovellbord in Widdow backley's house." For their misdemeanours they "were ordered to be committed to the stocks and weere presently comitted."

A man named George Linton was in 1633 committed to the Bargeate "for hedging on the Sabboth day." The beades of the ward of St. Michael's and St. John's, in the year 1638, reported Thomas Long, an Alehouse keeper, for permitting "greate disorder and revelling—on a Sabbath day at night to the dishonor of God and the disturbance of the neighbours." It was resolved "That the said Long shalbee from henceforth utterly suppressed and disabled from keeping an Alehouse within this Towne. And—there shal bee IIIIs IIIId a piece leavied on those persons that were drinking there at the time aforesaid." In the year 1641 it was ordered

that all the town gates except Bargate and the Water gates should be closed on Sundays. These instances illustrate the growth of a spirit in favour of strict Sunday observance which reached its culmination in the Commonwealth and Protectorate, and which has never really disappeared from our English life.

(c) *Lectures*.—Another striking feature of seventeenth century religious life was the increasing love of the people for preaching. Laud provoked extreme hostility by his efforts to crush the power of the pulpit, and to substitute an imposing ceremonial which might appeal to the senses, for the sermon which arrested the mind. In addition to the ordinary parochial clergymen there were a great many preachers or lecturers. These lecturers made preaching their especial business. They frequently remained in the vestry of the church until the service was completed, and then they would issue forth and mount the pulpit and preach sometimes very long sermons. They were a company of religious free lances, but very slightly attached to any religious organisation, and were generally Calvinistic in doctrine. These especially attracted the notice of Laud, who attempted, not with complete success, to put them down. Lectures were formerly delivered generally in Holyrood Church. The town lecturer from 1607-1615 was Mr. Thomas Hitchcock, who appears to have been a man of some note, and who evidently commanded the love and esteem of the people. A most interesting deposition has been preserved which illustrates the power of Mr. Hitchcock. "Forasmuch as we and the rest of the inhabitants of this towne by good experience doe find the great love and affeccion that our now lecturer Mr. Thomas Hitchcocke beareth unto this Towne, insomuch that his willingnes to contynewe and abide amongst us is such that he is verie ready and doth preffer to exchange anie lyvinge that shall befall unto him for any small thinge in this towne, although the same shall exceede by much the value of this, rather then to

depart from us. And more especially, wch is above all things to be regarded, havinge had nowe almost four yeres experience of his doctrine life and conversacon to be such and soe religious as he hath donn great good in this place by his extraordinarie zealous and laborious preaching whereby he hath bread great reformacon in many of the inhabitants of this place, as alsoe for his great paines taken in the vacancies of the two vicorages of St. Michael's and Holyroode, wee the sayd Aldermen and Assistants in consideracon of the promisse and in farther hope of the greate good and blessinge of God that is like to come uppon this place by his faithfull p<sup>r</sup>ceedinge in his mynistry and contynuall labor<sup>s</sup> in Gods service by him, so well begun and hitherto countynued, and doe by theis p<sup>r</sup>sents as much as in us lyeth constrane the said Mr. Thos. Hitchcock to be our lecturer soe longe as it shall be to his good likinge and he shall contynewe personally with this our towne, hoping and not doubting but that our verie good Lo Bishopp of Winton will give approbation thereunto."

In the year 1615 the vicar of Holyrood, James Rowlandson, the rector of St. Laurence and St. John's, William Pyne, and the vicar of St. Michael's, George Vernon, were appointed to deliver the Thursday lectures at Holyrood. They were "to have the contribucons equally betweene them. (They havinge agreed amongst themselves to yt purpose.) And two or three sufficient persons of everie parishe of this Towne shall be named and appoynted to reparaire to such as will contribute to the same lecture and sett down in writinge what everie of them will yerely contribute thereunto." The king's declaration of 1629 in which he enjoined silence upon the conflicting voices in the Church of England, and the orders given concerning lecturers, must have made some alteration in the character of these lectures. The Archdeacon of Winchester sent a paper to the Borough authorities giving very precise directions as to the arrangement of lectures. None were now to

take upon themselves the function of preaching who were not attached to some cure. The preacher must not now mount the pulpit unless he had previously read the church service in his surplice, and when he entered the pulpit he must be clothed in his preaching gown. Still these lectures were continued, and we find among the lecturers of 1647 Nathaniel Robinson, who was a Presbyterian intruder.

(d) *The Separatists and the Rise of Organised Non-conformity.*—The contrary forces which were struggling for mastery within the Church of England finally resulted in a schism. In the year 1662, organised Dissent was born. Separatist communities arose in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and multiplied their number considerably during the Stuart period. Still until the passing of the Clarendon Code there had been no such things as Nonconformity on a large scale. It is noteworthy that neither the Anglican nor the Presbyterian regarded the toleration of independent religious communities with anything but the liveliest aversion. To permit them to realize their religious life in their own way seemed to most men of that day to open the flood-gates to an absolute deluge of individualism fatal to the very existence of revealed religion. The exigencies of the political situation under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, together with the dominance of a mind—that of Oliver Cromwell—to which toleration was a congenial idea, swept away the barriers which Episcopalian and Presbyterian religionists had so zealously maintained. Cromwell established a Puritan state church, and extended his toleration to all those sects which maintained a religion consistent (to his way of thinking), with historic Christianity. Anglicanism which had identified itself with the Royalist cause was proscribed because it was politically dangerous, not because it was religiously heterodox. The Roman Catholic faith and the Socinian creed could not be recognised because to the Puritan they were utterly

subversive of the Christian religion. At the Restoration, when the Anglican came to his own again, the sects became the victims of bitter persecution; and it was only the attack of James II. upon Protestantism itself which induced the ecclesiastics of the Church of England to hold out the olive branch to the despised Nonconformists. When James II. was driven off the throne and William III. became king a Toleration Act granting freedom of worship to all orthodox Protestants was necessitated by the logic of events.

The authorities of Southampton were sometimes perplexed as to the treatment of Separatists. Two or three prominent inhabitants of the town were connected with the Nonconformists' cause; notably Nathaniel Robinson, Giles Say, Robert Thorner and Isaac Watts (father of the eminent divine and hymn-writer). In the assembly book an entry dated January 18th, 1646/7, runs as follows: "Ordered that Mr. Robinson bee sent for to the Audithouse and to bee advised to preach noe more excepte hee procure himselfe to bee legally ordained accordinge to the Ecclesiastical lawes of this Realme. But answere was returned that hee was gon out of the Towne." Two days later a special meeting was convened "to consider what course is fitt to bee taken with Mr. Robinson who is not an ordeyned minister and yett preacheth publiqely." The matter was held over until Major Murford had been consulted; but on the same day orders were given to the constables to warn several suspected inhabitants of the town "that from henceforth they doe not meete at any conventicles or unlawfull assemblies to heare the word of God preached or expounded by any person whatsoever that is not lawfully ordeyned." Nathaniel Robinson, although he did not receive episcopal ordination, became rector of the combined parishes of St. Laurence and St. John's about the year 1648, and later on about the year 1653 he was intruded into the living of All Saints. Upon the passing of the Act of Uni-

formity, 1662, he was ejected from his livings and became the minister of an Independent congregation, which developed into the Above Bar Congregational Church. A fellow in misfortune with him was Giles Say, vicar of St. Michael's, who was expelled from his living at the same time, and who ended his days as minister of a nonconformist community at Guestwick in Norfolk. Both these men during the period of persecution which marked the reigns of Charles II. and James II. preached as opportunity occurred in private houses, and suffered imprisonment for so doing. The year 1683, which marked the complete triumph of the king over his Whig opponents, seems to have brought a resurgence of the persecuting spirit. In that year Nathaniel Robinson was bound over in a sum of £40 to appear at the next sessions; and the beadles were ordered to "make presentm<sup>ts</sup> of all such persons within there severall wards that doe not repaire to their respective Parish Churches: and that those presentm<sup>ts</sup> be made every Tuesday." The order was repeated the following year. "Ordered that warr<sup>ts</sup> doe issue to ye Constables to require the Bidells to make present of all persons that refuse or neglect to come to Church." The Toleration Act was however not far distant. In July of the year 1687, "Nathaniel Robinson did this day come into Court and give notice pursuant to a late act of Parliament that the house he intends to preach in is the New built house above bar street in the pish of All Sts between the houses of John ffoy on the South part and the widow Palmer on the North." At the same time a certain Richard King named "the house where John Greenwood now dwelleth to be the house wherein he intends to preach." Richard King probably became minister of a Baptist Church, which it seems likely was the original of the congregation which now meets in East Street Baptist Chapel. The history of this Church prior to the year 1764 is unfortunately lost to view. Although Southampton, during the time when Dissenters

## 158 Religious Life in the Seventeenth Century

were subjected to a most bitter persecution, was in all probability a pretty safe refuge for the Separatists, yet Nonconformity did not flourish until many years after the Act of Toleration. The Above Bar Church seems to have been the only noteworthy Dissenting place of worship up to the year 1780. Concerning this chapel there are two or three features worthy of remark. It is noteworthy that in 1689 the Church consisted of a Minister (Rev. Nathaniel Robinson) two elders, four deacons and seventy-four members, of whom half were men and half women. Among the elders was Mr. Robert Thorner who died in the year 1690, leaving bequests for religious, educational and charitable objects. He had held the meeting-house where the congregation worshipped on lease, and at his death bequeathed the remainder of the lease to the officers of the Church together with a sum of £200. Among his other charities he left £500 to go to Harvard College in America and money to go to the establishment of an alms-house for poor widows in Southampton. One of the deacons was Isaac Watts, who had suffered imprisonment in God's House prison for his nonconformity, and who is chiefly noteworthy as the father of the famous hymn-writer. This latter was born in the year 1674. He was educated at the Grammar School of Southampton, and later on in life preached several times in Above Bar Church. A handsome monument in one of the town's parks celebrates his memory. It is worthy of remark that in the year 1680 the Quakers obtained possession of a piece of ground in the Avenue for a burial ground which is still in their possession.

The seventeenth century thus witnessed the only possible solution of the religious difficulty. Toleration, though granted after much struggle and grudgingly—for Unitarianism and Roman Catholicism were still proscribed—was the only course to which events irresistibly pointed. The full working out of the

principle of freedom in religion was only a matter of time. And to this consummation the labours and sufferings of men like Nathaniel Robinson and Giles Day contributed not a little.

There is one other feature of religious belief to which reference must be made in closing this chapter—a feature which was not peculiar to the seventeenth century, and which is less marked towards the close of that century—and that is the practically universal belief in witchcraft.

(e) *Witchcraft*.—The men of that day had as lively a belief in the powers of evil as they had in the powers of good. And their vivid realisation of the contact between the individual soul and the unseen spiritual forces surrounding it led them to inflict fearful punishments upon those whom they believed to be instruments not of the Divine but of the demoniac activity. Should any judge, influenced by humanitarian sentiment or common sense, refuse to sentence a so-called wizard or witch, grave doubts were entertained concerning his religious condition. It is fearful to think of the atrocities committed which were inspired by a belief that was regarded as bound up with the Christian religion. The responsibility for these atrocities cannot with justice be laid solely on any one section of religious England; “In its origin,” says G. M. Trevelyan in his book on “England under the Stuarts” (p. 33), “the witch-hunt was stirred up by no section; it arose out of a profound and universal belief.” Still, a special fanaticism with reference to witchcraft characterised the Calvinists, who, as Professor Gardiner has so well pointed out, regarded the law of God as a commandment forbidding what was wrong rather than as a living harmony of infinite varieties. James I., who neglected the higher aspects of the creed of his native-land, thoroughly believed in the activity of the spirits of evil. In the year 1603, a new law was made against witchcraft, and 70,000 people were put to death between the



dates of 1603 and 1680 for this impossible offence.\* The principal things forbidden were to remove or conjure an evil spirit, to consult, covenant with, or feed one; to take up the body of a dead person for use in magic, to hurt life or limb, to seek for treasure or lost or stolen goods, to procure love, or to injure cattle by means of charms. In the year 1632, a certain William Barchseale was cited before the magistrates of Southampton for using witchcraft to discover the whereabouts of some stolen cloth. He was heard to state "that any man going about to find out stolen goods doth yt with greate difficultie, with fastinge and praying three daies together, and greate paines taken therein. And when a spirrit is rayسد none hath power to see yt but children of eleven or twelve yeares of age or such as are true maides." The magistrates asked this man "what arte or meanes hee used to discover theis parties" (those who had stolen the cloth), and he replied that "hee used noe magicall arte or comunication but onlie a key and a bible." He was referred for trial to the next assizes.

A most interesting story connected with witchcraft was narrated before the justices in the year 1636 by a certain John Primmer, who had had the misfortune to be lodged in the Bargate prison. He said that a fellow prisoner named Robert Keyes began to talk to him, one day, in a rather uncanny manner about weird and ghostly sights which appeared in the prison at night time—sights which it seemed this Keyes could summon "Betweene the houres of XI and XII at midnight" (runs the deposition) "the said Keyes blew out his candle and spake certain words w<sup>ch</sup> this Exa<sup>ite</sup> understood not and that thereupon presently appeared five strange things in sundrye shapes, one like a bull, another in the forme of a white beare, and the other three like little puppy dogs without heads tumbling on the

---

\*Social England by H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann, Vol. IV., p. 120.

ground before him ; whereat this exa<sup>ite</sup> being affrighted began to rise up where hee lay and the said Keyes willed him not to be afraid, for they should doe him noe harme, and that all the time theis apparitions were in the prison (being about the space of a quarter of an hour) the said Keyes spake certaine words to them w<sup>ch</sup> this examine understood not, and that there was a greate light in the prison all that tyme. And that upon the suddaine they all vanished away, but how this exa<sup>ite</sup> knoweth not." The whole story is redolent of Phosphorus, and recalls a certain vivid scene in Charles Reade's novel the "Cloister and the Hearth."

Such depositions as these show how real to our forefathers was the belief in direct communication between men and spirits, and how easy it was for a bad man to utilise this credulity to further his own ends. Indeed, we reach here a consideration which has not always been taken into account. It is of course impossible to justify the infamous laws which were made against an impossible offence. Yet it is worthy of note that not a few of those who pretended to be in possession of supernatural powers did so for some unworthy object. These merited punishment, but of course not punishment of such terrible severity as was dealt out to them. The growth of humanitarian sentiment and the predominance of the scientific temper have made witch-hunting an absolute impossibility.

W. CAMFIELD, M.A.

### Ministerial Co-operation in Yorkshire, 1787.

The following interesting document has been communicated by Jas. Cocks, Esq., of Bredbury.

Rules to be observed by the Ministers engaged in preaching the monthly Lectures.

**W**E whose names are under-written, being Ministers of the Independent Churches in the West-Riding of this County, considering ourselves in Duty bound according to our Abilities, to promote the Interest of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Good of our Fellow Creatures in the Earth, with a View hereunto have agreed to the following Rules :

I. That there shall be a monthly Lecture for eight Months in each Year, to be held at our several Places of Residence by regular Rotation, except an Exchange of Places be mutually agreed upon by the Parties more immediately concerned.

II. That two Ministers in this Connexion shall preach at each Lecture: Subjects left to their own Discretion.

III. That the Ministers of this Association shall be called upon to preach at these Lectures, according to the Time elapsed since they were engaged on such Occasions.

IV. That if a Minister fall sick, or be otherwise unavoidably prevented from filling up his Place, it shall rest with him to appoint a Minister in this Connexion to officiate as his Substitute.

V. Such occasional Services done for an absent Brother shall not exempt the officiating Minister from being called upon in due Course to take his Part at these Meetings according to Appointment.

VI. That wherever the Church or Congregation shall of their own Goodwill choose to bear the expences of a Dinner for the Ministers, or any Part thereof, it shall be thankfully accepted, without any murmurings or hard Thinking against other Congregations.

VII. In order that the Expences of this Undertaking may fall upon the Ministers with as great Equality as possible, We mutually agree, that every Minister in this Association, being absent at such stated times, shall, for every such Instance, forfeit one Shilling towards the Expences, to be laid out as Circumstances shall require. These Forfeits to be advanced by the Minister upon the Premises where the Lecture is held, and by him collected afterwards as Opportunity shall serve. Forfeits the same as at other Times altho. the Expences be born by the People belonging to the Place.

VIII. That the Place where, and time when each Lecture shall be held, together with the Nomination of Ministers to preach, with all other matters relative to this Business shall always be settled at the last Meeting in the Year. N.B.—No Alterations to be made but by a Majority at that Meeting.

IX. As the Scriptures call upon Ministers to be Ensamples to the People, we mutually agree, that if any Member of this Association shall be guilty of such Immoralities as exclude Persons from Church Communion, or deny the fundamental Doctrines of the Scriptures, viz., The Fall of Man and all his Posterity by Sin—The Deity of Christ—Atonement by his Death—Justification by his Righteousness and eternal Life by him, shall first be admonished as a Brother; but, if no Reformation take place, and a Majority appear against him, he shall be excluded from this Society.

X. Be it further observed, we have no objection to hear the Cases of contending Parties between whom Differences may arise, but give up all Pretensions to any Power in us to decide upon other Churches Matters

## 164 Ministerial Co-operation in Yorkshire, 1787

of Dispute. We can only give what we wish always to be ready to receive, viz., Advice in disputable Cases.

XI. That Company promiscuously shall not be admitted into the Minister's Room until the Business belonging to the Association be concluded.

Lastly. That any Expences occurring to the Secretary for the Time being, either by Postage for Letters or otherwise relating to these Lectures, shall, at the End of every Year be reimbursed out of the Monies raised by Forfeits.

Signed by Order of the Meeting

T. KNIGHT, Halifax

T. GROVE, Rotherham

J. TOOTHILL, Hopton

J. DAWSON, Cleckheaton

S. WALKER, Northowram

W. MOORHOUSE, Huddersfield

Robt. GALLAND, Holmfirth

J. COCKIN, Kippin

(W.) TAPP, Pontefract

(T.) HOLGATE, Bradford

(J.) SOWDEN, Morley

(S.) BRUCE, Wakefield

(E.) PARSONS, Leeds

S. LOWELL, Bridgehouse

(J.) BREWER, Sheffield

(O.) BENNETT, Heckmondwike.

HALIFAX, 11 *April*, 87.

### NOTES.

REV. TITUS KNIGHT.—First Minister of Square Chapel, Halifax (1772-1791). Died 1792, aged 74. Author of "Dialogues on Important Subjects," etc.

REV. THOMAS GROVE—of Rotherham (1777-1793). "One of the Oxford Students expelled for praying, reading and expounding the Scriptures." At Wooburn (Berks), 1768-1777. Removed from Rotherham to Walsall. Died October 6th, 1817. (See Summer's "History of Berks to Congregational Churches," page 83.

## Ministerial Co-operation in Yorkshire, 1787 165

- REV. JONATHAN TOOTHILL.—Educated at Heckmondwike Academy. Minister at Hopton, 1766–1826. Died June 1st, 1826, aged 83 years.
- REV. JAMES DAWSON—of Heckmondwike Academy. Minister at Cleckheaton, 1769–1795.
- REV. SAMUEL WALKER—of Heckmondwike Academy. At Northwram, 1775–1792. Succeeded Rev. Joseph Scott as Tutor of Heckmondwike Academy. Died in 1796.
- REV. WILLIAM MOORHOUSE.—First Minister of the Congregational Church at Huddersfield (1772–1823). A leading spirit in the foundation of Rotherham College. Died 1823, aged 80.
- REV. ROBERT GALLAND.—Heckmondwike Academy. At Holmfirth from 1779 to 1800. Previously at Ilkerton. Died 1801, aged 62.
- REV. JOSEPH COCKIN.—Heckmondwike Academy. Ministered at Kipping Church, Bradford, from 1778 to 1791. Removed to Square Chapel, Halifax, in 1792, where he remained until his death in 1828.
- REV. WILLIAM TAPP.—Details of his life are meagre. He removed from Pontefract in 1791.
- REV. THOMAS HOLGATE.—Horton Lane Chapel, Bradford, 1784–1806. Previously at Marple Bridge, Derbyshire. Died 1806, aged 58 years.
- REV. JOSEPH SOWDEN.—Educated at Trevecca Academy. Minister at Rehoboth Chapel, Morley (from Truro) in 1782. Ebenezer Chapel, Booth, 1787–1794, whence he removed to Sowerby. Went to Warrington in 1800, and died at Bolton, 1822.
- REV. SAMUEL BRUCE.—Heckmondwike Academy. Removed from Grimsby to Zion Chapel, Wakefield (1782–1826). Died June 1st, 1833, aged 79 (see "Evangelical Magazine," August, 1833).
- REV. EDWARD PARSONS.—Trevecca. White Chapel and Salem Chapel, Leeds, 1785–*circa*. 1833.
- REV. SAMUEL LOWELL.—North-end Chapel, Brighouse, 1782–1789. Removed to Woodbridge, Suffolk, and afterwards to Bridge Street, Bristol.
- REV. JEHOIADA BREWER.—First Minister of Queen Street Chapel, Sheffield (1783–1795). Removed to Carr's Lane, Birmingham, 1795. See "Independency in Warwickshire," page 179.
- REV. OBADIAH BENNETT.—Upper Chapel, Heckmondwike, 1786–1792, when he resigned.

## Concerning Periwigs

(These curious verses may be taken as representing the decadence of New England Puritanism. The British Museum Press-Mark is 11623. a. 60).

### SIGNS OF APOSTASY LAMENTED.

Dost thou the Name of *Christian* Profess ?  
 Then let some Signs appear in *outward* Dress ;  
 Or else a sore Suspition thou dost leave,  
 That CHRIST indeed thy Soul did ne're receive ;  
 So as of Him alone to make thy Choice,  
 In saddest Sorrows in Him to Rejoyce.

ART thou one of CHRIST's Sheep, where is the Mark ?  
 Is that it on thy Head ? it's very Dark ;  
 It hardly will be own'd at the last Day,  
 But JESUS CHRIST unto all such will say,  
 Away be gone, begone away from me,  
 I am displeas'd *both* with thy Garb *and* Thee.

LET thy *Attire* be such in any case,  
 As may bear *outward* Signs of *inward* Grace ;  
 Then sure those Signs some carry on their Head,  
 So plainly show the inward Man is Dead.  
 LORD, pluck such Brands as these out of the Fire,  
 So we thy Rich Grace shall the more Admire,  
 And make us Blush, and be Asham'd that we  
 Should *Glory* in that, which our *Shame* should be.

THE Word of GOD calls things by the right name,  
 So do not we, lest we ourselves should blame :  
 Pride by the name of Decency we call,  
 Although to *Adam* it gave such a fall ;  
 Which hath benumm'd our Senses, so that we  
 Remain stark Blind, till GOD doth make us see :  
 The greater is the Danger we are in  
 By reason of that Toothsome Cursed Sin.

O what a shame to *Christians* should this be ;  
 That *Sorcerers* should so affected be,  
 As by *Paul's* Preaching from their Sins to turn,  
 And readily all their ill Books to burn ?  
 O that our *Top-knot* wearers would do so,  
 Their foolish *Baubles* readily forego ;  
 O what an Honour it would be to them  
 In sight of GOD, and of all sober men ?

WHEN *Periwigs* in thrones and *Pulpits* get,  
 And *Hairy Top-knots* in high seats are set ;  
 Then may we Pray, have Mercy, LORD, on us  
 That in *New England* it should now be thus,  
 Which in time past a Land of Pray'r hath been,  
 But now is Pray'r turn'd out of Doors by Sin :  
 For *Pride* and *Prayer* can't together dwell.  
 One leads to Heaven, the *other* leads to Hell.

Art thou a *Christian*, O then why dost wear  
 Upon thy Sacred Head, the filthy *Hair*  
 Of some vile Wretch, by foul Disease that fell,  
 Whose Soul perhaps is burning now in Hell ?  
 O therefore I do you most humbly pray,  
 Your monstrous *Perriwigs* cast quite away :  
 If JESUS CHRIST unto your Souls were sweet,  
 Those *Toys* on Head you'd trample under Feet,  
 And say to them with indignation  
 As *Ephraim* to his Idols, be you gone ;  
 We never will have more to do with you,  
 Lest GOD in's wrath out of his Land us Spue.

A TENDER Conscience a great Blessing is,  
 Sure willingly such will not do amiss ;  
 But carefully will watch against all Sin,  
 In *outward* Man as well as Heart within :  
 Abstaining all appearances of Evil,  
 Lest they therein resemble should the Devil.  
 Many there are that say they do believe,  
 But they therein do but themselves deceive ;  
 For Faith that's true will purifie the Heart,  
 And from the most beloved Sin will part.

WHAT Mercy is't, that GOD will chide and strike  
 His dearest Children ; if they will walk like  
 The foolish World, who Lust and Pride do mind,  
 Reward thereof they in the end will find  
 Bitter to be, if on they yet do go,



## Concerning Periwigs

Because Sin leads to final overthrow.  
 Then help us LORD to mend our way, that we  
 In Heart and Life may wholly turn to Thee ;  
 And cast away our *Foolish Fancies* all,  
 Lest GOD in wrath take *Head* and *Crown* and all.

I AM amazed much to think how we  
 Are backward gone from GOD, and cannot see  
 Who're allow themselves in *one* known Sin,  
 Satan hath got such safely in his Gin :  
 And if that their Repentance come too late,  
 All such will be shut out of Heaven's Gate ;  
 If you therefore this Gate would enter in,  
 You must be sure to fight against *all* Sin.  
 No *Perriwig*, or *Hairy Top-knot* spare,  
 Though they as dear as Eye or Right-hand are ;  
 Else thou canst not with *David* say, Lord I  
 Have kept myself from *mine* Iniquity !

### A *Caution* to prevent *Scandal*.

A FALSE Report against thy Brother, thou  
 Shalt not take up, much less thy self allow  
 Him to defame, in Thought, a Deed, or Tongue :  
 GOD is a just Revenger of such Wrong.  
 And will *again* them pay in their own Coin,  
 Who *thus* their Brother's Credit do purloin ;  
 And will on such his Righteous Sentence pass,  
 Which shall make them cry out, woe and Alas !  
 That ever I my Brother's Name should tear,  
 Whom I in Love upon my Heart should bear !  
 As CHRIST my Saviour hath commanded me,  
 Whereby thou mayst know He hath Loved thee.  
 If thou dost not Love Him whom thou dost see,  
 How can'st thou say in Heart thou Lovest Me ?  
 Which Love, O LORD, in me increase, that I,  
 Whilst I do Live, may longing be to Dye.

---

By a Friend, who though no lover of *Perriwigs* or *Top-knots*,  
 yet is a real lover *of*, and well-wisher *to*, and a hearty petitioner  
*for* the Eternal Salvation of your precious immortal Souls.

BENJAMIN BOSWORTH,  
*of New-England.*  
 In the 81st Year of my Age, 1693.