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EDITORIAL

In this issue Roger Ottewill conducts readers to Edwardian Hampshire to meet the county’s Congregational pastors, both local, cosmo-local and cosmopolitan (all terms he explains), among whom we find the influential Welsh wizard, J D Jones of Bournemouth, called “the arch-wangler of Nonconformity” by David Lloyd George, who knew a thing or two about wangling. We travel north of the border to study that understated contribution to Scottish Congregationalism, the Evangelical Union, explicitly through its academy. Lastly, like many others in 2011, we turn aside to mark the 400th anniversary of the King James Version of the Bible. In this magazine, our examination of this Jacobean masterpiece involves a consideration of its origins, amid the demands for further reform of the established church, and the growth of those forerunners of Congregationalism, the English separatists.

NEWS AND VIEWS

We were saddened to learn of the death of John Taylor, for many years the editor of the Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society and, after 1972, of its successor and our sister journal, the Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society. More recently he was joint editor, with Clyde Binfield, of the useful Who They Were in the Reformed Churches of England and Wales 1901–2000 (2007). In order to update it, in his retirement John had made it his business to add details and cards to the massive index of Congregational ministers, compiled originally by Charles Surman, and kept at Dr Williams’s Library, of which he had been a long serving trustee. John was a member of our history society too and, understanding the particular demands of editorship, would send written and very welcome encouragement when he was pleased with our efforts.

Some readers will have noticed that Bunhill Fields’ graveyard in the City of London has been upgraded to grade 1 listed status—a helpful development which should result in greater protection for the graves of Isaac Watts and other dissenting luminaries. Bunhill Fields was established in the 1660s as a burial ground for nonconformists and has, to my knowledge, always been known for that uniquely distinctive characteristic. However the announcement on BBC Radio Four spoke of it as the burial place of “literary” figures like John Bunyan, Daniel Defoe and William Blake, with no reference to their religious affiliations which, after all, informed their literary achievements. I presume that this is explained by the fact that the BBC, perhaps correctly, assumes that religious
nonconformity means little or nothing to many people these days. Nevertheless that description does seem to be a mite ‘economical with the truth’.

CORRESPONDENCE

Noel Parry of Lapford, in Devon, has written in response to the piece in our last issue, concerning the proposed guide to sites of greatest interest to Old Dissent, and specifically of interest to Congregationalists and other Free Church Christians. He was happy with the inclusion of Norwich Old Meeting, Bunyan Meeting, Bedford, and Gainsborough Old Hall but was surprised that the Congregational church at Chulmleigh in his home county was not mentioned. He comments on its “fascinating interior with its 18th century wooden clock, its minstrel gallery and the funeral hatchments on the walls”, commemorating the important local families of Stucley and Bowring who are claimed as founders of the cause. We look forward to other, equally constructive critical comments and suggestions.
THE HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE, THE KING JAMES BIBLE AND THE SEPARATISTS

The 400th anniversary of the publication of the King James or Authorised Version of the Bible is an occasion for rejoicing both for its enrichment of the English language and imagination and for its contribution to the greater understanding and spread of Christianity. Over time the KJV, arguably the most important book published in English, has become a Protestant icon and, for conservative Christians, a seminal work of unchallengeable divine authority. In addition, it was the vehicle by which many peoples learned to read and articulate in English and, at the least, it remains the richest source of pithy sayings and fond quotations. Its place in English culture and history is assured. Yet its origin in the dissatisfaction of puritans with the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean Church of England is less well known, and even less recognised is its link with the English religious separatists of the time. The KJV was, of course, the most substantive result of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604.

After Elizabeth I’s death, with the accession of King James I of England (James VI of Scotland) most English puritans hoped that the Church of England might at last be further reformed. In April 1603 while the king was on his way south to London, he was presented with the Millenary Petition which set out several grievances. The moderate wording of the petition impressed the king who had a serious interest in theology and he decided to summon a conference, over which he would himself preside and at which the puritan grievances could be discussed. The hub of the criticism was that the Church of England, in its practices and structure, still dangerously resembled pre-Reformation Roman Catholicism. The bishops were alarmed also by the king’s positive response to the puritan demand to end the practice of “impropricate tithes”, whereby bishoprics were funded from parish incomes. The king’s proclamation of 24 October 1603 announced a public disputation would be held on November 1 “concerning such as seditiously seek reformation” in ecclesiastical matters. His proclamation also cautioned that the Church of England was “near to the condition of the primitive Church” and was “agreeable to God’s word”.1

The separatists, radical Protestants who broke away from the national church to form their own separate fellowships of Christians, should not be confused with the puritans, who were their spiritual and theological cousins, but who remained within the Church of England. A narrow but significant line divided

the many puritans from the separatists whose numbers were few. In contrast to
the separatists, the puritans attended the parish churches, sought preferment
within the established church and did not form alternative churches of the godly.
Although they shared the separatists’ extreme distaste for liturgy and ritual, the
great majority of puritans baulked at making such a break and condemned those
who did. The separatists despaired that the national church would ever be further
reformed, before daring to take the dangerous step of breaking with the
establishment. In consequence the desire for a more intense experience of God
resulted in a form of semi-separatism for some zealots.

The Coming Conference

The outbreak of plague in London set back the date for the conference to 14–18
January 1604 at Hampton Court, some distance from the city. Although the
meeting initially aroused optimism among the puritans it resulted, despite the
decision to produce a new version of the English Bible, in an undeniable puritan
setback. No new ecclesiastical settlement was forthcoming and the KJV itself was
merely the king’s tactical sop to assuage the puritans.

Only four puritans were definitely summoned to attend by the king who,
through the privy council, nominated all the participants (although doubt
remains whether a fifth, Richard Field, who attended the conference, was a
puritan representative\(^2\)). John Rainolds (1549–1607), president of Corpus Christi
College, Oxford, was described in Barlow’s account of the conference as the
“Foreman”, that is the puritans’ leading spokesman there.\(^3\) He was a friend of
Henry Robinson, the bishop of Carlisle from 1598, who was also at Hampton
Court.

Certainly with Rainolds were Laurence Chaderton, Thomas Sparke and John
Knewstub. All four were moderates, and unsympathetic to the separatists. They
were out-numbered by representatives of the establishment, seventeen or
eighteen bishops and deans, some of whom, like the Scotsman John Gordon,
dean of Salisbury since 1603, had puritan sympathies. The standard bearer for
Anglicanism proved Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, who was consistently
hostile to the puritans, although John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, was
present and he too was intolerant of puritanism. In addition, Robert Cecil
(1563–1612), the secretary of state, and other privy councillors were in
attendance.\(^4\)

\(^2\). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter ODNB). Field probably spoke
only once at the conference. Despite attracting the praise of Rainolds when young, he
came to defend the Church of England as a true church.

\(^3\). W Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference* (1604) 23.

12–19.
The Millenary Petition

The petition was so called because it professed to represent the views of over a thousand of the king’s subjects, although it bore no signatures. It concentrated on widespread abuses like the reform of church courts, the abolition of non-resident parish clergy and pluralism (whereby clergy held more than one post), and it wanted preaching ministers to replace ignorant, non-preaching and poorly paid clergy. James himself sympathised with the wish for a preaching and teaching ministry in every parish. It also asked for some ceremonial reform which would end the wearing of the clerical cap and surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, and the ring in marriage, and it sought some changes to the prayer book, like removing such terms as ‘priest’ and ‘absolution’, and ending lessons from the Apocrypha. The petitioners also wanted parishioners to be examined before they took communion and they hoped that strict Sabbath observance would be enforced.

Doctrine had a minor place in the petition, with only two sentences critical of “popish opinion” still taught or defended in the church and the puritan desire for “uniformity of doctrine prescribed”. It did not ask for the abolition of episcopacy, nor did it seek to set up a presbyterian system in England. Indeed the moderate demands of the petition caused Whitgift some concern.

Chief among those who contributed to the framing of the petition in March 1603, and to securing support for it, were Arthur Hildersham (1563–1632) and his friend, Stephen Egerton (1555–1622). Hildersham was a godly cleric who repeatedly fell foul of the bishops for questioning the canon laws, refusing to kneel at communion, failing to wear the surplice and hood for worship, and other misdemeanours. Though having suffered suspension and having been imprisoned in the Fleet and King’s Bench prisons, Hildersham refused to countenance separation from the church. Egerton was a veteran London radical who had taken part in interviews in 1590 with the separatists, Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, then in the Fleet prison, in an attempt to persuade them to renounce their views. After the Millenary Petition, Hildersham and Egerton were among those preparing “instructions” for the puritans who would attend the conference. Their plan involved sending petitions from the country, listing similar grievances, and arousing clergy and laity to agitate for reform. The bishops also rallied their forces and in October 1603 King James gave orders to arrest the puritans securing signatures to their petitions in Sussex (almost 1300 had been obtained there).

Another contributor to the petition was Henry Jacob (1562/3–1624), who

had shared the puritan abhorrence of separatism but, after visiting the separatist Francis Johnson in prison in 1596 in an attempt to convince him of his “great ignorance and errors”, revised his thinking. Jacob came to occupy a position halfway between the puritans and the separatists. In June 1603 he was living in Wood Street, London, from where he directed his part in the campaign to sway the king towards reform. Attempting to gain support in Oxford, he wrote to Christopher Dale of Merton College and Henry Airay, the provost of Queen’s, who was a friend of Rainolds and was one of only two or three Oxford college heads who disapproved of the university’s refutation of the Millenary Petition. However Dale informed the university authorities of Jacob’s scheme and the latter was condemned as a schismatic and his reform proposals were formally rebutted.7

Jacob then appeared in Sussex where he won over large numbers of clergy and laity. In September 1603 Whitgift and Bancroft wrote to Robert Cecil, specifically citing “One Jacob, a very insolent person, of much more boldness than either learning or judgement; a man that hath been imprisoned by us for his disobedience … an especial leader in the first petition” in Sussex. Indeed the reaction to Jacob’s success there may have contributed to the delay in holding the conference until January 1604. The four nominated puritans were advised by 27 delegates from several English counties, among whom Jacob was one of three advisors from London.8

**Hampton Court Palace**

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Hampton Court was among the most magnificent buildings in the kingdom. By choosing this extravagant Tudor palace for the conference, James demonstrated the power and prestige of the monarchy. The luxurious rooms had ornate plaster ceilings, decorated in blue and gold, while the king himself sat on a velvet-covered chair at one end of the hall, with behind him a resplendent embroidered representation of the royal coat of arms. The conference met in an icy cold January, so fires blazed in the elaborate hearths in every room. This was James’s kingdom, his palace and his warmth and the four puritans could not have failed to notice that they were recipients of regal munificence.

On January 12, 1604, days before the conference, the king enumerated three topics to be discussed. These were the Book of Common Prayer and forms of worship used in the church, excommunication and the ecclesiastical courts, and the provision of “fit and able” ministers for Ireland.9 At Hampton Court the

---

7. Ibid.
8. For Jacob and Airay see ODNB.
bishops wore silk and satin robes, to the annoyance of the puritans who saw such flamboyance as akin to Catholic pomp and who dressed plainly. When the bishops and deans entered the presence chamber, they found the four puritans together “sitting upon a forme”.10

**The puritans at Hampton Court**

Chaderton, Knewstub and Rainolds had all been involved in the movement to establish classes along presbyterian lines in the 1580s and all four men were Calvinists. The eirenic Thomas Sparke (1548–1616), the minister of Bletchley in Buckinghamshire, also had long established puritan credentials. In December 1584 he and Walter Travers had represented the godly about subscription to the prayer book in a meeting with archbishop Whitgift and bishop Cooper of Winchester at Lambeth Palace. Sparke and Travers advocated changes to the prayer book, especially removing lessons from the Apocrypha, but Whitgift made no concessions. Sparke’s presence at Hampton Court in 1604 was even more frustrating for his supporters. Indeed, having remained silent on the first day at the conference, he had a private audience with the king on the second day and, thereafter, completely abandoned his former scruples, having apparently been persuaded of the royal supremacy over the church and that bishops owed their position to divine not civil law.11

John Knewstub (1544–1624), a fellow of St John’s College, Cambridge, had petitioned against the wearing of clerical vestments in the late 1560s. He was prominent in the Church of England’s campaign against the heterodoxy of the Family of Love in the 1570s and 80s, although this prominence helped mask his own hesitations about church order. Having been presented to the living of Cockfield in Suffolk in 1579, in 1582 he was host to a gathering of mostly East Anglian clergymen who discussed prayer book observance. In 1583 he and others protested to the bishop of Norwich against Whitgift’s three articles, aimed at enforcing conformity, and they objected to the baptism and burial rites. The signatories were suspended from the exercise of their ministry. In 1603, Knewstub was active in the border region of Suffolk and Essex and was often cited for refusing to wear the surplice or use the sign of the cross in baptism, an objection he made at Hampton Court. He also advocated fasts and strict Sabbath observance.12

Knewstub’s friend, Laurence Chaderton (1536?–1640), lived to a great age, having shed his Lancashire Catholicism (and been disinherited for so doing) in favour of evangelical Protestantism while studying at Cambridge. He became the

---

10. Ibid 2. Bancroft said the puritans dressed not in university attire but in “Turky gownes”, that is like merchants trading with Turkey. Ibid 27.
first master of Emmanuel College in 1584, a college which was founded that year to serve as a seminary of godly preachers. The surplice was never worn in Emmanuel’s chapel and communion was administered only to those considered worthy to receive it; all who received the elements did so while sitting. At its heart, Emmanuel uniquely had a kind of conference which discussed matters of doctrine and which regularly came to collective decisions critical of formal church practice.

Chaderton too had presbyterian leanings, as his lecture notes and writings of the 1580s and 90s show, although he demurred before openly revealing his true opinions. However one publication, widely attributed to Chaderton, is A Fruitfull Sermon, on Romans 12, in which the author candidly “loathed … the calling of Archbishop, Bishop, Deans … and all such as be rather members and parts of the whore and strumpet of Rome”. Such unequivocal language leaves no doubt as to the author’s wish for radical reform of the church. Yet, like Rainolds, Chaderton was on friendly terms with Bancroft and he had attended Cambridge with Lancelot Andrewes.

The participants at Hampton Court, with the king as the exception, were all drawn from a small social group and the puritan representatives had friends among the bishops and cathedral deans. The conference at Hampton Court was in truth a series of meetings between men of similar backgrounds.

Archbishop, Bishops and Deans

Those members of the establishment who attended the conference included Whitgift (1530–1604) who was unwell and Bancroft (1544–1610), whose ambition led him to be impatient and combative. In contrast, the anti-Catholic bishop of Durham, Toby Matthew (1544–1628), who was there was witty and persuasive. He too hoped to succeed Whitgift.

The bishops were not of one mind. The bishop of Winchester, Thomas Bilson (1546–1616), a learned man, seemed to welcome theological controversy but he opposed the conference in principle, believing it mistaken to grant the puritans a platform, and undignified to meet “men of so meane place and quality”. The bishop of Worcester, Gervase Babington (1549/50–1610), a moderate, regarded the quarrels with the puritans as sinful. The bishop of Chichester, Anthony Watson (?–1605), was embarrassed because Sussex, in his diocese, had proved such fertile ground for puritanism and several of the advisors supporting the puritans at Hampton Court came from there. The bishop of St

---

13. Ibid 105. In the context of improper conduct, Chaderton was forced at Hampton Court to admit Emmanuel’s practice of “sitting Communions” which he defended “by reason of the seats, so placed as they be”. Yet, he said, “they had some kneeling also”. Ibid.
David’s, Anthony Rudd (1548/9–1615), was broadly sympathetic to Rainolds’ moderate puritanism.

Among the others, the dean of Westminster, Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626), had recently made clear his views on royal authority, having preached a sermon explaining that some Biblical passages proved that the king should rule both church and state—assisted by the bishops. The dean of St Paul’s, John Overall (1560–1619), was Andrewes’s loyal friend. The dean of the Chapel Royal, James Montagu (1568–1618), was influential at court and sympathetic to the puritans but was loathed by Bancroft. The dean of Chester, William Barlow (d.1613), had served Elizabeth in 1601 by preaching a sermon, commissioned by Cecil, which condemned the rebellion of the Earl of Essex. His account of the conference betrayed his sycophantic tendencies.

The Conference

On the first day, Saturday, January 14, James spoke only with the bishops and their party, choosing not to admit the puritans to his presence. Private baptism especially by women, provided a subject for intense argument, but the king insisted that only the clergy should administer baptisms. On their part the bishops were shocked by James’s occasional use of vulgar and coarse language. The conference’s first day ended after three hours.

The puritans were permitted to kneel and speak to the king, who had Bancroft and Bilson in attendance, on Monday 16th, but Bancroft, “in some passion”, interrupted them twice that day.15 Although the Millenary Petition barely mentioned doctrine, it was given more prominence at Hampton Court. There Rainolds expressed his hope that Christian doctrine might be preserved “in purity, according to God’s word” in the Church of England, thus basing his faith on the text of the scriptures. He went on to suggest that the 39 articles should be revised to include the Lambeth articles, a set of Calvinist teachings, touching on predestination and salvation, which Whitgift and others had approved in 1595.16

The king charged the puritans to cite scriptural condemnations of the practices to which they objected, but then confuted their replies with obvious pleasure. Bancroft, who maintained that puritanism threatened royal authority, sought every opportunity to show its affinity with presbyterianism. When discussing how the church might be better organised and in alluding to prophesyings, Rainolds used the words “the Bishoppe with his Presbyteri should determine all such pointes”. This touched a raw nerve for James who felt “somewhat stirred” about how presbyterianism in Scotland had limited his

---

powers and stated “that a Scottish Presbytery ... as well agreeith with a
Monarchy, as God, and the Divell”. According to Barlow, James used his famous
dictum, “No bishop, no king!” (which he uttered twice), and ended the day with
the threat to the puritans that “I shall make them conforme themselves, or I will
harrie them out of the land, or else doe worse”.\textsuperscript{17} Other witnesses admitted that
the king had said this but James’s ire was soon past and the session did not end in
bitterness. Indeed the conference was for the most part cordial. On ecclesiastical
discipline, excommunication for trifling matters was to be abolished, and the
hasty trials of the commissaries' court were to be reviewed and amended.

Wanting to give the puritans some concessions, James seized on Rainolds’
plea “that there might be a newe translation of the Bible because, those which
were allowed in the raignes of Henrie the eight, and Edward the sixt, were
corrup and not answerable to the truth of the Originall”.\textsuperscript{18} Rainolds may have
hoped that the one Bible would be the Geneva Bible (not the “Bishop’s Bible”) but,
given its anti-monarchical annotation, James opted for a new translation—a
king’s version authorised for a state church. Early on January 18, James met the
bishops and deans and then summoned the puritans to hear his decisions. Only
small changes were to be made to the Book of Common Prayer, but he
explained his idea for the Bible:

   “His Highnesse wished, that some especiall pains should be taken in that behalf
for one uniforme translation ... and this to be done by the best learned of both
the Universities, after them to be reviewed by the Bishops, and the chiefe learned
of the Church; from them to be presented to the Privy Councell; and lastly to bee
ratified by his Royall authority; to be read in the whole Church, and no other.”
He also added “that no marginal notes should be added—having found in them
which are annexed to the Geneva translation ... some notes very partial, untrue,
seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits.”

Although James’s proposal seemed to accede to a puritan demand, by
criticising the Geneva Bible, he had sided with the bishops. He had also set up a
means of checking and, if need be, censoring the new version at every stage.
Indeed, having come from a reformed church in Scotland, James’s enthusiasm for
the Church of England surprised many. The puritans had not understood that he
had often been at loggerheads with the presbyterians in Scotland and that he had
supported bishops there.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Accounts of the Conference}

The fullest summary of the conference was made by the dean of Chester,
William Barlow. Although his record of proceedings, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference* (1604), was criticised on its publication, he replied that his was not a verbatim report but “an extract, wherein is the substance of the whole”. His account was long taken as reliable but later scholars have shown how he presented his material to show that the monarch and the puritans were bound to disagree. Clearly Barlow was not objective but wrote as a propagandist for Bancroft’s party and was rewarded for doing so.

One account of the conference describes Chaderton at Hampton Court “as mute as any fish” whose only contribution was to plead for indulgence for the ministers of his native Lancashire, who objected to wearing the surplice and making the sign of the cross in baptism.20 If this is true, he may have seen his task at Hampton Court as securing the best terms possible, realising that the tide was against puritanism. Chaderton himself vehemently contested Barlow’s report.

Other witnesses also left records of the proceedings. Toby Matthew took notes. One man included details in a letter to a friend in the country and James himself wrote about it in a letter to Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, in which he claimed to “have pepperid thaime [the puritans] … soundlie”.21

**The Revision/Translation of the Bible**

Several of those at Hampton Court were among the 54 scholars who worked in the six groups charged with translation. Presaging later attitudes to the Bible, published in 1611, Rainolds regarded his work on the KJV as the most important of his life, although over three quarters of the agreed text was written by the long dead William Tyndale. The work of revision of the earlier English translations—the KJV announces on its title page “with the former translations diligently compared and revised”,22 chiefly Tyndale, Coverdale, the Bishops’ Bible and the Geneva Bible, with its marginal commentary)—was divided between six groups of scholars, with Rainolds part of that group, working on the prophets. This group was officially led by John Harding, the regius professor of Hebrew, but it met at Rainolds’ lodgings at Corpus Christi College three times a week.

Andrewes directed the group, which included his friend, Overall, translating the Old Testament from Genesis to II Kings. Chaderton was part of the group dealing with the Old Testament from Chronicles to the Song of Songs and Barlow was director of the group responsible for the New Testament epistles, Romans to Jude. His labours earned him the bishopric of Rochester in May

22. Much of the familiar text of the KJV today dates from the late eighteenth century when printers’ errors and thousands of minor variants and inaccuracies were tidied up.
1606 and two years later he moved to the see of Lincoln. Bilson was one of two overall supervisors of the final version.23

**After the Conference—**  
the Anglican Backlash and the canons

The disciplinarian Bancroft became archbishop of Canterbury after Whitgift’s death, only six weeks after the conference. Under his influence a collection of 141 canons was passed by the convocation of Canterbury in 1604 and of York in 1606. They dealt with, among other subjects, the conduct of worship, the administration of the sacraments, the duties of clerics, the furniture and care of church buildings, and the ecclesiastical courts. Clearly many of the canons, all drawn up by Bancroft himself, were aimed against the puritans. In particular, all ministers were required to subscribe to three articles. The first affirmed royal supremacy and caused no problems. The third article stated that all the Thirty-Nine Articles of the prayer book were agreeable to the ‘Word of God’ and this was more contentious. However, the second article caused great distress for it stated that the Book of Common Prayer “containeth in it nothing contrary to word of God” and required all ministers to use only the authorised services. Radical puritans simply could not accept this but subscription was imposed from the winter of 1604–5.24

Bancroft’s strategy of imposing the canons and constitutions in order to compel conformity forced puritan ministers to choose between the established order and their scruples. For most, separatism continued to be “the unacceptable face of puritan radicalism” from which there was “no return”. Even so, some zealous puritans did separate from the established church—for instance, Henry Jacob felt compelled to move to a position which would be described as semi-separatist, although he would have repudiated that term.25

More typically Knewstub begged the king for tolerance of those in Suffolk who wished to avoid wearing the surplice and making the sign of the cross in baptism but to no avail.26 He retained his living but was repeatedly reported for non-compliance with church law. In those circumstances, Chaderton’s oft used response to the demand for compliance with the rubric was to hedge and qualify. He and his allies tried to fend off the possibility of mass deprivations or, even worse, schism and separation by claiming the surplice, the sign of the cross, and

---

23. Nicolson op. cit. 251–9. 48 scholars were assigned to six groups, each with its own director, making 54 in all.
kneeling were indifferent and should not be imposed by authority (for compulsion
rendered them no longer indifferent). Yet, he also argued, that it was not always
necessary to refuse them. For instance, he allowed that the use of the ceremonies
might be justified if, by so doing, souls were won for the gospel and many clergy
who continued to refuse subscription to the bishops’ demands and thus facing
suspension and deprivation, looked to Chaderton for advice.27 Chaderton, at the
heart of Cambridge puritanism from the 1560s until his retirement in 1622,
managed to survive in the university “without let or hindrance”. That is he
remained committed to the national church even when it had consistently given
him no reason to believe his hopes for it would be realised. In addition, Stephen
Egerton was suspended for the third time in 1604 but, despite his defiant non-
compliance, he was restored to the lectureship at Blackfriars three years later.28

However some puritans still hoped to persuade James and, in the winter of
1604, the king was approached at Royston, when hunting, by 27 puritans who
presented him with a petition detailing their requests. He demanded the
“disorderly” group should immediately quit his presence and then urged the
bishops to impose the canon laws.

Like Chaderton, Rainolds also resorted to delaying tactics, writing many
letters to explain his views. He hoped to convince the king and Bancroft of his
conformity without being made to subscribe publicly, a device which succeeded
until 1605 when he was finally brought to submit, by the impending visit of the
king to Oxford. However Rainolds seems to have survived even this, although
by then his health was failing.

The bishops’ campaign to enforce the canons appeared to succeed as the
government claimed that only ninety clergy were deprived of their livings. Many
non-conforming ministers continued in the parishes but chose not to draw
attention to themselves. The puritan claim that up to 300 ministers were
dismissed is not supported by official records but, if 300 is accurate, it represented
3% of the total number of clergy at the time while the government figure of 90
amounted to only 1%. It is probable that Bancroft’s campaign merely removed
the hard-liners.29

Almost separatist—Brightman, Bradshaw and Baynes

Some puritans found Chaderton’s willing moderation too tame. Thomas
Brightman, for instance, regarded the offending ceremonies in the Church of
England as “simply unlawful” and against the direct word of God, as revealed in
scripture. He could not, in conscience, conform to what he (and the mass of
puritans) saw as idolatry. The radical Brightman, a Bedfordshire cleric, who died
in 1607 but whose writings proved influential posthumously, especially on the Independents of the 1630s and 40s, considered Chaderton’s stance to be “equivocating” and therefore he restricted the godly to those who refused subscription to Bancroft’s articles—which practically amounted to separation.30

Chaderton’s protégé, the firebrand William Bradshaw (bap 1570–1618), had studied at Emmanuel, Cambridge, from 1589 and had become friends with that other leading puritan Arthur Hildersham. Bradshaw became a fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, in the mid-1590s but by then he had become more radical than both Chaderton and Hildersham. In particular, he could not regard the offending ceremonies as ‘indifferent’. To him they were popish and unlawful and he advised fellow clergy to resist the call to submit. In July 1601 Bradshaw left Cambridge for good, becoming a parish lecturer in Chatham, although meeting opposition there, he then moved to a post in a puritan household in Derbyshire where he secured a preaching licence from the more sympathetic bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.

Following the Hampton Court Conference, Bradshaw produced a number of controversial publications, including *A Treatise of the nature and use of things indifferent* (Amsterdam 1605) in which he identified some consequences of the ceremonies.

“They have been and are the special means and occasion of the schism of many hundred Brownists. Of much superstition in many thousand ignorant protestants and of confirmation of many infinites of wilful papists in their idolatry … Also (if it be a sin to dislike our Lords Spiritual), there is no one greater cause that moveth those that the profane call puritans to do it then these ceremonies which if they might be freed from as all other reformed churches are, there is no other civil obedience or subjection due unto them that they would refuse to perform in as low a degree as any other whatsoever.”31

In Bradshaw’s view then the odious ceremonies led many godly people, perhaps hundreds, as he alleged, to separate from the Church of England while they confirmed others in their superstition and idolatry and in their contempt for the bishops. For these reasons, they were intolerable.

Also among Bradshaw’s writings at this time was *English Puritanism e: containeing the m aine opinions of the rigidest sort of those that are called puritanes in the realm e of England* (1605) which has been called “one of the intellectual fathers of independency”. It attacks the bishops, treating episcopacy as unscriptural, and upholds the autonomy of each congregation. Bradshaw argued that “every Companie, Congregation or Assemblie of men, ordinariilie joyneing together in the true worship of God, is a true visible church of Christ and that the same title is

31. W Bradshaw *A Treatise of things indifferent* (Amsterdam 1605) 21, Lake op. cit. 265.
improperlie attributed to any other Convocations, Synods Societies, combinations, or assemblies whatsoever”. All churches are “equall, and of the same power and authoritie” and every church should have the “power and libertie to elect & chuse their owne Spirituall and Ecclesiasticall Officers”.32 He insisted on the self-sufficiency and autonomy of each congregation “as the basic and irreducible unit of church structure”. This idea undermined the concept of a national, hierarchical church. Not only did Bradshaw have no place for bishops but neither did he supplant them with synodical government, although he retained the Calvinist offices of pastors, teachers, elders and deacons in this church (as did also John Owen and the Congregationalists at the Savoy Conference in 1658). He was content that the powers of the episcopacy should revert to the king. For Bradshaw no ecclesiastical authorities stood between the “individual congregation and the universal catholic church” which itself was composed of “all protestants, pastors, ministers and governors living this day in Europe and all the painful resident pastors in our own country”. Bradshaw understood only individual churches or congregations as “jurisdictional bodies, and not the national church”.

Although Bradshaw proposed a form of congregationalism, an idea almost synonymous with schism and separation, he still condemned contemporary separatists in his The unreasonablenesse of the separation (1614) which expressly refuted the works of Francis Johnson. His “non-separating congregationalism” or independency was intended to remain within English puritanism. Yet the logic of Bradshaw’s convictions led him to the brink of separation, even if he did not step over, and remarkably no fellow puritan contradicted him publicly. Undeniably his ideas had “an ostensible affinity with those of congregational separatists”, like Johnson and Henry Ainsworth (1569–1622) who had moved to Amsterdam in the 1590s, yet Bradshaw denied the accusation of separatism.33

Paul Baynes (c1573–1617) was suspended from his lectureship at St Andrew’s, Cambridge, in 1608. In his Commentary (1618) on Ephesians, published posthumously, he held that the New Testament only allows for a ministry of ‘pastors and teachers’, thus ruling out the claim of the bishops. In his The Diocesans Tryall (Amsterdam 1621), which was edited by William Ames, Baynes also argued that only parochial churches have a scriptural right to the name of church and all ministers/pastors are equal in status. Yet Baynes also disapproved of separatism and, like Bradshaw, has been numbered among the non-separating congregationalists.34

**Effects on separatism**

Notwithstanding the efforts of such radicals to stay within the Church of

34. Watts op. cit. 53–4, Tyacke *Fortunes* op. cit. 11–12. For Baynes see ODNB.
England, Elizabethan puritanism saw a “logical progression of rejection and withdrawal from the established church; a progression which reached its logical conclusion in separation”. Setbacks to Elizabethan presbyterianism in the 1580s and 90s had led to “a resurgence of separatist activity in London” and it was not accidental that in 1593 members of Francis Johnson’s London church stated that they had become separatists after hearing presbyterian sermons and being convinced of the total corruption of the Church of England, which bears out Bradshaw’s explanation of the growth of separatism.

Soon after James’s accession, like their fellows among the puritans who entertained hopes of reform, a number of English separatists, Francis Johnson among them, approached the king directly and found him willing “to have speech with some of us touching this cause”. They pleaded for permission to live in their native country in peace, professing and practising the gospel, as they understood it, without molestation, just as the stranger churches of French and Dutch Protestants in London did; that is they sought a similar freedom and independence from the hierarchy of the Church of England. The hopes of these separatists were utterly dashed.

**A Spur to Separate**

Henry Jacob was among those who felt the setback of the conference hard. In July or August 1604 he published in Middleburg his *Reasons taken out of God’s Word and the best humane testimonies proving a necessitie of reforming our Churches in England* which led to his arrest by Bishop Richard Vaughan of London (who had replaced Bancroft) and imprisonment in the Clink for eight months. In *Reasons* he stated, now agreeing with Johnson, that no “Catholike, or Universall Church Visible”, nor “any Nationall, or Provinciall, or Diocesan Church” is found in the New Testament. Rather the “particular ordinarie Congregation”, which is evident in scripture, is the “only … true visible Church of Christ”. Jacob maintained that in the New Testament “Only a particular ordinary constant congregation of Christians … is appointed and reckoned to be a visible Church”. He also argued now, like the separatists, that such a church should be “constituted and gathered … by a free mutual consent of believers joining and covenying to live as members of a holy society”. However he saw no reason for such gathered churches to sever all links with the parish churches, especially where the minister is godly and preaches reformation. Jacob did not see himself as a separatist and the term semi-separatist is more appropriate.  

from prison before April 1605, having promised not to speak publicly against the church’s government for six months. By 1610 he was in the Netherlands.36

In the border country where the counties of Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire join, other disappointed puritans were moved to gather separatist churches. John Smyth, formerly a fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge, became pastor at Gainsborough while Richard Clyfton was joined by John Robinson at Scrooby. Both these groups travelled to Amsterdam in 1608 and in 1609 Robinson became pastor of the Scrooby church which moved to Leiden and from which emerged about half of the Mayflower ‘pilgrims’ who crossed the Atlantic in 1620.

The rejection of reform at Hampton Court, and the repressive measures that followed, forced others too to reconsider their places within the established church. The theologian, William Ames (1576–1633), fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge, fled to the Netherlands in 1610 and there met fellow refugees, Henry Jacob and Robert Parker. Ames attracted attention by publishing a Latin translation of Bradshaw’s *English Puritanismus* as *Puritanismus Anglicanus* (1610). The book carried a preface by Ames in which he set out the three characteristics of an English puritan who, he stated, wanted a pure church, taught and practised personal piety, and took the Bible as his authority. Ames invited others to join him in rejecting all ecclesiastical hierarchy and in accepting the autonomy of each church. Clearly he was a forerunner of Congregationalism. He also stood firmly in the English puritan tradition of wanting an end to the wearing of the surplice, to the sign of the cross in baptism, and to kneeling to receive communion.37

In the Low Countries Ames became “the chief voice of the religious exiles and of radical puritanism generally”. He defined the church as “a society of believers joined together by a special bond among themselves, for the constant exercise of the communion of saints”. He further defined that bond as “a covenant, either express or implicit, whereby believers do particularly bind themselves to perform all those duties, both towards God and one toward another, which pertain to the respect and edification of the church”. Such a church had no need for either a bishop or a presbytery and only such a local fellowship, and “not larger”, could properly be called a church. Ames’s teaching proved influential on the 25 to 30 Anglo-Scottish churches in the Netherlands at that time and was an inspiration for those who were to follow that pattern of Congregationalism which was called “the New England way”. Indeed after his death in 1633, his widow and son eventually chose to emigrate to New England.38

Robert Parker (c1564–1614), vicar of Stanton St Bernard, in Wiltshire, 1593–1607, published his *Scholasticall discourse against symbolizing with Antichrist* in

---

36. Watts Ibid.
37. ODNB.
38. W Ames ‘Marrow of Sacred Divinity’ in *Works* (1643) 187, Tyacke *Fortunes* op. cit. 12–17, ODNB.
ceremonies, especially the signe of the crosse and then fled to the Low Countries in 1607 to escape the ensuing backlash. In 1610 he was in Leiden where he was sheltered by John Robinson’s church for a while, although he felt more at home with the semi-separatism of Jacob and Ames. Jacob, Ames, Parker and their fellows, though disavowing full separatism, still argued for the autonomy of each local church.\textsuperscript{39} They may even have influenced Robinson to a less exclusive separatism than he had earlier held. Yet the continuing links with the Low Countries were such that by 1616 Jacob had returned to England, where he and others covenanted together to form the church of semi-separatists in Southwark, of which he became the pastor.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The KJV was intended by its translators to yield “good fruit” for the Church of England. Indeed in its epistle dedicatory they wrote of being “traduced by Popish Persons at home and abroad” on the one side and on the other by “self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil”, ie the radical puritans and separatists. This Bible was not then for those on the extremes, like the separatists, but rather for the loyal folk of the established church. The Hampton Court Conference not only resulted in the great boon of the King James Version of the Bible of 1611 but also revealed the impotence of the puritans to secure reform. The conference was followed by a whole raft of anti-puritan legislation, realised in Bancroft’s code of canons. Although the puritans protested and argued the finer points of theology, the great majority accepted the episcopal burden.\textsuperscript{41}

However an obstinate but significant minority, reading the signs of the times, felt driven by the uncompromising measures of the powers that be to join the separatists abroad or, at least, to occupy a semi-separatist position. As Bradshaw implied, although other factors were active, the failure at Hampton Court fuelled the growth of the separatists in numbers and significance. For instance, Francis Johnson’s church in Amsterdam had less than 40 members in 1597 when he first arrived in the city. Yet by 1609 it had grown to “about 300 communicants”, as William Bradford, later to be the governor of the Plymouth colony in Massachusetts, observed. Without doubt Bancroft’s repressive measures directed the “hearts and minds of otherwise moderate” men and women to look more kindly at the separatist option.\textsuperscript{42}

\textit{Alan Argent}

\textsuperscript{39} ODNB.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Seaver op. cit. 220.
\textsuperscript{42} B R White \textit{The English Separatist Tradition} (Oxford 1971) 112–5.
LOCALS AND COSMOPOLITANS: CONGREGATIONAL PASTORS IN EDWARDIAN HAMPSHIRE

Introduction

His ministry [from 1910 to 1950] in … village churches surrounding Fordingbridge, Hants, was outstanding, and he continued to travel by bicycle to his four churches in a hilly district until he was well over seventy-five years of age … By self-sacrificing acts of kindness, he strove to help as many people as he could.1

… through his ministry from the pulpit of Richmond Hill [Bournemouth], and through the many books of sermons and addresses which he published, he made a vital impression on the religious life of his age … Under his leadership [from 1898 to 1937] the church became known to a far wider circle than his own town or denomination, or even his own country.2

These are extracts from the contrasting obituaries of two pastors who had charge of Hampshire Congregational churches during the Edwardian era. The first summarises the ministry of John Baines who was, in every respect, the epitome of what might be described as a local pastor. The second is from the obituary of John Daniel (J D) Jones who encapsulated all the characteristics of a cosmopolitan pastor.

The distinction between local and cosmopolitan was first made by the sociologist, Robert Merton, in his study of ‘community influentials’.3 As it was put in a later work by Albert Goldberg, in which he applied the notion to professionals: ‘The “locals” were interested primarily in the immediate community, while the interests of the “cosmopolitans” included the world outside their community as well.’4 Thus, a sharp contrast was drawn between local and cosmopolitan. For the purposes of this article, however, rather than a dichotomy it is felt to be more appropriate to conceive of a continuum, with Baines and Jones being located at opposite ends. Many of their fellow pastors occupied intermediary positions being more or less local or cosmopolitan in their orientation.

1. Congregational Year Book (hereafter CYB) (1952) 527.
2. CYB (1943) 417.
In what follows consideration is given to Congregational pastors serving Hampshire churches and chapels during the long Edwardian era from 1901 to 1914 using the local—cosmopolitan continuum as a frame of reference. This is felt to be particularly germane given the geographical and social composition of Hampshire at the turn of the twentieth century. As it was put in the annual report for 1902 of the executive committee of the Hampshire Congregational Union:

Bearing in mind the peculiar characteristics of our County, a large agricultural area, a few country towns, its fashionable watering places, a growing seaport, a dockyard town with great naval and military interests, none of which present features the most favourable to Nonconformity, no manufacturing and no mining industries, remembering these conditions of our work we may well recall the history of the last years with much gratitude, not only were we the first to recognise the value of union, but that union has enabled us, in no small degree, to keep in the front rank of progressive work, in our denomination, for the Kingdom of Christ.5

In such circumstances, it was undoubtedly necessary to recruit pastors who were well suited for the varying requirements of, in Biblical language, different parts of the vineyard if the work was to be fruitful.

Indeed, it can be argued that one of the strengths of the pastorate in Edwardian Hampshire lay in the diversity of orientations and associated qualities which it embraced and the mutual respect, which pastors had for each other. In this regard, it is striking that Jones, for example, viewed country pastors, like Baines, as ‘the Victoria Cross men of the Congregational ministry’6 and that pastors of the larger town churches were more than willing to support their rural colleagues by speaking at events in the smaller village chapels and taking a particular interest in their well-being. Thus, there was a strong sense of collegiality within the pastorate. This was of considerable importance at a time when churches were experiencing an increased threat from what was sometimes referred to as ‘mammon in a thousand forms and in a great many ugly guises’7 and Hampshire Congregationalists, along with fellow Christians in other denominations, were having to negotiate a more perplexing, if not hostile, cultural milieu. Before their very eyes, the hold which Christian belief and practices had previously exercised over much of society during the Victorian era was gradually being eroded and pastors were faced with the daunting task of sustaining their congregations through more turbulent times.

In preparing this article, considerable reliance has been placed on material

6. *Hants and Berks Gazette* (hereafter HBG) October 2, 1909. At the time, Jones was Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.
7. *Southampton Times and Hampshire Express* (hereafter STHE), November 21, 1908.
from not only obituaries but also testimony from contemporary records, such as local newspapers, and from church histories. Although these are not necessarily the most objective of historical sources, with their tendency to accentuate the positive, they do offer insight into the attributes and talents that were required of Congregational pastors or, as Bourdieu puts it, in his study of deceased academics, ‘the system of adjectives used maps out the world of professorial virtues (italics in the original).’

Given the nature of the pastor’s calling, ‘virtues’ is undoubtedly an appropriate term to use in this context.

**Local Pastors**

The essential characteristics of the typical local pastor can best be seen by briefly reviewing the careers of a number of those who exemplified this style of ministry, starting with Baines. Born in 1869 at Peterborough, Baines was a talented musician and, prior to entering the ministry, he attained the position of first violinist in the orchestra of the town’s Theatre Royal. However, ‘his Christian experience aroused in him other desires, and he turned to the work of active evangelism.’

This led inexorably to full time ministry, initially in Kent and from 1903 in Hampshire, though he still used his skills as a violinist to good effect at church gatherings. Between 1903 and 1910 he was pastor of the small Congregational church at Stockbridge, which is situated on the main route from Romsey to Andover, and thereafter the Stuckton group of chapels. The group consisted of Alderholt, Frogham and Godshill as well as Stuckton.

Baines was renowned for his zeal for the personal gospel and his belief in the power of prayer. W S Griffiths, pastor of Fordingbridge Congregational Church, who knew him well, observed that: ‘His boundless energy often left others breathless, and his serene faith often made us feel ashamed.’ However, perhaps the ultimate accolade for Baines was to be described as ‘an inspiring example to others … [and] a shining witness to power given by faith in Jesus Christ.’

Another quintessential local pastor was James Richards, who had charge of the Congregational church in the small town of Overton, near Basingstoke, for 24 years from 1892 to 1916. Richards was a native of Kent and, prior to his ministry in Hampshire, he had been involved in Christian service with the Evangelistic Society and had pastored a mission in London and a church in

---

9. CYB (1952) 527.
10. As noted earlier these were all within the vicinity of the small town of Fordingbridge, which is located in the extreme west of Hampshire close to the border with Wiltshire.
11. Quoted in his obituary, CYB (1952) 527.
12. CYB (1952) 527.
Surrey. At a gathering to commemorate the ninth anniversary of his Overton pastorate in 1901, reference was made to the fact that:

During the … years in which Mr and Mrs Richards … [had] been resident in … [the town] they … [had] made themselves as generally beloved by all members of the community, both Churchmen and Dissenters, that, as evinced at the last District Council election when Mr Richards was returned at the head of the poll, there are no more popular persons in the place. And deservedly so, for the Pastor and his no less estimable wife are the ideal of what a country parson and his wife should be. They have won a well-merited renown for hospitality, geniality, and better still, for the sweet words of comfort and faith with which they have solaced the afflicted and troubled.13

The fulsome references to Mrs Richards are a timely reminder of the contribution often made by pastors’ wives to the effectiveness of their husbands’ ministry.

The high regard in which Richards was held translated into a thriving church. Speaking in a somewhat self-congratulatory manner at the autumnal meeting of the Hampshire Congregational Union (HCU) in 1906, Richards had this to say:

Fourteen years ago they had 35 of a congregation, now they had 140 (applause). The congregation had thus been steadily increasing, and this year it was larger than ever. If they had come to his church last Sunday they would have seen one side of his chapel filled with young men. Last year they raised £85, and £32 of that sum went towards repairs.14

The church also had a flourishing Sunday school and a range of satellite organisations, including branches of Christian Endeavour and Band of Hope. By 1909, the Church was reporting average attendances of 196.15 In recognition of Richards’ loyal service and effective ministry, in 1910 he received full ordination at the spring meeting of the HCU held in Southampton.

Additional examples of pastors serving for long periods in one location come from south east Hampshire. These were George Charrett at Emsworth, from 1892 to 1913; Frederick Hern at Rowlands Castle, 1901 to 1936; and Samuel Longmore at Bishops Waltham, from 1894 to 1924. Like Richards, they were able to put down deep roots and play an important part in community as well as church life. Charrett ‘exercised a great and lasting influence for good in the town and neighbourhood’ and ‘stood firm as the one Nonconformist representative on the old … School Board.’16 Hern ‘took an active interest in local affairs, served on the District Council and its Guardian’s Committee, and was chairman of the Parish Council.’17 Longmore ‘played a full part in the life of’ Bishop’s

17. *CYB* (1958) 419.
Waltham. He was a member of the school board and, following the changes wrought by the Education Act 1902, he served as chairman of the managers of the council school, until he retired in the 1920s. In addition, he was a member of the parish council. Two of these pastors, Charrett and Hern, were also natives of Hampshire. As it was put in Hern’s obituary, they ‘had a deep affection for the county and its people.’ This characteristic they shared with two other local pastors, Noah Brewer and Herbert Rose. Between 1901 and 1916 Brewer served the HCU as an evangelist ministering at East Meon from 1901 to 1905; Locks Heath from 1905 to 1912; and East End and Pilley, two chapels in the New Forest located a short distance from Lymington, from 1912 to 1916. Brewer was described as ‘a man of firm convictions and evangelistic fervour … [with a] fine physical appearance … a deep and strong voice … and … always a helpful messenger of Christ.’ Later in his ministerial career he moved away from Hampshire. By contrast, Rose undertook ‘all his ministerial work … in his own county’, work that was described as ‘simple but earnest’. Originally a Methodist lay preacher, in 1906 he succeeded Brewer as pastor of East Meon Congregational Church, moving to Hayling Island in 1908, Hythe in 1914 and Sarisbury Green in 1916. He returned to Hythe in 1931 and retired in 1934.

Another local pastor was George Field, who had been brought up in the established church, but had transferred his denominational loyalty to the free churches during his teenage years. After 11 years at Kenilworth, where he had been ordained, in ‘1902 he accepted an invitation to Throop, Hampshire [near Bournemouth], where his main life’s work was done.’ Here one of his major goals, which he successfully achieved, was to raise the necessary funds to build a church at Moordown, for which Throop had responsibility. According to his obituary, ‘he believed that the minister’s best work was done in the homes of his people.’ He was also said to prefer ‘a more rural life’.

Being a local pastor, however, was not the exclusive preserve of those who ministered in rural areas. James Thompson, for example, spent a considerable period of his ministry, 1885 to 1908, in Northam, a working class district of Southampton. Born at Swanland near Hull and converted at the age of 18, he served as a pastor in Yorkshire, before moving to Hampshire in 1882, first to
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19. Charrett was born at Bishop’s Sutton near Winchester and Hern at Romsey.
20. CYB (1958) 419.
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22. CYB (1949) 510.
23. CYB (1954) 525.
24. CYB (1951) 511.
25. CYB (1951) 511.
Bishop’s Waltham and then Northam. Described in his obituary as ‘a godly man, a loyal Congregationalist, and a devoted minister of Jesus Christ’, he also possessed what might be called ‘the common touch’. A ‘large’ man in every respect, his very long pastorate was testament to both the high regard in which he was held and his ‘staying power’ in what was a particularly challenging location. Here he undoubtedly made his mark and was ‘affectionately styled “the Bishop of Northam”’.\textsuperscript{26} That said he appears to have displayed considerable humility in serving as pastor. As the \textit{Hampshire Independent} put it: ‘The work there [i.e Northam] is impressed with his personality and the pastor and the church have one feature in common—they are both unostentatious.’\textsuperscript{27} In this regard, a summary of Thompson’s responses to some questions put to him in 1905, for a series on local religious leaders which appeared in the \textit{Hampshire Independent}, are particularly insightful:

\begin{quote}
Northam Congregational Church is attended exclusively by the working classes. Mr Thompson is proud of this fact. There are no “kid gloves” congregations in Northam. The deacons, as well as the members are working men. As Mr Thompson has thus been nineteen years in touch with the members, he knows a good deal about them, and it will be extremely pleasing to religious workers to learn that no lugubrious fears or opinions have been born from his … experience of Christianity among the working classes. “Complaints have been made that the working classes don’t attend public worship,” he said, when questioned upon the subject, “but they do in Northam”.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

Clearly he was a staunch advocate of the belief that the gospel, if presented appropriately, could touch members of the working class and that Congregationalism was not the exclusive preserve of the middle classes, which was a common perception.

For Thompson, like his fellow local pastors, a close identification with the community they served was without question a key trait. Arising from this was their intimate knowledge of the area in which they ministered; their sensitivity towards their flock; and the outgoing manner in which they engaged with those who were not members of their church. This was undoubtedly made possible by the relative longevity of their ministries. Indeed, it was only through serving for lengthy periods in a particular locality that they could embody what Harold Laski has characterised as, in a somewhat different context, the ‘genius of place’.\textsuperscript{29} Some local pastors, such as Richards and Longmore, gave expression to this genius by serving on public authorities. Others, however, devoted all their energy to the life of the local church.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[26.] STHE December 21, 1907.
\item[27.] Hampshire Independent (hereafter HI) March 25, 1905.
\item[28.] HI March 25, 1905.
\item[29.] H Laski \textit{A Grammar of Politics} 5th Edition (London 1948) 412. Laski used the phrase in a discussion of the principles of local government.
\end{footnotes}
Whatever their stance on public service, local pastors were often portrayed as having what was sometimes described as a ‘simple faith’. Here the word ‘simple’ was used in a virtuous not a pejorative sense. It was meant to convey the uncomplicated, modest and traditional manner in which local pastors communicated their faith to others through their preaching and during their pastoral visits. Often buttressing their simple faith was an evangelical piety which informed their mode of behaviour and relations with members of their flock both individually and collectively.

Of course, there was always the danger that those exhibiting such virtues might be patronised by other pastors who adopted what they regarded as a more modern outlook. This, however, does not appear to have been the case. Indeed, cosmopolitans often had a high regard and boundless admiration for their colleagues labouring in what could be a very challenging part of the vineyard.

Cosmopolitan Pastors

While the stage on which a local pastor served his denomination was narrow and familiar and, it has to be acknowledged, somewhat inward looking and parochial, that for cosmopolitans was broad and outward facing. The archetypal Hampshire cosmopolitan pastor, J D Jones, was born at Ruthin in Wales. Having obtained a BA degree in classics at the Victoria University of Manchester, he trained for the ministry at Lancashire College. His first charge was Newland Congregational Church in Lincoln. In 1898 he moved to Richmond Hill where he remained until he retired in 1937. During these years he not only exercised pastoral responsibility for the largest Congregational church in Hampshire, with a membership of over 700, but also ministered literally to the world at large. He visited ‘churches in the United States and in the British Commonwealth as well as in the Mission Field’ and from 1930 until his death in 1942 acted as moderator of the International Congregational Council.30 Closer to home he served as chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1909–10 and again in 1925–26 and, as Alan Argent has shown in his insightful account of J D’s life, over a long period he contributed in a wide variety of ways to the work of the union, not least through policy initiatives and fund raising.31

Notwithstanding these global and national roles, as indicated earlier, he retained a high regard for local pastors and ‘loved nothing better than to serve the village churches at their anniversaries. It was his sympathy for the village minister which led him to the campaign to raise the Central Fund of £250,000 for bringing ministerial stipends up to a minimum figure’ of £120 per year.32

30. CYB (1943) 417.
32. CYB (1943) 417.
recognition of ‘the vital impression … [which he made] on the whole religious life of his age’ he was made a Companion of Honour by George V in 1927.33

Another cosmopolitan pastor was Alexander Grieve. Although his father was a Scot, Grieve hailed from Pembrokeshire, “Little England beyond Wales”. In some respects a consummate academic, he nonetheless spent ten years in India with the London Missionary Society followed by five years, 1905–9, as pastor of the Abbey Congregational Church in Romsey. After this he returned to academia where he remained until his retirement in 1950. Not surprisingly, he was well qualified academically, as the following extract from his obituary illustrates:

Local board and secondary school education was followed by terms at University College, Aberystwyth (1891–94), Mansfield College, Oxford, under Dr A M Fairbairn (1894–97), and then a year in Berlin under von Harnack. Triple First Class Honours—in English at London BA (1894), in Theology at Oxford (1897), and in History at London BD (1912), led on to a London Doctorate in Divinity (1915) awarded for a thesis on Early Christianity in Spain.34

His first academic post in 1909 was that of professor of New Testament and Church History at the Yorkshire United College in Bradford. From there he secured appointment as ‘Principal of the Scottish Congregational College, Edinburgh (1917–21); President of Lancashire Independent College (1922–43); and Lecturer in Early Church History at the University of Manchester for the same period, where he was also Dean of the Faculty of Theology. A member of the Senate of the University of London, he was also an external examiner to most of the British Universities at various times.’ Notwithstanding his academic prowess and his standing as ‘one of the giants’ of Congregationalism during the first half of the twentieth century, ‘he never lost sight of his ministerial calling’ and at Romsey he ‘left a still verdant memory.’ 35 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.’36 He served as chairman of the Congregational Union in 1936–37.

The third example of a cosmopolitan is Reginald Thompson. Also hailing from Wales, he was born at Cardiff. After training for the ministry at New College, London, his first pastorate, 1907–11, was at London Street Congregational Church in Basingstoke. Here he made a considerable impression.

34. CYB (1953) 508.
35. CYB (1953) 508.
36. Mansfield College Magazine No 142 (Jan 1953) 132.
He was a gifted preacher, and ‘not infrequently chairs had to be set in the aisles to accommodate the numbers who came to worship.’37 Given his undoubted talents, it was not surprising that his pastorate proved a relatively brief one and in late 1910 he was, in a contemporary phrase, ‘head hunted’ to become the pastor of Queen Street Congregational Church in Wolverhampton where he served until 1922. From there he went on to pastorates at St Georges Road in Bolton from 1922 to 1930 and Redland Park in Bristol from 1930 to 1947. Like, Jones and Grieve, he was a chairman of the Congregational Union, an honour he exercised in 1938–39. Although he remained, as it was put in his obituary, ‘pre-eminently a pastor’, it was a ‘pastoral concern for the souls of men and women which led him to his two great “external” enthusiasms—the cause of foreign missions and the cause of Temperance’. However, in pursuing these interests as ‘a magnificent advocate’, he never forgot his formative years as a pastor in Basingstoke and returned to speak at services there whenever he was able to do so.38

In their different ways, these three examples of cosmopolitan pastors could be said to personify John Wesley’s famous saying that ‘I look on all the world as my parish’. Through the posts they held and the causes they championed, their influence extended well beyond the churches for which they acted as pastor. In so doing, they were ambassadors for Congregationalism, in general, and at certain stages in their careers, Hampshire Congregationalism, in particular. Not surprisingly, cosmopolitan pastors were likely to be more sophisticated and nuanced than locals in their theological stance and to be more receptive to what were described by Jones and others as ‘progressive’ modes of thought. As Jones expressed it: ‘They had to show in the new age that a man could be open-eyed, and give a fresh and willing acceptance to all the revelations of God, and yet remain a humble believer in Jesus Christ as the saviour of man.’39 For cosmopolitans the virtue of scholarship was much in evidence. This was tempered, however, by their recognition of the value of local roots and witness and an unpretentious approach for the ongoing health and ultimately the long term survival of Congregationalism, particularly in rural areas.

It could be argued that without the ministry of cosmopolitans Hampshire would have been regarded as a Congregational backwater. Instead, churches, such as Richmond Hill, were destinations for what might be described as ‘ecclesiastical tourists’. Indeed, in some ways, cosmopolitans were the closest that Congregationalism came, with its non-hierarchal traditions and strong belief in the primacy of the local church, to having an episcopate and some of their churches regarded as cathedrals.
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Of course, relatively few pastors were unambiguously cosmopolitan in their orientation or, for that matter, purely local. Most combined elements of both. Put another way, between the two extremes, there were many pastors who combined some local virtues with those of a more cosmopolitan character. The latter were often displayed in the contribution which they made to the wider ministry particularly at county level. To borrow an expression from Goldberg, these pastors might be given the working appellation of ‘cosmo-local’.

**Cosmo-local Pastors**

Arguably, the combining of a cosmopolitan with a more local focus was closely linked to the development and nurturing of collegiality within Congregationalism. This could take a variety of forms, with one of the most visible being office-holding within bodies, such as the HCU, which could trace its origins back to the late eighteenth century. Although individual churches remained independent and self-governing, the HCU and similar bodies facilitated co-operation and the provision of financial support for the weaker churches, chapels and preaching stations, especially in rural areas. However, to operate effectively they needed pastors who were willing to combine what was invariably a very demanding local ministry with a broader outlook and it was here that cosmo-locals could make a distinctive offering to the well-being of Congregationalism.

A good example of a cosmo-local from Edwardian Hampshire is Richard Wells, pastor of Havant Congregational Church 1882 to 1905 and a distinguished secretary of the HCU. According to his obituary he was responsible for making it ‘a model of spiritual fellowship and practical co-operation.’ Indeed, his reputation and secretarial skills were such that in 1905 he was appointed secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, a post he held until his death in 1923, and in which he displayed ‘his precision, resourcefulness and sympathy.’ A fuller and more rounded picture of Wells can be gained from the reflections of someone who knew him while he was at Havant:

> He had great natural attributes; handsome presence, fine physique, distinguished bearing, great personal charm, tact, grace, and courtesy, a genius for making and keeping friends, organizing ability of a high order, sincerity and singleness of purpose; he had more wit than humour, no music, a pretty turn of speech ... an aptitude for games .. Through everything ran the finely tempered blade of undeviating loyalty as Christian, Nonconformist and Congregationalist.
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One of Wells’ successors at county level was George Saunders. He spent 16 years, 1904–20, as the highly respected pastor of the relatively large and prestigious Above Bar Congregational Church in Southampton and for nine of these was the ‘beloved secretary of the Hampshire Union.’ He also possessed ‘exceptional preaching gifts, and the fruitfulness of his pulpit work owed much to his helpful prayers’.45

Apart from the office of secretary, there were many other posts to be filled within the HCU, such as president, treasurer, Sunday school secretary and district secretary, and consequently there was a constant need for volunteers from the pastorate and, occasionally, the ranks of senior lay Congregationalists in Hampshire to occupy them. It seems likely that without the contribution of cosmo-locals, over-arching bodies, such as the HCU, would have struggled to survive.

While office-holding was perhaps the most exacting of ways in which pastors could demonstrate their cosmo-local credentials there were other means of doing so. These included accepting invitations to be the guest preacher at an event in another church, including church and Sunday school anniversaries and public recognition services.46 Within Edwardian Hampshire, there were a considerable number of pastors whose reputations were such that they were in constant demand as speakers. One of these was David John who ministered at Jewry Street Congregational Church in Winchester 1901–6. At his previous Church in Boston, Lincolnshire, ‘he made a fine reputation as a preacher’ and this was sustained during his time in Hampshire.47 Another fine speaker was William Miles, the pastor of Buckland Congregational Church in Portsmouth 1903–21. Like a relatively large number of other Hampshire pastors, he was Welsh and, in keeping with his background, he had a way with words. Thus, not surprisingly, his ‘years of … ministry [at Buckland] were marked by brilliant preaching and abounding congregations.’48 Another Welshman with similar attributes was Ieuan Maldwyn Jones, pastor of Albion Congregational Church in Southampton 1904–17. On the basis of the sermons he preached, on his first Sunday as pastor, he was deemed to possess ‘a good pulpit presence … and … a remarkably fine voice’. The content of his sermons was also considered to be ‘of great power and of much practical helpfulness’.49 Such qualities were in evidence throughout his career and this inevitably made him a popular choice for guest preacher.
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The contributions of cosmo-locals also extended beyond Congregationalism and involved participation in the work of Free Church Councils. For example, Vincett Cook, pastor of Kingsfield Congregational Church in Southampton 1890–1904 and subsequently Bitterne Congregational Church 1904–24 was ‘secretary of the Southampton Free Church Council for twenty-one years, being twice elected President.’ In this role ‘his painstaking devotion and brotherly spirit promoted efficiency and unity.’ He also found time to serve as ‘secretary and lecturer for the Hants Free Church Federation’ for twenty years.50 Similarly, Louis Bailey, pastor of Fareham Congregational Church 1904–10 was very active within local Free Church circles. In the words of the church historian, on his departure from Fareham he was ‘thanked … for an affectionate and energetic ministry which had encompassed not only the Congregational Church, but also other Free Churches within the area.’51

Other cosmo-locals were involved in the wider ministry of the Church through writing and publication. Arthur Martin, for example, the highly regarded first pastor of Avenue Congregational Church in Southampton, who served from 1894 to 1905, when ill-health compelled him to move to Buxton Congregational Church, ‘wrote strenuously and six books came from his pen … his first and last books were attempts to interpret Christ and make Him known to others.’52 A further example is Ben Evans, pastor of Winton Congregational Church 1897–1908, who ‘was a prolific writer, judging by letters, pamphlets and lectures which he delivered in various parts of England and Wales.’53 James Learmount, who ministered at Christchurch Congregational Church 1900–06, also ‘possessed literary gifts that greatly widened his ministry’ through newspaper articles on religious topics and books of talks for children.54

Engagement in activities of these kinds undoubtedly enhanced the status of individual pastors and helped to raise and sustain the profile of Congregationalism more generally. It also demonstrated the virtue of cooperation and confirmed the ecumenical credentials of Congregationalists and their willingness to make common cause on matters of mutual concern with members of other Free Churches. Faced with a more perplexing and challenging environment, increased collaboration across denominational boundaries was clearly a rational response, with cosmo-local pastors being in the vanguard.

---
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Conclusion

Underlying this article is the view that, by the Edwardian era, for Congregationalism to flourish in a geographically diverse area, such as mainland Hampshire, a good mix of pastors was essential. The denomination had evolved to a point where, although the merits of localism might remain a necessity, they were no longer a sufficient condition for the continued vitality of either individual churches or Congregationalism more broadly. Put another way, Independency no longer implied separation and dissociation. On the contrary an injection of cosmopolitanism and the sharing of resources, exchange of ideas and willingness to minister on a wider canvas, which this implied, were now regarded as essential. Although the virtues of diligence, integrity and fervour, to which all pastors aspired, remained of considerable importance, recognition of the different ways in which such qualities could be expressed gave rise to a far more variegated pastorate than might otherwise have been the case.

Moreover, regardless of their position on the local–cosmopolitan continuum, the demands placed on Congregational pastors were considerable. The role of pastor was by no means a sinecure. In the words of Noah Brewer’s obituary, pastors needed a ‘strong faith and undaunted spirit’ to see them through the highs and lows of their ministries.55 Like Edward Kirby, pastor of Havant Congregational Church 1910–23, many would have ‘felt deeply the joys and disappointments of the Ministry.’56 Nonetheless, it would seem that most ministers were able to combine the strength of character, that they needed to lead and inspire their congregations, with the sensitivity and empathy, that was required in helping individuals cope with the stresses and strains of, not only their spiritual, but also their material lives.

As it was said of David Beynon, at the commencement of his ministry in Freemantle, a suburb of Southampton, in 1902, a pastor needed to be a ‘hard worker, faithful teacher, and friend’.57 While these are clearly admirable qualities, it is still legitimate to ask whether anything further was required if pastors were to help their churches withstand increasing competition from secular pursuits and the erosion of their standing within society. Arguably they also needed to be assertive and to possess an ability to present the Christian message in ways that resonated with the concerns and pre-occupations of the ‘un-churched’ in their communities. In short, they had to do more than simply preach to the converted. This, of course, was easier said than done. Nonetheless, some pastors through the medium of local missions and special services did seek, with some success, to build up and add to their flocks.

---
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Whether local, cosmopolitan or cosmo-local, much was expected of pastors. Hence it is a testament to the attractiveness and resilience of the Christian faith, in general, and Congregationalism, in particular, that so many were able and willing to labour in a vineyard at a time when the harvest was not always as plentiful as might have been desired.

Roger Ottewill
James Morison became minister of Clerk’s Lane United Secession Church, Kilmarnock, on 1st October, 1840, and was declared no longer a minister or member of the Secession eight months later, as a result of teaching the doctrine of the universal atonement of Christ. All but a few of his congregation left the Secession with him and continued to meet under him as an Independent church in the Clerk’s Lane Chapel. 1 The following year Robert Morison 2 was declared no longer a minister of the Secession for sympathising with his son, and Alexander C. Rutherford 3 and John Guthrie 4 suffered the same fate in 1843. The churches of the four men became centres of evangelistic activity, with extensive religious awakenings among their members and in their localities, and the controversy surrounding the four ministers led them to take an important step theologically. “They found by the arguments brought against them and by systematic study of the Scriptures, that the ground they occupied during their trials was not, on the whole, so secure and Scriptural as they imagined it was. This was decidedly true of the leading spirit of the four, and ultimately he was forced to abandon the last distinctive Calvinistic doctrine to which he clung. From Moderate Calvinism, Mr Morison and the others advanced to the doctrines of universal atonement, universal and resistible grace of the Holy Spirit, conditional election, and limited foreordination. By the proclamation of these doctrines from the pulpit and by the press an extensive interest was excited, more particularly in the west of Scotland. The “new views” were welcomed by large numbers, who left the churches where the doctrines of the Confession were preached, and were formed into groups for the study of the Bible and the preaching of the Gospel. In order that the movement might not run to seed, and might be made permanently useful, some organisation was seen to be necessary. ... it was determined to hold a meeting of the expelled pastors and representatives of their

3. For Rutherford (1809–1878) see TSCM 142.
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churches to consider how best to consolidate the movement. The meeting was held in the vestry of Clerk’s Lane Church, Kilmarnock, on the 16th day of May, 1843, and was attended by thirteen persons—four ministers, one evangelist, and eight elders—representing three churches and two preaching stations”.5 The brethren agreed at this meeting to form themselves into an association under the designation of “Evangelical Union”.

The need to train young men for the ministry was also noted at the above meeting. “Infant churches were rising—applications were being made, more than could be met—and besides, in the several churches there were a few young men of decided talent and piety who were eager to devote themselves to the work of the ministry”.6 Moreover, a theology which differed considerably from any taught in existing theological seminaries had been adopted. In these circumstances it was also agreed that an Academy be established in Kilmarnock under James Morison and at the beginning of August 1843 the institution opened with Morison acting as sole professor and giving his services gratuitously. In deciding to have a curriculum of five sessions of eight weeks each in August and September each year, Morison copied the practice of the Secession Church, enabling the students who studied divinity for two months to also attend the Arts classes at the University during the winter—“thus materially shortening the period of study without lessening materially the advantages of the students. Teachers of schools, also, could attend the theological lectures, while their classes were enjoying their annual vacation. … Morison had only four public students during his first session. … Besides these four public students several earnest and intelligent laymen made such arrangements that they were able to attend business and also be present”.7 Morison later remarked in 1887, at the opening of new Evangelical Union Theological Hall premises at 18 Moray Place, Regent Park, Glasgow:

There is more than one humble class-room to which I look back with intense interest. The first was a room attached to the old manse in Clerk’s Lane, Kilmarnock. … The professor’s chair and desk were of remarkably primitive construction. But there were ranged in front of me nine students, four of whom, if not five, still live. There were our secretary, A M Wilson8 of Bathgate, and Robert Hunter,9 our Professor Emeritus of Hebrew, … there was Dr William Landels,10 … Henry Melville,11 … The remaining five embrace the names of
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James McMillan,12 … James Guthrie,13 a surgeon in Kilmarnock, … and David Drummond,14 a man little in stature and silent in society, but a powerful preacher. There was also one Thomas Murray;15 and lastly, there was George Young,16 … There was a class of 17 students in the second year of the institution, and in the third there were 32 in all. It was necessary that we should obtain more commodious premises. The congregational class-room of Clerk’s Lane Church, situated above the lower room, in which our first session was held, was put at my disposal. And thus we had roomy and comfortable quarters for several years—as long, in short, as I was permitted to remain in Kilmarnock.17

A born teacher and gifted student, Morison stated in the report of the year 1844, “The studies of the classes are strictly Bible studies—studies designed to inspire the students with holy enthusiasm for the investigation of the original Scriptures … In reference to the exegesis of the Old Testament, there were two Hebrew classes. The Senior Class was composed of those who had during the previous session commenced the study of Hebrew. In this class, the Book of Jonah, Psalms i. ii. xvi. lxxxiv. and ciii. were read, critically analysed, and expounded. In the Junior Class the language was taught, and Genesis i.–iii. and Psalm xxiii. were read and construed. In reference to the New Testament, there were also two classes. In the Senior Class, Romans iv.–vi. and John i.–v. were read, and critically and elaborately analysed. … In the Junior Class, New Testament Greek was taught grammatically, and a chapter or two of the New Testament read and construed. Besides these exercises, the students met at stated times for the consideration of controverted points of dogmatic theology. At these meetings they had their Hebrew Bibles and Greek Testaments, and carefully examined … the passages of Scripture bearing on the topic of discussion. … Essays on these themes were prepared and read by the students. Their sermons had to be delivered before a promiscuous audience, among which the class dispersed themselves”.18 As a matter of necessity rather than of choice, the students as a rule became preachers as soon as they had finished their first session and it was in this way they received their training in pastoral theology.19

Some months after the opening of the E U Academy, heretical tendencies were noted in the student body of the Glasgow Theological Academy. Writing to his son on 28th March, 1844, Ralph Wardlaw states, “In the class, I find it necessary to depart from my ordinary course, and to introduce a part of it, with some additions, out of its place, that, namely, which relates to Divine influence in

12. For McMillan (d.1849) see TSCM 100.
13. For Guthrie see TSCM 59.
14. For Drummond (1806–1874) see TSCM 38.
15. For Murray see TSCM 117.
16. For Young see TSCM 176.
17. The Evangelical Union Annual (1888) 54–55.
19. Adamson op. cit. 249.
regeneration, the doctrine of election and final perseverance, &c.; a heretical tendency, I am concerned to say, having discovered itself to some little extent of such points among the young men, springing up from the Morisonian controversy, and from the tendency to jump to extremes”.20 Three questions were put to the Congregational students, one of which was, "Do you hold, or do you not, the necessity of a special influence of the Holy Spirit in order to the regeneration of the sinner, or his conversion to God, distinct from the influence of the word, or of providential circumstances, but accompanying these means, and rendering them efficacious?".21 Nine students were expelled as a result of their answers and five of them22 joined the second session of the E U Academy in order to complete their theological studies.

At the close of the 1845 session Morison intimated, “I intend to form a class (D.V.) next session for the purpose of teaching Syriac, and enabling those who learn to make use of that oldest and best of all versions of the New Testament, the Peshito.”23

In the Systematic department Morison was assisted in 1846 and 1847 sessions by John Guthrie, who was appointed Professor of Systematic Theology by the E U Conference in September 1847 and later to teach Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis. The Academy Committee was appointed by and responsible to the annual Conference. Guthrie accepted a call in October 1848 from the church which met in the Mechanics’ Hall, North Hanover Street, Glasgow, “that he might be nearer the centre for his academical duties”.24 He later removed to Greenock in 1851 and Morison moved to Guthrie’s former charge, believing greater opportunity would be afforded him to prosecute his ministry, in that “He would (1st) have access to the College [University] library and other large collections of books which would be of incalculable moment to him in facilitating his progress in several works which he contemplated, and for which he had been for some years endeavouring to acquire the requisite literary qualification. (2nd) He would have a wider field for pulpit usefulness in a large city, where less prejudice existed against him personally, and where the public mind was more open to give truth a fair hearing. (3rd) The Theological Hall would be more likely to flourish in a large centre of population both as regarded
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its influence and the number of students”. Morison was inducted to the Glasgow charge in October 1851 and the premises of the new North Dundas Street Church, opened in 1853, accommodated the Academy. There were twenty-seven students around 1851.

Morison had a severe illness in the spring of 1852, which was the precursor of the physical weakness from which he ever afterwards more or less suffered. Indeed in some years prior to his departure for London in 1861 Guthrie found himself teaching both New Testament Exegesis and Systematic Theology. With Guthrie’s departure Fergus Ferguson agreed to superintend the Hebrew class and William Taylor of Kendal the Systematic department. Taylor was appointed Professor of Systematic Theology the following year and Robert Hunter was appointed Professor of Hebrew in 1864. John Kirk would appear to have undertaken the teaching of Pastoral Theology in 1857 and occupied the chair of Pastoral Theology from 1860.

Morison, vacating his chair on health grounds in 1875, was the precursor of considerable change in the E U Academy. He was appointed “Principal, with the discretionary power to give what occasional instruction he may find convenient” and the following year, when Kirk vacated his chair, “in view of the reconstruction of the Hall, and of the fact that the funds for the maintenance of the Pastoral Chair were available only for the incumbency of Professor Kirk”, it was recommended to Conference that the chair be allowed to lapse. It was also recommended to the forthcoming Conference that in addition to the two remaining chairs of Hebrew and Systematic Theology there should be two others, one of New Testament Exegesis and Biblical Criticism and another of Apologetics. “For this latter Chair their eyes were turned earnestly towards the Rev A M Fairbairn, of Aberdeen”, indeed the institution of such a chair had arisen from his “pre-eminent qualifications to fill it”. A member of the Academy Committee, Fairbairn had recently delivered a paper to the E U
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Conference concerning the supply of students. Fairbairn declined the nomination and was appointed Principal of Airedale Independent College, Bradford, in 1877. In the meantime, the Conference was also informed that Hunter had resigned his chair but agreed to discharge his duties for another session while a replacement was sought. In light of the foregoing, Robert Craig was appointed in 1876 to the chair of New Testament Exegesis and Biblical Criticism and John Guthrie to that of Apologetics. Guthrie vacated his chair in 1878 on health grounds and Craig vacated his in 1879 on removal to Salford, Manchester. His health improved, Morison agreed to occupy temporarily the chair vacated by Craig and continued to occupy it until 1891. Meanwhile Hunter, who resigned in 1876, continued to occupy his chair until 1882 when he resigned on health grounds. Two years later Alexander McNair was appointed to fill the Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis chair in 1884.

The Academy designation was changed to the Evangelical Union Theological Hall around 1877 and the institution had around one hundred and thirty-two students associated with it between 1843 and 1860, a fair number of whom were laymen, in the first ten years or so especially, with no intention of becoming ministers. The classes 1861 to 1865 were the largest in the Academy’s history; that of 1861 had twenty-seven students, and possibly between its inception and 1887 two hundred and ninety-nine students passed through the institution. For many years there were no bursaries and every student had to support himself.

With the union of the Evangelical Union and the Congregational Union of Scotland, Taylor and McNair became professors in Theological Hall of the Congregational Union of Scotland in 1897.

Lori Anne Ferrell, who teaches at Claremont University in California, is a cultural historian with scholarly interests in the literature and religion of early modern England. She has published work on James I’s preachers and is editing for publication the sermons of the metaphysical poet and Anglican cleric, John Donne. She is, therefore, well qualified for the task of examining the relation between this set of ancient writings and its readers and hearers. She is fascinated by the truth that, although for much of its life the Bible remained inaccessible to most, the people in general still wanted to read and understand it. Ferrell did much of the research for this book in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, and so she only deals with copies of the Bible held in that collection, thus ruling out the texts of eastern orthodoxy and Bibles from the European continent, and leaving her with the scriptures in English.

She escorts us quickly from the Hebrew sacred books to pope Damasus in Rome and to Jerome who, consummate scholar that he was, used corrupted versions of the text in order to construct the Vulgate, arguably the most enduring Bible in history. We soon arrive in early medieval Britain with a manuscript copy of the Codex Amiatinus, which may have originated in a Benedictine monastery in northern England. Her study begins in earnest with the English Bible at the time of the Norman conquest, taking it through two chapters to the early 16th century. The oldest book in the Huntington Library is the “elegantly idiosyncratic” Gundulf Bible, named after the 11th century bishop of Rochester, a friend of archbishop Lanfranc. By the time of the Reformation this was on its way to becoming less a working text and more a valuable collector’s item. Yet the search for an authentic text continued, especially by protestant scholars in the 16th and 17th centuries, though the authority of the Vulgate had been assured for a thousand years.

Ferrell argues that the medieval Bible was not as remote from the people as has often been assumed—decorated psalters for the wealthy, pageants and mystery/miracle plays enacted in the streets, the small and practical Paris Vulgates. We meet, among others, the Ellesmere Psalter, Matthew Parker’s Anglo-Saxon Gospels, and the Bible reading and translating onomatopoeically nicknamed Lollards with their “pestiferous English books”. She also maintains that the Bible of the Reformation was not as popular as has been taught. Yet her greatest claim is that the English Bible had its greatest impact once it had crossed the Atlantic to become the American Bible—as she puts it, “the KJV’s irresistible colonization of the New World”. We touch on John Eliot, in 17th century Massachusetts, whom she calls infelicitously and anachronistically “the
Reverend” and who translated the Bible into the native American language Algonquin.

She is happy to flavour her text with personal comments—English is a “satisfying mouthful of a language” on p 64, with eavesdropping illustrations on p 243, making her book far from dusty, and she acknowledges that “the Bible is hard”, that is complex or “the slipperiest text around”. Nevertheless some awkwardnesses creep in. Her description of the 1200s as one of the “wanderlustiest periods in the entire history of western civilization” seems a trifle overdone, given the relatively static populations of the feudal system, but she is consistently lively. I might add also that, with her book’s title, we do not find the people receive very much space. That is understandable because monarchs ordered deaths and translations and the people simply observed.

Hers is a familiar story, told well, and presented with 55 illustrations, all disappointingly black and white, an index, and 11 pages of scholarly endnotes.

Adam Stone


This handsome book analyses and recreates the world of the Mayflower pilgrims, their origins and their first ten years in the New World. In so doing it covers the development of the English separatists from the reign of Elizabeth I to the early years of the colony in New England centred on Boston. The colony remained an experiment for some years, until 1628, when the growing market in beaver furs provided the product which enabled it to be successful.

The book draws on primary source material in England and it aims to place the pilgrims in their Jacobean setting in old and New England. This requires some imagination for we are divided from them by “an abyss of difference”, as Bunker explains. He sets this experiment in its context, with the comet of 1618, the Thirty Years War, the rival Dutch and French merchant marines, politics at the Jacobean court, among other items, and he describes in detail the voyage of the 102 men, women and children (half of them from separatist families in Leiden) who took nine weeks to cross the ocean. He gives special attention to Christopher Jones, the ship’s master, to William Bradford, soon to be the colony’s governor, and to the first thanksgiving in America.

Then, after 70 pages, Bunker turns back in time to Robert ‘Troublechurch’ Browne and to the origins of the separatists. Again he is painstaking in his attention to detail, attempting to uncover the motives which led these pilgrims to separate from the established church and from the mainstream society of their day. In doing so Bunker has to speculate on the impact of local and national events—on the social ranking of gentlemen, of alleged improprieties by William Brewster’s father on his pilgrim son, on the authorities’ fear of local Catholic recusant families, on the godly activity in Hull where Brewster’s uncle was
mayor, and on sympathy and help for the Protestants in their uprising against the
Spanish in the Netherlands. Bunker is consistently thorough.

After another 70 pages we move to James I’s death in 1625 and to an account
of the relevant events of his reign. We meet Thomas Helwys, described as “the
forgotten leader of the Pilgrim flight from England”, and the more familiar John
Robinson and John Smyth, with their separatist churches at Scrooby and
Gainsborough respectively. Helwys or Elvish, as the records uncovered by
Bunker then call him (a piece of convincing detective work), led the separatists’
flight to the Netherlands in 1608. Bunker likens the exile of the pilgrims to that
of the Irish earls from Donegal and the Moriscos (Moslems in Andalusia) from
Spain—all cruel acts of displaced humanity occurring at this time.

In the Netherlands Smyth’s acceptance of anti-paedobaptist principles led to
Robinson’s church, of about 100 people, moving in 1609 to Leiden, a city then
short of labour for its textile industry, yet where conditions were harsh and
disease was epidemic (John Robinson himself died in 1625 in his early 50s). Most
English separatists, then numbering about 300, stayed behind in Leiden and did
not cross the ocean with Bradford and Brewster. Once in New England the
pilgrims discovered the ferocity of a north-eastern American winter, which none
had warned them about, and 44 of the Mayflower’s passengers died and half of
its crew before spring arrived. There the Mayflower Compact was signed,
whereby all signatories agreed to abide by such “government and governors” as
they shall choose, according to the covenant between the colonists. The meetings
with native Americans, like Samoset and Squanto who spoke English,
transformed their situation, enabling peace with Massasoit, the local chief,
though encounters with others were not always friendly. Yet, despite hardship,
vioence and disease, the colony survived and grew.

Bunker has delved into sources often overlooked in archive collections in this
country, as well as in New England, to bring his story out of the “shadowy
monochrome” into “color, light, and sound”, as he puts it. He has spent some
time examining and describing the topography which benefits the book greatly.
His publishers are to be congratulated for not insisting that Bunker cut the size
of his script. He writes at length, and illustrates his text with very unacademic
allusions to Dick Whittington, Coco Chanel, Daphne du Maurier, and even
Dunkin Donuts—perhaps betraying his journalistic background—but he writes
well and with obvious authority, though he is stronger on narrative than analysis.
This is a welcome production, though I doubt that it will end the stream of
works attempting to detail the Plymouth colony. Curiously he uses throughout
the term Brownist to describe the separatists when they themselves disavowed it.
His maps and illustrations are all good and Bunker has been his own
photographer. The book has a bibliography, endnotes and a full index.

William Hayter

This short booklet began as a lecture but has since expanded. The friendship it describes is well known of, if its details are for many a little sketchy. Cowper’s fits of depressive illness seem very modern, given our greater awareness of the causes of nervous breakdowns and suicide, and treatment for the symptoms. Yet the solution of evangelical religion is not so readily taken today. Newton was a few years older than his unstable but talented friend and of a markedly different character. After conversion, he might have become an Independent minister but was drawn to seek ordination in the Church of England.

Newton had been at Olney for three years when in 1767 he first met Cowper. The two were instantly attracted to each other. Their former home in Olney is now a museum. Their collaboration on a hymnbook, “an inspired idea” writes Dix, occurred in the 1770s and was completed in 1779. That latter year Newton moved to London to the living of St Mary Woolnoth in the City where he became friends with William Romaine, the famous evangelical preacher, and William Wilberforce.

Cowper’s letters, Dix found, charming. Over a thousand of them survive, reminding us that modern emails are no substitute. Cowper’s translations of Homer occupied much time and labour but he was still subject to disturbed nights and terrifying dreams and he believed the consolations of salvation were for others, not for him. Newton remained “the friend of my heart”, as Cowper called him in later years, and Newton, the former slave trader, preached the poet’s funeral sermon in 1800. He himself died in 1807.

This is a useful guide to these two very human Christians. Dix offers three “Afterwords”—on the Sunday evening prayer meetings, on Cowper’s illness and Newton’s influence, and the fitting monument to their friendship of the Olney Hymns.

Martin Bayes


Anne Isba’s biography of Elizabeth Fry (1780–1845) is a treasure for anyone interested in the life and work of this early nineteenth-century reformer. Consisting of thirteen chapters, divided over four parts—An Unlikely Heroine; The Newgate Experiment; Spreading the Word; and The Final Years—this is a well-organised, well-researched and very readable biography. Elizabeth Fry’s achievements as a prison reformer, with a special focus on improving the situation of female prisoners, are well known. In a nutshell, she first visited
Newgate Prison in 1813, seriously began her reform work there in the winter of 1816/1817, in April 1817 established the Ladies’ Association for the Reformation of the Female Prisoners in Newgate—which in 1821 became the British Ladies’ Society for Promoting the Reformation of Female Prisoners, she published a handbook with her main recommendations called *Observations on the Visiting, Superintendence, and Government, of Female Prisoners* (1827), and managed to get her reforms enshrined in law (the 1823 Gaols Act and the 1835 Prisons Act). In addition, she was involved in other philanthropic causes, and made a number of trips to the European continent to advocate prison reform there as well, again with considerable success.

But even though the story is largely known, Anne Isba has managed to write a fresh and inspiring biography, based primarily on her reading of Elizabeth Fry’s forty-six diaries, as well as additional research. The book, intended for a broader audience, is written in a light tone, but nevertheless conveys a profound understanding of the issues at stake: the life story of an exceptional woman, the broader social history of Great Britain at the time, religion, and social reform. Isba describes Elizabeth Fry as a strong woman from a rich family, embedded in a network of well-situated and supporting family members and fellow reformers, and deeply motivated to improve the situation of her fellow human beings, especially ‘those of her own sex’ (as she put it in her *Observations*). She places Fry in a longer history of prison reform, starting with the story of Elizabeth Hootten (1600–1672) and followed by John Howard (1726–1790), on whose work as a prison reformer ‘future generations could build’ (p 52). The reader gets a clear sense of Fry’s perseverance—after all, although she did receive a lot of help, she was a married woman with eleven children whose health was often failing her, but who nonetheless for a quarter of a century dedicated most of her time and efforts to social reform. Isba does not just depict Elizabeth Fry as strong and persevering, but also as very human. The author suggests that Fry’s religious and social activities, which necessitated long periods from home, were more than an outlet for her enormous talents: they also offered an escape from a disappointing marriage. And quoting Fry’s niece, Elizabeth Gurney, Isba mentions Fry’s ability to ‘look’ a sermon (p 170), her liking of vin de Bordeaux (p 171), and her ability to make ‘all work, whoever they may be’ (p 168).

The most innovative part of the book is the chapter about Fry’s importance as a pioneer of professional nursing in Britain. Despite Florence Nightingale’s fame, it was Elizabeth Fry ‘who in 1840 established in London the country’s first school for nurses, the Institution of Nursing Sisters’ (p 177). The story of Fry’s personal involvement with and talent for nursing is not new, nor is the Kaiserswerth connection: Pastor Fliedner in 1824 in London met with Fry. Back home, he established the first German society for improving prison discipline, based on her principles. The institute he founded in Kaiserswerth subsequently expanded in a number of ways, and by 1840 included a hospital and a nursing institute. When Elizabeth Fry in turn visited Kaiserswerth in 1840, what she saw there motivated her to establish a training institute for nurses, who would be working especially for the less well-off. In Isba’s words, this enabled Fry to
achieve ‘two objectives with one initiative: raising nursing standards, and making nursing care available to those in need, even if they could not afford it’ (178–179). The author convincingly argues that it was Fry, not Nightingale, who pioneered modern, professional nursing in Britain, and supports this claim with extensive quotes from authoritative sources: the British Medical Journal and the journal Nursing Record and Hospital World (Chapter 11).

There are a number of things that to my mind might have deserved more attention, such as the increasing government support for solitary confinement, which Fry opposed but whose advance she could not stem, and her broader impact in encouraging and legitimising middle-class women to enter the public sphere. But this intelligent biography is a welcome addition to the existing literature about an exceptional woman.

Francisca de Haan


The prolific scholar, M Wynn Thomas, equally adept in Welsh and English, has produced a study of the pivotal influence of chapel life on Welsh writing in English. Thomas is confident enough to explore his theme with reference to his own experiences, as much as through the national story. He explains at the outset that “cherished memories” of his grandmother and parents have been his “constant companions” throughout his work on the book and it shows. As a result this academic begins by recalling the meteoric career of the evangelist, Evan Roberts, and the Welsh revival of 1904–5 which had international effects. The author’s grandmother, or mam-gu, had accompanied Roberts on his first evangelistic tour. Sadly his preaching soon became a series of media events and some followers quickly came to resemble groupies. Roberts and mam-gu remained friends and, forty years later, they looked back on the revival and agreed that it had failed through “its lurid melodrama, its gross hysteria, its vulgarity”. Thomas finds that that past, in particular, is a foreign country today, and he struggles with it.

Roberts was, he writes, “a sensitive, troubled, anguished psyche. He, the revival … and mam-gu: … remain many fathoms too complex to be fully explained by any of the subsequent, reductive, explanatory models and discourses. No one has yet come near taking the measure of the man, his force, his psychic energy, his dramatic mood swings.” Later we encounter a late 20th century literary version of Roberts as “a Welsh puritan Rasputin”. And, as is true for many Welsh folk in my experience, the influence of Thomas’s mam-gu was formative, not tangential. Thomas has dedicated this book to his mam-gu for he admits it is as much about her and her world, as it is about Welsh nonconformity. He knows too that 20th century Wales moved from a predominantly religious to a predominantly secular culture and that transition remains largely unexplored.
Wynn Thomas admires the magnificent Welsh hymn ‘Dyma gariad fel y moroedd’ which is, as he says, “an expansive celebration of God’s oceanic compassion”. He concludes that “No religious culture capable of producing” such a hymn “could possibly be all bad”. He recognises the chapels as having been “the theatre of fantasy, the nursery of art” and here are big headed ministers, double dealing deacons and hypocrites, among the arduous of the pious and the preacher’s search for the hwyl. Readers of this magazine will not need to pay too close attention to the author’s explanation, or ‘bluffer’s guide’ as he calls it, of how Wales was taken by a nonconformist “spiritual storm”. He explores those 19th century writers who view the chapels from without, and from within, nonconformity and he examines how Welsh nonconformity took over and even co-existed with many pre-Christian practices (wise-women, sin-eaters etc). Making an appearance in the text, therefore, are writers like T J Llewellyn Prichard (who wrote of the romantic brigand Twm Sion Catti), Gwyn Jones, Gwyn Thomas and others, but surprisingly also there is Ernest Jones, Freud’s disciple and biographer, who was an exact contemporary and neighbour of Evan Roberts—the two were born only a mile or two apart. Literary giants like Dylan Thomas (of Unitarian ancestry), Glyn Jones (Welsh Independent/Annibynwyr), Emyr Humphreys (Church in Wales converting to Annibynwyr) and Roland Mathias (staunch nonconformist) are given due space. M Wynn Thomas himself was brought up in the “uniformly kind and warmly supportive” atmosphere of two Annibynwyr chapels—“Congregationalism was the most libertarian and humanistic of all the branches of Dissent”, wrote the crusading anti-chapel Gwyn Thomas.

In this book Thomas shows that for many important Welsh writers their creative beginnings lay in the words used and heard in the chapels. Yet he knows that his book has serious limitations. By restricting its focus to English language works, it cannot fully examine the cultural impact of nonconformity on Wales because it has ruled out the very significant Welsh language contribution. Of course, it also offers no comparatives with other nations, even small nations, like the Netherlands and Denmark, traditionally Protestant, although Thomas himself itemises Norway and New England. This reader would also have benefitted from a map or two, detailing some of the towns and villages cited in the text.

However this is not to say all. The shade of Thomas’s mam-gu, and those of many other mam-gus, still powerfully influences modern Wales and those who seek to understand this small, but amazingly vibrant, country and its culture, must wrestle with the nonconformity that shaped and moved them with such imaginative force. I commend this work to all those who wish to understand Wales, its literature and its unique chapel culture.

This is a subject ripe for investigation and John Briggs, a loyal Baptist, tackles it with energy and commitment. He is well qualified for his task as he grew up in a joint Baptist/Congregational church, Christ Church and Upton Chapel, in Lambeth North, south London. At the outset he states his agreement with that ecumenical Baptist scholar, Ernest Payne, that the history of these two groups of churches is “one and indivisible”. He is strong then on their common history, their shared Congregational polity, and the emergence of open communion and open membership churches, like those in Bedfordshire and the adjacent counties, which were influenced by Bunyan, who did not want baptism to be a divisive issue (as, one suspects, no more does John Briggs). He points out the cooperation between the two branches of the congregational family in village itinerancy during the evangelical revival, when working with other Christians was not always possible. Their principle of cohesion was, he writes, “a bond of peace”.

The setting up of national unions occurred along parallel lines for these bodies, both with vaguely Calvinist articles of faith and order. Although such moves encouraged the sense of separate denominational identities, throughout the 19th century calls for a formal coming together between them persisted. Sharing in schools, colleges, churches, and joint national assemblies in 1886 and 1901 only strengthened such calls. Yet Briggs detects theological and ecclesiological factors pulling the two bodies apart, with Spurgeon and the Downgrade controversy on the one side and Baldwin Brown and liberalism on the other. Both bodies have allowed some centralization, with Congregationalists merging with Presbyterians in the United Reformed Church and Baptists transforming their organization from 29 associations into 13 new regions. Indeed his final comment is that Baptists increasingly belong “not only to the congregational tradition” but also to the “pneumatic”, which rather leaves the Congregational Federation, which curiously does not have a single mention (even in a footnote), as the heir continuing its lively witness to the spirit of independency.

I found this a fascinating lecture, entertaining and yet also annoying. Given that a number of representatives from the CF were present at his lecture, it is strange that Prof Briggs ignored its contribution, although he did notice the URC and the Evangelical Fellowship of Congregational Churches. His discussion of Nathaniel Micklem and his influential friends neither refers to nor explains Wheeler Robinson’s and the Baptists’ decision to erect a separate Regent’s Park College in Oxford, against the wishes of the Mansfield College Council. Did that decision imply a distrust of the Congregationalists, and Micklem in particular, when Robinson and Regent’s Park had happily cooperated for many years at Mansfield College under principal Selbie (Micklem’s
predecessor—also curiously omitted by Briggs)? Briggs’ uncritical view of Micklem seems to echo the dominant attitude of the last half century which modern scholars might call into question.

Other infelicities have crept in. Congregationalist is a noun not an adjective. Ritschl (p 33) should be spelt thus and the Congregational Union of England and Wales began life in 1831, not 1832–3 (p 18).

Alan Argent

---
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