

# 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)

<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.

**T**HE Annual Meeting of the Society held in the Memorial Hall on May 9th was a very encouraging one. There was a good and representative attendance, and keen interest was shown in the Society's work. The paper printed within, read by one of the Society's youngest members, Mr. Geoffrey Nuttall, of Balliol College, Oxford, led to a brisk discussion. Mr. Nuttall, who has just taken his degree at Oxford, has our best wishes for his theological course at Mansfield. Dr. Grieve was re-elected President of the Society, the Rev. R. G. Martin, M.A., Secretary, and Mr. R. H. Muddiman, Treasurer. The only disquieting feature was the balance sheet, which is printed below. It showed that despite the fact that we are only printing two 48-page issues annually our balance in hand is gradually diminishing. Much matter awaits publication, and the *Transactions* ought to be enlarged rather than reduced, but unless an increased income is forthcoming there will be no option in a year or two's time but to limit our issues to one a year. The alternative, of course, is a large increase in membership, and once more we appeal to members to do a little propaganda to secure ordinary members (5s. a year), honorary members (one guinea a year), or life members (ten guineas). The Baptist Historical Society, we were ashamed to learn the other day, has a much larger membership than our own.

\* \* \* \*

The Autumnal Meeting of the Society will be held on Wednesday, September 27th, in Circus Street Church, Nottingham, when Prof. H. F. Sanders, B.A., D.D., will speak on "Early Puritanism in Nottingham." The Meeting will be open to the public as well as to members of the Society.

\* \* \* \*

For some time we have had on our desk a massive volume, *Leonard Bacon: A Statesman of the Church* (Yale and Oxford Presses, 30s.). It is described by the late Dr. B. W. Bacon as a family memorial. Projected immediately after its subject's death half a century ago, and started by the next generation, the biography was tackled in earnest by Leonard Bacon's grandson, Theodore Davenport Bacon. He, too, died before the final revision was made, and it was left to his brother, the New Testament scholar, the memory of whose loss is still with us, to act as editor. It is to be regretted that

such a large book, dealing with an important period in the Congregational life of the United States, should have no index, for it ought to be frequently used.

Leonard Bacon was born in 1802 and died in 1881. He came to be known as "the Pope of Congregationalism," and exercised a powerful ministry, not only in Center Church, New Haven, but throughout the denomination. He was a controversialist *par excellence*, and loved debate. In religious journalism, too, he was a prominent figure, being one of the founders of *The Independent*, and it is well that we should have this full account of his life and work. A chapter is devoted to the Beecher case, but much more valuable to-day is the account of Congregationalism's relationship with Presbyterianism during the period. It has its lessons for British Congregationalism at present. There is much, too, of course, about the Civil War and the Slavery question.

\* \* \* \*

An English Congregational family not unworthy to be compared with the New England Bacons is that of William Byles, of Bradford, and we are glad that one of its members, Mr. F. G. Byles, has written for private circulation a life of his father, who was a contemporary (1807-1891) of Leonard Bacon. Born in Henley, William Byles was apprenticed to printing, and in 1833 went to Bradford as manager of a new weekly paper, the *Bradford Observer*. His son describes how he made that paper into a prosperous daily, which counted a great deal for Liberalism in the West Riding, and how he gave to education, politics, and business life sons and daughters to work in his own spirit. He tells, too, of the central place religion had in his life, of all that he did for Horton Lane Chapel and for the Congregational Churches in general, becoming in 1877 the first lay Chairman of the Yorkshire Congregational Union, as his daughter became the first woman Chairman half a century later.

Familiar Bradford Congregational names crowd the pages—Milligan, Salt, Craven, Wade, Fairbairn. Byles lived through the heyday of West Riding Congregationalism, of Liberalism, and of the *Bradford Observer*, and we cannot read of the period without disquiet, almost consternation, when we contrast it with our own day.

*William Byles* is the record of a family of a type not uncommon in 19th-century Congregationalism, and one which reflected credit on the denomination. Would that there were more like it to-day!

## Was Cromwell an Iconoclast ?

### SYNOPSIS.

- I.—Consideration of Reformation iconoclasm : under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth ; due to royal injunctions, both general and particular ; and to Puritan bishops and deans. (This is relevant : for Cromwell blamed for much Reformation iconoclasm ; and Commonwealth iconoclasm must be seen against its historical context.)
- II.—Soldiers regularly iconoclastic, as in 1264 and 1685. Consideration of Royalist iconoclasm. Parliamentary iconoclasm neither due to Puritanism of soldiers nor attributable to generals.
- III.—Parliamentarian officers known to have restrained soldiers and protected buildings. Parliamentary iconoclasm exaggerated at Winchester and Exeter, and lacking at Oxford.
- IV.—A note on William Dowsing.
- V.—Brief defence of iconoclastic spirit, when proceeding from a religious motive. We differ from Reformation iconoclasts through holding principles of toleration first proclaimed in high circles by Cromwell.

**I**N the *Transactions* of last September I tried to exhibit some evidence of the moderation and tolerance which formed one of Oliver Cromwell's most striking characteristics.

In a vague and general way his toleration is now usually recognized by serious historians ; yet, where religion is concerned, he is still too often spoken and thought of as a bitter persecutor, a devotee of iconoclasm, and a hypocrite whose much-boasted freedom of conscience applied only to his own narrow sect. Even in the "Home University Library," as I pointed out, we have a book on *The Church of England* by the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, in which the author skims over the Protectorate without so much as once mentioning Cromwell's name, laying emphasis on "the tyranny of the Commonwealth," not least in its "cheap and obvious method . . . of retaliation" in the ejection of the clergy. The impression gained from this book of Canon Watson's is in part corrected by another volume in the same series, also by an Oxford historian, where we read that

A London Episcopalian could hear his service with impunity, Catholics were not persecuted, the Jews were allowed to trade and open a synagogue.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Keith Feiling, *England under the Tudors and Stuarts*, p. 177.

## Was Cromwell an Iconoclast ?

My object to-day, however, is to consider not so much the ejection of the clergy or the extent to which Anglican and Roman Catholic services were prohibited, but rather the charge of iconoclasm, a charge which is levelled against Cromwell perhaps more frequently than any other accusation. Wherever you go, it is the same. In the great cathedrals it is Cromwell who was responsible for the smashing of the medieval stained glass windows and for the demolishing of the images ; in a little village church away in the Welsh hills it is still Cromwell who broke down their precious rood-screen, though he kindly left a few fragments to inspire the sightseer with a keener regret for what is gone. There is endless confusion by unlettered vergers between Oliver and his ancestor, Thomas Cromwell, whose inroads generally go unmentioned ; yet Thomas Cromwell is often personally responsible, as the Vicegerent of Henry VIII., for the ruin of monastic churches, whether the ruin is complete, as at Winchcomb, or only partial, as at Malmesbury, where the nave alone still remains in regular use. It would, however, be absurd to credit Thomas Cromwell with every piece of Reformation iconoclasm—how much more absurd to saddle Oliver with whatever damage there was during the Commonwealth. That there was damage during the Commonwealth goes without saying ; my present purpose is to try to determine its relative extent and the degree in which the Independents, and Cromwell in particular, may be held responsible for it.

In order to do this and to see Parliamentary iconoclasm in its proper relations and proportions, it is necessary first to consider at some length the damage which was committed at the Reformation. I therefore ask your patience while I run over some examples of Reformation destruction—destruction for which Oliver Cromwell is too often ignorantly blamed. It may be divided, for purposes of convenience, into two sections ; the damage done in obedience to royal injunction : and the damage done by Puritan bishops and deans.

Apart from the general injunctions, which were issued by Henry in 1538, and by Edward and Elizabeth at the beginning of their reigns, the Sovereign sometimes sent special commands to a particular cathedral. Thus Chichester received the following message from Henry VIII. :

Ye shall see bothe the place where the same shryne standyth to be raysed and defaced even to the very ground, and all

other such images of the church as any notable superstition hath been used to be taken and conveyed away.<sup>1</sup>

At Lincoln in 1540 the authorities were commanded

to take downe as well y<sup>e</sup> said shryne and superstitious reliquyes as superfluouse Jueles ;

and in the next year when

Cranmer deplored the slight effect which had been wrought by the royal orders for the destruction of the bones and images of supposed saints . . . he forthwith received letters from the king, enjoining him to cause "due search to be made in his cathedral churches<sup>2</sup>, and if any shrine, covering of shrine, table, monument of miracles, or other pilgrimage, do there continue, to cause it to be taken away, so as there remain no memory of it."

For examples of the damage committed by Puritan ecclesiastical officials, we will pass over such recognized iconoclasts as Ridley and Hooper and turn our attention to some less well-known men. At Lincoln

Bishop Holbech . . . together with George Henage Dean of Lincoln pulled down and defaced most of the beautiful tombs in this Church ; and broke all the Figures of the Saints round about this Building, and pulled down those (of) our Saviour, the Virgin, and the Crucifix ; so that at the End of the Year 1548, there was scarcely a whole Figure or Tomb remaining.

Durham suffered in a similar way from a succession of Puritan deans. The first was Robert Horne, who was Dean from 1551 to 1553 and again from 1559 to 1561.

Without delay Horne began reforming his cathedral and its services on the strictest Puritan lines. With his own hands he removed St. Cuthbert's tomb in the cloisters, and tore down the "superstitious ornaments" in the cathedral and in St. Nicholas Church.<sup>3</sup>

So much for particular instances of both kinds of destruction under Henry and Edward. For the purpose of a more general survey, I quote a passage from an author who writes impartially alike of Anglican, Roman Catholic and Puritan in Tudor days :

Under Henry images had, as we have seen, suffered. Henry, however, made an effort to discriminate between them by

<sup>1</sup> All quotations not otherwise acknowledged are taken from *Bell's Cathedral Series*, the bias of which is not in favour of Puritanism.

<sup>2</sup> Note the plural.

<sup>3</sup> *D. N. B.*

ordering only "abused images" to be taken down. This differentiation was, at least in theory, continued by the Edwardine Visitors, with this important difference; under Henry it would appear that the final decision lay with the diocesan authorities, while under Edward this decision passed into local hands. As a result, a spirit of iconoclasm was let loose, much wider in its reach than the mere letter of the Visitors' Injunction demanded. A single complaint in a parish was sufficient to convince the visitors that an image was abused. Protest was useless, and an era of destruction began far in advance of anything Henrician in this connection. . . . On Feb. 11, 1548, an Order in Council abolished the distinction between abused and non-abused images, and ordered that all images should be destroyed. From that point onwards the work of destruction went on throughout the country. Cranmer cleared the Diocese of Canterbury of them in 1548. The Oxford Colleges witnessed a like outbreak of zeal in the spring of 1549, when even the niches of the statues were destroyed. Bishop Ridley swept the Diocese of London in 1550, and in the following year Bishop Bulkeley followed suit in Northern Wales. In the same year Bishop Hooper's zeal outran the law, as he ordered all the effigies on tombs to be destroyed in the Dioceses of Gloucester and Worcester, though "images upon tombs" were specially exempted from destruction by Act of Parliament. In dealing with pictures, mural paintings, and stained windows, no quarter was allowed from the beginning of the reign. From the year of the Royal Visitation a wholesale destruction in connection with these pious gifts was carried on. Nor was the destruction confined to churches alone. The Royal Visitors invaded the privacy of the people's homes, and the clergy were commanded to see that their parishioners destroyed all symbols and pictures in their houses. Indeed, Ridley went so far as to demand for punishment the names of those who "kept in their houses undefaced any monuments of superstition."<sup>1</sup>

If we turn to the early years of Elizabeth's reign we find a similar state of affairs. The Queen's personal inclinations became increasingly opposed to Puritan ideals, though at first the reaction to Romanism after the Marian persecutions was strong, and in 1559 a Royal Injunction was issued

That they shall take away utterly extinct and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables candlesticks, trindals and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments

---

<sup>1</sup> W. P. M. Kennedy, *Studies in Tudor History*, pp. 91 f.

of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glasses, windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses.<sup>1</sup>

Elizabeth also, like her father, sometimes sent special commands to particular cathedrals. Bristol, for instance, received the following notice in December, 1561 :

Whereas we are credibly informed that there are divers tabernacles for Images as well as in the fronture of the Roodloft . . . as also in the frontures back and ends of the wall wheare the com̄ table standeth . . . we have thought good to direct these our lr̄es unto you and to require you to cause the said tabernacles to be defaced, hewen down and afterwards to be made a playne wall. **Six months earlier the Queen had sent a command to Southwark "That the Rood Loft be taken down."**

We left Robert Horne as Puritan Dean of Durham. In 1561 he was promoted to the Bishopric of Winchester and there he continued his iconoclasm.

Horne's puritanical fanaticism led him in his visitations of his cathedral, as well as of the colleges subject to him, to order the destruction of every painted window, image, vestment, ornament or architectural structure, which he regarded as superstitious. . . . At New Colledge the whole of the rich tabernacle work covering the east end of the chapel was shattered to pieces, the wall being made flat, whitened, and inscribed with scripture texts. The cloisters and chapterhouse of his cathedral were pulled down to save the cost of repair and "to turn their leaden roofs into gold."<sup>2</sup>

After Horne left Durham for Winchester, the next Dean of Durham but one was William Whittingham, a New Testament scholar and a friend of John Knox. His zeal for the abolition of all superstition was as great as Horne's.

He caused some of the [stone and marble coffins of the priors] to be plucked up . . . and to be used as troughs for horses to drink in, or hogs to feed in. . . . He also defaced all such stones as had any pictures of brass, or other imagery work, or chalice wrought, engraven upon them. . . .

Two holy-water stones of fine marble . . . were taken away . . . and carried into his kitchen, and employ'd to profane uses by

<sup>1</sup> *ib.*, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> *D. N. B.*



his servants. . . . He also caused the image of St. Cuthbert . . . and also other ancient monuments to be defaced, and broken all to pieces.<sup>1</sup>

Norwich, again, lost its Lady Chapel and Chapter House at the hands of one of its prebendaries, George Gardiner, who also in 1570 was one of those who entered the choir of the cathedral and, among other outrages, broke down the organ.<sup>2</sup>

Writing of the period immediately following Elizabeth's accession, Prof. Kennedy says :

Almost immediately a spirit of iconoclasm was let loose, as the Royal Visitors ordered the churchwardens in every parish to destroy all shrines, images and stained glass windows as monuments of the gross superstition abolished by Act of Parliament. Nor was the sacredness of the houses of the people respected. Search was made in them for any images of the saints, and for holy pictures, and these were ruthlessly offered up to the new religion, any attempt to retain or conceal them being severely punished. . . .

We can well imagine how these royal orders turned the entire country into not only a camp of religious warfare, but also into a vast field of wanton destruction. Every shrine and picture, every tabernacle and altar, every image and relic of the saints was handed over to brutal sacrilege ; while above all sounded the voice of the new State Minister denouncing the ancient Faith of England and encouraging the work of demolition. Indeed, things reached such a pass that the Government was compelled to step in a few years later and attempt to save the chancels from complete destruction . . .

. . . we pass to the rood screen and loft which guarded the " holy of holies," with beautiful figures of the Crucified Redeemer and of Our Lady and St. John. The destruction of these works of art and piety began early in the reign. It must be remembered that the vast majority of them were erected by people then alive, as the " reforming zeal " under Edward VI. had dealt with them in the severest possible manner, and few, if any, had been allowed to remain. There was no definite order made for their destruction in 1559, but the Royal Visitors encouraged the work, and, in many cases, figures and lofts shared the fate of other " monuments of superstition." There is quite a strong catena of evidence which goes to show that the Elizabethan Visitors were not

<sup>1</sup> Anthony à Wood, *Athenæ Ozonienses*, 3rd edn., Vol. I., pp. 449 f.

<sup>2</sup> *D. N. B.*

behind their Edwardine predecessors. Roods and lofts were destroyed and sold in London, in Bedfordshire, in Exeter, for example, in 1559, and in not a few cases where sales took place there is a record that the wood of the rood was used for making bridges, for testers for beds, for ceilings, and for the Communion Table. It was one of the most usual sights in an Elizabethan parish from 1559 to 1563 to find the beautiful carvings at the entrance to the chancel being carted off to repair some waterway or the floor or roof of some secular building. On the other hand, it must be recorded that an effort was made in 1563 by the Government to preserve the chancel-screens, and in some cases this was successful.<sup>1</sup>

This long quotation gives us a more general view of the destruction which was carried on all over the country; it also makes it clear that the demand for iconoclasm was not simply from above but was often spontaneous and local. In Strype's words :

The people, in the beginning of the King's (Edward VI.'s) reign, were very forward in pulling down and defacing images, even without permission. This was done in Portsmouth; where divers crucifixes and saints were plucked down and destroyed. In one church here the image of St. John the Evangelist, standing in the chancel by the high altar, was taken away, and a table of alabaster broken, and in it an image of Christ crucified contemptuously used; one eye bored out and the side pierced.<sup>2</sup>

There is some interesting evidence which goes to show that, at Rochester at least, the monuments destroyed were left in their defaced condition after the outburst of Elizabethan iconoclasm; for in the British Museum (Mr. G. H. Palmer tells us) is a MS. entitled *A relation of a short survey of the Westerne Counties of England*, by a Norwich lieutenant. When this Norwich lieutenant comes to describe the monuments of Rochester Cathedral

he names some and alludes to "diverse others also of antiquity, so dismembered, defac'd and abused as I was forced to leave them to some better discovery than I was able to render of them; as also the venerable shrine of St. William."

The date of the pamphlet is 1635; so the damage cannot conceivably be due to Cromwellian iconoclasm.

It is now time—indeed more than time—to see how much

<sup>1</sup> W. P. M. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 167 f., 171 f.

<sup>2</sup> Strype, *Memorials* (1822 edn.), Vol. II., pt. I., p. 53.

destruction may, and how much may not, be fairly attributed to the Parliamentarians. Before doing so, however, it is just worth noticing that the strong feeling about images and the like which shows itself under the later Tudors and again during the Civil Wars did not die out in the intervening years, though it is not so much in evidence. In 1604, for instance, a law of Edward VI. declaring all images which had been the objects of superstitious usage to be illegal was revived, and is, for that matter, still in force. A few years later the Bishop of Gloucester refused to enter his Cathedral because the Dean, who happened to be Laud, had restored the Communion Table to its original eastern position ; while everyone knows the excitement Laud caused by setting up the image of the Virgin over the porch of St. Mary's at Oxford, one man giving evidence at Laud's trial that he had seen a man bow and pray to the image. At Salisbury Henry Shergold, recorder of the city and a justice of the peace, persuaded the parish of St. Edmund's to obtain legal permission to remove a window representing God the Father, "in form of a little old man in a blue and red coat, with a pouch by his side" ; the very sound reason for this iconoclasm being that "many simple people, at their going in and out of church, did reverence to this window, because, as they said, the Lord their God was there." Yet, despite the legal permission, Laud moved, at a meeting of the Star Chamber, "that he might be fined a thousand pounds, and removed from his recordership ; that he be committed close prisoner to the Fleet till he pay his fine, and then be bound to his good behaviour. To all of which the court agreed, except to the fine, which was mitigated to five hundred pounds."<sup>1</sup> This was in 1632.

It is, therefore, in a historical sequence of almost a hundred years that the Parliamentary iconoclasm should be considered, and not, as is so often the case, as if it were a strange insensate fury utterly divorced from its historical context. Anglicans would do well to remember that any fair criticism of Cromwellian iconoclasm applies also, *mutatis mutandis*, to Edwardian and to Elizabethan iconoclasm ; and that abundance of the damage for which Cromwell is blamed was committed thirty years and more before he was born.

A further injustice which is often indulged is to write of the Parliamentary soldiers' misdeeds as if they were all attri-

---

<sup>1</sup> Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, I. 450 ff.

butable to their generals or even personally to Cromwell. Bishop Hall is sometimes quoted as an eye-witness of the damaging of Norwich Cathedral, but those who quote him never see that his language demonstrates the absurdity of seriously attributing the damage to Cromwell or the other Parliamentary leaders.

A whole rabble of volunteers (he tells us) clambered over the walls . . . Lord, what work was here ! what clattering of glasses ! what beating down of walls ! what tearing up of monuments ! what pulling down of seats ! . . . what tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ-pipes !<sup>1</sup>

It is surely a commonplace that soldiers, whether starving or victorious, have never shown reverence for sacred buildings. A common popular accusation against the Parliamentarians is that they stabled their horses in the cathedrals. If they did, were they the first to do so, or the last ? In 1264, when Rochester Cathedral was invaded by the soldiers of Simon de Montfort,

The oratories, cloisters, chapter-house, infirmary and all the sacred buildings were turned into horses' stables, and everywhere filled with the dung of animals and the defilement of dead bodies.

In 1685, again, during Monmouth's rebellion,

The duke's followers came to Wells, turned the cathedral into a stable, tore the lead off the roof for bullets, pulled down several of the statues, broached a barrel of beer on the high altar, and would have destroyed the altar itself, had not Grey, one of their leaders, defended it with his sword.

We need not, however, take examples so far away from the Commonwealth period. It was the Parliamentarians who stormed Lichfield Cathedral and demolished the central spire ; but they did so only because the Royalists had made of the cathedral an enemy fort in the midst of a Parliamentary city : and to Puritan eyes there does not seem to be any essential difference between using a sacred building as a military fort and using it as a stable. The same thing happened at Hereford.

Hereford Cathedral (says a recent writer) had nearly as much to endure at the hands of the Royalist garrison as at those of the Parliamentary besiegers. The lead was stripped

---

<sup>1</sup> *Works* (1837 edn.), Vol. I., pp. liv., f.

from its roof for military purposes. . . . Finally, in December 1645, Hereford was taken for the last time and sacked. *Though some at least of the Parliamentary officers endeavoured to save the cathedral,*<sup>1</sup> the incoming troops committed widespread destruction.<sup>2</sup>

At Colchester, once more, the Royalists used the churchyard for the station of a cannon.<sup>3</sup> Further, at Scarborough the Royalists did exactly what the Parliamentarians did at Lichfield; for here it was the Parliamentarians who used the church as a fort, the Royalists who destroyed it.<sup>4</sup> The desecration and destruction was thus not all on one side. The occasion when there was least excuse for damage was at Carlisle, since it had been expressly provided in the terms of submission that no church should be defaced;<sup>5</sup> but fortunately the destruction here need not trouble us overmuch, as the general was Leslie and the soldiers Scottish Presbyterians!

If an instance is wanted where the Cromwellian soldiers behaved as one would expect of men with some conscience in them, we can find it at Worcester. For during the siege of 1646

. . . there is no record of riot or pillage; in fact, the diarist of the siege favourably compares the behaviour of the parliament men with that of the garrison, who says he, "rob and plunder without discipline or punishment; whereas the parliament soldiers behave quietly, receive their contribution, and are content: having among them good discipline."

In any case, as I have said, it is hardly fair to attribute the damage committed by victorious soldiers to their generals, more especially when the generals are found trying to prevent the destruction. That this was the case at Hereford we have just seen; Fairfax's protection of York is well known; so is Cromwell's letter "To the Reverend Mr. Hitch, at Ely":

Lest the Soldiers should in any tumultuary or disorderly way attempt the reformation of the Cathedral Church, I require

<sup>1</sup> My own italics.

<sup>2</sup> E. Foord, *Hereford and Tintern*, pp. 43 f.

<sup>3</sup> E. L. Cutts, *Colchester*, p. 180.

<sup>4</sup> See J. B. Baker, *History of Scarborough (sic)*, p. 152, for a brief addressed to Charles II. in 1660, pleading that their

two fair churches were by the violence of the canon beat down; that in one day there were threescore pieces of ordnance discharged ag<sup>st</sup> the steeple of the upper church there, called St. Mary's, and the choir thereof quite beaten down . . . the other church, called St. Thomas's Church, was by the violence of the ordnance quite ruined and battered down.

<sup>5</sup> Mandell Creighton, *Carlisle*, p. 158.

you to forbear altogether your Choir-service, so unedifying and offensive :—and this as you shall answer it, if any disorder should arise thereupon.<sup>1</sup>

Plain-spoken words in all conscience, but surely hardly the words of an iconoclast !

Less well known perhaps is the fact that a similar care was shown for Salisbury Cathedral, though the name of its protector remains unknown.

At the time of the Reformation it suffered but little, *except in the wholesale destruction of its painted glass.*<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pope in his *Life of Bishop Ward* says that even during the Civil War, when it was abandoned, workmen were engaged to keep it in repair. . . .

We find as evidence of the secret influence exerted in its behalf that when one of Waller's officers sent up to the Parliament certain plate and a pulpit cloth from Salisbury Cathedral, he was ordered to restore them, as it was considered that he had overstepped his commission ; all that was retained being certain copes, hangings and a picture of the Virgin.

An example of a parish church which received protection is Ewelme, in Oxfordshire, now famous for its remarkable series of medieval brasses. The preservation of these monuments is owing to the care of a Parliamentarian colonel, Anthony Martyn, who locked the doors of the church and so prevented the soldiers from breaking in. The roodloft is gone and the niches are bare of their statues, "but," as the verger for once admits, "those were destroyed at the Reformation." Another Parliamentarian officer who appears to have used his influence to prevent destruction was Nathaniel Fiennes, son of "Old Subtlety," Lord Saye and Sele ; he was an old Wykehamite and accordingly "interested himself so warmly in behalf of (Winchester) college as to protect it from all violence."<sup>3</sup>

It was probably partly due to Fiennes that Winchester Cathedral escaped without much harm. The vergers of to-day love to tell how Cromwell's soldiers blasphemously scattered the bones of the Saxon kings whose remains lie in the chests on top of the choir screens. They were not Cromwell's soldiers, in any case, but Sir William Waller's, and the bones seem to

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, Letter XIX.

<sup>2</sup> My own italics.

<sup>3</sup> J. Milner, *History of Winchester*, Vol. I., p. 415.

have been carefully collected, as the chests are where they always were ; but there is some doubt about the whole story. For Dean Kitchin quotes contemporary evidence that the Parliamentary soldiers ruined the chantries and broke in pieces Queen Mary's chair in which she sat at her marriage.

... as, however (the Dean continues), the chantries with their effigies remain unspoiled, and the chair is still in the Cathedral, we must make allowances for the heat of partisanship. . . .

The truth is (says the Dean) that Thomas Cromwell, over a century before, and Bishop Horne, under Queen Elizabeth, had already swept away all the statues and objects of worship, and that the Puritans (*i.e.*, the Parliamentarians) on the whole did remarkably little mischief.<sup>1</sup>

This should caution us against accepting with undue confidence even contemporary records of the damage committed by the Parliamentarians. The same false stories are told of Exeter. In Freeman's words :

... it is a mere legendary belief that ... some specially frightful desecration of Saint Peter's and other churches followed on the entrance of Fairfax ... the account in (the contemporary Royalist journal) *Mercurius Rusticus* which has given vogue to the common story is wholly untrue ... no general mutilation or desecration took place at this time.

[in 1657] ... the useless cloister was pulled down, and a serge-market built on its site. This is the only piece of sheer destruction recorded in these times, a small matter beside the sweeping away of all the monastic churches at the earlier time of havoc. At Exeter, as elsewhere, the sixteenth century was far more destructive than the seventeenth.<sup>2</sup>

I quote (may I repeat ?) from E. A. Freeman.

As a final example of the restraining and tolerant spirit by the Parliamentary leaders we may consider the University of Oxford. In the words of the official historian,

Nothing perhaps reveals more clearly the temper of the English Revolution, the instinctive moderation which prevailed in the end over violence and excess, than the history of the University of Oxford between the surrender to Fairfax and the return of Charles II.<sup>3</sup>

In particular, the Parliamentary visitation of the University

<sup>1</sup> G. W. Kitchin, *Winchester*, p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> E. A. Freeman, *Exeter*, pp. 206, 208.

<sup>3</sup> C. E. Mallet, *History of University of Oxford*, Vol. II., p. 370.

compares most favourably with the Edwardian visitation : under the latter

In many quarters there was a fresh outcry against idolatry. Painted windows were condemned and removed. The noble reredos at All Souls was demolished.<sup>1</sup>

Of the Parliamentary visitors, on the other hand, the historian remarks :

With the severity shown there mingled a good deal of magnanimity and patience, and a degree of tolerance which was remarkable considering the conquerors' reputation for rigidity of view.<sup>2</sup>

There is no mention of any iconoclasm such as had taken place under the Edwardian Visitors ; the object which was removed was the organ at Magdalen College, but this, so far from being destroyed, was taken to Hampton Court for Cromwell's private delight.<sup>3</sup>

Before concluding, it is only fair to say a word about William Dowsing, the noted iconoclast of East Anglia during the Civil Wars. Three points about him should be noticed. The first is that the warrant for his iconoclasm was given to him, in accordance with the Ordinance of 1643 for the destruction of images and other superstitious objects, not by Cromwell, but by the Earl of Manchester, whose "religious views, though sincere, were not very deep"—"he inclined to presbyterianism from circumstances rather than from conviction"<sup>4</sup>—and who quarrelled irreparably with Cromwell in the following year.<sup>5</sup>

Secondly, it is probably unfair to argue, as is sometimes done, that iconoclasm like Dowsing's was carried out all over the country ; one would expect the spirit of iconoclasm to be most powerful in East Anglia where Puritanism was most vehement, and it is significant that, apart from his own Deputies, Dowsing appears to be the only man we know to whom a warrant for iconoclasm was actually given.

Lastly, the extent of his destruction is often exaggerated.

<sup>1</sup> *ib.*, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.*, p. 383.

<sup>3</sup> It is now in Tewkesbury Abbey.

<sup>4</sup> *D. N. B.*

<sup>5</sup> It is stated in *Notes and Queries*, 3rd Ser., Vol. XII., p. 380, that "Dowsing was one of the very men who lost his occupation through Cromwell's usurpation—one of the creatures whom he afterwards described in such biting words in his speeches—and who therefore plotted against his life perpetually"; but I cannot find any evidence for this.



The best account of his work, together with a transcript of his *Journal*, is to be found in an article by the Rev. C. H. E. White in Vol. VI. of the *Proceedings* of the Suffolk Archæological Institute. Mr. White can scarcely write for indignation at Dowsing's vandalism, but even he admits that the church fabric seems always to have been respected, that fonts were hardly touched, and that out of the five hundred odd churches in Suffolk but little more than a third were visited by Dowsing at all. It also appears that the printed copies of Dowsing's work give him credit (or discredit) for far more iconoclasm than do the MSS. of his *Journal*; a correspondent of *Notes and Queries* called attention to the fact that, where the printed copies spoke of breaking down 30 superstitious pictures at Blyford and 28 at Dunwich, a MS. in his possession gave the numbers as 20 in each case, while, whereas at Cove the printed copies gave 42 as the number of pictures demolished, in the MS. the number was only 4.<sup>1</sup> In any case Dowsing gives himself away, so far as accuracy is concerned,<sup>2</sup> by his easy use of round numbers; "at Buers we brake down 600 superstitious pictures," "at Clare we brake down 1000 pictures superstitious, I brake down 200": how convenient that there were just 1000, and how strange that Dowsing counted them so conscientiously!

Looking back over what I have said, I draw three main conclusions. First, that it is unjust to attribute the iconoclastic spirit of Parliamentary armies to their Puritanism or to their generals, since all soldiers, including Royalist soldiers, tend inevitably to be iconoclastic; secondly, that Cromwell<sup>3</sup> and other Parliamentary leaders are known to have attempted on several occasions to restrain the soldiers' iconoclasm and to protect the buildings, and that their attempts are almost

<sup>1</sup> *Notes and Queries*, 3rd Ser., Vol. XII., p. 490.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. White speaks of Dowsing's "extreme accuracy"!

<sup>3</sup> The only evidence of personal iconoclasm by Cromwell which I have been able to find is in a 1686 *Hist. of the Cath. of Peterborough*, where we are told that Cromwell "espying a little crucifix in a window aloft, which none perhaps before had scarce observed, gets a ladder and breaks it down zealously (*sic*) with his own hand"; and this, in view of its standing alone, in view also of the untrustworthiness of seventeenth century records of iconoclasm, hardly evokes complete conviction. It is quoted in Storm Jameson, *Decline of Merry England*, p. 155. More characteristic of Cromwell is the story told at Bosbury, near Malvern, that, when the soldiers would have demolished the churchyard cross, Cromwell allowed it to remain, on condition that it was inscribed with the words, which may still be read: Honour not ye † but God for Christ. Cromwell was certainly in the district for the battle of Worcester; perhaps it is due to his personal influence that the windows of Malvern Priory Church were not touched.

always forgotten, while the damage, whether of the soldiers or of a man like Dowsing, is often grossly exaggerated; and thirdly, that not only is Cromwell unfairly blamed for much Reformation iconoclasm but that in any case where in the Civil Wars there was iconoclasm from a serious religious motive and not from mere military wildness, it should be considered in its historical context as expressing the extremist spirit which from the earliest days of the changes in religious faith and practice had desired "a reformation without tarrying for anie."

Into the reasons for this iconoclastic spirit, which inevitably accompanies a sincere religious revival, I must not go now; but I think we should agree that the basic reason was not the Puritan desire to return to the simplicity of New Testament religion, simply as New Testament religion, nor even a passionate hatred of Rome and all her ways, though no doubt both emotions played their part; the basic reason was rather a deep anxiety to preserve in all its purity the free and direct communion with God which, once experienced, must direct and control the whole of life henceforth. Pope and bishop and priest must go, for they are unnecessary hindrances to the soul's unfettered relationship with God; for precisely the same reason images and all other superstitious trappings must go too.

Listen to Cromwell's own words. First his deep personal religion:

What a nature hath my Father: *He is LOVE.*<sup>1</sup>

I dare not say, He hideth His face from me. He giveth me to see light in His light.<sup>2</sup>

. . . as well without the Written Word as with it . . . He doth speak to the hearts and consciences of men.<sup>3</sup>

Who ever tasted that graciousness of His, and could go less in desire,—less than pressing after full enjoyment?<sup>4</sup>

Second, his correspondingly deep impatience with all obstacles to the full enjoyment of communion:

These men that live upon their *mumpsimus* and *sumpsimus*, their Masses and Service-Books, their dead and carnal worship,—no marvel if they be strangers to God.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, Letter CLXXXVII.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.*, Letter II.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.*, Speech IV. (towards the end).

<sup>4</sup> *ib.*, Letter XLI.

<sup>5</sup> *ib.*, Speech IV. (towards the end).

Do we not share this impatience ? I think we do. As Dr. Selbie said recently, with that apparent self-righteousness of which Puritans have always been accused, "Ritual is for babes in the faith, not for grown men." We are still iconoclasts in spirit, if we are Puritans at all. The only difference between us and the Reformation Puritans in this matter is that we now have a larger tolerance and a conviction that we ought to "have a respect unto all, and be pitiful and tender towards all, though of different judgements."<sup>1</sup> Whose words are those ? Oliver Cromwell's. "... because some of us are enemies to rapine and other wickednesses," writes Oliver, "we are said to be 'factious', to 'seek to maintain our opinions in religion by force'—which we detest and abhor."<sup>2</sup> To-day we can say with honesty, what the Reformation iconoclasts could not, that "in things of the mind we look for no compulsion, but that of light and reason."<sup>3</sup> And those, once more, are Oliver Cromwell's words. "In things of the mind we look for no compulsion, but that of light and reason."

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

---

<sup>1</sup> *ib.*, Speech I.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.*, Letter XXIII.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.*, Letter XXXI. (towards the end).

## Some Early Scottish Independents.

**D**ISTINCTLY the most interesting early appearance of Independency in Scotland occurred at Aberdeen in the Cromwellian period. It involved several interesting and forceful personalities, and of these it is proposed to give some account. Before attempting this, however, it seems desirable to present a short reminder of the extent to which Independent influences from England had prepared the way for this movement, and then of the precise situation within Scottish Presbyterianism which immediately induced it.

In 1584 Robert Browne and a few friends settled for a time in Edinburgh, but the Presbytery dealt faithfully with them, and the populace regarded them with an extreme want of sympathy. John Penry, though for some years in Scotland, did nothing to further Independency. But Row reports private religious meetings in Edinburgh as early as 1620. Those who attended were jeered at as "candle-light congregations," "puritans, separatists, brounists." The matter became more public, and in 1624 some people were charged with keeping private conventicles, to which they applied the name *Congregations*. One was even said to have a Brownist minister in his house. The result was a proclamation by the Privy Council against "damnable sortis of Anabaptistis, Famileis of Love, Browneists . . . and mony such pestis."

By 1640 Sectarianism could be described as "beginning to bud in Scotlande," and Brownists who arrived from England met with some success, aided by Scottish Exiles from Ireland. Very strong cleavage of opinion resulted in the Church of Scotland; some (like David Calderwood, the historian, who had unpleasant memories of Brownists in Holland) were violently opposed to anything which endangered the Presbyterian doctrine of the Church and ministry, while others (even including such leaders as Dickson, Blair and Rutherford) were much impressed by the obvious sincerity and piety of these people. There had been an attempt to bring the matter before the Assembly of 1639, and in the following year an Act, carefully worded for the sake of unanimity, was passed against private religious meetings. The whole question, however, was

reopened in 1641, and a new law accepted, deprecating error and schism rather than forbidding the meetings. The practice did not cease, and at Aberdeen in 1642 an Irish immigrant started a repetition of what had been occurring in the South West. This disturbing "encrease of Brownisme in the North" was reported to the General Assembly and a similar complaint came in from the Presbytery of Hamilton.

The worrying feature of the movement was the holding of religious services without a duly ordained minister. But now we trace another kind of influence, and this time one which has left a permanent mark upon the Church of Scotland and its daughter Churches in the Colonies. The discussion of Brownist appearances led to the issue of official warnings against "novations," which in turn produced a reply from a band of ministers in stout defence of these. The innovations were certain modifications of the accustomed Scottish forms of worship, in particular, the departure from the use of the Lord's Prayer and the Doxology.

The former had been a regular feature of John Knox's service, and Brownist influences (which people did not always clearly distinguish from those of Puritanism) taught men to "scunner" at it, and were much resented. The singing of the *Gloria Patri* at the end of metrical psalms was also an old custom in Scotland, and David Calderwood fought against its discontinuance. Baillie reports some objectors to it in his parish, and shows little sympathy with them. But opposition continued, and by the time of the Westminster Directory it was found advisable for the sake of peace to omit any reference to the Doxology. The Lord's Prayer was retained, and John Neave's arguments against it were "heard with disdain," but in 1649 the Assembly was persuaded, and a later writer comments that

As the General Assembly laid aside the Lord's Prayer, so our Lord who composed and commanded the use of that prayer, laid aside the General Assembly.

When in 1661 the Lord's Prayer and Doxology were restored they very naturally came to be associated in the popular mind with the Episcopacy with which they returned. A newspaper in that year reported that a preacher had made use of the Doxology, a practice which "has been a great stranger to our Kirk these many years." The new Episcopalian Synod in Aberdeen in 1662 revived the use of the Lord's Prayer, and

recommendations were made about both practices in 1682 and 1688 which shows that they were scarcely universal. The *Doxology Approven* of Robert Edward, written in 1683, reveals widespread disquiet with regard to this innocent detail. Yet we must remember that between 1662 and 1690 there was little beyond the Lord's Prayer and the Doxology to distinguish the service in Scotland from the Presbyterian service of the preceding period. At the Revolution Settlement they were dropped simply for this reason, and for a couple of centuries were unheard of in Presbyterian public worship in Scotland.

Independent ideas in the sphere of Church Government had made an official entry into Scotland in 1641, when a letter from some ministers in England called forth a definitely hostile declaration from the General Assembly. The Assembly soon afterwards took measures to stop the circulation of books tending to Separatism, and in the succeeding period a good deal was written on this subject (*e.g.*, by the eminent preacher, James Durham), giving expression to strong Scottish feeling against anything in the nature of Schism.

The remarkable advance of Independency in England caused much anxiety to Scottish Church leaders. The Assembly of 1647 took steps to crush Independent tendencies, and pointed out that the constant intercourse with England created

Danger to have infection derived unto us from thence, to have the beginnings and seeds of heresie and schisme brought in amongst us, which may spread as a leprosie and fret as a gangrene.

And later James Guthrie of Stirling was to put in print as his First Consideration regarding dangers that threatened Scotland, "the swarm of pestilent errors and heresies" in England.

No one had been more impressed with the possibilities in this connexion than Robert Baillie, whose *Letters and Journals* are still the best guide to this period of Scottish history. Already in 1639 he had seen the hand of Brownism in the movement for popular election of ministers, and he began a treatise against Independency. As one of the representatives of the Church to the Westminster Assembly, he was quickly brought to realize how strong Independent opinion was coming to be in England and his letters ring with excited warnings. The toleration so dear to Independents he frequently condemns,

and the liberty of lay preaching was to him a specially obnoxious feature of their system. He was particularly worried by the way in which Scottish soldiers in England—"our silly, simple lads"—might become infected. His *Dissuasive* appeared in 1645, and his *Anabaptism the true fountain of Independency* in 1647.

An entirely new stage was reached when the "Sectarian army," as everybody called it, invaded Scotland in 1650. The ministers were much perturbed. Cromwell's chaplains and troopers preached in Edinburgh pulpits, ministers who favoured Independent or Anabaptist principles were planted in several vacant parishes, toleration was proclaimed to all who worshipped in any "Gospel way," small congregations gathered round zealous soldiers at Leith and Ayr and even "beyond Inverness," and the obdurate hostility of the Scottish Kirk led to the breaking up of the Assembly of 1653, the last Assembly to meet until 1690. Independents and Anabaptists had full opportunity to exercise their gifts, and undoubtedly they made an impression. Some popular excitement was roused by adult baptisms in the Water of Leith, by the rumour that a minister's wife had been "dippit" near Dundee, by the conversion to Baptist principles of more than one parish minister, and so on. The works of Independent writers found their way into Scotland, and learned churchmen thought it necessary to answer them. Thus James Wood, of St. Andrews, who had already come into conflict with an Independent chaplain at Cupar, printed an elaborate reply to Lockyer's *Little Stone*, and Professor Douglas, of Aberdeen, by his *Vindiciæ Academicarum* joined in the attempt to defend the University-trained minister, while Brodie of Brodie tried to confirm his old faith by reading Thomas Edwards *Against Toleration*.

It was inevitable that some should permanently and many temporarily fall under the influence of these live and earnest invaders. The net result seems to have been small but not negligible. At the close of the period it could be said that the Sectaries were

Very few, and inconsiderable in comparison to the body of the Church, scarce one in a thousand, yet is the infection such as ought not to be despised or neglected.

Meanwhile a serious split was developing in the Church of

Scotland. That there were two parties among the Presbyterians became increasingly evident after the Engagement with King Charles (Dec., 1647). The extreme Covenanters regarded this as a betrayal of the cause of Christ because it did not require Charles to accept and enforce the Covenant and permanently establish Presbyterianism in England. All who supported the Engagement came to be regarded as Malignants. This moderate party came to grief at the Battle of Preston (Aug., 1648). The more violent Covenanters rose to power, and passed the Act of Classes (Jan., 1649) excluding Engagers from positions of trust. After Dunbar (Sep., 1650) the moderate party was again in the ascendant and strong enough to have Charles II crowned (Jan., 1651) and to repeal the Act of Classes (May, 1651). The Commission of the Church was a party to this repeal, and when the General Assembly met in July the stricter party at once made trouble. John Menzeis proposed that

The members of the Commission of the Kirke could not be admitted to sit in the Assembly in regard their proceedings had been scandalouse,

and at a later sitting a formal protest was submitted by the minority declaring the Assembly illegally constituted. From this Protest they came to be named Protesters, while the more moderate party, from certain liberal resolutions in connexion with the repeal of the Act of Classes, were called Resolutioners. The Protesters seceded from the Assembly, and there was a very real rift in the whole Church. It was from among the strict Protesters that the Aberdeen Independents made their appearance, and their development in this direction was undoubtedly due to contact with the English army.

In May, 1652, an important letter was issued by Alexander Jaffray, John Row, John Menzeis, William Moor, and Andrew Birnie. Of the first three we shall speak more fully later. Moor is most probably the laird of Scotstoun, a city bailie, who had become Professor of Mathematics at Marischal College, and Principal of the College, a man of learning and of good position. Birnie was apparently a Regent (or junior teacher) in Marischal College. The letter emphasizes the conviction of the signatories that in the Church of Scotland the ordinances were being prostituted to a profane mixed multitude, and that "the Congregational way comes nearer to the pattern of the Word than our classical form," and that only



## Some Early Scottish Independents

those of a "blameless and gospel-like behaviour" should be constituent members of the Church. Soon afterwards a similar document was presented to the Synod of Aberdeen signed by John Row, John Seaton, and John Menzeis. The Synod found that it was contrary to the Word and to the mind of the Church, and the three friends formally

Separated themselves from the discipline and government of this Kirk to Independencie.

The leading Protesters, including Rutherford and Warriston, were so much worried about the schism that they travelled to Aberdeen for conference with the rebels. Baillie declared that at this time

Almost all in both Colleges from Remonstrators [Protesters] had avowedlie gone over to Independencie

and he goes on to speak of "the Apostates in the Colledge of Aberdeen." The October Synod appointed a special Committee to look into the matter. The Independents held a Communion service together in the Greyfriars Kirk, but thereafter abandoned the idea of forming a separate Church. The movement, however, by no means immediately collapsed, for in 1653 we find a report being prepared in Aberdeen regarding

Separatists, Anabaptists, Independents and others of that manner, the growth of which goes on apace within the bounds.

There was indeed no permanent result from the little revolt, and the leaders of it had all departed from their Independent opinions by the Restoration; but the incident is of genuine interest as special evidence of the reality of Independent influence at this period in Scotland, and particularly as showing how this influence affected one group of men of the highest standing, intellect, and character.

The leaders of the Aberdeen Independents are worthy of closer study. John Row came of a celebrated clerical family. His grandfather, a Doctor of Laws of Padua and agent of the Scottish clergy at Rome, accepted the Reformation and became one of Knox's coadjutors in establishing it in Scotland, and died as minister of Perth. He had a son John, who became minister of Carnock, zealously opposed the advance of Episcopacy in Scotland, and rejoiced in its overthrow, and is

remembered for the strong Presbyterian bias of his *History of the Kirk of Scotland*.

Though bald with age and prest with weight,  
 In crooked times, this man went straight,  
 His pen kept hid things in record,  
 For which the prelates him abhorred,  
 And here Carnock, his little quarter,  
 For Canterbury he would not barter.

It was his son John who became an Independent. He had been a schoolmaster at Perth, and had there quickly shown his principles and his determination to maintain them. When Presbyterianism was confirmed in Scotland he entered the ministry and was ordained to a charge in Aberdeen. His outstanding interest was Hebrew. He published a Hebrew Grammar and Dictionary, and at the request of the Town Council taught Hebrew at Marischal College. It is evident from accounts we have of him what an eager disputant he was in theological and biblical questions; and how laborious he was as a student is evident from manuscripts preserved, especially a little tractate in King's College Library, Aberdeen, entitled *Ane Overture*, an attempt to amend many readings of the Authorized Version of the Bible. An ardent Covenanter, he introduced the Lecture and other Covenanting practices and disciplines. Twice he had to flee the city when Montrose appeared before it, but he had his revenge in the pulpit afterwards, for Spalding tells us that one of the ministers

Cryit out aganes Montroiss and his army, calling them bloodie botcheris, traittouris, perfidious and of the hellish crew,

and adds that John Row was "as malicious."

In the counsels of the Church Row played a prominent part, and it was scarcely surprising that on the ejection of the generous-hearted but small-minded Dr. Guild, he was singled out by Cromwell's government for the Principalship of King's College. King's was a residential College at that time, and the Principal was largely concerned with the religious instruction of the students, who were mere boys and upon whom he exerted permanent influence. But Row had further a busy time raising money for the new block of College buildings, part of which remains and is known as the Cromwell Tower, and securing useful grants for the Universities of Aberdeen.

During his day the College regulations were also thoroughly revised, prescribing the daily routine and the daily fare, threatening punishment for such student crimes as conversing in English or answering for others at roll-call, and even forbidding the licking of dirty fingers at table and the throwing of bones at one another.

Scott's *Fasti* makes out that Row had at one period an Independent Church in Edinburgh, but this is obviously a misunderstanding; and Lamont says he was an Anabaptist and refused to baptize infants, but there is no evidence for this, and as Principal he had no call to baptize anyone. His interest, however, certainly turned to Congregationalism in 1652. A letter to his brother has been preserved and covers the whole ground of his difficulties regarding the Church of Scotland. "We think a member of a congregations of Christ ought to be a visible saint," he says, and he refers to the "impure mixture" at present and to his doubts about the rights of the Courts of the Church to overrule congregations.

After the failure to establish an Independent congregation at Aberdeen, Row seems gradually to have settled down under Presbyterian Church Government, but at the Restoration he made an undignified attempt to ingratiate himself with the new authorities by a poem in which he spoke with contempt of his benefactor Cromwell. He was nevertheless removed from his office, and had to turn to private teaching, dying at length in somewhat obscure poverty in the home of a daughter, the wife of a minister near Aberdeen.

John Seaton was minister of the Second Charge of St. Machar's, the Cathedral of Aberdeen, and parish Church of Old Aberdeen, the tiny city which King's College dominated. He took part in the effort to propagate Independent teaching in Aberdeen in 1652, but found little support in his own congregation. It appeared that he disapproved of Kirk Sessions, and his elders were emphatic in their desire to abide by the established customs of the Church of Scotland, complained to the Presbytery, and even sent a representative to Edinburgh to deal further in the matter. Seaton left the Session and its discipline work; and William Douglas, Professor of Divinity at King's College, was induced to act in his place. Early in 1653 the minister of the First Charge fell ill, but Seaton was still in disfavour; and when in March the minister died, Professor Douglas became Moderator,

The elders and deacons having supplicated him for this end, and also that everie Weddensday he should lecture, and baptize the children of the parish.

The Session records, communion vessels, copies of Acts of Assembly, and various documents, were handed over to Douglas for safe keeping.

It is evident that Seaton had not the personality to draw his people to his convictions. Eventually he modified his views, and in 1656 was accepted as minister of the still vacant First Charge; but differences of opinion soon cropped up again, and next year he moved to a charge at Felton Bridge in Northumberland. Soon after the Restoration he was "outed" from this Church, and returned to Aberdeen with his family.

A more important member of the group was Professor John Menzeis, a character of great interest and a real force in the ecclesiastical life of Aberdeen. Connected with an old and doggedly Roman Catholic family, he was himself most prominent as a zealous champion of Protestantism, and most of his writing and preaching as well as his University disputations and lectures were directed against Romanism. His public discussions with the Jesuit Dempster were famous, denunciation of opponents being still a favourite weapon of the eloquent in his time, and one which he could wield with the best. Dempster had called him "a cock in his own midden," so he retorted cheaply that

To exchange papers with you in your scurvie straine will be but as if when an asse kicks at a man he should kick at the asse again.

Dempster charged him with "continual railing in pulpit" against Romanism, and said his attacks were

A masse and heap of digressions, copied out of controversy books, of misapplied phrases, of grosse mistakeings and of injurious and railing words.

And elsewhere he added that Menzeis "lives in altercations, as a salamander in the fire," referred to his "fierceness in fighting with a scolding and a railing tongue," and attributed his reputation to

A pharisaical countenance, a puritanical tone and a strong voice, colouring some slight learning, and reading of pamphlets,

with plagiarary phrases and passages, to stuff up a book in print, and turn the glass twice in his sermons.

The fame of this controversy reached the author of the Scots Hudibras, for he writes :

Who reason in generals  
Th' argument contentious and brauls,  
They bring but bout-gates and golinzies,  
Like Dempster disputing with Meinzies ;  
Men hardly can scratch others' faces  
When they are distant twenty paces.

Another celebrated controversy in which Menzeis was specially involved was that against the Quakers, who had risen to prominence in the district under the leadership, first of Alexander Jaffray and later of the celebrated Apologist, Robert Barclay. Menzeis was declared by Quakers to have "furiously and maliciously" set himself against them, and they believed it was largely due to him that Bishop and Magistrates were led to exert themselves in persecution.

Menzeis was Professor of Divinity at Marischal College from 1649 till his death in 1684, with the exception of the year 1679-80. As a University teacher he was popular and successful, and we hear of him as

A very great, pious and most learned man, well seen in the Popish and Arminian controversy.

It was, however, as a preacher that he excelled, and he preached constantly—"a great preacher of the Gospel," very powerful and eloquent

Very fervent in his way of preaching, so that after his coming home, he was necessitate to change his shirt.

His strong personality, religious enthusiasm, acute mind, eloquent utterance, and sound business capacity gained him considerable influence and much respect in the city, and we find him in various positions of honour and trust, such as the Rectorship of King's College to which he was repeatedly elected "by unanimous vote." The good opinion he had earned is clear from the fact that when by 1679 he was finding the preaching obligations of his Chair a heavy strain, Bishop Scougall proposed him for the lighter Professorship at King's College, and the Synod of the Church unanimously approved

and he transferred to Old Aberdeen for a year. The Town Council, however, exerted itself in the most kindly way to bring him back to Marischal College on easier terms, showing what long experience had taught them to think of him.

Menzeis had been a staunch Covenanter, and very energetically took the side of the extremer section of these, the Protesters, but 1652 saw his further progress to Independency. Some have regarded him as the leader of the Aberdeen movement. He certainly was its chief speaker. In 1654 he spent some months in London, whither he had been summoned by Cromwell to consult upon Scottish affairs, and he was no doubt an Independent in his sympathies at this time, although a recorded conversation with Johnston of Warristoun suggests that he was wavering. Writing in 1658 Baillie stated that Menzeis was now weary of Independency and content to return to the Presbytery.

But the pendulum swung further with him as with many others, and he was content to preach the official sermon in Aberdeen on the occasion of the Restoration, not refraining from the expected flatteries of the King, though contriving to spend much of his time attacking Romanism. In 1661 his name appeared on a list of possible Bishops; but by the following year he was developing scruples once more, and it was only after a considerable resistance that he finally abandoned what the Synod called his "seditious carriage," and settled down to be a good Episcopalian. He thus retained his Chair; and, when in 1681 the Test was required of him, although again he hesitated and at first refused, yet presently he submitted.

His brother-in-law has left on record that at the last Menzeis

Was very penitent for complying with prelacy and even for turning Independent; his taking the Test was the thing that grieved him most.

It is difficult to know how much weight to give to this statement; but one is not surprised that contemporary judgment classed Menzeis as a temporizer. Enthusiasm, however, was his outstanding feature, whatever cause he advocated. Perhaps one might even apply rather the word used to describe John Knox, and sum up his characteristics in the word *Vehemency*.

In some respects the most interesting man of the Aberdeen group was the layman, Alexander Jaffray, who describes the

movement in his well-known *Diary*. Son of a landed proprietor near Aberdeen, he had a somewhat random education, but attained some culture, married young, travelled abroad and in England, and had much exciting adventure and several narrow escapes in the wild times which his home district experienced in 1643-5. He was a man of considerable force of character, genuine administrative ability, and some social gifts, and he rose to eminence in local government, became a Member of Parliament, served on numerous committees of State, and was one of the select commissioners sent to Holland in 1649 and 1650 to negotiate with Charles II. Jaffray was wounded at the Battle of Dunbar and remained for some months a prisoner in the hands of the Sectarian troops. During this time he had some intercourse with Cromwell and also saw something of John Owen and others who were capable of influencing an earnest and open-minded gentleman. Cromwell impressed Jaffray; but Cromwell must in turn have been impressed by his prisoner, for he afterwards made him one of the five Scottish members of his Union Parliament in 1653-54; and in 1657 he moved him to Edinburgh as Director of the Chancellery in Scotland.

Jaffray was a sincerely religious man, fond of religious reading, and an eager student of the Bible. He became troubled and uncomfortable about the trend of the Church in Scotland since the Covenants, increasingly doubtful of the lawfulness of forced uniformity, and of that doctrine of Presbyterian infallibility which he traced in the Covenants. What he saw and heard of Independency attracted him, and he was delighted when he discovered that there were men like Menzeis and Row and others at Aberdeen whose minds were moving in the same direction. Independents had made on the whole a good impression in Aberdeen, as we know from Gilbert Burnet. Now Jaffray discussed their doctrines and practices with everyone. He even journeyed to Edinburgh to confer with Church leaders, and although he found them cold to his enthusiasms he went home more than ever satisfied that he was following the guidance of the Holy Spirit in advocating and supporting Separation. He took his share in the attempt to form a congregation in Aberdeen. When the group drifted apart he seems to have turned more to personal religion than to ecclesiastical problems, again a little doubtful, but still interested and always seeking.

After the Restoration he lost his office and returned to

Aberdeen, soon beginning to be stirred by the Quaker movement and presently becoming the most prominent and enthusiastic of the Quakers of Aberdeenshire, and of course in complete hostility to his former ally, John Menzeis. He died in 1673, having suffered not a little for his opinions, and leaving a family which long continued the Quaker tradition in the North-East of Scotland.

Such were Row, Seaton, Menzeis, and Jaffray, the leaders of what proved a temporary, but was at the time a very significant movement. Presbyterianism and Congregationalism do not seem readily to settle down side by side. Perhaps they are not sufficiently incompatible. In Scotland the established Church was scarcely so utterly far away as the established Church in England seemed to be, and no doubt many people felt it possible to continue within its fold who were not very happy there, but who could not at all have endured the Church of England. In any case Independency did not spread in Scotland as it had done in England, but during this period of the 17th century it won the allegiance of a small band of earnest, capable, intellectual men in and about Aberdeen, and doubtless to a lesser degree affected the outlook of many others. It did not outwardly survive the Restoration period—it must not be forgotten how very Presbyterian was Episcopacy in Scotland—and the Haldanes had practically to begin Independency all over again. In the 17th century, nevertheless, Independency did travel north, and did quite definitely, though perhaps more indirectly than directly, leave its mark upon the religious life of the people of Scotland.

G. D. HENDERSON.



## South Cave Congregational Church.

**I**N *Transactions* XI. 182, the following note appears in the interesting story of South Cave Congregational Church :

The Rev. Mr. Whitridge (who preached here various times, according to Mr. Tapp's Diary) appears to have supplied South Cave for a time after Mr. Tapp's decease, but up to the present no details have come to light.

The following facts may be interesting to your readers. The settlement and ordination of the Rev. John Whitridge took place at Carlisle in July, 1814, when the membership of the Church in the Border City was fifty. In June, 1816, the Chapel was enlarged and handed over by Trustees of Lady Glenorchy to the Church. On 17th June, 1819, the Rev. John Whitridge resigned his pastorate at Carlisle. In February, 1820, Carlisle Church invited Mr. Thomas Woodrow, of Glasgow Academy, to the pastorate. He was minister of the Carlisle Church till 1835, when he emigrated to America. Mr. Woodrow was the grandfather of President Woodrow Wilson.

In the interest of readers of the article on South Cave Church, it may be pointed out that after 17th June, 1819, Mr. Whitridge was free to seek another charge and as Mr. Tapp and he were friendly he may have been living in the vicinity of South Cave when Mr. Tapp died on 20th Nov., 1819.

In the same article on p. 181 read *Forton* for *Foston*.

WILLIAM ROBINSON.

## The Dutch Church in Norwich<sup>1</sup>

Folio Page

[Continued from page 48.]

Their handes hereunto sett to the one, and the archebissshopes hande to the other, the one remayninge with hym and the other withe them: the seyde Isebrandus and Theophilus called ageyne, had sentence agaynste eyther of them pronownced, that neyther of them shulde mynyster anye more within the diosses and other thinges in manner as after appearethe by his decree followenge.

1571.

The decree of the byshopp of Canturburye withe the reste of the Comyssoners the xvi of Septembre.

87 Whearas ther hathe bene certayne dysorders and dissencions raysed up and maynteyned, betwixte the ministers them || selves, and also by that occasion the rather, betwixte the people of the Duche church in Norwiche, And hathe further more appeared certeyne contemptes and disobedi-  
ence amonges them, aswel towarde the reverende fater, the Bysshoppe of that diocesse, as also agaynste the quyete governemente of the worshippingfull companye of the Maior and Citezins, to the greate disquiete and hurte of the publike peace amonges themselves. Wherupon, we here underwretton, Comyssoners to the Quenis Majestie in cawses ecclesiasticall: desyrous that all parsons above seyde, shulde demeane themselves to the pleasure of God, and tractablye, under the quyete governemente of the prince in her lawes, for showinge some thankefullnes to her highnes, for suche benefytes as the partyes aforesayd have receyved of her princelye favore and mercye, and to the extirpation of all grwdge and disorder that maye hereafter ensewe. We the seide commissioners

<sup>1</sup> Collation with the original calls for the following corrections in the instalment previously published. [S.S.S.]

p. 34, l. 6. *Add* [is] between 'who' and 'meete' to make meaning clear.

p. 36, l. 4. *For xxxiiii<sup>th</sup> read xxiiii<sup>th</sup>.*

p. 36, l. 26. *For it read is.*

p. 40. Opposite the second Itm *add* 42.

p. 41, l. 32. *For parties read partes.*

p. 42, l. 27. *For trayre read trarye.*

p. 44, l. 38. *For asewl read aswel.*

p. 45. Opposite l. 15 *add* 44d.

p. 46, l. 32. *Delete* final 'e' in Archebissshoppee.

have ordered and decreed to stablishe emonges them, these orders followenge : Over and above all suche rewles and decrees as shall hereafter be taken by the seyde Comissioners, for the whole and intire rwle and governemente of all forreine straungers cominge into the realme for defence and savegarde of . . . iences, to the trewe worde of God, as is pretendid.

Ed. London. Robt. Winton. John Hamounde.

46d

Fyrste we decree, that the reverende fater, the Bysshopp of the diocesse for the tyme beinge, have to hymselfe his ecclesiasticall iurisdiction, whole and intyre, as the lawes of the realme have provided.

That neither the Maior and the Citezins, shall intermedle themselves, in cawses meere ecclesiasticall. And that the ministers and people of the seide congregation, be also obedient and submytte themselves in their spirituall governemente to his order and direccion (from tyme to tyme) exceptinge to themselves, their accustomed manner of governemente amonge themselves, hitherto graciouslye borne and suffred by || the Quenis Highenes, and her honorable cowncell.

88

And also reservinge to the Maior and comonaltye of the Citye for the tyme beinge, their governemente in all civile and politique cawses, accordinge to the lawes and statutes of the realme, whiche we meane not to preiudice, by anye thyng before decreed or otherwise to be decreed, nott doubghtinge but that they wyll aswel mayntayne all suche straungers as intende to use the Quenis favoure toward them obedientlye and thankfullye, as also correcte and punishe the offenders of the Quenis peace, or otherwise transegresse the lawes and statutes of the realme.

And further we ordre and decree, that for the better maynteyninge of peace and quyete hereafter : Neyther Isebrandus Balkins, neyther Theophilus Rickwaert, nor Anthonius Alyvet, (late ministers) shall hereafter remaine in anye ecclesiasticall ministerie, or anie seniorite, within the Citye of Norwiche, nor in the cownty of the same. Nor yet anie of them to be taken elected or admitted to minister enie manner publique funcion within the Citye and suburbes of London. Whiche ower decree, risinge of greater cawses then here brieflye can be shewed : We wyll to be inviolablye observed, under the payne of enpresonmente withowte redemption of anye partye, offendinge to the contrarie.

And furthermore, whear ther hathe bene information

Folio Page

made to us the seyde Comysionars, that partelye the Maior and certayne aldermen of that Citty, have taken upon them, to use and chalenge to themselves, all suche spirituall iurisdiction as belongethe not unto them : And that therupon they have enpresoned certayne of the seide mynisters, contrarye to lawe and equitie. We the seyde Comissioners, upon dewe prouffe and examination of the same, have fownde the seyde information utrewe : And do also by theese presentes testifye, of the orderlye protestacion made, by Robert Sucklinge, Thomas 89 Beamonde, || and Symon Bowde Aldermen, and in the name of the Maior and Comonaltye ther, sente up by hym for that purpose, as by their handes subscriptions maye appeare, viz—:

47 They do proteste that they meane not at anye tyme . . . con . . . to the lawes of the realme, and contrarye to the l . . . . . the Citty, to intermeddle with . . . . . spiritwall in . . . . . meerlye partayninge to the offycer ecclesiasticall in the orderinge of the seyde straungers. And further they proteste, that neyther they, nor anye other to their knowedge, have mente to abuse the seyde straungers (as have bene complayned) by anye private order or booke, to preiudice the libertie of the seyde straungers, either by engrossinge into their owne handes, their bayes wrowght by them, to their private use, or yett to engrosse up the wolle used of the seide straungers to be onelye bowght at the handes of anye of the seyde aldermen or comoners of the same (otherwise then the lawes of the realme do parmytte) or as they maye do by the graunte of the Quenis Majestie.

Itm they do proteste, that they take yt not for anye greife or displeasure, that the seyde ministers shulde be as afore ordered, taken from their seyde Citty: Or that they be offended to have the seyde straungers to be well and quietelye governed, aswell in their manner of lyvinge ecclesiasticallye, as in the manner of their lyvinge Civillie amongst them. And do also proteste, that the seyde straungers accordinge to the Quenis Majestie's charter and Letters of tolleracion from her Majestie's privie counsell in that behalfe graunted, maye lyve franckelye and freelye amongst them yf they wyll (so that they breake not nor dissolve the quyete governemente in their seyde Citty) as before their comynge hath bene used, accordinge to the lawes and liberties graunted afore tyme. Itm we do order and decree, that one Johannus Pawlus sometyme of the Congregation of Sandewiche, do immedi-

Folio Page  
90

atelye || departe the Citye of Norwiche, accordinge to the decree made the xxii<sup>th</sup> of the monethe of Decembre 1570 and whatsoever he be that shall contynue, kepe secrete or maintayne the seide Paule contrarie to the order aforeseide, that he and theye, do not onelye forfeit twentye pounce the pece, but also be enpresoned accordinge to the discretion of the Maior of the Citye.

Itm wher we made restreincte by ower Letters sente from us to the Duche congregation, for not proceedinge to anye eleccion of newe ministers, of their segnors and eight men, untill we shulde consider of the whole matter, Nowe we decree the seyde restraincte to be voide, and that they maye procede to the eleccion of (oneli) twoo ministers, To the eleccion of their segnors, and of their eight men. Provided allwayes, that the names of the parties so elected, be declared to the reverende father the Bysshoppe of Norwiche : And the seide eleccion by hym to be confirmed or repealed, accordinge to his discretion. And that the persons elected, do contynue in suche sorte as was used in the dayes of Kynge Edwarde, by the prescription of Master Alasco, and was practized at the fyrste.

47d

Itm we do decree, and charge all theis followenge, and othersuche in that congregation : Viz. Romaine de Beere. John Cuttman. Peter Obrye. Francis Trian. Wylliam Stenae, Petz de Camere, Charles Harman, beinge translated of their owne authorite from one churche to another : To indevoure themselves (principallye) to go abowght ther private affaires quietelye, and not to entermeddle (beinge exiled from the ghospell as they pretende) to trouble the peace and concorde of the reste of the godlye congregation hereafter. Or ellis to avoyde that churche : leaste through 91 their demerites, others that wolde lyve quyetye and godlye, be hyndered by their attemptes and doenges.

Matthu Cantuar'. Ed' London. Robt. Winton. John Hamont.

This decree under the comissioners greate seale was directed by the bysshopp and the Maior, and after the bishop had viewed yt, sent yt to his chauncellor, that he and Master Maior shulde deale therin, which the chauncellor dyd ; Wher upon grewe a newe contention : for the byshoppe (somewhat favouringe the parte of Theophilus, prycked for ther concistori of the disordered sorte : and for the politique elders, Master Maior ordeyned viii Duche and iii or Wallownes to be of the most honesteste parsons : and for the brydelynge of the reste, dyd sweare them to se observed the articles hereafter ensewinge. viz—:

Folio Page

1. Fyrste that you as oversears of your circuites, shall se (accordinge to the Quenis highnes letters pattentes) That yf anye of the thyrtye masters lycensed under M<sup>r</sup>. Maior's seale of offyce, do dye or departe the Citye, that you, or the more parte of you geve names of the moste best men of occupation and good conversacon (not beinge denizens) to be placed in their romuthes.
2. It<sup>m</sup> that eche one nowe havinge suche lettres, and be of the disordered behaviours, or excepted in the former decrees, that ye presente them to be denownced, and to nominate for ther places suche as ye wyll undertake to be of lyke honesty aforesyde.
3. It<sup>m</sup> that none be permitted here to enhabite, not havinge escriptes from the Maior accordinge to the thred article. And that suche b . . . of your churche, and all in the Citye not to passe the nombre of ii<sup>m</sup> viii<sup>c</sup> xxvi parsons, men, women & chyl dren, accordinge to the letters of the xxi daye of November 1569.
- 48 4. It<sup>m</sup> that ye presente all unbrideled parsons, that wyll  
92 not spare || the openinge ther mouthes to speake agaynst orders made for them, by the lawes of this realme, or agaynste suche decrees as ar made for them or agaynste them, eyther by the metropolitan and comyssioners, the byshop or ordinari, the Maior & aldermen, Shreves and Comonaltye, or agaynst anye offycer appointed, that accordinge to their desartes, they maye sustayne condingne ponyshement.
5. It<sup>m</sup> that ye presente suche as be sectuaries or do maynteyne anye scismes, contentions, quarellinges or suche lyke, to the offence and greife of their bretherne.
6. It<sup>m</sup> that ye presente suche as make anie conventicles or gatheringes of people for anye other cause, then tendethe to suche orders as ar to you prescribed: Or ells that suche gatheringes and concours tende not to the breache of the Quenis Highnes peace.
7. It<sup>m</sup> that ye presente suche as of themselves presume to make lawes and ordenaunces for Civil cawses, and put them in execution befor they be ratefyed by the order of Master Maior or of the Comon Assemblye.
8. It<sup>m</sup> that ye presente suche, as do exacte upon their bretherne anye sommes of money for their private cawses, other then the lawes of the realme wyll beare.
9. It<sup>m</sup> that ye presente suche, as refuse to be rewled by you, in all good order: whiche yf they refuse, ye shall call the ayde of the Counstable of that Warde them to

enprison withe their ayders and abbettors, dwringe Master Maiors pleasure.

10. Itm̄ ye shall (as arbitrators of petye cawses) make ende emonges your bretherne, as before tyme hath bene accustomed. ||

93 11. Itm̄ ye shall do all other comaundementes from Master Maior and the aldermen of wardes, and all other thinges to you appartayninge.

Note that there is an article lefte owte, which is wretton in folio. And bycause the governours urged that the seaventhe article shulde seme to breake their ordenaunces of the draperye, and that the fourtene parsons prayed a proviso therin, yt was set downe in these wordes.

Provided allwayes that we the Maior and aldermen do not lett that those of the draperye maye mete to make orders for their occupation as is conveniente, so yt be done in the presentes of the eight and fower and the reste appointed, and withe their agreemente ratified with the reste, and beinge presented to Master Maior and his bretherne to that ende.

Theis articles by the tenne persons by Mr. Maior appointed well viewed they presented verye manye disordered persons to thende that none of them might be in the eleccion nowe to be done. Yet by the labor of Theophilus and his complyces, the byshop was made their frende, so that they were chosen of the most contention and might not be removed of the bysshop tyll order cam from the hie comissioners in manner hereafter ensewinge, viz— :

To the right worshipful Master Maior of the Citty of Norwiche, and to the Aldermen of the same.

94 Wheare we understaunde, by credible reporte of the unrestfull dissention betwixte the straungers themselves, the conspirators of whiche dissention regardinge nothinge the goodnes of God in this their exile, nor the Quenis Maiesties greate favoure towards them and her lovinge subiectes good intertaynemente : Neyther consideringe the shame and sclander they worke to Chryste, his ghospell and religion, and to the perpetuall blotte of their nation, so insolente in a straunge cuntrye. Whiche in sences pretendinge a defence of their consciens and mainteyn-  
 aunce of trewe religion. And under the cloake || therof, be rathar as Jwdas and Barrabas amonges a christian societie. Wherupon we have thought good to advertise your Lordshipp to stande earnestelye to the reformation

Folio Page

of them. And seinge that diverse of them, supposinge that the maiestrates of this nation, havinge nothings elles a doo but to sarve their turnes. We require your Lordeshipp as we do also Master Maior and his bretherne, to governe them in lesse libertye then they have hetherto used (or rather abbused.) And therupon we wyll you the bysshopp to accepte syxe of these men fyrst chosen seniors, viz—:

Mr. Mathue Richens	John de Spigell	John de Rode
Nicasius de Wilde	Cornelis de Heill	Maximilian van Dan.

And your Lordeshipp or your chauncelor, with the counsell of this aforeseyde syxe of that nombre that had the moste voyces nexte unto the fyrst xii men

Cornelis Willen	Joose de Ram	Jaques van Borwen
Hubrect vander Heiden	Lambrechte Halfe	Phillippus Andrias biers
Adrian de Porter	Barnard van Diinsye	

Robert Jansy	Peter Haegman	Jacob de Volder.
--------------	---------------	------------------

And yf this can not be done by your discretion to some quyete contentation, beinge chosen but for one yere to come. Then we require you the bysshopp and your offycers in all cawses ecclesiasticall to proced accordinge to your ecclesiasticall iurisdiction, not regardinge their particuler eleccions or disciplins, befor, so shamefullye abbused. And appointe you their preachers and ministers accordinglye. And whearas ther is muche standinge in the validite of their eleccions (exe . . . they deserve better by their more quiete behaviour . . . shalbe lesse regarded. Moreover whear S. . . thought but to revenge their yll willers (as they take them) and so to abuse their romethes privatlye in fullfyllinge their owne partiall stomakes. We requyre you the bysshopp and the Maior of the Citye to bridle in suche unrueleye sprites: And yf ther be anye contentious heades lurkinge in those || congregations, to fire them to this unnaturall and barbarows dissention. We require you and chardge you in the Quenis Maiesties name, to roote them owte. And yf anye suche be, whome ye can not rwle, we will be meanis to the uttermost of ower power to have them considered. And thus expectinge your answers, we comytte you to God as ower selves. From Lambheth this therd of Novembre 1571.

49

95

Matthue Cantuar' Ed. London.	Thomas Lincha'.
Thomas Wattes	Thomas Galle. Jo. Hamounde.



Folio Page

Upon this lettre, The Bysshopp appointed his chauncelor in his place to sett. Who together with Master Maior and Master Aldriche, the Satherdaye the xvii<sup>th</sup>. of Novembre 1571 at the Guylde Haule dyd assemble, callynge befor them the vi parsons before apponted, who by anye meanis wolde have Joose de Ram to be one. And bycause he was a denizen, he was reiected. The reste havinge obieccions ageynste them, ther certified by seaven of the tenne men. Yet two of them promisinge to conforme themselves, were added to the reste, who wyselye conferringe with the reste and the deacons accorded and were brought to unitye of all partes, exepte the iiii<sup>or</sup> Governours onely. Whiche were Anthonius Paschesson Anthonius Paulus Jacob de Vos John Gherarde. Who restyed all the doenges of those appointed by Master Maior. [ . . . . ]

- 68 142 NOTE that whylest the Duche church was somewhat stayed of the late contention, and whylest men of mysbehavioure were a sendinge awaye, dyd come from the Lords of the Cownsell a Lettre dated the xxviii of Octobre 1571 to have greate regarde of the straungers: The contents wherof be, as hereafter ensewethe.
- To ower lovinge ffrends, the Maior and his bretherne: The Customer, Controller and searcher of the Citye of Norwiche—
- After ower hartye comendacions: for asmuche as yt is perceyved, that upon a gracious and mercifull dysposicion, in the Quens moste excellente majestie, in grauntynge favoure to suche straungers, as have of late tyme bene compelled for the avoydinge of the Calamities and troubles that weare in sondrye countryes beyonde the seas: besyds a greate multitude of good, honeste, and devoute poore and afflicted people: Ther are also another nombre of evel disposed people (under coullour of religion and pietye) latelye entred at sondry ports and Cryckes into the realme, wherbie the naturall good subiects are lyke (not onelye to be corrupted with the evel condicions of them whiche are naught) but also by the excesse nombre of bothe
- 68d 143 sortes, shall || sustayne dyverse ways suche lacks as yt is not meete to be borne withall, besydes other inconveniencences iustelye to be feared, by practyse of the lewder sorte. ffor remedye wherof, her maiestye hathe wylled us, presentlye and withoute delaye, to take order for redresse hereof: and therwithe also, to cause suche moderation to be used, as in no one Citye or towne, shulde be anie greater nombre of strangers, (thoughe they be of honeste conversation) suffred to resorte and abyde, other-

Folio Page

wise then maye stande charitablye, with the weale, or at the leaste, withoute damadge of the naturall enhabitaunts of the same places. Wherupon as we have directed order to other counties, Cities and towns, so do we at this present to you: wyllinge and comaundinge you (forthewithe) to take order. That beginninge the tenth daye of the nexte monthe, at whiche tyme, a lyke inquisicion shalbe begonne, throughe other the maritime counties of the realme: You do by all good meanes that in you shall lye, cawse a good and trewe searche to be made, howe manye Straungers of everie nation, are within that Citye. And distinctlie apparte, howe manie are come into that Citye, sythence the xxv daye of Marche laste, and by what qualitie and meanis, they do lyve and sustayne themselves, and howe they do inhabite, and in what sorte, they do resort orderlye to anie churches and places of prayer, to heare and use divine service and Sacraments, as (by the Ecclesiasticall Lawes of the realme) they owght to do: Or otherwise, wheare anie straungers are tollerated withall, by the Bysshoppe of the diocesse, to use divine servis in their owne mother tounge: and hereof to make us sertificate.

And further you shall, circumspectlye, and charitablye consider emonge your selves (beinge publique offycers) usinge conference herein withe the Bysshoppe of the diocesse (yf he be neere unto you) or withe the ordenarie, parson, or curate of the place, whether the whole nombre of straungers || nowe residente in that Citye (beinge of honeste conversacion) maye withoute dammage to the natwrrall good subiects of the same, contynue in as greate nombre, as they nowe are. And yf the nombre shall seeme to you to greate: To consider howe manye maye be suffred to remayne, and in what sorte; And to what other places conveniente (for their reliefe) the excesse maye be sente to have habitacion. So as order maye be geven for that purpose. Wherin we do not meane that oure regarde be had, but onelye to suche straungers, as are knowen to be honeste in conversacion, and well dysposed to the obediens of the Quenis Maiestie, and the realme. ffor so it is mente: And so, we wyll you, that all other straungers of contrarye sorte, that shall not shewe a good and open testymonye, to be obediens, as above is sayde, shall be charged as unprofitable parsons, to departe by a reasonable tyme.

And therin you shall use all carefullness and circumspencion, to cause them (indede) to departe. . . .

Folio Page

69

Besydes this you shall cawse a dewe searche . . . what armoure, or offencyve weapons, and . . . in their howses : And yf cawse, so shall seeme requisyte, to comytte the same into the custodye, of some meete parsons of that Citey, that maye be awnswerhable for the same, to the owners. And of all this the premisses, we chardge you (with all spede) to make to us awnswere (by wrightinge) with your opinions in anie thinge, concerninge the same : when you have considered of the parsons, whome you shall thinke, meete to be sente awaye owte of the realme. We wolde that ye shulde advertise us of the nombre, qualities and condicions of the trade, and manner of lyvinge of the same persons so meete to be sente owte of the realme, before theye be sente awaye. And so we bydd you farewell, ffrom Grenewiche the xxviii of Octobre 1571. ||

145

Your lovinge firends

N. Bacon C. S.

Tho Sussex

ff' Bedford

Ro Leycestre

Ed Clynton

Wyllm Howarde

Willm Burglyye

Jamis Crofte.

Raphe Sadlerche. Tho. Smythe.

69d 147

To the right honorable, the Lords of the  
Quene her Majestie's privie counsell.

Ower humble dewties to your honors premised, it maye please the same, that accordinge to the purporte of your honorable Lettres of the xxvi of October, we have moste dewetefullye weyed and considered the same. And accordinge to your honorable comaundements, at the prescribed daye, have procedid to the iuste viewe and searche of all strangers, then reciaunte within this Citey, conteyninge in nombre as ffollowethe.

men of the Duche nation—868.

men of the Walloune nation

—203

women of bothe nations 1,173

chyl dren under age, of 14 years

—1681

3,925 wherof  
be chyl dren  
inglish borne

} 666

Of the whiche nombre aforeseyde, be come to this  
Citey, sythen the xxv daye of Marche laste paste.

Men of the Duche nation—85

Men of the Walloune nation

—25

women of bothe nations—85

Children of both nations . . .

355 } who sustayne them-  
selvis by workinge and  
mak . . . comodities  
. . . . .  
wherof is . . . . .  
. . . . .

and one frenche man from Depe of no occ . . . . .

folio Page  
70

The aforeseyde Straungers, be of two severall churches : the Duche church, and Wallowne church. And bothe theye do use their divine servis, and the administracion of Sacraments, in their owne Lauguage, by the tolleracion of the Quenis Majesties hie Comissioners, and the Bysshoppe of the Diocesse.

And concerninge the nombre before specified : beinge of good conversacion, usinge their lawfull exercises ||  
 148 accordinge to the Quenis Majesties Letters pattents : and by her highnes clemencie, parmitted here to enhabite, for the better peoplinge of this her majesties Citeye. We fynde the nombre verie conveniente, and profitable for this comon weale : Beinge a people hetherto (for the more parte) well inclyned, in dewe obediens to her Majestie's Lawes, and well applienge themselves in their exercises, wherbie bothe their owne people and owers, be kepte in worke, (and maynteyned) to the greate benefyte, and comon weale of this Citeye and countrye adioyninge. Onelye of late, some discention hath rysen emongste them, of the Duche church, by three ministers of theirs, and grewe to partes takinge, one sorte agaynste another : whiche contravercie, is not altogether yet pacified (nott withstandinge the greate paynes, that the Quenis Majestie's hie comissioners have taken therin) nor lyke to be, so longe, as anie of those three ministers remayne in this Citeye : Namelie Theophilus Rickwaerte, who in ower opinions (if he be parmitted in anye place of this realme, wyll be a disturbance of this congregation, as hetherto he hathe bene. Here be also certeyne disordered : Some beinge of no church, other some geven to odious . . . and troublesome parsons, wherof we had geven comandemente for the amovinge of seaventene of them : And thoughte further to have proceded agaynste suche lyke, as cawse had required, yf your honorable letters had not come in the meane tyme. Other some here be of artizans, men of honest conversacion, and yet not nedefull in this Comonwealthe : As Taylors, Shomakers, Bakers, and Joyners, whiche be offensyve to some of ower Citezins (beinge of like occupation) wherupon we have taken order, to the pacification hereof. Some also be denizens latelie made, that be entred into trades, to  
 149 the offence || of many Citezins. Moreover in the searche and viewe aforeseyde, we fynde no armoure, but offensive weapons as folowethe, viz, Calyvers twoo, dags and pistolats xlv, halberds and bylls fower twoo, Bore spears two, swords and rapers CCLxx. And for that the quantite

Folio Page

70d

is not greate, we have lefte them remayninge, untill we knowe furder of your honors pleasurs

And herein we thinke ower selves, moste bownden to your honnors, who from tyme to tyme, have shewed your speciall care and love towards this Citty and Comon weale of the same. And for that your pleasure is, that we shulde not onely certifye awnswaere to your honorable lettres, but also ower opinions, towchinge some conveniente place for straungers to enhabite in (yf the nombre weare here to excessyve) whiche indewtifullwise, we have before awnswared under your honorable ffavours: we suppose in ower cimple opinions, haven townes, to be no convenient place for straungers, nor yet anie place within the counties of Norffolke and Suffolke, but muste needis be, to the greate detrymente (and hinderaunce) of this Comon weale, by reason of conveyenge awaye secretelye, the worke sponne yarne, whiche is more naturallie sponne here then in anie other place of the realme. And further, for the Bayes, and mockados, and suche other comodities, as are here practized and used. And thus in moste humble wise we do take ower leaves, Comyttinge your honours to the proteccion of the almightye: ffrom Norwiche the xvi<sup>th</sup>. of Novembre a<sup>o</sup> 1571.

Your honnors to commaunde,  
Thomas Grene Maior.

	John Aldriche	Edmunde Warden	John Reade	
	Thomas Sotherton	Thomas Pecke	Eliza Bate	
	Thomas Whalle	Chrystopher Some	Symon Bowde	
	Robert Woode	Robert Sucklynge	Thomas Layer	
Shreves	{	Henrie Grene- wode	Thomas Beamonde Nicholas Baker	
		Edwarde Pye	John Sucklynge	Chrystofer Layer.
		Richerd Bate	Thomas Cully.	Thomas Gleane
		Thomas Gooche.		

81d 183

Order for straungers by the comissioners lettre.  
Master Wyllm fferrou Maior.

After our hartye comendacons, wheras sondrye straungers borne in the Lowe countryes, of late examyned befor us the Quenis Majesties comissioners in their behalfe appoynted, do maynteyne the most horrible & dampnable error of the anabaptistes, and in the same detestable erreure, manye of them do willfullye & obstinatlye contynue. And we fearinge leaste these corruptions be spred in dyverse places

Folio Page

of her Majestie's realme, wheare those straungers do inhabitte, and so wolde dayelye increase, yf yt be note in tyme carefulllye forsene and suppressed, fior lyke as her Majesties good intente and meanyge is, to succoure those straungers, as for trewe and godly religion ar dryven to seke refuge, so her highnes intente is not anye wayes to reliefe anye that under pretence of godly religion, shulde remayne here in her Maiesties dominions, and professe so horrible heresyas. Wherfor we accordinge to her Maiesties comysson directed unto us, for the dyscharge both of ower dewetyes to God, and her Maiestye, have thought (upon some spedye order to be taken, for the suppressinge of them, and for parte of ower determinacion therin) we have taken order that all straungers aswel men as women (beinge of yeris of dyscretion, remayeninge or dwellynge, in anye place within her maiesties realme) shall geve their assente, and subscribe to the articles herein enclosed, devised for that purpose. And therfor we have thought good, streightelye to chardge and commande youe, in her maiesties name, that forthewithe, upon receipte hereof, ye call befor you all suche straungers, as are remayninge within that Citye. And therupon, 82 184 takyng their names, aswell men as women, || beinge of yeris of dyscretion as aforeseyde, to cawse not onelye everye of them (nowe dwellynge ther) but also suche, as hereafter shall happen to remayne or dwell ther, befor they shalbe admytted ther to remayne, Publikelye to subscribe their names, or sette their marks or signes (in your presents) to the seyde articles. We require you, to sende them withe speede unto us, to be further consydered, as shall appertayne. And that onys everie yere, ye make us trewe certificate (in Mychaellmes tearme nexte) of your doengs herein: Wherof we require you, not to fayle, to have a carefull and dilygente consideration, as in so weightye a cause is requisyte, and as ye wyll awnswere to the contrarye. And so we bydd you hartelye farewell: from London the seaventh of June 1575.

Your lovinge frendes

Ed. London	Edmunde Ruffus	Wyllm Cordall
Roger Marwoode	R. Monson.	G. Shearaerde.
		John Yongs.
Alex' Nowell.	Thomas Brumeleye	Thomas Wilson.

The Articles Subscribed.

1. That Chryste toke fleshe, of the substaunce of the Virgyn Marye.

2. That the infaunts of the ffeythefull, are to be babtized.
3. That yt is lawefull for a Chrystian, to take an othe.
4. That a Chrystian man: maye be a magestrate, and beare the sworde of offyce of auctorite.
5. That yt is lawefull, for a christian magestrate to execute obstinate heretiques. ||
- 185 6. That yt is lawefull, for a Christian man to warre.
7. That yt is lawefull, for a Christian man, to require the awthorite of the Magestrate, and of the lawe, that he maye be delyvered from wronge, and restored to right.
8. That a Christian man, maye lawefullye have proprietye in his goodes, and not to make them Comon, yet owghte (accordinge to the rewle of charite) to relieve the nedye, accordinge to his habilitye.

To all whiche articles, the whole companye of alyens, dyd putte their hands ffrom the xxvii daye of June 1575, etc :

- 231 The same daye Commethe master Salomon Smythe mynister of the Duche church, and complayneth agaynste dyverse Alyans, as here after ensewethe, viz—:

Right wooshipfull master Maior, these are moste humblye to beseche you, that to the better advauncinge of God his glorye, and the avoydinge and repressinge of greate enormityes, dyseorders and myschefes, whiche dayelye happenethe here emongst the straungers, to the greate offence of the godlye, and to the sclaunder of the ghospell. It shall please you and the aldermen of this Citye your bretherne to comaunde that these three articles followenge, be (from henceforthe) streightlye observed and kepte: upon suche paynes as yt shall lyke you to appoynte.

ffyrste that no stranger that usethe to make or sell aquavite or aqua cumposita shall (from henceforthe presume to receyve into his housse, anie one, to sell hym to drynke or tipples anie aquavite: And also that none shall resorte to suche howses for to drincke the same: And that none shall carrye anye, from housse to housse, to provoke men to the drinke of the same.

Itm that no straunger, shall from henceforthe presume, to go walkinge abowght the Citye, or abrode, upon the sabaothe dayes and festivall dayes, befor fower of the Clocke after dynner, or that the divine service be ended.

Folio Page

232 Itm̄ that no straunger or straungers inhabitinge this Citie || shall (from henceforthe) frequente, or resorte to anie taverne, inne or alehousse for to drincke, excepte upon a iuste and urgente occasion.

Wherupon the orders before made (for these cawses) were considered of, upon the whiche, a decree was made, as hereafter is specified.

By the Maior.

To the wallowns and Duche nation of this Citie. Wher in the tyme of master Pecke Maior, beinge the eleaventh of Julii 1573, An ordenaunce was made: That no parson or parsons (beinge Straungers) shall upon anie sondaye or holidaye (beinge dayes of prayer) to walke abowght the streetes, or owte of the Citie gates, to playe, or sytte to talke, in the tyme of the sermons or prayers. Or dwringe that tyme, or at anye other tyme, shall also drinke or eate, in anye Inne, Taverne or Tippelynge housse: upon payne of fyve shyllings for the fyrste tyme, and tenne shyllings for the seconde tyme and everie tyme after: To be devyded, One parte to the maior, one other parte to the poore, and the thred to the presenter, and the fourthe to the balye.

And further to be corrected by Master Maior.

The paynes for the chyldren to be upon ther fathers and mothers: And servauntes of their masters. And the balye to loose syxe shyllings, for not presentynge the same, two parts to the Maior and the presenter, and two partes to the poore. And wheras the syxte daye of Novembre 1574 in the fyrste tyme of eny [my?] mairaltye, Emongs other things yt was ordeyned: That no straunger shulde sell in open streete or housse, anie aquavite or aquacomposita (by them or other made) to anie other straunger: Nor shall resorte to drynke, in anye Inne, Typplinge howsse or other place, upon anye sondaye or other dayes, and excepte yt be in their owne howses in good order: In payne of twoo shyllings for everye tyme One parte to be to the maior, one other to the poore, and || the thred, to the presenter or presentors. And bycaus 233 the foreseyd offences (nottwithstandinge the premisses) 99d are of late, growen agayne to suche rypenes, as complayntes are not onelye made therof, but also earnesteste requeste, that the lawes aforeseyde maye be putte in execution.

Knowe ye therfor, That I Chrystopher Some Maior with the assente of my brethren the Aldermen, do comaunde that



## The Dutch Church in Norwich

Folio Page

the seyde ordenaunces (from henceforthe) be putte in execution upon everye offender accordinglye. In wittnes wherof I the seyde Maior, have hereunto putte my hande, the xv<sup>th</sup>. daye of Marche 1 5 8 0, the three and twentyethe yere of the reigne of ower Sovereigne Ladye : Elizabethe, by the grace of God of Englande, fraunce, and Irelande Quene : defender of the feithe etc :

Xpofes Some Maior.

[Concluded.]

STEPHEN S. SLAUGHTER.

### CONGREGATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

#### SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS, 1932.

<i>Receipts.</i>	£	s.	d.	<i>Expenditure.</i>	£	s.	d.
To Balance forward,				By Printing <i>Trans-</i>			
31/12/31 ..	27	8	6	actions .. ..	41	3	0
Subscriptions, 1932 ..	32	18	6	Postages and Receipts	2	0	0
Arrears .. ..		15	0	Hire of Hall, Annual			
Subscriptions in Ad-				Meeting .. ..	1	1	0
vance .. ..	2	7	7	Subscription to Friends			
Sale of <i>Transactions</i>		5	0	Historical Society ..	5	0	
				Editorial Expenses ..	18	0	
				Balance in hand,			
				31/12/32 .. ..	18	7	7
	£63	14	7		£63	14	7

Audited and found correct,

C. LEE DAVIS,

21/4/33.

*Hon. Auditor.*