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EDITORIAL

This issue’s fourth contribution, Alan Sell’s consideration of Geoffrey Nuttall as a theologian, brings its readers back to the first contribution, Stephen Orchard’s exploration of London’s Nonconformity in the reign of William and Mary as noted by a contemporary.

From the 1930s to the 1990s, and indeed beyond, Geoffrey Nuttall was a pivotal figure in the Congregational and United Reformed Church History Societies. From the 1950s and indeed even earlier, he was internationally known as a historian of seventeenth-century Puritanism, of the eighteenth-century Evangelical Revival, and of what connected them. He was also a minister of the Gospel and he taught in a theological college. Historians can be theologians, theologians are sometimes historians. Alan Sell adds Geoffrey Nuttall to the lengthening list of ministers whose theology and philosophy he has examined in the certainty that their beliefs have shaped the churches which they served.

Brenda Moon delighted members with her “Fearful Outbreak of Egyptology” at the Society’s Hawarden weekend in September 2009. She died in March 2011, not long after submitting her paper for publication. Obituaries in The Independent, The Guardian, and The Scotsman, celebrated her professional distinction as librarian. From the 1950s to the 1990s she worked in the university libraries of Sheffield, Hull and Edinburgh. In each place she was a member of the Congregational or United Reformed Church. At Edinburgh she was the first woman to head a Scottish university library, and she oversaw what The Scotsman called its “dramatic modernisation”. At Hull, where she was deputy librarian, Philip Larkin laid a poem, “The Daily Things We Do”, on her desk, to celebrate the golden jubilee of that library’s opening. As The Guardian’s obituaryist noted, “everyone underestimated her, although the intelligent only ever did that once”. A Congregational paradox, perhaps?

Anniversaries are the theme of Roger Ottewill’s contribution; Mr Ottewill lives in Southampton, but is a research student at the University of Birmingham.

We welcome as reviewer Neil Thorogood, Director of Pastoral Studies at Westminster College, Cambridge.

Note: Attention is drawn to events to mark the Great Ejectment of 1662 in the course of 2012, including:
28 April – West Midlands Synod.
26 May – Dr Williams’s Library, Centre for Dissenting Studies.
9 June – Friends of the Congregational Library (sponsored by the Congregational & General Insurance plc) at Dr Williams’s Library.
27-28 June – conference at the University of Manchester.
15 July – Wessex Synod.
18 August – worship at Brixton Congregational Church.
24-27 August – 350th anniversary of Romsey URC.
28-30 August – Churches Together in England sponsored conference at the University of Exeter.
22 September – URC History Society Study Day.

*In all cases Margaret Thompson can supply more detailed information.*
Zachary Merrill (d. 1729) comes to our attention in A. G. Matthews’s *Calamy Revised* as son-in-law to Samuel Ogden, the Derbyshire ejected minister, who kept school in Derby and, afterwards, at Wirksworth, where he was minister. Matthews tells us that Merrill was Ogden’s usher, that is to say, assistant. He directs us to two manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, one Merrill’s description of Ogden’s teaching methods and the other a book of manuscript sermons by Ogden. What Matthews does not tell us, for it is not germane to his purpose, is that the notebook containing the description of Ogden’s teaching methods also has a collection of anecdotes collected by Merrill while he was in London, from 1691 onwards. While not so informative as a Journal these forty pages of notes give a flavour of Nonconformity in the years immediately after Toleration, including reminiscences of earlier times.

Although Matthews makes no mention of it, Zachary Merrill was one of the first ministers of a Meeting House at Rosslyn Hill, Hampstead, after Toleration. His time as Ogden’s usher was most probably spent in Derby, rather than Wirksworth, north of Derby. Ogden became school master there after having been successfully prosecuted for keeping school in Derby. According to Charles Surman, Zachary Merrill was a chaplain and tutor in Chelsea by 1690 and living in St Giles’s parish when Richard Baxter bequeathed books to him in 1694. Merrill’s move from Derbyshire to London was possibly occasioned by his securing the post in Chelsea but it is evident from the manuscript that his association with Hampstead, where he eventually became sole minister, dates from August 1692 at the latest. It was presumably his enhanced status as a prospective minister which made it possible for him to marry. His did not become Ogden’s son-in-law until after his move to London. Zachary Merrill married Rachel Ogden at Kirk Ireton on 13 April 1693. This is not mentioned in his notebook; half the entries relate to the period between 1691 and 1693, before Merrill’s marriage, and the other half from 1698 to 1702. Samuel Ogden himself died in May 1697 and was buried at Wirksworth on 27 May. His widow, Esther, followed him in 1698, being buried on 8 March. She was the sister of the two Barnett brothers who were ejected in Shropshire. Zachary and Rachel lived in Hampstead. The marriage lasted fifteen years at most and there is no record of any children. The widowed Zachary Merrill married a rich heiress from his congregation, namely Rebecca Honywood, at St Katharine’s by the Tower, on 21 September 1708. Rachel’s death and his new marriage lie beyond the period covered in the notebook, which has no dated entry after 1705. This time there were children, Rebecca, Isaac, and Edward. The sons were still minors when Zachary died

---

2. Dr. Williams’s Library, Surman Index 1141.
in 1729 and only one son, Isaac, although he is unnamed, features in the widow Rebecca’s will, which was made in 1731. (She died in 1733).

Sir Robert Honywood⁢ and his wife Mary were the founders of a rich and influential dynasty. Although they are mostly remembered as a Kent family, of Petts Court, Charing, the Honywoods also had an estate at Marks Hall, near Coggeshall, in Essex, held by Robert’s son, Sir Thomas Honywood (1586-1666), a Parliamentarian. When the widowed Mary Honywood died at Marks Hall in 1620, aged ninety-three, she was celebrated both for her age and her 367 descendants. Untangling the Honywood family is therefore complicated. One grandson was Michael Honywood, (1597-1681), Dean of St Paul’s. Another, so far as we can tell, was Edward Honywood, third son of Sir Thomas Honywood of Greenwich⁴. Edward’s son Isaac Honywood was a merchant and banker, who had a house on Rosslyn Hill in Hampstead and supported the Nonconformist Meeting which met at his house from 1692 and possibly earlier⁵. This was the historic basis of the subsequent Rosslyn Hill Chapel.

The Merrill wills show how prosperous the Honywood marriage made the former school usher⁶. Rebecca had come to Zachary accompanied by a dowry of the Hampstead house, with a best parlour looking to the road, where their single daughter, Rebecca, died in 1735⁸. There was also a tenement and two shops on the north side of Lombard Street, and £500 to be invested in property. This money had bought land and houses in Fyfield, Essex. Nor was this all; Zachary had also to leave instructions about the farm at Morestead in Hampshire, which her father had left to Rebecca. All this property was to return to the widow and then to pass to Isaac. Since Rebecca dealt only with the Hampstead property in her will, and left a few keepsakes to the unnamed Isaac, we might assume that she had already passed the other property over after Zachary’s death. Certainly the daughter Rebecca, who was left the Hampstead house, willed it to her brother Isaac. Both mother and daughter left legacies to Honywood relatives and to John Partington, Merrill’s successor as minister at Hampstead.

Although there is little about Merrill himself in the notebook we learn rather more about him than was known in modern times. Apart from Matthews’s reference we have a few mentions of Merrill in histories of Rosslyn Hill Chapel, which tell us that he was an original trustee of the will of Daniel Williams and wrote an exposition on 1 Peter, as well as some extra material for Matthew Henry’s Commentary⁸. In the Journal he appears not to be ordained

---

3. Sir Robert Honywood d.1629. For the various members of the Honywood family see ODNB.
4. Burke’s Peerage.
6. The will of Zachary Merrill is NA PROB 11/636 and of his widow, Rebecca, 11/662.
7. See will of Rebecca Merrill, NA PROB 11/671.
in February 1692, when Richard Steel advises him to seek a degree in Scotland before being ordained to work regularly. This was the year before he married Rachel Ogden, which further supports the suggestion that it was a regular appointment at Hampstead that made this possible. We also see a more public man than the bare records suggest. He records conversations with leading London ministers, such as John Howe, confirms the dominance of the ideas of Richard Baxter among them, and records anecdotes going back to the beginning of the seventeenth century. There is an extended interview with the dying Thomas Brand, minister and philanthropist; a record of conversations with William Lorimer, a Scot who became a London Nonconformist and who had connections with French Protestants; a report of John Howe's abortive attempt to negotiate with William Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester, after Toleration; and a long anecdote, told by Howe, concerning Lawrence Chaderton, the first Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, as a student. Merrill also collected advice on books to read and how various ministers kept their Common Place Books. He also met Roger Morrice, whose *Entring Book* tells us so much about the same period, and to which these few pages of Merrill are supplementary.9

Although there is little philosophical reflection in the text it does show evidence of the intellectual curiosity of Nonconformists in the era of Toleration. The frame of reference moves from Biblical hermeneutics, through the attempted conversion of Yemeni Jews in the sixth century, to the latest observations using the microscope. This appetite for discovery and freedom of thought will issue in ecclesial and doctrinal controversy as the eighteenth century unfolds. The extensive references to French Protestantism and its fate remind us that fear of popery was not an intellectual game for these survivors of the years of persecution, but a matter of life and death. Apart from giving a sense of the milieu of London Dissent after Toleration the Journal also tells us something of how a non-graduate Dissenter educated himself in this period.

A transcript of the text as it stands makes difficult reading because of the frequent use of abbreviations and the thorn character. It is therefore presented here with abbreviations mostly drawn out. Spelling has been modified where the author uses double letters and modern usage prefers a single one. Other archaisms and spellings have been left to stand. Verbs have not been supplied where they are implied, in order to retain the note-like character of the text as a whole. It is made obvious where it has been impossible to decipher the original. The intention is to give the flavour of the original without the reader spending too long deciphering the meaning. As far as possible the various persons mentioned have been identified and most of them have entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, which can supply further details of their lives and interests.

STEPHEN ORCHARD

---

Apr. 4. 1691. Covent Garden

Yesterday Mr Burgess told me two notable stories of the conversion of 2 lewd sinners. 1. Who was first debauched by the D. of B and since lived with a Gentleman as a wife (tho not married) about 120 mile from London. The other a whore to Mr. Claypole that married Oliver’s daughter, both lately within a quarter of a year.

Dr. B. transcribed some of his paragraphs 4 times before he published them. The Countess of Rad told me of going to Whitehall she found it in the Queen’s hand. Mr. B.

Dr. B. always first considers what subject to be upon, then chooses his text, afterwards reads whatever he has upon that, and resolves he’ll have whatever they have and carry it as far beyond them as he can. Mr B.

May 4. 91. This day I was at Mr Steel’s, Mr Wood coming in speaking of John Machin said that he had a Concupiscientia for salvation of souls and tho the Iron was blunt yet being red had it made a deeper impression then Steel itself.

May 13. 1691.

Mr Burgess advised me to let some ministers read over sermons before I preached them, saying of Dr Tn never preached a sermon for a long time but which Dr. Bs. read before.

I will never yield that Justification is founded on works, they justify our faith but faith justifies us to god a nuptial band.

I asked him what Encouragement he had to preach to dead sinners. Answer. Enough for the Spirit of god does work in the cause of men while hear my the word, if they do not resist. When I called learning came forth that went out spiritually. Word to enable yourself Gospel is called ministration of Spirit. Otherwise preaching word is a foolish thing as Apostle says. But he adds because his ministry of spirit thereof we faint not. I come into pulpit with a prophecy in my soul that the spirit will accompany this word I speak make successful. Every one may be saved if they will because Spirit ready to assist. Burgess.

10. Daniel Burgess, 1645-1713, son of the ejected minister Daniel Burgess, minister in Covent Garden.
12. Lord (John) Claypole, d.1688, Master of Horse under Cromwell and married to his daughter, Elizabeth.
14. Richard Steele, ejected from Hanmer, Flint, was registered preacher at Hoxton in 1689, d.1692.
15. John Wood, 1631-1690, of Norton, Derbyshire, but also active in Staffordshire.
17. An eager desire.
18. Possibly John Tillotson, see note 73.
Momento. King James 1 told the Doctor that read his sermon he now knew who they meant by the Christian preacher etc. Burgess

June. 4. 1691. Covent Garden
I went yesterday to take my last farewell of Mr. Brand19 at Kensington. He was to my apprehension something worse than before as to some symptoms. He expressed his willingness to die. Said he did not desire life for life's sake, nor for anything of the pleasure and profit of life. But only for usefulness and the work he was in. He had rather die that morn than live longer and not be useful to the world. He said he thought he had sometimes met with the assistance of the Spirit of God and if ever he did it was at Hastings in Sussex, which in the times of the former Liberty was the most wicked place in all that Country. He and 11 more would set up a Meeting there. But when he came tho it was a heathenish barren place yet it pleased god to give in a little time great Encouragement. For our Lords day the meeting was no sooner opened but they flocked in, and in his prayer he had such a violent impulse came into his mind concerning that having Compassion on the Multitude would not send them away empty that he could scarce contain himself; and one of his hearers was in like manner affected and coming to him after sermon told him he had a most violent impression in that part of the Exercise. A Doctor of physic in the town as wicked a wretch as man that ever lived for debauchery and drinking, was first awakened and after Converted so that he afterward became an Eminent and did Excessively spend himself in preaching. But Mr. Brand never had so sharp an Impulse upon his mind before or since. I am just gone, said he, but if god give faith and patience all will have a glorious issue. P.S. He fears will hang for his wickedness.

About Books.
Read Turretine20 very much, and Mr. Burroughs21 works are very good. Mr. Lowe's extraordinary. Caryl22 good. Perkins23 good, but his juice is sucked out and so would not advice to them. He added that he had read a Multitude of Books more than ever did him good. But if he were young again he would not touch them, only read the scriptures with 2 or 3 good Commentaries on them, Rivet24 etc: the dearest books are the Cheapest and best. Beza without Commentary and Notes not worth 2d. Marlorat25 a poor dry book. Change Perkins for Turretine who has sucked in the juice of all others. I writ, says he, many hundred sheets both of practical and polemical divinity about Scientia

---

20. Francis Turretin, d.1687, one of the authors of the Helvetic Confession.
21. Thomas Burroughs, c.1610-1670, ejected from Cottesbrook, Northants.
25. Augustine Malorat published a scriptural thesaurus in 1574 and various annotations.
Media, the Trinity, Crell and Bisterfield, all which I do not now value. Nothing pleased him like his preach and catechising and what he did for the conversion of souls. He has left his boys at Bishop H[ull] Somersetshire, but gives them at present 20L p annum and gets 40L from the fund. Mr. Brand's Directions for Conversion are Excellent. He and Mr. Trench printed it once. Advised me to be much in prayer to god, study on my knees in prayer, and at parting desired me to pray for him awhile, he should not need it long. Two snares, says he, ministers fall into. Diffidence and pride, the one if before great congregations and learned, other if over a mean and yet popular, especially if they be affected. Watch and pray: 5 physicians consulted about opening his breast but they thought if it were in pleura it would move issue down sometimes.

Mr Sam. Johnson, author of Julian, made the Prince of Oranges Declaration. Lady Russel.

Dr. Bates told that he heard Dr. Meriton on a Fast day, at Aldermanbury Church, pray that our souls might be frost Nailed so we might not slide or fall away.

Memento Liquor beer Saith

No. 29. 1691.

I went that day to Burntwood & Met there 9 ministers, worthy Men etc. Mr. Hall the day before told me that the occasion of Mr. Vines Conversion was his first sermon which upon the positive order of his father he preached. Several scholars heard him. Text I am the Vine. My father (pointing to the old man) is the Husbandman (his father being so) when he had finished his jingling discourse Scholars applauded him but his father cudgelled him saying the Husbandman must prune the vine.

Tom Fuller's father called his son down, come down thou jingling Coxcomb.

Dec. 10. 1691. London

Mr Barton told me today that Mrs Baxter left her husband 800L in debt but

---

26. John Henry Bisterfield, c.1605-1655, wrote against Socinians such as Johannes Crell, 1570-1633.
27. Samuel Johnson, 1649-1703, Anglican divine and violently anti-papist, was convicted in 1683 and his book, Julian the Apostate, burned by the public hangman. He was publicly whipped in 1686 for his attacks on James II. William III awarded him a pension.
29. William Bates, 1625-1699, ejected from St Dunstan's in the West and a Pinners' Hall lecturer.
32. Thomas Fuller, 1608-1661, historian.
33. Margaret Charlton, married Baxter in 1662 and died in 1681,
my Lady Hampden and some others got him out. Lady Hampden got 50L of 
Sir William Ellis and so they set him clear. & he told Mr Barton that it was easier 
matter to get money than to lay it out for He had for a sum given to Earl of 
Clarendon. 80L a year paid quarterly, and before 500L to lay out but in 
Charitable uses, and could not find a Convenient way to dispose of it. He had 
given away his own estate in Shropshire. He left Sir H. Ashhurst Executor. 
Mr. Barton 
Mr Morrice was saying to Mr. Burgess and me that we had suffered a great 
loss of Dr. Manton with whom died our political entering. Mrs Baxter for 
Charity and now Mr Baxter. But he would never preach to the height of his 
parts: About lovers of pleasures. 
Sir John Maynard thought to be greatest lawyer of the age. Not exceeded by 
Glyn or Hale but perfect in scripture. Mr. Morrice. 
Memento Sir John Rotherham’s Hints which he gave yesterday about P. of 
Wales.

Dec. ult. New year’s Eve 1691
I dined at Mr Hill’s Judge Hook told at Dinner incident of 6 Brothers in one 
House converted by Mr Baxter’s Call to Unconverted. That Mr Baxter Had 
letters from Duke of Saxony, of Brandenburgh out of Germany & Denmark to 
signify what good his books had done.

Feb. 26. 1691/2 
Yesterday I visited Mr Steel and enquiring about his interleaved Bible So He 
advised me by all means to use One for 1. when is reading any of father’s He 
lights on any Excellent Gloss. He puts it down or at least makes a reference to 
it in his Bible. 2. any good Notion in Reading or hearing down with it there, & 
then ’tis ready if occasion either to preach on or Quote of Text. He added I

34. Sarah (d.1687), daughter of Thomas Foley of Witley Court, Worcestershire, first wife of 
John Hampden the younger, 1653-1696. 
35. Sir William Ellis, 1609-1680, lawyer and MP, who presumably made his gift before he 
died. 
37. Sir Henry Ashurst was the son of Henry Ashurst, d.1680, both of whom were friends of 
Baxter. 
38. See Note 9. 
39. Thomas Manton, ejected from St Paul’s, Covent Garden, d.1677. 
40. Sir John Maynard, 1602-1690, judge, was Morrice’s patron for a while. 
41. Sir Matthew Glynne, 1603-1666, judge and supporter of the Presbyterians. 
42. Sir Matthew Hale, 1609-1676, judge and MP. 
43. John Rotheram, Baron of the Exchequer from 1688, with Daniel Burgess as his 
chaplain. 
44. Joseph Hill, 1626-1707, ministered in Holland and supplied intelligence to the English 
government. 
45. Possibly John Hooke, lawyer, 1655-1712.
never make use of any Analysis Piscator\textsuperscript{46} or others in expounding or preaching, but read the Chapter and analyze myself. The business of Exposition is to explain hard things, To be critical and Exact. In Analysing is more pleasant but I think 'tis the business of preaching therefore for 40 years I have only used the other tho' it be more dry. Bishop Hall's Book\textsuperscript{47} is instar omnium\textsuperscript{48} it explains only Hard places, and when I have consulted many Expositors and then come to him I have found him to give a clear sound and good theme and so you need only him. I never found Piscator and others to be same. For Commonplace I gathered the heads when young about 500. but I collected many things especially philosophical which now I do not value or esteem much. So I have given my son a Catalogue about 400. every Friday I used to commonplace all I read each week; and this was the Advantage of it. came on Saturday to finish my sermons I had things fresh in my memory.

But I have now I believed 2000 things to commonplace which are turned down in books and not done. In prayer in preaching in all labour for a holy fervour a love to souls and Zeal for god's glory.

Speaking of Baptists in Devizes.

There is no good done by disputing with them. But by gentle, pious, winning Carriage undermine them, undermine them with love and piety and that is the way which by Experience I have found best.

I would have you by all means to go to Scotland and have a degree, 'tis a Test of Learning and shows that we do not enter precariously but upon due qualifications and then come back and be ordained so fall to the work regularly.

March 1. 1691/2

This day I visited Mr Ker\textsuperscript{49} Who said that He thought Mr Baxter did very far transcend Dr Twisse\textsuperscript{50} and Dr Dodd\textsuperscript{51} and was incomparably Beyond any writer in the English Orb. Mr Pool's English Annotations\textsuperscript{52} He commended to me for a practical Commentary. Bishop Hall a poor book, His Character better. Piscator's Translation I prefer before Junius who is a little crabbed and Piscator's scholastics are good but they are in Pool. Malorat a man of good Judgment useful book on N.T. He gives different opinions and yet is a Continued Discourse which requires pains and Judgment. Dr Friedlibis\textsuperscript{53} the whole Bible I bought very cheap. Mr Clark hath sometime given a good spiritual same otherwise on the Old Testament He hath done little

\textsuperscript{46} Johannes Piscator, 1546-1625, Bible commentator and annotator.
\textsuperscript{47} John Hall, 1633-1710, Bishop of Bristol.
\textsuperscript{48} Literally, "indeed all".
\textsuperscript{49} Possibly William Ker, a Scot, fl. 1689.
\textsuperscript{50} William Twisse, 1578-1646, prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly.
\textsuperscript{51} John Dod, c. 1549-1645.
\textsuperscript{52} Matthew Poole, 1624-1679, who produced a synopsis of Biblical notes in Latin.
\textsuperscript{53} Amadeus Friedlibis, 1593-1652.
and Nothing of History and Topography a weak man in comparison with Pool. I expect great things from Mr Hurst\textsuperscript{54} on Minor prophets. He was a learned man and his book about Ignorance of Natural man is very well done. Mr Baxter tho young when he first wrote yet outstood and was too hard for all that opposed him; and these personal Reflections and vindication of him which he was put to did not depress his spirit; that he should under all maintain such a calm spiritual temper is truly admirable. Those thing in Practical Divinity which he does sometimes but touch in transiting are more satisfactory than many pages of another perhaps Learned Author. Bishops Burnett\textsuperscript{55} and Kidder\textsuperscript{56} would have preached his funeral sermon. For common places I commonplace Every thing and Have a large Book wherein I write Every thing and have another small long book in which I have my commonplace Heads and so make Reference in that to my Large Hodgepodge book but if the thing I would transcribe be rare then I refer in my small book only by Author.

This day Mr Burgess visiting Mr Howe\textsuperscript{57} in his gout and told him what Sir Audley Mervyn said of Dr Harrison and Rolls, both troubled with gout that He hoped both of them were Orthodox but neither were sound divines. Mr How ingeniouly replied, true we can't pretend to much soundness but I hope we may be \textit{Oρθοτημεύω} though we can't be \textit{Oρθοθοδοξία}.\textsuperscript{58}

Mr How told Mr Burgess Concerning Dr Lazarus Seaman\textsuperscript{59} that He was very learned as morose. He when many others scrupled it did give notice of Charles's Return that He would keep and preach on Jan 30. Many that were High Tories came expecting he should pay the Nonconformists. He chose David's words upbraiding Abner. 1 Samuel xxvi. 15.16. when he had aggravated murder especially of Royal Blood. He came to speak of the mistake of those that thought it necessary to do that in some it's true, saith mistake did not excuse tho it lessens their sin. He told them they were persons that were better trained up instructed in principles of Loyalty, High pretenders to it, and for such as they to stand still and see such a thing done, with Hands in pockets, as the Lord Liveth ye are worthy to die because ye have not kept your Master the Lord's Anointed &c.

A Wiltshire peddler in Civil Wars never soldiered, told his Neighbours when any Soldiers came to ask who he for Would answer what do you mean Sir? Are you for King or Parliament? Why they are not fallen out I hope? Yes and who are ye for? None of them till they are better agreed.

\textsuperscript{54} Henry Hurst, 1629-1690, who spent his last years in Covent Garden.
\textsuperscript{55} Gilbert Burnet, 1643-1715, Bishop of Salisbury.
\textsuperscript{56} Richard Kidder, 1633-1703, Bishop of Bath and Wells.
\textsuperscript{57} John Howe, 1630-1705, ejected from Great Torrington, promoter of Presbyterian/ Congregational union.
\textsuperscript{58} He hoped they would talk straight even if they could not walk straight.
\textsuperscript{59} Lazarus Seaman, d.1675, Master of Peterhouse, Cambridge.
March 26, 1692
I preached for Mr Read\(^{60}\), who afterward told me that He would earnestly advise me to imitate Mr Baxter and to that end to buy all his works. For there is scarce any subject but he hath writ upon it and as Bishop Wilkins\(^{61}\) saith no subject he took but what He cultivated and improved. Collect an Index to them. One index for scriptures explained, and another for matters to refer to his several books this would be of mighty advantage to you and would be easily done while young if I had time I would set to it now. Common place for References would be very useful. I have Wilson’s Dictionary interleaved. Mr Read.

Mart. ult. 1692
I went on this day to see Mr Woodcock\(^{62}\) speaking to him of Common place He told me that Mr Gataker\(^{63}\) was a great Critic, and good Divine. He had an Erasmus Chiliad\(^{64}\) interleaved to which he referred all his critical Learning, and an Interleaved Bible to which He referred all His controversy but best way is to make Common place of Reference. Excellent to preach Body of Divinity. Mr Woodcock.

Apr. 1. 1692
Yesterday I took Mr Ch. And Mr Holworthy\(^{65}\) to visit Mr Boyle’s\(^{66}\) Library. We saw a very strong digestive that would supple the hardest bone, a good collection of Minerals and ores and earths. I had before seen his Library containing 330 fol. 801 qtos. 2490 Oct and 12, most of them well bound they may be had for 3 or 400L (tho worth 1000) because they must not be sold by Auction. He was a most unaffected Gentleman. His lodging Room and the other were very plain etc.
Scapula Lexicon with Harmarus and Maortius Edit. 1650. best pr. 26L. Harmar sine Maortio 10L. Mr Ker.
Beza with Commentaries Best.
Mr Glascock\(^{67}\) contracts the books (polemical) which He reads, never Common places. Of which he showed me several. Ushers Arrival, Socinianism and Arminianism Controversy. Advised me to read Sulpitius Severus and

---

60. Joseph Read, c.1635-1712, assistant to Richard Baxter, had his own Meeting House in Westminster by this time.
62. Thomas Woodcock, c.1620-1694, ejected from St Andrew Undershaft, London, lived in Hackney, and had ministered at Hampstead.
63. Thomas Gataker, 1574-1654, or his son, Charles, c.1614-1680.
64. Erasmus’s Chiliad was a collection of adages taken from classical sources.
65. Possibly Matthew Holworthy, son of Sir Matthew Holworthy of Norfolk.
66. Robert Boyle, 1627-1691, the chemist.
67. A John Glascock, minister, d.1661 and this may be a son or other relative.
June 14 1692. Pyrgo
The frugality of former Ages was the great reason of the advance the Gentry made in their Estates, their Housekeeping was noble enough. Exceeds anything we see now, but the Gentry lived in the Country, looked after their own Estates & so improved them. Sir Tho: Cheek (for Instance) a West County Gentleman, bought Pyrgo of Ld Grey, and in one year bought besides, Chilverditch and Tillingham Lordships of my Ld Warwick Northweal which yield above 2000L per Annum. His second wife was the Lady Essex Rich daughter of Earl of Warwick by whom He had 3 sons Robt. Tho. & Charles & 5 Daughters, all which he married to considerable fortunes. Frances the Eldest to Dr Lancelott Lake. Essex to the Earl of Manchester. Anne to Earl of Warwick. fourth to Sir Gilb (or Charles) Gerrard. Eliz to Sir Rich. Franklyn Sir Tho. Cheek & Sir Tho. Barrington were Knights of the Shire for Essex.

Old Scot this year 80 years old told me that he lived with Sir Thomas Edmonds, who was either Secretary or Lord Keeper to King Charles the 1 in year ’38 & hath seen King Charles at Albans, which house Sir Thomas built. And that Sir Thomas did earnestly expostulate with the king & persuade him not to go against the Scots, told him what the Issue would be if He did quarrel with the Parliament & make war upon his subjects, & seeing he could not prevail, He threw up his Employment, & Come so much concerned to Albans that He fell into black Jaundice from which Dr Mayerne could not recover him so died.

Hedgehog bristles good against stone. Mr Symonds. Ashen Keyes to libation of Ale boiled with spoonful of Virgin Honey, drink & exciteth Urine mightily.

Aug. 22. 1692. Hampstead
Mr Jo. Jackson – son to Arthur Jackson that writ annotations told this day,
that Archbishop Ussher\textsuperscript{77} was of Convocation which imposed etc oath in 40 or
41. & that the good Archbishop told Mr Jackson how he was rated and insulted
by Several of Convocation, because he was against that Oath as if He had been
a schoolboy. – Mr Jackson.
He also told me that when the Act of Uniformity was about passing He was at
one Mr Beal's and in comes Dr Tillotson\textsuperscript{78} who came to tell them that the Act
was passed, about Renouncing and saith the Dr it had been well if they had put
us to Renounce our Reason too. This Mr Jackson told me he heard and durst
make oath of it if called to it.
When Mr J. was fellow of Queens Dr Patrick\textsuperscript{79} was there who used to meet
every week in Mr J's Chamber with Sam. Jacomb\textsuperscript{80} and others to pray, as the
Dr owns in his sermon at Mr Jacomb's funeral.
He told me that Dr Patrick did not (He believes) write friendly Debates, this
not like him, but Cradock\textsuperscript{81} did it, who was of an insulting temper. But he
thinks he might see it & that they might agree not to let world know who did
it.
This day Dr Horton\textsuperscript{82} gave Assent and Consent to all and every thing in his
Book holding Bible in his Hand. Mr Jackson.

\textbf{Aught 27. 1692}
Yesterday I visited Mr Stephen Lobb\textsuperscript{83} who acquainted with his Affairs in King
James's Court. And there in Heat of Popish plot. He wrote a book dedicated to
Marquis Halifax\textsuperscript{84} when they presented it to him, were treated nobly & saith
Marquis Gentlemen, mind your hits, & get your Liberty settled while under
fears of Popery, for if you do not now, the Church Men will drive you before
them like Chaff.

\textbf{Oct. 22. 1692}
Yesterday Mr Lob told me that Dr Owen said it would be worth much ado if Dr
Crisp's\textsuperscript{85} writings could be excused from Antinomianism not to be vindicated.
Baxter a prodigious Man. Studied thoroughly, many against him that never
understood him & those that follow him feared ditto. Require a good stock of

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Reference} & \textbf{Details} \\
\hline
77. & James Ussher, 1581-1656, Archbishop of Armagh. \\
78. & John Tillotson, 1630-1694, Archbishop of Canterbury. \\
79. & John Patrick, 1632-1695, prebend of Peterborough and precentor of Chichester. \\
80. & Thomas Jacombe, 1622-1687, ejected from St Martin's, Ludgate and then chaplain to
   the Dowager Countess of Exeter. His funeral sermon was preached by William Bates. \\
81. & Samuel Cradock, 1621-1706, ejected from North Cadbury, Somerset, and kept an
   academy at Wickhambrook, Suffolk. \\
82. & This episode has not been traced. \\
83. & Stephen Lobb, \textit{d.1699}, minister of Fetter Lane Meeting, known as “the Jacobite
   Independent” for representing Independents at the court of James II. He also ministered
   in Hampstead. \\
84. & George Saville, 1633-1695, created Marquis of Halifax in 1679. \\
85. & Tobias Crisp, 1600-1643, whose works were republished by his son in 1690.
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
Metaphysic to follow him in Catholic Theology. He likes every book of free grace & so Dr O. urged they differ more in Expression usually. Mr William’s book neither fully nor rightly states the Controversy & [?] Arguments weak & nothing gives so great Advantage as to confute weakly. Ch better Scholar but satirical, they that subscribe profess to subscribe not to Argumentative part but only to the stating truth and Error. beside An order of Nothing Polemic be published without Consent of board, this violates. Controversy between us and Conformist not about Ceremony or form of prayer, but about Church and Government. They would have Ministers of parish Assembly no pastors but Bishops & Dioceses to be Church in firme speciem. This not so in Christ’s time as to be seen in my Healing Attery[?] wherein All Churches beyond seas for us. Mr Baxter Holds that the To oredere Justifies use if the Object your act does it. Mr Lobb.

March 9
This day Mr Cotton whom I met at Mr Jackson’s in Hogsden [Hoxton], that a glass of Claret with a little powder of Alabaster would stay any flux, a Jesuit used it with wonderful success and he as long before His remedy was discovered – powder as much as will lie on a 6d. Lady Ashurst salve for Lips to my Lady R. mix bees wax, fresh butter, and orange flower water it does incomparably. Melt resin in a pot & then put into it powder of Alabaster till it be pretty thick and it will cement stronger than any glue, for wood? Mr Jackson. White paint, such as picture drawers use, is excellent for earthenware, China, etc. German balls for shoes nothing but bees wax with mutton suet and Lamp black. Curtiss About Decrees. They are absolute with respect to god. Subjective, but Conditional wth respect Creatures. Objective 27 of Acts makes plain god absolutely decreed that if stayed in ship they died, if go live. Ker. Dr Horneck eats no black puddings nor things strangled, for 2 reasons which he told us. 1. Because that Command. Things strangled & from Blood which he thinks is perpetual, tho some think it to be only temporary given to unite the

86. Daniel Williams, c.1643-1716, *Gospel Truth stated.*
87. The sense suggests reading “Cr” for “Crisp” but the text is more obviously “Ch”.
88. Lobb published various controversial pamphlets but no title corresponds with this.
89. “oredere” may simply be a misspelling of “order”. The sense seems to be that if the object is justifiable then ordering it is also justifiable, but the remark may be linked with church order.
90. Mr Cotton was a predecessor of Merrill as minister at Hampstead.
91. The wife of Sir William Ashurst, whose father was a friend of Richard Baxter. He was Lord Mayor of London in 1693.
Jewish and the Ct Churches, but this is the Argument to prove a Command perpetual viz. that which was commanded before the Law, under the Law, and under the Gospel, that is perpetual but those are such. 2. Because all the Churches Eastern and western observed it many centuries together, 'twas the Western Church first broke, Eastern observes it to this day. The Latin Church first broke it to make way for Transubstantiation, for if blood might not be eaten, then not drunk, so not in Sacrament. Tertullian speak particularly of black pudding that forbidden. Botulus cruore distentus. All difficulty lies in perpetuity of Command. There begun early to be a dispute about eating. Those entering that formerly were of the Pythagorean sect that they might eat only herbs, roots etc. others scrupled whether eat things offered to Idols for the Heathen used bring beast offerings to their Idols, part belong to priests part the people had back again, but nevertheless it had been offered, so when these Heathen invited their friend or Relations that were Christians to Eat either of those things offered, or also to dine with the priest they scrupled as find in Romans 14. The Apostle determines it upon charity let not one judge another, or offend one another. So I do not prescribe a Rule, nor judge any that Eat but am not satisfied myself, especially when such variety besides, neither Black pudding nor Rabbits or anything strangled – this bring into mind vast revenue Heathen priest for they could not Eat or Consume all that was brought to them so they sold it, & this occasion a scruple, which St. Paul determines that they might when sold in shambles.

The High Priest at Jerusalem might have vast revenue, live very great for all the shoulders were his and more, besides he was not to sell any of it, but the priests were to dine with him, so 'tis likely he never sat down under 2 or 300 men and kept greater table than King of Judea.

Lady Packington with whom Dr Hammond Lived, generally thought to be Author whole Duty Man was capable writing in such a style and was a very extraordinary Woman. Dr Horneck.

Dr Bates sermon. When Sun appearing all the Stars seem withdrawn tho where are still so when Competition god and Creatures all must disappear before him he is all in all.

Mr Mather New England Speaking Divine protection. One Angel destroyed 18400 abed that Angel is alive still.

Osborne that wrote Advice to Son was walking by Coach (with one Mr Draper) up a hill in Oxfordshire. He fell, put out thigh & presently cried out, A Pox of my Star. Neck or Nothing.

93. "Sausage full of blood."
94. Dorothy, Lady Pakington, d.1679.
95. George Hammond, c.1620-1705, ejected from Dorchester and fled to London 1685.
96. Increase Mather, 1639-1723, a Massachusetts Congregationalist who was in London 1688-1692.
97. Francis Osborne, 1593-1659, writer who lived in Oxfordshire.
98. William Draper of Nether Worton, Oxfordshire, Francis Osborne’s bother-in-law.
In Oxford one Mr Sampson that preached when not Bachelor of Arts, and had
dogs memory, so he fixed as preacher in Country place, whither not long after
Mr H Hickman came, and the people were forward in Commending Mr Sampson as an incomparable person to Mr H. he asked what was his Excellency above other men. Say they He never looks upon his book. Why, saith Mr Hickman, I see He is the same still that was in the College, for He never looked on his book there.

A Lady complaining to Dr Sibbs that her Chaplain was very tedious in prayer, the Dr step to him when about to begin, and whisper to him, Turn length into strength.

Mr Wilner (Minister) told me He knew Mr Mason well, & that the famous
passage in Dr Moore's Dialogues about Elias to come, gave him the first
hint of all that for which He was so famous.

Mr Carbonelles told Mr Hawes present when Bochartus (that was then but
26 yr old) disputed & baffled Monsieur Veron, upon which a popish Gentleman said to protestant Gentleman [?] I see your Learned are more learned than our Learned but in lieu of that our Ignorant are more Ignorant than your Ignorant.

Mr Polhill told Mr Sykes that in Mr Howe Vanity Man Mortal that was as
good Rhetoric ever dropt from English pen.

Qui bene latuit bene vixit qui bene tacuit bene dixit. Qui bene valuit bene fecit.
Ergo lateo taceo valeo dixi.

Mr Baxter with Mr Sylvester as to Mr Pell, said He to Mr Sylvester, He
goes as far beyond you as you do beyond me.

Roman Vitriol pounded & put in to a pint bottle with water to fill 2/3d of the
bottle & held to your nose stopped Mr Sylvester's bleeding at the nose after he
had in vain tried many Remedies from Tuesday morning to Wednesday night.
Mr Bowes\textsuperscript{109} told us of one (How) had excellent Microscopes whereby He discovered 100s Animals in Semina Humana in pepper water, in Vinegar etc. but none in blood. dip a drop upon the Object glass and would be 1000s. Bishop Wilkins observes how far Nature transcends Art for the most polished Razor is after all Jagged but the wings of Butterfly delicately smooth. Nothing finer than wings of a moth, for all that dust that we see between our fingers they all feather, every particle is a perfect feather.

Nov. 17, 1698
Mr Lob commends Vortius for directions how the Borders where several Provinces belonging to different princes ought to pray for those princes to which they belong so as Not to endanger themselves by affronting other Neighbouring States or Princes.
Mr Lorimer\textsuperscript{110} told me that Mr Primrose\textsuperscript{111} affirms that are many gross mistakes in Mr Quick’s Synodicon.\textsuperscript{112}
Dr Hicks\textsuperscript{113} in his sermon at Commencement, falls foul upon Mr Fleming\textsuperscript{114} for relating those stories in the 1st part fulfilling scripture.
The late history of Nonconformity, done by new England Man\textsuperscript{115} is quite mistaken in affirming that Bishop Turin to say that of the Waldensians which He did not say, but on Contrary said 'tis mere fable.
Redpath\textsuperscript{116} wrote Answer to Scotch presbyters on Eloquence, neither of them had any regard for truth.
They have done Mr Rutherford\textsuperscript{117} an Injury in publishing his letters. Many silly things printed in them. Joseph Allen’s\textsuperscript{118} letter by a great deal.

\textsuperscript{109}. Possibly Paul Bowes, d.1702, lawyer and historian, who became Fellow of the Royal Society in 1699.
\textsuperscript{110}. William Lorimer, a Scot who took Anglican orders in 1664 but afterwards became a Nonconformist.
\textsuperscript{111}. Possibly one of the sons of Dr Gilbert Primrose, d.1651.
\textsuperscript{112}. John Quick, 1636-1706, Nonconformist minister, published the Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, a history of French Protestantism, in 1692.
\textsuperscript{113}. This may be George Hicks, 1642-1715, a non-juror.
\textsuperscript{114}. Robert Fleming, 1630-1694, whose best-known work was Fulfiling of the Scripture, published in parts, hence the reference to the First Part.
\textsuperscript{115}. Eleutheria: or, An Idea of the Reformation in England: and a history of non-conformity in and since that Reformation. With predictions of a more glorious reformation and revolution at hand. Written in the year 1696. Mostly compiled and mainta’nd from unexceptionable writings of conformable divines in the Church of England. To which is added, The conformists reasons for joining with the nonconformists in divine worship. By another hand. (London: printed for J.R. and sold by A. Baldwin in Warwick-lane). I am grateful to Dr David Wykes for drawing my attention to this work, believed to be by Cotton Mather, who fits the description of a “New England man”.
\textsuperscript{116}. Redpath was presumably a Scot known to Lorimer.
\textsuperscript{117}. Samuel Rutherford, c.1600-1661, Principal of St Mary’s College, St Andrews, whose secretary, Ward, published his letters in 1664, against his wishes.
\textsuperscript{118}. Joseph Alleine, 1634-1668, ejected from Taunton.
Milton\textsuperscript{119} a good Grammarian, a schoolmaster. He practised the Doctrine Divorce upon own wife, at last taken to be under Secretary to Oliver, vindicated the Cutting off Charles's Head against Salmarius, for which never called to Account, but he had a brother that was a Papist, and he ('twas thought) died one.

Dr Maurice\textsuperscript{120} a Considerable defendant of Episcopacy, wrote against Mr Clarkson\textsuperscript{121}, whose The publisher of whose book, either did not understand what He published, or else Could not read the Notes of Mr Clarkson, for quotes were not to be found in the places alleged or any where else in the work so Dr Maurice had the Advantage.

He wrote also against Mr Baxter of Episcopacy. But is very bold in his reply, for Mr Baxter quote one Deradon\textsuperscript{122} (author of the Philosophy, & of the [?] of the Mass) & transcribes several matters from him proving that Nestorius was a good Man, that he was persecuted unjustly for denying that B. Mary was Mother of god. He did allow that She was Mother of Christ which Christ was god but not that she was mother of god, for then she must be a Goddess & so worshipped which He would not allow. So Deradon proves that Cyril of Alexandria was in fault and Nestorius was an Honest man, even from Cyril's account of him. Dr Morrice [sic] in Answer to that states there is no such book in the world, which was boldly said for I had the book (states Mr Lorimer to me). I sent the book to Mr Baxter. Dr Owen read it, Mr Nath. Taylor read it, I had it from Dr Lewis Du Moulin,\textsuperscript{123} to whom returned it again but the book is very scarce& it may be Dr Maurice never saw, but 'twas impudently done to say there was no such book. Lorimer.

King William is Erastian. He does not understand how a Church should have power to assemble without the Magistrate, whereas that many famous Synods & Councils before Constantine turned Christian that never asked Emperors' leaves, but Now Church of Scotland and the King do not disagree about it. Dr Stillingfleet Irenicon answered by Dr Rule\textsuperscript{124} very learnedly.

Gregentius\textsuperscript{125} relates a story of the Strange manner of the Conversion of the Jews at the court of the Homerites in Ethiopia. How that an Archbishop undertook to show them Jesus of Nazareth alive, that there upon his prayer

\textsuperscript{119} John Milton, 1608-1674, published a tract \textit{True Religion}, in 1673 against popery.
\textsuperscript{120} Henry Maurice,1648-1691, made Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford the year he died.
\textsuperscript{121} David Clarkson, 1622-1686, ejected from Mortlake, Surrey and co-pastor with John Owen.
\textsuperscript{122} David Deradon, c.1600-1664, French Protestant.
\textsuperscript{123} Louis Du Moulin, 1606-1680, born in Paris; Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford during the Commonwealth, but also physician and controversialist.
\textsuperscript{124} Gilbert Rule, d.1701, preached in Scotland after ejection from Berwick, and forced to take refuge in Holland. Principal of Edinburgh University from 1690.
\textsuperscript{125} Gregentius, Bishop of Taphar in Arabia Felix in the 6th century. An edition of his \textit{Disputatio cum Herbano}, giving an account of his dealings with Yemeni Jews, was published in Paris in 1586.
instantly appeared, but as soon as they had seen him they were struck blind. So
would not comply till the Archbishop had recovered them to sight by prayer,
then they were baptised.
Monsieur Brousson,\textsuperscript{126} that was broke upon wheel the 4th of Nov last was
sincere good Man. The Papists were resolved upon his death long since & they
offered many years ago 50000 livres for any one that Brought Him and
Monsieur Vivant\textsuperscript{127} either dead or alive, whereupon Monsieur Brousson
resolved to go armed no longer but betook self to the arms of Christians,
prayers & tears. Mr Vivant resolved to go well armed and gave out that He
would kill any man that assaulted him that He would not be taken for he said
they would certainly break him upon the Wheel, put him to a painful Death.
Brousson dissuaded him but in vain, at length they heard of Vivant having hid
in a Cave, and a party of Dragoons coming for him. He having his Arms by
him defended himself so bravely that He killed 3 of them whereupon the
Commander seeing the Rest discouraged, advancing at the Head of them Mr
Vivant going too far toward him in the Mouth of Cave to Kill him also was shot
& died presently. Brousson escaped many years till at last was taken, strangled
and then broke upon the wheel.
Auberline (lat Albertinus)\textsuperscript{128} an excellent Book the best upon the Controversiall
part, relating to the Eucharist.
Dr Prideaux\textsuperscript{129} Life of Mahomet a good book, the best that been writ of late.
Not very much in Bradley Sermons\textsuperscript{130} nor in Harris.\textsuperscript{131} Kidder and Williams\textsuperscript{132}
the best.
Mr Baxter told Mr Lorimer that He was very strong in his youth. He could
throw an Iron ball farther than most men, and he could twist an iron Horses
hoove, bend it over.
Fisher Bishop Rochester\textsuperscript{133} wrote against Luther and died in same cause as Sir
Tho. More, yet wrote a good Book de fiducia & misericordia dei, wherein
places all in Christ's death.
I asked Mr Lorimer about the Recantation of Dr Lewis Du Moulin. He saith
that was little in it, but that he confessed to me (saith Mr Lorimer) that Dr
Patrick & Burnet had been with him and pressed him to recant what written
against Ch England. He answered that He had written against Laudian faction,
and that he had done well in doing so, but was sorry if this was understood of
the sober and true part of the Ch of England.\textsuperscript{134}

\textsuperscript{126} Claude Brousson, 1647-1697.
\textsuperscript{127} Vivant has not been identified.
\textsuperscript{128} Aegidius Albertinus, 1560-1620.
\textsuperscript{129} Humphrey Prideaux, 1648-1724, orientalist, published \textit{Life of Mahomet} in 1697.
\textsuperscript{130} Thomas Bradley, 1597-1670.
\textsuperscript{131} Probably Robert Harris, 1581-1658.
\textsuperscript{132} Daniel Williams, c.1643-1716, is probably meant.
\textsuperscript{133} John Fisher, 1459-1535, Bishop of Rochester, executed by Henry VIII.
\textsuperscript{134} This was published as \textit{Last Words}, in 1680.
Dr Du Moulin could have translated Bishop Barlow\textsuperscript{135} book called \textit{Popery}\textsuperscript{136} the Bishop said. Tho he valued Dr Du Moulin & knew he could do it well yet he could not employ for Prince Rupert had undertaken to have it done and that Dr Greaves\textsuperscript{137} to do it & had 100L of the Prince for doing it. When the Prince recommended it to the King, Charles replied Great Tom of Lincoln makes a great Noise.

Pelling\textsuperscript{138} a Debauched wicked fellow.

Mr. Lorimer.

Mr Lorimer was in France when the book that Mr Claude\textsuperscript{139} Answered called \textit{Just prejudices against the Calvinists} came out. He happened be in Booksellers Shop, & being by 2 persons there taken to be a foreigner they spoke to him in Latin, and invited him to their Lodgings. He went, They called in a 3d person who immediately fell upon the Dispute of the Resolution of faith. He was not better provided on any Topic than that Having Read Baronius\textsuperscript{140} over and over, \textit{de formati objecto fidei} and Chillingworth,\textsuperscript{141} & Laud against Fisher, etc. he was too hard for them, so they came to return his visit and brought their pockets full of books and particularly, \textit{Just prejudices against Calvinism} where the argument or Cavil that the Reformers had no powers no authority to reform themselves, that we have no Ministers. Mr Lorimer answered that if they had asked Ministers those which for Reformers ordained in the Church, and thereby were bound to preach Christian doctrine and by consequence to reform themselves from those corruptions that had adulterated it they bound by the vows of their Ordination which they said in the Church of Rome to reform themselves.

But saith Mr Lorimer what you allege in General against Calvinists signifies nothing, you must purge yourselves of those Criminations that we allege against you or else, tho ye still make me doubt whether our Church be true, yet I am sure your Church is false, because I see you guilty Idolatry & if tho I leave our Church I sure yours false your Idolatry is in ye worship Host. We deny it they say.

Argument. If the Bread wine be not transubstantiated then you are guilty, but etc.

Denied the Consequence and said, tho we should be mistaken yet not guilty Idolatry for we verily believe Christ is it, if not we loose life rather than worship Host. Answer & say they your Daille, your great Daille\textsuperscript{142} tells us

\textsuperscript{135} Thomas Barlow, 1607-1691, Bishop of Lincoln.
\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Popery, or the Principles and Position of the Church of Rome very dangerous to all} (London: 1678).
\textsuperscript{137} It is not obvious which Dr. Greaves is meant.
\textsuperscript{138} Edward Pelling, c.1640-1718, prebend of Westminster and royal chaplain.
\textsuperscript{139} Jean Claude, 1619-1687, minister at Charenton, near Paris.
\textsuperscript{140} Cesare Baronio, 1538-1607, Roman Catholic apologist.
\textsuperscript{141} William Chillingworth, 1602-1644, a Roman Catholic convert who reverted to Protestantism.
\textsuperscript{142} Jean Daille, 1594-1679, minister at Charenton, near Paris.
(here they pull his book out their pockets) that if Stranger having heard when Christ was upon earth that was son god, should be moved to go & worship, but having never seen him before should mistake Him, and when he comes into the Room should fall down at An Apostle's foot He would guilty of mistake, not Idolatry. Because he really thought the true Christ there. — Answer. This mistake involuntary. He thought the Apostle Christ, if not, would died, if the 12 Apostles should told, there is not Christ that yet would worship, guilty Idolatry. We tell you and prove it by arguments ye cannot answer that ye mistaken yet ye run Hazard Damnation that ye will do it therefor ye guilty Idolatry. 2. There was some similitude between Christ & the apostle, that may excuse, but none between a little round wafer and the Human nature of Christ. I have confounded you. So they asked him whether he durst give it under his [hand] that they expose their souls to Damnation by worship the Host. He paused a while and Considering that a Scotch nobleman son of Ld Stairs'143 was by, that might be tempted to think He was not so resolved as that he durst not suffer for it He gave it under hand, and so parted. But Monsieur Claude advised Him to change his Lodgings and come nearer to Charenton.

Volusinus144 that wrote de tranquillitate Anima was a Scotch Man. His true name was Wilson. He was not an Ecclesiastic, but yet had some preferments at Rome under some Cardinal. Coming into England upon some account He went to wait on Fisher told him that there were some things in the providence of god that we could never understand, particularly that the German Heretic should understand more of Method of god way pardoning sinners by the work of Jesus Christ than the Catholic Church which showed that Fisher had received some light by reading Luther, whom He, at the appointment of Henry 8 was writing against. His book printed after Death, by Cossander, de fiducio et misericordia Dei, is very orthodox in renouncing all merit, and ascribing all to faith in Christ & yet he was martyr to the Church of Rome, and tho a Cardinal's Cap was sent him, yet Henry 8 cut off head before the cap could be put on, because he would not own the Kings Supremacy saying that an Ecclesiastic Head upon temporal shoulders would not agree and they have canonized him.

I was saying to Mr Lorimer that I did believe the Papists since they deal in lies, errors and heresies were given over by god in judgment to believe lies As the Jews are hardened.

Saith Mr Lorimer your Comparison is good & continued He, I remember that Gerson, who lived in the Time of the Council of Constance, and consented to the Death of Jon Huss, about 250 year ago, yet he says, that the Coming of Antichrist will be partly as coming of true Christ for as in the days Christ all were looking for the messiah & expecting him, & yet were among them they knew it not, so will Coming of Antichrist be. The Church will not know it tho he be come amongst & in the very midst of you.

144. Florentius Volusenus, c.1504-1547, wrote De animi tranquilliæ.
I make, Added He, a great difference between the Churches of Rome before, & since Council of Trent. Mr Lorimer.

Mr Collier\textsuperscript{145} cures his horse of a Cold by giving him a sack glass full of syrup of ground Ivy in pint of Ale and riding him upon it. One glass usually cures, but if be repeated once or twice infallible.

Mr Barker\textsuperscript{146} preached up a middle state a little before He died. Mr Lorimer and I heard Mr Fleming speak of the Hades (at Salters Hall) as not being to be understood of the whole invisible State, but as departing the particular Orb or place of separate souls, where some are kept for Everlasting life & some are Kept in prison to be punished, & (added he) this Notion of the Jews, & ancient Christians yea and the Scriptures themselves. Z.M.

Thomas de Albis (White) wrote a Book de media statu Animorum, for which He was excommunicate at Rome.

Those that think the souls of men are ignorant after death, what shall become of them at Judgment, go beyond the Papists, for say they, Those that are in purgatory are sure they shall go to Heaven, & those that in Hell or Heaven are sure they shall afterwards alter. Mr Lorimer.

Mr Sylvester told me He that god was not displeased with Hezekiah showing his treasures for but a Common Civility, but the true reason was this. The Babylonians were great Idolatry Stargazers and did worship the Sun and they seeing the sun stop course were amazed at and hearing that this was done upon account of King of Judah they were the more astonished and that it was time for them to make him their friend that could command their god. Hereupon they send ambassadors and Hezekiah instead of owning and preaching to them the god of Heaven, did assume the glory to himself and did not improve his Opportunity for gods glory.

Sep. 25. 99.

Mr Stephens\textsuperscript{147} told me – He went to Judge Hale who had told him of his intentions to marry and told him My Lord (said he) I have been much concerned at what you pleased to say to me of your design to marry for said He I know your spirit so well that you above the Concerns of Riches or honour & therefore I fear you will marry much below your self upon Expectation of Higher Degree of virtue but continued He, we often find people that marry well in meaner state, with their preferments change the manners.

Lord Hale replied, Sir, when I consult my Conscience and my God, I seldom do amiss, but when I take my friends advice very often.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{145} Possibly a son of Abel Collier, 1629-1695, ejected in Warwickshire and preached in various places.

\textsuperscript{146} Matthew Barker, c.1620-1698, ejected London minister, at Miles Lane Meeting at his death.

\textsuperscript{147} Edward Stephens, d.1706, who married Hale’s daughter Mary.

\textsuperscript{148} Hale married Ann Bishop, who was of lower social rank, as his second wife in 1664.
Lord Chief Justice Hale’s Life was writ by Dr Burnet a mere mercenary business He was hired by the Booksellers & hath often misrepresented the Judge in 2 first pages are several faults which may be corrected by gravestones and Registers.

This very day Capt Wilner and I saw Codling Tree in Blossom, in Mrs Sowersby’s Garden at Hampstead.
Mr Bolton149 told me that as Tertullian said of Cyprian De magistra. so his father was wont to say of Arthus Hildersham150 give me my master.

Feb. 99.
Mr Carbonell told me that He was well acquainted with Mr Sacheverell151 of Nottingham that Mr Sacheverell did desire three or 4 merchants to meet with him such evenings every week to discourse of Trade & other Merchants were Sir James Houblon,152 Mr Sidgwick, Mr Carbonell, & Mr Goddard.153 Old Madam Lame154 speaking of Mr Jon Warren155 of Hatfield, said he was a most Singular friend for he used to set a portion of Time aside weekly, to pray particularly for his friends and represent their case particularly to god, for that he kept a list of their names for the purpose.
Dr Hall the present Bishop of Bristol did highly extol Mr Clarkson’s book of free grace desire Mr Pawling156 to give it to Mr Locke.157 Jasper Mayne158 a Clergyman of Oxford preach before dean Fell159 said I cannot give you a Definition of an Hypocrite but I can show you one pointing towards the Dean.
Mr Pope160 that married Bishop Wilkin’s Mother, in his sermon gave three signs of the evening coming on. 1. when labourers are going home. Many dying at a time, that were eminent in the Ministry. 2. when shadows grow longer than the substance. 3. when the wild Beast begins to go abroad, ’twas in Lauds Time.

149. This Mr. Bolton cannot be positively identified.
151. William Sacheverell, 1628-1691, of Barton, Nottingham, was a prominent Whig.
152. Sir James Houblon, d.1700, a director of the Bank of England, his brother John being Governor.
153. Sidgwick and Goddard have not been identified.
154. Madam Lame or Larne cannot be identified.
155. John Warren, 1621-1696, ejected from Hatfield Broad Oak in Essex and formed a Congregational church there and in Bishop’s Stortford.
156. Robert Pawling, Whig politician in Oxford and then Controller of the Stamp Office, Lincoln’s Inn, friend of Locke and a Nonconformist.
157. John Locke, 1632-1704, the philosopher.
159. John Fell, 1625-1686, Dean of Christ Church and Bishop of Oxford.
160. Bishop Wilkins’s mother was a daughter of John Dod, see note 51.
Dr South\textsuperscript{161} in his Oration in theatre, reflecting upon the Royal Society said, pedicules Culices, & serpentis multum magnificent.

The present Dr Birch\textsuperscript{162} and his brother were educated at Oxford for many years before they were matriculated; their father a worthy parson would not permit them to be entered, only they lodged in the town & were tutored by Dr Ashton, author of the proposal for widows.\textsuperscript{163} Some were angry at the Dr for teaching them, but Dr Wallis\textsuperscript{164} said He might teach who he would. Mr Pawling.

Mr Harcourt\textsuperscript{165} was speaking in H. of Commons happened to look another way & Sir J Trevor the Speaker\textsuperscript{166} called to him & told him, that by the Rules of that House he ought to Direct his speech towards the Chair & Sir said Mr Harcourt, I did, but you looked another way. (He squinted grievously). Mr Hoby.\textsuperscript{167}

May 1700.
'Twas in the morning Mr Howe the Minister coming to Hampstead sent for me. Among other Discourses I asked whether there seemed to be any tendency towards a Comprehension or a relaxation in the Church. He replied he saw nothing that looked that way, and, then told me the following story, that about the year 78, or 79, in the time of the popish plot, He was sent to by the present Bishop of Worcester Dr Lloyd\textsuperscript{168} desiring him, come and dine with him the next day, I admired saith He that a Bishop whom I had never seen, or at least with whom I had no acquaintance should so desire me to dine with him, The answer I gave was that I was engaged for Dinner but would wait on him afterwards. He sent again to let me know that since I could not dine He would not give me the trouble to come so far as his house, but would meet me at the Dean of Canterbury, Dr Tillotson. We met, said He, and business was to know of me what I thought would satisfy the Nonconformists that so they might come in to the Church. I answered him, that I could not tell what would satisfy any but Myself, for all not equal latitude. The Bishop still pressed me to give an answer what I thought would satisfy the most, for saith He I would have it so large as comprehendeth Most of them. I told him, that I thought they would go a considerable way if would make the law so as that they might promote principles[?] Reformation: Why Saith the Bishop, for this reason I am for taking the lay Chancellors quite away as being the Hindrance of Reformation.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{1} Robert South, 1634-1716, prebend of Westminster, unsympathetic to Nonconformity and here very dismissive of the Royal Society as fleas and lice.
\bibitem{2} Peter Birch, c.1652-1710, a High Churchman, in spite of his Presbyterian upbringing.
\bibitem{3} This work has not been identified.
\bibitem{4} John Wallis, 1616-1703, professor of geometry at Oxford.
\bibitem{5} Simon Harcourt, c.1661-1727, subsequently 1st Viscount Harcourt.
\bibitem{6} John Trevor, 1637-1717, Speaker from 1685.
\bibitem{7} Probably a son of Peregrine Hoby, 1602-1678.
\bibitem{8} William Lloyd, 1627-1717, Bishop of Worcester from 1690.
\end{thebibliography}
At last since Mr Howe could not be frod, they agreed upon a meeting the next night at 7. o clock at the D. Pauls (Stillingfleet). Mr Howe proposed that might bring in Mr Baxter, by no means said the Bishop. Then he proposed Dr Bates, no man better said the Bishop. According Dr Bates & I came at 7 o clock to the Deans, who had provided a very handsome Treat, so we waited 8 till 9, till near 10, but the Bishop never came nor sent, nor did he ever take notice of it, & that very night as we heard the next day, the Bishop threw out the bill of Exclusion from the House of Lords so no more any Comprehension.

Aug. 28. 1700.
This day Monsieur Berland\textsuperscript{169} & I went to visit Mr Stephens at Canewood, He speaking of praying for the Dead, did own that expressly say that Dr Fowler\textsuperscript{170} the present Bishop of Gloucester did acknowledge to Mr Stephens that it was Lawful to pray for the dead & that he himself did practice. Bishop Barron\textsuperscript{171} of St Asaph did order Orate pro Anima upon his own Tomb, & Mr Thorndike\textsuperscript{172} whom Dr Allix\textsuperscript{173} saith was greatest man the Church of England hath had did order it to be put upon his Tomb in Westminster. Mr Stephens.
The smoke, fire, Brimstone in Beast, a prophecy of Gunpowder in Revelation. By Bishop Lloyd.
The inward Chambers, should translated Cupboards. Mat. 24. 26. so the French, so express Text against Mass which kept in cupboards. Marius D’Assigny.\textsuperscript{174}
Mark Serjeant\textsuperscript{175} brought before Justice in Suffolk would reply nothing but to every question your worship is wise. Justice bid be gone, bring again when sober. Next morning, How now saith Justice ye drunk, why. What did say? The Justice told, why, nothing but worship wise Saith Mark. Yea drunk indeed saith Justice fellow is either Knave or fool. Mark looks at Justice Constable replied I am between both Sir. What saith Sirra, don’t ye know that I am Justice querying, /yes Sir, you are a Justice and a poor one. Mr Ray.\textsuperscript{176}
Here lies Wm Pryn
Late Bencher of Lincolns Inne
Who went thro thick and thin
& never was out nor in.\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{169} Berland is a French Huguenot name.
\textsuperscript{170} Edward Fowler, 1632-1714, Bishop of Gloucester.
\textsuperscript{171} Isaac Barrow, 1614-1680, Bishop of St Asaph; the inscription ["Pray for the soul of"] caused controversy.
\textsuperscript{172} Herbert Thorndike, 1598-1672, canon of Westminster.
\textsuperscript{173} Peter Allix, 1641-1717, French Protestant refugee who joined the Church of England.
\textsuperscript{174} Marius D’Assigny, 1643-1717, incumbent of Woodham Walter, Essex.
\textsuperscript{175} Appears to mean Mark, who was a Serjeant.
\textsuperscript{176} John Ray, 1627-1719, deprived of Fellowship of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1662, but became famous as a naturalist.
\textsuperscript{177} William Prynne, 1600-1669, Puritan controversialist, was buried at Lincoln’s Inn.
July 22. 1702.
The Reverend Mr Howe at Hampstead. — I told him the story about Mr Tho. Edge’s premonition of his own Death. He admired the Story, & intimated that it should be printed into Mr Calamy’s Collection.

In return to mine He told me that He hath been credibly informed of some such stories that have not proved true. Instanced in Tale One of Dr Chadderton the first master of Emmanuel College in Cambridge. In his younger years He was something Loose and negligent of his studies, but having good parts He would perform very well when any thing forced him to his Book. Being the next day to perform some solemn Exercise in the College He was late in his Study overnight and there appears to him an Old Man in a gown who told him he was come to forewarn him of his Death which was very near. He was to die the third day from that, And he should have these Signs. The next morning says He, you shall make Blood instead of Urine and the Day after you shall see the 2 birds in your Chamber shall die, and the third day you shall die yourself. Mr Chadderton upon that went to bed something affrighted, and lay till morning. In the morning he dips his Handkerchief in the Chamber pot, and takes it up he was surprised to find it all blood. This added to his Consternation. He sends for a particular friend of College and tells him all. His friend dissuades him from the belief of it, thinks Apparition might be a fancy and this bloody urine a curable disease, but however stays with him all that day and lay with him to assist and Comfort him the more in the night. Next day as were walking in the Chamber, down dropt one of the birds dead, by and by other also. This amazeth them both, and both did then conclude that Mr Chadderton must die the next day. Accordingly His friend doth assist him in his preparation to utmost of his power.

In the evening comes a letter from Mr Chadderton, that mother lay at point of Death, about 10 or 11 miles off at her house and desired him by all means to come to her house the next Day. What to do they did not know, but consulted and argued matter both ways, pro and Con. At last Mr Chadderton determined the matter himself, that He would go. Vicit pietas. He thought if did die He might with as much Comfort die in act of such pity and offer cheer to his mother as any other way. His friend agrees, and the next day gets him an Easy able and Surefooted Horse. Mounts him hires 2 men to attend him, and to walk close by the neck of Horse all way a foot pace. Accompanies him some way out of Town himself and then took his leave of him. They had not gone far, In this manner, but down comes the horse, the Men being just at hand, lay hold of him, and take him up again, and the Horse without any Damage, they mount

178. Thomas Edge, c.1628-1678, ejected from Gawsworth, Cheshire and preached in Chelford.
179. Edmund Calamy, 1671-1732, the biographer of Nonconformist ministers.
180. Lawrence Chaderton, c.1536-1640, was an undergraduate at Christ’s College, Cambridge in the 1560s, and became an ardent Puritan while there. His family were from Oldham.
him again, and march as before. About 3 or 4 Miles from Cambridge they pass thro a village where was a Tavern and in the Upper Room four Scholars that were come thither to make merry. They seeing him pass by call to him Tom Chadderton! Tom Chadderton! He had no mind at all then to come near them, but they ran Down Stairs, and seized the Bridle & brought him so Down. He would not light; the wine was brought down, but He refusing to drink as they would have had him, one of the scholars thinking himself slighted and affronted, and being hotheaded with wine, pulls a sort of a stiletto from under his Gown, and stabs Mr Chadderton but not Ill as to endanger his life at all, the point either stopping upon some rib, or something else so as to give him a slight wound only the Men being just at Hand got him away again, and so he escaped that day safe and lived to extreme old Age.

I methinks said I this spirit must be some Evil spirit that had a design to trepan him out of his life. Mr Howe answered whatever spirit it was it must needs be under Control of the great spirit of all who might use such means to awake Mr Chadderton to more seriousness and care about his Soul.

The Other was of a Seaman, that told Mr Howe how being in a sea fight under Monk181 & being afraid of Death because was till then most p[?]ingly wicked. He begged mercy and a sign of [ ] should then be Killed. Had the sign he desired viz. A piece of Red Cloth, swimming by the ship, yet lived long after. but thereby Converted else.

May 29.1705.
Books recommended to me this day by Mr Matthew Sylvester.
Theses Solmurienses, very good 4 pts182
Syllabus Authoris' Germanid. 2 vol fol.183
Besaldus,184 Gatakers works.185
Bchartus. Buchanan's Common places.186
Lymborchs187 Collatio. His Body of Divinity much better & clearer than Carcellius.188
Dr Edwds Books good, but his Preacher is Excellent.189
Dr Cudworth System good but he has too advantageously put together all

182. Theses Solmuriensis in 2 vols was published at Saumur in 1641 and remained authoritative into the nineteenth century.
183. This collection has not been identified.
184. Besaldus is the name of an Italian family.
185. Gataker, see note 63.
186. Possibly David Buchan, c.1595-c.1652, Scottish historian.
187. Philipp van Lymborch, 1633-1712, published A compleat system ...
188. John Carcellius is credited with editing Thomas More's response to Luther, but this does not fit the context. Perhaps someone else is meant — the original is difficult to read.
189. John Edwards, 1637-1716.
the Atheists Objections which should have been related & answered membratim.\textsuperscript{190}

Mr Baxter commended his Diligence but said He had not gone deep enough. Julius Pollux his Lexicon excellent.\textsuperscript{191}

Sir John Maynard left in Mss an account of the Trial of our Saviour, to show how basely they Injured him according to the principles of the Jewish Law. He told me that the main thing which stuck with him in point of Conformity was the power of Impositions, and the safety of submitting to them, In the New Testament the Apostles searched to look at the Characters of Ministers qualifications rather than other formality etc In the Jewish law was the family of Aaron not so in N. T.

Mr Kings books.\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{190.} Ralph Cudworth, 1617-1688. Sylvester would have preferred "limb by limb".
\textsuperscript{191.} Julius Pollux, published \textit{Ononmasticon}, 1541.
\textsuperscript{192.} It is not clear which Mr King is meant.
"A FEARFUL OUTBREAK OF EGYPTOLOGY"
IN THE NORTH-WEST

The title of this paper is a quotation from that remarkable book, *Grey Pastures*, by Haslam Mills, a one-time journalist on the *Manchester Guardian*. It arose out of a series of articles in that newspaper, and was first published in book form in 1924. It has recently been reprinted by the Chapels Society. Haslam Mills was writing about members of Albion Congregational Church in Ashton-under Lyne, nine miles east of Manchester, and as he was writing about people still living at the time, he disguised their names.

This was the heyday of Nonconformity in the Manchester area but Albion Congregational Chapel, as it was then known, was no ordinary chapel, it was the cultural centre of the town, and wealthy, with rows of carriages at the door on Sundays, and it was zealous in its work of education and self-improvement. Its Literary Society attracted over a hundred men and women to its weekly meetings in the Albion Schools nearby, and not infrequently it was addressed by members who had travelled to Egypt and other Bible lands.

One of its leading members was Charles Timothy Bradbury (1827-1907), a cotton manufacturer, who appears to have been a somewhat eccentric character, always standing for prayers, for example, when everyone else was sitting down. In Haslam Mills’s book he is disguised as Mr Darlington. Charles Bradbury was one of the first to be affected by the "fearful outbreak of Egyptology", and from time to time entertained lecturers at his home, Riversvale Hall, which stood in what is now Daisy Nook Country Park. His daughter, Kate, (1854-1902) became a close friend of Amelia Edwards, (1831-1892), who was a Joint Honorary Secretary and effectively the founder of the Egypt Exploration Fund, later the Egypt Exploration Society. Kate accompanied Amelia on her American lecture tour of New England and the Mid-West in 1889-90.

Amelia Edwards and other Egyptologists were always welcome at Riversvale, but not, perhaps, always at ease there: "Your picture of the Vale is pathetic" wrote Stuart Poole, the other Joint Honorary Secretary, of the EEF, to Amelia: "we have lost something of a class by aping the aristocracy." What he meant by this is obscure, but possibly Mr Poole was referring to the strict and formal regime which prevailed in what was a wealthy merchant’s house. He found Kate something of an enigma, but an impressive one. "She interests me, as Homer says, awfully. There is the restlessness of an imprisoned genius about her." Kate’s own interest in Egypt was almost certainly aroused by the visitors

1. This paper is published by kind permission of Dr Moon’s sister and executrix, Miss Mary Moon.
to Riversvale, where she found herself in the company of Egyptologists such as Flinders Petrie and his Assistant, Francis Llewellyn Griffith. She married the latter in 1896, and wholeheartedly supported him in his work. At her marriage her father settled a considerable fortune on her, and when she died, childless, in 1902, after all too brief a married life, it was her money which enabled her husband to devote himself to Egyptology. He became a leading scholar in the field in his generation and the generosity of Kate and her father enabled the foundation of the Griffith Institute in Oxford.

But Kate Bradbury and her father were not the only Congregationalists of Ashton fired by “a fearful outbreak of Egyptology”; there was also the Revd. Aquila Dodgson (1829-1919). Although he was born in Hull and died in Leeds, he spent much of his active life on the other side of the Pennines at Limehurst, Ashton-under-Lyne. The obituary in the Yorkshire Post referred to “the charm of his modest personal character, instinct with old world courtesy.” Although he was ordained as a Congregational minister in Hull, he had to abandon this calling because his voice was not strong enough for the demands of the pulpit, and he became a cotton-spinner in Ashton.

Aquila Dodgson had clearly been affected as early as 1882 by the “fearful outbreak of Egyptology” in the Ashton area. In that year he corresponded with the Keeper of Oriental Antiquities at the British Museum, Dr Samuel Birch, who was able to tell him in a letter of 13th October that a papyrus which he had submitted for advice was the malediction of a pagan mother upon her son for having embraced Christianity. This important document, still known as the Dodgson papyrus, would be published by the Society for Biblical Archaeology. It had been given to Aquila Dodgson by another Congregational minister, Elkanah Armitage, of Waterhead, Oldham. It was one of two Demotic papyri which Armitage had bought “out of the tray of a lad on the island of Elephantine” in January 1881, and he had given both to his friend. The papyrus was duly published by Professor Revillout in 1883, and again in 1909 by Frank Griffith, who added an amusing story, that when Aquila Dodgson “received his celebrated papyrus from Mr Armitage there was a clay seal attached to it. When the papyrus was mounted under glass, the seal was removed and put in a little crystal box. Unfortunately the box had been appropriated for another purpose by some member of the household without antiquarian instincts and the seal lost, much to his chagrin.”

In 1883, Aquila Dodgson is found addressing the Albion Literary Society on

5. Griffith Institute (GI), Dodgson correspondence, 1.1.
collection is very modest, but I shall be happy to forward you a list of what I have, and also to obtain for you particulars of others which have come under Three of the Pharaohs.9 On 4th November 1886 he wrote to Amelia: “My own my notice. I will also make enquiries respecting any wh. may be in the hands of private gentlemen in this district – not overlooking our local museums.”10 At New Year 1884 he had sent her a copy of the catalogue of the collection of antiquities belonging to his neighbours the Sidebothams. Amelia replied on 5th January 1884: “You are an ally worth having! I never cease to congratulate myself on having made your acquaintance.”11 Aquila Dodgson helped Amelia Edwards in a number of ways, sending her lists and reports, and keeping her informed about “the scarabs, mummy and stela at Owen’s College, Manchester", which became Manchester University. He visited Peel Park Museum in Macclesfield on her behalf, and wrote: “the Curator assisted me most genially for 3 hours in taking squeezes of Hieros” for which Amelia had asked.

It is clear from their correspondence that Flinders Petrie knew the Dodgsons and the Bradburys well. On 4th January 1887 Petrie wrote to Aquila Dodgson from Egypt: “Before I left England I sent up a few fine Egyptian things to the Manchester Fine Art Exhibition on loan.”12 He stayed with the Dodgsons at Limehurst in Ashton in August 1887, and the following month sent Aquila a copy in sheets of a report he had prepared on the Tomb of Seti I.13 In April 1888 he writes from Hawara in the Fayum, where he was excavating: “Pray inform your good friend Mr Bradbury that he shall have the examination of all the patterned cloths if he likes, I shall much value a technical report on them.”14

In a letter of 11 July 1889 Petrie wrote to Aquila that he was “grieved to hear of his great catastrophe” and hoped “that the insurance affairs are satisfactory enough to leave you without future cares as to ways and means.”15 What the catastrophe was is not explained, but some time later, in 1891, Aquila retired, and moved to Leeds, where he became Honorary Librarian of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society. He became increasingly interested in numismatics and astronomy, and most of his energy was given to cataloguing the coin collections there, working at this well into his eighties. Even so, his interest in ancient Egypt did not wane: he gave talks to the Society on “The Orientation of Egyptian Temples” in 189716 and on “Star Temples of

10. EES archives, XVI.e.36.
11. GI, Dodgson correspondence, 2.3.1.
12. GI, Dodgson correspondence, 4.3.
13. GI, Dodgson correspondence, 4.9.
14. GI, Dodgson correspondence, 4.12.
15. GI, Dodgson correspondence, 4.16.
Throughout his long life he helped scholars with his unobtrusive and meticulous recording of finds and collections.

In the same letter of July 1889 Petrie urged Aquila to come out to Egypt and stay with him for three months in his working environment. But Aquila hesitated. He had no doubt heard of the somewhat primitive and frugal life which Petrie lived in Egypt, and there was Mrs Dodgson to think of; ladies travelling up the Nile would expect the comfort of a dahabieh. Petrie's response at the mention of Mrs Dodgson was not altogether encouraging. "If Mrs Dodgson cares to come, he hopes she will." They would have to live in tents, and "I do not keep a cook, but I see no difficulty for a practical person in the way of your prudent wife." He lists his stores: fish, tongue, vegetable soup, jam, wholemeal biscuits, cocoa, tea, coffee. It was winter 1891 before Mr and Mrs Dodgson eventually made the trip up the Nile, and they went by steamer, visiting Petrie briefly at Tel el-Amarna, then going on to marvel at the wonders of Thebes. "It will be one of the greatest treats of your life," wrote Petrie.

As early as 1873-74, Amelia Edwards herself had made her trip up the Nile with a friend, not named in her book, *A Thousand Miles up the Nile* but identifiable as Lucy Renshaw, during which cruise they met two congenial ladies travelling in another boat at exactly the same time. Amelia and Lucy were both from the south of England, but the newcomers, Marianne Brocklehurst (1832-1898) and her companion, Mary Booth, came from the north-west. Marianne grew up in Hurdsfield, about twelve miles south of Manchester. She was the youngest of five children of a wealthy silk manufacturer. The family were Unitarians. From childhood, Marianne Brocklehurst was interested in antiquities and had explored the archaeology of the moors near her home. She travelled in the Middle East on two subsequent occasions, in 1882-83 and in 1890-91, but it was her first trip up the Nile in 1873-74 which was the most rewarding. Her charming illustrated diary of this journey was published in 2004 for the Macclesfield Museums Trust. She built a museum, now called West Park Museum, to house her collection of antiquities, and gave it to the town of Macclesfield, nineteen miles from Manchester. This was the museum visited by Aquila Dodgson. Marianne's collection was listed and published as a catalogue by Dr Rosalie David in 1979.

Marianne Brocklehurst was taken seriously by major Egyptologists of the time. Among the antiquities which she purchased in Luxor in 1874 was an

---

important papyrus, now known as the Brocklehurst papyrus. In a letter of 30th October 1887 Gaston Maspero expresses his thanks to her for her permission to publish this papyrus.21 Flinders Petrie visited her and her museum in September 1887. Her diary is light-hearted and full of humour, but it also reveals her as a highly educated and articulate woman.

In *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, Amelia Edwards disclaimed any desire to become “the happy proprietor of an ancient Egyptian” and she disapproved of the “growing passion for mummies among Nile travellers.”22 One such enthusiast was a Mr Leigh of Stockport, a town about six and a half miles from Manchester. Both Aquila Dodgson and Amelia Edwards approached Petrie on Mr Leigh’s behalf. Petrie wrote to Aquila on 4th December 1888, suggesting a portrait instead: “If I cannot get a ritual [mummy] at Boulak he [Mr Leigh] might perhaps be content with one of the gilt-faced creatures of Ptolemaic era.”23 But Amelia explained, “Pray don’t think of saving a portrait for Mr Leigh. He only wants a mummy – and the more showy, I should say, the better. Mr Leigh is a manufacturer at Stockport – & his hobby is the great Sunday School there – the largest in the world. The building contains 500 rooms & the scholars (of all ages & degrees) are over 2000. (I really think it is 5000.) He wants to walk this mummy bodily into the Sunday School & he will probably get our friend Mr Dodgson to lecture on it to the scholars – and after that I conclude he will give it to the Stockport Museum.”24 But it was not a priority for Petrie – “Mr Leigh of Stockport still wants that mummy,” Amelia reminded him six months later.25

A “fearful outbreak of Egyptology” can also be traced in the towns north of Manchester, and above all in Bolton, twelve miles away, where Miss Annie Barlow (1863-1941) lived with her brother. She was a Methodist, and a campaigner for social and educational causes including the Egypt Exploration Fund. The Egyptological collection in Bolton Museum is still regarded as one of the finest in the provinces.26

Another native of Bolton who fell victim to the same “fearful outbreak of Egyptology” was Mr Jesse Haworth, who is more closely associated with Manchester. It was Amelia Edwards who introduced him to Flinders Petrie. In January 1887, when Petrie had resigned from the EEF, and his future as an archaeologist was uncertain, she lost no time in seeking an alternative source of funding for him, recognising his outstanding genius in the field. “I have a scheme in my head,” she wrote to him on 19th January, “which may come to something – or nothing…I have come to know, by correspondence only, a very wealthy and intelligent man (merchant class) who has travelled in Egypt & is

23. GI, Dodgson correspondence, 4.12.
25. UCL, Petrie Papers, 9.46.
26. UCL, Petrie Papers, 9.43.
enthusiastically fond of Egyptian antiquities. Now it has occurred to me that he is just the man that might be got to undertake the excavation of the Labyrinth [at Hawara] and put it into your hands.”27 Five days later she had already approached “this good and enlightened man” who “leaves your hands quite free. You are to employ the money as you may think best for the cause of science. He does not care for mere ordinary curiosities... He says ‘I have not the slightest wish for a mummy unless it might be of historical interest.’”28 By 18th March she had named the benefactor: Mr Jesse Haworth of Woodside, Bowdon, a well-to-do suburb of Manchester, and all had been arranged.

Jesse Haworth (1835-1920) was a cotton manufacturer and merchant – and a Congregationalist. “He is a religious man,” Amelia wrote to Petrie on 16th June, “& if you could throw any light on the Bible, as at Tarpahnes, he would be gratified. But he does not want plunder, and wishes to keep well out of sight.”29 He had married into another eminent Congregational family when he took Marianne Armitage as his wife in 1871. She was the sister of the Revd. Elkanah Armitage (1844-1929), who gave Aquila Dodgson the “Dodgson Papyrus”. Elkanah himself, educated at Owen’s College, Manchester and Trinity College Cambridge, became Professor of Philosophy and Apologetics at Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford, having previously ministered in Rotherham and lectured at its Congregational College. He married Ella Sophia Bulley, the first research student of Newnham College, Cambridge in 1871. She wrote on history and archaeology and received a degree from Manchester for her work in archaeology. The Haworths and the Armitages went to Egypt together in 1880-81, and on their return the Armitages gave many lectures about their journey. Both the Haworths and the Armitages were members, not of Albion, but of Bowdon Downs Congregational Church. As Anthony Ashton writes, “there was close contact – and some rivalry – between Bowdon Downs and Albion.”30

Petrie was at first a little doubtful of being “bound entirely to an individual”31 such as Jesse Haworth, but was persuaded by Amelia that there were absolutely no strings attached to Mr Haworth’s support. “He wants nothing for himself,” she assured him. “It is idle to be too proud or exact with a good man like this.”32 Petrie visited the Manchester area in the summer of 1887, and was clearly charmed by both the Haworths and the Dodgsons who had offered him hospitality. “What you tell me is just what I had imagined of both families,” Amelia wrote to him, “but it is a great comfort to find that

27. UCL, Petrie Papers, 9.19.
31. EES Archives, XVII.c.51.
32. UCL, Petrie Papers, 9.20.
they are all so nice & so simple in their ways. Their letters all round, husbands’
and wives’, show a charming hospitality & great intelligence.”

That year, 1887, there was a grand Fine Arts Exhibition in Manchester to
celebrate Queen Victoria’s Jubilee, which was widely reported in the press, and
in the autumn Amelia Edwards went to the Manchester area on a lecturing tour.
“Most of my present audience,” she told the ladies of Alderley Edge on one of
her engagements, “will have seen Hatasu’s magnificent throne-chair in its
place of honour under the dome in the centre of the building. That beautiful
object, then the property of my friend Mr Jesse Haworth, was the most
venerable and interesting work in that wonderful collection, as it is now one
of the most precious … objects in our own Egyptian galleries at the British
Museum. I need not, I am sure, remind you that even before the Manchester
exhibition was closed, Mr Haworth had patriotically presented the throne-chair
of Queen Hatasu to the nation.”

This was only the beginning of Jesse Haworth’s generosity in the cause of
Egyptology. His funding, and that of Martyn Kennard, enabled Petrie to
excavate in a private capacity for nine sessions; thereafter he worked again for
a time under the auspices of the EEF. Many of the artefacts which were found
and, with the permission of the Egyptian government, brought to Britain, were
given to the Manchester Museum, which served as the Museum of Manchester
University, and Haworth contributed largely to the building of an extension to
the museum, opened in 1912; this houses the private collection which he
bequeathed to the University. The extension is named after him and there his
bust and that of his wife can be seen, and behind them the stela of Isis, one of
his earliest gifts. His benefactions to the University were acknowledged by an
honorary degree of Doctor of laws. His generosity extended to the City: he
received a citation for his services to the arts in 1907. Nor did he forget the
needs of his church: he was a subscriber to the re-building of Albion Chapel,
which had outgrown the premises of 1835. The old chapel was demolished
in 1964, but the “new” church, opened in 1895, still stands today in a
commanding position in Ashton-under-Lyne.

An examination of the list of subscribers and donors to the Egypt
Exploration Fund in the 1880s shows (taking 1888 as an example) that no less
than nineteen per cent of the subscribers came from the Manchester area, from
a radius of under twenty miles from the city centre. This remarkable fact
prompts one to ask why the north-west was such a hotbed of Egyptology, and
what it was that aroused interest more particularly in the area.

There were a number of causes. First, during the American Civil War of
1861-65, when supplies from the new world were cut off by blockades,
Lancashire eyes had turned to Egypt as a source for raw cotton, and trade
relations with Egypt were flourishing. Secondly, the strength of the
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Nonconformists in the north-west, with their emphasis on the Biblical teaching of the Old as well as the New Testaments, brought a particular interest in the archaeology in the lands of the Bible and the decipherment of newly discovered texts. Thirdly, Amelia Edwards's popular book, *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, first published in 1877, had stimulated interest in ancient Egypt among the growing proportion of the population who formed the reading classes, and had drawn attention to the urgent need to preserve the remains of the ancient civilization, thus inspiring the newly rich middle classes not only to travel to Egypt themselves, but also to support excavation there and to build up collections of the relics.

Amelia Edwards's influence was noticeable in other ways too: she made two lecture tours of the north-west, in the autumns of 1887, and 1888, speaking on a variety of ancient Egyptian themes. Her lecture at the Royal Institution, Manchester, on "The Social and Political Condition of Women in ancient Egypt" was repeated in Alderley Edge, Macclesfield and elsewhere, appealing especially to women, who were becoming more highly educated and more politically active. On some of the occasions of her lectures local branches of the EEF were formed. Of the eighteen Local Honorary Secretaries thus coordinating local support for the Fund, no fewer than seven came from the Manchester area.

Lastly, the opportunity to help create or enhance local collections undoubtedly suited the north-west. This was where the new money was, and where philanthropy was consequently in vogue. To many of the great industrialists and manufacturing families of the north-west, this was a safe and visible way of contributing to local cultural and educational amenities in an area where civic pride was high. In consequence, the "fearful outbreak of Egyptology" in the 1880s and 1890s left this area astonishingly rich in Egyptological collections, and greatly enhanced Egyptological study not only there, but in London and Oxford too.
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"EVOKING THE SPIRIT OF THE PAST": THE CELEBRATION OF ANNIVERSARIES BY THE ABBEY CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH IN ROMSEY 1901-1912

They had come to the 244th anniversary and surely God had blessed them, and blessed them richly. He never came into the church without casting his eyes along the two rows of shields, and thinking of all that the men wrote and did for the glory of God and the strengthening of His people in that sanctuary. It would be good for them from time to time to refresh their spirits on what the men of old wrote and did for them.¹

With these words, Alexander Grieve, minister of the Abbey Congregational Church in the market town of Romsey, sought in 1906 to express something of the debt that he and those listening to him owed to their spiritual forebears.

Dating its origins to the Great Ejection of 1662 the Abbey Congregational Church was one of the most historic in Hampshire. The founding of the Church was attributed to Thomas Warren, of Houghton near Stockbridge, who had been offered and had rejected the Bishoprics of Winchester and Salisbury. Following his ejection he came to Romsey and initially held services in a private house. Subsequently an Independent Church was formed from which emerged the Abbey Congregational Church. In 1889 new and distinctive church buildings were opened which survive to this day. The church was described as built “in the Perpendicular style, from designs by Messrs. Bonella and Paull, architects, of London, and includes an archway, connected by a turret with the main building, forming a striking and picturesque feature.”²

As one of Romsey’s historians, Phoebe Berrow, has pointed out, the building often “confuses tourists in search of the Abbey Church.” She goes on to observe that inside the Congregational Church, “the seats and gallery [are] arranged in a circular pattern that gives a very pleasant intimacy.”³ Notwithstanding his ejection, it is particularly apt that the remains of Thomas Warren lie in the south transept of Romsey Abbey, with an inscription that includes the words “… t’was Christ he preached, loved, lived.”⁴

Undoubtedly, it was the Abbey Congregational Church’s longevity that gave its anniversaries a special resonance and sense of occasion. As yet, however, there does not appear to be anything that could be described as a historiography

1. Hampshire Independent, 5 May 1906.
of Free Church anniversaries. For example, neither Simon Green nor Jeffrey Cox in their studies of church life in West Yorkshire and Lambeth respectively, review systematically how anniversaries were celebrated and the meanings that might accrue to them. Likewise in his study of Reading, Yeo makes no particular reference to what were often significant events in the Nonconformist calendar.

For Free Churches, the anniversaries of their foundation served a variety of purposes. First, they provided church members with an opportunity to reflect upon past achievements and to derive inspiration from, and express gratitude for, the services that their predecessors had rendered. Allied to this awareness of the past, members used the anniversary to rededicate themselves to fulfilling the tasks and meeting the challenges they currently faced and to gird their loins for the future. Secondly, they served as occasions for fellowship and expressions of solidarity with other churches. Thirdly, they enabled the local church to engage with the wider community. Lastly, they offered a platform from which invited speakers could air whatever was on their minds. This might be anything from current issues and concerns to the nature and theological basis of Congregationalism.

In view of the multifaceted nature of anniversaries, it is proposed in this paper to examine the manner in which they were celebrated by the Abbey Congregational Church during the Edwardian era and to assess what they might have meant to those involved. Specifically, consideration is given to anniversaries held between 1901, the 239th, and 1912, the highly symbolic 250th. As it was put in the church magazine, the 250th celebrations were "anticipated with very considerable interest for many months, and the successful issue afforded the greatest pleasure to members of the Church and congregation and also to a very wide circle of well wishers and friends."

During this period, the Abbey Congregational Church had three distinguished and much loved and respected pastors. In addition to Alexander Grieve, who served from 1905 to 1909, when he departed for a professorship at the United College in Yorkshire, they were Hugh Ross Williamson, who began what was his first pastorate in 1897 and left for Trowbridge in 1904, and Albert Bage, who arrived from Stannary Congregational Church in Halifax in
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1909 and served until 1914 when he returned to Yorkshire and a pastorate in Bradford.

In the words of his son, Williamson arrived in Romsey “at the age of thirty, tall, fiery-haired, Scots and enthusiastic”.9 With what some might describe as experience of the real world of shipbuilding, he began his studies for the ministry at Paton College at the age of twenty-six. Described as “a big man – big in body, mind and heart,” later in his career he was to become the first moderator of the Eastern Province of the Congregational Union.10

Although his father was a Scot, Grieve hailed from Pembrokeshire, “Little England beyond Wales”. In some respects a consummate academic, he was a missionary in India, before his pastorate in Romsey, and “alongside his scholastic work ... he never lost his sense of ministerial calling.”11 After his death the following tribute was paid to him in the magazine of his alma mater, Mansfield College: “His knowledge of the Bible and of literature was immense, his wit and humour were unexpected, fresh and quotable; his love of people and his pastoral touch were remarkable.”12

Bage was born in Sheffield and had a Primitive Methodist background. One gets the impression that he was a plain speaking Yorkshireman, although much of his ministry was spent in other parts of the country. In his obituary he is described as “a man of deep faith, with a strong evangelical outlook, kindly, lovable, and loyal to his church and friends.”13 His move south in 1909 was prompted by the hope that the change of climate would benefit the “health of his family”.14

Notwithstanding their different backgrounds, careers, and possibly temperaments, while serving at Romsey all three ministers were very conscious of the Abbey Church’s traditions. These they nurtured and sustained.

In preparing this paper considerable reliance has been placed on newspaper accounts, supplemented with church records. Although such sources are selective and partial, they offer insights into the organisational aspects of anniversaries and the themes addressed by the key speakers. They also serve as a basis for gauging the atmosphere and general mood and assessing any changes in the years leading up to the 250th anniversary.

Format of Anniversary Celebrations

At Abbey, like other Congregational churches, the anniversary celebrations were usually held over two days. In the case of Romsey, these were a Sunday
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and Monday, generally in late April or early May. On the Sunday there were special services in the morning and evening with a visiting preacher, often of some note. They included, in 1906, H.T. Andrews, Professor of Church History and New Testament Exegesis at New College, Hampstead; in 1907, A.E. Garvie, Principal elect of New College; and, in 1912, George Saunders, Secretary of the Hampshire Congregational Union (HCU) and minister of Above Bar Congregational Church in Southampton. From 1907, during Sunday afternoon there was an open meeting of the Men’s Own Brotherhood, which was started by Alexander Grieve. It was reported that for this event in 1912 “the audience which filled the church … [was] largely composed of ladies.”

On Monday evening a public meeting was held, often preceded by a tea, with the chair taken by a leading figure from the HCU. He was supported by ministers and members of other Congregational churches and sometimes neighbouring Free Churches. Visiting speakers were often the ministers of leading churches within Hampshire, such as J.D. Jones from Richmond Hill Congregational Church in Bournemouth and Ieuan Maldwyn Jones from Albion Congregational Church in Southampton. Occasionally, speakers came from further afield. In 1903, for example, one speaker was the well known preacher Charles Silvester Horne from Whitefield’s Church in Tottenham Court Road and, in 1904, J.A. Mitchell the Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. The fact that Abbey could attract such big names was testimony to its standing within the Congregational world. How the speakers felt about the demands placed upon them is not entirely clear. Since they were likely to have had full diaries, it is probable that in what they had to say there was a considerable amount of recycling.

Up to the middle of the decade, the Church Secretary would present at the public meeting an annual report on the progress of the church and its activities. So, for example, in 1902 it was reported that “in reviewing the work for the past year … [Ernest Barling, Church Secretary and by occupation a grocer], thought they had been greatly blessed and had much to be thankful for.” However, this practice was repetitive since the report had already been presented at the annual church meeting held in January, so it was discontinued following the arrival of Alexander Grieve in 1905. Nonetheless, the public meeting continued to serve as a shop window for the Church vis-à-vis the local community. That said it had a quasi-religious format with opening prayers, spiritual exercises, doxology, and benediction.

Another notable feature of the proceedings was music, which included not only the singing of hymns, but also contributions from choir members in the
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form of solos and anthems. The latter normally involved local talent, but in 1910 and 1912 the services of a visiting singer, Madame Anna Shergold, were secured. She was described as “the popular soloist from the Queen’s Hall, London, and other concerts.”

Music could be said to have served the dual role of providing entertainment and stimulating reflection. Apart from catering, it was one of the few areas in which women could play a leading role in anniversary proceedings.

No official records of the numbers attending either the services or the public meetings have been found. Press reports simply referred to “large congregations,” “largely-attended public meeting,” or as in 1911 “about 120 sat down” to the tea. In 1907, “the attendance was somewhat reduced by the drenching rain” and again in 1908, “the unpleasant weather militated against a large attendance.”

Although the anniversary celebrations were primarily linked to the foundation of the church, on a number of occasions other anniversaries were also to the fore. For example, in 1903 the celebrations seem to have been more closely associated with the sixth year of Hugh Ross Williamson’s pastorate than with the 241st of the foundation of the church, while in 1908 much was made of the fact that the anniversary was “really a triple one, for it was the 246th of the church, the 20th of the present building and the third of Mr Grieve’s pastorate.”

Whatever was being celebrated, it seems likely that the minister and deacons would have had the biggest say in determining the format, with ordinary members having a limited voice. They were in this sense top down occasions. Nonetheless, all the surviving evidence suggests that anniversaries were events of some magnitude and consequence for the entire membership of Abbey Congregational Church.

**Past, Present and Future**

With its long history, Romsey was seen as exemplifying the resilience of Congregationalism and its members as being specially privileged in belonging to a church with such a pedigree. As R.W.S. Griffith J.P. from Fritham, who chaired the public meeting in 1901, pointed out: “This was their 239th anniversary; there must be something in Free Churchism and Congre-
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gationalism to have enabled them to achieve such a record." Such was the longevity of Abbey Congregational Church that ministers of some of the more recently founded churches, who were invited to speak at anniversary events, could display a degree of envy. For example, in 1901, J. D. Jones observed that: "The [Romsey] church had a great history; his in Bournemouth was a good one, but it was new," or as reported elsewhere: "He should like to have the traditions that that church had behind it transferred to his Church at Bournemouth." However, as Jones reminded his listeners, "unless these traditions – and they were magnificent – became an inspiration they would become a snare." In other words, churches should not dwell on the past but use it as a springboard for renewed endeavour in the present and future. This linking of the past with the present and future was a theme taken up by many anniversary speakers. In 1904, Ernest L. Lane, a registrar of births and deaths from Bournemouth and current Chairman of the HCU, commented that: "as he looked around their church it showed that they did not believe in the past merely, but they looked forward." Two years later, John Ridley, a retired ironmonger and deacon of the Avenue Congregational Church in Southampton, who was serving as Chairman of the HCU, observed that:

Anniversary meetings took them at Romsey a long way back, their church had a splendid history, which embodied the names of men who would never be forgotten. It was a good thing to have a past, but he hoped they were not going to live in the past. They should let the past only inspire them for the future, and nerve them to increase energies.

Similarly, in 1911, the Revd David Tran from Eastleigh, remarked that:

At their church in Romsey they had entered on a glorious heritage ... Many good men had passed on before and the work was now handed on to those of the present generation.

Not surprisingly, the Great Ejection of 1662 and its legacy dominated proceedings at the 250th anniversary in 1912. All of the principal contributors spoke about it at length and, in their different ways, pressed for the spirit of 1662 to inspire those present. Thus, at the afternoon meeting, George Saunders ended his address by challenging his listeners with the affirmation that "the best way to commemorate the 250 years was for each one of them to

27. *Hampshire Advertiser*, 4 May 1901.
29. Ibid.
re-consecrate themselves, and that with all the passion of their souls there
might be the passion and spirit of the Crucified." 33 During the evening,
William Miles, minister of Buckland Congregational Church in Portsmouth,
argued that: "It was something to know that they came from a good faith; they
were children of the Puritans; let them live to be worthy of them." 34 At the
same meeting, Ieuan Maldwyn Jones contended that: "They wanted to foster
the spirit of loyalty to the Congregational Church that the men of an earlier day
founded. They were the sons of the prophets; let them be worthy sons (Great
applause)." 35

How far these and earlier exhortations had any effect is difficult to say. It is
clear, however, that from about 1905 the Romsey church experienced a period
of decline. Membership peaked in 1903 with 280 on the Church roll. 36 By
1913 the number of members had fallen to 230. In the elections for deacons,
those voting fell from 185 in 1903 to 149 in 1912. Although full information
is not available, there was a reduction in the weekly offerings from £198 8s 8d
in 1907 to £172 3s 10d in 1913. 37 Seen in this light, it could be said that the
rhetoric of some of the speakers was to little avail. Countervailing forces and
worldly distractions were at work and these were difficult to resist and reverse,
notwithstanding appeals to church members to emulate the zeal and commit­
ment of their predecessors.

Fellowship and Solidarity

A number of anniversaries were characterised by a demonstration of the
strong bonds between the Abbey Congregational Church and other Congre­
gational churches in Hampshire. In part this was due to the friendship between
ministers and the fact that, during the later part of his pastorate, Hugh Ross
Williamson was Secretary of the Sunday School Section of the HCU and that
he and Alexander Grieve were in demand as speakers elsewhere. In 1904 repre­
sentatives from East Street Congregational Church in Andover testified to the
high regard in which Williamson was held by their church and presented him
with two volumes of Edward Burnett Tylor's *Primitive Culture*. In these was
the inscription: "Presented to the Rev H.R. Williamson by his friends at

36. This included non-residents and members of the "branch churches" in the villages of
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Andover Congregational Church as a mark of grateful esteem and affection, May 1904.\textsuperscript{38}

In 1906, John Ridley made reference to the "good fellowship that had always existed between the Avenue [Congregational] Church in Southampton and Romsey and in Mr Williamson, the late minister, the Avenue Church had a very sincere friend."\textsuperscript{39} Likewise, Alexander Grieve was a "great friend" to the new church at Eastleigh.\textsuperscript{40}

Anniversaries also exemplified the degree of solidarity that existed between the Abbey Congregational Church and other Free Churches within Romsey. For example, in 1901 the Wesleyan Methodist, Primitive Methodist and Baptist ministers were on the platform for the Monday evening meeting, while in 1907 the Baptist minister, E.J. Burrows, was both in attendance and spoke:

> He brought a greeting from his church to them, and he congratulated them upon their anniversary ... He thought that if ... [their] church flourished in the town, then every other church flourished (applause). As representing a sister church he ... prayed that it might be one of the most successful years they had ever had (applause).\textsuperscript{41}

At this time, there appears to have a very good rapport between the Baptists and Congregationalists in Romsey, since in 1908 reference was made to the fact that Alexander Grieve had "assisted so greatly a few weeks ago at the Baptist anniversary and so showed his brotherliness."\textsuperscript{42}

Although there is no evidence of Anglicans attending the anniversary meetings, some speakers went out of their way to make it clear that they bore no animosity towards the Church of England. Sentiments, such as those expressed by Ieuan Maldwyn Jones in 1912, would have been shared, almost certainly, by many in the audience:

> That night they did not meet to have a go at the Church of England; they respected her, and while he was on holiday he spent part of his Sabbaths in worship in the Church. He bore absolutely no ill-feeling against the Church of England, but at the same time he made no apology for being a Nonconformist.\textsuperscript{43}

Nevertheless, the impression given was that these were very much Free Church gatherings with a number of speakers emphasising their distinctiveness and the Biblical basis of their church order. Indeed, in 1903, R.W.S Griffith J.P., who was again chairing the proceedings, resorted to heavy handed sarcasm to make his point:
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He found amongst his friends and acquaintances of the Anglican Church a colossal ignorance of the faith and position and principles of the members of the Free Churches. He should like to point out they used the bible (hear, hear) and built their institution and faith on it (applause). They believed in Jesus Christ, and worshipped him (hear, hear). He should like to state that they believed in the ten commandments (hear, hear), the commandments written by the finger of God and not those written by the finger of man. He said that because in one of their local papers he saw that a writer said that by their [Anglican] Church catechism Church people had been taught their duty to God and their neighbours, which the poor creatures in the Free Churches were thought not to have (laughter). He should also like to say they did pay their ministers (laughter). He should like to point out that they built decent churches, and he should like to bring his friends of the Anglican Church to such a fine place as that [i.e. Abbey Congregational Church] to show an instance of it. He should like to point out that they supported outside organisations to a large extent (hear, hear). As a people they were loyal to the King (hear, hear), and were not secret societies banded together for the undermining of the Constitution (laughter) ... They believed ... that the spiritual vitality of the Church could only be sustained by separation from the State (applause).44

This captures something of the frustration which Nonconformists, in general, and Congregationalists, in particular, felt with respect to Anglicans at this time. There was also a wish to distance themselves from, in the words of Silvester Horne, “the appalling superstition that existed under ritualism and ‘sacerdotalism’.”45 This was a direct reference to some of the practices which had been developing within a number of Anglo-Catholic churches at this time. In the words of Henry Coley, minister of Christchurch Congregational Church, “they believed in going direct to God without the intervention of any man.”46

Moreover, latent animosities between Anglicans and Congregationalists could surface at any time. In this respect, it is noteworthy that the 250th anniversary celebrations touched a raw nerve with some Anglicans as evidenced by the heated debate subsequently conducted through the correspondence columns of the Romsey Advertiser. This was initiated by Cyril Edwards, Rector of Mottisfont, a parish near Romsey, who was also Honorary Secretary of the Church Defence Committee.47 He took particular exception to the use of
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the word “persecution” by speakers when referring to the experiences of Thomas Warren in 1662. This prompted a rejoinder from Alexander Grieve who, although no longer pastor, visited Romsey shortly after the celebrations. Albert Bage was away at the time. Although the debate was conducted in a civilised manner, with Cyril Edwards referring to Alexander Grieve as “my old friend” and both agreeing that, despite having different views on the nature of the Great Ejection, they had much in common, their language was, on occasions, robust.48 Furthermore, the fact that the debate went on for nearly three months indicates something of the strength of feeling amongst the protagonists, of whom there were a number besides Edwards and Grieve, as well as the desire of each to have the last word.

Engagement with the Local Community

Given that some of the anniversary events were billed as for the “public”, it was clear that the Abbey Congregational Church hoped that they would serve as a means of engaging with the local community, if not in the form of traditional outreach, then at least by demonstrating that the church was still very much a going concern. It is not possible to determine how many, if any, non churchgoers attended the “public” meetings. Nonetheless, the fact that they were extensively reported in the local press suggests that it was felt the readers, whether churchgoers or not, would have some interest in the proceedings. It was certainly one way in which the Church could present itself and publicise its achievements to the community at large, especially during the years when the Church Secretary reported on progress. Moreover, given that press accounts often included summaries of what was said, particularly on Monday evenings, they contributed to the wider dissemination of Christian discourse and of current thinking on issues which confronted the Abbey Congregational Church and more widely. For example, in May 1907, readers of the Hampshire Independent would have seen the following remarks made by Francis Sloper, minister of Boscombe Congregational Church and Chairman of the HCU at the public meeting:

There was an old gentleman at Rome, who called himself the Vicar of Christ, but the only Vicar of Christ on Earth was the Holy Spirit. Having a great Gospel and a Great God, they wanted great souls to carry on the work ... They wanted everywhere men 'whose hearts God had touched,' men being saved to save. Congregationalists who had realised that they had a great gospel and a great God were like the Caister lifeboatmen, who never turned back. They should say, as said the men of old, 'We are doing a great work, and cannot come down.'49

How non-churchgoers might have reacted to such remarks is now difficult
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to gauge. It is likely, however, that many would have been sufficiently familiar with religious language, expectations and sensibilities from Sunday school days at least, for such sentiments not to have appeared odd or overly partisan: some of the protocols of discursive Christianity were much in evidence at anniversary gatherings.\textsuperscript{50} Indeed, they could be said to have made a contribution, however modest, to sustaining a faith society in Romsey and beyond.\textsuperscript{51}

**Issues and Concerns**

Arguably the most important function of the anniversary, particularly at the public meeting on Monday evening, was to provide an occasion for what might be characterised as an exercise in heart searching. This could take a variety of forms. It might involve the minister reflecting on his role. In 1906, Alexander Grieve had this to say about his first year at the Church:

... he was described as the pastor, which meant shepherd; he might be a poor one but he hoped not a false one. A pastor might be a minister, and he hoped he was in this case. He certainly tried to strike that note in the beginning of his work ... and he must leave his friends to say if he had been successful in maintaining that note or not. As long as it pleased God to continue their mutual work that relationship which he believed he began he should always strive to maintain – he should strive to be the servant of the people of that church.\textsuperscript{52}

These reflections tended to echo the remarks of other speakers who were keen to stress the collaborative and participative nature of Congregational church life. For example, in 1904 J.A. Mitchell reminded his audience that “in Scripture the church was called a tree, and was described as a ‘partnership,’ and he thought that nothing was likely to inspire zeal more than a ‘partnership’.”\textsuperscript{53}

Many speakers tended to reflect on the role of the Church in broader terms. Indeed, the theological underpinnings of the Free Churches in general and Congregationalism as a branch of Nonconformity, in particular, were themes to which speakers constantly returned. Speaking in 1901, J. D. Jones argued that for “a true revival of religion ... their ministry must have three characteristics. It must be Protestant, it must be evangelical, and it must be progressive.”\textsuperscript{54} Protestantism was contrasted favourably with Romanism, while Evangelicalism, which spoke to the “hearts of man”, was seen as
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superior to Unitarianism, which Jones described as “Christianity robbed of its grandeur.” To be progressive meant accepting new truths while remaining “loyal to Christ.” What these new truths might have been are not spelt out in detail in the press report. This simply states that Jones “gave some ideas on higher criticism and fresh revelations of truth, and then concluded a powerful and closely reasoned address.” Although the blending of traditional beliefs with some at least of the outcomes of Biblical criticism sounds reasonable enough, it could be argued that for Jones, and others who thought like him, the full implications of what this meant in practice was not fully worked out and use of the term “progressive” was simply a rhetorical device.

Two years later, in addressing the question “What was the Congregational Church?” Jones claimed that: “Their church was not a democracy but a theocracy. It was not built upon the political doctrine of the equality of man, but upon the reality of the presence of Christ.”

In 1907, Francis Sloper expressed the view that Congregationalists and Baptists had “the greatest form of [church] government in the world... with no outside prelate or priest to interfere with them.” As George Saunders put it in 1912, the founders of Congregationalism “were an ‘ecclesia,’” called out of the world into a new fellowship, a new union, those who had known Christ as their Lord and Saviour.” Of central importance to many speakers was the ideal of the “enthronement of conscience,” which they saw as lying at the heart of Nonconformity.

Nonetheless, while Edwardian Congregationalism might be based on long established and well founded principles tempered perhaps by new truths, a number of anniversary speakers sought to address the more challenging question of how the church should move forward. In 1907, Ieuan Maldwyn Jones spoke on the subject of “The Church of the Future.” In his view this “would be a free church, absolutely free from State control, and absolutely free from any encumbrance of any theological dogmas.” It would also have to work with the grain of, and not resist, what he described as the spirit of the age – a love of excitement and of change. This would involve the churches becoming social centres, thereby giving practical expression to the concept of the institutional church. Somewhat provocatively, he argued:

What was now the social centre? A public-house there was no other. Why should a man have to go to a public-house if he wanted to have a smoke or talk to a friend of his? Why should a man have to go to a public-house if he wanted to pay his subscription to a friendly society? Why ought not a too much, its billiard-room? ... They must endeavour to make their
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60. This was a phrase used by Ieuan Maldwyn Jones in 1912.
church to have a concert hall, its club-room, and, if he did not shock them churches a social centre, and so appeal to the whole man ... The churches existed for the people, for the very poorest people, the finest friendship of the true church was for the publican and sinner, but the friendship of the church today was not for these people – at least it was true in many places (hear, hear) ... The church was the place where rich and poor should meet together in the sight of God, and the church that recognised that was the church of the future. 61

In part, these remarks were linked to the need for the churches to find effective ways of appealing to the working classes and of attracting young men, segments of society with which churches struggled to engage.

A different stance was adopted by John Evelyn Thomas, the assistant minister of Richmond Hill Congregational Church in Bournemouth. Speaking in 1909, he addressed the following comments to his audience:

Let them ask themselves on that anniversary whether in their church life they were always hoping and seeking when they went to God's house to be brought face to face with Him. Then the churches also existed to redeem and uplift men and women and make them men and women of character. They must try in the daily lives to be men and women of principle. They must have as their ideals the making of the churches missionary and educative. The church should not be a dull place, but at the same time it should not be a Vanity Fair. It should be a hive of industry, but not a house of merchandise. 62

In his view, the mission-centred nature of churches needed to be blended with a highly developed educative role.

Many speakers took a reasonably positive view of the Church and its ability to move forward through accommodation with the spirit of the age. One exception was Thomas Cynor Evans of Bitterne Park Congregational Church in Southampton, who in 1911 expressed views that were both sombre and prophetic:

These were great days in many respects as far as the achievements, and as far as the material prosperity of our land were concerned, but, alas, they were not great days as far as the church was concerned. Somehow or other the church seemed to be impotent and helpless. The reason [for] it was that they were neither hot nor cold. 63

Such pessimism at church anniversaries was unusual but, with the benefit of hindsight, it could be seen as a more accurate assessment of the situation.

In some respects, Evans was simply articulating the ongoing frustration of

61. *Hampshire Independent*, 4 May 1907.
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many pastors and church members regarding those who took no interest in the Church or Christian beliefs and practices. Here the most frequently used word, running like a *leitmotif* through much of the discourse, was “indifference”. In 1903, Silvester Horne eloquently declaimed on this theme:

It was indifference they had to fight, that indifference which was a reaction against sacerdotalism. As Christian people they should weigh well the call of Christ to be up and doing in their various spheres of activity. He did not profess to know what the church there [i.e. Romsey] was like. He expected it was superior to the churches he invariably met with. In these there was the glowing heart, those who gave themselves without reserve to the work of Christ; outside those warmed by the inner fire, those more or less lukewarm; then the outer circle more indifferent still; and then the great arctic circle, those who were insensible to the warmth of the light and heat of the Christian Church. Their business was to draw these out of the frigid regions and to bring them near the centre, that the passion and love of Jesus Christ might be for their joy and for the blessing of the world outside.64

Superior or not, members of Abbey Congregational Church still had to confront the challenge of how best to transmit this warmth to the religiously indifferent.

Although many of the addresses were primarily ecclesiastical in their subject matter, a number were overtly political, particularly in the early years of the new century. In 1902 and 1903, when the controversy surrounding the Education Act of 1902 was at its height, it was almost inevitable that speakers would devote some attention to the issue. Indeed, in 1902 the Revd J. Binney adopted a somewhat belligerent stance and, in the words of the *Ramsey Advertiser*, mounted a “spirited attack on the Education Bill”:

The Education Bill of to-day was a call to arms (hear, hear). The forces of reaction had set themselves in battle array. The principles of representative Government, freedom of the English citizen, and the efficiency of England’s children were sacrificed to the clerical interest, to the interests of sectarianism, and unless the members of the Free Churches aroused themselves and combined to arrest this attack on civil liberty irreparable evil would be done to the cause of national education and national progress (hear, hear).65

This was fighting talk and it greatly appealed to the audience. Such politicisation, however, was not sustained and thereafter overtly political comments were relatively rare. In some respects this is surprising given the controversies that shortly arose over such issues as old age pensions and

---

64. *Ramsey Advertiser*, 26 June 1903.
the People's Budget of 1909. A likely explanation is that with a Liberal
government, many Congregationalists and other Nonconformists were anxious
not to raise the political temperature any further.

Mood

It would be too simple to claim that there was a noticeable shift in the
atmosphere at Abbey's anniversary celebrations from one infused with success
to one tinged with failure. Nonetheless, in the early years it is possible to
detect, especially in the annual reports, a hint of triumphalism. In 1903, for
example:

Mr Barling [church secretary] gave a very excellent report, which, he said,
showed continuous progress. They had more than maintained their
numbers. They started the year with 270 members, and finished with 280
(hear), and some had either died or left the town for other churches. Since
1897, when Mr Williamson came, when they had 179 members, they had
gone on to the present number. In the [Sunday] school they had 479 and
250 in the Band of Hope, £34 12s 4d had been raised for the London
Missionary Society. The other societies and two village churches [at
Awebridge and Braishfield] were flourishing. Last year they had a debt of
£800 and they raised between £400 and £500, and then their minister by
astonishing perseverance raised the rest (hear and applause).66

It is interesting that the indicators of success were readily quantifiable,
thereby privileging attainments that could be measured over those which could
not, such as a deepening of the spiritual life of the church and improvements
in the quality of the teaching in the Sunday school.

In later years, there were still measurable achievements to celebrate but
they were, in many ways, less ambitious. In 1912, for example, it was reported
that:

In order to commemorate ... [the 250th] anniversary, they were endeavou­ring
to raise a fund of £200, with the idea of strengthening their financial
position for the work of the church, and some repairs were urgently needed
to the property. Members and friends had promised £153 14s 10d, to be
paid by November of this year. They had received out of the promises £78
0s 6d, and they were very anxious to raise the whole by the end of the year.
(Appause).67

Use of the word "anxious" suggests that there was some uncertainty about
achieving what was clearly a far more modest target by comparison with a
decade earlier. From the minutes of church meetings, it is clear that the target
was not met, although Albert Bage sought to cast what had been achieved in a

positive light. Thus, at a meeting in November 1912, when donations and promises to date were only £161 17s 10d:

The Pastor in pointing out that another effort was needed, and was actually being made to complete the object of the 250th Fund – said all would rejoice that the fund had done so well, and to him it certainly was an intense satisfaction.68

However, the additional effort was unsuccessful and it was necessary to adopt some creative accounting measures for the financial year 1912 to suggest that the target of £200 had nearly been achieved.

Financial difficulties resurfaced a few months later, when in July 1913 the Church Secretary asked for serious attention to be given to “the present financial position of the church and said that £20 was urgently needed before the end of Sept.”69 Once again, raising the money proved to be problematic. An initial appeal raised just over £8 and it was only thanks to a special Christmas social and sale of work that the amount required was eventually secured.

Although it is unlikely that financial concerns alone would have dampened spirits at anniversary celebrations, they may well have contributed to greater introspection on the part of those who saw them as indicative of the tougher conditions that the church now faced. Indeed, it would have been necessary for those in leadership positions to put on a brave face as they sought to ensure that Abbey Congregational Church anniversaries continued to raise morale and contribute to the generation of positive public perceptions of the church. That said it was clearly necessary for a balance to be struck between the celebratory nature of anniversaries and underlying reality.

Conclusion

Evidence from the Abbey Congregational Church in Romsey confirms that, not surprisingly, church anniversaries were primarily occasions for commemoration and celebration. Those who attended would have expected the mood to be upbeat and frequently self-congratulatory in tone, with an appeal to take heart from the achievements, and indeed the tribulations, of the past. As Alexander Grieve put it in one of his letters to the Romsey Advertiser:

... we who pride ourselves on standing in the succession of those who suffered would do well to remember that “the wrath of man worketh not a righteousness that is God’s,” and leaving the dead to bury its own dead should make it our care to catch and hand on the living spirit which nerved them for the “great refusal” of which Thomas Warren was so fine an example.70

68. Abbey Congregational Church, Romsey, Minute Book, HRO 78A01/A1/5.
69. Abbey Congregational Church, Romsey, Minute Book, HRO 78A01/A1/5.
70. Romsey Advertiser, 21 June 1912.
For Grieve and those who thought like him, evoking the spirit of the past was an essential prerequisite for engaging with the demands of the present. Such a stance, however, carried with it the danger that too great a preoccupation with the past might deflect attention from current trials and new challenges. Constant vigilance was required if any negative outcomes of church anniversaries were to be minimised.71

ROGER OTTEWILL

71. I am very grateful to Clyde Binfield and Hugh McLeod for their help and guidance in the preparation of this article.
IS GEOFFREY AMONG THE THEOLOGIANS?¹  
PART I

Almost certainly Geoffrey F. Nuttall would have returned a negative answer to the above question, and he would have recognized the allusion to I Samuel 10: 11 (AV). In the strictly professional sense he was not a theologian. With reference to what he calls “the limits of Nuttall’s range” Clyde Binfield has remarked, “He is an ecclesiastical historian, but neither a theologian nor a philosopher.”² He was, as is widely known, an historian of distinction, applauded for his precision in argument, his assiduity in research, and his mastery of the linguistic and other tools of his trade. Articles have been written on Nuttall the Early Modern historian, the friend, the librarian, the scholar and humanist,³ but not on Nuttall the theologian. This is not surprising when we consider that there are two things that constructive and systematic theologians might reasonably be expected to do, which Nuttall was not required to do, and did not attempt.

In the first place, he did not engage in great detail with current theological trends, though he did leave a few clues to his thoughts on some of them, and these illuminate his general theological stance. Among his earlier publications, one not listed in the published bibliographies,⁴ is a lucid report of the 1937 Congregational Theological Conference on “Revelation and faith.” It is notable for two things in particular. First, Nuttall brings out the striking contrast between the positions adopted by the theological liberal, Thomas Wigley, and

¹. The following abbreviations are used in this paper:
(a) The works of G. F. Nuttall
(b) Journals
CHST: Congregational Historical Society Transactions.
CQ: The Congregational Quarterly.

³. See JURCHS, Vol. 9, November 1996. The articles are by Patrick Collinson, Raymond Brown, Ronald Bocking and Tai Liu.
the staunch Barthian, F. W. Camfield. Whereas the former distrusted intuition and advocated a rationalistic stance, the latter held that "man's reason, and man's world were completely lost in the impotence of sin, nor could he allow that in man's knowledge of God God is ever the object of man's thought, ever a \textit{datum}."\textsuperscript{5} These speakers and, indeed, the conference at large, prompted Nuttall's reflection, "I wished ... that the discussion had kept throughout more closely to the realm of the personal, to which Principal Franks (may I call him an impenitent Christian humanist?) brought it back more than once."\textsuperscript{6}

Secondly, Nuttall contrasts the views of Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, "who somewhat dominated the Conference",\textsuperscript{7} and Robert Franks: "Mr. Cunliffe-Jones expressed the contrast by claiming that the Christian revelation was a revelation in history, with which thought must be made to fit in, and by rejecting Dr. Franks's philosophical method of constructing a metaphysic, into which revelation was then fitted"; on which Nuttall muses, "I should have thought that the more logical part of a metaphysic, the examination of the capacities and instruments of thought, was a \textit{sine qua non} of theology simply \textit{qua} thought."\textsuperscript{8} Nuttall welcomed Cunliffe-Jones's emphasis upon history:

... but I was the more dismayed, when I learned what it meant. [He] rightly claimed that (for knowledge, if not existentially) there are no pure facts, that history is the interpreted fact, though the interpreting of it is history too; but he seemed unwilling to accept the corollary that there may be more or less of interpretation as well as different interpretations, and that we cannot treat the interpreted fact as if it had not been interpreted, we must judge the correctness of the interpretation. Absolute forms are as non-existent as pure facts, and the Christian revelation, just because it is historical, must submit to a criticism of the forms in which it was interpreted.\textsuperscript{9}

Because of Cunliffe-Jones's reluctance at this point, Nuttall concluded that his approach to history was of the pre-Reformation sort:

What I mean by a pre-Reformation emphasis is the implicit assumption that by the Christian revelation we must (not only \textit{can} but \textit{must}) understand the same as the Apostles meant and as the Church has always meant, and I call it pre-Reformation because it carries with it a theory of the unity of the Church over against heresy, which history disproves and Protestantism rejects.... We have to ask all the time, in the broadest historical sense, \textit{quales homines interfuerint} (Calvin).... I am aware that this emphasis on the Spirit-guided use of the individual's judgment is increasingly out of

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{CQ}, XV no. 4, October 1937, 503. \\
\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{7} \textit{Ibid.}, 504. \\
\textsuperscript{8} \textit{Ibid.} \\
\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Ibid.}
favour now, when liberalism is dismissed *en bloc* as atomic, when ‘community’ is in the air, and when Barth joins hands with Neo-Thomism in decrying personality; but I do not see how it can be avoided.\(^{10}\)

In the light of the above report it is not fanciful to suppose that Nuttall had dogmatism of the Barthian kind within his sights when he wrote concerning ideas which “offer themselves with the apparent immediacy of perceptions”, that “if we are to carry the conviction that what we have seen is *true* to others to whom our moment of vision has not been granted, we have to depend largely upon the normal forms of logical presentation.”\(^{11}\) This approach places Nuttall on the side of the aforementioned Robert Franks, whose principal objection to Barth was the latter’s groundless assumption that the Word of God was equivalent to his own theology, and his abandonment on inadequate grounds of the apologetic aspect of commending the faith – faults on account of which Franks barred Barth from the pantheon of great theologians.\(^{12}\)

More formally, in the Foreword to his justly admired book, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, Nuttall did not hesitate to name names:

The desire to lean upon a powerful external authority, which politically found expression in Fascism and National-Socialism, has favoured the claims of the Roman Catholic Church and of a ‘Word of God’ in Scripture which judges but may not be judged. Rudolf Otto and Karl Barth have proclaimed a God who is *ganz Anderes* and a revelation which is purely divine and given, *sui generis*, containing no element of human, and therefore fallible, creation or even discovery. Neo-Thomists and Neo-Calvinists agree in laying emphasis upon dogmas and confessions, and tend to treat faith as assent to a static deposit, to a closed system, of doctrine, rather than as an *ἐνέργεια* springing directly from living, personal experience. In the reaction against an optimistic humanism which seemed hardly to need any doctrine of the Holy Spirit, human incapacity through Original Sin has been so exaggerated latterly as virtually to deny the doctrine.\(^{13}\)

The second way in which Nuttall did not behave as a theologian might is that he did not discuss the several “departments” of systematic theology in order. This, of course, is a statement of fact which implies no adverse judgement whatsoever, for, to repeat, as an ecclesiastical historian he was in no way bound to do this, and we should not emulate those reviewers who castigate authors for failing to do what they had neither the intention nor the need of doing. It would

---

be foolish to lay the dogmatic scheme from creation to eschatology against Nuttall’s writings with a view to ticking the doctrinal boxes. Were the attempt made we should find, for example, that he had little to say about creation, the attributes traditionally ascribed to God, theories of the atonement, and the Trinity (albeit his thought is pervaded by the conviction of a personal relationship with the Father through the Son by the Spirit);¹⁴ but such a finding would represent a profound missing of the point.

Far better to recall that, according to his own self-assessment, Nuttall’s calling to be a minister of the Gospel was the primary claim upon him, his work as an ecclesiastical historian being a prominent way in which he fulfilled his vocation. Now it is all too evident that however hard they try (and some seem to try very hard), ministers of religion can never entirely succeed in avoiding theology. In some cases their encounters with the discipline yield effusions ranging from the platitudinous to the grotesque; but not in Nuttall’s case. Although he never essayed a systematic theology and, as we have seen, viewed some such creations with scepticism, a sharp theological mind was in operation through all his historical writings, his preaching and his pastoral care. For this reason I feel bound gently to query a remark made by Professor N. H. Keeble at Nuttall’s Memorial Service: “Geoffrey was interested... in the experience of faith rather than in theology, in communities of believers rather than in ecclesiology.”¹⁵ I suggest that this is too disjunctive a mode of expression, for to Nuttall the experience of faith was a theological experience—an experience of God, not, for example, something akin to an undifferentiated cosy glow. In this he was akin to Schleiermacher, on whom his friend and mentor, W. B. Selbie, had published a monograph;¹⁶ and in communities of believers—the gathered, visible saints—he found the realization of his New Testament ecclesiology. Thus, whereas Clyde Binfield declared that Nuttall was “not a theologian”, he nevertheless discerned correctly that in Nuttall’s view, “Church history was a continuation of gospel history. It was an

¹⁴. In one of his few specific references to the Trinity Nuttall declares, “It is still arguable that the doctrine of the Trinity as commonly held is not in Scripture, any more than is the word Trinity (which, for that matter, will not be found in the proposed new Congregational Declaration of Faith, either).” See Congregationalists and Creeds, (London: Epworth Press, 1966), 7. It is less noteworthy that the doctrine “as commonly held is not in Scripture” than that the term is absent from the Declaration. For while it is equally arguable that the New Testament contains the germ of, or of clues pointing towards, the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine was forged over time in a missionary situation and in face of alternative views. It is more than arguable, it is abundantly clear, that the 1967 Declaration of the Congregational Church in England and Wales (on the committee of which Nuttall served) is trinitarian in form.

¹⁵. The service was held at The American Church (Whitefields) in London on 16 November 2007. Professor Keeble’s address is found in Geoffrey Fillingham Nuttall 1911-2007, (Prestatyn: Churchprint, 2008). I quote from page 21.

It thus transpires that when we attend closely to Nuttall’s corpus we have no difficulty in detecting a number of interlocking theological themes which reverberate throughout, and are omnipresent as, for example, the Cross is in the writings of P. T. Forsyth. These themes are the experience of the presence of God in Christ by the Spirit, among the visible and voluntarist saints, as inspiring practical holiness, and as an harbinger of heaven. I shall attend to each of these in turn, whilst at the same time recognizing that to be true to Nuttall we must attempt to think them concurrently: for him they were all of a piece. The history is at the service of these theological emphases. This is not to say that history is made to fit them, or is distorted by them. The point to the contrary was made by Nuttall himself: “theology must always be studied in the interplay of its full historical context.” Consistently with this it is more than implicit, it is placarded in his writings, that history must be studied with reference to the lives, beliefs, hopes and fears of those who are its actors. Nuttall’s occasional references to “what is called intellectual history” is a faintly disparaging way of distancing himself from those historians (including some quite well known ones) who treated thought in abstraction from the human context within which it evolved. That he could never do; he was a “real people” historian.

I

Nuttall’s understanding of history and of the historian’s – or, at least, of his - task led him to declare that “we are not seeking to exclude the eternal but to discover it in the only place in which it is discoverable, in the temporal.” After all,

The doctrine of the Incarnation, properly understood, is a historical doctrine: that God revealed Himself uniquely in a particular personality at a particular time.... Unfortunately the doctrine of the Incarnation has been torn from its context and interpreted in the light of conceptions of God un-Hebraic and unconcerned with either history or personality. These have produced doctrines accepted by traditional orthodoxy which are so patently unhistorical as the impersonality of Christ’s humanity.

This was not Nuttall’s way. On the contrary, his examination of New Testament texts (in Greek, of course) was meticulous, and he was no less

18. In these theological concerns those of a philosophical bent may detect at least an echo of Kant’s postulates (that is, conditions, not presuppositions) of thought: God, freedom and immortality.
19. PS, 234.
20. PS, 236.
21. Ibid., 236-7.
concerned than Calvin to pay heed to “the whole course of [Christ’s] obedience.” Thus, for example, he writes

[Christ’s] suffering on the Cross cannot properly be separated ... from his suffering in Gethsemane.... It is ... because of Jesus’ whole life, but above all because of his death on the Cross, that Paul can cry, as in ecstasy, ‘He loved me, and gave himself for me!’ Many whose hearts would have remained hard to Christ’s appeals throughout his ministry have been broken by his self-breaking on the Cross.

This leads Nuttall to one of his most precise statements concerning the person of Christ: “[T]he whole burden of his life and message is to point men to God and assure men of God, as the One whose own being and purpose he sets forth in living image. In God alone is his inspiration and his security. He is as he is because God is as he is.”

But he suffers. Does the Father, then, suffer? Nuttall goes so far as to say that “there must have been something analogous to the Cross in the heart of God himself. Only imagination and poetry have feet delicate enough to tread here.”

The fact is that some theologians have worn hobnails at this point, whether for or against the divine impassibility. Nuttall pursues the matter no further – and good theologians know when to stop; but he has said enough to indicate his dissent at this point from Robert Franks, who staunchly upheld God’s impassibility. We should note, however, Nuttall’s careful use of the term “analogy”. He is in general well aware of the importance of the Creator-creature distinction, and with regard to the particular matter in hand he writes

Between Jesus the man and his Father God there must be difference. To deny this would not only be blasphemous, it would make nonsense of the story and rob it of all possible religious significance. What makes the story unlike all others is that, alongside this difference and (somehow) not in contradiction to it, there was in the faith of those who told it, a oneness between Jesus and God of a kind without analogy in the experience of men ... In Jesus God himself had drawn near. In Jesus’ self-giving was the self-giving of God himself. The love of Jesus was one with the love of God.

24. Ibid., 68.
25. Ibid., 70.
27. *BTL*, 75. When in *RH*, 69, Nuttall declares that “Christ’s birth and death and resurrection have made a difference: a difference not to God, but to men’s understanding of God” (my italics), he simply means that because of Christ we understand God in a fresh way; he is not asserting that God is non-susceptible to change.
The last two sentences quoted encapsulate Nuttall’s own belief, but note the careful “(somehow)” and “in the faith of those who told it.” The latter qualification states the fact but also begs the question of the reliability of the testimony.

In pondering the Cross, Nuttall made much of the exemplary nature of Christ’s suffering, in which connection he frequently had recourse to Quaker writers. “Fox’s constant call to be ready and willing to endure suffering”, he wrote, “is regularly associated with remembrance of Christ’s cross.”28 Elsewhere he speculated that because “in this country our faith, whatever its peculiarities, be it Baptist, be it pacifist, is now tolerated, by taking away our opportunity to accept suffering for Christ’s sake, [this may] weaken our principles or at least deprive us of a means of witness and ministry and persuasion.”29 But at the heart of Nuttall’s thought on the Cross was the conviction that Jesus came to seek and to save the lost, and he invoked his much-loved Dante in making his point:

“In the middle of our life’s way I found myself in a dark wood, where the straight path was lost: O how hard it is to say what it was like, the impenetrable, thorny thicket of this wood – the very thought of it makes me afraid again!’ So Dante begins his great poem; and it was just for such fearful, lost souls in life’s dark wood, where the trees are thick and the paths all overgrown, that Jesus came: to seek and to save them.”30

He further noted that the phrase “seeking and saving” was “so familiar that it is difficult to appreciate how remarkable it is: how new, strange and revolutionary: new and different from what characterizes all other religions.”31 As he elsewhere put it, “it is His seeking and saving which is a distinguishing mark of Jesus Christ.”32 He did not, however, expound what was done at the Cross at any great length.

Before coming to the main thrust of Nuttall’s position on the person and work of Christ it may be appropriate briefly to consider the question of the doctrine of salvation as it was raised in the disputes between Calvinists and Arminians. This, after all, is territory with which Nuttall’s professional interests made him very familiar; but it also affords an example of his judicious, generally non-disjunctive, approach to argumentation:

Antinomianism is not Calvinism; but it is Calvinism’s peril. Every religious system has its peril. Catholicism can degenerate into superstition, Protestantism into a thin humanism. So Calvinism can degenerate into antinomianism of a dry, doctrinal kind, in which God’s predetermination of

29. *CPH*, 64.
30. *BTL*, 60.
31. Ibid., 59.
32. *CPH*, 75.
all things not only precludes human action, including obedience to God’s law, but makes it gratuitous for those already predestined to salvation. The curious thing is that Calvinism’s opposite, whether Arminianism, universalism or enthusiasm, can also degenerate into antinomianism, though of a more practical kind. Here an emphasis on the unconditioned love of God for all men, or on the ability of me, by their reason of their innate goodness, to have some share in their salvation, at least by way of response to God’s grace, can breed a tolerant compassionateness, and then a loose permissiveness, wholly antipathetic to the fulfilment of law divine or human.\(^{33}\)

Except for the noun in the first clause – for which we might substitute “Christian-humanistic”, it is not difficult to imagine Nuttall nodding approvingly at the following obituary description of the Nathaniel Trotman: “His sentiments were strictly Calvinistic; his subjects purely evangelical. In his preaching there was the light of doctrine, without the dryness of system; the warmth of experience without the wild-fire of enthusiasm; the necessity of morality without the ostentation of pharisaism.”\(^{34}\)

Without question the major thrust in Nuttall’s thought on the person of Christ was that it is with the risen and living Lord that we have to do. “From the beginning,” he declared “‘Jesus and the resurrection’ was the new message.”\(^{35}\) As to the resurrection itself, Nuttall observed that “It is sometimes argued that, if his tomb had not been empty, the authorities would surely have produced His body. It may be argued with almost equal force that, if His tomb was empty, it is strange that the apostles made so little of it – unless they were less interested in this aspect of His resurrection than is much modern apologia.”\(^{36}\) They were fastening upon the experience which Nuttall described in the following terms:

One of the first implications of the resurrection of Jesus is that this relationship to him, this being with Him, is still possible: is possible, indeed, in a far wider way than before. Before, only a few could be with Him…. Now, no longer solely the twelve, not even the ten times twelve met together in Jerusalem, but all who will may come close to Him in discipleship, trust, love and self-abandonment.\(^{37}\)

It is the same message, albeit couched in different terms, as that preached exactly three hundred years earlier by the Friend, Francis Howgill:


\(^{34}\) Quoted by Nuttall, *ibid.*, 427.


\(^{36}\) *RH*, 65.

If you say you love him, manifest your love unto him, by following his Light revealed in you, which leads into the true Separation from Sin unto the Lord, to see his Presence near you, who will guide you with his Eye; ... and here you will see your Teacher not removed into a Corner, but present, when you are upon your Beds, and about your labour, convincing, instructing, leading, correcting, judging, and giving Peace to all that love and follow him.38

For the early Quakers, as for Nuttall (and in contradistinction from the Cambridge Platonists, for whom it was the divinely-illuminated reason and conscience),39 the Light is a supernatural gift. As William Penn put it, "It is not our Way of Speaking to say the Light within is the Rule of the Christian Religion; but that the Light of Christ within us is the Rule of true Christians, so that it is not our Light but Christ's Light that is our Rule."40 In the wake of Penn – and of Paul – Nuttall contends that "the living Spirit of the Risen Christ is also a life-giving Spirit."41 To that Holy Spirit I now turn.

II

Before enumerating Nuttall's pneumatological insights (for as with other doctrines he did not bequeath a fully-fledged pneumatology) it is necessary to indicate his general perspective on the matter. This is clearly seen in his finest book, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. He explained his intention of giving a voice to the Separatists and early Quakers, and he distinguished these from Calvin: "Calvin himself, for all his stress on the Spirit's witness, yielding an intuitive certitude of Scripture as αὐτοπιστός, has been pronounced justly [by P. Wernle] kein Geistesmensch."42 In a footnote he added, "For Calvin the Holy Spirit is a necessity of thought rather than something known in experience."43 I shall return to this problematic assertion in due course. As regards Greek thought, Nuttall declared that while the Greeks thought clearly "within the limits of what they had found about God," they had not found what the Hebrews had found: "The vital difference may be put in a word by saying that they had not found Him. Greek thought

39. See HSPCF, 18, where Nuttall, somewhat misleadingly, describes John Norris as being "another of the Cambridge School." There were, indeed, affinities between the thought of Norris and the Cambridge Platonists, but Norris, an Oxford man, was a generation younger than the Cambridge divines; he was greatly influenced by Malebranche, as they were not; and he argued that Robert Barclay had a constricted understanding of the Light. See further, Alan P. F. Sell, Enlightenment, Ecumenism, Evangel. Theological Themes and Thinkers 1550-2000, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005), ch. 1.
41. RH, 69.
42. HSPFE, 6.
43. Ibid., n. 5.
may be put in a word by saying that they had not found Him. Greek thought about God remains thought about a principle, a problem, something deduced, an ideal. Hebrew thought is about a person...44 Christian thought, not least early Quaker thought,45 could not think of the Spirit without thinking of Christ, the Word made flesh, of whom we learn in the Bible, the message of which is conveyed to us by the same Spirit.

With this we come to the relation between the Spirit and the Word. Nuttall observed that whereas, prior to the Reformation, religious experience “had necessarily been coloured by the ecclesiastical medium,” now it was “an experience of a directly biblical type, the experience which Scripture terms ‘being filled with the Spirit.’”46 This change raised the question of the locus of authority, on which matter Nuttall had this to say:

In Christianity as a whole the question may be answered in one of three ways; authority may be found in the Church, the Bible, or the self. Each of these may be subdivided: the Church may be the Church as represented by the local priest, by tradition, by the Pope, or by a General Council; the Bible may be taken as a whole, or especial authority may be found in parts of it, or in the words of Jesus alone; the authority of the self may be thought of as dependent on the supernatural enlightening of the self by the Holy Spirit, or on the universal but still God-given gift of reason, or finally on reason itself, as the possession of man in his own right. The attitude which we adopt towards the Reformation and towards the history of Protestantism depends very much on the side we support in this controversy of authority; according to our decision we shall condemn the Reformation as mistaken or arrogant, praise it as the Golden Age in Christianity, or regard it as but the beginning of a movement towards freedom, a freedom which, through the clinging power of tradition, it could not itself immediately attain. Whatever be our attitude, however, the fact would seem to be that at the Reformation the authority of the Church (as then constituted) was denied, the authority of the Bible asserted, and the authority of the self, in experience and reasoning, foreshadowed.47

It was the conviction of the Puritans that by the Holy Spirit’s inspiration the Bible was God’s Word, and by the Spirit’s enlightening its message was brought home to attentive readers: thus Spirit and Word belonged together. Whereas it was said of Quakerism’s founder that “Though the Bible was lost,

44. HSO, 3. That Nuttall should write this more popular book on the Holy Spirit was the idea of his wife, Mary.
it might be found in the mouth of George Fox"; in early Quakerism there developed a tendency systematically to disjoin Word and Spirit, not because Quakers scorned the written Word, but because they believed that the same Spirit who had inspired the apostles was now inspiring them. When Cromwell wrote that "As well without the Written Word as with it God doth speak to the hearts and consciences of men" he was, said Nuttall, endorsing a Quaker sentiment. The next Quakerly step was that, to some, the Spirit became "the touchstone by which all else is to be tried, including the Bible itself."

Hence the protest of the Congregationalist, John Owen: "He that would utterly separate the Spirit from the Word had as good burn the Bible." While in general sympathy with this, even Richard Baxter allowed the possibility of "extraordinary, confirmed, revelation" - the operative term being the middle one. John Robinson, the pastor to the Pilgrims, implied that those who read the Bible may be misguided in the conclusions which they, however honestly, draw from it. He was reported as saying of the Calvinists that "they stick where he [Calvin] left them; a misery much to be lamented; for though they were precious shining lights in their time, yet God had not revealed his whole will to them; and were they now living, saith he, they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light, as that they had received." For his own part he was recalled as famously declaring that "the Lord has more light and truth yet to break forth out of his holy word", but this does not imply the necessary disjoining of Word and Spirit. Without question many Separatists and Puritans would have agreed with Calvin that "God did not bring forth his Word among men for the sake of a momentary display, intending at the coming of his Spirit to abolish it. Rather, he sent down the same Spirit by whose power he had dispensed the Word, to complete his work by the efficacious confirmation of the Word."

Again, Calvin, who was by no means unacquainted with enthusiasts, insisted that "the Spirit, promised to us, has not the task of inventing new and unheard-of revelations, or of forging a new kind of doctrine, to lead us away from the received doctrine of the gospel, but of sealing our minds with that very doctrine which is recommended by the gospel." In a

49. *PS*, 175, quoting O. Cromwell, *Letters and Speeches*, Speech IV. According to the Dent Everyman edition, which was Nuttall's and is now, with his markings, in my possession, this is a conflation of two sentences in volume III, 84, the first of which is qualified by the phrase "in extraordinary circumstances."
word, the Spirit would not contradict the Word — a position consistently held by many from Calvin to Nuttall.

While learning from his forebears that Word and Spirit may not be disjoined, and that the latter does not contradict the former, Nuttall was well aware that our approach to Scripture cannot be on all fours with that of the early Puritans, for whom “The sheet-anchor... was that Scripture contained the law of the Lord: a model or pattern for all life, social and national life as well as ecclesiastical, down to the smallest details of the individual’s personal behaviour.”

We, however, “no longer seek an infallible law in Scripture, and in the performance of what commands we do find there we think it right to leave considerable liberty...” There are broader questions of interpretation too:

John Owen ... held firmly and controversially to the divine inspiration of the points in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; while a century later Job Orton, who ‘in spite of his connection with presbyterians... always regarded himself as “quite an independent”’, ‘and whom... both orthodox and heterodox dissenters have venerated ... as a patriarch’, held that to distinguish between the Epistles and the Gospels, in the way universal among us to-day, was the clear mark of a Socinian.

All this granted, there is no reason to doubt that when Nuttall asserted that the Separatists “were not ashamed to acknowledge the converting power of God’s Spirit in their hearts through His Word in the Bible, without the intervention of ‘other men’” he was also speaking for himself.

Like many in the Puritan tradition, Nuttall steered between the Scylla of biblicist legalism and the Charybdis of charismatic excess — “enthusiasm” as its early opponents called it. As to the former, there was some chafing within Puritanism itself: “The Sabbatarianism, long sermons, psalm-singing, fast days and rigid morals which developed came to seem as much a piece of legalistic paraphernalia or abracadabra as the masses, penances and indulgences of unreformed Roman Catholicism had seemed”, in which connection Nuttall quoted Walter Cradock of the Congregational church, Llanvaches, as saying, “I fear our fast dayes are the most smoky dayes in God’s nostrills of all the dayes of the year”, and drew the moral that “Scrupulosity, if wound too tight, eventually, and suddenly, springs back, or out into a new freedom.”
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general, Nuttall elsewhere remarked, the Congregationalist’s “appeal to ‘the Bible alone’ has been evangelical rather than rationalizing.”63 As to the latter, Nuttall looked back to the Lollards: “Ignorant, mistaken, fanatical the Lollards must often have been; but in their devotion to the Bible which they made their own, and in the sincere common sense with which they attacked the accumulations of tradition, they hold an important place in the evolution of English Church History.”64 James Nayler, the Quaker, understood that “the greatest and best gifts... from God are accompanied with the chiefest and worst temptations”;65 and the pattern was repeated during the Evangelical Revival, on which Nuttall commented,

The excitement of Revival can tempt some natures and sensibilities into extravagance and fanaticism and, in the power of a freedom above the law, to shake off moral constriction; the inspiration claimed may come to be treated as independent of datum, medium or check in Scripture, history or the fellowship of the Church, in extreme cases even of Christ; personal assurance, impatient of reasoning’s slower persuasions, can unfit for honest argument; and, taken together, this may drive an inquirer into deism or unbelief.66

Against all unbalanced enthusiasm, and with evident approval, Nuttall quoted Richard Baxter’s words:

Doth the Spirit work on a man as on a beast or a stone?... No, the Spirit or God supposeth nature, and worketh on man as man; by exciting your own understanding and will to do their parts.67

III

This brings us to the place Nuttall accorded first to reason and then to will. Recognizing that Puritanism was rooted in the Renaissance as well as in the Reformation, Nuttall concurred with Robert Vaughan in holding that “the collocation ‘enlightened Protestantism and sound reason’ was a Puritan sine qua non.”68 Illustrations of this fact abound in Nuttall’s writings. Thus, for example, he quoted John Owen: “The true Nature of Saving Illumination consists in this, that it gives the Mind such a direct intuitive insight and prospect into Spiritual Things, as that in their own Spiritual Nature they suit,
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please and satisfie it”;69 and Richard Baxter: “All that come into the world of nature, [Christ] enlighteneth with the light of Nature...; And all that come into the world of grace he enlighteneth with the light of supernatural Revelation.”70 But Nuttall thought that Baxter went too far when he declared that

the Spirit and reason are not to be here disjoined, much less opposed. As reason sufficeth not without the Spirit, being dark and asleep; so the Spirit worketh not on the will but by the reason: he moveth not a man as a beast or stone, to do a thing he knoweth not why, but by illumination giveth him the soundest reason for the doing of it.71

This, to Nuttall, precluded extraordinary modes of illumination by the Spirit which were above and beyond the range of our discursive reason – and, as we saw, Baxter elsewhere allowed the possibility of “confirmed” extraordinary revelations.

All of which is to say that while enamoured of reason, not least as an interpretative instrument and as that which checks the fantastic, Nuttall was far from being a rationalist. At the same time, he was concerned that “too keen a fear of reason, may lead paradoxically through the atrophying of the critical faculty, to something near an identification between God’s ways and man’s.”72 Positively, “Reason and conscience... the instruments God has given men for discovering what is true and what is the right thing for us to do, ... remain the normal means by which, as Christians, we become conscious of the guidance of His Spirit.”73 Thus, just as the Spirit was not to be disjoined from the Word, so the Spirit was not to be disjoined from reason, though his range is wider. This accords with Nuttall’s judgment that “The Puritans were right in rejecting Quaker claims to infallibility; but in arguing that the Quakers could not possess the same Spirit as inspired the Apostles, for then they would be infallible, quod erat absurdum, they were wrong.”74

In further expounding his view, Nuttall turns to Coleridge for the phrase, “whatever finds me, bears witness for itself that it had proceeded from a Holy Spirit...”,75 and adds, “In the sphere of theology such a criterion in experience is quickly condemned as thin and subjective.”76 I should have thought that the immediate difficulty with Coleridge’s phrase is that people have been found by all manner of bizarre notions, and that therefore the posited criterion is far
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too elastic: but let that pass. The important concern is the reasoned appeal to experience, and in this connection Nuttall invoked his teacher, C. J. Cadoux:

Why should religious knowledge be the one field in which the limitation and infallibility of our minds are supposed to vitiate the process of our learning and allowed to sap our trust in the accessibility of truth?... despite the margin of uncertainty, we have through our inward, spiritual powers – as through our powers of seeing and hearing – such measure of knowledge, light, and certainty as is sufficient for our daily need; and we have no right or reason to demand more.77

Nuttall made the point for himself by contrasting Bishop Pecock’s epistemology with that of the Lollards:

[...] in the last resort the authority Pecock advanced for his faith was not so different from that of the Lollards. If pressed, Pecock could only have admitted that the reason, by which articles of faith are to be proved, is its own intrinsic authority, which is a telling illustration of the non-rationalism, ultimately at one with the non-rationalism of a religious conviction, to which the rationalist is eventually driven back, for he would have found it hard to defend the authority of reason by reason. A pragmatic defence he could and did give: ‘we han noon other power’; but at least as implicit in the Lollards’ biblicism... was the assertion of another power, in its own sphere as imperious and impregnable as reason, the power of divine inspiration. Reliance on the one power is in the end on exactly the same footing as reliance on the other; and to live entirely by logic would be as absurd as the life to which an uncritical biblicism also led.78

Elsewhere Nuttall made an analogous point with reference to Bernard of Clairvaux: “Bernard felt, as Dante was to feel, that after the sharp conclusion to which one is brought by the power of the Holy Spirit every logical demonstration must be dull (ottusa). Nor should such an attitude be dismissed as obscurantist. To obscurantism it may lead; but so may scholastic reasoning lead to aridity and barrenness.”79 Not the least important reason for Nuttall’s delight in Dante’s works was the latter’s recognition that “Reason’s wings are short, and logical argument is a blunted instrument; truth is something which must be seen, shining, self-evident and sure, in its own light.”80 The status of allegedly self-evidencing truths is a matter over which much ink has been spilt but, intriguing – and important – though the question is, it cannot be pursued here.

Turning now to the will and the conscience, we must hear what Nuttall had to say concerning their freedom. In a paper published in the wake of the celebration of the tercentenary of the Great Ejectment of 1660-62, Nuttall drew the following lessons from the witness of the seventeenth-century radicals:

I am persuaded of two things. The first is this: that of all the liberties for which we are concerned, first and fundamental is liberty of conscience, liberty for worship, freedom of communion with God. These religious radicals, to whom much in our heritage is owing, were concerned, like ourselves, that civic liberties lost should be regained and that many kinds of freedom should be granted more widely. But their first concern, from which all else sprang, was for liberty of worship according to conscience. Till that was gained they were willing to lose, for themselves, their liberties of person and property, let alone any equality of rights and opportunities.81

Moreover,

These men could go to prison cheerfully, despite the indescribable filth and ill-treatment they had to face, despite all the loss of liberty, because at a deeper level they had already willingly let their liberty go. They did not think of themselves as free men, free men though in the world’s eyes they believed they ought to be. They thought of themselves as the servants of God, and they went to prison at His call, in pursuance of His will, which, day in, day out, they had been striving to fulfil, in small things as well as in great.82

As George Hughes of Plymouth, ejected under the Act of Uniformity and now in prison, wrote to his similarly imprisoned son, “free communion with God in Prison is worth a thousand Liberties gain’d with the Loss of Liberty of Spirit.”83

It is not fanciful to suspect that, as he pondered these things, Nuttall’s mind turned to the spirits in Dante’s Paradiso, of whom he remarked that “The spirits’ vision of Him, on which their blessedness depends, is all of grace, ... In response to such munificence, the spirits willingly accept the divine providence and disposal of themselves as a necessity dictated by God’s love.”84 If we add to this some lines that Nuttall’s great-great-grandfather, Charles Williams, wrote for the opening of New College, London, on 11 May 1850, we have Christian liberty coupled with the ecclesiological and eschatological dimensions of the Spirit’s work to which I shall come shortly. Williams charged “the future students and teachers of the College to lead others
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To all the freedom with which Christ makes free,
And to the brotherhood of his Church on earth,
Instinct with life, and love, and joy, and hope,
Foretasting now the blessedness of heaven."85

To Puritans, Quakers and Nuttall alike, freedom of worship entailed the right and obligation to "Praise God with that joyful alacrity which beseemeth one that is ready to pass into Glory, and try whether this will not cure the peoples weariness."86 He would likewise have endorsed Baxter's further words concerning preaching: "Preach with such life and awakening seriousness; Preach with such grateful holy eloquence, and with such easie method, and with such variety of wholesome matter, that the people may never be aweary of you"87 and to any preacher he would have applied Fox's general, experimental, exhortation: "You will say, Christ saith this, and the apostles say this, but what canst thou say"88 Nor would the words of Bunyan, who preached "what I felt, what I smartingly did feel"89 have been far from his mind. Extempore proclamation was implicit in Bunyan's practice; it was the exercising of the gift of the Spirit; and it was something which caused Baxter to oppose untutored lay preaching.90 As to public prayer, Baxter's advice was that ministers should "pray with that heavenly life and fervour as may wrap up the souls of those that joyne with you, and try then whether they will be aweary."91 More radical Puritans opposed all set forms in worship in the interests of openness to the Spirit, and among their number on this matter was John Owen, who disputed the issue with Richard Baxter, who could not see that singing the set words of psalms and hymns differed in principle from using set forms of prayer.92 Nuttall struck his own balance in the following way:

There is no reason why extempore prayer and read prayer, 'prophesying' and formal preaching, silent meetings and sacramental services should not be recognized, all in their several ways, as capable of divine inspiration and as means whereby men come into personal communion with God through Christ... So long as each practice is kept free from the mechanical, impersonal corruptions introduced by sacerdotalism, each may have its place in Christian worship.

90. See *HSPFE*, 81.
As he continued to reflect on the worship of the Congregationalists we may be sure that he spoke for himself:

What was fundamental was not the ‘shadowish or figurative ordinances’, but the baptism of the Spirit and the feeding on spiritual bread; was not episcopacy or ministerial ordination or ecclesiastical polity of any kind, for ‘the true Succession’ was ‘through the Spirit’, and the Spirit blew where it listed; was not in creeds or catechisms or liturgies or any forms which might quench the Spirit and darken what fresh light might be given. What was fundamental was the personal reception, both individually and communally, of the Spirit; was in the possession of the Spirit’s gifts and graces; was in not grieving the Spirit.

Here, once again, are ecclesiological matters to which I shall shortly turn, but before leaving the specific theme of freedom I must comment upon Nuttall’s negative phrase, “not in creeds or catechisms.” Adverting to the tradition into which he was born, Nuttall informs us that, historically, Congregationalists hesitated over creeds because they were man-made, whereas Scripture was given by God; because, “when once established, creeds take on a fixity proper only to what is given in the revelation itself”; and because they unduly elevate the intellectual over the experimental. Underlying all of these, however, was the fact that “Congregationalists have taken vehement exception to the imposition of creeds.” This point weighed very strongly with Nuttall. He quoted the Independent John Cook with approval: “compulsion can no more gain the heart, than the fish can love the fisherman”, and on his own account he declared in a broadcast talk that “the perception that the simple New Testament confession ‘Jesus is Lord’ not only excludes all human claims to lordship over the church but can only be made freely by willing minds that have not been forced. Both these positions are clearly stated in the Savoy Declaration [1658].” Furthermore, with reference to that “simple” confession, Nuttall was in the tolerant line of Baxter and Doddridge. “Two things”, wrote Baxter, “have set the Church on fire, and been plagues of it above one thousand years. 1. Enlarging our Creed, and making more fundamentals than ever God made. 2. Composing (and so imposing) our Creeds and Confessions in our own words and phrases.” Consistently with this, the Reformed pastor par excellence, who advised those wishing to attach

---
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“denominational” labels to him that if “meer Christian” did not satisfy them they could call him a “Catholick Christian”,101 exhorted Peter Ince to “bottom upon Christ and the great fundamentals. Unite in those with men of holiness & righteousness. Prosecute that union affectionately & unweariedly: & keep you eye upon that glory where we shall be one.”102 In thus protesting, Baxter was expressing his deep concern for Christian unity, as, later, did Doddridge:

[1]t is one very important article of my faith that I am bound in duty affectionately to esteem and embrace all who practically comply with the design and the revelation and love of our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, how much soever they may differ from myself in their language or their conceptions about any speculative points.103

Just as Nuttall sought a middle way between charismatic excesses and rationalism, so in connection with Christian confession he sought a middle way between ecclesiastical credal rigidity and authoritarianism on the one hand and the utterly unconstrained right of private judgment on the other. Thus, he wrote,

when Rome, becoming Modernist overnight (as a Capuchin friar has remarked), goes beyond the traditio passiva of the Council of Trent to traditio activa as the living authority which justifies the proclamation of a new dogma, such as the Assumption of the Virgin, we draw back as uneasily as when we see private judgment leading Robert Robinson to something like Unitarianism.104

He underlined the ecclesiological point elsewhere in these uncompromising terms: “To claim doctrinal infallibility whether for individuals or for the Church as a whole is as much Ranterism as to claim moral perfectibility. For it is to claim exemption from the limitations of time and place which are of the essence of history.”105 But the further reference to matters ecclesiological brings us to Nuttall’s doctrine of the Church – a doctrine according to which the individual’s discernment of the mind of Christ through the Word by the Spirit is both facilitated, and where necessary tempered, by the fellowship of visible saints.106
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In Nuttall’s view the Church is constituted by the call of Christ and by his presence in its midst. In his address to the London Society of Jews and Christians he dwelt upon the importance for Christians of Jesus’s words, “Ye did not choose me, but I chose you” (John 15: 16). But “As a Christian I must not say that they are not found in the Lord’s mouth; for the transformation from the Old Israel to the new is most sharply expressed herein, that the title ‘the Lord’, which before was given to God alone, is now given also to Jesus…. Christians, the Church, while remaining, as they believe, the chosen people of God, are also distinctively Christ’s people…” 107 By the end of the second century the meaning of “people” had changed, as had the reference of the term “chosen”: “No longer a distinct nation in their own eyes or a distinct race in the eyes of others, the distinction of Christians now lay inwardly in faith and obedience to God in Christ and outwardly in an outgoing life of love and service.” 108 Within the Congregational tradition the corporate response to Christ’s call is traditionally in the form of a covenant. That is to say, “The covenant is recognized as what formally constitutes a church: John Robinson says explicitly that ‘a company consisting though but of two or three… gathered together in the name of Christ by a covenant made to walk in all the ways of God known to them is a church.’” 109

Another way of expressing the Church’s constitutive factor is to say that it is “the community of the Spirit” 110 – which is to say that the risen Christ dwells by the Spirit in the midst of the visible saints. Yet another way of making the point is to say that

Just as… the Reformers dissolved the monasteries, no longer believing that ‘the religious life’ should be confined to a spiritual elite, so now the Puritans replaced the mysticism which blossomed in solitude, apart from the world, by an intense assurance of God’s nearness open to ordinary men and women in their daily experience and found most easily in the fellowship of believers.’ 111

Richard Baxter underlined the point as crisply as any: “Thy presence makes a crowd, a Church.” 112

As Nuttall ruefully reflected,

Again and again, the Church, in its official form, has sunk low into disputations, persecutions of its own members, self-aggrandisment, conventional
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acceptance of the standards of the world round about it. And, considering the dead weight which in this way has so often been against any conception, any experience, of the Spirit as known to Paul, what is astonishing is not that the experience has been so little shared or sought but rather its constant renewal... In England the Puritans with their 'prophesyings', the Independents with their 'Church meetings', the Quakers with their silent meetings for worship, the Methodists with their 'class meetings', have all in their turn been among these [renewal] groups.\textsuperscript{113}

That such a witness flowed directly down to Nuttall is clear from his own testimony: "The Christian's Master is the risen Lord, whose ministry remains as constant and living, as effective and transforming, as ever it was in Galilee... Still He attaches us livingly to Himself, still He shares with us His mind, His experience, all that His ministry costs Him, even the oft-repeated bitter cup."\textsuperscript{114}

In my opinion Nuttall was correct in saying that the Church is not constituted by the sacraments, and he invoked a variety of persons in support. He quoted the Separatist Henry Barrow as saying that "many thousands that never attained the symbol of the Supper yet do feed of the body and blood of Christ unto eternal life";\textsuperscript{115} and as for baptism, Richard Baxter, by no means the most radical of Puritans, declared that "it is a dishonourable doctrine against God and Christianity to say that God layeth his love and mans salvation so much on a Ceremony, as to damn or deny an upright holy soul for want of it... The thing signified is necessary to salvation."\textsuperscript{116}

In view of Nuttall's stance, it is not surprising that he was deeply distressed by the report of the international Anglican-Reformed dialogue, \textit{God's Reign and Our Unity}. Indeed, he wrote a trenchant critique of it which he passed to me. He felt that it was too damning - even by his standards - to see the light of published day. It would therefore be wrong of me to refer to it in detail. I can, however, say that he detected a number of exegetical sins and some pre-critical exposition; but what angered him most was the reiterated claim that the Church is constituted by the sacraments.\textsuperscript{117} This not only undermined the
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Gospel in his opinion, but it opened the way to sacerdotalism of the kind which prompted him to wonder “how a theologian so devoted to wholeness as Gore is can be so sectarian over episcopacy”, and to declare that he “would not have episcopal hands, even Gore’s, laid on his head for all the unity in Christendom.” Supplementing his desire not to violate the Gospel at this specific point was Nuttall’s broader conviction that “the truly Christian community… will be marked not by uniformity but by genuine unity”, and “Genuine unity is possible only if there is a large measure of freedom.”

The fact that such concerns flowed from Nuttall’s pen in what might, prima facie, have seemed unlikely contexts is testimony to the anxiety he felt at some ecumenical tendencies. Thus, in his pamphlet on the Countess of Huntingdon’s Trevecca College he writes,

“I do not see any justification for dismissing Trevecca’s ecumenicity of the gospel as self-defeating because lacking in true churchmanship. The Trevecca method could at least claim that it led to many conversions and to the gathering of new congregations. Our own efforts after ecumenicity, with less and hesitant preaching and more frequent observance of the sacrament, are being accompanied by a falling-off in the number of communicant members; nor have we avoided, or yet successfully met, fresh difficulties over ordination…. With all their deficiencies [the Trevecca preachers] preached the gospel and kept the flame of faith alive. I sometimes wonder whether the independent undenominational evangelical mission preachers of today, who would be approved for ordination by few and whose sermons might be acceptable to none of us, are not performing a similar service in our own time, till present calamities are overpast and faith and reason again embrace.”

It follows from the foregoing that since Christ alone is Lord of the Church there is something irregular (the early Separatists would have said, “of Antichrist”) about a state-established Church. In 1646 the saints at Bury St. Edmunds made no bones about it:

And wee being convinced in Conscience of the evill of ye Church of England, and of all other states wch are contrary to Christ’s institution, And being (according to Christes institutions and Comandements) fully Separates, not only from them, but also from those who Communicate with them either publickly or privately, Wee resolve by the grace of God, not to returne unto their vaine inventions, their human devices, their abominable

Idolatries or superstitious high places, which were built and dedicated to idolatry.\textsuperscript{121}

However, Nuttall carefully pointed out that in the course of the Separatist-Congregational tradition there were both those who advocated the complete separation of Church and state, and those who would have had an established Church provided it were of their favoured kind. The broad Congregational tradition is represented by Jeremiah Burroughes: "What Nationall Worship hath Christ instituted? Doth our birth in the Nation make us members of the Church? These things are so palpably plaine to any that will understand, that tis tedious to spend time about them."\textsuperscript{122} John Owen came to endorse this position, declaring that "He that will not separate from the World and false-worship is a separate from Christ."\textsuperscript{123}

In expressing his own view Nuttall took his point of departure from Anders Nygren, and concluded with what must surely be one of his most radical suggestions:

In \textit{Christus Victor} for last March [Nygren] re-presented the Lutheran doctrine of the two kingdoms: the kingdom of God, of Christ, of the Gospel and of the Word of God; in short, the Church; and the kingdom of the world, of evil, of the Law and of the sword; in short, the State; and never the twain shall meet. 'It is against the will of God', Dr. Nygren writes, 'to try to rule the world by the Gospel. God has ordained an entirely different government to rule the world.' Now certainly we need to guard against making an identification, an easy merging, of the Church and the world, or of the Church and the State; but in fact it has often been those with a lively sense of the difference between the Church and the State who have been the most active in bringing Christian influences to bear, in order to \textit{transform} the State and its functions.... These things can be done; and I never heard that any Lutheran declined a food parcel because it expressed the intrusion of the gospel of love into the alien kingdom of a warring world.... So far as I can see, this contrast between the ways of Christ's disciples and the ways of the rulers of the nations is not meant to be a wall of partition which nothing, not even the transforming power of Christ, can break down. It involves His disciples in a way of life which will be not only towards one another within the Church, but eventually towards the rulers of the nations themselves. If that is so, I think we must work for the abandonment of


\textsuperscript{122} VS, 64, quoting J. Burroughes, \textit{A Vindication}, (1646), 22, from William Bartlet, \textit{ὑπογραφὴ or a Model of the Primitive Congregational Way}, (1647), 22.

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 54, quoting J. Owen, \textit{Eschol: ...Or, Rules of Direction for the walking of the saints in fellowship, according to the order of the Gospel}, (1648), Rule V.
soverignty abandonment of sovereignty internationally as well as within the nation; and if this should being about enslavement, the acceptance of it willingly and redemptively, would after all, be in line with the main burden of the Christian ethic.

Not that I think that any nation is at present ready to abandon its sovereignty.124

Turning now from the constitution of the Church we may come to what the older divines called its matter: those who comprise it. In the first place the Church comprises the called, visible saints. Separated unto Christ they are separated from "the world", and also from the Church of England into which "the world" has infiltrated. This, at least, was the Separatist view, as well as that of Burroughes, Owen and others. Nor were Congregationalists alone in advocating separation from the godless world. Concerning Bunyan, Nuttall wrote that

By implication The Pilgrim's Progress is a powerful plea for separatism. If there was a case for separating from the Roman Church, there was also a case for separating from a worldly Church. Mr. Formalist and Mr. Pliable might find a place in it, but they could not be members of the Church of Christ in Bedford, who are in principle already translated from death to life because they love the brethren, with a love greater than their own. This is another way of saying that for Bunyan ecclesiology has its roots in Christology and in awareness of Christ.125

Likewise, Richard Baxter declared that "The Church's separation from the unbelieving world is a necessary duty: for what is a Church, but a society dedicated or sanctified to God, by separation from the rest of the world? II Cor. 6: 17, 18."126

This stream of testimony flowed down into our own time through the witness and writings of Nuttall, his friendship with, and lectures to, Anglicans notwithstanding. He contrasted the Congregational understanding of membership with other views thus:

In much modern discussion church membership is not considered of vital import, and the Church invisible is brought in to include those supposed in some sense to be Christians though outside the Church as organized: it is another effect of universalism. In the seventeenth century it was still the other way round: it was the Church visible which was the Church at large, the all-inclusive net containing fishes bad as well as good, while the Church

invisible denoted the saints, the few, known only to God. With this
distinction, which today those who allow it, as well as those who deny it,
agree is ‘not biblical’, the early Congregationalists were not concerned.
Their concern was with the visible Church; and within the visible Church
they allowed none but saints, and visible saints.127

William Bartlet expressed the positive point in these terms: the Church is “a
free society or communion of visible saints, embodyed and knit together by a
voluntary consent.”128 In his exposition of the matter Henry Burton
specifically referred to the fact that the saints “freely enter into Covenant.”129
In Nuttall’s opinion, “That [the early Congregationalists] should ... have
perceived that in the new fellowship which was created, only a free response,
in others no less than in themselves, was worthy of God’s grace is the most
remarkable thing about them.”130

Nuttall was nothing less than realistic when he declared that “Whatever the
name, some form of discipline is necessary for any self-respecting community,
if only to manifest and preserve its identity.”131 But this is a pragmatic
consideration. The early Congregationalists, no less than Nuttall himself,
thought theologically in terms of godly discipline under the Gospel: discipline
designed to honour God, maintain the integrity of the Church and reclaim the
sinful. Every church polity, no doubt, has its pitfalls, and Nuttall was well
aware that “In practice, there is ... some danger of a tendency for those who
believe themselves to be the elect to believe themselves also to be the élite.”132
It was necessary to recognize that the saints were also sinners, and at Church
Meeting members would be received into the covenant of the ground of their
profession of faith and their godly walk (whereas Presbyterians required an
affirmation of faith only), and they would be expected to maintain a godly
walk. If they did not, Church Meeting would prayerfully consider the situation,
hoping that any discipline meted out would prompt repentance and restoration
to fellowship.

As to Church Meeting itself, Nuttall considered that it was “The distinctive
feature of the Congregational polity ... in which not only chosen officers
but every member had an equal share in the church’s government.”133 In a
broadcast talk he subsequently elaborated the point, with reference to the
Congregational Church’s Declaration of Faith (1967):

In intention church meeting is not, as it may appear to be, a democracy,
with equal rights for all. It is, rather, a carrying forward of the Protestant
emphasis on the church as a gathered and worshipping community. The

127. VS, 160.
128. VS, 72, quoting William Bartlet, Ἑγωγραφία, 30.
130. VS, 167.
133. HSPFE, 119.
Lord whose presence gives reality to the church’s worship also has a will, for the church to perform; and if His people reverently seek it He makes it known to them, not infrequently through the disciplined sensitiveness of the simple.\textsuperscript{134} Corporate expectancy and corporate obedience are thus marks of the church meeting. Such a conception makes demands of every church member and also requires faith in God’s enabling power. So, Congregationalists believe, does the New Testament.\textsuperscript{135}

The brief of Church Meeting was, of course, much wider than the disciplining (which sometimes degenerated into the policing) of wayward saints. It concerned the church’s witness and mission, but also right order as regards the sacraments. As Nuttall pointed out, the Congregationalists inherited from the Separatists the view that “the sacraments, being seals of God’s Covenant, ought to be administered only to the faithful, and Baptism to their seed or those under their government”\textsuperscript{136} and he proceeded to explain that “Not only a pastor ... but a genuine \textit{coetus fidelium}, was a \textit{sine qua non}.”\textsuperscript{137} Because there was no such thing on board ship, John Cotton refused to baptize a baby, named Seaborn, who was born in mid-Atlantic.\textsuperscript{138} Similarly, the Lord’s Supper, as a sacrament of the Church was instituted for its members only. On all of which Nuttall had his thoughts:

Baptists and Congregationalists were at one, so long as they held to a Calvinist theology and discipline, in associating the Lord’s Supper and the church meeting. The presence at both was both an immense privilege and the duty of all church members, giving devotional and responsible meaning to membership, and of none but members; and the absence of members from either ordinance was an occasion for discipline. With our abandonment of Calvinism, we are still at one, but negatively. We no longer require attendance at either ordinance as a condition of membership; and we practise an open communion, in which we welcome all Christians, if not all men whatsoever, to the Lord’s Table, and in some churches to the church meeting also. It is not surprising that church meetings are now often ill attended. With the duty, the sense of privilege – in the proper, Calvinist sense of being “chosen, called, faithful”, has gone. The Lord’s Supper is ill attended too. It would be worse attended, were it not that here ecumenical pressures encourage frequent observance, though on an understanding in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{134} In “Law and liberty in Puritanism,” 23, we may not be mistaken in suspecting that Nuttall enjoyed quoting Walter Cradock’s \textit{Glad Tydings from Heaven}, (1648), 29: “the Spirit of God in the least Saint is better able to determine than all the Bishops.”
  \item \textsuperscript{135} Quoted by C. Binfield, “Profile: Geoffrey Nuttall,” 83.
  \item \textsuperscript{137} \textit{HSPFE}, 94.
\end{itemize}
terms of individual piety almost wholly foreign to the communal and
domestic piety of our fathers. They at the table accepted their mutual
responsibilities of holiness and love, and together boasted their Saviour's
name before the scoffing age, knowing themselves to be

A little spot enclosed by grace
Out of the world's wide wilderness.\textsuperscript{139}

On associations and councils wider (I do not say "higher") than the local
Church Meeting Nuttall did not have a great deal to say. He did, however, offer
his "Impressions" of the Seventh International Congregational Council which
met at St. Andrews in 1953. Among other things he noted that

In the document which was issued after the Council it is stated that 'We
believe that the mind of Christ for His people is given to Councils by the same
Spirit that guides the local church.' This is true; but nothing is gained by
shutting our eyes to the fact that a Council is not, and cannot be, 'the same'
as a local church. The people who compose a Council are met temporarily and
\textit{ad hoc}, they do not know each other and have not given themselves to one
another in continuing fellowship and mutual support, they do not know their
Moderator in the way they know their minister nor does he so know them;
which, since for Christians the personal is normally the channel through
which God makes Himself known, makes a difference that is vital and
inescapable. This is not at all to deny that the mind of Christ may be dis­
covered in Councils. It is to say . . . that we have yet much to do in working out,
and in being faithful to, the procedure which is appropriate for Councils.\textsuperscript{140}

For the ideal as it applies both to Church Meeting and to wider Councils
Nuttall turned to a poem entitled "The Association", written in 1790 by the
Baptist Benjamin Francis:

\begin{quote}
The sacred page thy only rule and guide,
'Thus saith the Lord' shall thy debated decide;
While charity spreads her balmy wings
O'er different notions, in indifferent things,
And graceful order, walking hand in hand
With cheerful freedom, leads her willing band . . .
In thee, impartial discipline maintains
Harmonious order, but aloud disclaims
All human force to rule the human mind,
Impose opinions, and the conscience bind.\textsuperscript{141}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{139} G. F. Nuttall, "Calvinism in Free Church History," 424.
What, finally, of the Church’s ministers? Taking his cue from the New Testament, Nuttall explains that there, “Leading the worship of the community was ... not a matter of sex, of office, or even of what we nowadays call function. It was a gift of the Spirit. Only so could a man (or woman) venture on it: but when the gift was offered it was not to be refused.”142 If the call to ministry was from God – a *sine qua non* in Congregational eyes – the orderly call of the saints in Church Meeting gave practical effect to it.143 Thus “Ordination is the public recognition that God’s Spirit has made a man overseer of a particular congregation; it is the congregation which ordains, not the other ministers present.”144 William Strong specified the stages thus:

First, the Spirit doth gift the men, and qualifie them for the work ... Secondly, ... he doth stir up the hearts of men, to chuse men, & to call them forth unto the works whom he hath gifted, and qualified for it: ... Thirdly, there is yet something more, and that is persons being thus chosen, there is a sanction, and a stablishment from the Holy-Ghost, that doth come upon them ...145

Thomas Hooker underlined the point that ordination “presupposeth an officer constituted, doth not constitute; therefore it is not an act of Power, but Order.”146 Precisely because the call to ministry had nothing to do with the conveying of sacerdotal *potestas*, it was perfectly possible for churches to continue in the absence of an ordained minister. As Nuttall put it, “in the Congregational tradition, while the ministry has been honoured and desired, it is a church without a covenant which is the monstrosity, not a church without a minister.”147 Whilst recognizing, with Cromwell, that the true apostolic succession was “through the Spirit”, he did grant that this view “has its perils, both intellectual and moral ... it may degenerate into humanism of a debased kind, just as sacerdotalism, which is the diametrically opposed conception of the church, may degenerate into superstition. But it is a positive conception, with its own theological foundation and its own inner articulation.”148 Certainly, none of the possible pitfalls in Congregational ordination theory in any way tempted Nuttall towards more sacerdotal views. Thus, for example, when G. K. A. Bell said that “the unity of the Church is found in the unity of the episcopate”, and that non-episcopal ministries lack “not ordination, but the special link with the Apostolic Ministry”, Nuttall found it fortunate that Professor T. W. Manson “drives a coach and horses through” this position, and concurred with Manson that “There is only one ‘essential ministry’ in the

142. *HSO*, 57.
Church, the perpetual ministry of the Risen and Ever-Present Lord Himself."\textsuperscript{149}

Two aspects of ordination services are of particular importance. First, "Ordination ... was an occasion when not only the unity and fellowship of the church which had called the minister but the unity and fellowship between the churches in general found visible expression",\textsuperscript{150} both in the orderly discharge of the ordinand from the place of his previous membership, and in the attendance at ordination services of ministers and "messengers" from other churches. Secondly, during the service "you do not answer set questions with set answers, you make your own declaration of faith and experience, proclaiming the faith as it has come to you and telling what great things God has done for you."\textsuperscript{151}

Finally, as to the minister's bearing, Nuttall charged those holding that high office "to deepen and enrich [their] devotional life for the service of others" by cultivating "the large outlook; the ordered life; and the tender spirit. The opposites of these - the narrow outlook, the disorderly life and the hard spirit - we all recognize as wrong and to be avoided."\textsuperscript{152}


\textsuperscript{150} PS, 94.

\textsuperscript{151} G. F. Nuttall, \textit{Congregationalists and Creeds}, 5.

\textsuperscript{152} PS, 246.
REVIEWS


The preface to this book identifies its main purpose as being to offer students "a guide as they begin to orient themselves to the study of the Reformation" – thirty four authors ("experts in the field, scholars who have spent their careers explaining the arcana of the Reformation"), contribute over four-hundred articles which cover theological topics (such as atonement, certainty, Christology, eschatology, grace, predestination, priesthood of believers, etc.), notable individuals (Theodore de Beza, Martin Bucer, Heinrich Bullinger, Guillaume Farel and, of course, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and others), specific places (Basel, Geneva, Zurich, for example) and notable documents (Augsburg Confession, Heidelberg Catechism, Helvetic Confessions etc.). The period covered is roughly 1500 to 1650, but the book recognises that the Reformation had its antecedents, and Hus and Wyclif are, rightly, included, alongside space for Aristotle and Plato, Augustine, Lombard and other notables such as Jerome of Prague. The content is not partisan, and the Counter-Reformation, as well as figures such as Ignatius of Loyola and Teresa of Avila, are also included.

Perhaps worthy of note is the fact that space is given to the Reformation in England with articles included on the Act of Supremacy (1534), the Book of Common Prayer, Miles Coverdale, Thomas Cranmer, Thomas Cromwell, “England”, Elizabeth I, the Elizabethan Settlement, Henry VIII, Richard Hooker, Hugh Latimer, William Tyndale and the Thirty-Nine Articles as well as on Mary I, Thomas More and Thomas Wolsey. Of particular interest to readers of this Journal will be the inclusion of entries on Dissenters and Puritans, though it has to be said that the book tends more towards the established Reformation in England than the dissenting one, perhaps in agreement with Peter Marshall (University of Warwick) who says that “The English Reformation took several peculiar courses, and ended up, by accident, giving birth to a distinct variant of world Christianity: Anglicanism”. Of course, the claim cannot (and should not) be denied, though it is possible to ponder whether this was the only “distinct” Christian expression to arise from the Reformation in England. It is disappointing to see that entries concerning the progress of the English Reformation (and its regress) number around twenty, but the Reformation in Scotland seems worthy only of three: John Knox, the Scots Confession, and Mary Queen of Scots.

As indicated in the preface, the articles are brief. Each one is between 150 and 450 words and, as far as is possible, the theological articles include Lutheran and Calvinist perspectives, while also attempting a balance between magisterial and radical re formations. Clearly little detail can be mentioned, but what is included is more remarkable than what is left out, and each entry is
both erudite and succinct. Brief suggestions for further reading are contained
at the end of each article, and the book includes a primary bibliography of
works (by and large available in translation) which extends to eleven pages and
a secondary bibliography which extends to thirty.

The book will definitely have its uses. It fulfils its aims well, offering both
a brief summary and a list of essential material for more detailed study. To have
such reference books available has to be something to be warmly welcomed.

ROBERT POPE

The Oxford Handbook of Methodist Studies. Ed. by William J. Abraham

Like other volumes in the series, this Oxford Handbook is a major work of
reference containing essays by many of the leading figures in the field. The
maturity and vitality of Methodist studies is reflected in the fact that the
opening chapter is written by the Anglican historian, Jonathan Clark, while
the closing essay is by the Baptist historian, David Bebbington. Each is a
characteristic tour de force, and Clark’s essay contains a bracing critique of
long cherished Methodist myths, helping us to see Wesley and Whitefield
through the eyes of their hostile Anglican critics. These essays were
commissioned by two Methodist editors, and the Handbook contains writing
by some of the world’s leading Methodist scholars, including the historian
David Hempton, the liturgist Geoffrey Wainwright, the philosopher Jerry
Walls, and the theologian Stanley Hauerwas. Many of the authors are engaged
in a project of retrieval and renewal, mining the tradition for resources that can
assist Methodism in the twenty-first century. While this means that their work
is not simply driven by historical curiosity, it also ensures that even the
theological essays are seriously engaged with the Wesleys and later Methodist
tradition. So there is much here to interest historians of religious thought and
practice.

The forty-two chapters are divided into six subsections. Part I on the History
of Methodism is the largest with eleven essays. Part II covers Ecclesial Forms
and Structures; Part III Worship; Part IV Spiritual Experiences, Evangelism,
Mission, Ecumenism; Part V Theology; and Part VI Ethics and Politics. The
range of themes is very broad indeed, and there is a nice mix of the old-
fashioned and the fashionable. Alongside discussions of gender, race,
ecumenism and liberation theology, there are chapters on connexionalism,
discipline, preaching, holiness, and traditional doctrinal topics (scripture,
trinity, sin, grace, christology, pneumatology, perfection, assurance, predestination).
Indeed, the volume shows how the “new religious history” and the “old
church history” can and should work together, and how historians and theologians can both contribute to the understanding of religious traditions. This is a well rounded and multi-disciplinary collection.

There is one major lacuna, and in the absence of an introduction, the rationale for it is never explained. For most of these writers, Methodism equals Wesleyanism, and the lack of attention to Calvinistic Methodism is a problem. Whitefield is discussed in the first two chapters (by Clark and Richard Heitzenrater), but thereafter he is mentioned just half-a-dozen times in almost 700 pages. By contrast, the Wesleys occupy three and half pages of the index. There ought to have been at least one essay on non-Wesleyan branches of Methodism, which in the eighteenth century were at least as important as Wesley’s movement. Scholars like Sylvia Frey and Vincent Carretta have noted that nearly all the earliest black authors on both sides of the Atlantic from Jupiter Hammon to Olaudah Equiano were connected to Calvinistic Methodist networks. Some of these figures are mentioned in Lamin Sanneh’s chapter on the roots of the global Christian awakening, but the essay on African-American Methodism omits them altogether. The country of Wales merits just two fleeting references in the entire book, presumably because the Methodism that flourished there was Calvinistic; only Jonathan Clark even registers the names of Howell Harris and Daniel Rowland. This would not matter so much if the collection had been entitled, The Oxford Handbook of Wesleyan Studies, but even then the opportunity would have been missed to develop the comparative study of “Methodisms”. The volume reflects the preoccupations and the blind spots of American Wesleyanism, though given that one of the editors hails from Ireland, he might have hoped that his home country would attract more than a single paragraph.

In other respects, however, this Oxford Handbook succeeds admirably. It showcases some of the latest historical research and goes some way towards locating Wesley within his wider eighteenth-century contexts. A number of authors offer condensed versions of major books – Wigger on Asbury and Hempton on British and American Methodism are cases in point. Others synthesise a wide range of scholarship. And still others venture distinctive interpretations. One of the most thought-provoking is Donald Dayton’s account of the genetic links between Methodism and Pentecostalism, which argues that John Fletcher’s teaching (on believers being “baptized with the Pentecostal power of the Holy Ghost” after their conversion) prepared the way for the Holiness and Pentecostal movements. On this reading, Wesley’s Holiness grandchildren and Pentecostal great-grandchildren were to become far more numerous than his Methodist sons and daughters.

If the historical sections of this work are rich and illuminating, the theological essays also engage intensively with the primary texts of the Wesleys. It is striking to see how contemporary Methodist theologians are reclaiming aspects of their founders’ thought (especially their Trinitarianism and sacramentalism). Indeed, a number of essays suggest that contemporary Methodists are recovering a pristine Methodism that was left behind in the
nineteenth century. The authors might have paid more attention to elements of eighteenth-century Methodism that they are not seeking to retrieve. Some remind us that the early Methodists vowed to “flee the wrath to come”, but the ominous spectre of “eternity” that haunted the early Evangelicals’ imaginations has largely vanished from contemporary Methodism, or at least from contemporary Methodist theology. The index contains no entry for either heaven or hell, and while both get passing mentions in the book, this is surely one way in which the mentality of modern American Methodists is often far removed from that of Wesley and his original disciples. Desire to establish continuity with Wesley can lead Methodists to underplay their departures from him. So while the new movement of Methodist resourcement is a welcome development, and a stimulant to historical research, it can produce history that is too strongly present-minded.

Despite such shortcomings, The Oxford Handbook is a very rich resource for everyone interested in one of the most powerful traditions within English-speaking Protestantism. Its historical and theological essays deserve to be read well beyond Wesleyan circles. Priced at £95 in hardback, readers will be pleased to learn that a paperback edition has been released in 2011.

JOHN COFFEY


This magnificent book and companion DVD-ROM is the fruit of a collaboration of several partners to present “gems of biblical art found in Wales.” It takes as its starting point the vital role of the vernacular Welsh Bible, which became available from 1588, in helping to sustain Welsh language and fund writers across the ages. But it goes on to explore the many ways, often until now under-appreciated, that scripture has influenced and inspired the visual culture of Wales, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The contributions span a broad sweep of visual arts and locations. Whilst the bulk of the artworks included were created and located in Wales, significant works by wider movements that have had an impact in Wales are included, as are works and artists no longer there. There are many works found now in galleries and museums included but the book also engages with much from churches, chapels and synagogues across the country so that there is an encounter with the liturgical and congregational context for the art and a real sense of how scripture is alive in context through what artists have shaped. There is a fascinating diversity of media explored as well: stained glass; mosaic; sculpture; mural; book illustration and painting. Attention is given to original works in situ and mass-produced material that opens up conversation.
about the ways in which art influenced by the Bible has connected with popular culture, although this latter is a minor theme. The contributors are also deliberately drawn from a wide field; the biblical and artistic alongside the social and historical.

Initial essays helpfully establish some key contours. Densil Morgan’s and John Morgan-Guy’s chapters unfold the central place of the Bible in Welsh life and arts whilst also opening up some of the significant discontinuities. Martin O’Kane provides an excellent summary of ways in which art and scripture connect and influence each other by drawing upon a wide range of examples and types.

More specific chapters then take us into particular strands of the story. An evocative essay by John Harvey looks at the changing place of the visual in Welsh Nonconformity by exploring evolution in chapel architecture as a tangible attempt to prioritise the word of God preached rather than seen. Peter Lord explores the artisan tradition and takes us into the world of the printmaker whilst Martin Crampin considers the medieval influences. David Jasper rounds off this section by exploring the influence in Wales of the Pre-Raphaelites. This is an eclectic mix but serves to highlight a wide range of forces and dispositions at work in both the creating and reception of art and art’s engagement with the Bible.

The book then dramatically narrows its focus with a series of chapters on particular artists: the Apocalyptic art of Blair Hughes-Stanton (1902-81); the engravings of David Jones (1895-1974); the biblical paintings of Ivor Williams (1908-82); the stained glass of Wilhelmina Geddes (1887-1955) and John Petts (1914-91). Inevitably the choice of whom to include and whom to leave out will delight or upset according to each reader’s preferences. These chapters tend to be very brief but they offer a glimpse of these artists’ work and make a host of thought-provoking connections to the wider themes of the book. Given the ubiquitous nature of art that references the apostle Paul, he has a chapter to himself which explores his treatment in various stained glass windows. Andreas Andreopoulos provides a fascinating account of the ways in which the Bible is encountered through the icons of St Nicholas’s Orthodox Church in Cardiff. Sharman Kadish takes us into the story of Welsh Jewish communities and the development of synagogues and their art.

Two concluding chapters explore the ways in which the Bible is treated and has been an influence within art held in private and public collections in Wales, and how the biblical traditions are still influencing artists in Wales today.

The book is superbly illustrated throughout to a high standard of reproduction. The DVD-ROM expands significantly the already impressive scope of the book with interviews with artists, a host of images and commentary by a wide range of experts. It is important to note that both book and DVD are two parts of a three-part resource. The third part is a vast on-line database of images of art captured during the research project and now hosted by the National Library of Wales.

This is an impressive and authoritative glimpse of how the Bible has touched
and been handled by the visual arts in one part of the world. It offers a wealth of leads and insights that could be fruitfully explored further. There is material here to inspire, provoke and move us. Both in terms of what the book represents, and the even greater material available digitally, this is a significant contribution to the story of art and an evocative encounter with the story of the Bible.

NEIL THOROGOOD


Margaret Ruxton has written this small biographical booklet about her father, Norman Henry Snaith, at the request of the Wesley Historical Society (Yorkshire) who perceived there to be a gap in the annals of Methodist History. Norman Snaith was a third generation Primitive Methodist Minister, influenced by that denomination’s ethos. (Primitive Methodism is discussed in an Appendix). This chronological narrative, necessarily brief, details the major stages of his life. As a young person, Norman Snaith contracted polio, and its consequences had a profound effect on his spirituality and maturity. Early on, he displayed great intellectual ability. At Oxford he became a gifted Old Testament scholar and theologian. After ordination in 1925, Norman Snaith served as a Circuit Minister, combining his ministerial duties with his Old Testament studies and the first of many academic publications appeared. From 1936 he was to be Old Testament Tutor at Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds – subsequently becoming Principal in 1953. Around 1946, Norman Snaith was appointed to the Old Testament Panel for the New English Bible. In 1958 he became President of the Methodist Conference – dominating the assembly with “serene dignity, whimsical humour, and strength of character”. As in all his ministry, he displayed great energy, travelling extensively and giving many talks. Two of his major Presidential Addresses are summarized in Appendices. He retired in 1961 but remained active scholastically, in the church, and pursuing his hobbies.

In this booklet we approach a “humble and very private man ... [who] did not leave any private papers”, who has to be met in his writings, (listed in a final Appendix). Clearly Norman Snaith was an erudite and original Old Testament scholar, a textual expert and expositor. But he was also a skilled teacher and communicator. He could relate both to the academic and to the interested lay person; and he was well-known for his morning radio broadcasts. He displayed his Primitive Methodist roots both by expressing a “Dissentient View” in the Report of the Anglican-Methodist Unity scheme, 1955-1972, and
his attitude to baptism (in water and in the Spirit). Throughout his ministry, Norman Snaith was interested in people from all walks of life and he was always open, friendly and warm-hearted. He was a family man, and very ably supported by his wife, Winifred. All his life he tried to follow Jesus Christ, and at heart he was one of “Mr Wesley’s Preachers”.

PETER M. BRANT


This book is an account of the formation and development of what is now the Training Board of the Congregational Federation. It is painstakingly researched and meticulously presented. It reveals not only the development of the Board, through many alterations of direction, style, and responsibility, but it is also honest enough to admit that at times the Board was in danger of losing its way. It reads very like the minutes of the meetings of the Board throughout the years under review. And minutes of any organisation can sometimes be so detailed that any reader who has not been involved in the enterprise might find the record monotonous. This book, indeed, is too “in-house” to engage many readers from outside the Congregational Federation.

There is one intriguing aspect of the life of the Federation that I imagine was not intended by the author. The Federation began as an alternative way of “being church” to the recently formed United Reformed Church. It wanted to retain the autonomy of the local Church (an aim with which some of us had much sympathy) and eschewed anything that smacked of central organisation. This book reveals a steady movement in that unintended direction and suggests that the Federation has become as much of an integrated nation-wide operation as any other denomination. That, in turn, suggests a significant task for the author: a full history of the Congregational Federation, for which this book is a useful building block.

KEITH FORECAST