Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Trinity College Library Dublin

University of Dublin

THIS THESIS MAY BE READ ONLY
IN THE LIBRARY

Trinity College Library College Street Dublin 2 Ireland

PROTESTANT DISSENT AND CONTROVERSY
IN IRELAND, 1660-1711

DECLARATION

This thesis was written under the supervision of Brian Clarke, MA, PhD, FRCG, FRCR, Professor of Modern History, during 1987-91. It is entirely my own work and has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree in this or any other university.

In accordance with the PHIL KILROY, M.A.(U.C.D.) College Dublin, the library has been asked to copy this thesis upon request.

A thesis submitted to the School of History in the University of Dublin for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Trinity College Dublin

October 1991

PROTESTANT DISSENT AND CONTROVERSY
IN IRELAND, 1660-1711

THESIS
2413

WILL KILROY, M.A. (U.C.D.)

A thesis submitted to the School of History in the
University of Dublin for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy.

Trinity College Dublin
October 1991

DECLARATION

This thesis was written under the supervision of Aidan Clarke, MA, PhD, FCTD, MRIA, Erasmus Smith's Professor of Modern History, during 1987-91. It is entirely my own work and has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree in this or any other university.

In accordance with the regulations of Trinity College Dublin, the Library may lend or copy this thesis upon request.

Phil Kilroy

Phil Kilroy.

14. x. 9

PUBLISHED BY CORK UNIVERSITY PRESS

1994

CONTENTS

Contents	p. 1
Acknowledgements.....	p. 2
Abbreviations.....	p. 3
Preface	p. 4
Chapter 1 The Scottish Presbyterian Church in Ireland after the Restoration.....	p. 6
Chapter 2 Divisions within the Scottish Presbyterian Church in Ireland	p. 25
Chapter 3 Tensions among Scottish Presbyterians in Dublin	p. 51
Chapter 4 English Presbyterians in Ireland, 1655-1711	p. 68
Chapter 5 Independents in Ireland, 1655-1711....	p. 88
Chapter 6 Quakers in Ireland, 1653-1711.....	p. 109
Chapter 7 Controversies in Ireland between Quakers and: a) English Presbyterians b) Independents c) Scottish Presbyterians d) the Established Church.....	p. 136
Chapter 8 William King and the Presbyterian tradition in Ireland	p. 183
Chapter 9 Presbyterians in Ireland after 1688....	p. 213
Chapter 10 Achievement.....	p. 239
Bibliography	p. 252

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due to the librarians and staff in: Dublin: Trinity College Library, the National Library Ireland, Religious Society of Friend's in Ireland Historical Library, the Gilbert Library, Marsh's Library, Representative Church Body Library, Royal Irish Academy, Unitarian Church, St. Stephen's Green West. In Belfast: the Public Record Office Northern Ireland, the Queen's University Library, the Linenhall Library, Union Theological College Library, Presbyterian Historical Society Library. In Armagh: Armagh Public Library; Local History, Irish Reference Department, S.E.L.B. In Londonderry: Magee College Library. In Cashel: GPA-Bolton Library. In Edinburgh: the National Library Scotland, the Public Record Office, New College Library, University of Edinburgh Library. In Oxford: the Bodleian Library. In Cambridge: University College Library, Trinity College Library. In London: the British Library, Library of the Religious Society of Friend's, Dr. William's Library, the Congregational Library, Lambeth Palace Library, Victoria and Albert Museum Library, the Public Record Office, the Institute of Historical Research.

In addition to my colleagues, family and friends, I would like to thank those who have helped me in a particular way: Angela Campbell, Margaret MacCurtain, Jane Olhmeyer, Keith Lindley, J.M.Barkley, T.C. Barnard, G.O.Simms, Raymond Gillespie, James Maguire, Alan Falconer, Terence McCaughy, Steven C. ffeary-Smyrl, Marie McCarthy. My greatest thanks are due to my supervisor, Aidan Clarke, who has been exacting and encouraging throughout the course of this work.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations in T.W.Moody, F.X.Martin, F.J.Byrne, *A new history of Ireland*, iii (Oxford,1976), pp xxvi-xxxvii, have been used throughout, with the following additions:

F.L.D. Friends Library Dublin

F.L.L. Friends Library London

J.F.H.S. Journal of the Friends
Historical Society

N.L.S. National Library Scotland

U.L.C. University Library Cambridge

B.L. British Library

Baum. Papers Baumgartner Papers, Strype
correspondence, University
Library Cambridge

Dating

All dates are given old style, except that the year is taken to begin on 1 January.

References

The Carte Manuscripts, Bodleian Library Oxford.

All folio references in this thesis are from the original manuscripts and are not taken from the Edwards catalogue.

PREFACE

This thesis examines how Quakers, Independents, Scottish and English Presbyterians fared in Ireland between 1660 -1711. Each group is studied through controversies that arose within and between them, which served to sharpen their self-perception and clarify their position within the Protestant tradition in Ireland.¹ Printed controversies provided the core material for this study. Most of these are accessible, though some are held in obscure collections and a few are unique copies. The fact that they are scattered in various libraries in Ireland, Scotland and England symbolises the very real exchange and communication between these three countries in the second half of the 17th century.

Some of the works studied originated during the Interregnum when censorship had broken down and there was an outpouring of books, sermons, tracts and pamphlets. Such freedom of the press ended when Charles II was restored; strict rules for the printing of books were laid down in Ireland, in 1664 and again in 1671. Yet these did not hinder the Independents, English Presbyterians or the Quakers from publishing their works.² In theory, only the King's printer, John Crooke, could print, bind and publish books. However, in practice these obstacles could be overcome if the book or pamphlet was signed either by the Lord Lieutenant, a bishop or an important member of the government or church.³ If this procedure was not adopted then the work was printed without indicating the place or the printer, or, alternatively, the work was printed in London, Edinburgh or Glasgow.

Such relative freedom to print material was not enjoyed by the Scottish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland prior to 1688. This forced them to import books from Scotland, something noted with disapproval by the governments of the day.⁴ When they did begin to publish material in Ireland this was deeply resented by the Established Church.⁵ In view of this dearth of printed material the Minutes of the Laggan and Antrim meetings, the Burt Kirk Session Minutes and the Wodrow Manuscripts provided the necessary background evidence and some material for the controversies both within Scottish Presbyterianism and with other protestant dissenters in the country.

1. In *Protestant dissent in Ireland, 1687-1780* (London, 1948), J.C. Beckett treated dissent within the political context of the period. Neither the Baptists nor the Huguenots have been included in this study as their history would not lend itself to this type of study. The Baptists are the subject of a Ph.D. due for presentation in the near future.

2. Mary Pollard, *Dublin's trade in books* (Oxford, 1989), pp 7-8, 13-14, 95.

3. Thomas Jenner dedicated his work to the Earl and Lady Donegal, presented it to the Lord Lieutenant and asked the bishop of Leighlin for approbation of the book. Thomas Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised and confuted* (n.p., 1670), Dedication; William Penn, *The second part of the serious apology for the....Quakers* (n.p., 1671), pp 178-9; M.R. Brailsford, *The making of William Penn* (London, 1933), p. 75.

4. Bodleian Library Oxford, Carte Manuscripts, 45, ff 317, 330; Peter Brooks, *Ulster Presbyterianism* (Dublin, 1987), p. 46.

5. *A Representation of the present state of religion*, 1711, pp 10-11

Except for the New Row Baptismal Register,⁶ the lack of church records for both the English Presbyterians and the Independents in Ireland is a serious gap and sources such as *The Diary of John Cook* and *The Mather Papers* went some distance in providing some contemporary background.⁷ Further evidence was contained in the non-controversial works of some authors, their sermons, tracts and memoirs; funeral orations on the death of a controversial figure were of particular value, or at least provided clues to other sources.⁸ The Dr. Williams Library and the Congregational Library, London, contain invaluable material on many of the dissenters studied in this thesis.

The recently moved and re-opened Quaker Library in Dublin contains probably the most consistent background material. Records survive for all the monthly, province and national meetings; for births, marriages and deaths; and, most useful for this study, for disownments/dismissals. In addition, the accounts of *Sufferings*, the histories of the Quakers, the biographies/autobiographies and journals, written at this time are valuable background sources. Coupled with the material held in the Friends Library London, adequate context was provided for the various controversies which Quakers had both within themselves and with other dissenters in Ireland, as well as with the Established Church.

Gradually and through many disparate sources, the history of dissent in Ireland after the Restoration began to emerge and clarify. Rather than an abrupt change at the Restoration there was a slow, gradual growth in awareness and articulation as to where each one stood in the country, what strengths and weaknesses they had and how these could be addressed. There was a constant effort at containment of differences in order to survive, and of disownment when this was no longer possible. By 1711 the Scottish Presbyterians and the Quakers had consolidated structures which held their membership together and affected their way of life, of worship, discipline and belief. However, both Independents and English Presbyterians developed a more singular, individualised form of church order, worship, discipline and theology. This was due as much to their situation in Ireland as to their respective theological positions.

These contrasting forms of religious experience created a wide and rich experience of religious dissent among the Protestant community in Ireland at this time and can be seen as the outcome of the Interregnum. For the civil war period in general marked either the foundation or further growth of dissenting groups in Ireland. Prior to that, dissent had been barely comprehended within the Established Church, under the leadership of James Ussher. After 1660 it was well and truly outside and could not be contained. The passage to self awareness and definition was difficult and uncertain for the Quakers, Independents, Scottish and English Presbyterians. But each succeeded in making their mark and contributed to the development and tradition of Protestant dissent in Ireland in the second half of the 17th century.

6. Unitarian Church, St. Stephen's Green West, Dublin. Eustace Street Congregation: New Row Baptismal Register, 1653-1737.

7. John Cook, *The diary of John Cook begun 1696.*; The Mather Papers in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, viii, 4th series (Boston, 1868).

8. The King Manuscripts, T.C.D., the Carte Manuscripts, Oxford, the Bradshaw Collection and Baumgartner Papers, Cambridge all provided essential material, though often from the Established Church or government point of view.

CHAPTER 1

THE SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND AFTER THE RESTORATION

In February 1649 the Belfast presbytery wrote to the 'sectarian party' in England and denounced its actions:

they have with a high hand despised the oath in breaking the Covenant...and likewise labour to establish by laws an universal toleration of all religions....[have] strong oppositions to presbyterial governmenthave proceeded to the trial of the King..and with cruel hands put him to death...We cannot but declare our utter dislike and detestation of such unwarrantable practices, directly subverting our Covenant, religion, laws and liberties.¹

The presbytery's *Representation* was made with anger and conviction, and with the expectation that it would be heard and obeyed. The tone and content of such statements underlined the strong position Presbyterians felt they held in Ulster. This was due not only to recent growth in strength there on account of the war; from the early stages of the Ulster plantation presbyterian ministers had come to Ireland, for different reasons, and found they could negotiate with some of the Established Church bishops, such as Knox of Raphoe and Echlin of Down and Connor, on the issue of ordination and ministry.² This was an accommodation which suited both groups at the time; ministers were needed in the country and the Established Church was Calvinistic and comprehensive under the leadership of Ussher. Thus as long as the 1615 Irish

1. *A necessary representation of the present evils and eminent dangers to religion, laws and liberties arising from the late and present practices of the sectarian party in England...* By the Presbytery of Belfast February 15 1649, pp 42-3.

2. John Livingstone, *A brief historical relation of the life of Mr. John Livingstone*....ed. Thomas McCrie (Edinburgh, 1848), pp 58-9; Andrew Stewart, *History of the church of Ireland*, in Patrick Adair, *A true narrative... of the Presbyterian church in Ireland (1623-1670)*, with introduction and notes by W.D.Killen (Belfast, 1866), p. 313; Marilyn Westerkamp, *Triumph of the laity, Scots-Irish piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760* (Oxford, 1988), pp 20-23; R. Buick Knox, *James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh* (Cardiff, 1967), pp 174-77; David Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish confederates* (Belfast, 1981), pp 12-13.

Articles were in operation, and bishops like Ussher, Knox and Echlin held sees in Ulster, a certain kind of *modus vivendi* was possible.

With the arrival of Thomas Wentworth as Lord Deputy in 1633 this wide interpretation and comprehension ceased. Under Wentworth's leadership the Established Church in Convocation (1634) accepted the 39 Articles of the Church of England, and, by implication at least, degraded or even abrogated the Irish Articles of 1615.³ Following on this, the presbyterian ministers were required either to conform to the 1634 Articles of religion or leave their parishes. Certainly in a short time the whole tone and atmosphere had changed and in 1636, Henry Leslie, who succeeded Echlin as bishop of Down and Connor, debated with the presbyterian ministers on their difficulty in accepting the Book of Common Prayer.⁴ This debate, significant in itself, also symbolised presbyterian rejection of the Established Church as reformed in 1634 by Laud, Wentworth and Bramhall. Leslie tried hard to meet them at least half way in the debate, making several concessions; but the arrival of Bramhall in the course of the debate heightened the differences and polarised the two traditions acutely. The *modus vivendi* was over. When Wentworth imposed the Black Oath in 1639, requiring rejection of the Solemn League and Covenant, it was clear that there would be no place for presbyterians in Wentworth's Ireland.⁵

However, the ministers had been in Ireland long enough to establish definite forms and structures for ministry and worship, and these were sufficiently strong to sustain a period of harassment. No longer able to preach in the parish churches, ministers resorted to the monthly lecture

3. This was subject of long debate: Nicholas Bernard, *The judgement of the late archbishop of Armagh*, 2nd edition (London, 1659); Peter Heylin, *Respondet Petrus or the answer of Peter Heylin to so much of Dr. Bernard's book, entitled The judgement of the late Primate of Ireland. An appendix.* (London, 1658); Nicholas Bernard, *Clavi Trabales or nails fastened by some great masters of assemblies confirming the King's supremacy...* (London, 1661), p. 62 ff; Peter Heylin, *Aerius Redivivus or the history of the presbyterians* (Oxford, 1670), pp 392- 5; Richard Parr, *Life of James Ussher* (London, 1686), pp 42-3, 66; *The works of the most reverend... John Bramhall*, ed. John Vesey (Dublin, 1676), introduction, (no pagination) and pp 935-7.

4. J.S. Reid, *The history of the Presbyterian church in Ireland*, 3 vols, (Belfast 1867), i, Appendix iv, p. 523 ff

5. Adair, *A true Narrative*, pp 95-101; Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters*, pp 18-19, 21-22, 32; Westerkamp, *Triumph of the laity*, pp 36, 38.

established in 1625 to cope with the Six-Mile-Water Revival. Such meetings lasted an evening and full day, usually a Thursday and Friday; sometimes the monthly meeting was followed by a communion service, which extended the meeting to the following Monday. Meetings were generally led by ministers but occasionally the numbers were too great and laypersons led small groups in prayer and preparation for communion.⁶ It was a formative experience not just for future elders but also for small groups maintaining themselves without ministers for lengthy periods. Both these developments were to be significant in the post Restoration period.

Five chaplains came with the Scottish army sent to Ireland in 1642 and these ministers organised the soldiers into congregations and sessions, thus establishing the first formal Presbytery in Ireland. Soon those people, who had had ministers prior to Wentworth's policy, heard of this and asked for ministers to come and preach and even reside among them. These requests were sent to the General Assembly in Scotland,⁷ and gradually presbyterian congregations emerged in Ulster. By 1653 there were twenty four presbyterian ministers and by 1654 the first presbytery had divided into three presbyteries; by 1659 there were five in all.⁸

These two phases in the growth of presbyterianism in Ulster, the first ending with the ejection of the ministers after 1634 and the second, beginning in 1642, gave presbyterians a strong sense of their place in Ulster. Coupled with the doctrine of predestination and the belief that it was their destiny to rule, they had real motivation for speaking out strongly in February 1649. This was not well received in England, and the

6. Westerkamp, *Triumph of the laity*, pp 23-36; Livingstone, *A brief relation*, p. 12.

7. *Acts of the General assemblies of the Church of Scotland, 1638-49* (Edinburgh, 1691), pp 138, 159, 190, 214 and Index; Livingstone, *A brief historical relation*, pp 37-8.

8. Minutes of the Antrim meeting, 1654-58 (Public Record Office Northern Ireland, D. 1759/ 1A/ 1); The Templepatrick session book, 1646-1743 (P.R.O.N.I., CR4/12/B/1), partly published by W.T. Latimer, 'The old session book of Templepatrick presbyterian church, Co. Antrim', in *R.S.A.I. Jn*, 25, 1895 and 31, 1901; Adair, *A true narrative*, pp 204-15, 217-8, 220-3; Reid, *History of the presbyterian church in Ireland*, ii, 193-238; Westerkamp, *Triumph of the laity*, pp 47-51; Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters*, pp 290-1.

'sectarian party', furious at the criticism of the Belfast Presbytery, instructed John Milton to write a reply.⁹ Milton berated 'these pretended brethren' of a small town in Ulster who took it on themselves to rebuke the party in England; they had no right to preach 'beyond the diocese of Patrick or Columba'.¹⁰ He accused them of being worse than the bishops and on a par with Rome, claiming 'absolute and independing jurisdiction, as from like advantage and occasion...the Pope has for many ages done'.¹¹ These 'most grave and reverend Carmelites' denied their own founder, John Knox, who taught the doctrine of deposing and of killing kings:¹²

And thus while they deny that any such rule can be found, the rule is found in their own country given them by their own first presbyterian institutor; and they themselves like irregular friars walking contrary to the rule of their own foundation deserve for so gross an ignorance and transgression to be disciplined upon their own stools....so haughty in the pontifical see of Belfast'.

Two presbyterian ministers, Jeremy Kerr and Jeremy O'Quinn, refused to read the *Representation* to their congregations, and they appealed to the General Assembly in Scotland for support.¹³ Although they were presbyterians they supported Milton's views, and this tension within presbyterianism ran right through the second half of the 17th century. It was a tension between those who adhered to the King and accepted royal authority in religious affairs and those who rejected this as contrary to the Covenant in all its purity. This double strand in Irish Presbyterianism grew side by side in Ulster, and in some other parts of Ireland, and was a source of internal and external conflict. In effect it was an extension of what was going on in Scotland at this time between the Resolutioners and the Remonstrants.

9. *Observations upon the articles of peace with the Irish rebels on the letter of Ormonde to Col. Jones and the representation of the Presbytery at Belfast* [1649].

10. *Ibid*, pp 54-55.

11. *Ibid*, pp 55-56. John Bramhall thought the same of Scottish presbyterians in 1649, calling the General Assembly of Scotland Antichrist. [John Bramhall], *A fair warning to take heed of the Scottish discipline...most injurious to the civil magistrate* (n.p., 1649), p. 32.

12. *Ibid*, pp 63-65.

13. *News from Ireland* (London, 1650).

In view of this, in 1654 it was felt necessary to pass the Act of Bangor.¹⁴ By this Act ministers who came to Ireland were not to bring in or even speak of the divisions in Scotland. No congregation was to send to Scotland for a minister without first consulting the presbytery. The presbytery would write to Scotland, to both factions, and only those ministers recommended by both would be accepted in Ireland. In this way it was hoped to maintain some control of ministers who came from Scotland. However, it was not successful as the tradition of dissent in presbyterianism was well established in Ireland since the 1620's, and contact with Scotland was natural both theologically and socially, for both countries were geographically proximate as the shores of a lake. Thus the two strands of presbyterianism were destined to exist side by side and seek expression in their different ways.

Scottish presbyterianism in Ulster entered into a third phase after the Restoration, and when records resume in the 1670's it is clear that the presbyterian way of life, worship and ministry were working well and increasing in confidence. The five meetings already in existence in 1659, Antrim, Down, the Route, Laggan and Tyrone, were thriving. A general committee composed of delegates from the five meetings had been established and met on a regular basis. It did not call itself a synod and sought to define its powers during this period. In September 1672 it asked the meetings to discuss whether it had juridical power to conclude matters before them. The Antrim meeting thought it better not to give the general committee such power then, possibly because it was too difficult to communicate freely in public.¹⁵ In practice, however, the general committee assumed a great deal of business sent in by the meetings and whatever it decided was considered binding on all.¹⁶

14. Adair, *A true narrative*, ii, pp 209-18.

15. Minutes of the Antrim meeting, 1671-91, pp 59, 64 (P.R.O.N.I. D 1759/1A/2). This was proposed again in 1679 and the Laggan meeting thought it inadvisable to give the general committee power over all the meetings. Minutes of the Laggan Meeting, p. 333 (P.R.O.N.I. D 1759/1E/1).

16. 10 September 1673, Laggan minutes, p.64 ; 11 March 1673, Antrim Minutes, p.83.

Detailed instructions were given to the two ministers delegated to represent the meeting on the general general committee; delegates returned to their own meetings with detailed replies, opinions and suggestions.¹⁷ A good example of how the general committee worked is found in the Laggan minutes for August/September 1679. Apparently the Tyrone meeting had several complaints: fasts/thanksgivings were being held without other meetings being told; the Down meeting had given in to the magistrate without the other meetings agreeing to this step; it was rumoured that the Down meeting told the people they could take the oath of supremacy 'in some sense'. So the Tyrone meeting asked the Antrim, Route and Laggan meetings to set down 'an authoritative general committee to prevent separate actings in things of common concernment', in the interest of harmony and unity. The Laggan meeting agreed with all the points raised by the Tyrone meeting and asked that they be treated at the next general committee meeting at Ballymena.¹⁸

While it is not clear how often the general committee met in a year, possibly once and perhaps twice, the five meetings met monthly. Substantial records exist for Antrim and the Laggan; there are also records of the kirk sessions of Burt, Carnmoney, Dundonald and Templepatrick. The meeting was held every month and minutes were taken which indicate a simple structure: Name of the meeting, date, place and number present. Ministers and elders were almost always present at the Laggan meeting but not at Antrim until after 1687.¹⁹ A record of those present and absent was noted. Absences were frowned upon and 'juridically rebuked'.²⁰ This was followed by correspondence and the meetings' reply to it. Other business could include maintenance of ministers, visitation of parishes, arrangements for communion services, public penance and discipline, the training and

17. Laggan minutes, pp 181, 209, 219, 333; ii, p. 48; Antrim minutes, pp 209, 217, 260-1, 298, 313, 372.

18. Laggan minutes, ii, pp 17, 21-2.

19. 3 May 1687, Antrim minutes, p. 298.

20. 19 May 1674, Laggan minutes, 1672-1695, p. 112.

ordination of candidates for ministry, the call from other congregations in Ireland for visits of ministers or applying to Scotland for ministers to supply need in Ireland.

Maintenance of ministers was a serious concern after the restoration for the salaries they had received during the closing years of the Interregnum were withdrawn. The people had to pay tithes to the reformed church and support their own presbyterian minister as well. While the Regium Donum was granted after 1672, it could not maintain the ministry and so ministers were sent around to the congregations to tell them to provide maintenance. Those congregations which called a minister were responsible for building a meeting house, and none were to call a minister unless they were prepared to maintain him. The Down meeting felt this should be dealt with seriously, otherwise the church would fail.²¹

Visitation of the kirk was carried out by the ministers and elders appointed by the meeting. One of the best examples of this dates from 1654. The visitation of Broadisland was held on 11 October that year,²² commissioned by the Antrim Presbytery, with a moderator, Patrick Adair, and two other ministers, Anthony Kennedy and Thomas Hall. Two elders were also present. The minister, Robert Cunningham, was sent out of the room and the elders of the kirk were asked about 'the soundness and authority of his doctrine, his painfulness in catechising, visiting the families and sick persons and how they were satisfied with his life and conversation, with his impartiality in discipline'. The elders were also asked about maintenance and told to warn the session that the minister would be removed if he was not paid properly.

21. 22 Dec. 1674, Laggan minutes, p. 151; cf. pp 93, 101; 2 Feb. 1675, Antrim meeting, p. 165. 30 April 1678, Burt Kirk Session minutes (Union Theological College, Belfast), no pagination; April 1693, Laggan minutes, p. 188; Ibid, May 1695, p. 282. (Inisowen asked for a minister in 1695; having asked three times they got a probationer; in 1697 they were told to pay him properly or he would be removed. Ibid, pp 246, 307, 313, 420).

22. Antrim minutes, 1654-1658, p. 1.

This procedure was not possible publicly after the Restoration but a muted form of it seems to have existed in that ministers censured each other at the meetings, though without the elders present.²³ The account of the Burt Kirk Session for 1678 tells how in April Robert Rule and Robert Campbell told the heads of families in Burt to provide the ministers' house with timber and money 'to the end he may employ workmen as he thinks fit'.²⁴ In 1686 Carnmoney session noted the people were ignoring their dues and decided that the minister was to be paid before he baptised children.²⁵

The communion service was held in different parts of the country and its organisation ensured a type of visitation in so far as ministers joined together for the service. This was held about once a year and attended not only by the congregation in the parish but by vast crowds in neighbouring parishes. On Saturday there was sermon as a preparation and on Sunday the service began at 8 am and lasted until the late afternoon. The communicants sat on long forms; other forms, higher and covered with linen cloths, served as tables. Every full standing member could communicate by right yet none could be admitted without a token of admission from their session. This token was withheld from any who were in penance, had a bad reputation, or who had not paid fines. During the service there were from 8 - 12 tables for communion and a separate address was delivered to each party; one minister addressed the people in the church and 2-3 other ministers addressed the crowd outside. Sometimes refreshments were supplied in a neighbouring field, even with drink which was frowned on by the ministers as this broke the sabbath.²⁶

23. 11 August 1680, Laggan minutes, p. 73.

24. 30 April 1678, Burt Kirk Session minutes.

25. The register of the session of Carnmoney, 1686-1748 (Presbyterian Historical Society, 1686 f.1).

26. Latimer, *The old session-book of Templepatrick presbyterian church, Co. Antrim*, pp 259-60.

The tradition of having large communion services was well rooted in Ireland from the early 17th century. John Livingstone described them in detail.²⁷ This continued throughout the Commonwealth period and after. For example, in June 1647 the Templepatrick Kirk Session asked two men to go to Carrickfergus for 40 bottles of the 'best claret and one bushel of French flour' for the communion service.²⁸ In 1657 for another communion service in May, 36 bottles of wine and one bushel of flour was bought; again in June 1660 36 bottles were ordered and one bushel of flour; for their service in 1670 four flagons of wine were ordered and in 1693 14 gallons.²⁹ In Burt for a communion service in July 1694 36 bottles were sent for from Belfast.³⁰

It seems that communion services were rare during 1660-1670. Times were too difficult. However in 1670 Templepatrick session decided to have a service on 26 June, indicating that this was the first in a long time 'because of the prelates'.³¹ There was freedom to have such public services at this time. Robert Campbell wrote to Thomas Wyllie in August 1674 that they had a communion service in Londonderry the previous summer and declared 'as for public matters I bless the Lord to continue our liberty'.³² Again in 1679 the size of a communion service in Armagh caused great concern because of the political unrest then in the country. The suspicion such large meetings aroused, particularly at times of crisis in Ireland and Scotland will be developed later.³³ Quite a detailed account of another communion service is given in the Burt session book for 1681:³⁴

27. Livingstone, *A brief historical relation*, p. 30.

28. Latimer, *The old session book of Templepatrick presbyterian church, Co. Antrim* p. 265.

29. Templepatrick Session Book 1646-1743, f.122, 162, 169, 171.

30. 15 July 1694, Burt Kirk Session. Full details are given of the costs of transport, for grinding wheat and baking the bread; the cost of a communion ticket that year was 3s.6p.

31. 26 June 1670, Templepatrick Session Book 1646-1743, f. 169.

32. National Library Scotland, The Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio 26, No 132, f. 229.

33. Lovell to Coghill, 6 July 1679 (Bodleian Library Oxford, The Carte Manuscripts, 221, f. 196).

34. July 1681, Burt Kirk Session minutes.

July 24, am. Mr. Gordon of Glendermot preached on 2 Cor. 5.7.
pm. Mr. Hampton preached on Cant. 5.1.

July 27 Wednesday, Day of humiliation before communion.
am. Mr. Gordon preached on 1 Cor. 5.7.
pm. Mr. Tailzor preached on James 8. 9-10.

July 30 Saturday, Mr. Craghead of Donoghmore preached on
John. 4.14.

July 31 Sunday, Mr. Craghead of Donoghmore preached 1 Cor. 11.23
'before the work of the tables began'.
Mr. Gordon preached in Col. 2.6. and Mr. Crooks,
Ballykelly, on Gen. 6.9.

Thus in the course of a week six sermons were preached
and the parish had three visiting ministers for the
preparation period and the actual communion service
itself.³⁵

Discipline and penance were strict and executed by the
kirk session. The minister and elders sat as a court and
judged the behaviour of the congregation. The congregation
was divided into districts each of which was the
responsibility of an elder, who was to observe the moral
conduct of those in his charge. At the session two elders
were named to visit houses the following Sunday during
service to see who was missing, and especially to find out
who were in the alehouses. The minutes of the Antrim
meeting and of the Templepatrick session for the
Commonwealth period show the activity of the elders to
have been quite comprehensive. Members of the congregation
were called to account for missing the sabbath, drinking
then and at other times in excess, for adultery and
fornication, for murder, for desertion, for irregular
marriages, bigamy.

35. Robert Craghead who preached twice at the service wrote a tract on the communion
service. Robert Craghead, *Advice to Communicants* (Edinburgh 1695). This is not a
controversial work and was written for those who had found heavier books
incomprehensible.

The most common correction by far was that concerned with sexual mores, and the Antrim Minutes contains long lists of those who were discovered at fault.³⁶ Some faults could be amended by fines but sexual ones had to be publicly acknowledged and punished, normally for three Sundays in a row, sitting on a stool, in front of the pulpit facing the congregation; sometimes those being disciplined had to wear a white sheet and even stand in a basin of cold water.³⁷ Sometimes other meetings were informed about the faults of a member. Such sinners were visited by one or even two ministers; when repentance was considered genuine the person was absolved and allowed back to full membership.³⁸

It was not possible to exercise such discipline in public after the Restoration but there are indications that it was exercised privately. In 1672 the Antrim meeting noted that it was not able to cite people, 'the case of the time being such that the brethren could not call such persons so frequently before them as usually'.³⁹ It is evident from the Laggan minutes that private censures did go on at the meetings,⁴⁰ but it was recognised as unsatisfactory. In 1676 each minister was advised to go about re establishing discipline gradually, and not to judge each other's pace in this; moreover it was recommended that before proceeding to bring a person to public notice for censure, the meeting should be consulted first.⁴¹ There is no doubt but that discipline was enforced however quietly. John Will, minister of Glendermot, was deprived in September 1679. Elders examined his conversation and doctrine which

36. Antrim minutes 1654-58, p. 45 and passim. Also, Trinity College Dublin Manuscripts, 883, i, f. 189.

37. Latimer, *The old session book of Templepatrick Presbyterian Church, Co. Antrim*, pp 130-34.

38. Case of Isobel Atchinson of Ballyclare. Antrim minutes 1654-58, pp 12, 20, 27.

39. Antrim minutes 1671-1691, p. 51.

40. Laggan minutes 1672-1695, pp 28,42; Laggan minutes, ii, p. 73 (P.R.O.N.I. D1759/1E/2).

41. 9 May 1676, Laggan minutes, p. 222 and 9 Jan. 1677, p. 244.

had given scandal. Burt Kirk session exercised public censure from at least 1678 and by 1694 was censuring faults and settling disputes in the area.⁴² The Antrim meeting seems not to have resumed public censure before 1687, for in that year they asked whether or not it could be resumed in view of the indulgence given by James 11.⁴³

Another form of discipline that a meeting exercised was the imposition of fasts on the congregation for different reasons. In 1672 a fast was appointed 'for excessive rains'.⁴⁴ This must have caused some problems as the meeting asked John Hart to write to Mr. Semple in Dublin for advice; the reply was that fasts were observed elsewhere to no harm. So the following year another fast was set for four reasons: excessive rains; the propagation of the gospel; purging of the three kingdoms of popery and superstition; the King and inferior magistrates.⁴⁵ Fast days were a regular feature of church discipline; they were appointed in time of natural calamity, in times of stress in the community, for example the sudden deaths of two ministers,⁴⁶ and in times of political turmoil.

Around the time of the Popish Plot the Laggan set a fast for 28 November 1678. It agreed that if the magistrate set a fast they would observe that date instead; and if a day of thanksgiving was set for the discovery of the Popish Plot then they would observe that too.⁴⁷ Such fasts seem to have been held unhindered by the authorities. There is some evidence to show that fasts were appointed for a certain day in all the meetings.⁴⁸ However, after February 1681, it was considered unsafe to hold fasts on the same day, for in that year the Laggan meeting had

42. Laggan minutes, ii, p. 34; cf pp 35, 59 for Will's acceptance and maintenance after deprivation, Burt Kirk session, 10 March 1678; 10 May 1694, Case of Janet and John Logan; Cases of stealing, disputes over lands and animals p. 280 ff, at end of MSS, 1698-1703.

43. 3 May 1687 Antrim minutes, p. 298.

44. Oct. 1672, Antrim Minutes, p. 63; Oct. 1672, Laggan minutes, p. 25.

45. 30 July 1673, Laggan minutes, p. 58.

46. 22 Dec. 1674, Laggan minutes, p. 157.

47. 13 Nov. 1678, Laggan minutes, p. 322.

48. 2 Feb. 1681, Laggan minutes, ii, p. 85.

arranged for a fast to be held on February 17. Such independence was seen as subversive by the government and the ministers who called the fast were called to trial in Dublin.⁴⁹

The quality of personnel and of formation for the ministry was seen as of great importance and the Antrim meeting minutes contain a lengthy description of the preparation necessary prior to ordination. Firstly, the candidate should not be admitted for trials unless sufficient testimonials were provided, not just about knowledge of scripture but also 'their piety, peaceableness and prudence'. The rules for trials were to be full and exact: popular sermons, disputes, questioning on scripture, cases, chronology, languages; not only was the candidate to be tried by the meeting to which he belonged, but also by delegates from former meetings. Ideally this should be done publicly, but this was impossible; so members of the meeting considering the ordination of a candidate should visit his former congregation and find out all they could about him. Trials of candidates went on during the meetings and reports were made on their progress until they reached the standard for ordination.⁵⁰

Ordination itself was to be secret and only those trusted with this were to be present. Just before ordination the candidate was questioned for soundness of faith and for views on Popery, Arminianism, Prelacy, Erastianism, Independency. He was to adhere to the Covenant and 'considering the temper of the times' be peaceful and subject to his colleagues. As soon as the candidate was ordained he left for Scotland for some time until he could return to Ireland safely with the impression given that he had been ordained in Scotland.⁵¹ Moreover the general committee decided that the newly ordained should subscribe

49. Wodrow MSS, Quarto 75, No.18, *Some short account of the troubles Messrs William Trail, James Alexander, Robert Campbell and John Hart, ministers in the Laggan in the north of Ireland, met with upon account of fast appointed by the presbyterial meeting in that boundary.* Text also in Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, ii, Appendix ix, p. 574 ff

50. Laggan minutes, pp 54, 58, 69, 72, 97.

51. Rules for ordination, drawn up in 1672. Antrim minutes, 1671-1691, p.32 ff

to the Act of Bangor, August 1654, by which the church divisions in Scotland were not to be introduced in Ireland.⁵²

Congregations could call ministers, either from within Ireland or from Scotland.⁵³ When political events were difficult in Scotland ministers came over for refuge until the storms abated; this created a supply of ministers in Ireland but it was uncertain for the Scottish congregations called their ministers back as soon as it was possible for them to resume their ministry.⁵⁴ Calls also came from Virginia and Maryland.⁵⁵ The Laggan meeting was very insistent that all calls came through it and were not initiated by a congregation on its own. If this was not adhered to the meeting refused to visit and inspect the congregation, or take responsibility for it in any way.⁵⁶

Services were held in houses, barns or stables according as was possible and available. In the course of the 1660's meeting houses were built and Primate Margetson, no doubt exaggerating, claimed that by 1669 meeting houses had been built in almost every parish, especially in the north.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, there is evidence that having a meeting house was being taken for granted; even Bishop Mossom of Derry gave permission for one to be built in Urney in 1679.⁵⁸

52. 13 Aug. 1672, Antrim minutes, p. 53; 21 August 1672, Laggan minutes, 1672-1695, pp 7-8.

53. 16 Feb. 1671, Call from Londonderry session to Thomas Wyllie (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, f. 212).

54. The case of Londonderry calling Robert Rule of Stirling is a good example of the conflict of interests and calls for ministers. Laggan minutes, pp 25, 50, 110, 126, 170, 173; Laggan minutes, ii, p. 48.

55. Laggan minutes, pp 1-2, 7, 51, 107, 271, 284, 312; Laggan minutes, ii, pp 82, 85, 91, 119, 184, 202, 224, 228; Antrim minutes 1671-91, p. 169. Boyd S. Schlenther, *The life and writings of Frances Makemie* (Presbyterian Historical Society Philadelphia, 1971), p. 13. John Hart kept up links with Increase Mather in Boston. Ibid, p. 249 and *The Mather Papers in Collection of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, viii, 4th series (Boston, 1868), p. 37.

56. Laggan minutes, pp 1-2; 25.

57. Margetson to Ormonde, 4 June 1669 (Bodl., Carte MSS 37, f. 39).

58. Laggan minutes, ii, p. 13; cf. Laggan minutes pp 267, 273, 283, 335 for details.

An interesting case emerged in 1673 when Thomas Gowan was given leave by the new bishop, Thomas Hackett, to preach in the parish church at Antrim.⁵⁹ The difficult question was whether he should do this at all; and, if he did, would the people be trapped into accepting the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer ?. In so doing the sabbath could be profaned; the alternative was for the people to miss worship on Sunday. As a way out of the dilemma, Lord Massarene was asked to build a meeting house which he refused to do; it would have placed him in a difficult position with regard to Ormonde.⁶⁰

The Massarene family, with that of Donegal, leaned towards English Presbyterianism and appointed chaplains from within that tradition.⁶¹ Thus the family did not attend the parish church and liturgy. In 1678 Ormonde complained that only twelve went to the parish church in Antrim on Sundays and that the illegal meeting house was better frequented. He blamed Massarene for this, accusing him of never attending the parish church but having conventicles, either at home or in his mother-in-law's house. Massarene defended his actions, protesting that he attended the church sometimes and found over a hundred there. He denied all responsibility for the illegal meeting house, but remarked it was poor affair, a small thatched house outside the town. Ormonde was not convinced and repeated the complaint in 1681.⁶²

59. Thomas Gowan was born in Scotland and educated at Edinburgh. He was ordained for Donnagh, Glaslough in 1658 and deposed in 1661 for non conformity. He continued to minister at Connor until 1671 when he was called to Antrim, to minister there and run a school. He wrote several treatises in Latin. James Mc Connell, *Fasti of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1613-1840* (Belfast, 1951), no. 44, p. 9; Thomas Witherow, *Historical and literary memorials of presbyterianism in Ireland*, 2 vols (London/Belfast, 1879-80), p. 53.

60. In 1665 Ormonde warned Massarene to 'retire out of Ulster' unless he conformed to the Established Church (2 Oct. 1665, Bodl., Carte MSS 49, f. 201).

61. A.Gordon and G.K.Smith, *Historic Memorials of the First Presbyterian Church in Belfast* (Belfast, 1887), p. 10; Edward Calamy, *An historical account of my own life, with some reflections on the times I have lived in, 1671-1731*, ed. J.T. Rutt, 2 vols (London, 1830), ii, 629. Originally from Devon, it was natural that Massarene would have English Presbyterian chaplains; besides, as Jeremy Taylor remarked in 1660, 'the gentry being little better than servants while they live under the Presbytery' [Scottish], Massarene would prefer to retain his independence. Taylor, *A sermon preached at the consecration of the two archbishops and ten bishops, 27 Jan. 1661* (Dublin, 1661), p. 34.

62. Ormonde to Massarene, 12 Jan. 1678 (H.M.C., Appendix to 6th Report, p.170); Ormonde to Massarene, 5 Feb. 1681 (Bodl., Carte MSS 147, ff 132, 134).

In fact, however, the Established Church had quietly undermined Ormonde's position: prior to Gowan's arrival in Antrim, Massarene's own chaplain, the English Presbyterian, John Howe, was given permission by the then bishop of Down and Connor, Roger Boyle, and the Primate, James Margetson, to preach in the parish church on Sunday afternoons 'after the liturgy had been read'.⁶³ Margetson remarked

'in a pretty full meeting of the clergy ...that he would have Mr. Howe have any pulpit (where he had any concern) open to him in which he at any time was free to preach'.⁶⁴

From the Scottish Presbyterian point of view Sunday worship in the parish church in Antrim remained unacceptable. Gowan tried to get agreement by compromise, undertaking to ensure an interval between the Established Church act of worship and their own form of worship. Pressure must have been heavy for he asked that his critics be treated as 'disorderly and scandalous' and disciplined accordingly. In the end, Gowan threatened to return to his former church at Glaslough if a meeting house was not provided by the people. The controversy went on until 1676, when a small meeting house was built outside Antrim, apparently built by themselves.⁶⁵

So Thomas Gowan stayed in Antrim and was a valued member of the kirk; any contribution he made was respected. Since 1666 he ran a school in Antrim which was approved by all the meetings. In December 1674 the Antrim meeting noted that Gowan was educating young men in philosophy for eight years and that the school was endangered by others being set up in Ulster. The meeting proposed that there be just one school for presbyterians; that all ministers encourage parents to send their children there; that one of the

63. James Armstrong, 'An appendix containing a summary history of the presbyterian church in the city of Dublin' in *A discourse on presbyterian ordination* (Dublin, 1829), pp 84-6; H.C. Waddell, *The presbytery of Route* (Belfast, 1960), p. 31.

64. Edward Calamy, *Memoirs of the life of the late Mr. John Howe* (London, 1734), pp 53-4; J.T. Carson, John Howe: Chaplain to Lord Massarene at Antrim Castle, 1671-1677 in *Bulletin of the Presbyterian Historical Society of Ireland*, no. 7 (Dec. 1977), p. 14.

65. Antrim minutes, 1671-1691, pp 74, 78, 83, 88, 96, 100.

meetings oversee the school, especially the matter taught there; that the school should be in Antrim and that Gowan continue as teacher.⁶⁶ The Laggan meeting fully concurred with this and expressed great satisfaction with the school. A few months later they sent the general committee two recommendations about the school, suggesting that 2 or 3 of the nearer meetings could be visitors to the school, and that there should be some kind of graduation ceremony for those who completed the school course 'as some public declaring them to be fit to teach the liberal arts'.⁶⁷

In March 1675 the Antrim meeting proposed that a divinity school be established in Antrim under the supervision of Thomas Gowan and John Howe.⁶⁸ This idea seems to have borne fruition though under the leadership of William Legatt⁶⁹:

Mr. John Leask of Gillhall near Dromore testifies: that William Legatt [nonconformist] of Dromore teaches the course of divinity to 6 scholars, some whereof intend to be master of Arts, who lodging in the towns come twice a week to the said Mr. Legatt's house to be instructed in divinity; which disputations are performed publicly whereto they invite others to come and be auditors thereof; and that the said Mr. Leask was by one of the students desired to come thither and propose an argument in order whereunto he offered his thesis in writing which he refused to accept. He further testifies that Mr. Legatt did debate with John Magill of Gillhall esq. both publicly and privately to contribute something to Mr. Gowan of Antrim towards the maintaining of his college [as they call it] where he teaches the course of philosophy.⁷⁰

This development in education was seen as a real threat to peace and stability:

66. 1 Dec. 1674, Antrim minutes, 1671-91, p. 161; Canon 99 of the 1634 Articles decreed that logic and philosophy were to be taught only in Trinity College Dublin, not in schools. R.D. Edwards, 'The history of the laws against Protestant non-conformity in Ireland from the Restoration (1660) to the Declaration of Indulgence (1687)', (U.C.D. M.A., 1932), p. 62. Gowan published two educational works: *Ars sciendi, sive logica, nova methodo disposita* ([London], 1682); *Logica elentica* (Dublin, 1683).

67. 2 Feb. 1675, Laggan minutes, p. 157; 6 July 1675, Laggan minutes, p. 181, Nos 6, 8.

68. Antrim minutes, pp 169, 171.

69. Bodl., Carte MSS 221, f. 194 (no date).

70. There were others who tried to have schools. An account of the public schools within the province of Ulster. 'School at Strabane taught by a fanatical person' (British Library Manuscripts, Stowe MSS 202, f. 330. April 1685); Fulke White, Antrim minutes, p. 252; Nov. 1687, John Binning, Antrim minutes, pp 329, 404; Oct. 1688, Archibald Pettigrew, Antrim minutes, p. 403; this may have been due to the fact that the philosophy school at Antrim was unable to function after May 1686. 4 May 1686, Antrim minutes, pp 260-1; George Fleming's daughter kept a school in Benburb, Co Armagh (c. 1670). Patrick Walker, *Some remarkable passages in the life and death of Alexander Peden* (3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1728), p. 106; Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 58-60.

...by pamphlets and letters without any name or author they stick out to slander even the greatest persons in the kingdom...as long as they are suffered to brood young ones to supply the vacancies occasioned by the death of the old....have their nurseries where a kind of philosophy and the tongues are taught and generally grammar schools as well as those for the English tongue are kept by those whom they choose and their catechisms taught to children.⁷¹

Linked with the work of education was the insistence that the 'history of this kirk' be written. Thomas Hall and Patrick Adair were asked in April 1672 by the Antrim meeting to gather papers and send them to John Drysdale 'the writer of histories'. Nothing had been done by October of the same year so the Laggan meeting asked Thomas Drummond to write a history of the church before the wars, and William Semple and James Wallace after the Commonwealth.⁷² There was a constant search for material throughout the 1670's and finally Adair was entrusted with writing the work.⁷³ Further encouragement for such writing was provided by Thomas Wyllie, minister at Coleraine, who was responsible for having Calderwood's History of the Kirk of Scotland published in Holland in 1678. By 1679 it was circulating in the north of Ireland.⁷⁴

A strong and cohesive body of doctrine and practice held this church together during a period of great uncertainty and sporadic persecution. It had a clear and simple form of government by general committee, meeting and session. Each level of government had certain issues to deal with and standards to maintain; the three levels also ensured steady communication between the kirks and allowed policy to be developed and tested. The congregations were held by the kirk sessions which had power to impose censures on any breaches. The authority exercised by session, meeting and general committee seems to have been accepted generally with few exceptions.⁷⁵ However severe the

71. Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 317.

72. Antrim minutes, p. 32 ; Laggan minutes, p. 26.

73. Antrim minutes, p. 71. Laggan minutes p. 181, 191, 198, 225, 264, 306. Laggan minutes, ii, pp 28, 48, 71, 79, 79, 80.

74. David Maxwell to John Coghill, 17 June 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 330); J. Mullin, *History of New Row Presbyterian Church, Coleraine* (Antrim, 1976), p. 8.

75. Case of William Liston and John Semple. 2 May 1694, Laggan minutes, ii, p. 236; cf pp 241, 246, 254.

discipline was it gave a certain sureness to the kirk; this was strengthened by the quality of ministry that existed and that was in process of being trained. With a sense of history and the need to write their story the presbyterians at this time further rooted themselves in this island to which they had been sent to bring the gospel. The strength they had built up among themselves had real impact and was a shock to the Established Church.

In January 1677, Thomas Otway, bishop of Killala and Achonry, complained to Essex about 'the Scotch presbyters who ramble up and down to debauch the people'. He arrested two of the ministers and discovered a whole network of families who acted as safe houses for travelling ministers in Sligo and Roscommon. The bishop was sure that his diocese was not isolated in this respect:

I am informed that some of this gang wander over all the provinces of Ireland; that your Excellency hears not of them because most of the justices of the peace of this kingdom are almost all presbyterian...many of the justices that are not so yet are as bad by their laziness.⁷⁶

But it was not merely effective organisation that held the kirk together. At the spiritual level Presbyterians had the sense of being a chosen people in the midst of idolatry and sin. They believed that in and through their election by Christ they could win through; they always hoped to be the 'Church of Ireland' and were prepared to wait and suffer for that cause. There were some in their midst who wished to push that cause hard and with violence if necessary. This the majority could not accept and it tried to contain the fanatic element in Ireland and its growing influence from Scotland.

76. B.L., Stowe MSS 211, f. 120; also, ff 45, 47, 114, 120; H.M.C. Ormonde MSS, iv, pp 17-20; H.G. Wood-Martin, *History of Sligo county and town*, 3 vols (Dublin, 1882-92), iii, p. 144; Oliver Plunkett also wrote about the increasing numbers and influence of presbyterians in Ireland, John Hanly, *The letters of Oliver Plunkett, 1625-1681*, (Dublin, 1979), pp 373, 381, 387, 394, 443, 455, 530, 538.

DIVISION WITHIN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND

Lord Caulfield told Bramhall in October 1660 that heresies and schisms abounded in Ireland:¹

Not many days ago it was hardly possible to find two of one religion. And therein are those unhappy northern quarters most miserable, abounding with all sorts of licentious persons; but those we esteem most dangerous are the presbyterian factions who do not like publicly to preach up the authority of the Kirk to be above that of the Crown ...I have myself discoursed with divers of their ministers both in public and private who have maintained that the Kirk has power to excommunicate their kings; and when the oath of allegiance and supremacy were administered here one of them told me we had pulled down one Pope and set up another.

The situation in the north of Ireland was turbulent in the autumn of 1660. Jeremy Taylor reported some ministers preaching sedition, rejecting the monarchy and urging revolution. Others were prepared to accept the monarchy and even episcopacy but hoped the King would not impose it in Ireland.² Certainly presbyterians tried to discredit Taylor in the hope of getting him removed.³ Some of the 'prime incendiaries' spread rumours that Taylor was an Arminian, a Socinian or a half-papist; they got copies of his books and 'appointed a committee of Scotch ministers' to examine them and send a report to the King.⁴ Taylor tried to debate with them but the ministers refused; Taylor then sent a summary of what was being spread abroad in the north of Ireland⁵:

A particular of such doctrines as are usually preached and taught by the Scotch ministers in the north of Ireland in the diocese of Down and Connor.

1. Edward Berwick (ed.), *Rawdon Papers* (London 1819), 127-8.

2. Taylor to Montgomery, 27 Oct. 1660 (Bodl., Carte MSS 31, f. 36).

3. This was not new. F.R. Bolton, *The Caroline tradition in the church of Ireland* (London 1958), p. 26 ff; T.C. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland* (Oxford, 1975), p. 132.

4. Taylor to Ormonde, 19 Dec. 1660 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 25); Maxwell to Taylor, 3 Dec. 1660 (*Cal. S.P. Ire., 1660-2*, 115-6); Mountrath and Bury to Secretary Nicholas, 12 Dec. 1660 (*Cal. S.P. Ire., 1660-2*, 128-9).

5. Taylor to Lane, 19 Dec. 1660 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 29, 28).

- that the Covenanters first drew the bloody sword; and before they would submit to these oaths, viz. of allegiance and supremacy and to these popish ceremonies they would draw it again.
- that times of persecution are coming on, worse than in Queen Mary's days.
- that they would do well to get the Bible by heart because they will not be suffered to keep a Bible in their houses.
- that the times are now at hand when it should be safer to break the sabbath than a holy day.
- that the King's concessions in his declaration are a little mite of favour and no more.
- that the service book and the mass book were both hatched in hell by the devil.
- that we have got a King and the King has brought the bishops and they will bring in popery and then farewell all; and yet you, without, be valiant for the truth.
- they pray that the Lord though he suffers these wolves the bishops to come into his Kirk here on earth, yet that he would never let them come into his Kirk in heaven.

And many more seditious and more ridiculous not fit to trouble any person of honour with.

In this context of great unrest and turbulence , the Restoration was a disaster both theologically and politically for presbyterians, and they made no secret of their disappointment. Their hopes had been high when the Convention, which met in March 1660, requested:

That godly, learned, orthodox and ordained preaching ministers of the Gospel (and no other as ministers and preachers) be settled and that as speedily as may be throughout this nation and that only in a parochial way and encouraged and supported by tithes, glebes and other legal maintenance.⁶

In addition, a well known presbyterian, Samuel Coxe, was appointed chaplain to the Convention; and when a committee of eight ministers was appointed to advise the Convention's committee on religion, Coxe and Patrick Adair were on it.⁷ However, such hopes were short lived, for by June 1660 the Commissioners appointed by the Convention to

6. 30 Mar. 1660, Instructions for Sir John Clotworthy and William Aston Esq., members of the General Convention of Ireland now employed into England by the said Convention (B.L., Add.MSS, 32,471, f. 82v).

7. Adair, *A true narrative*, p. 230 ff; Samuel Coxe, *Two sermons preached at Christchurch Dublin beginning the general convention of Ireland* (Dublin, 1660); J.I.Maguire, 'The Dublin Convention, the protestant community and the emergence of an ecclesiastical settlement in 1660' in Art Cosgrove and J.I.Maguire (eds), *Parliament and community* (Belfast, 1983), pp 130-1; McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 44, p.9. For Coxe, see Ch. 4, n. 20.

treat with the King recognised that the initiative had passed from their hands. Caught in a double bind they gave the King a double message when they asked:

That the church of Ireland be resettled in doctrine, discipline and worship, as it was in the time of your most royal father of blessed memory, according to the laws then and now in force in that kingdom, with such liberty to tender consciences as your majesty in your declaration dated at Breda...has been graciously pleased to declare, and that godly learned, orthodox and ordained preaching ministers of the gospel be settled there as speedily as may be in a parochial way and supported by tithes, glebes and other legal maintenance.⁸

The contradictions inherent in the text indicated the polarisation not only at court not also within the Irish Convention at this time. Episcopacy was in the ascendant and this was signalled by the appointment of John Bramhall as Archbishop of Armagh. This was grim news for the Presbyterians and the synod of Ballymena sent William Keyes, an English Presbyterian, and William Richardson of Killyleagh to London to plead their case with the King. Their mission failed.⁹ A further representation was made in early January 1661, this time to the Lords Justices in Dublin, again to no avail.¹⁰ Under pressure from newly appointed bishops, especially Jeremy Taylor of Down and Connor, and George Wild of Derry, further representations were made both to the King and to Ormonde.¹¹ No wonder then, after all the petitions and representations made at the time, presbyterians were disillusioned with the outcome of the Restoration.

8. The further humble desires of the commissioners of the General Convention of Ireland appointed to attend your majesty (T.C.D., MSS 808, no. 9, f. 156).

9. Adair, *A true narrative*, pp 241-4. Richardson was born in Scotland and ordained for Killyleagh in 1649. McConnell, *Fasti*, no.98, p. 47. For Keyes, see Ch. 3, n. 4.

10. William Montgomery, *The Montgomery Manuscripts, 1603-1706*, ed. George Hill (Belfast, 1859), pp 236-7, n. 76; Thomas Morrice, *A collection of the state letters of Roger Boyle 1st Earl of Orrery* (Dublin, 1743), p. 22.

11. H.M.C., *Hastings MSS*, iv, 104, 109-10; Paper from the Scotch ministers given me by the Lord Massarene, 30 Sept. 1662, signed P. Adair, A. Stewart, W. Semple (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 298-9; Adair, *A true narrative*, pp 268-9; R. and G. Ross to Ormonde, 25 Mar. 1663 (Bodl., MSS 31, f.381); 1 Apr. 1663, A demonstration of the loyalty of the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster made out of many particular instances (Bodl., Clarendon MSS 80, f. 380); Reasons why the petitioned indulgence should be granted to the people of the north of Ireland (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f.77).

Yet their response to Blood's Plot in 1663, (a conspiracy of discontented officers with a few ministers, led by Thomas Blood), was very mixed; generally ministers were unwilling to be part of the movement in Ireland at the time. Had Blood succeeded their stance might have been very different.¹² However, suspicion of complicity was enough for Ormonde at the time, and many ministers were arrested and jailed for security reasons in Carrickfergus and Carlingford as well as Derry and Lifford.¹³ It is clear that some of the presbyterian ministers were considered highly dangerous to the state, even if nothing conclusive could be proved against them. It was known that Andrew McCormick, minister at Magherolin, had assured the plotters in Dublin that 20,000 Scots in the north were ready to join in the revolt which included the plan to kill both the King and Ormonde.¹⁴

By the middle of June 1663 some presbyterian ministers in Down and Antrim were under arrest and some were on the run. Among those arrested was John Drysdale who had come from Scotland around the time of the plot; he had been ejected by Taylor and this sudden return looked suspicious to the bishop.¹⁵ Lord Conway told Ormonde that there were plots of Scottish ministers both in Antrim and Down and in the Laggan area, one of which was to take Kilkenny; but he had no proof and the arrested ministers could not be held indefinitely. He suggested that they could be scattered to remote places until they agreed to leave Ireland for good.¹⁶

12. Bodl., Carte MSS 32, ff 412, 419, 437, 122, 123, 282, 328, 331, 393-4; Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 82, 85, 88; R.L.Greaves, *Deliver us from evil* (Oxford 1986), pp. 43-5; 135-57; Charles McNeill (ed.), *The Tanner Letters*, I.M.C., (Dublin, 1943), p 401 ff

13. T.W.Moody and J.G.Simms (ed.), *The bishopric of Derry and the Irish society of London, 1602-1705*, 2 vols, I.M.C. (Dublin 1968, 1983), i, No 149, p. 358.

14. R.M.Young *Historical notices of old Belfast and its vicinity*. (Belfast 1896), p.103; *Tanner Letters*, 404. Both McCormick and John Crookshanks were leaders at the Pentland Rising in Scotland in 1666. I.B.Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters* (London, 1976), p. 64. For Crookshanks, McConnell, *Fasti* no. 48, p. 10.

15. Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 82. Drysdale had been in Ireland from at least 1643 and preached sedition in Londonderry (Bodl., Carte MSS 8, f. 157).

16. Conway to Ormonde, 8 July 1663 (Bodl., Carte MSS 32, f. 419; also, ff 122, 123, 331).

For his part the bishop of Raphoe, Robert Leslie, arrested the suspected ministers in his diocese. He picked out the ringleaders, among them John Hart who was considered 'the most dangerous of them', though he had refused to join the plot if the King was to be killed; even so it was clear he had a great deal of knowledge about the plot and contacts in Scotland about it.¹⁷ Bishop Wild of Derry similarly arrested ministers in his diocese and tried to contain their influence, though he echoed what other bishops said in that he had no proper jail to hold all the ministers properly.¹⁸ So due to inadequate evidence and accommodation, the suspect ministers could not be held indefinitely though those held by the bishop of Raphoe were only released in 1670.¹⁹ Some received protection from patrons or friends; others were forced to leave the country or go to another part of Ireland.²⁰ In a move to discover and isolate the fanatic element in the country a proclamation was issued giving indulgence to all non conformists, from 29 June - 24 December 1663, because they did not rebel.²¹ In this way Ormonde hoped the country could be restored to some peace and stability.

Thomas Price, bishop of Kildare, wrote to Ormonde on the 10 July 1663 to tell him that one of his clergy, a Scot though born in the north Ireland and who spent a good part of his life there, received visits from his countrymen since the plot was discovered. He found them :

very tumultuous and are very much engaged in that plot and that that they have their meetings very frequently in an island in the county of Antrim called Rathry, where those of the north of Ireland are to meet others of the same gang out of Scotland the 22 of this instant July. They are determined to go there even if there is an embargo on shipping; they will go to Red Bay three miles from Rathlin.²²

17. *Tanner Letters*, 404; Bishop of Raphoe to Ormonde, 3 July 1663 (Bodl., Carte MSS 32, f. 398; also ff 412, 437).

18. Wild to Ormonde, 7 August 1663 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 85).

19. Adair, *A true narrative*, pp 283-288.

20. Ibid pp 271-288; Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 301.

21. Bodl., Carte MSS 68, f. 596.

22. Bodl., Carte MSS 32, f. 328.

In other words, the unrest in the north would not cease just because the plot had been discovered in Dublin. The ferment was bigger and older than the immediate problem of rebellion. For it had become clear gradually to the presbyterians that there was no possibility of being the state church, that their situation had radically changed and that they were quite impoverished in many ways, certainly economically and politically. Something similar was happening in Scotland, and this had repercussions among presbyterians in Ireland, for communication between the two countries was frequent and easy. The north of Ireland was nearer to the west of Scotland than Dublin; families lived in both countries, and were a short boat journey away from each other. News travelled quickly this way. Moreover, at this time ministers were trained and ordained in Scotland and it was natural that contacts made there would be maintained.²³

In 1665 the ministers who had been banished to Scotland on account of the the 1663 plot had begun to return. Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down and Connor, was furious and reported that those who had started to conform to the Established Church had joined the conventicles again.²⁴ The following year news of the Pentland Rising in Scotland reverberated in the north of Ireland and Arlington warned Ormonde that it could be serious.²⁵ Ormonde told Arlington that he knew that 'some come from Scotland who called themselves ministers...who have a great concourse of people that follow and hear them preach all manner of sedition'.²⁶ Three weeks later Taylor told Ormonde that the rising in Scotland had a real effect in his diocese and that John Crookshanks, who was involved in Blood's Plot in 1663, had been in the north sometime before the rebellion.

23. A Proclamation had been issued in Dublin, with the names of all suspects of the Plot included; a copy of this had been sent to Scotland, where all who had come from Ireland within the previous ten days were to be examined, June 1663 (Bodl., Carte MSS 71, f. 386); *The Registers of the Privy Council of Scotland*. Third series, vol i, 1661-1664, p. 371.

24. 5 Nov. 1665, Bodl., Carte MSS 34, f. 297. In 1664 Taylor recalled all the copies he could of his 'The liberty of prophesying' and burnt them 'as a protest against its use by non-conformists'. C.J. Stranks, *The life and writings of Jeremy Taylor* (London, 1952), p. 259.

25. 24 Nov. 1666 (Bodl., Carte MSS 46, f. 192); also, ff 160, 193-5; Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 109 for account of the rising in Scotland.

26. 8 Dec. 1666 (Bodl., Carte MSS 51, f. 174v).

For Taylor it was a mistake to allow the banished ministers to return. Now they received pensions from the people 'by the authority of some landlords or rather landladies'.²⁷ Anthony Kennedy of Templepatrick preached an inflammatory sermon praising the godly people in Scotland. The bishop heard that the people, when paying their tithes at All Saints, signed the bond with the phrase 'in case there be no war or public disturbance before that time'. Ormonde asked for a list of the ministers who had returned, for the names of the landowners who forced the people to pay the ministers, and told Taylor to arrest Kennedy.²⁸

The unrest was not confined to the north east. Lord Dungannon told Sir George Rawdon to seize Major Hugh Montgomery, the horsebreeder in county Derry. Montgomery had been watched for some time. It was well known that he had conventicles at his house either in the kiln or the stables where up to 700 could meet at one time. Montgomery had not been at public worship since the Restoration, and baptisms, fasts and the communion service were all held on his property. Anthony Kennedy preached there on 4, 9 and 11 September 1666.²⁹ Montgomery also received itinerant preachers into his house. For example, James Patrick, a minister from Scotland, came to Montgomery's house, preached and baptised, and then returned to Scotland before the rebellion.³⁰ In January 1667 Robert Mossom, bishop of Derry told Ormonde³¹ :

That the factious preachers which run out of Scotland (like wild boars hunted out of a forest and throw their foam of seditious doctrine among the people) and other itinerant preachers which wander out of other dioceses be seized. And to that end the bishops be entrusted with 2-3 blank warrants

27. 26 Dec. 1666 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 116; Adair, *A true narrative*, p. 281.

28. 29 Dec. 1666 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 117; also f. 284 for list of ministers).

29. 18 Dec. 1666, *Rawdon Papers* p. 222; An examination of Hugh Montgomery of Co. Londonderry (Bodl., Carte MSS 35, ff 80, 88).

30. Bodl., Carte MSS 36, f. 14; also Bodl., Carte MSS 35, f. 80; Bodl. Carte MSS 45, f. 284. In 1688 Major Montgomery still kept his nonconformist minister and a meeting place for 500: Antrim minutes p. 365; George Hill (ed.), *The Montgomery Manuscripts 1603-1706* (Belfast 1859), p. 356.

31. 31 Jan. 1667 (Bodl., Carte MSS 35, f. 87).

for the governor of Ulster which the bishop may use privately by his agents, to avoid the odium upon himself, the better to prevail in undeceiving the seduced multitudes.

Unrest continued and the following year it was reported that meetings were being held all through Antrim and that the Covenant was being taken.³² This was confirmed by the Chancellor, Michael Boyle, when he wrote to Ormonde in October 1668 indicating that the bishop had told him how bad the situation was in Down and Connor. Some of the assemblies went on all night, during which the Covenant was taken. Ormonde replied:

It is not strange that the non conformists in the north of Ireland when they are more numerous and united should assume more boldness in their meetings than in other places.

Yet he acknowledged that if the Covenant was being revived the government would have to be very severe; otherwise it will be seen as 'stupid, negligent and miraculously infatuated'. The presbyterians needed to know 'that the liberty they have is from compassion to their misguided judgements and not from any apprehensions of their power'.³³ An extensive list of the ministers preaching in the north was sent to Boyle in November 1668 and it indicated just how strong the ministry was there, and how the links with Scotland were continuing and developing.³⁴ Lord Dungannon wrote to Ormonde³⁵:

I find great disorder among the Scotch. I wish it may not come to mischief. All those Scottish ministers that were silenced here and afterwards sent to Scotland by your Grace's command are now returned and in all places preach up the Covenant very openly and with a boldness in my mind very dangerous'.

Dungannon warned that people who formerly had conformed no longer did so; the presbyterian congregations were full and met in barns and houses, while the parish churches

32. Sydenham to Page, 18 Sept. 1668 (Bodl., Carte MSS 36, ff 330-32). The ministers involved were: Patrick Adair, William Keyes, Thomas Gowan, Thomas Hall; many from Coleraine, Belfast, Carrickfergus and the Route attended; at one meeting five candles burned from dusk to dawn.

33. Boyle to Ormonde, 26 Sept. 1668 (Bodl., Carte MSS 36, f. 334); Ormonde to Boyle, 20 Oct. 1668 (Bodl., Carte MSS 49, f. 375).

34. A list of dissenting ministers in Ulster for the Lord Chancellor, 6 Nov. 1668 (Bodl., Carte MSS 36, f. 345).

35. 12 Dec. 1668 (Bodl., Carte MSS 36, f. 404); also, Ormonde to Ossory, 29 Dec. 1668 (Bodl., Carte MSS 48, f. 317).

were empty. If this continued rebellion would follow. Both Ormonde and the King took this warning from Dungannon seriously, even though the Chancellor had in fact told Ormonde about the growing audacity of the presbyterians in September 1668. On December 29 1668 Ormonde told Boyle that:

the preaching up of the Covenant so boldly and so frequently and in so many places is a degree beyond conventicling and is the next immediate step to active rebellion.³⁶

The archbishop of Armagh summarised the situation:

We have been and are much disordered and the people perverted by the multitude of conventicles of different sects who are now arrived to that boldness that there is scarce a parish where there is not a meeting house to that end and publicly owned, especially in the north where they are said to grow formidable by the vast numbers of those who meet together and [as far as I am informed by understanding persons] that have erected presbyteries, chosen elders, appointed salaries to the ministers who are for the most part either emissaries or banished out of Scotland.³⁷

The only solution that the archbishop could suggest was to have the law put into action by the justices of the peace, forcing the people to come to church. It was not as simple as that for the strength of the presbyterians was very real and they were held together by their conviction and organisation and the leadership of their ministers. Margetson's report indicates the power presbyterian ministers had developed since the refoundation of the church in 1642. In the midst of harassment and uncertainty presbyterians had created a structure and form of church government that was firm and enduring. After the Restoration the church went on less overtly at first but gradually it emerged strong and rooted, clear in its purpose and tried by persecution. While the bishops and the government were aware that the presbyterians continued to meet, the strength of their growth and the consistency of their organisation evaded them.

36. Bodl., Carte MSS 49, f.397; also, Boyle to Ormonde, 24 Jan.1669 (Bodl., Carte MSS 37, f. 2).

37. Margetson to Ormonde, 4 June 1669 (Bodl., Carte MSS 37, f. 39).

Events in Scotland always had repercussions among presbyterians in Ireland, especially the series of rebellions and persecutions that occurred in Scotland after the Restoration. Thus, the Pentland Rising in 1666, the 1679 Rising and the battle of Bothwell Bridge, and the Killing Time of 1684-88 were marked in Ireland by unrest, covenanting movements and some seeking refuge in Ireland during these times. Nevertheless, the Scottish Presbyterian church in Ireland was not confined or defined solely by specific, dramatic events in Scotland. There was continual and ongoing contact and exchange, at many levels, which simply emerged more clearly in times of heightened political strife. Ministers were called from Scotland to serve in Irish congregations; some came to flee persecution in their own country and exercised real influence in Ireland. Others were itinerant ministers, without a fixed church, and they too nurtured the bonds between Scotland and Ireland.

Calling a minister from Scotland was very common though not always prudent. For example, in 1672 the people of Derry wanted to call Robert Rule of Stirling as their minister but the Laggan meeting advised them to postpone the call on account of 'the late difference between the bishop and them'.³⁸ Bishop Mossom of Derry had written to Essex, complaining that the presbyterians in Derry needed a restraint order as they had got very powerful and treated the Established Church in a very highhanded way. The magistrates upheld the Established Church, otherwise 'we should have been trod on as dirt and the whole ministry with us'.³⁹ Essex had already warned Whitehall that the presbyterians in Derry were very factious,⁴⁰ but in recounting how the bishop of Derry reached an agreement with the presbyterians, he reflected on the wider issue:⁴¹

38. 18 Sept. 1672, Laggan minutes, p. 15.

39. Mossum to Essex, 13 Sept. 1672 (B.L., Stowe MSS 200, f. 235).

40. Essex to Arlington, 20 Aug. 1672, Osmund Airey (ed.), *Essex Papers*, Camden Society, New series, xlvii, 1672-79 (London, 1890) pp 14-16.

41. Essex to Arlington, 8 Oct. 1672 (Essex Papers, p.34).

I have here enclosed a copy of the bishop of Londonderry's letter by which your lordship will find the terms which those nonconformists are at present brought to, which I hope for a time may keep the quiet, but the cure of that evil must be by another course, for I find that almost all the seditious preachers of Scotland, who are so factious and turbulent there as the government will not endure them, do upon their banishment out of that kingdom repair hither, and these are the men who are most followed by the multitude.

In the same letter Essex explained to Arlington that the Scots in the inland counties of the north east of Ireland conformed to the church, whereas those Scots on the coast were 'a very factious and turbulent generation'. This concern was very real for the west coast of Scotland was the centre of unrest and had easy and quick access to Ireland. Throughout this period there is constant reference to this and numerous instructions from Lord Deputies and from Whitehall to guard the coasts of the north east from those rebels who wanted to evade arrest by either fleeing Ireland for Scotland, or more commonly, fleeing Scotland for refuge in Ireland.⁴²

The newly appointed bishop of Down and Connor, Thomas Hackett, bore out Essex's point and understood quickly that in his diocese there were two types of Scottish Presbyterian: those who accepted the Restoration settlement, the moderates; and the Remonstrators, who rejected it. The latter:

therefore driven out hither, who are mad, factious, preaching up the people's liberties, spreading seditious books printed in Holland since this war, of which some are fixed and some they call itinerant preachers....These excite the people to outrages against their legal incumbents....perform all parochial duties here and defraud the ministers of their dues (not content with preaching as they are in England), and what is of most wicked consequence, after they have married persons, the coupled on discontents part, and pretend they were not legally married.....They are but lately come, disowned by all the principal men and may be as silently returned whence they come...

I do not altogether despair of bringing some of the moderates to a fair treaty...I hope likewise to divide them which I have essayed by suggesting to them probabilities of kindness

42. In March 1675, the archbishop of Glasgow complained that Galloway was infested with itinerant and vagrant preachers from Ireland (H.M.C. 2nd Report (London, 1874), appendix, p. 203).

for those who are moderate, and that the violent only hinder them from, and that therefore they will discriminate themselves from that party.⁴³

The government sought to use this tension within the presbyterians to its own advantage by granting indulgence to those who accepted the Restoration settlement, thereby isolating the more militant faction. Certainly the meetings in Ireland saw the itinerant preachers and some of the ministers called to congregations in Ireland from Scotland as a real threat to their own survival.⁴⁴ On the other hand, the government saw presbyterian organisation and structure as a threat in itself. It was known that meetings were regularly held and that a committee held power and authority over all the congregations; the formation of ministers for ordination was recognised as a source of potential danger, as well as the schools and use of the catechism.⁴⁵

To the Established Church, moderation within the presbyterian church was a matter of degree: all presbyterians were a menace and danger. Thus when the Laggan meeting responded to a call from the people of Sligo and sent two ministers there on a visit, the bishop of Killala and Achonry was furious.⁴⁶ Yet the visit of the two ministers, Samuel Halliday and William Henry, was really similar to visits of other ministers to places that had no resident minister of their own.

However it was viewed, either by government or the Established Church, the Scottish Presbyterian church in Ireland had to contain within itself serious divisions which could erupt at any time. It only needed an incident to allow such divisions to surface.⁴⁷ This was provided by

43. Hackett to Essex, 29 Oct. 1672 (B.L., Stowe MSS 200, f.334); also, Hackett to Essex, 3 May [1673] (B.L., Stowe MSS 202, f.1). In April 1673 the Laggan meeting suggested Sir Robert Hamilton act for them in Dublin and asked Lord Granard's opinion on this choice Laggan minutes, pp 45,64. Similarly in 1677, the Laggan wrote to Patrick Adair and asked him to go to Dublin to represent their grievances. Laggan minutes, p.264.

44. 3 Aug. 1677, Laggan minutes, p. 276; 3 July 1678, Laggan minutes, p. 306.

45. March 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 314, 317).

46. 28 Nov. 1676, Laggan minutes, p. 238; Otway to Essex, 22 Jan. 1677 (B.L., Stowe MSS 211, ff 45, 47, 114, 120, 238).; H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, iv, pp 17-18, 19-20, 25-6.

47. In 1677 Archbishop Boyle told Ormonde that 'the Covenant was much in vogue among them [presbyterians] and publicly owned'. Edward Mac Lysaght (ed.), *Calendar of the Orrery Papers*, I.M.C. (Dublin, 1941), p. 188).

the murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, James Sharp in May 1679. Later on in the month a presbyterian in Derry, Henry Osborne, declared in public that he was pleased the archbishop was killed.⁴⁸ Such views were reported and presbyterian ministers were suspected of being in favour with the rebels in Scotland who were defeated in June 1679 at Bothwell Bridge.

The unrest in the north, generated by events in Scotland and by the numbers who fled to Ireland for safety, was expressed by increased meetings and more belligerent expressions of rebellion. Thomas Nisbett wrote a long account of developments in Ballymoney area.⁴⁹ Communion services were very numerous, having at each one up to 3 or 4,000 present. The temper of such meetings was very belligerent and full of threats:

To be short, they all expect a sudden demolishing of the present established church in so much as hereabouts many refuse to take their tithes to the clergy. A militia is here raised and arms put in the hands of very many as malicious and bloody enemies of the church of England as any Jesuits in the world; while the Jesuits are deservedly banished [from] these kingdoms, 'tis strange the state should think it prudent or convenient to allow a sort of ministry of the same spirit and principle, infusing into the rabble that if Christ will not help himself they must help him. If some course be not taken, I assure you none of the established church clergy shall be able to travel five miles in this country without peril to his life.

Those presbyterian ministers who tried to hold a moderate position were under pressure both to hold their congregations in check and defend their ministry to the government. Robert Rule, minister of Derry, explained that while he was sorry that the Covenanters in Scotland 'are under such sad oppressions which provoked them to it' yet he could neither support the murder of Sharp nor the use of violence, either in Scotland or in Ireland.⁵⁰

48. Robson to Wilson, 23 May 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 221, f. 195); Maxwell to Coghill, 17 June 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 330). James Russell, one of those involved in the assassination of Sharp, was found in Ireland, but he escaped. I.B. Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters* (London, 1976) p. 95; J.G. Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters*, (Pittsburgh, 1980), pp 121, 123.

49. Nisbett to Crooks, 25 June 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 273-4. Also, Richard Tennison, *A sermon preached at the primary visitation of Michael, archbishop of Armagh* (Dublin, 1679) pp 4, 29, 32-33.

50. Rule to Stewart, 5 July 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 221, f. 220). Stewart was a member of the Council of State; he came from a presbyterian family but conformed after the Restoration. He became 1st Baron of Ramelton and later Viscount Mountjoy. H.M.C.,

With the defeat of the rebels in Scotland the problems in Ireland were increased. Some of the rebels in Scotland had fled to Ireland and a watch had been set up for them at the ports. However, since many of the justices of the peace were presbyterian it was suspected that many who should have been arrested entered Ireland freely.⁵¹ On the other hand, the general committee felt it had to make a formal representation of its position to Ormonde and so they sent a petition to him through Lord Granard on 5 July 1679.⁵² This petition contained the usual points: that they had been loyal to the King during the Interregnum and after the Restoration; that now they were much maligned and misrepresented and wanted to declare in public that they knew nothing about the rebellion in Scotland and had no part in it. Ormonde found this far too vague and thought it clarified nothing in reality.

Ormonde was particularly suspicious of the ministers of the Laggan meeting and in the light of this Stewart urged them to make a clear, public declaration of their complete loyalty. This they refused to do, saying it had to be done in full synod, and such an assembly was not possible for them to hold. However, the ministers promised to try to deal with some resolutions in committee. The Laggan was not in favour of an address to the King, but suggested writing to Lord Granard and asking him to represent their loyalty. Finally agreement seems to have been reached for an address to the King was circulated for approval.⁵³

The rebellion in Scotland was over but the movement of radical groups both there and in Ireland continued. Copies of the declaration of Sanquhair, basically a restatement

Ormonde, v, 517; *Cal.S.P.Dom.* 1683, p. 73; Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii, pp 99 n. 13, 339, 339 n. 49.

51. Bodl., Carte MSS 221, ff 196, 197, 199, 202, 200, 203, 210, 214, 217, 219, 223; Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 314, 317, 319,, 331, 338-9; Ormonde to Rawdon, 26 June 1679 (Rawdon Papers, p.262); Orrery to Essex, 24 June 1679 (B.L., Stowe MSS 212, f 357). This problem was foreseen by archbishop Margetson in 1664 (Bodl., Carte MSS 33, f. 287).

52. Wodrow MSS Quarto 36, f.70; Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f.345. The petition was signed by Michael Bruce, Killinchy, who was well known for his radical sympathies. Michael Bruce, *The rattling of dry bones*, (n.p., 1672) and *Six dreadful alarms* (Edinburgh, 1675); Bruce was born in Edinburgh in 1634 and came to Killinchy in 1657; deposed in 1661, he went to Scotland until 1670 when he returned to Killinchy. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 38, p. 7; Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 46-52; C.W.McKinney, *Killinchy* (1968), pp 22-5.

53. Ormonde to Stewart, 8 July 1679 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 347).

of the Solemn League and Covenant, were found in Ireland and the government reprinted the document as an example of the sedition threatening both countries.⁵⁴ The declaration disowned the Stuarts and those ministers who accepted the Indulgence offered by the King. It was militant in tone and defiant in its defence of reformation principles as understood by the Protesters. Moderate presbyterian ministers continued to exercise their ministry and were not involved with the spirit of this declaration. However, with all the suspicions surrounding them many of their actions and practices were seen either as seditious or potentially so.

For example, the Laggan meeting decided to call a public fast for the 17 February 1681. There was nothing very unusual in this, as fasts were part of the congregations discipline, and other meetings had held fasts that year and seem to have been left undisturbed afterwards. However, given the temper of the times and the fact that in law only the King could grant a fast, at the request of Parliament, this action in the Laggan took on new significance.⁵⁵ The causes for the fast were outlined in three parts: the sins of the people and of the times; the judgements of God on the people; petitions to God.⁵⁶ This looked innocent enough and yet there was great unrest in the area, some of the soldiers refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy.⁵⁷ The ministers were blamed for this, particularly William Trail, James Alexander, Robert Campbell and John Hart. They were called to Dublin to defend their action in calling the fast in February.⁵⁸

54. *A true and exact copy of a treasonable and bloody paper, the fanatics new Covenant, which was taken from Mr. Donald Cargill at Queensferry, June 3 1680, one of their field preachers, a declared rebel and traitor, together with their execrable declaration. Published at the cross of Sanquair on the 22 of the said month after a solemn procession and singing of psalms by Cameron the notorious ringleader of and preacher at their field conventicles, accompanied with twenty of that wicked crew.* (Reprinted at Dublin, 1680). Ormonde to Lauderdale, 16 July 1680 (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 361).

55. Laggan minutes, p. 85

56. Laggan minutes, p. 86.

57. Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 362- 67.

58. Wodrow MSS, Quarto 75, No. 18; Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii, Appendix XI, pp 574-89. The trial of the presbyterian ministers underlined a problem Ormonde had in trying to prosecute dissenters. Ormonde to the Primate, 11 July 1682 (Bodl., Carte MSS 50, f. 194): 'that which troubles me in that point is that our lawyers in Ireland do not agree that the laws in Ireland can be made use of against any dissenters but the papists for whom they say they were only calculated. I mean that the Act of Uniformity or any other regarding religion of the church. But that the law against riots and unlawful assemblies may possibly be interpreted to reach them is not denied by any I have spoken with upon the whole matter. I confess I did not like the stretching of penal laws beyond their original intention by subsequent construction, since it cannot be foreseen whom such a precedent may hurt'.

Trail in particular was suspected of substituting the oath of supremacy for a version of his own; he was also clerk to the meeting and held the minutes book.⁵⁹ He was questioned carefully at the trial in Dublin and he denied that he had ever taken the Solemn League and Covenant; he refused to take the oath of supremacy, saying that he was not free to do so, except in the sense understood in No. 58 of the Irish Articles, 1615. Though he acknowledged the King's supremacy, Trail confounded and amused his questioners on what exactly that meant to presbyterians and episcopalians. He declared that he accepted all the 1615 Articles, with some exception regarding no.77. That in itself was indicative of the stance held by the Laggan meeting and of the more moderate elements among Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland.⁶⁰ Trail also defended the fast of February 17 saying it was 'a fast in a corner' not a national fast such as the King would have to authorise for the country. It was a good performance and Trail seemed to have the sympathy of the court. Nevertheless, the ministers were imprisoned in Lifford for eight months but in circumstances which allowed them to continue their ministry to the people.⁶¹

David Houston and Alexander Peden

The career of David Houston in Ireland is central to the maintenance of the extreme element in presbyterianism in the second half of the 17th century in Ireland. As early as 1671 the Antrim meeting noted that Houston was in Glenarm 'exercising a ministry without consent of the

59. Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 363, 365; The Laggan minutes stop in April 1681 and resume in 1690.

60. Art. 77: Every particular Church has authority to institute, to change, and clean put away ceremonies and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous or be abused; and to constitute other, making more to seemliness, to order, or edification. (This is part of Art. 34 of the 39 Articles). The Westminster Confession was greatly influenced by the 1615 Irish Articles, and parts of the Confession are identical to some of the Irish Articles. A.I.C.Heron (ed.), *The Westminster Confession in the world today* (Edinburgh, 1972), pp 7, 45; John Thompson, 'The Westminster Confession' in J.L.M. Haire and others, *Challenge and conflict. Essays in Irish Presbyterian history and doctrine* (Antrim, 1981), pp 8-9.

61. Trail went to America and eventually returned to Scotland. W.T. Latimer, *History of the Irish Presbyterians* (Belfast, 1902), p. 173; R.F.G. Holmes, *Our Presbyterian heritage* (Publications committee, Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1985), p. 46; Schlenther, *The life and writings of Francis Makemie*, p. 13.

meeting'. He was told to leave the country for awhile, which he agreed to do, on the condition that he was given a testimonial.⁶² However, this seems not to have happened and a month later the Antrim meeting notes that Houston had talked with the Route meeting and acknowledged in public his 'irregular carriage' at Ballymoney; he also asked leave to stay in Ireland.⁶³

The 'irregular carriage' of Houston was his adherence to the Covenant tradition and his rejection of any co-operation with the monarchy and prelacy. For Houston the King had forfeited his right to loyalty when he renounced his acceptance of the Covenant made in 1650. In Scotland such views were called either Protester or Remonstrant, and as time wore on this faction became more and more outspoken. Ministers with these views refused to accept parishes from patrons and became itinerant ministers with quite strong followings, especially in the west of Scotland. Both, ministers and followers, were a source and catalyst for deep social unrest and caused in great part the successive revolutions in Scotland of 1666 and 1679, and provoked the Killing Time of 1684-8.⁶⁴ Their feeling became more acute when the Indulgence was accepted by many of the ministers in Scotland in 1672. From then onwards the Covenant was more and more invoked in a militant way.

No wonder then that the Route was anxious to either control or eject Houston. However, Houston seems not to have complied with what the Route asked, for in February 1672 that meeting appointed Thomas Wyllie to preach on 10 March at Ballymoney on the sabbath 'after forenoon to intimate the suspension of David Houston from all carriage

62. 8 August 1671, Antrim minutes p. 3. Houston was born near Paisley in 1633. He went to Glasgow University in 1648 and took his M.A. in 1654. He came to Antrim in 1660 as a licentiate and undertook to supply some congregations belonging to the Route meeting. Nothing is known of his training for the ministry but presumably he was greatly influenced by the Covenant tradition. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 163, pp 67-8; Adam Loughridge, *The Covenanters in Ireland* (Rathfriland, 1987), p.11.

63. 5 Sept. 1671, Antrim minutes p. 5.

64. Stevenson, *The Covenanters*, pp 59-69; Rosalind Mitchison, *Lordship and Patronage* (London 1983) pp 68-92; Julia Buckroyd, *Church and State in Scotland 1660-1681* (Edinburgh 1980), *passim*.

of the ministry'; the people were advised not to hear him and that if they did they 'would be deprived of the sealing ordinances' and marriage.⁶⁵ Since November 1671 there had been 'scandalous divisions' in Coleraine, obviously caused by Houston.⁶⁶ By February 1672 the Route had decided to proceed against him and he was summoned to appear before the meeting at Coleraine on the last Tuesday in March. Their basic objection lay in his disorderly behaviour and unwillingness to heed the meeting. He was a licensed preacher at this stage and not ordained, nor even in trials. In any event he was deprived by the Route for his 'stormy and boisterous' attitude towards the meeting, for dividing the parish of Ballymoney and affecting other congregations nearby, by preaching at the borders of parishes on the sabbath and during the week at Macosquin.

Such disobedience was intolerable and Houston was deprived.⁶⁷ There is evidence that the Route meeting thought of trying to get Houston arrested by the magistrate. On 5 March 1672 William Semple wrote to Thomas Wyllie from Dublin and encouraged the view that someone get advice on depositions on oath and see if this would be offensive to the magistrate.⁶⁸ A Captain Hunstone sent for Houston and warned him he would be arrested if he went on disturbing the people. The officer remarked later that Houston knew well enough what he was doing and had decided to submit himself to censure by the ministry.⁶⁹ The fact that the ministers were prepared to go to law over the case indicates how much the general body of presbyterians wished to dissociate themselves from the fanatic element

65. 27 Feb. 1672, Meeting of the Route (Wodrow MSS, Folio 32, No. 89); P.R.O.N.I. T. 525, no. 16; Robert Allen, 'Scottish ecclesiastical influence upon Irish Presbyterianism from the non-subscription controversy to the union of Synods' (M.A. Q.U.B., 1940) p. 16. Thomas Wyllie was minister of Coleraine c.1669. Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scotianae*, 7 vols (Edinburgh 1920), iii, pp 49,94 ; Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii p.407; Robert Wodrow, *History of the sufferings of the church of Scotland from the restoration to the revolution*, 4 vols (Glasgow 1836), i, 326; Wodrow MSS., Folio 32, Nos 110,111. He was instrumental in having David Calderwood's *History of the Kirk of Scotland* published in Holland in 1678.

66. Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 123, f.215.

67. Wodrow MSS, Folio 32, no 89 ; P.R.O.N.I., T.525, 16.

68. Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 124, f.217; also, 13 March 1672 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, f. 218).

69. Shaw to Wyllie 14 March 1672 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 125, f.219; also, Adair to Wyllie, 20 March 1672 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 127, f.222).

in their own church. On their perceived loyalty to the King and government lay their hopes for toleration and for growth. Besides at this time the Indulgence was being negotiated on their behalf by Lord Granard.

Some months later, the Laggan meeting asked for details on the case, and on receipt of them fully concurred with what the Antrim meeting decided: a rebuke first and if necessary a judicial trial.⁷⁰ In September 1672, the Antrim meeting recorded Houston's confession, and recognised it as the best possible solution given the situation; the confession had been sent to all the meetings for their judgement. A month later, since Houston seemed in good faith, he was allowed to preach in the Route except to the people he had disturbed originally.⁷¹

There the matter seems to have rested, at least for a time. However, there were developments in Scotland which would have heartened Houston. In 1681, following the deaths of Richard Cameron and Donald Cargill, 'remnant' congregations formed themselves into praying societies, in order to support each other in the times of persecution. They had their first meeting at Lesmahagow on the 15 December 1681. They set up a union, and decided to have a fortnightly circular letter and quarterly meetings. They drew up a declaration in 1682, which was a mixture of the former declarations of Sanquair and Rutherglen, repudiating, among several points, all unconstitutional acts of the King and the acceptance of the Indulgence by ministers. This signalled to the government that radical Covenanters would not surrender any of their convictions; the Cameronians, as they were called, were sought out and executed summarily during the 'Killing Time' of 1684-88.⁷²

70. 21 August 1672, Laggan minutes, p.7; 23 October 1672, Laggan minutes, p.23.

71. Antrim minutes, pp. 57, 60.

72. [Alexander Shields], *A hind let loose or a historical representation of the testimonies of the church of Scotland* (n.p., 1687); Alexander Shields, *The history of the Scotch presbytery, being an epitome of The Hind let loose* (London, 1692); J.K. Hewison, *The Covenanters*, 2 vols, (Glasgow, 1913), ii, Appendix iii, The United Societies, p. 557; I.B. Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters* (London, 1976), pp 110, 124; I.B. Cowan, 'The Covenanters. A revision article' in *Scottish Historical Review*, xlvii, (1968), pp 47-52; Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters*, pp 95-127; Magnus Linklater and Christian Hesketh, *For King and conscience, John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, 1648- 1689* (London, 1989), pp 65-8.

James Renwick, who witnessed the execution of Cargill, joined the societies and became leader of the Cameronians until his execution in 1688.⁷³ No doubt Houston made contact with the Cameronians in Scotland and there is evidence that the united societies made contact with Ireland during this period.⁷⁴ Certainly Renwick visited Dublin in the autumn of 1683, on his way back from Holland.⁷⁵

The Killing Times began in Scotland in 1684, when the Apologetical Declaration was issued in October by the Cameronians. This was an open declaration of war on the government and on all who supported it. It was no different in content from the Sanquair declaration but the tone was desperate. Repression followed and the atmosphere of martyrdom hung around the persecuted. This event in Scotland had repercussions in Ireland and from October 1684 there was evidence that Scots were arriving on the east coast of Ireland.⁷⁶ In particular, James Callwell came from Scotland bearing a copy of the declaration and spreading abroad. He told the people not to heed the indulged ministers who prayed for the King. Callwell was a society follower and had given hospitality to a preacher, James Wilson, when he stayed in the north the previous year.⁷⁷ Prisoners taken at Carrickfergus admitted:

they had subscribed to a kind of engagement carried about by one Callwell amongst the Scotch in the north, the substance of which is to assist the brethren now persecuted for the cause of religion in Scotland....when they were asked whether they would pray for the King or no the only answer that could be got from them to that question was that they would pray for the elect.⁷⁸

73. Thomas Houston, *The life of James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1987), pp 10-11.

74. Wodrow MSS, Folio 24, as recorded in Wodrow MSS, Quarto CIX (Index to the MSS) is missing from the collection in the National Library Scotland. Despite extensive searches there and elsewhere it cannot be found. The index lists several letters: 3 Oct 1683, Letter of the societies to their friends in Dublin, f.98; c.1685, Letter from some people in Ireland, f 177; 2 March 1687, Letter to friends in Ireland, f.210; 26 Dec. 1688, Paper from Ireland to the societies, f.240; 24 July 1689, Societies' letter to their friends in Ireland, f. 252. Also, ff 209 and 216 contain material on Houston and Renwick, Sept. 1686-Aug. 1687. Some of these letters were published in the 18th century. See Ch. 3, nos 32 and 33.

75. Houston, *The Life of James Renwick*, p. 12. For Renwick, see Ch. 3, n. 32.

76. Bodl., Carte MSS 40, ff 182, 187, 188; also, f.189 for the October Declaration; Bodl., Carte MSS 50, f 228; B.L., Landsdowne MSS 1152 A, ff 182, 176, 156, 330-1, 344, 347, 349, 354, 361.

77. Nov.- Dec. 1684, (Bodl., Carte MSS 40, ff 190, 190v, 191,191v, 192). Callwell was a bookbinder. H.M.C., *Ormonde*, vii, 293-4.

78. 26 Nov. 1684 (Bodl., Carte MSS 220, f. 64).

David Houston returned to Ireland in August 1686. Although he was not a formal member of the united societies then, he invited people in the north to join Renwick's party in Scotland.⁷⁹ It is clear that the people of Ballycastle, Aghoghill, Drumall and Ballymoney supported Houston and Renwick. Major Montgomery of Coleraine could also have been involved for he had kept a minister of his own and a place for 500 on his farm since the Restoration.⁸⁰ In any event, the Antrim meeting noted that Houston had returned and that both the Route and Down meetings complained that 'multitudes' were following him and that this 'schism and flame' needed to be repressed.⁸¹ Houston was suspended, having been cited three times and witnesses called, even though this was difficult to do at the time.⁸²

Sometime in the autumn of 1686 Houston asked to join the united societies. Two of the societies' members travelled to Ireland and talked with Houston to discover his motivation and attitude towards them. They also went to the places where Houston preached and spoke to many people there, who were full of stories which they refused to write down, possibly out of fear. The visitors declared Houston to be satisfactory and that he answered all the complaints made about himself; nevertheless the societies sent another minister to Ireland with a letter for Houston and with the commission to find out if the accusations against Houston were valid. Before the minister left Scotland a meeting was held of all the ministers who had been in Ireland and they found nothing in Houston's actions that were different from their own; yet there were some further queries which he had to be faced with.

By December 1686 Houston had returned to Scotland and both he and Alexander Shields were presented with the testimonies of the societies. Houston agreed with all

79. 1 Mar. 1687, Antrim minutes, p. 292.

80. 5 July 1687, Antrim minutes, p. 365.

81. 3 Aug. 1686, Antrim minutes, p. 272.

82. 2 Nov. 1686, Antrim minutes, p. 274.

their principles and judgements. He then asked to read some of his own testimonies to them which explained why he did not obey the meetings in Ireland; he also had testimonies from where he preached in Ireland which were supportive of his ministry.⁸³ He said that he refused to baptise children of those who paid tithes. He also rejected those ministers who either accepted the indulgence or co-operated in any with the authorities:

whensoever he knew of any transaction of the ministers with the so called magistrates he did quit the meeting house and refused subordination to those ministers, which was a little after Bothwell.

Renwick thought highly of Houston and wrote:

For my own part, I thought he seemed to have a right state of the cause and a right impression of the case of the church, and to be tender-hearted and zealous in the frame of his spirit, particularly for the royalties of Christ and against the idol of the Lord's jealousy, the ecclesiastic supremacy and civil tyranny.⁸⁴

Obviously Houston had rejected his own meeting of the Route in 1679 and turned to the societies for admittance to their form of church order and conviction. The societies accepted him and sent someone to Ireland to bring his wife and family back to Scotland.⁸⁵ It was the end of any kind of membership with the Route. In March 1687 the Antrim meeting noted that Houston was forbidden to preach in Ireland and in fact had left for Scotland. This was not enough; the meeting thought he should be deposed in view of his behaviour. It had ample proof of Houston's activities and this was sent formally to the

83. 5 July 1687, Antrim minutes, p.305. Houston's followers from Ballycastle, Aghoghill, Drumall and Ballymoney, about 23 in all, wrote a testimony in support of him.

84. Loughridge, *The Covenanters in Ireland*, p.12.

85. The principal acts and conclusions of the united societies in the west and south from their rise in 1681 to their ministerial journey to the assembly 1690 (Wodrow MSS, Quarto 38, ff 161, 170, 171, 173-4, 178, ; also f.182, 189; Bodl., Carte MSS 40, f.190.

presbyterian meetings in Scotland. At the same time, his followers in Ireland had to be disciplined and the meeting of the Route asked all the meetings in Ireland for advice. Basically Houston had flouted its authority, disowned it and appealed from them and the meetings in Ireland to the 1st General Assembly of the church of Scotland. This is a strange statement for it is clear that Houston appealed to the societies only in Scotland, and indeed invited his followers to join with James Renwick in Scotland.⁸⁶

Houston returned to Ireland after the revolution of 1688 and settled in or near Newtownards, Co. Down under the protection of Lord Mount Alexander of the Ards, who hoped to use him to keep peace in the area.⁸⁷ Not for long, however, for in 1694 he was accused by the bishop of preaching the Covenant to a congregation of 500 in Armoy.⁸⁸ Thus, for the space of twenty five years Houston maintained a small, convinced number of people who rejected the Restoration settlement. These caused divisions and unrest among presbyterians when the majority of ministers and members were resolved to try and live and work with the government. By and large the majority view held and moderate presbyterians consolidated their structure and organisation. Such a project could be jeopardised by fanatic elements in both Ireland and Scotland and so any threat was treated with severity. However much they may have been attracted to the call of the Covenanters most presbyterians knew it unrealistic in their situation.

So within the Scottish Presbyterian church in Ireland the element of extremism was seen as a real threat to the freedom ministers enjoyed on the whole. It was essential that the meetings and the general committee controlled the formation and ordination of ministers, as well as the

86. 1 March 1687, Antrim minutes, pp 287, 292.

87. Hill, *The Montgomery Manuscripts*, p.274, n. 51. Houston gave Mount Alexander 'a bond of compliance'.

88. Bishops of Meath and Derry to Capel, 24 Mar. 1694 (*SP.* 63, 256, no. 29); 2 June 1698, Hugh Mc Henry of Dumfries, follower of Houston, suspected of wanting to come to Ireland. Records of the General Synod of Ulster, 1691-1820, 3 vols (Belfast, 1898), ii, 32; Notes at end of the Antrim minutes; Loughridge, *The Covenanters in Ireland*, p. 13.

calls congregations made to ministers. Through this they hoped to vet all their personnel and reject any who refused to come through the system. David Houston played along with the Route meeting but never intended to conform to the moderate stance of the indulged ministers. For a time he stayed within the system, and at least the meetings had a way of trying to discipline him, even if it failed. The wandering or itinerant preacher, who belonged to no meeting at all, did not come under any authority. They were influential and held a certain attraction; they came and went and brought news of all that was happening in the country and indeed in Scotland. A number were on the run from the authorities in Scotland and found safe houses in Ireland. Since the majority of presbyterians were originally from Scotland this was a welcome link with the homeland and assured the preacher of a welcome. He would be seen as a kind of martyr and prophet, suffering for the Kirk and resisting the enemy's persecution. Such was Alexander Peden.

He was deprived of his ministry in New Luce in 1663 and for ten years was a conventicle preacher in Scotland and Ireland. As an itinerant preacher he visited Armagh in the early 1670's and encouraged the Goodhall family there in their resistance to prelacy.⁸⁹ Peden was arrested in Scotland in 1673 and spent over six years in the Bass Rock prison. Although he was banished to America in 1679 this never materialised; Peden in fact made his way back to Ireland. There he berated the ministers who complied with the government's order that all presbyterian ministers were to declare that they had no part in Bothwell Bridge and did not approve of it. Peden said of those ministers who went to Dublin that they were 'sent and gone the Devil's errand'.⁹⁰ Peden stayed around the

89. Patrick Walker, *Some remarkable passages of the life and death of Mr. Alexander Peden, late minister of the gospel at New Glenluce in Galloway*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh, 1728), p. 106; John Howie, *Biographia Scotiana or a brief historical account of the most eminent Scots worthies* (Glasgow, 1827), p. 514 ff; Mrs. Goodhall's memoirs of her husbands residence and imprisonment at Armagh A.D. 1658-77, in Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii, Appendix no. viii, p. 563; F.J. Bigger, 'Alexander Peden, the "Prophet"' in *U.J.A.*, ix, no. 3 (July, 1903), pp 116-27; Thomas Cameron, *Peden the prophet* (Edinburgh 1981), pp 20-21; John C. Johnston, *Alexander Peden, the prophet of the Covenant* (Mourne Missionary Trust, 1988), pp 83-5; A Smellie, *Men of the Covenant* (Banner of Truth, 1975), Ch. xxxv.

90. Walker, *Some remarkable passages*, p. 55; Johnson, *Alexander Peden*, pp 109-10.

Antrim area in 1679, and was in Ireland again in 1682, 1684 and 1685. Local presbyterian ministers opposed him and resented the fanatic element Peden nurtured.⁹¹ With the activities of Houston already disturbing the people and maintaining unrest and the spirit of rebellion, Peden was viewed by many of the ministers as a nuisance and as a threat to the church. Though Peden never joined the united societies he had great admiration for Cargill and Cameron and in time learnt to respect Renwick; he was very much within the Covenanter tradition, contributing to it by his way of life and resistance. His preaching must have been striking⁹²:

Now, what is it that has carried through the sufferers for Christ these twenty-two years in Scotland?...It is the filling up of Christ's sufferings in Scotland according to the ancient decree of heaven. For my part I seek no more, if He bids me go. He bade many, from 1660 to the year of the Pentlands engagement, go forth to scaffolds and gibbets for Him, and they sought no more but His commission. They went and He carried them well through. Then in 1666 at Pentland, He bade so many go to the fields and die for Him, and so many to scaffolds and lay down their lives for Him. They sought no more but His commission. They went and He carried them well through. Again, 1679, at Bothwell, He bade many go to the fields and scaffolds and die for Him. They sought no more but His commission and went. And afterwards in the year 1680, at Ayrmooss, He bade so many go to the fields and scaffolds for Him. They sought no more but His commission and went. This cup of suffering has come all the way down from Abel to this year, 1682, in Scotland.

No doubt this is the type of sermon Peden preached in Ireland, full of fire and flame. He held meetings in the houses of friends at night and sustained the hopes of the hearers for the return of the Covenant days. Convinced as this small following was of their cause, mainstream

91. Walker, *Some remarkable passages*, p. 112; also, pp 56-8, 111-18 for details of where Peden stayed in Ireland; Johnson, *Alexander Peden*, pp 123-9.

92. John Howie, *Sermons delivered in times of persecution in Scotland* (Edinburgh 1880) p. 567.

presbyterians feared their potential to disrupt the entire church and have them all branded as fanatics. The more radical movement among presbyterians in Ireland was sustained and nurtured by the ministry of itinerant preachers from Scotland. The fact that this was occasional and dependent on political circumstances ensured that lay people would develop in confidence and independence. This was not entirely new, for from the beginnings of presbyterianism in Ireland the laity were involved in their own form of worship and prayer. This was due both to scarcity and harassment of ministers.⁹³ It created a tradition which found expression in a new context: maintaining the societies formed both in Scotland and Ireland in the early 1680's, covenanting societies, which rejected the stance of mainstream presbyterianism.

93. Livingstone, *Brief historical relation*, p. 80; Stewart, *History of the church of Ireland*, pp 320-21. When Houston and Peden died the small groups in Ireland were served by John Macmillan, who came to Ireland in 1707 and 1715; people brought their children to Scotland for baptism by Covenant ministers. Allen, 'Scottish ecclesiastical influence upon Irish presbyterianism', pp 225-6.

TENSIONS AMONG PRESBYTERIANS IN DUBLIN

After the Restoration Scottish Presbyterians became responsible for Bull Alley congregation in Dublin. Originally this church belonged to the Independents and was served by Robert Newbury and Robert Chambers.¹ However, Norbury died in 1662/3 and Chambers, a former minister in the Established Church, had to leave Dublin since he refused to conform and was involved in Blood's Plot. From the time of Norbury's death and Chambers departure from Ireland, the congregation was served by William Jacque, thus indicating a change in leadership from Independent to Scottish Presbyterian ministers.

Jacque came from Scotland during the Interregnum, was ordained at Aghadowey in 1655 and received a salary of £100 from Henry Cromwell. When the people of Clongish and the adjoining parishes in Longford asked for a minister, Jacque was sent to them in 1659. After the Restoration Jacque went to Bull Alley, and in 1663 he was arrested for complicity in Blood's Plot. Two merchants in Dublin, Thomas Boyd and John Wallis, went bail for him for £500 and Jacque was free to continue in Bull Alley.² There he stayed for some years until, dismissed from Bull Alley in 1667, he gathered his own congregation in Capel Street in 1668. No record survives to explain why Jacque was dismissed from Bull Alley, but this event remained a source of conflict and friction. Even as late as 1698 it was noted that Jacque had never been authorised to establish a congregation in Capel Street.³ Certainly

1. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p.90; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 136 n.1,137,143,175-6,192 n.41,203 n. 92; New Row Baptismal Register, ff 1-2; Chambers returned to Ireland in 1673. Essex to Arlington, 17 Apr. 1673 (Essex Papers, p.78).

2. Thomas Boyd was a Dublin merchant and M.P. for Bangor; he was expelled from the House of Commons in 1663 for complicity in Blood's Plot. Hill, *The Montgomery manuscripts*, pp 237, n.72, 139.

3. *Records of the General Synod of Ulster*, ii, p. 8. From 1661-67 Jacque was a member of the Laggan meeting. W.D.Baillie, *A history of congregations in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1610-1982* (Belfast,1982), p. 439.

Jacque wavered between the Independent and presbyterian form of church government, and confused his own congregation in the process. Nevertheless, while Jacque had difficulty accepting the authority of the general committee, he sought for recognition and inclusion within the meetings and attended the Antrim meeting on several occasions. It was an ambivalent relationship and caused unease in Dublin, allowing factions to grow within Capel congregation which were very difficult to resolve. William Keyes was sent to fill the gap in Bull Alley, on a short term basis at first; later on he was made permanent minister there.⁴

When the Antrim meeting minutes resume in 1672 the correspondence between Jacque and the meeting was extensive. At this time the Tyrone meeting had responsibility for Bull Alley and the south of Ireland in general.⁵ Jacque wanted the Capel Street congregation to be joined to the Antrim meeting, but the Antrim meeting was unsure about this, suspicious of Jacque's' stance on church order. To discover his position they asked those in Dublin who had complaints to send them to all five meetings in the north, so that the general committee, rather than just the Antrim Meeting, could deal with them. 'Grievances and grounds of the difference' were sent to the meeting by the elders in Dublin, but nothing at all came from Jacque himself.

The general committee censured Jacque for gathering a congregation without their consent.⁶ It suggested that Jacque accept a colleague, formed in the Scottish Presbyterian/moderate tradition, hoping in this way that the problem could be modified; if Jacque refused this offer he should be dismissed.⁷ William Semple, on business

4. Sermons of William Keyes in Dublin, 1672 (Magee College Derry, MSS 29, ff 479-91, 533-44; Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 90, 95-6; C.H.Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism in Dublin and the south and west of Ireland*, (London, 1890), p. 9; McConnell, *Fasti*, no.83, p. 44; Antrim minutes, pp 55, 60, 67, 69, 79, 83, 87; Laggan minutes, pp 35, 53, 72. R.M. Young, *Historical notes of old Belfast* (Belfast, 1896), pp 101-5; Bodl., Carte MSS 159, ff 151-151v; J.W. Nelson, 'The Belfast Presbyterians, 1670-1830' (Ph.D Q.U.B., 1985), pp 7, 9, 289. Keyes was an English Presbyterian who came to Glaslough in c.1658/9 and became chaplain to the Countess of Donegal from 1659-1673.

5. 3 July 1672, Antrim minutes, p. 48.

6. Oct. 1672, Antrim minutes, p. 64.

7. 9 Apr. 1672, Antrim minutes, p. 31.

in Dublin on behalf of the general committee, admitted that the most difficult part of his work was trying to keep a semblance of unity between Capel Street and Bull Alley until a decision was taken by the committee.⁸ In the same year the Tyrone meeting asked if they could be rid of the responsibility for Bull Alley and of having to send ministers to the south of Ireland; they were finding it hard enough to get ministers for their own needs. The Antrim meeting advised that before any decisions were taken Bull Alley should be represented at the next committee meeting, probably hoping to solve the problems of that congregation and Capel Street at the same time.⁹

In the same year the Laggan meeting decided to send one of their ministers, Archibald Hamilton, to visit the south of Ireland, in view of the question that a presbytery, (or meeting) be established in Dublin that would 'join with the rest of the synod and to subject themselves to the rest of their brethren'. The meeting recognised that this would be difficult to achieve due to the differences between Jacque and Bull Alley. Significantly the meeting referred to the Act of Bangor, 1654, whereby the disagreements in Scotland were not to be brought into the church in Ireland.¹⁰ This gives the clue that the tensions in the Dublin congregations were serious and not just about church order; they were in fact about the moderate versus fanatic stance of presbyterian ministers so crucial an issue in the north and in Scotland.¹¹

Jacque wrote to the Laggan meeting and asked it to try and persuade the Tyrone meeting to lessen pressure on him. Rather than act hastily the Laggan decided to send William Semple again to Dublin and get a report from him on which

8. William Semple for Thomas Fulton, 15 Mar. 1672 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, No.126, f. 221). Semple was minister at Letterkenny. Laggan minutes, p. 1; McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 103, p. 48.

9. 3 July 1672, Antrim minutes, p. 48. It appears that the Laggan took on responsibility for Dublin and the south at this time.

10. 21 Aug. 1672, Laggan minutes, pp 7-8; 13 Aug. 1672, Antrim minutes, p. 53.

11. 29 Oct. 1672, Hackett to Essex (*Essex Papers*, 37-8).

a decision could be taken. They also insisted that Jacque agree in writing to observe whatever decision the Laggan meeting took with regard to Bull Alley.¹² The following year, 1673, the Laggan meeting tried to conclude the business with Dublin:¹³

This meeting makes the overture to all the rest of the meetings that the business shall be de novo recognised by the meeting of Antrim together with the correspondents for the rest of the meetings.

At the same time another matter came up for discussion, linked with the Bull Alley/Capel Street situation. Two candidates in Dublin were ready for trials and ordination, William Cock and William Liston. On account of the differences in Dublin, the Laggan meeting could not see their way to allowing these ordinations to go forward. The Antrim and Tyrone meetings wrote to the Laggan and said they both thought the ordinations should take place. Apparently the Route meeting thought that Jacque himself should be annexed to the Antrim meeting, though the Tyrone meeting disagreed on this point. In view of all this, the Laggan decided to send two ministers to Dublin and gave them authority to decide what was best there and then and so end the affair; if the Dublin committee continued to disagree, no decision was to be taken and a report was to be drawn up instead. The result of this plan was that the committee asked the Laggan to ordain Liston and Cock.¹⁴

However, almost immediately there was a letter of protest from Colonel Sankey, William Keyes and William Cock.¹⁵ Keyes had asked to be relieved of his post in Dublin, giving reasons for his request which have not been recorded. However, the general committee exercised its authority and asked him to delay his decision until it had met with him. Eventually it was decided that Keyes should

12. 18 Sept. 1672, Laggan minutes, pp 18, 28.

13. 14 May 1673, Laggan minutes, p. 53.

14. Laggan minutes, pp 54, 57, 62; 26 Jan. 1673 (Magee College Derry, MS 29, f. 18).

15. Nov. 1673, Laggan minutes, p.72; Antrim minutes, pp 55, 60, 67; Laggan minutes, pp 35, 40, 52, 69, 72. There is no record of the actual content of this protest. Possibly they wanted a more formal recognition of presbyterian church order, which was achieved as a result of this long debate.

be permanently appointed to Bull Alley. The congregation at Belfast, in particular the Countess of Donegal, was not pleased, but the decision went through. This seems to have clarified the situation in Dublin, for in May 1673 Jacque declared that he was willing to conform to the presbyterian form of church government and recant anything that was considered erroneous; in response to his own request he was annexed to the Down meeting.¹⁶

The general committee also insisted on the following rules for the ordination of Liston and Cocks in Dublin:¹⁷ candidates were to accept the presbyterian confession; they were to be ordained 'with a primary relation to the church ministerial and only a secondary to the place in which he is to labour'; own the work of reformation carried out against popery; accept subjection to presbyterian government by sessions, presbyteries, synods and general assemblies; subscribe to the Act of Bangor, 1654. This last point indicated the source of the tension, which the Laggan had already pointed out. It was an effort to contain the dissident elements in the church and prevent the spread of unrest and fanaticism in Ireland. Through such rules for ordination it was hoped that ministers could be controlled and disciplined.¹⁸

Nor were the rules for Dublin alone. When Cork congregation asked for a minister and Mr. Cock proposed settling a Mr. Barclay there, the Laggan meeting encouraged this move on the condition that :

as he is in his judgement a Presbyterian so he would really show himself to be such by testifying his submission to the advice of his brethren and of subordination to the courts and jurisdiction of Jesus Christ amongst us.¹⁹

16. Antrim minutes, pp 69, 71, 79, 83, 87, 88.

17. 3 June 1673, Antrim minutes, p 97.

18. The Act of Bangor was included in the Rules for ordination operative in the northern meetings at this times. Candidates were to 'adhere to the Covenant' and be peaceful 'considering the temper of these times'. Antrim minutes, pp 53, 32-37. Such rules caused some tension over the question of Liston and Cock's ordinations; this was probably represented the conflict between the Independent stress on particular churches and the Scottish form of church government. Laggan minutes, pp 72, 76, 173, 237.

19. 9 Mar. 1675, Laggan minutes, p. 162. The Laggan rejected William Patterson for exercising a ministry in Sligo without reference to the meeting, 21 Aug. 1672, Laggan minutes, pp 1-2.

Another example of this insistence on adherence to the presbyterian form of church order occurred in 1679 when Cock wrote again from Tipperary and asked if he could ordain a Mr. Harding for Cork, with two ministers, Mr. Wood and Mr. Bernard. The advice to Cock was to see if Harding agreed to 'our confession of faith and catechism'. There seemed to be no objection to the two ministers named, one of whom was certainly of the Independent tradition.²⁰ In addition, in 1675, the general committee proposed that Keyes, Liston, Cocks and Jacque be annexed to the same meeting in the north, as this would be better for 'planting in the south'. However, the Laggan meeting did not think this a good idea at all, and nothing was done in this regard.²¹

A year later Jacque and Keyes asked that presbyterian ministers in and about Dublin at least be annexed to a meeting in the north. The Laggan suggested that all ministers in the south be established as a committee and annexed to the Antrim meeting and that when candidates are presented for trials in the south some of the Antrim meeting be present.²² Significantly Cock and Liston thought the plan would only work if 'the English godly ministers at and about Dublin concur and join with it'.²³ This seems to have happened for in 1681 at the ordination of Jacque's brother, Gideon, ministers of the English presbyterian churches in Dublin were allowed to assist at the trial and ordination, as well as :

20. 5 Feb. 1679, Laggan minutes, p. 328. James Wood was Independent minister at Youghal in 1657, where he disputed with the Quaker, James Sicklemore, on the question of ordination, (*To all the inhabitants of Youghal who are under the teachings of James Wood, 1657/8*). He did not conform and was schoolmaster at the Erasmus Smith school in Tipperary which was exempt from episcopal visitation during Smith's life time. T.C. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p. 192, n. 39; Edwards, 'History of the laws against Protestant non conformity', p. 136. Wood wrote *Shepardy spiritualised*, (London, 1680) It was dedicated to his 'beloved friends the sheeppmasters and shepherds in the county of Tipperary and Ireland'. Timothy Taylor wrote a letter of recommendation for it.

21. 26 May 1674, Antrim minutes, p. 147; 6 July 1675, Laggan minutes, p. 181.

22. Laggan minutes, pp 242, 246. This plan was not implemented then and in 1680 the Laggan repeated their proposal, if the Antrim meeting agreed to it. This agreement seems never to have been reached even though by 1683 the Antrim meeting was dealing with Dublin. 7 July 1680, Laggan minutes, ii, p. 65. cf. p. 194. In 1686 the Laggan asked again that Dublin be established as a meeting. Antrim minutes, p. 280.

23. Laggan minutes, p. 246.

the concurrence and assistance even of such ministers of the congregational way and judgement as have been ordained by a consistory of presbyters, as far as they can prudently seek and obtain it.²⁴

The northern committee was able to retain this hold over their ministers in Dublin, and indeed wherever one was called in the south, by insisting that ordinations could not take place there unless Scottish Presbyterian church order was accepted and all the meetings in the north had given their approval.²⁵ So the matter rested and apparently the authority of the northern committee was recognised and established. Jacque, too, seemed to have accepted the structure. For example, he was asked to go to Cork and examine the possibilities of the committee answering a call from there; it was also mooted that he answer a call himself to go to Longford, where he had been during the Interregnum. Jacque referred to the Antrim meeting for an assistant minister, as well as for clarification of certain matters. The relationship seemed harmonious.²⁶

However, this was not to last and some hints that all was not well came in May 1683 when the Dublin committee asked to be independent of the northern meetings; the only response to this request was to note that the Dublin committee paid no fees to the general committee; a donation of 10 s. was imposed, to be paid at Candlemas each year. However, at the same meeting a petition was presented by James Martin, a Belfast merchant:²⁷

from divers of the people of Mr. Jacque's congregation, with another paper containing a call to Mr. John Hutcheson to be colleague in the ministry with the said Mr. Jacque.

24. 20 Apr. 1681, Laggan minutes, ii, pp 93-4; Gideon Jacque was ordained for Wexford in 1681. 5 June 1681, New Ross (Magee College, MS 29, ff 395-401); McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 167, p. 69. By this time in Dublin Independent, English Presbyterian and Scottish Presbyterian ministers had formed a loose form of association and met monthly in the city. See Chapters 4 and 5.

25. Antrim minutes, pp 186, 188, 192. In 1710 the Synod of Ulster and the Presbytery of Dublin reached an agreement on ordination rules. Irwin, *Presbyterianism in Dublin*, pp 38-9; *Records of the General Synod of Ulster*, 3 vols (Belfast, 1890-98), i, pp 238-40.

26. 26 May 1674, Antrim minutes, p. 147; 13 June 1677, Laggan minutes, p. 264; Jan. 1683, Antrim minutes, p. 194; June 1683, Antrim minutes, p. 196.

27. Antrim minutes, pp 192-3. John Hutcheson was the son of Alexander Hutchinson, minister at Saintfield. Before 1679 he conducted a philosophy school at Newownards, Co. Down. He was ordained in 1690. He did not go to Capel Street but his father did from 1690-92. McConnell, *Fasti*, no 165, p. 68; no 76, p. 40; H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, v, 125, 608; Scotts, *Fasti*, vii, 663.

Jacque was present at this May meeting and was asked then if he could agree to the petition. He rejected it on several grounds: the petition was from a section of the congregation only; the problem of maintenance of two ministers by the congregation; the wisdom of having two ministers in Dublin in view of possible suppression of religious liberty. On these grounds the meeting decided to write a letter to the entire congregation in Capel Street and asked William Keyes of Bull Alley to speak to the congregation on a weekday and read the letter from the Antrim meeting.

The following month the Antrim meeting, again with Jacque present, heard that some in Capel Street persisted in their request to have John Hutchinson as assistant to Jacque. This time Jacque produced a counter petition from 66 of his congregation, rejecting the request for another minister. It was clear that Capel Street was a divided congregation and the Antrim meeting was not sure how much Jacque was at the centre of the problem. Thomas Boyd of Dublin wrote to the meeting and explained that he had withdrawn temporarily from Capel Street but gave no reasons; the meeting asked him for proof of Jacque's guilt in this affair, proof 'of such irregularities, as if known, might seem to render him unfit for the ministry, at least in Dublin'.²⁸

It is difficult to know if Jacque really was the centre of the problem. While it is true that he seemed to be ambivalent over the forms of church government expected by the northern committee, nevertheless he sat on the general committee and referred to it in case of dispute. The truth may lie in the motivations of the group that wished to have another minister assist Jacque. It was evident that they were dissatisfied and the source of their dissatisfaction may have been the stance that the ministers in general were taking with regard to the government and its policy. While there was no real

28. 12 June 1683, Antrim minutes, p. 195. Boyd had gone bail for Jacque when he was implicated in Blood's Plot. See note 2 above.

persecution of Protestant dissenters in Ireland at this time, it was evident that hard times were ahead. Should this happen, some could surrender to the government and others take the path of the Covenant actively.²⁹

If Boyd, who had been actively involved with Jacque in Blood's Plot in 1663, was so disillusioned as to withdraw from Capel Street congregation it could well have been because he felt Jacque had surrendered both freedom and principle. For in August 1683 Jacque accepted the government's restrictions regarding religious worship, along with the Independents and English Presbyterians.³⁰ In this context, Boyd would have been heartened by David Houston's visit to Dublin in January 1683.³¹ He would also have welcomed the visit of James Renwick in August of the same year.³² Certainly Renwick felt he had an opening in Dublin:

I think the Lord has a special hand in my coming to this place ...He has kindled a fire which I hope Satan will not soon quench. For all the people of this place were following men who did not follow the Lord and thought these were right enough; yet now some of them are saying we have been misled, we never knew before this we were standing between the Lord's camp and the adversaries...I have the more patience here because of the Lord's doing great things.³³

29. Philips to Boyle, 23 Jan. 1683 (H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, vi, 519-20). This mirrored the situation in Scotland where members of the United Societies felt that the vast majority of ministers had surrendered to the state and so betrayed the Kirk. In February 1683 they sent Alexander Gordon with a call to ministers in Ireland, naming Alexander Peden, Michael Bruce (at Killinchy) and Samuel Arnot. John Howie, *Faithful contendings displayed* (Glasgow, 1780), pp 49-50.

30. For the situation regarding religious liberty in Dublin at this time: The Mather Papers, in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, viii, 4th series (Boston, 1868), pp 37,44,44,46-7,54,56,65,486; *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin in the possession of the Municipal Corporation*, 6 vols (1172-1716), ed. J.T.Gilbert (Dublin, 1889-96), i, p.345. The Quakers continued to meet for public worship and were highly critical of the acquiescence of other Protestant dissenters. John Burnyeat, *The truth exalted* (London, 1691), pp 74-5,78-91, 87.

31. Phillips to Boyle, 23 Jan. 1683 (H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, vi, 519-20)

32. James Renwick was born in Galloway in 1662 and educated at Edinburgh. There he joined the secret meetings of the United Societies and witnessed the death of Donald Cargill. Destitute of ministers after the deaths of both Cameron and Cargill, the United Societies sent Renwick to Holland to be prepared for ministry; he studied at the university of Groningen and was ordained there by a Dutch presbytery. This ordination was queried by the Church in Scotland. Renwick returned to Scotland in September 1683, via Dublin. He led the United Societies in Scotland and Ireland until his death in 1688. Thomas Houston, *The life of James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1987), pp 8-12, 40-43; Alexander Shields, *The life and death of ...Mr. James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1724); Robert Simpson, *Life of the Rev. James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1843); W.H.Carslaw, *Life and times of James Renwick* (Paisley, 1901); W.H. Carslaw, *Life and letters of James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1893); Jean Lawson, *Life and times of Alexander Peden and James Renwick* (Glasgow, n.d. c.1905); Thomas Houston, *The letters of Rev. James Renwick, with and introduction by T.Houston* (Paisley, 1845); Howie, *Biographia Scotiana*, pp 528-46.

33. James Renwick to Robert Hamilton, Dublin, 24 Aug. 1683. A collection of letters consisting of ninety three, sixty one of which wrote by Rev. Mr. James Renwick, the remainder by Rev. Messrs John Livingstone, John Brown, John King, Donald Cargill, Richard Cameron, Alexander Peden and Alexander Shields. Also a few by M. Michael Shields at the direction of the general correspondence. From the years 1663-1689 inclusive (Edinburgh, 1764), p. 52.

When Renwick reached Scotland he wrote to a friend, exiled in Holland, giving details of the visit to Dublin. The people he met there wished him to stay in Dublin and argued that their need was greater than Scotland's, so he had to promise to return.

But, as the Lord stirred up some people to all this, their (so-called) ministers increased their malice, especially one Mr. Jacque, the ring leader of the rest, who sought to speak with me, which I would not, nor could, without stumbling of the people, refuse; who, when we met, we reasoned upon several heads...³⁴

They met again and Jacque asked why Renwick was drawing his congregation from him. Renwick

denied him to have a congregation and did only labour and desire to draw the people from sin unto their duty; and for accepting his call to preach, that I ought not, nor would not, because I could not own him as a faithful minister of Jesus Christ.³⁵

Jacque queried the validity of Renwick's ordination but Renwick refused to enter into a discussion on this as there were no true ministers to judge him and certainly Jacque was 'not competent to require that of me'. Besides, Renwick did not recognise Jacque's right to a congregation, to the exercise of ministry, especially for 'his yielding it up at the enemies command'.³⁶ This no doubt referred to Jacque's harassment by the government in the summer of 1683. He was cleared in law for 'holding an unlawful assembly' and so he continued to hold meetings in the city.³⁷ The fact that he went to court, accepted the law of the land was fault enough for Renwick and his supporters in Dublin.

Renwick and the United Societies³⁸ kept up correspondence

34. Renwick to Hamilton, Edinburgh, 20 Sept. 1683 (*A collection of letters*, p. 56).

35. Renwick to Hamilton, 20 Sept. 1683 (*A collection of letters*, p. 56).

36. Ibid, p. 57.

37. Arran to Ormonde 1 Aug. 1683 (H.M.C. *Ormonde MSS*, vii, pp 93-4); Bodl., Carte MSS 40, f. 54.

38. For details of the United Societies, their organisation and convictions: Alexander Shields, *The history of the Scotch presbytery, being an epitome of The Hind let loose* (London, 1692); Alexander Shields, *An informatory vindication of a poor, wasted, misrepresented, remnant of the suffering, anti-popish, anti-prelatick, anti-erastian, anti-sectarian true Presbyterian church of Christ in Scotland* (n.p., 1707); John Howie *Faithful contendings displayed* (Glasgow, 1780); Thomas Houston, *The life of James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1987).

with Dublin and on 3 October 1683 they wrote a long letter 'From the anti-popish, anti-prelatick, anti-erastian, true Presbyterian church of Scotland, to those that desire to join with the cause of God at Dublin in Ireland'. They wrote to their 'friends and covenanted brethren' a full account of the betrayal of the true Kirk by most and saw themselves as 'the remnant who keepeth their ground' and 'follow the good old way'.³⁹ They told the group in Dublin that it would have to choose between the united societies and the Dublin ministers. Those ministers had been wrong to accept the Indulgence, and now they were deserting 'their meeting houses at the command and threatening of men'. They were urged then to leave 'the backslidden ministers altogether unfaithful to our wronged Lord and Master'.⁴⁰

The welcome Renwick received in Dublin was commended by the United Societies; in addition, documents in Latin and English, proving his ordination were sent to Dublin. They promised to provide assistance by correspondence and help anyone sent over to Scotland 'whom the Lord sends forth unto us, clothed with his commission'.⁴¹ While it is not possible to say that this was the group that opposed Jacques in Capel Street, it seems clear that there were some in Dublin who belonged to covenanting societies and were actively involved in promoting the cause of Renwick and the United Societies. They were active in 1687, and Renwick recognised that:⁴²

There are sundry societies in Ireland come out of the defections of the time who are keeping correspondence with us; I am desired to visit them and I purpose God willing to do so. When Mr. David Houston was there in the end of spring he was very free and considerable numbers attended his preaching.

Continued interest and involvement was shown from Ireland in the United Societies and information was exchanged as to their purpose and growth.⁴³ This had begun at least as

39. *A collection of letters*, p. 352. This letter is listed in the Wodrow Index, Quarto CIX, for Folio 24, f. 98.

40. *Ibid*, pp 353-4.

41. *A collection of letters*, pp 356-7.

42. Renwick to Hamilton, 15 July 1687, (*A collection of letters*, p. 179).

early as February 1683 and fed into the on going Covenanting spirit which was strong among Scottish Presbyterians since the early days of the Covenant. It also built on the traditions established from the beginnings of presbyterianism in Ireland, of having groups meet for worship or for preparation for worship, in societies not necessarily having a minister to lead them. 1683 then was a momentous year for Capel Street congregation and the tensions between the two factions continued long after Renwick's visit in August.

By December 1683 nothing had been resolved and the meeting heard again from several of the Capel Street congregation. They asked that either John Hutchinson become Jacque's colleague or that they separate with him and form a new congregation. They also wrote to Patrick Adair, explaining their case. The meeting noted letters from this group, from William and Gideon Jacque, from the Dublin committee and from the pro-Jacque faction in Capel Street.⁴⁴ The contents of the letters were not noted down so it is difficult to know with any confidence what exactly was the source of division. The case wore on until March 1684 when the Antrim meeting agreed that Capel Street would have to divide since every effort to heal differences had failed. This was a blow and damaged the church, it was 'a scandal to our profession in that eminent place'.⁴⁵

By April 1684 the split had occurred and the meeting received letters from the new congregation at Newmarket in the Coombe reporting that they were receiving new members and they asked for a preacher. At the same time a letter of protest was sent from Capel Street and signed by Jacque and his congregation. The Antrim meeting decided to encourage the Newmarket congregation to get preachers themselves until something definite could be arranged.⁴⁶

43. To friends in Ireland, 2 March 1687; To friends in Ireland, 24 Jan. 1689 (*A collection of letters*, pp 388-9, 421-425) These letters are listed in the Wodrow Index, Quarto C CIX, for Folio 24, ff 177, 252.

44. Antrim minutes, pp 203-5.

45. Antrim minutes, p. 208.

46. Antrim minutes, p. 212.

The meeting was disturbed to hear that some ministers and people in Dublin were critical of the Antrim meetings' involvement in the Capel Street/Jacque/Newmarket affair. This was serious and Patrick Adair was deputed to write to Daniel Williams of Wood Street congregation and explain the case to him. The meeting also decided to try and find out the reasons why people had left Capel Street.⁴⁷

It is clear that the Antrim meeting was either unaware of or deliberately kept in the dark about the issues which led to the split in Dublin. Weary of the difficulties, it asked that the Down meeting take responsibility for Dublin, 'it never as yet having had the charge thereof'.⁴⁸ This did not happen, for in June 1684 two members of the Newmarket congregation asked the Antrim meeting again for preachers until Mr. Hutcheson could be appointed. The meeting decided to send Alexander Sinclair to Newmarket and so stabilise the situation there.⁴⁹

In June 1684, the Dublin committee once again asked to be free of the northern meetings, and the request seems to have been refused or ignored for the Antrim meeting in July 1684 reprimanded the Dublin committee. The meetings' approval of the Dublin minutes had not been acknowledged by either Keyes of Bull Alley or Jacque of Capel Street, and the meeting wondered if the ministers were actually meeting at all.⁵⁰ The Dublin committee may have wanted to be free of the general committee because of the tensions within the Scottish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland and because these were spilling over into Dublin and causing division. In Dublin they had to contend and work with the English Presbyterian and the Independent churches, and the possibility of harmony was greater if they could act freely on their own authority. Yet the petition does not seem to have been taken seriously.

47. Antrim minutes, p 217-18.

48. Antrim minutes, p. 219.

49. Ibid, p. 223. Sinclair did not go to Newmarket; he was sent to Waterford in 1686 and went to Bull Alley, then Plunkett Street in 1692. In 1687 Newmarket asked for Mr. Osburn of Brigh in Tyrone. Armstrong, *A summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 58, 95-6.

50. Ibid, pp 222, 227.

In August, on the advice of the Laggan and Route meetings, the meeting proceeded with the libel against Jacque.⁵¹ This decision was confirmed when respected members in Dublin advised that the libel should be pursued to the end. Tension in Dublin seems to have heightened and the meeting noted: 'Mr. Jacque sent a letter wherein he seems to decline our authority as proper judges in his cause'. One of the meeting, Mr. Hall, was deputed to write to Jacque and find out if he really meant to cut himself off; if there was some hope that he would still obey, one or two ministers were to go to Dublin, join William Keyes and Robert Kelso and some other ministers, and examine the libel against Jacque.⁵²

Little clarification was forthcoming from Jacque, though he talked of submitting to a 'lawful synod'. At the same time Thomas Boyd sent a signed libel to the meeting and a decision was taken to send two ministers to Dublin, John Anderson and James Pitcairn; they were to hear the case in secret. However, if Jacque disagreed with this procedure then the ministers were not to travel.⁵³ Jacque managed to block this move by proposing his own process and refusing any other; he threatened that 'he will be constrained to take such measures as will not be pleasant in the issue'.⁵⁴ This could have been a threat to expose the links between the United Societies in Scotland and interested persons in Dublin; such information would certainly have embarrassed the general body of moderate presbyterians.

Thoroughly weary of the affair, the Antrim meeting asked again to be relieved of the responsibility of Dublin and the south of Ireland.⁵⁵ Again, their request was not

51. Ibid, p. 231.

52. 2 Dec. 1684, Antrim minutes, p. 236. Robert Kelso was born in Templepatrick and educated in Scotland; he was sent to Wicklow in 1674. Mc Connell, *Fasti*, no 169, p. 69.

53. 6 Jan. 1685, Antrim minutes, p. 238.

54. 3 March 1685, Antrim minutes, p. 241.

55. 14 Apr. 1685, Antrim minutes, p. 244; the request was renewed the following year, 4 May 1686, Antrim minutes, p. 261.

granted, for a year later the Antrim meeting received approval from the Down meeting for the manner in which it handled the Jacque affair. But it was not over by any means. Gilbert Rule, who had been sent to Dublin by the Antrim meeting, was having a difficult time and was:

discouraged on the account of his being discountenanced and looked down on by Mr. Jacque, the ministers of Dublin and several professors therein and particularly that separation of others without and before the meetings allowance, as also the Chancery suit against Jacque by Mr. Boyd, and lastly the libel given in by Mr. Boyd against Mr. Jacque.⁵⁶

The meeting wanted to keep Rule in Dublin, especially in his capacity as assistant to Daniel Williams in Wood Street, and so the Newmarket congregation was asked to publicly acknowledge that they had acted wrongly in withdrawing from Capel Street without permission, even though they were provoked into doing it by Jacque. This was a decision taken in weariness for the meeting also indicated that it was ready to drop the libel against Jacque if only to keep the peace. The case in Chancery had to be settled but nothing was to be paid unless the law found in Jacque's favour. It was a way of forcing Jacque to show his hand while protecting the ministry of Rule and maintaining good relations with other ministers in the city.⁵⁷

This policy proved wise for in June 1686 Dr. Williams wrote from Dublin and told the meeting that, with great difficulty, he had healed the differences between the two congregations,

on this condition that the meeting will destroy the papers sent from Dublin hither from Mr. Boyd as matter of accusation against Mr. Jacque.

56. 6 Apr. 1686, Antrim minutes, p. 255. Rule had come to Ireland to escape harassment in Scotland. Alexander Gordon (ed.), *Freedom after ejection* (Manchester, 1917), p. 304; Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 69; Alexander Smellie, *Men of the Covenant* (Edinburgh, 1975), pp 402, 478, 512; E. Calamy, *An historical account*, ii, 514-18. His appointment to Wood Street was possibly a way of retaining good relations with the English Presbyterian in Dublin.

57. 6 Apr. 1686, Antrim minutes, p. 256. By July 1686 Rule reported that Newmarket admitted their mistake and that his own ministry was going well. Antrim minutes, p. 265.

The meeting welcomed this cautiously and asked that Boyd and Jacque confirm this decision in writing.⁵⁸ It is difficult to know if the matter ended there, for the following year the Antrim meeting once again asked for help in dealing with Dublin and the south of Ireland. If this was not forthcoming they would abandon all 'at the foot of the rest of the meetings'.⁵⁹ The committee responded to this in April 1688 and suggested that the Dublin ministers be annexed to the Tyrone meeting. They confessed little hope that this would be acceptable to Keyes or Comying. In any event the Antrim meeting was still supplying ministers to Capel Street in 1691, and the Synod of Ulster assumed responsibility for this after 1692.⁶⁰ In June 1698 Jacque's Capel Street congregation was freed by the General Synod of Ulster from any relation to Jacque, 'he never having been fixed there by any presbytery'.⁶¹

So ended a turbulent career in Ireland. In 1668 Jacque had gathered his own congregation in Capel Street and from this time conflict between the Independent and Presbyterian forms of church order ensued. For Scottish Presbyterians the basic structure of the church at Capel Street was fundamentally suspect but the northern committee persevered with it, possibly in the hope of reaching agreement with Jacque and also to avoid a public breach in the capital city. The unrest created by Jacque's ambivalence regarding church order allowed elements of unrest in the north of Ireland and in Scotland to affect Dublin. Through these exchanges the northern committee emerged as the source of authority and decision making. At the same time the Dublin committee found it difficult to work with that, and asked to be freed from the northern

58. 8 June 1686, Antim minutes, p. 263.

59. 7 June 1687, Antrim minutes, p. 305. The general committtee in May 1687 queried if there were openings in the south for ministers; perhaps the Antrim meetings felt it could not handle any more appointments. Antrim minutes, p. 298.

60. Antrim minutes, pp 372, 481. Armstrong, *A summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 96-99.

61. *Records of the General Synod of Ulster*, ii, p.8; Jacque had left Ireland by 1689, for he went to Whitehaven with other dissenting ministers from Dublin (New Row Baptismal Register, f. 11); later he returned to Scotland and ended his days in Biggar. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 77, p.41. Gideon Jacque went to Liberton in Edinburgh in 1692 and returned to Wexford in 1695. He refused the Abjuration oath. Mc Connell, *Fasti*, no.167, p.69; Laggan minutes, ii, pp 93-4.

committee: the situation in Dublin was too complex to be legislated for from the outside. Thus there was an uneasy relationship between these two committees, particularly in a time of crisis. In time it would be amicably resolved, but at this period it was a source of difficulty and strain, as all dissenters sought to find ways to maintain growth and stability.

ENGLISH PRESBYTERIANS IN IRELAND, 1655-1711

On the 29 August 1648 the Long Parliament passed 'The Form of Church government to be used in the church of England and Ireland '. While it was never implemented in Ireland it indicated the type of church government intended for the country and it was basically presbyterian in tone and content: government by congregational, classical, provincial and national assemblies; worship according to the Directory without exception; each congregation was to elect elders and to have weekly meetings; classical assemblies to meet monthly; provincial assemblies twice a year and national assemblies when summoned by Parliament. Each assembly had its own powers. The classical assembly was the basic instrument of government and very few powers were reserved to the provincial assembly. Rules and procedures for ordination were laid down in detail, as well as the role of lay people in the church. Disciplinary procedures were listed, and those particular faults needing correction; close co-operation with the magistrate was assumed in matters of discipline. In all it was a simple if comprehensive mode of church government.¹

This *Form of church government* appealed to a number of the clergy in Ireland during the Interregnum, many of them former Established Church ministers. The established church had only recently accepted the 39 Articles of the Church of England in the Convocation of 1634, thereby undermining the authority of the 1615 Irish Articles. These had been Calvinist in tone and content. In addition, Archbishop Ussher was a very influential figure and his views on a modified episcopacy were well known.²

1. U.L.C., *The form of church government to be used in the church of England and Ireland*, 29 August 1648; B.L., Stowe MSS 155, f. 80 ff

2. James Ussher, *The reduction of episcopacy* (London, 1687).

Thus, even without the *Form of church government* being enacted in Ireland there were some clergy who would adopt its general thrust anyway when the Book of Common Prayer and the ceremonies were abolished in June 1647.³ For them it was a matter of expediency, as Edward Worth was to explain later in 1660.⁴ Such clergy, particularly during the lord deputyship of Henry Cromwell, were joined by others from England, who were already sympathetic to the form of church government passed by Parliament. Whatever about their critics, both groups of clergy had to find ways of working together and strengthening their own discipline and organisation in order to prevent total breakdown into factions.

In view of the need for strong church government, ministers in Cork underlined the urgent necessity of an ordained ministry.⁵ They saw that some form of agreement was needed to guarantee ministry, create unity among themselves and prevent intruders and factions. They listed the consequences of non ordination, sixteen in all, each of them contributing to the confusion and ineffectiveness of religion in Ireland.⁶ They insisted on certificates of ordination which could be presented to the magistrates, who should only receive ministers legally ordained. To this purpose all were to:

seek ordination from our brethren, the Scots in Ulster; the inconveniences whereof ([the present state of affairs considered) are too obvious to need our instances; or from our brethren in England.

This was essential, even though they recognised it could be difficult to achieve, for journeys were long and expensive; besides certificates from such a distance could be forged.⁷ They obviously did not think they had power

3. Bodl., Carte MSS 21, ff 155, 176.

4. Worth to Bramhall, 3 Dec 1660, in St. J. Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland, 1647-1661* (Oxford, 1921), p. 227.

5. National Library Ireland, *The agreement and resolution of several associated ministers in the county of Cork for the ordaining of ministers* (Cork 1657).

6. Ibid, pp 13-15. Quakers at this time queried the ordination and ministries of Independent and presbyterian ministers. *To all the inhabitants of Youghal who are under the teachings of James Wood*. (n.p., c.1657/8). Wood was a newly ordained Independent minister at Youghal. Wood stayed in Ireland after the Restoration and seems not to have conformed; he ministered in Tipperary and was master of the Erasmus Smith school there, Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p.192n; in 1680 he published *Shepardy spiritualised*.

7. Ibid, p. 17.

of their own to ordain and they sought to belong to a wider body which aspired to be national church. In view of this aspiration, the Cork ministers wanted to be linked with either the Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster or the London Presbyterians. This was something Edward Worth, leader of the Cork association worked for, seeing in that connection the way forward towards a national church.⁸ Worth's colleague in Cork, Joseph Eyres, had belonged to a London *classis* and represented the Cork association in London in 1658.⁹

Henry Cromwell cultivated both the Cork association, under the leadership of Worth, and the Ulster Presbyterians. This was a move away from the influence of the Baptists and Independents, more in the direction of an organised and centralised church. It was a conservative movement and one that promised to be highly successful; had it been given time to develop the religious history of the country could have been very different. Indeed on 20 January 1658 Henry Cromwell issued a proclamation against ejected ministers of England and Scotland who had come to Ireland.¹⁰ Cromwell hoped to prevent unwanted and divisive elements entering the country, give the kind of church he wanted a chance to grow and thereby broaden the basis of Protestant consensus in the country.¹¹

He further encouraged this growth by calling ministers to Dublin in April 1658 to discuss their differences and try to come to some agreement together by which they could

8. B.L., Landsdowne MSS 823, f. 57. Worth was born in Cork and ordained in June 1641; he became Dean of Cork in 1645; by 1650 he was acting as minister in Cork, with Joseph Eyres and John Murcot, in controversy with the Baptists there; in 1655 he became minister at Waterford and returned to Cork in 1658. In 1660 he resumed his office as Dean of Cork and became bishop of Killaloe in 1661. John Power, 'Waterford clerical authors, from the work of Rev. Thomas Gimlette', in *Irish Literary Enquirer*, no. 3, (Dec 16, 1865), p. 28; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 117-22, 126-32. P. Dwyer, *The diocese of Killaloe from the reformation to the close of the 18th century* (Dublin, 1878), pp 317 ff, 343.

9. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p. 121. Joseph Eyres was born in county Cork and educated at Trinity College Dublin with Worth. He worked in Cork with Worth. *Alumni Dublinienses*, pp 5,354,895; B.L., Add. MSS, 19833, f. 12; B.L., Landsdowne MSS 823, f. 91. He wrote *The church sleeper awakened* (Cork and London, 1659) which gives a good picture of the strengthening power of the association in Cork and the standards required of the congregation there.

10. 20 January 1658, *By the Lord Deputy and Council* (Trinity College Dublin, Printed Books, Press A 7, 19).

11. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 117-122.

live and act in harmony. Such differences had prevented good government and divided the people: a convention of ministers was a possible way of resolving the problem.¹² The convention of ministers which met in Dublin in April 1658 faced a big agenda: maintenance of ministers; conversion of the Irish; healing of divisions; catechising and use of the sacraments; discipline and suppression of heresy; sabbath observance.¹³

Presbyterian influence at the convention was decisive and it neutered the power of the Independents. Tithes were re introduced and this was a major victory for Worth and the Ulster presbyterians. Edward Cooke, a Quaker, took a poor view of their work:

'The committee of old priests sitting at Dublin have approved of them...and challenge the 10th part of our goods which they say is now their own...[they] set themselves to roost in the old mass houses up and down the nation'.¹⁴

Worth went to England to present the findings of the convention to the English presbyterians in London, Oxford and Cambridge. He received full approval and told Henry Cromwell that those he met thought they could 'close with the congregational brethren on the terms humbly presented to your excellency by the Dublin convention'.¹⁵ Thus, in his capacity as leader of the presbyterians in Cork, Worth exercised real influence in ecclesiastical affairs in the country. Associated with him were such ministers as Joseph Eyres of Cork,¹⁶ Samuel Ladyman of Clonmel,¹⁷

12. The problem was raised in 1657: Proposals humbly tendered in order to the preventing such inconveniences as they may arise..1657 (B.L., Lansdowne MSS 1228, ff 8-10).

13. The humble address of the ministers by authority assembled out of the several provinces of Ireland. May 1658 (B.L., Lansdowne MSS 1228, f. 14; William Urwick, *Independency in Dublin in the olden times* (Dublin, 1862), p. 25.

14. F.L.L., Edward Cooke, *A paper from Quakers shewing the wickedness of the young priests lately come over into Ireland and how the evil justices of the peace set up the old mass houses for them. And also the taking away of goods out of people's houses that cannot for conscience sake pay for mending of old mass houses* (n.p., c.1658); for Edward Cooke, see Ch. 6, n. 17. Edward Worth, *The servant doing and the Lord blessing* (Dublin, 1659), p. 30. Lord Chief Justice Pepys advocated tithes and fixed ministries; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 155-60. See Ch. 6, n. 17.

15. Worth to Henry Cromwell, 20 July 1658 (B.L., Lansdowne MSS 823, f. 79). In June 1658 Henry Cromwell wrote to his father, supporting all that Worth was doing in Ireland and omitted that both he and Worth were against the Independents. *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, 7 vols, ed. T.Birch (London, 1742), vii, 162.

16. See above, n. 9.

17. Henry Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae*, 6 vols (Dublin, 1845-78), i, 347; B.L., Lansdowne MSS 823, f. 51. Ladyman conformed at the Restoration, and was appointed to the diocese of Cashel (Bodl., Carte MSS 221, f. 130; Bodl., Carte MSS 160, f.6).

Claudius Gilbert of Limerick¹⁸ and Daniel Burston of Waterford,¹⁹ all sympathetic to the presbyterian model of church government within Ireland and England. They belonged to the emerging number of ministers, not only in Cork but in the country, who were prepared to work for and support a form of national church on the lines proposed in 1648 but never actually executed.

By 1660 Henry Cromwell had left Ireland and the political climate was volatile. Yet there were signals of hope when Samuel Coxe, preaching to the General Convention in March 1660, argued for a presbyterian form of church government, denouncing the Independents, Quakers and Anabaptists.²⁰ But the hopes raised at the General Convention in Dublin were short lived and by the autumn it was clear that the Established Church would be restored.²¹ This meant that ministers would have to make up their minds as to where they stood, whether they could/would conform to the new realities. Edward Worth wrote to Bramhall in December 1660 and told him that the ministers in Cork had met for over a week and drawn up a paper of submission. In this paper they promised:²²

we shall observe duly in our respective cures those parts of the church liturgy or Common Prayer against which we know no just exception. Whereto we conceive ourselves more strictly engaged because we live in the midst of papists who are not distinguished by any other legal character but that of recusancy to the Common Prayer.

They admitted that in difficult times they had let some of the ecclesiastical laws drop, but argued also that these were 'alterable and changeable and not to be equated with

18. See Chapter 7, n. 3. Gilbert conformed at the Restoration.

19. Burston conformed after the Restoration. Power, *Waterford clerical authors*, p. 28; J. Colman, 'Some early Waterford clerical authors', in *Waterford Arch. Soc. Jn.*, vi. (1900), p. 178; Burston wrote *The evangelist evangelising* (Dublin, 1662) which was approved by Convocation in March 1663. T.C.D., MS 1038, f. 76v; *Fasti*, i, pp 140, 156, 174. Burston was minister at Tallow in 1655 and was probably a member of the Cork association. In his book, (pp 23,31,272), Burston admitted receiving 'presbyterial imposition of hands' which he rejected later on in favour of episcopal ordination. He became Dean of Waterford in 1670.

20. *Two sermons preached at Christchurch Dublin beginning the General Convention of Ireland* (Dublin, 1660). Coxe was minister at St. Katherine's church in Dublin and had been in Athlone prior to that; he was ejected in 1662. Representative Church Body, MSS Libr. 14, *Vestry Book of St. Katherine's and St. James, 1657-1692* pp 3, 25, 31, 47; John Healy, *History of the diocese of Meath*, 2 vols (Dublin, 1908), i, 299.

21. See Ch. 2. pp 26-7.

22. Worth to Bramhall, 3 Dec 1660, cited in Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland*, p. 227.

the word of God'. Some ministers 'conscientiously scruple' and there was genuine variety in practice, through circumstances, 'yet that variety naturally flows from one and the same principle of truth and unity'. It was essentially a pragmatic move on the part of the ministers, a change in direction, based on the need to have a church and government which could guarantee organised and disciplined church order, and protect ministers and people from Papists. However it was expressed, the ministers recognised that their project was a failed one, or at least that it had a new context and focus: that of the Established Church.

Thus several ministers conformed in 1661 and others had by March 25 1668 and were allowed to continue holding cures as members of the Established Church.²³ Others could not in conscience conform and they continued within the presbyterian tradition they had tried to develop in the south of Ireland, in communion with their colleagues in the north; they were joined by some who had not been in Ireland during the Interregnum and gradually formed themselves into separate churches. In this context Wood Street congregation in Dublin emerged as the centre for English Presbyterianism in Ireland.

+ COOKE STREET

CHURCH - see p. 88

The early history of Wood Street is scant. Certainly it existed in 1647 and was an Independent Church for John Owen preached there.²⁴ From 1652-61 Stephen Charnock, fellow of Trinity College Dublin and lecturer at St. Werburghs, preached at Wood Street. In 1657 he was joined by Edward Veal, who had been ordained for Dunboyne and was also a fellow of Trinity College Dublin; Veal left Dublin after the Restoration.²⁵ Samuel Marsden ministered at Wood Street after 1662, having been ejected from

23. Act of Uniformity 1668. Before the 25 March 1668 all clergy were to give public assent to the Book of Common Prayer and the ceremonies of the Established Church; by the 29 September 1668 they were to be episcopally ordained and have taken the declaration against rebellion and in particular the Solemn League and Covenant.

24. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 66.

25. Ibid, p. 68; Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism in Dublin*, p. 313. Veal left Dublin after the act of Uniformity was enforced and ran an academy at Stephney; Charnock had been Henry Cromwell's chaplain and was involved in the 1663 Plot, after which he moved to England. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 117, 136-7, 143.

Cheshire.²⁶ The church seems to have been unmarked by debate or controversy in the period before and after the Restoration and gradually, from Charnock's time, its Independent character gave way to that of English Presbyterianism.

In 1667 Daniel Williams, chaplain to the Earl and Countess of Meath and pastor at Drogheda was called to Wood Street congregation. There

he had an opportunity of public service for near twenty years, by his labours in the pulpit, by his prudent advice, by improving the interest he obtained in persons of the highest rank and by several other methods in which Providence chose to make him a general blessing.²⁷

While there is little written evidence regarding his time in Ireland, its impact was reflected in his will. He left money for the poor of Wood Street congregation and for the French refugees, as well as £1000 in perpetuity for promoting the gospel in Irish, all to be administered by trustees from Wood Street and New Row congregations.²⁸ He became better known when he went to London in 1687, where he was friendly with Richard Baxter and later with William of Orange; indeed at the turn of the century he was at the centre of debate between Presbyterians and Independents. While in Dublin Williams was assisted by Gilbert Rule from 1682-7, while Rule was seeking refugee from persecution in Scotland. Later Rule became Principal of Edinburgh University and adviser to William of Orange in Scotland.²⁹ Both men tried to keep the peace in the difficulties between Capel Street and Newmarket congregations, and did not enter into the debate, except when Williams wrote to

26. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 68.

27. Daniel Williams, *Practical discourses on several important subjects. To which is prefaced some account of his life and character*, 2 vols (London, 1738), ix. Williams was born in Wales c.1643/4 and came to Ireland soon after the Restoration as chaplain to the countess of Meath and pastor at Drogheda. He married into a wealthy family; his wife was the countess of Mountrath's sister and a convert of Edward Baynes of Cooke Street. Edmund Calamy, *A funeral sermon preached upon the occasion of the [death of] Mrs. Elizabeth Williams, June 10 1698* (London, 1698), pp 72-3, 89; D.N.B; Witherow, *Historical memorials*, pp 60-5.

28. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 68-9; E. Calamy, *A continuation of the account*, 2 vols (London, 1727), ii, pp 968-98.

29. Ibid, p. 69; Williams was influenced by Rule and his Scottish Presbyterianism. Gordon, *Freedom after ejection*, p. 384. See Ch. 3, n.56.

the general committee in the north to express concern over affairs in Dublin, and contributed to the resolution of the conflict.³⁰

The low public profile of Wood Street changed when Joseph Boyse came to Dublin in 1683 as assistant to Daniel Williams. Boyse was born in Leeds in 1660 of a puritan family and educated at Stepney by Stephen Veal, formerly of Wood Street. In 1662 Boyse went to Amsterdam and was chaplain to the Brownists there for some time. In 1679 he became chaplain to the Dowager Countess of Donegal in Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, and in 1683 came to Dublin. There he remained for forty five years and in the course of that time built up a reputation as a writer of weight, entering into the controversies of the day and strengthening the links between the northern, Scottish Presbyterians and the southern mainly English Presbyterians.³¹

It is basically through Boyse's writings that the history of Wood Street and the English Presbyterians in Ireland can be traced. Indeed while English Presbyterians in the south of Ireland were much fewer in number than their Scottish counterparts, nevertheless they maintained and extended their presence in the country. The diary of John Cook, written at the end of the 17th century, gives some useful details of how the English Presbyterian Church had evolved since the Restoration and the number of congregations in the south of Ireland.³²

When Cook began ministerial training in Dublin he 'began with several others a course of weekly exercise and disputation before the ministers of Dublin, Mr. Robert

30. Antrim minutes, pp 255-6, 265.

31. D.N.B; Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 70; Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism*, p. 314; Witherow, *Historical memorials*, pp 79-87. Controversies between Boyse and William King are dealt with in Chapter 8 ; and those concerning the Sacramental Test in Chapter 9.

32. Presbyterian Church in Ireland Historical Society Library, Belfast, *Diary of the reverend John Cook begun 1698*. Cook was born in Dublin 1677 and baptised by Mr. Chambers in Francis Street. In 1688 he was sent away to Whitehaven for safety until 1690 and on his return had a tutor for three years until he was ready to train for the ministry.

Henry, Mr. Nathaniel Weld, Mr. Joseph Boyse, Mr. Elias Travers, Mr. Alexander Sinclare, Mr. Thomas Emlin who held weekly meetings to this purpose'.³³ This group worked together on the formation of ministers, even though they belonged to different Presbyterian and Independent traditions: Robert Henry belonged to Capel Street congregation; Nathaniel Weld to New Row; Alexander Sinclare to Bull Alley; Elias Travers to Cooke Street; Boyse and Emlin to Wood Street.

Boyse put Cook in touch with the thinking of Baxter and 'had a very great veneration for him'. Cook wanted to follow both men's teaching and develop a 'charitable latitude in matter of opinion'. In c. 1696 Boyse and Emlin received Cook as a candidate for ministry in Wood Street, 'both (and especially the latter) being of very great abilities and eminent preachers'.³⁴ By 1697 he had passed all his trials and was licensed to preach. In that capacity he was sent to different congregations in the south of Ireland. He preached in Carlow, Clonmel, Waterford, Cork, Kinsale, Limerick and Tipperary. In May 1700 he received a call from Andrew Roe, 'a wealthy man', and friends in Tipperary, a small congregation which met in Roe's house. They promised him £50/£60 per annum with accommodation.³⁵

The following year, the little congregation wanted him to be ordained in order to have a communion service themselves; otherwise they had to go Clonmel for that. The request was laid before 'the ministers of Dublin and afterwards before the Munster ministers' and all agreed that Cook should be ordained for Tipperary. On 1 October 1701 he was ordained in Mr. Roe's house by ministers from Bandon, Clonmel, Waterford, Youghal, Cork, Mallow and Galway.³⁶ While there is no evidence to show how big

33. *Diary ofCook*, p. 3.

34. *Diaryof Cook*, p. 4.

35. In the 18th century there were two Roe families in Co. Tipperary, one in Thurles, the other in Cashel. William Nolan, 'Patterns of living in Co. Tipperary from 1770-1850' in William Nolan (ed.), *Tipperary: History and society* (Dublin, 1985), pp 306-7. In April 1686 one of Andrew Roe's children was baptised in New Row. New Row Baptismal Register, f.10.

36. *Diary....of Cook*, pp 5-6.

congregations were in the various towns, and every likelihood that they were small, nevertheless they continued to exist and exercised their own authority to call and maintain a minister; the body of ministers in Dublin and in Munster, the Dublin and the Munster presbyteries, acted as overseers of these churches and they ordained ministers as they thought fit and ready.

A hint of some of the differences that were occurring at this time between presbyterian ministers of differing traditions is caught in Cook's account of his examination prior to ordination:

Some exceptions were for awhile insisted on, on account of my latitude in the Arminian and Unitarian articles, but in compliance with the more severe temper of the aged brethren with whom I had to do, and being unwilling to sacrifice the Church's peace and the usefulness of my life and labours, to words and phrases, (in which according to the present plan the controversy very much lay) I gave a moderate satisfaction and removed their scruples, I renounced the systematic phrases and did my Confession in expressions of the greatest latitude and clearness I could.³⁷

Such latitude was tested in Dublin when Thomas Emlin was accused of denying the divinity of Christ and cast out of Wood Street by his own association of ministers in Dublin. Emlin came to Ireland as assistant to Boyse in 1691. Prior to that he had been chaplain to the countess of Donegal in England and in 1684 he accompanied her to Belfast. There he became friendly with Claudius Gilbert, who had been overtly presbyterian in Limerick during the Interregnum and conformed at the Restoration.³⁸ Emlin attended service in the parish church on Sundays in Belfast, and Gilbert came to Emlin's sermons in the Countess' house. Emlin often officiated for Gilbert in the parish church; in fact he had a licence to preach from the bishop and most thought Emlin had conformed; he even wore the dress of an Established Church clergyman.³⁹

37. *Diary.....of Cook*, pp 6-7.

38. Witherow, *Historical memorials*, pp 130-46; John Nelson, 'The Belfast Presbyterians, 1670-1830' (Ph.D. Q.U.B., 1985), p. 32.

39. *The Works of Mr. Thomas Emlin*, 3 vols (London, 1746), v-ix. Emlin was born in Lincolnshire in 1663 and went to Emmanuel College Cambridge; his parents, though puritans, were friendly with their local bishop.

In 1688 Boyse asked Emlin to join him in Wood Street on the condition he clarify his position in Belfast. Rumours had spread to Dublin that Emlin was preaching in the parish church, without license or ordination. Emlin replied that while he was prepared to preach anywhere he had not compromised on the question of ordination or subscription (presumably to the 39 Articles).⁴⁰ He did not accept Boyse's invitation then, but went to England where he met William Manning, a Socinian, who influenced Emlin's thinking at this time. Boyse repeated his request in 1690 and on this occasion Emlin agreed to come to Wood Street.⁴¹

By all accounts Emlin was a popular preacher. The members of Wood Street congregation were wealthy and of rank; among them was Esther Bury, a widow and daughter of a Jewish merchant in Meath, David Sollom. He married Mrs. Bury in 1694 and settled down to what promised to be a long stay in Dublin. However, by 1697 Emlin realised that he was

convinced that the God and father of Jesus Christ is alone the supreme being and superior in excellence and authority to his son....who derives all from him.⁴²

He decided to say nothing and for a time his views were not noticed. In June 1702 Dr. Duncan Cumming, a lay elder and former student for the ministry, told Boyse he had doubts about Emlin's orthodoxy. They decided to visit Emlin and ask him to declare his views on the divinity of Christ. Emlin told them he did not believe Christ to be equal with God, thereby denying the doctrine of the Trinity. At this point Emlin offered to leave Dublin and cause no problem to the congregation. Boyse insisted that the case be brought before the Dublin presbytery, which was a coalition of Scottish Presbyterian, English

40. *Works of Thomas Emlin*, x-xii; George Mathews, *An account of the trial... of Thomas Emlin for publication against the doctrine of the Trinity, with a sketch of his associates, predecessors and successors* (Dublin, 1839), pp 2-3.

41. *Ibid*, xviii; Mathews, *An account of the trial of ...Thomas Emlin*, pp 4-5.

42. *Ibid*, p. 17.

Presbyterian and Independent ministers. This meeting consisted of Nathaniel Weld of New Row, Independent; Elias Travers of Cooke Street, Independent; Francis Irredell of Capel Street, Scottish presbyterian; and Mr. Tate, who was minister to Sir Hercules Langford at Summerhill.⁴³ They dismissed him immediately without further consultation.⁴⁴ Writing some years later,⁴⁵ Emlin explained that he had difficulties with the doctrine of the Trinity for some years prior to the crisis in Wood Street. He was not alone in this and noted that John Howe, formerly Lord Massarene's chaplain, had put forward the idea of three infinite minds (tritheistical scheme) and no one had publicly dismissed and tried him. The instant dismissal offended Emlin and he resented that none of his congregation had been either consulted or even told he was leaving. So he decided to call the deacons and chief managers of the church and told them:

that differences in opinions had rendered me offensive to some there and to the other ministers, so that it seemed best I should leave them; therefore I thankfully owned the kindness and respects they had shown me for so many years and desired their dismissal.⁴⁶

The Dublin presbytery gave Emlin permission to go to London but told him not to preach there; they sent a special delegation to tell him this before he left Dublin, threatening to write about this to London.

To this imperious message, so full of affectation of authority and expressive of rigid presbyterian tyranny, (which yet was attended by an Independent minister (Weld) as one of the messengers)...they assumed too much in forbidding me to preach, who had no authority from them, nor owned any in them over me; that I had as much authority to forbid them to preach as they to forbid me....And this I suppose is what the northern ministers (in their address and apology to Queen

43. Healy, *History...of Meath*, i, pp 313-15; in 1683 Bishop Dopping of Meath forbade Tate to baptise or preach. For the Langford family: Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 104-6; David Nokes, *Jonathan Swift* (Oxford, 1985), pp 111, 220.

44. Mathews, *An account of the trial...of Thomas Emlin*, p. 10ff; [J. Boyse] *The difference between Mr. E[m]lin and Protestant dissenting ministers of D[ublin] truly represented* (n.p., 1702); *Diary ofJohn Cook*, p. 9. From at least 1682/3 dissenting ministers in Dublin met once a month to confer on matters of common interest. Urwick, *Independency in Dublin*, p. 30.

45. [Thomas Emlin], *A true narrative of the proceedings of the dissenting ministers of Dublin against Mr. Thomas Emlin*, (London, 1719), p. 12 ff

46. *Ibid*, p. 18

Anne, in answer to the convocation) call my being solemnly deposed from my office by a presbytery (though I never knew any who owned themselves to be such in Dublin).⁴⁷

Obviously Emlin resented the manner in which he was dismissed and the authoritarian attitude adopted by the Dublin presbytery, and he accused the ministers of acting like the Pope. When he reached London he set about publishing his own account of what happened in Dublin.⁴⁸ He sent several copies over to Dublin but the Dublin presbytery withheld them from the public until Boyse had written his response to Emlin's account;⁴⁹ both were published together, around the time that Emlin had returned to Dublin to settle his affairs.⁵⁰ While in Dublin he was arrested and put on trial on June 14, 1703. The court was composed of two archbishops and five bishops and Boyse was called to give evidence against Emlin. The court ruled that Emlin should be jailed and pay £1000 fine. The Archbishop of Dublin, Narcissus Marsh, in his capacity as Queen's Almoner, charged him a shilling in the pound of the whole fine.

All Emlin's former friends disowned him, especially those of superior rank in society; the dissenting ministers of Dublin ignored him and none came to visit him while he was in prison.⁵¹ In September 1702 the Munster presbytery declared against Emlin.⁵² This must have disappointed him deeply for he had tried to contact some of his former colleagues, among them John Cook, who was sympathetic towards Emlin. In 1702, at an ordination at Leap, Boyse told Cook that Emlin was about to be dismissed. On his return home to Tipperary, Cook received a letter from Emlin explaining his position and that he had decided to break from Wood Street congregation. A few days later Cook

47. Emlin, *A true narrative*, pp 19-20; *Diary of.... Cook*, p. 9.

48. *Humble Enquiry into the scripture account of the Lord Jesus Christ* (London, 1702); *Diary of...Cook*, p. 9.

49. Joseph Boyse, *A vindication of the true deity of our blessed Saviour* (Dublin, 1703).

50. *Diary of.... Cook*, p. 9. Cook visited Emlin in December 1702 while Emlin was still in Dublin; Emlin gave Cook copies of his account, hoping no doubt for support from him.

51. Emlin, *A true narrative*, pp 23- 31. Bishop Wethenhall visited him privately in jail and was friendly towards him. (p.29); *Dairy of.... Cook*, p. 11. Cook noted that the fine was reduced to between £60-70 after some time.

52. *Diary...of Cook*, p.10; D.N.B.

had another letter from Emlin saying this had happened and that he would go to England; but he refused to observe the sentence of the Dublin presbytery, not to preach there.

Obviously Emlin hoped for some understanding and support from Cook and other ministers. Cook admitted they had treated him badly:⁵³

In September last [1702] was an assembly of the southern ministers at Cork, where they joined in subscribing a protestation against Mr. Emlin and his errors. This was done not with that exactness that a matter of that nature requires for it was upon a bare account in general which they had from the ministers in Dublin. However, for peace sake and for avoiding animosity and contention, which being usually attended with the greatest uncharitableness.....I submitted to subscribe the same. I am not without very great doubts in this matter so much debated..

Emlin resented the intolerance he received in Dublin, from the dissenting ministers and from the Established Church. Referring to the Dublin presbytery which dismissed him, he was angry:⁵⁴

that men who dissent on principles of conscience and liberty and find so much indulgence from an Established Church, should yet domineer and impose on their brethren with such imperious, cruel severity, and even threaten them with the execution of those laws against which themselves once made such loud and uneasy complaints.

He was equally disillusioned with the Established Church in Ireland; he had enjoyed toleration in Belfast, but that was toleration from an absentee bishop, Thomas Hackett.⁵⁵ Emlin had thought the Established Church would have allowed latitude to discuss matters of religion, and he saw this as part of the Protestant tradition:⁵⁶

53. *Diary ...of Cook*, p.10. Cook must be recognised as sympathetic to Emlin for he was passed over when Wood Street congregation asked for him to succeed Emlin as assistant to Boyse. Cook did not really want the appointment, considering the treatment Emlin had received. In any event Richard Choppin was appointed in March 1703.

54. Emlin, *A true narrative*, Appendix, p. 66; Emlin recognised that Boyse was genuinely disturbed at his imprisonment and tried to help him then. Ibid, pp 36, 40.

55. Thomas Hackett was bishop of Down and Connor from 1672- 1694 and for most of that time resided in London. Hackett was deprived in 1694, following examination by an Ecclesiastical Commission. Bodl., MSS Carte 40, f. 265; Bodl., Carte MSS 220, f. 33; *Tanner Letters*, pp 465-6, 468, 486-8,490; R.C.B. MSS, Gg/2/7/3/27; Bodl., Rawlinson MSS c 926; Lambeth Palace MSS, Gibson Papers 929, 946; B.L., Lansdowne MSS 446; S.P. 63 256 nos 29, 30, 32,38,41 i and ii, 55 i; Cotton, *Fasti*, iii,208,232; v,235; i,240,466.

56. Emlin, *A true narrative*, p. 11.

Might not any Protestant then, all these things considered, venture upon a serious examination of modern creeds by the light of revelation, the words of Christ's own mouth and the writings of his inspired apostles ? Or might not I, who had been brought up in a diligent study of the scriptures and admitted to be a teacher of others, justly expect the liberty of declaring what I judged to be the doctrine of the gospel though rejected by others not more infallible than myself ?

Emlin was released from prison in July 1705 and went to England where he preached to a small congregation. He visited Ireland from time to time and saw 'the middling sort of people' who always welcomed him. Many of them felt that he had been treated badly and that a decrease in the Wood Street congregation dated from his dismissal.⁵⁷ Certainly the debate did not end there, either in Ireland or in England, but there was greater scope and toleration for Emlin in England, especially after the Salter's Hall decision in 1719 not to require subscription to any confession of faith.

Dissenters were in a difficult position at this time. In 1697 it was declared in law blasphemous to deny the Trinity, to maintain more than one God, to deny Christianity to be true or to deny the divine authority of the old and new testament.⁵⁸ Emlin's stance became a test case and dissenters could not afford to be seen against the law of the land. For this reason alone they could not afford to tolerate Emlin; he was the first Unitarian and paid the price for his conviction. No doubt there were many like Cook who agreed with him or at least had doubts and queries; there were probably many more who puzzled over the meaning of the Trinity and privately wondered at the relevancy of the debate. Most of all, Emlin himself knew that real freedom of debate was both impossible and yet key to any possibility of harmony within and between the churches. He cited Chillingworth:⁵⁹

57. *The Works of Mr. Thomas Emlin*, xlii.

58. David Berman, 'The Irish counter-Enlightenment', in Richard Kearney (ed.), *The Irish Mind* (Dublin, 1985), pp 121, 129, 137; In 1697 the Act for effective suppression of blasphemy and profaneness was passed. D.Berman, *A history of atheism in Britain from Hobbes to Russell* (Crom Helm, 1988), p. 25.

59. Emlin, *A true narrative*, p. 58.

This restraining the word of God from that latitude and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and his apostles left them, is and has been the only foundation of all the schisms of the church.

Boyse was never long without some involvement in debate or controversy and soon after the Emlin affair had quietened down the issue of episcopacy emerged again. Boyse and King had debated this a little in 1687.⁶⁰ However, King never took the issue further at that time, probably because of the political situation in Ireland then and because all Protestants needed to band together against the threat of Roman Catholicism. All this had quite changed by the early 18th century and such a fundamental point of difference between the Established Church and the presbyterian tradition became a subject of real debate.

In 1709 Boyse preached at an ordination in New Row, Dublin and in the course of the sermon denounced diocesan bishops and called such:

a grand and pompous sinecure, a domination over all the churches and ministers in a large district managed by others as his delegates but requiring little labour of a man's own and all this supported by large revenues and attended with considerable honours.⁶¹

In the sermon Boyse examined the role and function of leadership in the early church,⁶² and proved to his satisfaction that elders or ministers were never mentioned as subject to a bishop; in fact the office of elder and bishop were one and the same. Neither were bishops fixed in geographical areas in New Testament times; thus no diocesan bishops were established at that time, or made any claims to authority; indeed none of the apostles ever made episcopal claims as such. The superiority of bishops over presbyters began early after the apostles, when bishops in the large cities began to claim authority over lesser towns; this was a power struggle, not a question of a superior office or order in the church. As a human

60. See Ch. 8.

61. J[oseph] B[oyse], *The office of a scriptural bishop* (Dublin, 1709), p. 4. Boyse's argument here against bishops was basically what he had said in 1687: Christ never instituted diocesan bishops.

62. Ibid, p. 5 ff

constitution, bishops of larger cities like Rome and Constantinople began to claim superintendency over several particular churches. Damage was really wrought when these bishops began to turn several churches into one church governed by a bishop, something not in the gospels and not intended by Christ.⁶³

At the Savoy conference Ussher's model of episcopacy was offered as a compromise but it was rejected by the Church of England. This would have provided some middle ground between the churches and Boyse regretted that such good will was not matched by openness on the part of the restored church at that time. Indeed some bishops had declared the ordinations and ministries of dissenters null and void because they lacked the authority and ordination of a diocesan bishop, an attitude which was most offensive to the dissenters and rejected by them.⁶⁴

Boyse's sermon was answered by Edward Drury.⁶⁵ He rejected all Boyse's arguments, especially his calling the office of bishops 'a grand and pompous sinecure'. Drury argued that the Crown added some privileges to the office of bishop, but they were temporal dignities and had nothing to do with the fundamental, gospel office of bishops in the church. For Christ had invested some with power to be the rulers; this was not given to all, so there was a superior office that some exercised in the church. He claimed a difference in order and office as part of the church established by Christ from the beginning.⁶⁶

The debate continued and spread north to Belfast where John Campbell wrote to Boyse and asked him to prove from scripture that presbyterians had the right to ordain and

63. Boyse, *The office of a scriptural bishop*, pp 13-17.

64. Ibid, p. 18.

65. Edward Drury, *A discourse occasioned by Mr. Boyse's ordination sermon, entitled The office of a scriptural bishop* (Dublin, 1709). Cotton, *Fasti*, ii, 163, 154, 143. Two other Established Church ministers replied to Boyse in the same year. Matthew French, *An answer to Joseph Boyse's ordination sermon entitled The office of a scriptural bishop and to its appendix* (Dublin, 1709). Cotton, *Fasti*, iii, 267, v, 247; [Charles Whittingham], *Remarks upon some passages in Mr. Boyse's sermons vol i, more particularly in the Preface and the last sermon entitled The office of a scriptural bishop* (Dublin, 1709); Cotton, *Fasti*, ii, 130, 154.

66. Ibid, pp 3-4.

exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction; he asked the same of questions of John McBride of Belfast and Robert Craghead of Derry. He received no reply. So in 1710 he wrote a public letter to all dissenting ministers in Belfast, and the letter was actually delivered while the moderator was preaching.⁶⁷ Thomas Gowan replied to this letter in 1711.⁶⁸ Gowan cited some letters that he had received from his own colleagues in the ministry. One from John Abernethy asked that the debate be ignored as it flouted the wishes of the Queen in Parliament, when she asked that controversies cease. Apparently Abernethy had a letter from Campbell saying that Boyse's sermon in Dublin was the root cause of all the controversy. Nevertheless, Abernethy claimed that ordinations had taken place in church history without the presence of bishops.⁶⁹

John Malcolm⁷⁰ wrote to John Campbell and asked him to explain why the Established Church accepted the baptism of those who converted to them; was that not an admission that orders in others churches were valid ? Yet he resented that even the re ordination of Huguenot ministers was required 'though they come from that once famous church of France'.⁷¹ Gowan wrote to Campbell and argued that the office of apostles was extraordinary and temporary, that bishops and presbyters in the New Testament were one office; this was the doctrine of the Fathers of the Church in the first three centuries. In the light of this presbyterians could ordain and exercise jurisdiction.⁷² James Kirkpatrick wrote it even more clearly to Campbell when he said that bishops and presbyters had the:

67. John Campbell was an established church minister at Killead in Connor and Sego in Dromore. Cotton, *Fasti*, iii, 104,106; N.L.S., Pamphlets 2/97, No. 4.

68. Thomas Gowan, *The power of presbyters in ordination and church government without a superior asserted and proved from holy scripture* (n.p., 1711); McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 64, p. 37; no. 270, p. 103.

69. Gowan, *The power of presbyters*, pp 4-7. For Abernethy, see McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 213, p. 89.

70. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 186, p. 78; Witherow, *Historical memorials*, pp 217-20.

71. Gowan, *The power of presbyters*, pp 10-11.

72. *Ibid*, pp 12-18

same names, same work, same power in managing that work and the same qualification for it; they are the same persons and their office in every respect the same.⁷³

What lay behind this argument was different for Dublin and for the north of Ireland. When Boyse debated with King in 1688 and preached in Dublin in 1709, he asked that his church be accepted as valid, with valid orders and ministries, catholic in every way. When John Campbell asked the northern presbyterians to clarify their position on orders and jurisdiction, it was a much more serious issue. For the Established Church, bishops and clergy, resented the fact that presbyterians held synods and exercised jurisdiction over their people independently of the government. This was particularly sensitive at a time when Convocation had been summoned in 1703 but only licensed to act in 1711.⁷⁴

Gowan was aware of this and at the end of his work declared that jurisdiction was an unscriptural expression. He recognised that the Established Church could not make laws without permission from Parliament. Yet he assured Campbell that according to the Westminster Confession, Ch. 23, par. 3., presbyterians accepted the power of the civil magistrate to call synods and to be present at them. For Boyse, whose church would never hold any political or ecclesiastical threat to the Established Church, the debate remained theological, and he persisted. So in 1716, at another ordination, Boyse rejected

a late set of writers that call themselves Protestants who cry up the absolute necessity of an interrupted line of succession by what they call episcopal ordination....and this line of succession they are forced to derive through the polluted channel of the apostate church of Rome....Those reformed churches that have not retained the diocesan form of government, they reckon all their ordinations invalid and null....and all these pretended teachers...never sent by Christ, no better than lay intruders.⁷⁵

73. Gowan, *The power of presbyters*, p. 40. For Kirkpatrick, see Ch. 9, n. 82.

74. William Tisdall, *The nature and tendency of popular phrases in general*, (n.p., 1713) pp 19-20. See Ch. 10, n. 2.

75. Sermon xxxvi, preached at the ordination of Rev. Mr. John Leland, 1716 in Joseph Boyse, *Works*, 2 vols Dublin, 1728), i, p. 419.

But the fire of the debate did not catch; episcopacy had little to fear from Boyse and his colleagues. They had neither the numbers nor the organisation of the Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster. With the death of Boyse in 1728, Wood Street and indeed the English presbyterian tradition in Ireland had lost one of its best ministers who entered into all the debates of the day with vigour and consistency.

In the beginning, during the Interregnum in Ireland, clerics like Edward Worth in Cork and his associates had hoped for a national form of church government based on the *form of church government* passed in 1648 but never implemented. After the Restoration of the Established Church this hope died. Contrary to the Scottish Presbyterians, who could count on real support from Scotland and on the long tradition and presence they had in Ulster, the English Presbyterians had no such support or tradition in Ireland, except that of a few years of experimentation during the Interregnum. Through their own determination and good leadership, through their convictions sharpened by debate and controversy, English Presbyterians survived in Ireland. Had Scottish Presbyterianism triumphed as it did in Scotland then the history of English Presbyterianism in Ireland could have been very different. This was not to be. English Presbyterians did not expand or challenge the Established Church in Ireland in any serious way but they were an embodiment of another tradition of Protestant dissent in Ireland.

NO, COOKE ST.
WAS ENGLISH
PRESBYTERIAN
See PA 98-99.
Pine Kilmoy.

INDEPENDENT CHURCHES IN IRELAND, 1655- 1711

While Wood Street tended towards the English Presbyterian tradition, and Bull Alley and Capel Street to the Scottish Presbyterian tradition, [both] New Row (and Cooke Street *) belonged to the Independent/congregational tradition in Ireland. New Row church was founded when Samuel Winter and Samuel Mather were deposed for nonconformity in 1661 and had to withdraw from St. Nicholas parochial church. New Row boasted that it had never known division because they did not 'impose human inventions' and 'stuck to the Bible alone', keeping respect for each others religious rights.¹ In reality the Independents had been losing power in Ireland since Henry Cromwell effectively replaced Fleetwood in 1655. Cromwell wanted to develop a wider, more comprehensive church and so favoured the Scottish and English Presbyterians, thereby weakening the power of the Independents.²

In reaction to this and to the attitudes of their colleagues in ministry in England,³ the Independent churches in Dublin and Leinster, under the leadership of Winter, established their own forms of discipline and order in the autumn of 1659.⁴ They saw themselves as an association of ministers in Dublin/Leinster and they defined the form of church order and discipline needed to live in the midst of many enemies: Popery, Prelacy, Arminianism, Socianism, Seekerism, Quakerism,

1. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 21-2.

2. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 112-7; Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii, 560-2. See the signatures to the 1658 Address of the ministers to Henry Cromwell (B.L., Lansdowne MSS, 1228, f. 14). In this address it evident that both Samuel Winter and Edward Wale were reluctant signatories; they indicated this by signing separately from the body of ministers and with a heading 'For the substance of the matter I subscribe to the premises'.

3. Ibid, p. 128.

4. *The agreement and resolution of the ministers of Christ associated within the city of Dublin and province of Leinster*. Dublin 1659.

Antiscripturism and Erastianism.⁵ They opposed Popery and Prelacy in particular:⁶

not only as it is described in the Solemn League and Covenant but also as it is cried up by some in these days under the specious disguise of moderated, regulated or primitive episcopacy, and all the inventions of man tending thereunto.

This was an obvious rejection of Scottish Presbyterians and of Worth and the association of ministers in Cork. To survive in the midst of these and to counteract their influences, family worship was advocated in detail. This included reading of the scriptures, prayer, singing of psalms, repetition of sermons, observance of the sabbath. The ministers underlined the need for catechising according to the shorter or larger catechism, though ministers were free to use a different text if they wished. In this way the basic tenets of faith were passed on. The Directory of 1645 was to be used for worship.⁷

Discipline according to the scriptures was to be observed; those who did not do so would be excommunicated, though they could be readmitted on repentance. The offices of pastors and teachers were described, with that of the ruling elders and deacons. Pastors and elders were called to ministry by the people and were to be prepared properly before ordination or appointment. A general meeting, or assembly, was to be established for the sake of unity and to resolve differences. Meetings were to be called in the city, county and province which would be attended by ministers and elders. At the first general meeting a moderator would to be chosen, as well as a registrar to keep the minutes and records. All affairs were to be kept confidential and members were to have no involvement in civil and commonwealth affairs.⁸

5. *The agreement and resolution*, p. 2.

6. *Ibid*, p. 3.

7. *The agreement and resolution*, pp 5-8.

8. *Ibid*, pp 9-12

This structure set in motion the church order for Independents for the rest of the century. This *Agreement and resolution* did not initiate anything that had not been tried and lived out in Dublin and in some other parts of Ireland.⁹ It was rather a reflection of lived experience and it was written at a time when the Independents had gradually lost power and influence both in Ireland and England. The *Agreement* tacitly recognised this and the Independents saw themselves as the elect of God living in the midst of enemies, needing to support one another in order to survive. The Restoration interrupted this process for a time but enough had been articulated to allow the Independents to continue and consolidate what had been expressed in the 1659 Agreement.

New Row Independent church had powerful leaders in Winter and Mather and while both had to leave Ireland in 1661, Mather was able to return soon after and hold meetings in his house in Dublin until New Row was ready. He came to Ireland in 1654 to attend Henry Cromwell. In 1656 Mather was ordained in St. Nicholas church by Samuel Winter of Trinity College Dublin, Timothy Taylor of Carrickfergus and Thomas Jenner of Drogheda. He was made senior fellow of Trinity College Dublin and co pastor with Winter in St. Nicholas parish, though he preached every six weeks in Christchurch. Mather was also a commissioner for the approbation of ministers in Cork in August 1655, and so he enjoyed an established position in church affairs in Ireland. Yet, while convinced of his own way, Mather did not assume an aggressive stance towards other religious groups. When Cromwell asked him to displace episcopalian ministers Mather refused to do so, saying he was sent to preach the gospel but not to hinder others from so doing.¹⁰

9. Edward Wale to Henry Cromwell October 1658 (B.L., Lansdowne MSS 823, ff 134-6).

10. Mather was born in Lancashire in 1625; his family went to New England in 1634 and Mather graduated from Harvard in 1643. He returned to England and ministered in Oxford, Leith and then came in Dublin in 1654. R.L.Greaves and Robert Zaller, *Biographical dictionary of British radicals in the 17th century*, 3 vols (Harvester Press, 1982-4), ii, 228; D.N.B.; R.C.B., Seymour MS, p. 41; Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 277; Armstrong. *Summary history of the presbyterian churches*, p.79; William Urwick. *Independency in Dublin in the olden times* (Dublin, 1862), pp 16,23. William Urwick. *Early history of Trinity College Dublin, 1591-1660* (London, 1892), p.77; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p. 149; A.G. Matthews, *Calamy revised* (Oxford, 1934), p. 344. Commonwealth State accounts, *Anal. Hib.* xv, 1944, p. 295; Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, 2 vols (Hartford, 1853), ii, 39 ff; New Row Baptismal Register, ff 1-3.

Mather was disenchanted at the Restoration and expressed his disapproval of restored episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer, seeing in both the influence of Rome. Because of this, he was particularly insistent that the communion table at service was understood as a table for fellowship and not as an altar of sacrifice. The vehemence of his preaching caused Mountrath to forbid him to preach in October 1660; he was told to hand in his sermon notes, which he refused to do.¹¹ At this point he left Ireland for some time and by 1664 had returned ; in that year he was interrupted while preaching in Dublin and sent to prison for a short period.¹² Mather's sermon notes were published after his death by Nathaniel Mather, his brother, and no doubt these were the substance of what Mather preached in the early days of the Restoration.¹³

A collection of Mather's sermons was printed in 1683, again by his brother, and through them we can glean the essential traits of the Independent church in Dublin under his leadership. No doubt this reflected continuity from the Interregnum period into the new experience of being fully nonconformist.¹⁴ In keeping with the theology of particular churches, Mather taught that hierarchy of any kind was contrary to the gospel:¹⁵

For one gospel minister to claim a supremacy of jurisdiction over another gospel minister, within his own charge and congregation, this is that for which we justly call the Pope Antichrist.

11. *A testimony from the scripture against idolatry and superstition, in two sermons...The first witnessing in general against all the idols and inventions of men in the worship of God, the second more particularly against the ceremonies and some other corruptions of the Church of England. Preached the one Sept. 27, the other Sept. 30, 1660*(Dublin, 1672).

12. Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland 1647-1661*, pp 90,141; Urwick, *The early history of Trinity College Dublin*, pp.41-46; Mountrath and Bury to Secretary Nicholas 4 October 1660 (*Cal.S.P.Ire.*, 1660-2, p.41); E.Calamy, *An historical account*, 2 vols (n.p., 1830), ii, 415-19.

13. *A defence of the protestant religion against popery, in answer to a discourse of a roman catholic.* By an English protestant (n.p. 1672). The advertisement was signed by Mather: Dublin, July 31 1670.

14. Samuel Mather, *The figures or types of the Old Testament, by which Christ and the heavenly things of the gospel were preached and shadowed to the people of God of old* (n.p. 1683).

15. Mather, *The figures or types* p.189.

This of course was aimed not just against the papists but also at the Established Church, as well as the presbyterian churches of the English and Scottish traditions. They all had forms of church government and jurisdiction that expressed hierarchy and dependence. In contrast to this, the congregational churches stood alone and governed themselves as a single, gathered church of Christ. Mather was particularly hard on the Esatblished Church:¹⁶

There is a mongrel generation risen up, whom some have justly called Calvino-Papistas, Calvinian Papists, who are for the protestant doctrine and for popish worship. I refer it to everyone's conscience to judge whether it may not be fitly applied to our late innovators, who are for a 'linsey-woolsey' religion, a mixture of sound and wholesome doctrine with anti christian popish worship. The wine is mixed with water. The Protestant faith with popish ceremonies and superstitions.

Such human ceremonies were opposed to divine ceremonies and Mather saw the former as full of darkness and as 'the imps of Antichrist'. Peace among the churches, yes, but not at any price.¹⁷

Mather outlined the discipline of the gathered or congregational churches, which resembled the 1659 Agreement. For example, the process of excommunication indicated the standards expected in an Independent church. For private scandals suspension was imposed on the offending party. This was a temporary banning from church, from the sacraments and from voting, though technically the person was still a member of the church. Full and immediate excommunication was imposed for public offences such as fornication and incest.¹⁸ In the execution of such punishments the elders held great power. The minister told the congregation 'what God would have them to do' and the elders actually excommunicated the offenders. 'Somebody must do it and who better than the officers who have the

16. Mather, *The figures or types*, p.189.

17. Ibid, pp 189, 261ff, 352ff

18. Ibid, pp 366-84, *The gospel of the leprosy*, 12 April, 1665.

government of the church in their hands?'. The people were expected to shun the company of the excommunicated and were watched to see that they did so.¹⁹

If a congregation became lax or corrupt the minister might have:

to close with the lesser but sounder part of the people. And this is the remedy that all godly ministers generally have taken: they have left out the ignorant and profane parts of the parish from the sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper.²⁰

Although only one baptismal record exists for the Independent churches in the 17th century, it seems that in Ireland membership of the church had been established in two ways during the Interregnum. According to the practice of Samuel Winter in St. Nicholas within the Walls signing a covenant was required. This was a New England practice and one no doubt followed by Mather, too, for there was constant exchange and correspondence between ministers at this time. In 1662 the New England synod affirmed the permanent and personal membership of children baptised in the church, and of their right in turn to have their children baptised, too; voting in church matters and admittance to the Lord's Supper was reserved to the regenerate. Such was called the Half-Way Covenant and it served to prevent decline in membership.²¹

On the other hand, John Rogers, Independent minister at Christ Church in 1653, required a declaration of conversion and faith; signature of the covenant was optional. His congregation gave testimony to their experience of conversion either through dreams, sermons, inner experiences of change, all confirming their election.²² Rogers defined an Independent Church very

19. Mather, *The figures or types*, pp 381-2.

20. Mather, *The Figures and types*, p. 384.

21. Certainly children were baptised in New Row church from 1653 (New Row Baptismal Register, 1653-1737); E. Brooks Holifield, *The Covenant sealed* (Yale, 1974), pp 169-71, 196.

22. John Rogers, *Ohel or Beth-shemish* (London, 1653), Book ii, Ch. 6, pp 402-18; Also, 'The Covenant of the Church in Dublin collected out of the word of Christ according to the order of the Gospel'. Ibid, Book ii, Ch. 7, pp 459-60. For Rogers: Edward Rogers, *Life and opinion of a fifth monarchy man* (London, 1867), pp 57-74; P.G. Rogers, *The fifth monarchy men* (London, 1966), pp 20-27, 34-5, 43-5, 54-7, 63-7.

clearly in 1653, and gave a detailed description on how to form such a church and provide for the admission of new members. This was a format for the admission of adult members and did not envisage then the question of admitting children to the church.²³ However, by c. 1665 the Independents had reached consensus in Ireland along New England lines, for in his *Irenicum* Mather referred to the Independent practice of admitting 'such parents as besides the profession of Christian faith walk without offence and so are judged worthy of the Lord's Supper, and their children'.²⁴

Mather regretted that the first reformers had not totally abolished all popish things. Had this been done many divisions and conflicts could have been avoided. The Restoration brought back holy days, music in church and vestments when they had begun to disappear from church practice. No wonder he was disappointed when episcopacy was restored in 1660; it must have seemed a backward step. Yet Mather held that tithes in some form were necessary and that Parliament should settle this by law.²⁵

This then was the outline of the discipline and church order obtaining in New Row congregational church in Dublin after the Restoration. It retained the forms of worship and discipline from the Interregnum and it survived its critics. Among such was Samuel Coxe who preached two sermons to the General Convention of Ireland, one in March and the other in May 1660.²⁶ Speaking from within the English Presbyterian tradition, Coxe declared:

23. Rogers, *Ohel or Beth-shemish*, pp 137, 239ff; Rogers, *Life and opinion of a fifth monarchy man*, pp 63-7.

24. Samuel Mather, *Irenicum, or an essay for godly union wherein are humbly tendered some proposals in order to some union among the godly of different judgements* (London, 1680); pp 14-16; For the contacts between the two countries, see *The Mather Papers*; Winter was influenced by John Cotton in New England. Greaves and Zaller, *Biographical dictionary*, iii, 333. Edward Wale in Waterford had strict conditions for reception into his congregation (c.1658) (B.L., Landsdowne MSS 823, ff 134-6); Urwick, *Independency in Dublin*, pp 11-12.

25. Mather, *The figures or types*, pp 440, 595, 612, 649-50, 673ff

26. Samuel Coxe *Two sermons preached at Christchurch Dublin beginning the general convention of Ireland* (Dublin, 1660). See Ch. 4, n. 20.

The Anabaptists, the Quakers and even all those that have separated from the church of Christ in these nations have so interrupted our counsels, disturbed our Parliament and supplanted our laws and birth privileges ...

In particular Coxe urged that separate congregations be suppressed:

I desire this, that none be permitted to gather churches (as they call them) out of our parochial congregations or to exercise acts pertaining to church government in any of their private meetings.²⁷

While Coxe's criticisms were aimed at all types of separatists, the Independent tradition was included in his condemnation. He hoped for a presbyterian form of church settlement and saw the congregational way as fragmenting church presence and effectiveness. Ormonde saw it differently and perhaps from a more pragmatic point of view. He proposed to give 'congregational men some more indulgence than the law does'. This was to encourage non conformists in England to come to Ireland with their trade and stocks and so help to build and sustain the economy. Clear guidelines were issued whereby those who came had to profess full acceptance of the doctrine of the Established Church and the authority of the King and in return were freed from the penalties of the Act of Uniformity. They were allowed to exercise freedom of conscience, to build their own churches and have their own meetings as long as the bishop was informed and they met during the daytime. They could elect their own ministers and support them, though they were also obliged to pay the usual tithes in the parish. A register was to be established by the bishop and everyone over 16 years was to be listed there, sign an agreement to keep the peace and take the oath of abjuration.²⁸

27. Coxe, *Two sermons* pp 7, 25-6.

28. *Certain proposals humbly offered to the removal of such persons from England as by reasons of non conformity there* (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, ff 243, 275, 293, 288); Price to Bramhall, 5 July 1662. H.M.C., *Hastings MSS*, iv, 134.

This arrangement gave Independents the possibility of settling down in Ireland with the assurance that they could worship in peace. This was conditional on their observing the guidelines given them and so any hint of non observance was treated with suspicion. They had no legal guarantee of religious freedom and no protection from the law; it was toleration in return for peaceful behaviour and there were many who even then believed they were not to be trusted. It was important for their survival and freedom that the Independent churches avoid any hint of unrest or disquiet.²⁹

In this context the crisis caused in New Row congregation in 1669 by the preaching of Jeremiah Marsden needed to be dealt with quickly in order to protect both ministers and congregation.³⁰ In the hearing of friends and enemies Marsden had omitted to pray for the King and called all ceremonies contact with Satan's throne. This was inflammatory and the day after the sermon Mather spoke to Marsden and told him 'the godly ministers that walk with this church together with the elders and deacons desired a meeting within a week'. Marsden never came to the meeting, so two votes were passed:³¹

The one concerning your sister, declaring her a non member (which I have given her in a letter to her dated Nov. 10 1669). And the other concerning yourself, viz. that this church declared its disapproval of those reflections and offensive passages to the civil authority in our brother Marsden's late prayer and sermon.

Mather refuted the millenium sense that Marsden had used when preaching on the text Revelations 2. 13, which conjured up memories of the Fifth Monarchy and the turmoil of the civil war. Marsden's views had given real offence

29. Bodl., Carte MSS, ff 286, 288.

30. *A friendly consideration of some of the mistakes about the fifth monarchy*, 12 Nov. 1669, Dublin (Bodl., Rawlinson MSS, D 1347); Marsden with two of his brothers had come over to Ireland during the Interregnum. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland* p.140; Greaves and Zaller, *Biographical dictionary*, ii, 214-15. Marsden had been in Ireland in 1657-59, in Armagh and Clonmel; he maintained Fifth Monarchist views until his death in 1684, in Newgate. Walter Wilson, *The history and antquities of dissenting churches and meeting houses in Westminster and Southwark, including the lives of their ministers*, 4 vols (London, 1808-14), ii, pp 464-7; E. Calamy, *A continuation of the account* (London, 1727), ii, 942-5; E. Calamy, *An historical account*, ii, 796; B.S. Capp, *The fifth monarchy men* (London, 1972), pp 210, 212, 218, 221.

31. Mather, *A friendly consideration*, f.46.

to the magistrates and civil authorities in Dublin. While Mather agreed with Marsden in substance he could not accept his manner of expression which was too extreme. In fact Mather had gone to jail for similar views nine or ten years earlier: 'Nor do I disown the sober notion of the Fifth Monarchy but have preached it'.³² But Marsden wanted to pull down the magistrates, preach the Fifth Monarchy and he called the King a ruler of Sodom and Gommorah. Mather made it clear that now he held that good laws and good magistrates were in fact signs of the Fifth Monarchy. He reminded Marsden that the scriptures called all to pray for the King and magistrates. And while he accepted that the sacraments, church ordinances and the power of the keys had been abused, yet for all that the legal powers of magistrates were not rendered invalid. The King had been restored against both their wishes, but it had happened and they should accept this as the reality of the situation and not dream of other times.³³ In time all their hopes would be realised, 'by God's Providence'. Mather's views so expressed indicated a marked difference in tone and indeed a neutering of radical thought. No longer aspiring to be an agent of change, Mather had compromised his more extreme views in order to survive.

Marsden's sermon put the church under suspicion. It was reported that he had preached against the King in Mather's house, and people in high office in Dublin expressed surprise that this should be tolerated by Mather. As a result Mather's meetings were stopped and he was threatened with prison. There was a rumour that letters were sent to the King about it. This was serious for Mather explained to Marsden that over the years the King had been generous with 'peaceable nonconformists' and especially with Mather himself; the church had been left in peace to practice its own institutions, exercise church

32. Mather, *A friendly consideration*, f. 54.

33. Ibid, ff 47-50. Marsden did not renounce his views. In 1684 Richard Baxter wrote a tract against Marsden: *The second part against the schism, being animadversions on a book famed to be Mr. Ralphson's* (London, 1684). Ralphson was a pseudonym used by Marsden.

discipline, ordain and excommunicate, sing psalms during the Lord's supper. In other words, they had a lot of freedom to worship as they wished.

Mather reminded Marsden that Dr. Harrison, minister at the second Independent church at Cooke Street, had warned him:³⁴

When you first came over you told me Dr. Harrison sent this message by you to your sister: Remember me to your sister and tell her I hear she is breaking off from the church. Tell her it is not good to walk alone. I hear the reason of her breaking off is because Mr. Taylor and Mr. Mather used to pray for the King...tell her that will do us no hurt'.

Yet Marsden had done as his sister and brought the church into disrepute and put in jeopardy the religious liberty they had 'in Dublin in great measure now these nine years'.³⁵

Dr. Harrison, known as 'the walking Bible' came to Cooke Street in 1670. This church was English Presbyterian by tradition though it had famous Independent ministers as pastors; certainly Mather looked to Cooke Street for support and confirmation of his ministry. The church gathered at Winetavern Street when its minister, Edward Baines, was ejected in 1661. There the congregation met until 1673 when their new meeting house was ready in Cooke Street. Both Baines and Harrison had been in Ireland during the Interregnum, Harrison as chaplain to Henry Cromwell,³⁶ and Baines invited over to Ireland from Cambridge. Baines seems to have been within the English Presbyterian tradition and after ejection formed a congregation at Winetavern Street.³⁷ Baines died in 1670 and was succeeded that year by Thomas Harrison who returned at the request of the congregation.³⁸

34. Mather, *A friendly consideration*, ff 51-2.

35. Ibid, f. 18.

36. B.L., Landsdowne MSS 821, ff 155, 164, 170, 174, 212, 218, 222, 332. Mather supported Harrison when he needed to go to Dublin to escape his critics (f. 222).

37. Baines was involved in Blood's Plot. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 142-3.

38. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 83-84; Thomas Harrison, *Topica Sacra*, Dedicated to Henry Cromwell (Kirkbride, 1712); Edmund Calamy, *An account of the ministers, lecturers, masters and fellows of colleges and schoolmasters who were ejected or silenced after the restoration in 1660* (n.p., 1713), p. 121; Urwick, *Early history of Trinity College Dublin*, p. 81; Urwick, *Independency in Dublin*, p. 18. Harrison preached in America, England and Ireland. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 72, p. 39.

Harrison left Ireland with Cromwell in 1659 and on his return in 1670 had an effective ministry and was 'admired by all the brethren above all the rest'.³⁹ This church was attended by Lord Massarene, the Countess of Donegal,⁴⁰ and Lady Cole of the Enniskillen family. John Howe, who was appointed chaplain to the Massarene family in 1671, preached at both Cooke Street and Antrim until he returned to London in 1675. The bishop of Down and Connor as well as the archbishop of Armagh allowed him 'free liberty to preach in the public church in that town [Antrim] every Lord's day in the afternoon.'⁴¹ Elias Travers succeeded Howe as chaplain to Massarene in 1676, preached at Cooke Street and was ordained there by the Dublin Presbytery. Again he was facilitated by a former presbyterian of the English tradition since he stayed with Claudius Gilbert when he was preaching in Belfast.⁴² As a church it does not seem to have entered into public controversy, but tried to live quietly under the mild toleration of the government.

It seems then that the Independent tradition was able to exist in Dublin after the Restoration and enjoyed a degree of freedom that its counterpart in England envied. When Faithful Teate died in Dublin in 1666 there were huge numbers at his funeral, including the Lord mayor and aldermen and many of all ranks of society, about three thousand in all.⁴³ Similarly when Harrison died in 1682 there were huge numbers at his funeral and the funeral

39. 20 Aug. 1670 (Bodl., MSS 221, f, 174v).

40. A. Gordon and G.K. Smith, *Historic memorials of the first Presbyterian Church of Belfast* (Belfast, 1887) p. 10. Laetitia Hicks, countess of Donegal, was an English Presbyterian who had English Presbyterians as her chaplains: William Keyes, Samuel Bryan and Thomas Emlin. Keyes accepted the authority of the Scottish Presbyterians in the north and belonged to the Antrim meeting.

41. Howe had been in Ireland before the 1641 rebellion and returned to England during the rebellion. He was favoured by Cromwell, and ejected in 1662. In 1665 he took the Oxford oath and in 1671 returned to Dublin. E. Calamy, *Memoirs of the late Rev. Mr. John Howe* (London, 1734). For further detail on Howe, see Ch. 1, p. 20.

42. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 86; Urwick, *Early history of Trinity College Dublin*, p. 77; Joseph Boyse, *A sermon preached at the death of Mr. Elias Travers, + 5 May 1705 at Cooke Street under the care of Mr. Travers* in *The Works of Mr. Boyse of Dublin*, 2 vols (London, 1728), 430-1.

43. Bonnell to Strype, 23 Oct. 1666 (Cambridge University Library. Baumgartner Papers, Strype correspondence (hereafter Baumgartner Papers), Add. 4, iii, pt.i, f.20); St.J.D. Seymour, Faithful Teate, in *R.S.A.I. Jn.*, series 6, vol x (1920), pp 39-45; Calamy revised; B.L., Add Ms 36792, f. 34; B.L., Add MSS 15669, f. 15; Bodl., Carte MSS 328, f. 82; H.M.C., *Hastings* iv, p. 123. For Bonnell, William Hamilton, *The exemplary life of James Bonnell, Esq. Late Accomptant General of Ireland* (London, 1707); H.R. McAdoo, 'The religion of a layman' in *Search. A journal of the Church of Ireland*, vol 14, no. 1 (Spring, 1991), pp 36-43.

sermon was preached by Daniel Williams of Wood Street. Whatever about their past, the Independents after 1660 in Ireland were not seen as a great threat to the government, particularly as they were single gathered congregations and not bound to others in any organisational way. As Toby Bonnell wrote to John Strype:

Our nonconformists I hear make a shift to meet privately oft and that quietly...ours it seems are not troublesome nor quarrellsome as those of Scotland lately were, which also makes our bishops connive the more.⁴⁴

So Mather ministered unhindered in New Row, except for the period immediately after the Restoration and when Marsden threatened to preach up the Fifth Monarchy. Just as the Ulster Presbyterians could ill afford to have fanatics within their congregations, neither could the Independents allow divisive, disruptive elements among them. There was in fact no Fifth Monarchy movement in Ireland that Marsden represented, but to even evoke the old fears and memories was danger enough. Mather seems to have calmed the situation and nothing came of the threats to his congregation.

Mather's leadership in Dublin was a focus for unity and it is clear that he tried to reconcile differences between the Independents, Presbyterians and Baptists.⁴⁵ In his *Irenicum* he affirmed the common ground between the three churches: the Westminster Confession; prayer, preaching the Word, the Sabbath. Indeed, commenting on the Sabbath, Mather wrote:

There is no scruple made of joining together in prayer and preaching and hearing one another, which accordingly is ordinarily practised amongst us in this city.....for it was a thing much scrupled at in the former age before the late reformation by some whose name and sect have disappeared, being worn out by the further progress of the light and work of Christ amongst us.⁴⁶

44. 25 Dec.1666, Baumgartner Papers, Add. 1, f.1.

45. Mather, *Irenicum*.; T.J.Holmes, *The Minor Mathers* (Harvard, 1940), p.154.

46. Ibid, pp 2-4.

In the difficult area of church order and worship, Mather found uniting principles: the rule of scripture; ministry and ordinances appointed by Christ; careful admission to the Lord's Supper; rejection of episcopacy and the ceremonies of the Established Church. Even then he noted that they did not reject individual members of the Established Church. However, they differed on the issue of the universal, visible church, for Presbyterians denied the validity of particular churches; they also diverged on whether ordination was for a definite congregation or 'sine titulo'; and there were differing views on the function and authority of elders and of the Presbytery.⁴⁷ The question of baptism was key and Mather had to admit that reconciliation of views was most difficult with regard to it. Baptists held to adult baptism; Presbyterians administered baptism to all 'who profess the Christian religion and their children', while Independents added 'and are worthy of the Lord's supper'. Mather recognised that while there was some ground for meeting Presbyterian views, there was none for accommodation with the Baptists.

Changing his focus, Mather suggested that union and communion in Christ be the source of their unity, and within that perspective he proposed: that they recognise one another as true ministers of the gospel, help one another in ministry and receive approved members of each church to the Lord's Supper. It was the basis for some common vision and shared communion, since they were in 'a suffering condition together, under the pressures and yokes of men upon their consciences'.⁴⁸

However by 1668, on Mather's own admission, the pressure on their consciences was light. He wrote to his father:⁴⁹

47. Mather, *Irenicum*, pp 4-13.

48. Ibid, pp 16-18. Ministers from other churches performed baptisms in New Row (New Row Baptismal Register, ff 1,7,8,11,12,20).

49. Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, ii, 52.

If any had told me in April 1660 that I should have exercised the liberty of my ministry and conscience, either in England or Ireland, and that without conforming to the corruption of the times, and this for seven or eight years together, I should not have believed it; I should have thought it next to an impossibility.

Indeed he wrote the same to Marsden in the following year. Speaking of the King, he wrote:

He has suffered this church to practise all the ordinances and to observe all the institutions of Jesus Christ...even church discipline and excommunication, yea the singing of psalms....this church has ever practised it, whensoever they celebrated the supper of the Lord, which ...they did, even when things were at the worse, they have always concluded with the singing of a psalm, though it did expose them and their meeting to the more observation.⁵⁰

Mather recognised that at least they had Protestant rule in the country, and were allowed freedom of worship. The ideal for Mather would have been the purity and simplicity of the gospel, 'when the Lamb shall overcome the Beast' and all would be in the 'Kingdom of Christ in the 1000 years'.⁵¹ The future looked promising. In 1670 so many dissenting ministers came to Dublin that they had to be dispersed throughout the country.⁵² But this did not last long and by 1684 the situation had changed, at least for the Independents.

In that year John Baily, Independent minister at Limerick, noted that his church was in decline. The immediate reason was his imprisonment in Limerick but he recognised that unless 'some godly young man might be had, whose charge is small and might be less taken notice of than I was' the church in Limerick would fail. From at least 1682 some of his congregation began leaving for New England and Baily felt they had lost enthusiasm for and commitment to the church.⁵³

50. Mather, *A friendly consideration*, f. 52.

51. Ibid, f. 53.

52. Bodl., Carte MSS 221, f. 174.

53. *To my loving and dearly beloved Christian Friends in and about Limerick, 8 May 1684* (n.p.); *The Mather Papers*, p. 488. John Baily was born in Chester in 1643 and ministered in Limerick from 1669-83, when he went to New England. He was offered a chaplaincy by Ormonde, and promised a Deanery or even a bishopric, which he refused. He was jailed for non conformity in 1683 and he divided his congregation in seven groups and one group came daily to the jail for a sermon. Unable to continue thus he left Limerick in May 1684. Cotton Mather, *The life and death of....John Baily* (Boston, 1698), pp 33, 37-8; *The Mather Papers*, pp 486-91; James Holmes, *Increase Mather, A bibliography of his works*, 2 vols (Ohio, 1931), i, p. 142, n. 1.

The hazard for Independent churches, in terms of their future, was their lack of organisation between churches such as practised by the Scottish or English Presbyterians. This would have been alien to their theology and practice, for they were gathered churches, single congregations, having bonds of friendship with other churches but nothing more. In the absence of records it can be surmised that such isolation contributed to their decline in Ireland. Moreover, there was no provision for training second generation ministers for their churches; Baily hoped for 'some godly young man' but that was all. Without definite planning for and training of future ministers hope could not materialise into active ministry, at least in Ireland at this period:

Could we but procure a magistracyand a ministry, I know none might compare with us...Ireland has but few [ministers] it being but a planting, as it were, in that respect, though the north is very full.⁵⁴

As it was Baily could only exhort his congregation to live well, meet together and 'make your calling and election sure'. Their own theology worked against them; too much independence led to dispersion:

I advise you not to be strangers one to another; this has been an old fault all along.⁵⁵

To leave Limerick was not an easy decision, for Baily knew that his departure put the future of the church there in question.⁵⁶ Strictly speaking a congregation did not need a minister to be a church, but this was different in that Limerick congregation was losing a minister and had little hope of another. This was only important if they wished to go into the future. The theology and practice of the single, gathered congregation saw to immediate needs of

54. Thomas Baily (brother of John) to Cotton Mather, 6 June 1683. *The Mather Papers*, p. 491.

55. *To my loving and dearly beloved Christian friends*, p. 34.

56. Ibid, p. 5: 'I have peace in what I have done, whatever constructions at home or abroad may be put upon it'. Nathaniel Mather did not support such decisions, seeing them as desertion of the cause. David Cressy, *Coming over. Migration and communication between England and New England in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 51.

people; perhaps it was within the context of Providence that their future was viewed and it did not really matter that this or that particular church might not survive.

In 1682 Nathaniel Mather wrote to Increase Mather:

My maintenance falls short of what it was formerly and I fear is like to decrease. Few are added to us and the Devil has stirred unhappy instruments, both to beget prejudices against us and sow ill deeds of dissatisfaction among us...The Lord guide and help us.⁵⁷

Evidently New Row church was in difficulty, and it was a significant admission on Mather's part in 1687 when he declared:

I have long, and am still of opinion that it is as good for Protestants that are cordially so, to live under wise and just Popish governors as such Protestants as we have had many.⁵⁸

This admission from within the Independent tradition was a measure of the change that had occurred. Yet as early as 1669 Samuel Mather indicated a withdrawal of Independents from the political stage. In his reply to Marsden he appealed to Providence:

We must wait on the Lord's time for it and keep His way, and in the meantime submit to his wise and holy Providence....God has ways enough for the safety of his people besides that of making saintship a title to government.....For what is Antichrist but a minister intruding into the work of a magistrate ?.⁵⁹

This attitude, unthinkable in the 1650's, indicated acceptance of their inability as a church to influence political events. To try to do so was to act as Antichrist. Strong words indeed, but they were an adaptation to reality and a recognition of the need to find ways to live within it. As the century wore on it became more and more difficult for the Independent churches to survive financially. Because of this it was

57. 7 Nov. 1682, *The Mather Papers*, pp 40-1. Mather's final remark could refer to the friction between Capel Street and Newmarket congregations in Dublin. However, in March that year, Mather refused to baptise in private, indicating friction within his own church (New Row Baptismal Register, f. 7).

58. Mather to Richard Lobb, 26 Feb. 1687. *The Mather Papers*, p. 66.

59. Mather, *A friendly consideration*, ff 23, 49.

hard to attract and maintain ministers, and the future looked precarious. What rescued not only the Independent but also the English Presbyterian Churches from chronic decline was the establishment of a General Fund for both churches.

In contrast to New Row, Wood Street and Cooke Street churches had wealthy congregations which supported their ministers. Some of the ministers themselves were wealthy in their own right, or were patronised by wealthy families.⁶⁰ On the other hand, New Row does not seem to have been wealthy; indeed Nathaniel Mather complained of poor maintenance. Such a position, in the context of greater wealth and influence in the other Dublin churches, was potentially divisive, something hinted at by Mather in 1682.⁶¹

Strangely enough it was the imposition of the Test Act in 1704 which galvanised the congregations and ministers of both the Independent and English Presbyterian churches into action. In response to the evident hardships that ministers were suffering a General Fund was established in 1710.⁶² The aims of those who set up the Fund was to safeguard liberty of conscience, attract ministers to poor, small congregations, and encourage students for the ministry. The 'inconvenience and difficulty of private applications from particular persons on particular occasions and emergencies' was recognised. At the same time it was pointed out that wealthy persons had both the capacity and spiritual obligation to promote the aims of the General Fund. Steps were taken to administer the Fund correctly and a deed of trust was drawn up.

60. Boyse's sermons indicate the number of wealthy members in his congregation. See *Works*, i, Sermons, pp 311, 318, 430-1, 435-9. Richard Choppin came from 'an opulent Presbyterian family'. Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, pp 70; see p. 56, 58, 78; Boyse and Emlin were chaplains to the countess of Donegal and Travers was a nephew of Lord Robartes and chaplain to Massarene. From the evidence of his will, Williams was very wealthy man through marriage and property acquired. E. Calamy, *A continuation of the account*, ii, pp 983-89; E. Calamy, *A funeral sermon*, (London, 1698), pp 72, 89. E. Calamy, *An historical account*, ii, 56-7; H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, iv, 26; Emlin, too, married into a wealthy Jewish family from Meath. Emlin, *Works*, xx.

61. *The Mather Papers*, pp 40-1. He could have been referring also to the tensions within Capel Street congregation which led to a rupture in 1683.

62. Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism*, p. 33. The idea of a General Fund was first mooted in 1696; Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 58.

The first trustees were the ministers from Wood Street, Capel Street, New Row, Cooke Street and Plunkett Street (formerly Bull Alley). So it was a shared Fund between the Scottish Presbyterian, the English Presbyterian and the Independent churches.⁶³ In addition to the Fund, the English Presbyterians received 'The English Bounty' from Queen Anne in 1708 which must have helped the churches at this time.⁶⁴ Through the Bounty and the Fund the churches were rescued from the fate that John Baily feared in 1684. With a guaranteed income, however small, decline was slowed down and while expansion was not possible, maintenance was guaranteed, ministers provided for and the future of the churches ensured.

The sharing and administration of this General Fund was possible because Independents and Presbyterians had been co-operating with one another since the Restoration. And although English Presbyterians in theory at least, and Scottish Presbyterians in practice, had a stronger sense and different understanding of ministerial association than the Independents, the three churches worked together, out of necessity and the need to survive. This was the communion that Mather had advocated in his *Irenicum*.⁶⁵ It was essential that the churches in Ireland act as body and that disputes did not emerge publicly. There is evidence that some tensions between the English Presbyterians and the Independents lay below the surface and could not find expression in Dublin.⁶⁶

63. Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism*, pp 33-5. Wood Street was by far the greatest contributor to the Fund, especially Sir Arthur Langford. Joseph Damer of Tipperary also gave substantial monies. The Fund was £1,500 in 1710 and by 1829 had risen to £7,670, of which £6,750 came from Wood Street. Damer had been a Cromwellian soldier who fled to France in 1660 and returned in 1662. He bought lands in Co. Tipperary and through sheep farming built up a money lending business in Dublin. He was one of the executors for part of Daniel Williams' will. He died in 1720 leaving a fortune of £400,000. Swift wrote a satiric poem about him. P.C.Power, *History of South Tipperary* (Mercier Press, 1989) pp 81-2; Daithi O nOgain, 'An tOr Bui. Staidear an ghne de sheanchas Thiobraid Arann' in William Nolan (ed.), *Tipperary: History and society* (Dublin, 1985), pp 146-7; Calamy, *Continuation of the account*, ii, 983.

64. Ibid, p. 22. The Queen, under the influence of Calamy gave 'out of her privy purse the sum of £800 a year for the support of the English Presbyterians in the south of Ireland'. Classon Porter, *Regium Donum and ministerial maintenance* (Belfast, 1884), p. 13. But see J.C.Beckett, *Protestant dissent in Ireland, 1687-1780* (London, 1948), p. 115.

65. Certainly Emlin felt betrayed by his colleagues in Dublin and thought that Wood Street congregation began to decline from that time. Richard Choppin, preaching at Boyse's funeral in 1728, referred to 'this declining congregation'. Emlin, *Works*, xlii; Choppin, *A funeral sermon*, (Dublin, 1728), pp 12-3.

66. *The Mather Papers*, p. 41

However this changed when Daniel Williams and Nathaniel Mather moved to London after 1687. Both Williams and Mather were candidates in 1688 for the ministry at Lime Street Congregational Church in London. The members of the Church were hesitant about Williams' candidacy, even though he declared acceptance of particular, organised churches, that such 'are the proper seat and subject of gospel ordinances'; that they had power within themselves for their own government, without any outside jurisdiction; 'that visible saintship is the qualification of adult members'; that synods were for unity, not government; and that the consent of the church was required for admission to membership and for censures. Williams also promised not to change 'the practice of this church'.⁶⁷

In the event Lime Street congregation appointed Nathaniel Mather, for 'we think a Presbyterian minister an unsuitable officer to a congregational people', though it was hoped that Williams could be an occasional preacher in the church.⁶⁸ Tensions did not rest there and soon Mather and Williams clashed on the issue of predestination. With the movement towards some form of centralisation and proposed accommodation, especially in London, Independents and Presbyterians were bound to be at variance. This could not have happened in Ireland, especially in Dublin, for both churches could not afford to entertain public disputes there. Indeed it was Williams who helped keep the peace between the Scottish Presbyterians of New Market and Capel Street.⁶⁹ It is interesting that both Mathers and Williams, who had spent a long period in Ireland, only contended in public when they had moved to London. There they had wider scope and the issue of the *Heads of Agreement* to grapple with, and a different context within which to debate.⁷⁰

67. Robert Browne to James Ball, 27 June 1688 (Dr. Williams Library MSS 24. 67, no. 2. See also no. 1).

68. D.W.Lib. MSS 24. 67, nos 3 -5, June-July 1688. Wilson, *The history and antiquities of dissenting churches*, i, pp 212-50.

69. Gordon, *Freedom after ejection*, p. 384.

70. Daniel Williams, *Man made righteous by Christs's obedience*,...also some remarks on Mr. Mather's Postscript (1694) in D.Williams, *Practical discourses*, 2 vols (London, 1738), pp 169-275. N. Mather, *The righteousness of God through faith upon all without*

From the time of Henry Cromwell's arrival in Ireland the fortunes of the Independent churches changed. Cromwell's policy of widening the basis of church government to include Scottish and English Presbyterians robbed the Independents of their special status. Whereas Cromwell had no desire to crush the Independents his policy in effect reduced their influence and power in the country. From 1660 onwards the Independent churches in Ireland, mainly through the leadership of Samuel Mather of New Row, supported by Harrison of Cooke Street, survived and retained their particular theology. In 1695 Boyse wrote 'Of...the Independents and Anabaptists, there are but six congregations I know of in the Kingdom'. It is clear that there were two Independent congregations in Dublin: New Row and Cooke Street; one in Limerick; Gideon Jacque was minister to an Independent congregation in Wexford. James Wood ran a school in Tipperary and presumably had a congregation there; Thomas Jenner wrote his work against the Quakers 'living in Carlow in Ireland'.⁷¹ Because they were so few⁷² and therefore not a political threat these churches were left unhindered except in a time of political crisis, as in 1682/3. Even then they acceded to Marsh's request that they meet at home and not in their churches. Their need to survive and present a common front in Ireland helped to prevent controversy splitting the Independents and Presbyterians. It also provided the basis for a sharing of financial resources which guaranteed their futures.

difference who believe (London, 1694); John Howe to Wm. Taylor 18 Aug. 1694 (Bodl., Carte MSS 80, f. 584). For an account of the debate and its context, Michael Watts, *The dissenters*, (Oxford, 1985), pp.289-97; C.G.Bolam, *The English Presbyterians* (London, 1968), pp 113-25.

71. Boyse, *The case of the dissenting Protestants of Ireland* (Dublin, 1695), p. 2. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 167, p. 69; Magee College MSS 29, ff 395-401; Mathews, *An account of the trial...of Emlin*, p. 80; Laggan minutes, p. 328; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p. 192, n. 39; Edwards, 'History of the laws against non conformity', p. 36; Thomas Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised and confuted* (n.p., 1670), Title page.

72. New Row congregation numbered 88 between 1653-61, 95 between 1662-70, 171 between 1671-78, 195 between 1679-82, 216 between 1683-88, 162 between 1689-95, 228 between 1695-1701, 209 between 1701-4. New Row Baptismal Register, 1653-1737.

QUAKERS IN IRELAND, 1655-1711

In 1652 George Fox and his companions began preaching in the rural areas of north England and gradually moved southwards, increasing in numbers and impact.¹ They became known as the Quakers, a term of derision, and by 1655 were a force to be reckoned with in England. In the disturbed and restless society which obtained at this time, Quakers attracted people who were searching for ways to understand both their own lives and the events that were happening all round them. Indeed Quakers were bound to make an impact for they were a totally new group within the Protestant tradition. No doubt in some respects they mirrored several of the sects common in England since the Lollards, but historically the Quakers belonged to and originated during the civil war in England. While the personality of George Fox was very important, his companions were equally powerful and effective. Many of them came to Ireland from the earliest period of the movement and established themselves in the towns and cities, particularly the garrison towns of the country.

One of the first to come was William Edmundson and his life span paralleled the growth, development and reformation of Quakerism in Ireland. Edmundson came in 1653 and settled as a shopkeeper in Antrim. He began holding meetings in Lurgan, Co. Armagh and even at this early stage was persecuted for refusing to take the oath and using 'plain language'.² In 1655 he met George Fox in England and was affirmed in his convictions; he returned to Ireland and opened meetings in Dublin and all over the north to the extent that he was imprisoned in Armagh.³

1. Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London, 1985), pp 8-15; Barry Reay, 'Quakerism and society' in J.F.McGregor and Barry Reay (ed.) *Radical religion in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1986), pp 141-45.

2. William Edmundson, *Journal of the life of William Edmundson* (Dublin, 1715), pp 6, 9-13. Edmundson was born in Westmorland in 1627 and he died at Mountmellick in 1712. He came to Ireland with his brother who was a soldier in the Cromwellian army.

3. Ibid, p. 21.

By this time other Quakers from England began travelling in Ireland. In 1654 Miles Halhead, James Lancaster and Miles Batman preached in the cities and towns.⁴ In 1655 Elizabeth Fletcher, Elizabeth Smith and Barbara Blagdon preached in Dublin, Youghal, Cork and Limerick and suffering harassment, imprisonment and finally expulsion.⁵ Thomas Loe, already a prominent Quaker in England, also came to Ireland in 1655 shortly after release from prison in Oxford. He travelled in the south of Ireland, to Limerick, Youghal and Cork; he returned in 1657 and was reported to have preached 'through the Dublin streets from St. James' Gate to Stephen Rich's house, that is from the extreme west of the city to the extreme east'. William Penn was thirteen when he heard Loe preach in Cork. Loe also travelled to the north of Ireland, particularly in the Armagh area. At this time he began the tradition of writing letters to different towns and cities in Ireland, calling the inhabitants to repentance, or encouraging the newly convinced.⁶ Thus from the earliest period of the movement Quakers travelled in Ireland, creating a network of meetings and contacts and gaining converts.⁷ These came from all walks of life: gentry, farmers, shopkeepers, and especially soldiers.⁸

At this period Quaker teaching was more in reaction to other known beliefs rather than a defined set of convictions. While members of the Presbyterian and Independent churches could presume on some beliefs held in common, Quakers had already moved beyond and outside this frame of reference. Although their convictions would be articulated more clearly after the Restoration, even at this stage it was evident that Quakers rejected the doctrine of predestination and taught that salvation was

4. Joseph Besse, *A collection of the sufferings of the people called Quakers*, 2 vols (London, 1753), ii, 457 ff

5. John Rutt, *A history of the rise and progress of the people called Quakers in Ireland, 1653-1700* (Dublin, 1751), p. 81; O.C. Goodbody, 'Ireland in the 1650's' in *J.F.H.S.*, vol. xlviii (1956-8), p. 34 ff

6. Kenneth Carroll, 'Thomas Loe, friend of William Penn and apostle to Ireland' in J.W. Frost and J.M. Moore (ed.), *Seeking the Light* (London, 1986), pp 62-3.

7. Friends Library London, Caton MSS, ii, 3/71, 3/73, 3/92, 3/97, 3/133-4, 3/150, 3/154; Spence MSS, iii, 3/41.

8. Kenneth Carroll, 'Quakerism and the Cromwellian army' in *J.F.H.S.*, vol. 54, no. 3 (1978), pp 135-54.

open to and possible for all. To reach salvation each one was urged to turn to the Light within, the only true guide, above even the scriptures. It was a religion of inwardness which affected views on the Trinity, the Last Judgement and the resurrection of the body.

Quaker behaviour was consequent on their convictions and led to conflict: they preached in market places, interrupted sermons, refused to take oaths or pay tithes, insisted on using 'Thou' to all, refused to take off their hats in church or in the presence of superiors, denounced the clergy and the powerful. In fact they queried and rejected almost every aspect of life, both religious and secular. The bearers of such views inevitably drew the fear and anger of their hearers, unless of course they became convinced of the Quaker stance. Hostility towards the Quakers grew in Ireland in the measure that their presence in the country increased.

Such conflict is seen in the lives of Edmund Burrough and Francis Howgill who came to Ireland in 1655. They articulated the convictions of Quakers with vigour and were openly critical of government and churches. For this they were both persecuted and imprisoned. In response to this they further admonished and cursed their opposers:⁹

Cease from all your idle temples....Cease from all your idle worship and feigned praise, for God is not worshipped in vain traditions...Cease from all your idol shepherds and priests of Baal...cease from them and wait upon the Lord who is now risen to teach his people by his spirit in his way of truth and righteousness.

This was very strong, convinced language and in effect undermined the foundations of society. Yet from a stance based on an inner experience of God, Quakers felt called by God, much as the prophets of the Old Testament: they were duty-bound to admonish and curse if necessary all those in Ireland who held power and authority in the country. For example, Burrough and Howgill exhorted judges

9. *The visitation of the rebellious nation of Ireland* (1655), p.8.

in Ireland to do their duty, otherwise 'God will cast you out of the seat of judgement as he has done the power of kings and bishops before you'.¹⁰ Henry Cromwell was admonished, and the city of Dublin cursed.¹¹

As well as cursing and admonishing people in public, Quakers also offered to dispute in public with their opposers. A challenge was put to the priests of Dublin and elsewhere in Ireland to come to the city for a public debate.¹² Twenty seven queries were sent to the priests as matter for the event and these ranged over all the beliefs and practices of the christian churches and in particular asked:

13. What scriptures have you for infant baptism and for singing druids experience in rhyme and metre calling it an ordinance of God, and what scripture for a sacrament ?

15. What scripture or example have you for having a set place and a set way and staying 20 or 30 years at one place and bargaining with them beforehand for so much a year; were these things exercised by the apostles or are they your traditions and inventions ?.

17. Are not your places of worship idols and temples and is it not hypocrisy for you to be against papists and yet to worship in their churches ?

27. Whether they that say none can be cleansed from all sins while he be upon the earth do not make the power of the second Adam to be of less effect than the first to transgress ?.

It was clear that the Quakers were questioning the fundamentals of religion: the sacraments, church organisation, places of worship, the doctrine taught by scripture and particularly the doctrine of predestination. They were also critical of outward behaviour, even of mode of dress and manners.¹³ Quaker books teaching such views were picked up in Dublin in 1659:

10. *The visitation of..... Ireland*, p.19

11. Ibid, p. 20. Barbaba Blagdon also visited Dublin at this time and asked to speak to Cromwell. Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 458.

12. Ibid, p. 29; F. Howgill, *Some queries to you all who say you are ministers of Christ in Dublin and to the rest in Ireland, to be answered by you or by your upholders. From us who in scorn by your generation are called Quakers* (Swarthmore MSS,v, 10; Trans. vii p.49).

13. George Fox, William Morris, John Perrot, *Several warnings to the Baptised people* (n.p., 1659).

Quakers books consigned to one Samuel Claridge found on perusal to have an erroneous untoward spirit, denying external reverence to magistrates, condemning and disgracing ministers as antichristian, not ministers of Christ, but dumb dogs, priests and hirelings; expressing much bitterness against learning, maintaining perfection and freedom from sin in this life, also Popish and other tenets contrary to sound doctrine. Books to be detained, not suffered to be dispersed.¹⁴

Quakers at this period tended to be confrontational and all groups in society were liable to receive criticism. On 6 February 1656 Henry Cromwell wrote to Thurloe 'Our most considerable enemy now in our view are the Quakers'.¹⁵ Afraid that their influence among army officers was increasing, he ordered that the Quakers be ejected from the army ; they were to be arrested if they resisted tithes, preached or disturbed ministers and people. As it happened, the Quakers were not a political threat, but the fear that they could be ensured they would suffer persecution. In 1659 they appealed to Parliament,¹⁶ and listed their sufferings in some detail. On their own evidence, the treatment meted out to them was severe and relentless; some of the details are graphic. For example, Edward Cooke was :

put out of the army for owning the truth; and afterwards for speaking to a priest at Cork was almost murdered, and for speaking a few words in a steeplehouse at Dublin was imprisoned near a quarter of a year by the mayor there. And Robert Southwell of Kinsale meeting him in the street there sent him to prison and no cause given; and had his brass and pewter taken from him [worth about 30 shillings] for not paying to the repair of the steeplehouse in Bandon; and he being an inhabitant of that town, at whose house the servants of the Lord meet together every first day, had his windows broken by the people of that town and great stones thrown thereat, and had one of his children wounded, so that he and his family are in danger of their lives.¹⁷

14. 30 Nov 1659, Orders in Council in R.M. Young, *Historical notices of old Belfast and its vicinity* (Belfast, 1896), p. 107.

15. *Thurloe State Papers*, iv, 508, 672, 698. Quakers were active in Cork, Waterford and Kinsale in 1656 (R.C.B., Seymour MS, f. 334); Thomas Morford cried out and refused to sit while the Independent, Edward Bale, was preaching. Morford to Fox and Howgill, 6 May 1659 (F.L.L., Swarthmore MSS, i, 26; Trans., ii, 781); Joseph Eyres complained of being disturbed by some of 'unsound principles and unsavoury practices'. Eyres to Henry Cromwell, 27 Aug 1658, B.L., Lansdowne MSS 823, f. 91; Quakers and Anabaptists were reported as very active in Galway. Rueban Easthorp to Henry Cromwell, 11 June 1657 (B.L., Lansdowne MSS 823, f. 86).

16. *A narrative of the cruel and unjust sufferings of the people of God in the nation of Ireland called Quakers*, London 1659.

17. *A narrative*, p.1.

This was typical of the punishment suffered by Quakers for refusing tithes, speaking in public places, either in churches, market places or graveyards. Their behaviour was seen as disruptive and a threat to political stability. Their message and the mode of its delivery created tensions in the country. Quakers stated their beliefs with great conviction and often with vivid words and actions. This stance did not end in 1660 and records show that Quakers continued to be harassed for meeting together, refusing to pay tithes or pay for the repair of churches, refusing to go to church, to take oaths, take off their hats, stop work on holydays.¹⁸

Nevertheless, as in the Presbyterian and Independent churches, so too among the Quakers there was a change in tone and stance after 1660. It was a change which happened slowly in the years after the Restoration. The unusual behaviour of Quakers did not disappear immediately. For example, Solomon Eccles visited Ireland in 1669 and in September walked naked from the waist up into a Catholic service in Galway with burning coals on his head, declaring to the congregation:

'Woe to these idolatrous worshippers: God has sent me this day to warn you and to let you see that if you repent not what shall be your reward'.¹⁹

A month later, on release from prison, Eccles went to Cork and on the 16 October he went to the cathedral and called out at the end of Benjamin Crosse's sermon: 'The prayer of the wicked man is an abomination to the Lord'. Crosse had been a presbyterian and swore never to wear a surplice, but in fact he had done so, though Eccles had no knowledge of this background.²⁰ Such pattern of behaviour was part of Eccles' stance in the Quaker movement, but it was not common in Ireland after the Restoration.²¹ An exception

18. Abraham Fuller and Thomas Holms, *A brief relation of some part of the sufferings of the true Christians, the people of God (in scorn called Quakers) in Ireland, 1660-1671* (1672), p. 56 ff; Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 466 ff

19. Fuller and Holms, *A brief relation*, p. 45; Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 476; Solomon Eccles, *Signs are from the Lord* (London, 1663); *The Quaker's challenge*, (n.p., 1668); T.C[risp], *Babels' builders* (London, 1681).

20. Ibid, p. 44; Thomas Lunham, *Early Quakers in Cork*, in *Cork Hist.Soc.Jn.*, series 2, x, (1904), pp 104-5.

was the Irishman, John Exham, who went through Cork in 1667, with his head covered with hair cloth and ashes, proclaiming repentance. Like Eccles he was imprisoned.²² Further recorded cases of going naked as a sign are rare. In 1674 John Knight stood naked in a church in Cork, during the service and John Workman in Ross fasted for forty days.²³ In the main, however, Quakers gradually settled into their way of life, creating a tightly knit community which gave them great strength and stability. There seems to have been little controversy among themselves except for the issue of the Muggletonians in Cork and Dublin.

In 1672 Penn wrote a tract against the Muggletonians, refuting their tenets.²⁴ These were a mixture of beliefs, based on the dreams of John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton. Penn reduced them to six in all: that God is not an infinite spirit; that God did not create out of nothing; that the human soul is generated at conception and not before and separately by God; that soul and body go to dust and rise together in a general resurrection; that God incarnated in the shape of a man and died as God and man for three days; that God predestined some for salvation and some for damnation, and this could never be altered.

21. Solomon Eccles, *'Begin: In the year 1659 in the 4th month the last day of the month being the 5th day of the week, the presence of God was felt within me'*; S.E. Signs are from the Lord to a people or a nation. (London, 1663); In 1668 he challenged Papists and protestants to a fast for seven days and nights, then to keep awake seven days and nights: *The Quakers' challenge*; Kenneth Carroll, *Early Quakers and 'Going naked as a sign,' in Quaker History*, no. 67 (1978), pp 69-87.

22. Exham was born in Kerry and went to England to join the army, returning to Ireland in that capacity. He became convinced in 1658 and was visited by William Edmundson and Thomas Loe. In 1698 he went through Cork repeating the same performance as in 1667. F.L.D., *Half Yearly Meeting*, 1692-1710 (QM 1 C1, f. 61); in 1710 he went to Orrery's house and called him and all in it to repentance. The names of friends deceased in the kingdom of Ireland (F.L.D., YM F1, f. 61); Lunham, *Early Quakers in Cork*, p. 104; Rutty, *The rise and progress of the ... Quakers*, pp 105, 273; Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 466.

23. Edward Wetenhall, *A brief and modest reply to Mr. Penn's scurrilous and unchristian defence against the bishop of Cork* (Dublin, 1699), p. 15; Thomas Wright and Nicholas Harris, *Truth further defended and William Penn vindicated....* (n.p., 1700), pp 101, 158. John Burnyeat, Penn and Eccles travelled together in Ireland from Jan.-June 1670, and spoke at meetings; Penn showed every sign of approval of Eccles. Penn, *My Irish journal*, (ed.), Isobel Grubb (London, 1952), pp 34, 38-43, 59. There is no evidence of Quakers in Ireland going naked as sign prior to 1669.

24. William Penn, *The new witnesses proved old heretics* (n.p., 1672); Christopher Hill, Barry Reay, William Lamont, *The world of the Muggletonians* (London, 1983), p. 20-44.

In May 1673 the Cork meeting sought the advice of the half yearly meeting.²⁵ George Gamble who had been a fervent Quaker and had suffered for his convictions,²⁶ had become a Muggletonian under the influence of Col. Robert Phayre.²⁷ Gamble met Muggleton in London in 1671 or early 1672 and this confirmed his decision; he was joined by Henry Flaggator, Andrew Vivors and George Webber. Thus the Muggletonians developed in Cork and drew some converts to them from the Quakers.²⁸ The general meeting of friends had a copy of Reeve's book, *Transcendent spiritual treatise*. (1651). They examined and condemned the teachings of Reeve and Muggleton. In addition they noted a rumour: some Quakers had revived the teachings of the Muggletonians. In case this should have substance the findings of the general meeting were to be published in Cork:

[We] have very seriously and in the council of God weighed and considered the principles and doctrines of the aforesaid Reeve and Muggleton, and the spirit from whence they flow. And do in the name and authority of the holy spirit of truth judge and condemn that spirit as a spirit of error and blasphemy sprung from the bottomless pit of darkness and high presumption. And by this our testimony do deny and detest the same, as neither fit to touch, taste nor handle of. Warning and admonishing all people in the fear and dread of the Lord God of heaven and earth, both to turn from it and avoid it.²⁹

Muggleton replied quickly to this testimony of the Cork Quakers, pronouncing the twenty six Cork Quakers 'cursed and damned in their bodies and souls from the presence of God, elect men and angels, to eternity'.³⁰ This was nothing new as Muggleton had cursed many prominent Quakers

25. Testimony of a general meeting of Friends for the Province of Munster against the erroneous doctrines of John Rood and Lodowick Muggleton (F.L.D., Testimonies of disunity, QM 11 Fl, ff 1-3).

26. Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 472, 475, 476, 477.

27. As governor of Cork during the Interregnum, Phayre had been an enthusiastic Quaker. D.N.B.; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp 110, 149; Hill, Reay, Lamont, *The world of the Muggletonians*, p.47. Gamble was married to Phayre's daughter; Phayre's wife was known as 'the chief lady Muggletonian in the county'. Penn, *My Irish journal*, p. 74.

28. Testimony of a general meeting of Friends... for Munster.... (F.L.D., Testimonies of disunity, f. 4; Kenneth Carroll, 'Quakers and Muggletonians in 17th century Ireland', in David Blamires (ed.), *A Quaker miscellany for E. Milligan* (London, 1985), pp 49-56; Hill, Reay, Lamont, *The world of the Muggletonians*, pp 47-8; A.Jessopp, *The coming of the friars and other essays* (London, 1889), p.332.

29. Testimony of a general meeting of Friends ...for Munster (F.L.D., QM 11 Fl, f. 3).

30. Alexander Delemaine, *A volume of Spiritual epistles: being the copies of several letters written by the last two prophets and messengers of God, John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton* (London, 1820), pp 379-98.

in his day including George Fox, Edward Burrough, Francis Howgill, Thomas Loe and William Penn, all of whom were prominent in Ireland.³¹ Indeed Penn's own book had come out in 1672 and no doubt was a great help to the Cork Quakers in their resistance to the Muggletonians. In effect the Muggletonians in Cork seem to have been small in number and faded in importance with the passing of Gamble and his companions. However until at least 1687 Muggleton kept in touch with the Muggletonians in Ireland; he wrote long letters of encouragement and advice to several families and sent them his books.³²

Some of the teachings of the Muggletonians could have attracted Quakers to join them, and some in fact did even after the strong admonition of 1673.³³ They were the elect of God, the predestined; their organisation was informal; there was no preaching, worship or praying together, no regular meetings. They were not required to take a public stand; at the same time the doctrine of predestination made contact with other religious groups in Ireland easier and more respectable theologically. They remained a small group in the country and some Muggletonians seem to have existed in Dublin towards the end of the century.³⁴ Richard Lawrence, writing in 1682, felt the only groups in Ireland which could not be included within a comprehensive church, in the tradition of Ussher, were Roman Catholics, Quakers and Muggletonians.³⁵

31. Delemaine, *Spiritual Epistles*, pp 337,367,397; Carroll, *Thomas Loe, Friend of William Penn and apostle to Ireland*, pp 66-7.

32. Ibid, pp 372, 400, 462-3,499, 513.

33. Ibid, p. 499. 22 Aug. 1681, Charles Yeeles, Thomas Miller and John White converted to Muggletonianism.

34. Muggleton was in correspondence with Major John Dennison of Dublin in 1678. Delemaine, *Spiritual epistles*, p. 457; Marsh to Tenison, 10 Apr. 1697 (Lambeth Palace, Gibson Papers, MS 942, f. 133). Marsh mentioned four Muggletonians in Dublin; Amos Strettell and John Burnyeat, *The innocency of the Quakers manifested and the truth of their principles and doctrine cleared and defended from thewicked slanders of James Barry* (Dublin, 1687), pp 16-7; F.L.D., Sharp MSS, S.8, no.5, f.4; *A representation of the present state of religion with regard to infidelity, heresy, impiety and popery, drawn up and agreed by both houses of Convocation in Ireland, 1711*, p.7.

35. Richard Lawrence, *The interest of Ireland* (Dublin, 1682), part ii, ch.2, p. 96.

In the midst of such debates , Quakers consolidated their structures and their way of life. A good example of this growth is seen in the words of advice Joseph Sleigh gave his children before he died in 1683.³⁶ He told them to wait on the Lord in stillness and find the light and spirit of God within their own hearts. 'False ministers' would try to persuade them that sin was impossible to overcome, but this was a lie; the Light Within dispelled sin and darkness. Strengthened with these convictions, they were to watch over their behaviour: their conversation, manner of dress, language, attitude to the world; they were to keep to the company of Quakers. Should they decide to go into employment they were to seek honest families; if they wanted to marry they were to seek advice of wise persons and bring up their children according to Quaker values. In all their business dealings they were to 'behave yourselves upright and justly to all men, that so by your holy lives and conversations truth may be well spoken of which will cause the Lord to bless your endeavours'.³⁷

Such was the expectation and testament of a Quaker parent in the 1680's in Ireland and it indicated integration of personal and social values. This development had occurred slowly after the Restoration to such an extent that Penn wrote to the Yearly Meeting in London in 1698, impressed with the order and discipline of Irish Quakers:³⁸

their simplicity, gravity and coolness in managing their church affairs, their diligence in meetings, both for worship and business, their dispatch in mending differences and expedients to prevent them, but especially their zeal against covetousness and against indifferency in Truth's service and exemplary care to discourage an immoderate concern in pursuit of the things of this life.

36. Joseph Sleigh, *Good advice and counsel given forth by Joseph Sleigh of the city of Dublin in the time of his sickness to his children* (London, 1696); Will of Joseph Sleigh, 28 Dec. 1682. O.C. Goodbody, *Guide to Irish Quaker, 1654-1860*, I.M.C. (Dublin, 1967), no. 180, p. 85.

37. Ibid, pp 8-13, 20.

38. *Some account of the life of Joseph Pike of Cork, who died in the year 1729, written by himself, with preliminary observations by John Barclay* (London, 1837), xxx-xxxi; Thomas Story, *A journal of the life of Thomas Story* (Newcastle, 1747), p. 130. Penn was visiting Dublin at this time with Story and John Everett and they wrote to the London meeting.

It was this combination of personal convictions lived out in a closed group, coupled with a strong social/business sense, which enabled the Quakers to first survive and then thrive as a small, coherent and cohesive community in Ireland. Prior to 1669, when George Fox visited Ireland and established formal structures, Quaker meetings were informal and dependent upon Friends visiting an area and holding meetings as they travelled the country.³⁹ This was an effective way to maintain communication between the Friends in a time when the movement was very new and all were living through periods of great political unrest. By 1660, despite opposition, persecution and the informality of their structures, there were thirty established meeting places in Ireland.⁴⁰

Between 1660-68 William Edmundson had set up six-week meetings in Munster, Leinster and Ulster. These meetings dealt with administration of relief for those suffering persecution, care of the poor, reproof of those who had become lax, and registration of births, marriages and deaths.⁴¹ Further developments took place in 1669 when George Fox came to Ireland and with Edmundson established the Men's and Women's meetings in the main cities in Ireland. These were held monthly, but in Dublin the Men's meeting was held fortnightly and it acted as a permanent committee for the country. The monthly meetings took charge of local matters and sent representatives to the Province meetings, which met quarterly. A general meeting met for the first time in 1669 and continued to meet in spring and autumn for over a century. It was called the National or Half-Yearly Meeting and was composed of representatives sent from the Men's province meetings. The half yearly meeting sent representatives to the National meeting in London.⁴² In 1678 the Cork Women's meeting proposed to have a general meeting also. It was agreed

39. Edmundson, *Journal*, p. 23.; *Life of John Burnyeat, from The Truth Exalted*, J.B. London, 1691), pp 27 ff

40. C.F. Nuttall, (ed.), *Early Quaker Letters* (Oxford, 1957), p. 403.

41. *Christian discipline of the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland* (Dublin, 1971), p. 8.

42. Isobel Grubb, *The Quakers in Ireland*, (London, 1927), p. 29.

that the women would meet yearly at the time of the National meeting and they were left to organise themselves as they thought best.⁴³

The manner of life expected of the Quakers was demanding and was examined regularly. In 1679 the Province Men's meeting in Cork asked the monthly meetings to name Friends who could enquire into the lives of the membership and visit meetings to see that all was running properly. These acted very much like elders in the presbyterian tradition. They had to give good example in their own lives and see that parents educated their children properly. They were recommended to gather before the actual meeting of Friends and plan the agenda; they were responsible to see that minutes were taken, and records of births, marriages and deaths were up to date. During the visits to meetings elders were to note the faults of members and report them to the Men's Meeting, thereby establishing a system of inspection and discipline which covered all aspects of family and business life, even to extent of reporting who slept at the meetings.⁴⁴

This role was certainly in operation by 1671, very soon after Fox's visit.⁴⁵ Elders had to enquire into who had paid tithes and admonish them, while encouraging those who had resisted the pressure to pay. They looked into business dealings and rebuked those who lived beyond their means, broke their word or got into debt. Employers were examined to see if they acted justly towards their employees, particularly to check if they kept their word to pay with money rather than in kind; shopkeepers were scrutinised to see if they sold 'goods as truth will allow'.⁴⁶ Similar issues were dealt with in the Province Men's meeting in Limerick in 1679 with the added points of marriages, oaths and incidence of drunkenness.⁴⁷ The

43. *Christian Discipline*, pp 8-9.

44. Half Yearly Meetings 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A.10, ff 97, 177); Half Yearly Meeting held in Dublin, 10 Jan. 1692 (F.L.D., QM 1 CI, 1692-1710, f. 1).

45. *Ibid*, f. 381 (1671).

46. From the Province Men's Meeting in Cork, 30 April 1679, to the next Half Yearly Meeting (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, f. 22). Also, 1678 and 1695 (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, O).

47. Province Men's Meeting at Limerick 30 August 1679 (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, f. 23).

minutes of the Men's Meeting in Lurgan, 1678-89, refer to both men's and women's meetings dealing with all manner of business: land, marriage, wills, the poor, business practice, sexual offences, drunkenness.⁴⁸

Tithes were an ongoing burden on Quakers.⁴⁹ In 1680 William Morris wrote a tract against tithes, asking that Quakers be dispensed from them.⁵⁰ Morris had spent time in the consistory court and knew he would be there again, so this work was published in the hope of some redress. He maintained that in Old Testament times tithes were levied only within the lands of the twelve tribes of Israel, 'the Jewish national church'. So, Morris argued, tithes should be levied only on the members of the Established Church in Ireland and on no other religious group.⁵¹ Besides, Morris pointed out that tithes were intended originally for sharing among the poor, the widowed and orphaned and this simply did not happen in Ireland. Instead, the clergy extended their claim on all 'whether English or Irish, Protestant or Papist, true or false worshippers it matters not to them, or whether they are rich or poor, fatherless or widows, bound or free'.⁵²

In order to protect themselves, the meetings arranged that where possible Friends attended the assizes and sessions of the courts in order to help those prosecuted for tithes or indeed other breaches of the law.⁵³ Sometimes public

48. Lurgan Men's Meeting (P.R.O.N.I., T. 1062 45); Moate Meeting (F.L.D., MM IV M2, ff 1, 5, 6ff); Testimonies of denial and condemnation: A general Testimony (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, ff 1-5, 10-11, 15).

49. Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 466-93; National sufferings, 1655-93 (F.L.D., YMGI). Quakers suffered for non payment of tithes most of all between 1660-70; after that harassment was less intense; after the 1690 wars tithes were demanded more widely again. (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, f. 76; QM 11 ZI, R; YMGI, 1688 ff).

50. William Morris, *Tithes no gospel ordinance, nor ever instituted of God for the maintenance of a gospel ministry, but ended with the levitical priesthood and abolished by the offering up of Christ* (n.p., 1680). William Morris had been a Baptist and captain in the army in Ireland; he was convinced by William Edmundson and in 1659 wrote a pamphlet to Parliament, asking that the Quakers not be persecuted, imprisoned and harassed for tithes: *To the supreme authority....the Commons in Parliament assembled* (London, 1659); he lived in Bandonbridge after the Restoration. F.L.L. Biographies of Quakers; The names of Friends deceased ...in Ireland (F.L.D. YMFI f. 2v); Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 446; Rutty, *A history of....the Quakers*, 115, 144.

51. *Tithes no gospel*, pp 3, 5-6.

52. Ibid, p. 10.

53. Half Yearly Meetings 1676 ff (F.L.D. Half YM A 10, f. 13. 1687); Summary of the proceedings of several half years meetings held in Dublin for the nation of Ireland or a breviat of sundry needful general minutes and epistles thereof recommended to the several Provincial meetings of this nation and thence to the monthly or particular meetings to stir up friends to a faithful, diligent perseverance in the truth that the testimony and discipline thereof may be duly kept up to in all its branches, 1704. Collected by order of the Munster Province Meeting (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, A, 1669-73, Copies of applications to Justices of the Peace).

figures like Penn were able to help. In 1669 he persuaded the Lord Lieutenant to release all the Quakers in jail firstly in Dublin and then in the country. Fox also helped when Clarendon was appointed Lord Lieutenant. He gave him several names of Friends in Ireland, and told Friends to contact Clarendon on his arrival in Ireland and apply to him in case of need.⁵⁴ But if they were unable to prevent arrest, Quakers were instructed not to resist with violence.⁵⁵

Non payment of tithes was a matter of principle from the beginning and it was part of the body of convictions Quakers wished to pass on to their children. To this purpose in 1680 the Province Men's Meeting drew up directives for education within the family. Friends were urged to abide by the 'ancient principles of truth', and eleven points were drawn up. Tithes and any form of maintenance of priests were to be refused, as well as the repair of churches. All were to speak and act peacefully and use 'sound language', that is 'Thou' in conversation. They were to avoid swearing oaths or removing their hats except when at worship; all worldly customs and fashions were to be rejected. Cursing and all forms of worldly behaviour were to be shunned, as well as the forms of worship and religion of the world. All were urged to make up their differences quickly and never betray anything negative about one another to outsiders.⁵⁶

Between 1680- 1694 the more specific needs of young children were addressed. Children were to be educated within the Quaker tradition and not with other 'rude or proud children, with masters and mistresses who are not Friends'. They should not be allowed luxuries in food or drink, especially 'strong liqueurs', nor too much money to

54. Elia Buckley, 'William Penn in Dublin', in *Dublin Historical Record*, vi, no. 3 (June-Aug., 1944), p. 85; 'George Fox to Friends in Ireland, 1685' in *J.F.H.S.*, vii, no.4 (1910), p. 181; Story, *A journal....*, pp 128-9. For Penn in Waterford and Cashel, 1697, James Coleman, 'Some early Waterford clerical authors' in *Waterford Arch. Soc. Jn.*, vi, p. 181.

55. Summary of the proceedings ..1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, S., 1687).

56. 7 Aug 1680, Province Men's Meeting (F.L.D. QM 11 FI, f. 27). Also, 23 Aug 1680, Anne Jones fell into dancing, swearing and cursing (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, Testimonies of denial and condemnation, f. 56; 23 Sept 1687, misbehaving at a wedding, f. 141. For using oaths, Half Yearly Meeting 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A 10, f. 235).

spend or fine clothes. Some children spent too long at school and should be put to work hard. Yet they were not to be allowed begin big business projects which often ended in debt.⁵⁷ To maintain control over their children and indeed the parents, Quakers needed their own schools, and some were founded from at least 1675 onwards. By 1681 a meeting had been established for Quaker schoolmasters and generally parents were encouraged to send their children to these schools.⁵⁸ While parents were urged to give good example at home, the meetings were to inspect the schools and corrections were to be accepted by the parents.⁵⁹ Friends were not allowed to remove their children from school, nor were schoolmasters or schoolmistresses to close school without permission from the Men's Meeting.⁶⁰ Friends were encouraged to be teachers and it was suggested that poor children could be trained as teachers.⁶¹

If children were to be educated in the tradition, adults were to continue to observe the values so hard won in the early days. Again and again, at the meetings and in letters of exhortation, Friends were urged to live simply and plainly, in every way. So they were to dress simply and without affectation. House furniture was to be simple, useful and without ostentation, as was the type of materials to be used in the house. Plain speech was to characterise all their dealings, and they were not to bargain or get into an argument over purchases, especially in an alehouse. They were not to go to fairs except on business, and were forbidden to take part in the sports and pastimes at the fair. In other words, all their dealings and their manner of life was to reflect a basic simplicity.⁶² Alehouses and smoking were frowned on;

57. Half Yearly Meeting 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A 10, f. 75).

58. Summary of the proceedings... 1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, S. 1675, 1681, 1681-5).

59. Half Yearly Meeting 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A 10, f. 79 ff, 97; F.L.D. QM 11 FI f. 70).

60. Ibid, Nov. 1687 f. 315.

61. Ibid, 1691-5, ff 316, 317.

62. Ibid, f. 55 (1682, 1692/3, 1697), ff 245, 287 (1671, 1676, 1677, 1686, 1699); Summary of the proceedings ...1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, F., 1671-1694).

behaviour at funerals was to be plain and simple; brandy, or 'strong water', wine, tobacco and pipes, and cakes were not to be taken to excess at burials.⁶³

In 1688 the Half Yearly Meeting in Dublin felt that some reformation of life was needed and decided:⁶⁴

to advise all that profess the Truth to walk as becomes the gospel in their conversation, apparel, deportment and dealings etc which advice has not been so fully observed (by some) as we desired.

Friends were urged to keep to 'the pure language of Truth and be careful not to degenerate into the confused language of the world'; they were not to cut their hair and 'get great ruffling periwigs'; those who had to get their hair cut were to get 'such borders or periwigs as are plain and decent which best suits our principles'. The meeting expressed fear that some were growing cold and that children were not receiving proper formation; nor were meetings being attended:

our ancient practice....the neglect whereof we fear brings a coldness, deadness and barrenness upon the souls of some and may cause them to lose that warmth, freshness and zeal that was upon their hearts in former times.

Three years later, at the height of the war, Friends were told to look after each other and see the war as an opportunity to live simple uncluttered lives. Again all were urged to speak plainly and deal honestly, keep their word and give good example to the children. All were to watch mode of dress and avoid 'costly attire, foolish dresses and new fashions, ruffling periwigs, needless buttons, wide skirts and long flag sleeved coats which appears to answer the fashion rather than service'.⁶⁵

This stress on plain dress was insisted on from the beginning. Tailors were instructed to have meetings once in a half year, 'to prevent the making of garments not

63. Summary of the proceedings1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, B., 1697).

64. A testimony of tender advice and counsel given forth from our half yearly meeting in Dublin, the 9th of the 9th month 1688. Signed by Alexander Seaton.

65. From our half yearly meeting at Dublin, 9,10,11 Sept. 1691, pp 2-4.

agreeable to the plainness of the truth'. This was first suggested in 1677 and repeated in 1695 and 1703. Shoemakers were also given this instruction.⁶⁶ Obviously some kind of consistent reform was demanded and this continued throughout the years after the 1690 wars.⁶⁷ Joseph Pike recalled that in 1692 William Edmundson and the elders wanted to have a general reformation in dress, clothes and furniture; to enforce this each province meeting was to appoint 'cleanhanded and faithful friends' to inspect all the families. Pike admitted that all his furniture and house decorations were changed for plainer ones, 'in a word we thoroughly reformed our houses'.⁶⁸

In order to keep together as a close knit community, Friends who lived in the country were encouraged to settle near one another, 'for the ease and benefit of meetings and educating their children in the way of Truth'. Neither were they to move house without telling the meeting and getting certificates from their meeting before departure.⁶⁹ Another way of maintaining unity was their insistence on marriages between Friends only, validated at the meetings. Friends were instructed not to get married by a priest, nor to a 'person of the world'. Getting married by a priest was considered a serious fault and parents were urged to prevent their children doing this. Some were cast out of meetings for having married according to the rites of the Established Church.⁷⁰

66. Summary of the proceedings...1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 Zi, T. 1677); Testimonies of disunity, 1695 (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, f. 70).

67. *An epistle to Friends. Leinster Province meeting, 9-11 July 1698*; William Edmundson, *An epistle containing wholesome advice and counsel to all Friends* (n.p., 1701); William Edmundson's brother John (1625-1707) fell away from Quakerism in old age: Isobel Grubb, 'William Edmundson, 1627-1712' in *J.F.H.S.*, xl, 1948, pp 32-6.

68. *Some account of the life of Joseph Pike of Cork*, pp 59-66.

69. *From our half yearly meeting in Dublin, 9,10,11 Sept. 1691*, p. 6; Half Yearly Meetings, 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A 10, 1691, f. 185; 1680, f.295); Testimonies of denial and condemnation (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, f. 65).

70. Summary of the proceedings ...1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, XYZ, 1680). Testimonies of denial and condemnation (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, ff 25-7); Testimonies of disunity (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, f. 9 ff); D.E.C. Eversley, 'The demography of Irish Quakers, 1650-1850' in J.M. Goldstrom and L.A. Clarkson (ed.), *Irish population, economy and society*, (London, 1981), p. 61. Between 1655-1709 572 Quaker marriages occurred in Ireland. Isobel Grubb estimated that by 1700 there were 600-700 Quaker families in Ireland, with 30% of them living in Dublin. Grubb, *The Quakers in Ireland*, p.29.

Parents were urged to watch most carefully over this and refuse the marriage portion to any who would not obey; if they could not manage this the meeting was to be told.⁷¹

By 1680 the question of mixed marriages had become a problem and this was addressed by William Edmundson. He noted that some were marrying outside the Friends and were being married by 'the teachers of the world', the priests. Through an examination of marriage in the Old Testament, Edmundson showed his people that

a breach is made upon our youths to the wounding and grieving the spirit of the faithful that are Abraham's children and are of the same mind with Isaac and Rebecca and cannot give their children in marriage to her people upon any account.

By using biblical language and history, he depicted the Quakers as God's chosen, surrounded by false worshippers who tempted the chosen people to forsake the true way.⁷²

Another way of not conforming to the world and retaining their own value system was to work on holydays. Employers were not to let their apprentices⁷³ off on holydays, and shopkeepers were to have their shops open 'as much as in them lies' on Christmas Day and other holydays. On those days the shopowners were to stay in their shops all day and traders were to work all day, too. Until 1724 Quakers in Dublin at Christmas time asked the Lord Mayor's protection of their shops and property.⁷⁴ This was a form of testimony to their convictions and the meetings were

71. F.L.D., Half Y.M. A.10, 1680, ff 131, 134. This request was repeated in 1688 and 1691 (F.L.D. QM 11 ZI, B. 1688), and redress was to be sought from the government if co operation failed on this point. Such was the relationship between the Established Church and the Quakers in the 1680's that bishops were asked not to grant marriage licences to Friends unless they were sure of the parents consent to the marriage.

72. Paper of William Edmundson against mixed marriages, May 1680 (F.L.D., Half Y.M., A 11, Appendix, f. 416). Also, F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, E, Epistle of William Edmundson approved by the Half Year Meeting.

73. Friends were encouraged to place their children as apprentices among Quaker families; care of apprentices was examined by the meetings. (F.L.D. Half Y.M., A 10 1676, f. 9).

74. R.S. Harrison, 'Dublin Quakers in business, 1800-1850' (T.C.D., M.Litt., 1988), p. 433; 1680, 1682, 1703, Half Yearly Meetings 1676 ff (F.L.D. Half Y.M. A. 10, f. 41 (1676), repeated in 1696, 1701, 1706). In 1671 shop windows in Dublin were broken on Christmas Day. National Sufferings, 1655-1693 (F.L.D., YMGI f. 49); for years in Dublin there were riots on Christmas Day to force Quakers to shut their shops; nevertheless, such shops were popular as they had fixed prices. Buckley, *William Penn in Dublin*, p. 83.

responsible to see that Friends 'keep up the testimony for truth against the observations of such idolatrous times'.⁷⁵ However, some concession was made in 1691 when Friends were recommended to use the days in the weeks and months, in conversation and writing, 'according to the heathenish manner generally used in the world'.⁷⁶

Disputes were settled within the meetings and all were urged not to take cases beyond this context. In order to determine differences between Friends, a group was established, six from Ulster, six from Munster and twelve from Leinster, which sat after the half yearly meeting in Dublin and judged disputes which were not settled at the monthly or province meetings. It was like a court of appeal and it ensured that differences did not spill over into 'the world'.⁷⁷ Those who refused to settle differences within the meeting were to be disowned; yet, with a note of realism, those dismissed from meetings could be pursued in law by the injured party.⁷⁸

Just as disputes were not to go beyond the confines of the meetings, so doctrinal differences were not to be debated in public. To this purpose, Friends were forbidden to enter into 'public disputes with any about religion or in controversies in writing' without the permission of the meeting; if anyone wrote a book or tract it had to be submitted to the meeting before publication. Even those who had some books at home, critical of the Quakers, were to tell the meeting how they actually used such books.⁷⁹ Those who held doctrines contrary to the teachings of the Quakers were severely cautioned and sometimes disowned. In 1682 four men were accused of false doctrine concerning the devil.⁸⁰ In the same year, Joseph Arnold was called to

75. Summary of the proceedings (F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, C. 1676).

76. Ibid, C. 1691.

77. Concerning appeals, 1676 (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A. 10, f. 7; cf. f. 123 (1675) Friends to settle disputes at meetings; repeated in 1687).

78. Ibid, f. 45 (1676, 1677, 1696, 1697).

79. Half Yearly meeting 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A.10, Nov. 1693, f. 15; repeated in 1703).

80. Testimonies of denial and condemnation, 1662-1722 (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, ff 87-9). The four men were John Beckett, Thomas Smith, James Beckett and Christopher Marshall.

account for saying he worshipped wherever he wished, 'any worship that suited at the time'; he was also suspect for his interest in astrology.⁸¹ In 1697 Edward Bennet of Cork held views which were rejected by the Quakers. With the agreement of the province meeting Bennet was required to answer questions on his theory that the soul dies with the body and is not capable of reward or punishment; he also claimed that heaven and hell had no existence beyond 'the consciousness of men while they are in this world'. He had ten days to respond and when he failed to reply he was disowned.⁸²

The system of correction and disownment was exercised consistently and it kept the body of the Quakers closely knit, with a set of criteria which all had to observe. Failure to do so could be serious. If disowned a person could not be buried in the Friends burial ground, nor were any Friends to go to their funeral.⁸³ The disownment procedure was measured. First a person was presented with the accusation which he or she either could explain or disown; if this satisfied the meeting then membership was not withdrawn. However, this was not always the case. In 1671 John Howard 'fell into the accursed principle of Rantism' and committed adultery. Although he apologised the meeting rejected him.⁸⁴ Those who went to the Established Church service were severely rebuked; likewise those who got married by priest, or married without informing the meeting properly.⁸⁵

Traders were rebuked for malpractice, as was Joseph Thomas, a miller, for wasting corn and malt in his mill and for feeding pigs, swine and cattle out of the sacks.⁸⁶

81. Testimonies of denial and condemnation, 1662-1722 (F.L.D., MM 11 F1, f. 104.

82. Ibid, f. 8.

83. F.L.D., QM 11 Z1, B. 1682.

84. Testimonies of denial and condemnation, 1662-1722 (F.L.D., MM 11 F1, f. 8).

85. Ibid, ff 23-7, 36-7, 49, 50, 53; Mountmellick Monthly Meeting (F.L.D., MM V GI, ff 318-21). When a meeting was informed about the intention of persons to marry, letters were sent to other meetings to get information; sometimes such letters were sent to England or Scotland. Men's Meeting Dublin 1677 ff (F.L.D., MM II AI, f.275v. 1677).

86. Ibid, f. 64.

Friends were rebuked for moving from one part of the country to another without knowledge and permission from the meeting;⁸⁷ others were rebuked for taking out suits in Chancery.⁸⁸ It was source of sadness when Friends who had suffered for many years decided to go their own way and so had to be disowned by the meeting. This happened when Henry and Ellen Tatlock, who had endured a great deal of harassment in Waterford in the early days, broke from the Quakers in 1681. Henry Tatlock had been a tailor and then became a glazier; he glazed the windows of churches and even those of Cashel cathedral, something impossible for the meetings to accept.⁸⁹

In order to avoid disownment a Friend had to make an act of abjuration. This William Stanley did in November 1678, for he had taken an oath several times and tried to hide the fact. He was found out and rebuked. To avoid being disowned he made an act of abjuration which reads very like the opening of the Letter to the Hebrews and is a good example of the use Quakers made of Biblical language.⁹⁰ Sometimes cases went on for years. In Dublin Jane Pildren disturbed the meetings from 1668-79. Even Thomas Loe's reprimand had no effect, and it had to be delivered by letter as Pildren refused to meet him or come to a meeting. The Men's meeting tried to contain Pildren's behaviour in Dublin to no avail. The Women's meeting, established in 1677, was asked to see what it could do, but Pildren did not come to their meeting either. So the case was never solved satisfactorily and her strange behaviour continued to embarrass the Quakers in Dublin.⁹¹

87. Testimonies of denial and condemnation, 1662-1722 (F.L.D., MM 11 F1, f. 65). Also, ff 157, 255.

88. Ibid, f 69ff. William Chaunders took out a suit in Chancery against his landlord.

89. 1 Apr 1681, Testimonies of disunity (F.L.D., QM 11 F1, f. 7).

90. Ibid, f. 38. Stanley began: 'In all ages of time the Lord has appeared to the sons and daughters of men in making a glorious discovery of himself which [he] has in sundry times and in divers manners and in these latter days he has more largely appeared by his son...'

91. Ibid, ff 6-7; Men's Meeting Dublin 1677 ff (F.L.D., MM II A1, f. 63); Carroll, *Thomas Loe, Apostle to Ireland*, p. 66.

Records and minutes were kept from the beginning, and reminders as to their importance were made regularly. Monthly meetings were to keep records of births, marriages and deaths, as well as wills and inventories and give an account of all to the Half Yearly Meeting.⁹² Someone was deputed in the meeting to take care of wills and the executors of such were to be Friends; those who had not got Friends as executors had taken oaths and of course this was a serious offence.⁹³ Orphans were to be cared for by the meetings; trustees were appointed to look after their needs and ensure them some privacy regarding their affairs.⁹⁴ Towards the end of the 17th century, meetings were encouraged to get the ownership of their meeting houses and burial places legally settled.⁹⁵ Definite instructions were given as to how to keep records of the sufferings of Quakers; in addition they were forbidden to take farm or glebe lands; if they did they were cast out of the meetings; nor were they to buy even the tithe wool/lambs/corn/hay from a tithemonger or anyone involved in the collection of tithes; again those who did so were to be ostracised.⁹⁶

The sufferings of Quakers from the beginning in Ireland had been recorded and published and must have been a source of support and encouragement, much in the same way as the Scottish histories of the Kirk heartened Presbyterians.⁹⁷ In 1698, in an effort not only to keep records but also to have a written account of their history, the Half Yearly Meeting sent out a series of questions to all the meetings. These enquired into the origins of Quakers in each area, in some detail. Thomas

92. *From our Half Yearly Meeting, held in Dublin, September 9-11, 1691, signed by William Edmundson, Abraham Fuller and Amos Strettell.* p. 6.

93. *Testimonies of disunity*, (1684-5), (F.L.D., QM 11 F1, f. 395).

94. *Summary of the proceedings...* 1704 (F.L.D., QM 11 Z1, O, 1684). The poor were cared for by the meetings. *Men's Meeting Dublin* (F.L.D., MM 11 A1, f. 54).

95. *Ibid*, R. 1697. On the death of Joseph Sleigh, who was a widower, the five children were divided out among his mother and four Friends. *Irish Quaker Records*, no. 180, p. 85.

96. *Half Yearly Meetings*, 1676 ff (F.L.D., Half Y.M. A.10, f. 327 ff for 1671, 1672, 1673, 1678, 1695, 1698, 1699, 1706. Also, ff 345-8 for 1677, 1687, 1693).

97. William Stockdale, *Great cry of oppression or a brief relation of some part of the sufferings of the people called Quakers in Ireland, 1671-1681* (Dublin, 1683); Abraham Fuller and Thomas Holms, *A compendious view of some extraordinary sufferings of the people called Quakers in Ireland, 1655-1731* (n.p., 1671).

Wight of Cork was asked to put the material together and this in turn was revised by William Edmundson and later on by John Rutty. At this time there were fifty three registered meetings in the country. Thus not only was an historical account needed before the first generation post- Restoration Friends died, but such meetings needed to know their tradition and understand why reform of life was so insisted on by the leadership in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.⁹⁸ In 1704 a further help was offered to the meetings. That year a summary of all the Half Yearly Meetings held since 1669 was made, in the hope this would help the meetings keep true to the tradition and practice from the beginning.⁹⁹

This tradition and practice had served the Quakers well. Apart from the religious motivations underlying the development of Quakerism in Ireland, the actual system they created bridged the public and private aspect of their lives. They practised a rigorous form of self discipline and withdrawal from 'the world' and in this way survived as a group. At the same time they did business with this 'world', and maintained strict, upright values. But then correct economic behaviour promoted their way of life and anything less would have reflected badly on the body of Friends. Maintaining this balance between rejection of the standards of 'the world' and yet involvement within it, was the constant preoccupation of the leadership from the 1670's onwards, especially as Quakers became wealthy and influential. The number of calls for reformation of life reflected the growing prosperity of Quakers in Ireland.¹⁰⁰ This was seen as a real threat to the quality of life which was the basis of Quaker life and growth.

98. 9 Dec 1698, Dublin, Half Yearly Meeting, (F.L.D., QM 1 CI, 1692-1710, f. 16). Isobel Grubb, *Social conditions in Ireland in the 17th and 18th centuries* (London, 1916), p. 17.

99. Summary of the proceedings of several half years meetings held in Dublin for the nation of Ireland 1704 (F.L.D. QM 11 ZI).

100. Testimonies of denial and condemnation, General exhortation, 1679 (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, f. 49). Also, f. 93 (1682); 30 Apr. 1679, Testimonies of disunity (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, ff 22-3, 33, 39); *A testimony of tender advice and counsel given forth from our half yearly meeting in Dublin, 9 Nov. 1688.*

In September 1691 this threat was faced when Friends reflected on the effects of the war on their way of life. All were asked to take the opportunity, given them by losses in the war, to live up to the ideal of a simple, uncluttered life, both at personal and public level. The values so inculcated over the years were recommended again, in detail. It was both a reminder and strong recommendation.¹⁰¹ However, such words of advice were not strong enough, for at the Half Yearly Meeting in Dublin in 1692 Friends were warned again to check their excesses. Some had huge farms and big businesses and their life style was changing. Practical steps were to be taken in order to put an end to this. All meetings were to be examined by elders and reports given to the next Half Yearly Meeting.¹⁰²

Such moves persisted¹⁰³ and in 1701 William Edmundson wrote what must have been his strongest criticism and condemnation of many Quakers at that time. He railed against worldiness and the danger of making money; Friends came to the meetings, loved to hear the word of God but did not keep it; he condemned those who surrendered to the fashions of the world, in dress, houses, furnishings, and was especially critical of women and children. He had all the tone of a prophet, almost out of tune with his time.¹⁰⁴

For the Quakers had become accepted in the country and were not considered a threat to the government. Indeed, when John Burnyeat was jailed in 1683 he appealed to the Lord Deputy, the Earl of Arran, who said 'he had greater love for us than for any other dissenters because he believed we did men honestly'. In fact the Earl of Arran wrote to Ormonde at this time saying that only the Quakers held meetings in Dublin as they had 'no particular

101. *From our half yearly meeting held in Dublin, 9, 10, 11 Sept. 1691.*

102. Half Yearly Meeting held in Dublin, 8, 9, 10 Dec 1692 (F.L.D., QM 1 C1, 1692-1710, f.1); Testimonies of disunity (F.L.D., QM 11 FI, ff 33, 39, 62, 70, 72, 73).

103. William Edmundson, *An epistle to Friends, 9-11 July 1698, Leinster Province Meeting.*

104. William Edmundson, *An epistle containing wholesome advice and counsel to all Friends* (1701)

teachers to give warning to, it is likely they may meet again; but I do not look on them as a dangerous sect'. The Earl of Longford wrote to Arran saying that in Cork papists and non conformists had been suppressed, but that Quakers would be overlooked, 'most of whom are the greatest traders in the town and very peaceable men and submissive to the government'.¹⁰⁵ In fact at the Half Yearly Meeting in March 1685 it was noted:

to our public meetings abundance of other people came, even far more than could get into our house;...though the professors who shrink and hide, we are informed, do rail against the Friends; they do seem as if they were given up to hardness of heart and so set in their blindness and hardness...it appears they envy Friends good and are offended we do not fly into holes as they do.¹⁰⁶

Penn himself urged Ormonde to leave the Quakers in peace; 'avoid troubling conscientious and quiet believing dissenters. They are best for the country and not worst for the church'.¹⁰⁷ William Edmundson told Fox in 1687 that Quakers were being treated very well:¹⁰⁸

We have, several of us, several times been with the Lord Deputy of Ireland, i.e. Richard Talbot, 1st Earl of Tyrconnell, and [the] Chancellor of Ireland, i.e. Sir Alexander Fitton and other chiefs in government and they are ready to hear us and [be] very kind but especially Lord Chief Justice Nugent who is ready to do anything he can for us. Several Friends in Dublin, Cork, Cashel and Limerick [are] made aldermen and in corporations some made burgesses, so such like to meet with trials in these places and I wish the truth suffer not in that case.

Fox had misgivings about this and wondered if Quakers could hold office without having to take oaths and wear gowns; he asked 'Will they let them sit among them with

105. J.B[urnyeat] *The truth exalted* (London, 1691), pp 78-91; Arran to Ormonde, 4 Aug. 1683. H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, vii, p.95; Longford to Arran, 30 Aug. 1683. H.M.C., *Ormonde MSS*, vi, p.121. Archbishop Marsh imprisoned Anthony Sharp and Abraham Fuller in Dublin in 1684. O.C.Goodbody, 'Anthony Sharp, wool merchant, 1643-1707, and the Quaker community in Dublin' in *J.F.H.S.*, 48, no 1 (1956), p. 47.

106. Burnyeat, *The truth exalted*, p.87. At this time in Dublin all non conformists were forbidden to worship in public. Mather Papers, pp 56-7. Quakers tried to avoid clashing with the government of the day. In 1675 they disowned Alexander Riggs for his disruptive behaviour in public, fearing it would win Quakers a bad reputation. Testimonies of denial and condemnation (F.L.D., MM 11 FI, f. 19).

107. 9 Jan. 1684 (Bodl., Carte MSS 40, f. 128).

108. Edmundson to Fox, 12 Nov. 1687 (F.L.L., A.R.Barclay MSS Transcripts, no. 103, p. 298).

their hats on ?'. In the event Anthony Sharp and Samuel Claridge took office as aldermen of Dublin, were excused the oaths and wore no gowns.¹⁰⁹ When James II came to Dublin he gave his protection to the Quakers, 'well satisfied with the loyalty, peaceable demeanour and good affection of the Quakers'.¹¹⁰ James Bonnell, writing after the 1688 revolution in England and during its repercussions in Ireland, reflected:

The Quakers at first took civil offices under King James and were looked upon by us and the Roman Catholics as the same with them; but latterly when they see how things were like to go, they sided once more with us; however even to the last they were favoured in all things by the government and truly we looked upon it to be reward from God to them for the peaceableness of their behaviour in all things.¹¹¹

It was a long journey from 1653 when William Edmundson came to Ireland. He had lived through several periods of great upheaval, not least the the 1690 wars. His lifespan saw the gradual growth of Quakers from outcasts to grudgingly accepted members of society who were often resented less for their strange religious stance than their wealth. They had certainly come a long road in a short time. With the range of experience that he had, and the memories of enormous changes throughout his time in Ireland, Edmundson fought to retain what had been won so painfully by the first generation of Quakers.

Thomas Upsher wrote to Friends in Ireland, supporting Edmundson:¹¹²

I am under a necessity to remind you of the late prophecy of that ancient, eminent and faithful messenger and minister of Jesus Christ, William Edmundson in Dublin at this half years meeting, the substance of which was that a dreadful day of distress was hastening on apace and should surely come, in which the Lord would dung the ground in this and other

109. Isobel Grubb, 'Anthony Sharp, an unpublished memoir' in *Friends Quarterly Examiner*, vol. 59 (1925), p. 181; 5 Nov. 1687, Thompson to Ellis, B.L. Add. MSS 28876, f. 39 in *Anal. Hib.*, no. 32, (1985), p. 39; F.L.D., QM 11 ZI, O, 1688, and Nov. 1687, Half Yearly Meeting, A 10, f. 237; R.H. Murray, *Revolutionary Ireland and its settlement* (London, 1911), p. 65. Oaths had been dispensed with, for some Quakers, since at least 1672. *Cal. of the Anc. Rec. of Dublin*, v, 12.

110. 2 Aug. 1689, Protection for Quakers (T.C.D., MS 2203).

111. 5 Aug. 1690 [James Bonnell] to John Strype (U.L.C., MS Mm VI 49, No. 8). In 1696 Quakers had difficulty in taking the oath offered them but recognised that it tried to meet their sensitivities. Testimonies of disunity, F.L.D., QM 11 FI, f. 73 ff

112. To Friends in Ireland and elsewhere. Dublin, 15 May 1699 (B.L., Add. MSS 39,318, p. 7).

nations with the carcasses of men, and that the Lord would shake the fair and lofty buildings of many with their pleasant things that they have delighted in.

Upsher was hopeful that a remnant would hear the words of the prophet and go forward in the spirit of the early days.¹¹³ Nevertheless, the end of the 17th century was the end of an era, a definite period of growth had occurred and Quakers would have to try to live with what they had created through their own discipline and active presence in the country. The new journey would be different, for they no longer had to fight for a place or be concerned for survival. In the future they had to discover how to sustain what they had achieved since the Restoration.

113. *To Friends in Ireland...* 1698, p. 8.

CHAPTER 7

CONTROVERSIES BETWEEN QUAKERS AND ENGLISH PRESBYTERIANS, INDEPENDENTS, SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIANS AND THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

Quakers and English Presbyterians

In Ireland during the Interregnum Quakers and English Presbyterians clashed constantly. For their part, Quakers were bound to conflict with those conservative clergy who were searching for a strong church, with tithes restored and a settled ministry, able to control sects and wandering preachers. Discord was inevitable. From 1655 the Quakers grew in considerable strength in Limerick and Henry Ingoldsby, governor of the city tried to stem their growth.¹ The city had a succession of visits from Quakers, among them Edmund Burrough and John Howgill, Edward Cooke and James Sicklemore, Barbara Blagdon and John Perrott. When Perrott was imprisoned he was forced to hear a priest who was probably Claudius Gilbert: 'he having quite ended, I being moved by the Lord stood up and spoke', which action promptly added some further days in jail; this, with the use of 'Thee and Thou' and plainness of speech, is all Perrott could be accused of according to his own account to Henry Cromwell.²

Gilbert thought differently and saw the Quakers as a threat to the stability of the country.³ He wrote several

1. 31 March 1658 (B.L., Landsdowne MSS, 822 f.17). Claudius Gilbert, *The libertine schooled* (London, 1657), pp 55-7. See footnote 3 below for Gilbert.

2. 1 June 1656 (B.L., Landsdowne MSS 821, f. 12).

3. Claudius Gilbert was appointed to Limerick in 1652, at a salary of £150 per annum, soon raised to £200. In 1654, with eighteen laymen of the city, he wrote to Oliver Cromwell 'from the church of Christ at Limerick', asking for 'an able godly painful ministry'. St.J.D.Seymour, 'A puritan minister in Limerick' in *Jn. North Munster Arch. Soc.*, iv, no 3 (1919), p.3 ff; *Thurloe*, ii, p.118. Gilbert conformed at the Restoration and ministered in Belfast. In 1682 he published *A preservative against the change of*

tracts against the Quakers, and in *The libertine schooled* rejected any toleration of them. Their danger to society had been proved to Gilbert's satisfaction through the recantations of former Quakers, and through what magistrates and ministers had discovered in Ireland. It was clear to him that Quakerism could be summed up as popery and paganism,

'driven on by numerous Jesuits, friars and other Romish engineers to make a distraction and party for to serve their own ends, that having lost our truth and peace we may be fitted for their will'.⁴

Gilbert distrusted the Quakers and their ways of speaking, acting and praying, especially their extreme behaviour:

'they fume and foam, they range and toss...first ranting, then quaking...the Ranters were merrily, the Quakers were melancholically mad'.⁵

New groups were always seen in their antecedents, either in the history of the early church or in the early period of the reformation, or indeed in other religions. Thus, Gilbert linked this behaviour with the dervishes of Islam,⁶ with the saints of the Roman church, Dominic, Francis, Benedict, Ignatius, Catherine of Siena and Bridget, all 'the great patrons of Quakers'. Gilbert found the Quakers reminiscent of the Anabaptists in 16th century Germany; they needed the firm hand of the magistrates in Limerick:

The crowding of Quakers into these parts, especially into this city, has been a great concern of these lines...the tumultuousness of the Quaking rout had several times disturbed both the worshippers of God and the public peace.

religion, or a just and true idea of the Roman Catholic religion opposed to the flattering portraiture made thereof and particular to that of my lord of Condom. Translated out of the original by Claudius Gilbert, B.D. and minister of Belfast (London, 1683). He also contributed to Richard Baxter's *The certainty of the world's spirits* (London, 1691), pp 214 ff; 247 ff; Gilbert was prebendary of Armagh in 1666. Cotton, *Fasti*, iv, p.51; v, p.208. Gilbert remained on good terms with English presbyterians and was particularly friendly with the countess of Donegal's chaplains who tended to be English presbyterians.

4. Gilbert, *The libertine schooled*, (London, 1657), pp 18-19, 55. This work was written in response to a series of queries which had been distributed in the city, based on Christopher Blackwood's *The storming of Antichrist...1644*; Samuel Winter and Edward Worth had refuted this work. The author of the queries had also pleaded for toleration of the Quakers in Limerick.

5. Gilbert, *The libertine schooled*, p. 25.

6. 'Quaker' was used as term of contempt. For example, Samuel Winter used it to describe Islam, calling it 'the doctrine of Mahomet, that great Quaker'. *The sum of diverse sermons* (Dublin, 1656), p. 176.

They had ensnared many of our soldiers, infected divers of our citizens, gathered many disciples in the garrisons and country, and railed most vilely at the magistrates and ministers of Christ. They had spread multitudes of pamphlets, libels and papers...and by all possible ways laboured to gather a strong party....Divers papists among us began to like their way finding it so like the monkish course of their friars...The Quakers spoke out against the ordinances, the word, sacraments, prayers, the sabbath etc...They molested us daily from several parts of Ireland and England. Being turned out, they returned with their old tricks renewed.⁷

Gilbert spent hours debating with those Quakers who came to Limerick; he read their books and papers but got nowhere with them. Apparently some Quaker 'queries' were sent to Gilbert which he decided not to answer.⁸

In another work published soon after *The libertine schooled* Gilbert specified which teachings and views of the Quakers he found most difficult.⁹ In the preface Gilbert listed the errors of the age and included among them those of Naylor and Fox and indeed of Quakers in general; they were condemned as revivers of old, long condemned heresies. In particular he accused the Quakers of being presumptuous, perfectionist, slanderous and 'wild beasts' in terms of doctrine. For example, Quakers attacked the very humanity of Christ:¹⁰

What shall we think of those quaking impostors, that own no Christ above but what's in them, that renew the Ranter's blasphemy of Gods being all things, their being Christed etc....His humanity variously assaulted by notionists of an old and new stamp, by many Behemenists and the swarms of Quakers...casts them into strange dreams about Christ's manhood which they fancy to have been but a fiction and a figure, a phantasm and apparition, that vanished after a while, to represent that within them which they call Christ.

Gilbert insisted on this point, the humanity of Christ, for by attacking that Quakers undermined the centre of Christianity :

7. Gilbert, *The libertine schooled*, pp 55-6.

8. These could have been : F.Howgill, *Some queries to you all who say you are ministers of Christ in Dublin and to the rest of Ireland*.(n.d.,n.p.) Howgill was in Ireland in 1655. (F.L.L., Swarthmore MSS. v, 10; Trans. vii, p.49).

9. Gilbert, *A sovereign antidote against sinful errors, the epidemical plague of thses latter days* (London, 1658).

10. Gilbert, *A sovereign antidote*, p. 100.

Christ's incarnation, life and passion are with them but stories and shadows; the life and substance is all within them. There say they lies Christ very deep in every man's heart, covered with earth, to be born and raised up, to live and to die, to do and to suffer. As for the Christ that died at Jerusalem, many do slight him, and many that seem to own him verbally, yet renounce him effectively...our late Quakers ...have revived those rotten dregs from the Familists, adding a new dress and access thereto...¹¹

Gilbert accused the Quakers of rejecting Christ as the only mediator and so in some way claiming or winning salvation by their own efforts; they 'pretend sinless perfection and selfish righteousness'. Gilbert accused the Quakers of either denying or ignoring Christ's grace, they 'pass it in silence as needless or useless'. This struck at the heart of the doctrine of predestination and election and so was intolerable theologically.¹² Christ's own priesthood in heaven was devalued by the Quakers for they denied the need for his mediation . The fact that they claimed 'immediate revelations and infallible oracles....pretending extraordinary acquaintance with God and spirits', made Quakers dangerously similar to the stance of the gnostics in the early church.¹³ They also denied the resurrection, and 'own no Christ but what is within them'. They put scripture and their own 'pretended revelations' on an equal footing, 'giving to their pretended light within the infallibility which the papists give to their pope and council. Christ's ordinances were mocked by the Quakers and positively opposed by them.'¹⁴

Claudius Gilbert specifically accused the Quakers of being driven on by 'Jesuits, friars and other Roman engineers to make a distraction and party fit to serve their own ends'. He suspected that there was a well thought plan by Rome to try and win toleration for all sects and in this way make a path for the Roman church. To this purpose it was planned that Roman agents:¹⁵

11. Gilbert, *A sovereign antidote*, p.111.

12. Ibid, pp 105, 133.

13. Ibid, pp 107,108,110.

14. Ibid, pp 114,115,118,123.

15. Ibid, pp 18-19.

must therefore appear under a pharisaical monkish garb, pretending much to external righteousness and self denial that their plausible colours may disguise their horrid inside...What could not be done by Seekers, Levellers, Arminians and Ranters shall now be better carried on by Quakers, the sublimate of them all..

Gilbert also accused Quakers, in their personal life and behaviour, of being 'conceited perfectionists...in their pharisaical monkish holiness'. This referred even then to the austerity of life for which Quakers were becoming famed and which would become institutionalised. He also hinted that Quaker claims to infallibility were similar to that of the Pope, a charge that also would increase with the years.¹⁶

Gilbert grasped the significance of the Quaker movement and saw it as undermining the basic tenets of reformation theology and practice. He saw the presence of the Quakers as essentially destructive and negative. Thus very early on in its history there were radical differences between the Quakers and English Presbyterians regarding the nature and office of Christ, the doctrine of predestination and election, the place and role of sacraments, the authority of the gospel, the value of ordinances and their enforcement by the magistrates. In the view of the ministers and indeed the government of the day, these were considered essential for an ordered society. Quakers were undermining these foundations in a way which could only be interpreted as sinister. Just as the German Anabaptists brought confusion in their day, so the Quakers were doing in Ireland and specifically in Limerick, and through them Christ suffered in his magistrates, the civil deputies who acted in Christ's name. It was a fine defence of Ingoldsby.¹⁷.

Another conservative presbyterian minister, Samuel Ladyman, also attacked the Quakers and like Gilbert, compared them to the Anabaptists of Munster.¹⁸ Ladyman

16. Gilbert, *A sovereign antidote*, pp 3, 108-9, 115.

17. Ibid, p.145.

criticised the Quaker insistence on freedom of conscience which he called a subordinate rule, 'the understandings' echo'. He insisted that conscience needed laws, for on its own it was arbitrary and uncertain; even scripture could be abused by conscience. He reminded his hearers that John of Leyden claimed it was conscience that allowed him to have fifteen wives at one time.¹⁹

How easily, how often is it abused by the ignorance of some and the corruption of others? Were the application of this righteous law left to conscience, the Quakers' dreams might commence uncontrollable edicts. Some would leave their wives, children, their families, and our Saviour's words, Matt. 19:29, must both justify and commend them.²⁰

Although he was not known as a member of the association of ministers who worked for a presbyterian form of church government, George Pressicke of Dublin argued for a comprehensive church at the Restoration, asking in particular that former 'godly ministers' be allowed to preach in Ireland.²¹ Pressicke wrote a tract in 1660 against Anabaptists and Quakers in Ireland developing Gilbert and Ladyman's accusation that Quakers were like the Anabaptists of 16th century Germany.²² In his work Pressicke accused the Anabaptists and Quakers, sometimes with the Ranters and Levellers, of being very like the Anabaptists in Germany 139 years ago. Although all had their origin in the Roman church, Pressicke found the beliefs of the Anabaptists similar to what was held by Quakers in Ireland.

18. *The dangerous rule or a sermon preached at Clonmel in the province of Munster in Ireland, 3 August 1657, before the reverend judges of that circuit* (London, 1658). For Ladyman, see Ch. 4, n. 17.

19. Ladyman, *The dangerous rule*, pp 28,33,57, 68 -78.

20. Ibid, p.71.

21. *Certain queries touching the silencing of godly ministers* (n.p., 1661). Pressicke also entered into debate with Griffith Williams, bishop of Ossory, over Williams' book *The great Antichrist revealed*, and argued that the Westminster Assembly was not Antichrist, that presbyterians never acted like Rome and so were not Antichrist. An answer to Griffith Williams, Lord bishop of Ossory, his book entitled *The Great Antichrist revealed, before this time never discovered* (n.p., n.d.). Pressicke seems to have been an established church minister although he is not listed in the *Fasti*; he had a long divorce case which he presented first to two bishops in London during the Interregnum and then to the archbishop of Dublin, *A case of conscience propounded to a great bishop* (n.p., 1661).

22. *A brief relation of some of the most remarkable passages of the Anabaptists in High and Low Germany, 1521* (n.p., 1660).

He accused the Anabaptists, Quakers and Ranters of rejecting baptism, and while they refused oaths and the taking of offices as magistrates, they gave the power of the sword to ministers; they rejected profane learning and claimed that the ignorant were able to expound scripture, that there were no ministerial callings in the church but all were to speak as they were inspired. This teaching had been rife in the three nations for the past 8-9 years, but was particularly relevant when Pressicke wrote, for in 1659 there was a danger, for a short period, that Quakers and Baptists would unite against the government.²³ Pressicke found the life of John of Leyden very like that of the Quakers, who also ran naked and preached rebellion. Just as John of Leyden had preached repentance based on revelation he claimed to have received, so did the Quakers in Ireland:

'We may see the sad symptoms hereof among ourselves, some have not spared to say they hoped within a short time there should not be a minister in Ireland'.²⁴

Quakers took such accusations seriously. On 18 February 1656 Francis Howgill, then in Ireland, wrote to George Fox and James Naylor that enemies 'seek our life and accuse us for Jesuits and say they will swear against us'.²⁵ Attacks such as Pressicke's were provocative and Edmund Burrough responded on behalf of the Quakers.²⁶ He made it clear that he was only answering for the Quakers and he set out to defend Quakers in general though particularly in Ireland. He denied that they had any authority to exercise power which could in any way be called tyrannical or rebellious; rather they had been persecuted from the beginning. Neither did the Quakers originate from the Roman church, in fact the reformation churches stemmed from Rome; nor had they popish agents among them as Pressicke hinted. He accepted that they had their own revelations from God; they discerned spirits and lived

23. Pressicke, *A brief relation*, pp 1-4; Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p. 132.

24. *Ibid*, pp 8- 16.

25. F.L.L., A.R.Barclay MSS, Transcripts, no. 61, p.69.

26. Edmund Burrough, *A vindication of the people of God called Quakers...being an answer to a book dedicated to them by one George Pressicke* (London,1660).

plainly and soberly; they did not take oaths as this was contrary to the gospel, but for all that they were not against the magistrate or government or indeed ministers as such.

Burrough then addressed the Lords Justices, to whom he dedicated the work, and he asked if they had ever found the Quakers plotting in any way against the government. On the contrary, Burrough claimed, Quakers were good neighbours and good traders, dealing justly and honestly with all. And he declared:

We do own and acknowledge magistracy to be an ordinance of God, instituted of him for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of them that do well; and we acknowledge all just subjection to authority, magistracy and government. This is our principle and has been our practice known throughout these kingdoms, that we are subject by doing and suffering to whatever authority the Lord is pleased to set over us, without rebellion, seditious plotting or making war against any government or governor.²⁷

This is a strong statement on passive obedience; Burrough argued that rebellion was wrong, even if the state were unjust ; 'we must commit our cause to the Lord in such case'. Quakers were enemies, not to the church, ministry or gospel ordinances, but to the corruptions of papists and protestants. Ministry, church government, worship and discipline needed to be reformed not destroyed. But although Quakers were not rebellious, Burrough was equally clear that to impose faith, doctrine and worship by force of law and penalties was contrary to conscience and was in fact the work of Antichrist, the work of the devil.

In the same year, Burrough wrote another tract, intended for all but 'more particularly to the inhabitants of Ireland and all sorts of people therein'.²⁸ Using the prophetic style so common to Quakers at the time, Burrough

27. Burrough, *A vindication...of the...Quakers*, p. 22.

28. Edmund Burrough, *The everlasting gospel of repentance and remission of sins* (n.p., 1660).

denounced several groups, among them those who rejected the Light, sects which had no true worship, unjust judges, corrupt merchants and false ministers.²⁹ He asserted Quaker beliefs: guidance of conscience from the Light Within; out of this, and not the practices of religion, ordinances and duties, came new life; in this way the image of God was born in the human person. In the light of this, the ministry of false teachers had to be rejected. Instead of outer buildings for worship, the person became an inner temple and God was worshipped there without respect of days, times or places. This is what it meant to be saved and to live in the power of God; all forms of religion without this power had to be denied, including profession of scripture, ordinances, church membership, praying and preaching.³⁰

This was not just a defence of Quakerism but a restatement of the radical beliefs of Quakers which underlay their refusal to pay tithes, repair churches, go to any church services or in any way support the church system. Burrough was well aware that such statements would be rejected and he prepared his readers for persecution, warning them that meetings would be forbidden and that they would be expected to attend church conventicles. This was the mark of Antichrist, of the great Babylon of Revelation 13:

We need none of your outward prescriptions of forms of prayers, for the spirit of God teaches us in all these things, when and where and how we should worship the Lord God, who is a spirit.³¹

In the times ahead, Burrough warned, no private preachers would be allowed. This would stamp out the power of men and women to speak of God. Only those ordained would be allowed to preach, and this was truly another mark of Antichrist, for the education of ministers was not known

29. Burrough, *The everlasting gospel*, p. 3 ff

30. Ibid, p. 16 ff

31. Ibid, pp 21-24.

in the time of Christ. All the churches, Roman and Protestant, had the outer form of religion but in fact they all lacked the power of God within them.³² This is very much a transitional document when Burrough warned his people of the hard times ahead, with even more harassment from their critics.

However, in the period after the Restoration there is little evidence of controversy between English Presbyterians and Quakers in Ireland until the debate between Joseph Boyse and Samuel Fuller. While it is beyond the period under study, yet it deserves attention for it seems that Boyse's views on the Quakers were originally articulated in 1707, though published the year of his death, 1728.³³ Moreover, the contents of Boyse's criticism indicated the growth of Quakerism in Ireland between 1660-1707. The accusations levelled against the Quakers were well articulated in the queries and centred on the actual beliefs of the Quakers in the Bible and Creed, in the Light Within, the place of the scriptures with regard to the Light Within, the place of worship and sacrament, the significance of justification and redemption by Christ, the resurrection of the body. None of these were new but they were the persistent charges which critics made against the Quakers throughout this period. However, the last query betrayed the antagonism aroused by the Quakers:³⁴

Whether such vile errors when joined on the one hand with extreme pride and self-conceit, with gross censoriousness and uncharitableness in unsainting all that differ from them, with a wretched neglect of all family prayer and an

32. Burrough, *The everlasting gospel*, pp 27-32.

33. *Some queries offered to the consideration of the people called Quakers particularly of those in Queen's county* (n.p., n.d.). Printed in *The works of Mr. Boyse of Dublin*, 2 vols (London, 1728), ii, pp 398-400. Samuel Fuller, *A serious reply to twelve sections of abusive queries proposed to the consideration of the people called Quakers, concluding the works of Joseph Boyse yet alive, an aged and eminent preacher among the presbyterians in Dublin* (Dublin, 1728). However, in 1707 John Moor published a paper against the Quakers under the same title, *Some queries offered...* but with the addition 'By an inhabitant there'. The paper is included in a work by Moor, *Three discourses concerning transubstantiation, invocation of the saints and angels, worship of images* (Dublin, 1707). Both papers are identical. For Moor, *Fasti*, i, 272, 249; William King's *Letter Book* 1696-98 (T.C.D., MSS 750, f. 215); 'Mr. James Moor of Athy in my diocese, a worthy person', Narcissus Marsh, 1695 (Lambeth Palace, Gibson Papers, MS 942, f. 79). From 1708-16 Moor ministered in Dublin: Herbert Wood (ed.), *The parish registers of St. Catherine's, Dublin, 1636-1715* (Exeter/London, 1908). According to D.N.B. Boyse published a set of sermons on 1708. It is difficult to know who was the author of the queries; certainly Fuller assumed that Boyse was the writer, and noted in his book that few in Queen's Co. 'had either seen or read them since the author owned them'.

34. *Works of J. Boyse*, ii, 398-400.

immoderate pursuit of the world; and yet joined on the other with such an affected needless singularity in speech, garb and behaviour as the scriptures nowhere require, be not a palpable instance of Satan's transforming himself into an angel of light.

This was a continual source of friction: the Quakers were distinct in several ways from the accepted norms for practising religion within the reformation churches. Being different from and even dismissive of other traditions, pursuing wealth with success, dressing differently and speaking a language that was singular, indicated to many of their critics that Quakers were of the dark spirit. Their sin was to insist on being different.

Samuel Fuller was from Dublin, a writer and publisher in his own right. His *Reply* to Boyse was clear and well organised.³⁵ Coming as it does at the end of the period under study, Fuller's work showed the institutionalisation that had taken place among the Quakers over several decades. Although Fuller refuted all Boyse's points, and indeed tried to meet him as far as possible yet it was clear that on some issues there could be no agreement. For example, the sufficiency of God's grace and light for all was reasserted; predestination was rejected firmly as untenable. The Bible and the Creed held their place of importance but not as central as the Light Within:

With the primitive reformers we say the Bible is our creed, the Bible is the text, the Spirit is the interpreter and that to everyone for himself, thereby establishing the right of private judgement against all popish implicit faith, the very basis whereon the Reformation stands.³⁶

Certainly this is the reformation tradition pushed to its own conclusion. And Quakers insisted they were not to be judged or written off because they did not have the training or tradition of their opponents. Fuller pointed out that Quakers were not scholastically trained like the

35. Grubb, *Quakers in Ireland*, p. 91. Fuller wrote a book on astronomy and another called *Some principles and precepts of the Christian religion*. He died in 1736.

36. Fuller, *A serious reply*, p. 36.

presbyterian ministers, but 'a plain people' saying things simply, not going into words like 'substance' or 'essence'.³⁷ They were liberated from the burden of such learning and had built their own way of life, held to it, organised themselves to live it, disciplined those who fell away and dismissed those who would not conform to their expectations. It was as coherent a form of religion as any other in Ireland at the time, as highly disciplined and motivated as any other and succeeded in surviving through this discipline and commitment. Thus the Quakers persisted in living a form of Christianity which aroused the ire and condemnation of other traditions in the country.

Quakers and Independents

While public debate between English Presbyterians and Quakers lessened in the period after the Restoration, it continued between the Independents and Quakers especially after 1670. George Fox visited Ireland in 1669 and travelled the country establishing the Quakers on a more organised and purposeful basis. In the course of the visit he met many people of other persuasions and drew new converts to the movement. In his journal Fox recounted how he debated on election and predestination with 'many great persons' who came to James Hutchinsons's house for the discussion. Fox made it clear that Quakers did not accept strict predestination; rather they believed that Christ had died for all and that the gospel and salvation were available for all nations without exception.³⁸

37. Fuller, *A serious reply*, p.58. In fact, however, Fuller was well read and for example cites Ussher several times in his text to prove a point: pp 17, 40, 127.

38. *Journal of George Fox*, 2 vols (London, 1901), ii, 112-13. Hutchinson was a Quaker who lived at Knockballymeagher in north Tipperary. Penn, *My Irish journal*, pp 20, 67.

Such teaching was unacceptable to the Independents and about this time Samuel Mather outlined the essentials of christian belief: the doctrine of the Trinity, one God and three persons; the scripture; the deity of Christ; the immortality of the soul; the resurrection of the body.³⁹ Mather thought that anyone who did not believe in these essentials should be cast out of the church. It is significant that these points were the matter of debate with the Quakers at this time, and refuted in print by Timothy Taylor and Thomas Jenner in 1670.⁴⁰

By this time the tone and content of debate had changed. For one thing, Quaker convictions were well articulated by themselves and better grasped by outsiders, however critical and negative they were about them. In a sense, Quaker convictions were seen as even more of a threat than before, since it was clear that Quakers saw themselves as outside some of the accepted norms of the christian churches: the primary authority of the scriptures, the centrality of the humanity of Christ, the doctrine of the Trinity, the need for salvation from Christ alone, the place of sacraments and worship.

What had been a loosely held set of beliefs in the Interregnum had become, in a relatively short time, a rooted stance and mode of believing and acting in society. There was no question of their conformity to any church, for they had moved beyond that into their own space and intended to stay there. They organised themselves in such a way that this could be ensured, through their manner of life, regularity of meetings, setting down rules for family life and marriage, trade, dress, language and

39. Mather, *The figures or types*, p. 375.

40. Taylor was a Presbyterian and became an Independent; he was chaplain to Venables in Carrickfergus. There he occupied the former rectors's residence and the rent was paid by the corporation. He was one of the examiners for ministers appointed in 1655. From 1668 - 1681 he ministered in New Row. New Row Baptismal Register, ff 2-7; Armstrong, *Summary history of the presbyterian church*, p. 80; Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, 4 vols (London, 1813-20), ii, A1, 682; Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii, pp 229 n.16, 249-56; Bramhall to Lane, 28 Nov. 1660 (Bodl., Carte MSS 221, f.79); Inquisition 1657, Down and Connor.R.C.B., MS. Gg 2/7/3/27, pp 6, 71. (These are Classon Porters' notes); P.R.O.N.I., T. 780, Extracts from the Commonwealth and Carte papers, f. 12; B.L., Lansdowne MSS 823, ff 73, 139; Thurloe, *State Papers*, iv, 287. Thomas Jenner was educated at Christ College Cambridge and was minister of Horstead and Coltshall in Norfolk before going to New England and then to Ireland, first to Drogheda and later to Carlow. cf. title page to text *Quakerism anatomised*; Harrison to Henry Cromwell, 14 July 1656 (B.L., Lansdowne MSS 821 f. 200).

dwelling. They were a self contained group, held together and nurtured by the intensity of their commitment and conviction. As such this was bound to call forth criticism and antagonism.

When Taylor and Jenner wrote a tract denouncing the Quakers,⁴¹ Jenner explained that he wrote to fend off the 'the spreading gangrene of Quakerism in this kingdom and especially in these parts where the Lord has cast my lot'. He set about refuting Quakerism and examined its key errors. These he saw as fourfold: claiming no distinction between God and human beings, denying the Trinity, denying the humanity of Christ and denying that the scriptures were the word of God and as such had primary authority.

Jenner claimed that Quakers made no distinction between the nature of God and the nature of the human being, believing that the human soul is part of the divine essence. This was heretical for Jenner, who insisted on the spirit of Christ as distinct from the creature; to say otherwise made men and women equal to God, as well as making God partake in sinful humanity; and if there was no distinction, then men and women could do miracles, be omniscient and perfect.⁴² For the Independent tradition this was theologically impossible, since it admitted some human goodness and initiative in the work of salvation. Again, Quakers denied the Trinity, saying that there was no distinction of persons, nor was there any proof in scripture that there were three persons in God. This Jenner roundly refuted and reasserted the traditional doctrine of the Trinity as handed down through the centuries. He even asserted that angels were persons in their own right since they had reason.⁴³

41. Thomas Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised and confuted* (n.p., 1670). The work was dedicated to the Earl and Lady Donegal. Timothy Taylor wrote the Preface to the work.

42. Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised*, p.15 ff

43. Ibid, pp 30-33.

Another critical area in theology was Jenner's assumption that Quakers denied Christ to be God and man in one person, or that Christ had a true human body. Jenner cited Fox who declared, 'Christ has but one body and that is his church'. Jenner also cited a Quaker who wrote 'The redeemer of man is not that person who died at Jerusalem but the Light which is in every man by which he is given to see sin and enabled by it (if obedient to it) to be redeemed from sin'. Quakers thought that Christ only suffered and died as a figure, as an example, and not in any real way as God. For Jenner this negated the mystery of redemption, and gave the impression that people could save themselves. Again, this view struck at the heart of the doctrine of justification and allowed Quakers to claim inherent righteousness. Heresy indeed.

Jenner accused the Quakers of denying that the scriptures had primary authority as the word of God and that they were necessary for salvation. He knew this from his own experience:⁴⁴

Myself being in Carlow in Ireland [in] 1669 did there and then hear a Quaker (after a long oration of his) profess that if the Bible were out of the world, it were no matter, for there is no need of it to salvation, people might be as well saved without it as with it if they attend to the light within and the power of God within them, and that for his own part he was not at all beholding to it for any grace or good he gained from it.

Again, this was unacceptable, for the scriptures were the foundation and focus both for living and for theology. Such views were scandalous and destructive, and Jenner warned the Quakers that they were in danger of following the fate of the Anabaptists in 16th century Munster. Moreover, having rejected the rule of scripture, Quakers had developed the theme of the Light Within as central to their belief. They called it Christ, the Spirit, salvation, the covenant of grace, rule of conscience, and said this Light was in the believer or unbeliever alike.

44. Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised*, p. 52 ff

Again for Jenner this was just not true; there was a difference between the light of nature and the light of grace, and salvation was not open to the unbeliever.

Jenner knew that the Quakers claimed to use this Light Within as a way of discerning the spirit of good and evil, of right and wrong, of God or Satan. To prove his point Jenner told the story of a Quaker woman in Dublin who in the course of preaching said she had discovered a new light denied to other Quakers; they rejected her light but she in turn repudiated this judgement and said her light came immediately from God. Jenner asked, how could the Quakers really discern between the two views since they denied the scriptures and asserted that everyone had the light of God within them? In the case of conflict Jenner would appeal to an outside authority and the Quakers to a personal, interior one; but this led Jenner to conclude that Quakers thought themselves infallible, open to pride and evil influences.⁴⁵

Connected with the rejection of scripture was their negation of preaching or even reading or hearing scripture; worst of all, they preached from inspiration not from a text and even allowed women to preach, which Jenner ironically declared as 'contrary to the expressed word of God'.⁴⁶ They also ignored all church organisation, offices, ordinances; they disapproved of university trained ministers and of taking of money/tithes for the gospel. They even denied that the magistrates had a godly function in society which Jenner saw as very dangerous and undermining of society.

On a more practical, social level Jenner objected to the Quaker way of life, lived so separately from others. The language they used was mere flattery: 'elect of God; the perfect ones; the seed of God; the tender lambs of Christ; the new born'.⁴⁷ He also resented that Quakers only

45. Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised*, pp 85-86, 138-147. This could be a reference to Jane Pildren in Dublin. See Ch. 6. n. 92.

46. Ibid, p. 96 ff

47. Ibid, p. 186.

saluted their own, which was contrary to scripture; they insisted on addressing all as 'Thou' and took off their hats to no one, neither bowed or observed the ordinary civilities of life. Jenner rejected the Quaker practice of going naked as a sign, and called it a delusion by the devil.⁴⁸ He was sure that the silent meetings which Quakers held led to hysteria and generated an atmosphere in which strange things happened. Among examples, Jenner cited the case of Mrs. Wright:⁴⁹

The last summer the said George Fox (as I am informed) came to the house of Mr. Wright, near Castledermot here in Ireland, whose wife for a long time refused to go to the Quaker meetings or to hear them; but as soon as they said George Fox was come thither and had spoken with her, taking her by the hand and she hearing of him, she withdrew any further arguments, immediately turns an absolute professed Quaker (notwithstanding much means used to the contrary by myself and others)...

Jenner recounted the ministry undertaken by this woman in some detail and saw it stemming from the fatal meeting with Fox and the atmosphere created by this intense silence of waiting sustained during Quaker meetings. Such meetings were large and their numbers were growing. Jenner cited a letter a friend of his received regarding the growth of the Quakers both in Ireland and abroad, despite all the sufferings and hostilities they endured.

On the grounds both of their convictions and practice Jenner found the Quakers heretics. All that was essential not only to the Independents but also to the Christian tradition was apparently ignored or by-passed by the Quakers: the nature of God and the human being; the nature and historicity of Christ; the doctrine of the Trinity; the necessity and meaning of redemption and the theology of justification by Christ alone; the inherent unrighteousness of the creature and inability to attain perfection; the sacredness of scripture as the word of God; the preaching of the word; the necessity of

48. Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised*, pp 148-51; 15.

49. Ibid, pp 157-63; *A brief and true relation of Anne, wife of William Wright of Castledermot in the County of Kildare in Ireland*, in Mary Leadbeater, *Biographical notes of Friends in Ireland* (London, 1823), pp. 52-78. Anne Wright was attracted to the Quakers in Dublin in 1656 but was persuaded by Samuel Winter not to join them (pp 52-3). Also, *Names of Friends deceased in the kingdom of Ireland*. (F.L.D., Y.M.F.I., f.1.).

sacraments and church order and ministry, supported by the magistrate. For Quakers to stress the inner authority of the person over against the received Christian tradition of the day was bound to cause controversy. What had been a sect during the Interregnum, very much in the melting pot then, had emerged into a defined body of people in Ireland with its own coherence and way of life.

Taylor and Jenner's work was an attack on this way of life and conviction and so George Whitehead and William Penn were asked to write a reply. In May 1671 Fox wrote to Penn asking him to hurry up and publish:

Several friends newly come out of Ireland who informs of the great want of this book in answer to his [Jenner's], I desire thee speed it up, laying aside all other things till it be done...we understand that Jenner makes a trade of his books in sending and selling of them up and down.⁵⁰

In 1671 Whitehead and Penn published their reply to Jenner, a time when Penn was in Newgate prison.⁵¹ By way of stating their loyalty to the government, they dedicated the book to the Lord Lieutenant, Robartes, and his Council and all the magistrates in Ireland. They made the point:⁵²

It will always appear partial and unmanly that in a country only maintained by English civil interest those who are themselves dissenters and esteem persecution against them unchristian, should express so much Romish zeal in exasperating the civil magistrate to our utter ruin, who are both English and dissenters, too.

However, they did not wish to enter into debate 'with the sharp gusts of a Scottish-Presbyterian-directorian persecution' but rather to state their case moderately and leave the world to judge them. Besides they knew the Quakers had been very useful in Ireland and for this alone they had a right to be heard and protected. The first part of the book was written by Whitehead, who prefaced his

50. M.R.Brailsford, *The making of William Penn* (London, 1933), p. 208; also, p.75 for Penn's account of Jenner, 'an Independent Presbyterian priest of Ireland'; apparently Jenner went to the Lord Lieutenant who returned the book with the remark that 'the tares and wheat must grow together until the day of judgement'.

51. *A serious apology for the principles and practices of the people called Quakers against the malicious aspersions, erroneous doctrines and horrid blasphemies of T. Jenner and Timothy Taylor in their book entitled 'Quakerism anatomised and confuted' (n.p. 1671).*

52. Whitehead, *A serious apology*, Dedication.

remarks by saying all that Taylor and Jenner wrote against the Quakers were old arguments dredged up, out of date and well answered long ago. He can only conclude that both were trying to win favour with the government.

Whitehead proceeded to refute Jenner's description of Quaker beliefs. He insisted that Quakers recognised the difference between creator and created, the infinite and the finite; they did not claim equality with God. He admitted that some individual Quakers had exaggerated on this point and had been rebuked for it and he wished that Jenner had taken that into consideration.⁵³ With regard to the Trinity, Whitehead asserted that the Father, Word and Holy Spirit were God, but not distinct persons; the idea of three persons was merely an 'unscriptural invented distinction...managed by Jenner and some other of his brethren'. Whitehead declared that Quakers believed in the divinity of Christ and that Christ died not just as figure but in truth, and that his death and resurrection really did save. But while he rejected Jenner's doctrine of justification, declaring that Christ died for all, and not just for a few elect, predestined men and women, Whitehead also insisted on the perfection of the creature now in and through the power of God, as a direct result of Christ's death.⁵⁴

Whitehead argued that too much was asked of the Bible as a text; the scriptures were an expression of the spirit of God, but the spirit in them was wider than the the actual text and this spirit reached parts of the world where the Bible was not known. Moreover, anyone who spoke from the depth of the spirit spoke the word of God. Although Quakers esteemed the scriptures they did not set them above Christ or the Spirit of God as Jenner did in practice.⁵⁵

53. Whitehead, *A serious apology*, pp 23-25.

54. Ibid, pp 20, 32-42.

55. Ibid, pp 48-54.

Whitehead admitted the emphasis Quakers placed on the Light Within; it was their experience of God. He also defended the practice of going naked as a sign; both had a place in the scriptures.⁵⁶ Whereas Jenner called the Light Within the light of nature, Quakers in fact called it the light of divinity. This was contrary to the doctrine of predestination and election, which Whitehead called:

This pitiful, mean and narrow spirit of rigid presbyters which grounds all this their opposition against the universal favour of God upon a supposed personal election.⁵⁷

This refutation of Jenner and exposition of Quaker beliefs was followed by Penn's contribution written in prison.⁵⁸ He underlined some of the points Whitehead made and developed others. He argued that Fox was not against preaching as such, in fact Quakers received a mission to preach the gospel by 'an anointing' and through this were qualified to preach 'not in corners, or under protection of earthly powers, nor yet in set places for large stipends, but freely with our lives in our hands'.⁵⁹ Penn also explained the Quaker view of the Sabbath; they did not set aside consecrated days and times as Independents did, but they had definite days and times set apart for meetings and they did not neglect their family duties.⁶⁰

Quakers upheld the power of prophecy, needed then as in the early church, but resisted by ministers like Taylor and Jenner because they felt inadequate and feared losing their tithes. Penn also explained why the Quakers did not accept sacraments or 'ordinances of Christ' as Jenner called them. All the signs Christ used before his death were transformed at the resurrection and thus no longer valid nor necessary.⁶¹ Penn refuted some details of

56. Whitehead, *A serious apology*, pp 13-18; 22-24.

57. Ibid, pp 55-63.

58. Penn, *The second part of the serious apology for the principles and practices of the people called Quakers*.

59. Penn, *The second part* p 80 ff

60. Ibid, p. 12.

61. Ibid, pp 123;132 ff

Jenners' stories about Quakers in Ireland. He accused Jenner of asking the bishop of Leighlin for approbation of his book and called him a hypocrite; this ought to warn the reformed church 'what they themselves ought to expect from the spirit of Jenner and his brethren had they a power suitable to the Scottish-Directorian-will'.⁶²

At the end of his work, Penn refuted Taylor's preface to Jenner's book. Whereas Whitehead dealt with the actual text by Jenner, Taylor's Preface was particularly offensive to Penn. Using the book of Revelation, Taylor showed the rise of Antichrist, of the Church of Rome; he claimed that one of the devices used by the Pope to further his designs was to send Jesuits to infiltrate all religious societies. In this way differences and divisions could be fostered among Protestants. Taylor pointed out how useful the Quakers were in this regard for they resisted church government and so offended the 'the very canon of faith'. Indeed⁶³:

If the Quakers could but remove the ministers of Jesus Christ out of the gap, the Jesuits would with ease hand in the Pope at the breach.

Like Jesuits, the Quakers started new opinions and ways in religion. They denied the whole order of gospel ministry in relation to church order and ordinances. And then Taylor ventured:⁶⁴

I do not say that one Quaker in a hundred is a dogmatical formal papist, but I am satisfied that many Jesuits are designedly Quakers, stalking under them and ploughing under their heifer, that once more they may set the Pope's claim above the throne of Christ and his mitre above the crown.

The purpose of the book, *Quakerism anatomised and confuted*, was to expose the lies of the Quakers and Taylor pointed out that it was the first of its kind in Ireland. Both he and Jenner hoped to prove to the Quakers themselves that Antichrist was within them, that they were being used by

62. Penn, *The second part*, pp 178-9.

63. Jenner, *Quakerism anatomised and confuted*, Preface by Taylor.

64. Ibid.

Rome. Penn confessed amazement at Taylor's accusations, suggesting that in reality Quakers were further from popery than the 'Independent Presbyterians'. Quakers:

disown a settled ministry, tithes, infant water baptism, swearing, steeplehouses, external and visible signs under a gospel administration, the compliments, fashions and customs of the world; all highly owned, venerated and conformed to by Taylor and his brethren.⁶⁵

Finally, Penn asserted that Taylor need not attack Quakers regarding their stand on church government: the Scottish Covenant and Directory had been used to kill the King. In fact the Independents destroyed the true Republican model because the priests did not want to lose their tithes.⁶⁶ The tone of this section harked back to the old antagonisms between Independents and Quakers during the civil war. Then the lines of theological differences were not so clear. Yet Taylor would have been aware of their general thrust. Before he came to Ireland Taylor was in the parish of West Kirby with Samuel Eaton, with whom he co-authored a book on the Independent way. Eaton wrote several works against the Quakers and no doubt Taylor would have been familiar with Eaton's arguments.⁶⁷

To write a reply was not enough and Penn asked for an open debate on all these points with Taylor and Samuel Mather. Both expressed willingness to meet Penn in private but Penn refused this and wanted a public forum. This does not seem to have taken place. It is evident that the differences between the Independents and Quakers were very real both in theology and practice and there was little ground to give between them. Jenner and Taylor articulated criticisms which Quakers evoked both by their teaching and practice. Their independent stance and self contained way of living was a source of scandal to those traditions which looked to exterior authorities and sources for validation of their beliefs. The Quakers essentially

65. Penn, *The second part*, p. 193.

66. Ibid, pp 191-3; 197.

67. Samuel Eaton, *The Quakers confuted* (London, 1653); also *The perfect pharisee under monkish holiness* (London, c.1653); Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, p.140.

optimistic view of human beings, their belief in an inner human goodness which all people shared, all over the world, was intolerable in every sense to those steeped in a heavy theology of sin. Whether or not the Quakers could allow themselves to enjoy their theological liberty in real life is open to question; the Independent tradition was unable to even consider this a possibility, and so the differences between them were very deep and enduring.

Debates between Quakers and Independents continued and in 1673 James Parke, a Quaker, replied to a pamphlet which Daniel Burges of Dublin wrote against the Quakers.⁶⁸ No copy of Burges' work is extant but Parke in his reply indicated its main thrust.⁶⁹ Parke was in Dublin in 1673 and came across Burges' pamphlet and

'for the clearing of truth and for the sake of them that have inclination after it in Dublin or elsewhere, I have written in answer to it'.⁷⁰

By 1673 Burges had moved from Cork to Dublin and been ordained by Dr. Harrison of Cooke Street and 'some other ministers there'.⁷¹ Burges accused the Quakers of being a sect, full of heresy and delusion, and he criticised them on both social and theological grounds. He accused the Quakers of pretending to be honest and decent dealers, boasting their virtue. The Quakers, according to Burges, 'crow on the multitudes that turn to them in all parts, of which they seem proud with a witness' and yet they were composed of:

68. *The way of God and them that walk in it, vindicated against deceit and lies, being an answer to a malicious pamphlet entitled 'A caveat against the cheat of the Quaker's chaff, written by Daniel Burges, priest at Dublin in Ireland (n.p., 1673);* Parke, 1636-96, was born in Wales and was a prominent Quaker. He spent most of his life in England and published Quaker works. He was in Dublin, visiting Quakers, when he discovered Burges' pamphlet. He spoke at George Fox's burial. F.L.L., *Biographies of Quakers*; D.N.B.

69. D.N.B.; Daniel Burges, 1645-1713, born in Middlesex, was educated at Oxford. In 1667 the Earl of Orrery took him to Ireland for seven years to be headmaster of Orrery's school at Charleville, Co. Cork. By 1673 he was in Dublin, and chaplain to Lady Mervin near Dublin; he left Ireland in 1674, and went first to Marlborough and then to London in 1685.

70. Parke, *The way of God*, p. 4.

71. Mathew Henry, *Funeral sermon for Mr. Burges* (London, 1713), p. 32.

Ignoramuses, melancholy conceited fools, decayed shopkeepers to get and hoist up a trade, stale girls to get a husband and others of the like brand'.⁷²

Parke, of course, rejected all these accusations and asserted that Quakers became convinced freely and willingly. He admitted that

'It is well known that many substantial tradesman of all sorts, seeing the folly, deceit and wickedness of such as thou art...have turned to us and received the truth in the love of it'.⁷³

Burges had accused the Quakers of being as wealthy as the Pope and the Turks, and of boasting about it. While Parke did not deny that Quakers were wealthy he refuted that they boasted about it. On the theological level, Burges accused the Quakers of claiming perfection and of being more pure than others, glorying in their sufferings. Parke denied this, stating that Quakers simply admired God's grace in their lives. This was unacceptable to Burges for it meant the human person could freely respond to God and grow within that experience, and so in some way win their way to God. Again it was another example of the polarisation between predestination and the possibility of free response to God.⁷⁴ Burges accused Quakers of denying the doctrine of the Trinity and Parke refuted this, stating the view that the persons of the Trinity as such were not found in the scriptures; Father, Son and Holy Spirit were mentioned but not as as three distinct persons. Burges objected to the Quaker form of silent meetings, calling them inventions not found in the scriptures; they did not use the sacraments or the word of God, or God's worship as laid down in scripture. All such accusations were rejected by Parke and he affirmed that Quakers were true to the real meaning of worship by waiting in silence on God.⁷⁵

72. Parke, *The way of God*, p. 9.

73. Ibid, p. 9.

74. Ibid, pp 10- 12.

75. Ibid, pp 12- 15

At the end of the work Parke explained to the reader that Burges wrote the pamphlet because either:

'some people in Dublin did extol him for his unrighteous work which is for the fire. Yet others did believe he did it only to obtain acceptance among the clergymen there who had some suspicion of his fidelity to that church'.⁷⁶

The steady objections that the Independent churches had towards the Quakers found another expression in the debate between James Barry, minister of New Row church, and two Quakers, Amos Strettell and John Burnyeat. By all accounts, Barry had a strange life, bedevilled always by doubts whether or not he was elected or damned. Some of this he worked out in his own writing, and some by writing against the Quakers.⁷⁷ In 1699 Barry wrote his autobiography in which he recalled his companions in Dublin: Noah Bryan, Timothy Taylor, Samuel and Nathaniel Mather. He was born in Ireland in 1641 into an Established Church family and escaped so many dangers that later his family were disappointed 'that I should live to be fanatic'.⁷⁸

In 1666 he joined New Row congregation after years of struggling with the question of predestination which no one in the Established Church could answer to his satisfaction. The turning point came on Easter Monday evening in 1666 after a day of futile debate with his family, including his uncle the Lord Chief Justice Santry, and 'seven or eight of the ablest and most famed of the fathers of the church of England then in Dublin'.⁷⁹ Sometime later, on his own, Barry experienced election and began to follow Samuel Mather, saying that he was 'protected by God's elective love and left to stand alone when popery and Quakerism were coming in like a flood'.⁸⁰

76. Parke, *The way of God*, p. 17.

77. William Huntington, *The coal heavers cousin rescued from the bats*, The works of James Barry (London, 1788).

78. James Barry, *A reviving cordial* (London, 1699), p. 24.

79. Ibid, p. 51 ff; Lord Santry served as chairmen of the 1660 convention in Dublin, then as Sir James Barry and was a firm supporter of the Established Church. McGuire, *The Dublin convention and ecclesiastical settlement in 1660*, pp 133, 138; D.N.B.; Bernard Burke, *A genealogical history of the dormant...and extinct peerages of the British Empire* (London, 1883), p. 134. New Row Baptismal Register, ff 4, 5, 7.

80. Ibid, p. 118. This refers to the time when Tyrconnell put £100 on Barry's head and he had to flee Dublin in disguise. Huntington got this information from Barry's daughter: *A few fragments of the life and death of the Rev. James Barry, intended as a supplement to the coal heavers cousin*, by William Huntington (London, c.1790), p. 7.

Strettell and Burnyeat indicated that several papers passed between the Quakers and James Barry 'an Independent priest'. Barry preached publicly⁸¹ against the Quakers, particularly on two points: that Quakers denied the resurrection and that salvation was from Christ. By way of reply to these accusations the Quakers asked for a public meeting in Dublin to debate three points, the resurrection, justification (including election and reprobation) and perfection in sanctification. The Quakers offered their largest meeting house in the city, but Barry refused saying he would be laughed at by the Quakers. So Strettell and Burnyeat replied on paper.⁸²

However, Barry's criticisms were not confined to the area of strict theology. Like Burges in 1673, he accused the Quakers of being rich, saying:

I doubt not but that this is one of the most powerful engines by which the art of Quakerism has been propagated in the kingdoms of the earth.⁸³

Strettell and Burnyeat rejected this accusation; they saw their wealth as honestly earned and as a blessing; they criticised Barry who collected a lot of money on pretext of going to America, and said it would be far better if congregations were not charged; in other words had no money or tithes to pay to ministers.⁸⁴ Quakers did not regret their sufferings and afflictions, for they helped their own growth in the long term even though the immediate was often very painful:

Many to the losing of all, not having a bed left to lie on, nor cattle to till their ground, nor corn for bread, nor seed, nor tools to work with all; also whipping, stocking, stoning, imprisonment they have been treated with.⁸⁵

81. Anthony Sharp's witnesses noted that Barry preached in Thomas Court; one described him as 'a Presbyterian or Independent priest' and another as 'the Independent preacher in Thomas Court'. F.L.D., Sharp MSS, S.8, no.6, ff 3,3v,4v.

82. Amos Strettell and John Burnyeat, *The innocency of the Christian Quakers manifested and the truth of their principles and doctrines cleared and defended from the loud (but false) clamorous and base insinuations and wicked slanders of James Barry* (n.p., 1688), pp 1-10. Strettell was a leading Quaker in Dublin and in 1672 travelled with John Banks; he went bankrupt in 1720 and the National Meeting lent him £1000 interest free. Grubb, *The Quakers in Ireland*, pp 32-4.

83. Strettell and Burnyeat, *The innocency of the Quakers*, p. 11.

84. Ibid, p. 11.

85. Ibid, pp 12-13.

However this was not central to the debate, and the Quakers accused Barry of evading the issues he had treated in three papers:

In his first paper he calls us persons who delight in brangling and stirring up the spirit of animosity and prejudice, and men of as little charity and religion as those we receive our idle stories from...In his second paper he charges our principles to be dark and uncertain but lays down no argument against them...In his last he charges Quakerism...to be made up and constituted of subtlety causes dark and rotten, applying Ps. 17: 14 and Ps. 73:12 to them.⁸⁶

Strettell and Burnyeat challenged Barry to prove his points. And in addition they cited other witnesses who heard Barry say in a sermon that Quakers were 'the spawn of the Jesuits and the Jesuits the spawn of the devil'. Barry admitted to this. Others said they heard Barry couple the Muggletonians and Quakers; that he called the Quakers all kinds of names in public. Yet in all this time Barry refused to meet the Quakers in open debate.⁸⁷

Strettell and Burnyeat were forced to publish their defence. They asserted their belief in the resurrection, that the righteous go to heaven and the wicked to hell, but not with the same earthly body, in keeping with the gospel teaching of Luke 20:36 and 1 Cor. 15: 36-7;44;50. With regard to the question of righteousness, they explained the Quaker belief that the human person could have some inherent righteousness by virtue of response to God's grace, some degree of perfection and holiness.

Barry would have none of this: 'James Barry will have no mixture, it must be a faith without righteousness or else a justification and salvation without faith'.⁸⁸ But inherent righteousness was the constant teaching of Fox, Whitehead, Penn and Burrough. Strettell and Burnyeat asked how could Barry really know who was saved or not. Quaker truth was better: that all were saved in Christ and

86. Strettell and Burnyeat, *The innocency of the Quakers*, p. 15.

87. Ibid, 16-17.

88. Ibid, p. 23.

scripture upheld this. In view of all these accusations against them the Quakers appealed to Barry's congregation in Dublin and asked them to consider the leadership Barry was giving them.⁸⁹

The work, dated January 20 1688, contained a postscript noting that Anthony Sharp had sent two letters to Barry which were acknowledged and an answer promised. Sharp and Thomas Aston in Cavan Street had copies of all the correspondence between Barry and Strettell and Burnyeat. In November 1687 and January 1688 Sharp had written to Barry. Like Burnyeat and Strettell he refuted the accusations about Quaker belief in the resurrection of the body and clarified their understanding of perfection.⁹⁰ He insisted on the possibility of keeping God's commands:

God is just and commands no more than he offers his grace to enable men to obey if they would be led by Him, contrary to that opinion [which] says that no man either by his own power or any grace he has received is able to keep God's commands and so making it that God commands unreasonable things and impossibilities.⁹¹

This was of course the heart of the debate, two views of human nature in conflict, and some reply was awaited. Like Burnyeat and Strettell, Sharp asked for a public debate in Dublin, but neither a debate nor a written reply were forthcoming. Eventually, in 1715 Barry published his views on the Quakers, originally voiced in 1688 but not printed at the time for reasons which he outlined in the work.⁹² In the preface Barry explained why it took him so long to actually publish his work:

In the time of the popish government when popery and Quakerism smiled so amicably on each other as the two religions...which are nearest of kin of all the religions visibly professed in these kingdoms, the people called Quakers sent me a challenge in writing, which was afterwards published in print, to prove from the scriptures of truth the four doctrines here following:

89. Strettell and Burnyeat, *The innocency of the Quakers*, pp 18-31

90. F.L.D., Sharp MSS, S.8, no.5, f.16; Sharp MSS, S.8, no.6, f.1.

91. F.L.D., Sharp MSS, S.8, no.5, f.16.

92. James Barry, *The doctrine of particular election asserted and approved by God's word, in answer to a challenge given the author to make good the aforesaid doctrine* (n.p., 1715).

1. The doctrine of the resurrection of the fleshly body, which dies and turns to dust.
2. The doctrine of justification by the alone righteousness of Jesus Christ, freely imputed.
3. The doctrine of imperfection in sanctification in the most martyred believer, while in this world.
4. The doctrine of particular unconditionate election before time.

He explained that he had wanted to reply in print and indeed had promised his congregation to do so; paper had been bought and a printer chosen when 'the storm came suddenly on the protestants in Dublin, that we were soon scattered asunder'.⁹³ When he finally did publish Barry chose not to treat all four issues and concentrated on his own preoccupation, the doctrine of election. The argument was familiar: that God had elected a few to be justified and saved, 'and therefore not all the race of fallen mankind, as papists, Arminians, Quakers, Free-willers etc vainly teach'.⁹⁴ He proceeded to show how a person would know of election: self examination, temptation from the devil, determination to 'cast your soul at the foot of divine sovereignty', relying on the merits of Christ'. This was sure doctrine:

If John Burnyeat, or any of his friends, who oppose the doctrine of particular election, can prove by the scriptures that God has given, or is bound by any law to give, special saving grace to rebels, who have fallen by their causelessly abusing and losing the grace given in Adam...any other than what he bestows on his elect and that in the right of election, I will readily submit and yield the cause.⁹⁵

With regard to the Quaker query how a person knows they are elected, Barry replied that they simply knew by conviction. He based his teaching on particular election on the 39 Articles, the Westminster confession, ch.3, the Church of Scotland, the Church of Ireland 'in Bishop Ussher's time, 1615', the Church of France, Art.12, The Synod of Dort, 7th and 15th canon.⁹⁶ By citing so many confessions of faith, Barry tried to show the Quakers how

93. Barry, *The doctrine of particular election*, Preface i-vi.

94. Ibid, p. 19.

95. Ibid, p. 70.

96. Ibid, p. 84 ff

out of step they were with the teaching of the reformed churches generally, particularly on the doctrine of predestination.

The debate on predestination from 1660 onwards highlights some of the areas of disagreement between Quakers and Independents. It also showed how quickly they rooted themselves in the country. For by 1670 the Quakers were more than just a sect or group; they had established themselves in the country and did not weaken under harassment or persecution. They had become well knit and bonded by their strong organisation and mode of government. They had become wealthy and prosperous, respected and valued, and somewhat resented and envied for their success. On a theological level Quakers had put themselves beyond the accepted parameters of the christian life, rejecting the assumed essentials of christian commitment. In their life style and in some of their practices and beliefs they resembled papists, and in fact were suspected of being either crypto-Catholics or certainly allies of the papists in Ireland and England. Taylor and Barry dealt with this latter point. So too did the Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster.

Quakers and Scottish Presbyterians

Northern presbyterians were convinced that Quakers were crypto-Catholics. From the resumption of their records in 1672 both the Antrim and the Laggan meetings pressed for something in writing against the Quakers. Apparently John Hart was appointed before 1673 to write a tract and he seems to have produced a draft which was circulated among Presbyterians.⁹⁷ In 1673 John Howe and Thomas Gowan were

97. May - Nov., 1673, Laggan minutes, pp 48, 64, 68, 73.

asked by the Antrim meeting to write a tract against the Quakers and the Down and Tyrone meeting encouraged this work.⁹⁸ However, John Howe returned to London in 1675 and so Gowan was left to write the book on his own.⁹⁹ By 1680 the Laggan meeting wrote to the Antrim meeting for Gowan's book. It seems to have been in manuscript, for the Laggan asked either to copy Gowan's work themselves or pay the Antrim meeting to get it done for them.. Gowan sent some of the treatise that year which the Laggan minuted as important and to be read carefully.¹⁰⁰ It was a sign of the times when Gowan asked in 1683 that his work on the Quakers be omitted from the minutes; he was also at this time drawing up a further work, 'a compendious treatise against the Quakers'.¹⁰¹ By 1684 Gowan was dead and the Route meeting asked that someone be appointed to finish Gowan's treatise; Thomas Hall was asked but needed so much encouragement that the whole matter was referred to the committee.¹⁰²

Although nothing of Gowan's treatise is extant, there is evidence of the general approach to Quakers seen as a real threat in themselves and in their collusion with papists.¹⁰³ The presbyterian ministers urged their people to pray not just to stop popery and Quakerism but to uproot them entirely; ministers were recommended to preach in public and private on the errors of both, but not to get heatedly involved in debate or in personal animosity. The meetings were to be equipped with the Confession of faith, the larger and shorter catechisms, Mr. Pool's dialogue between papist and protestant, Mr. Fergusson's manuscript on the errors of the time. With such background information all should be able to refute and defend their

98. Jan.- March, 1673, Antrim minutes, pp 73,77.

99. *Memoirs of the late Rev. Mr. John Howe, collected by E. Calamy* (London, 1734), p.50.

100. July, 1680 - Feb. 1681, Laggan minutes, ii, pp 62, 79, 82,85.

101. Jan. 1683, Laggan minutes, pp 187,193.

102. Aug. 19, 1684, Antrim meeting, p.230; also pp 231,233,235,244,260.

103. *Overtures for guarding the people against popery and Quakerism to be considered, 1672* (Wodrow MSS, Folio 32, No. 91; copy in P.R.O.N.I., T.525, 16 and 17). For examples of of antagonism against Quakers by Scottish Presbyterians, Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii, 472-3; Also, J.M.Douglas 'Early Quakerism in Ireland' in *J.F.H.S.*, vol.48, No 1 (1956), pp 25-6.

position. Meetings were to appoint some members to read Quaker pamphlets and confute the errors they found in them, and perhaps write a little tract for general use.

Central however to the presbyterian view as expressed in this document was the conviction that Papists and Quakers were in collusion with one another:

Satan's design and Antichrist's design especial in the black mystery of Quakerism which is 1. to loose all the foundations of religion; 2. to cast off Christ the chief cornerstone of the holy scriptures which are the doctrinal foundation from being a foundation at all; 3. to destroy a ministry and order in the house of God and so to bring in anarchy and confusion which is attended with endless suits and debates; that so, in the last place, they may fix upon the spirits of people of rooted persuasion of a necessity of wheeling about again in the bosom of the mother church of Rome where they allege but groundlessly the only order and peace is to be found.

Brethren would inform the people that these wayfaring Quakers have no call from God...several of them have been discovered to be Jesuit priests and so Antichrist's pedlars.¹⁰⁴

This is the constant accusation made against the Quakers in Ireland and elsewhere: they were covert Roman Catholics. Rome was using confused dissenters, in this case the Quakers, to infiltrate the reformation churches, in this case the Presbyterian Church. This theme of linking Quakers and papists had already been addressed by Timothy Taylor in 1670.¹⁰⁵ Thus both Scottish Presbyterians and Independents in Ireland in the 1670's were convinced that there was collusion between the Quakers and papists. This idea was long rooted reaching back to the Interregnum.¹⁰⁶ It was a view shared by the Established Church.

104. *Overtures for guarding the people*, nos 3 and 5.

105. See here, notes 63-5.

106. See here, notes 4, 7, 25.

Quakers and the Established Church

In 1663 the Irish bishops were afraid that Charles II would grant toleration to papists and so undermine the Established Church in Ireland. In addition they rejected toleration of any dissenters, for the papists:

put on visors of several sects and factions and under that pretence oppose the established religion in any country privately with more success than they did openly. They should endeavour to make the sects so considerable as to gain universal toleration wherein they may be included by the benefits whereof they might advance the catholic cause with security and confidence.¹⁰⁷

Thus the Established Church was suspicious of the possible link between Quakers and Roman Catholics. By the time Jenner and Taylor and the presbyterians in the north accused Quakers of being hidden catholics or of being used by papists, the ground had been well prepared and suspicions well established. In the wake of the Popish Plot the attacks on Quakers were renewed. Robert Ware warned against any kind of separation from the Established Church, and accused the Quakers of being crypto-Catholics.¹⁰⁸ Toleration of any kind was rejected as the papists, since the Reformation itself, had tried to infiltrate and divide Protestants. Ware made the curious claim that priests and Jesuits plotted the death of Charles I and worked their way into Cromwell's army, and he implied that Cromwell was happy enough to use them when he wanted.¹⁰⁹ Ware cited evidence from people still living who experienced at first hand the use papists made

107. Fair warning or xxv reasons against popery. With a letter to the King from the Archbishop of Canterbury against toleration (London, 1663). Signed by twelve Irish bishops and addressed to the Lords and Commons in Parliament. Reasons 15, 25.

108. Robert Ware, *Foxes and firebrands or a specimen of the danger and harmony of popery and separation, wherein is proved from undeniable matter of fact and reason that separation from the church of England is in the judgment of the papists and by sad experience found the most compendious way to introduce popery and to ruin the protestant religion* (2nd ed., Dublin, 1682). John Nalson wrote Part I, and Ware Part II and III.

109. Ware, *Foxes and Firebrands*, pp 86-89, 90-95. Also, Bramhall to Ussher 20 July, 1654 (*Foxes and Firebrands*, iii, p.150).

of sects in Ireland.

Some of this evidence concerned Jesuits disguised as preachers , or other priests disguised as Anabaptists, Independents;¹¹⁰ but Ware claimed that the Quakers were really taken over by the Franciscans, or used by them as a cover for their activities. To find a way to infiltrate the Quakers, the Franciscans suppressed their own practices of Mass, prayers to saints and images, the supremacy of the pope; this plot was masterminded from London. It was easy to insinuate themselves with the Quakers, for both had similar ways of acting: they went around in two or threes; they used coarse clothes and condemned luxury; they persuaded people to join them, pretending visions, revelations and prophecies, messages and new lights; they were uncivil and saluted no one properly or showed no respect towards the magistrate; they taught that the saints are perfectly holy in this life and do not sin. Indeed, Ware claimed that just as the Anabaptists sprang from the Roman Church, so the Quakers originated from the Franciscans.¹¹¹

In another work the following year, Ware reworked the same theme, giving an account of how the Jesuits worked within the several sects in Ireland during the Interregnum. But

These jesuitical policies were not sufficient to distract this nation without the help of Ignatius of Loyola's new found religion which was Quakerism.¹¹²

However far fetched such theories seem now there is no doubt that since the Quakers came to Ireland in 1655 there was always controversy about their origin, membership and purpose. Quakers themselves admitted as much and were careful to distance themselves from papists or from any suspicion of collusion with them. When Gerard Moor, a Carmelite, recanted in 1682 Ware asked him to be tutor to

110. Ware, *Foxes and Firebrands*, pp 98, 104, 107, 139.

111. Ibid, pp 141-150, 195.

112. R. Ware, *The hunting of the Romish fox and the quenching of sectarian fire-brands, being a specimen of popery and separation* (Dublin, 1683), pp 232-35.

his son. Anne Harris, a Quaker, warned Ware to check carefully that Moor was really a convert, for she said the Quakers had been much deceived in this way.¹¹³ In the same year a rumour was put abroad that Quakers were paying a man, Crosby, to preach, and that he had been seen coming out of a Mass house in Dublin. The Quakers rejected this, pointing out that their practice in any event was not to hire preachers.¹¹⁴ Anthony Sharp, Quaker and successful business man in Dublin, was accused in 1674 of being a Roman Catholic because he hired papists in his business.¹¹⁵

This type of strong feeling fed into the common distrust of Quakers in Ireland. They were suspect from all points of view and struggled hard to be accepted in their own right. They suffered this with their colleagues in England who were similarly scapegoated.¹¹⁶ In 1680 George Fox denied that Quakers were Catholics:¹¹⁷

We have been branded as being papists and Jesuits and popishly affected. But be it known to all the world that we are neither papists nor popishly affected; for our religion, way and worship, and the grace truth, spirit, faith and gospel of Christ, which we walk and live in, was before the Pope, papists and Jesuits and their religions and worships were.

And we have suffered in the days of Oliver Cromwell and in his Long Parliament time; and before Oliver was Protector, we suffered by papists laws and laws made in Queen Mary's time. And we suffered in the days of Presbyterians, Independents and Anabaptists and now the Episcopalians.

And the chief cause of all our sufferings, that have been by all those that have had power was for denying and not joining to the popish and jesuitical ways and relics of the papists which they held up and allowed among them.

113. Ware, *The hunting of the Romish fox*, p.235.

114. 13 Mar. 1683 (F.L.D., Testimonies of denial and condemnation, MM II FI, ff 84-5.

115. Isabel Grubb, 'Anthony Sharp, An unpublished memoir', pp 180-1.

116. Richard Baxter, *The Quaker's catechism* (London, 1655); William Prynne, *The Quaker's unmasked* (London, 1655); E. Burrough, *The memorable works of a son of thunder and consolation* (London, 1672); John Faldo, *Quakerism no Christianity* (London, 1673).

117. George Fox, *The Protestant Christian-Quaker a sufferer by relics of popery* (London, 1680), p. 14.

However, Ware's writings seem to have done the Quakers little harm in terms of their treatment by the government. While antagonism may not have abated between the sects, it is clear that by 1683 the Quakers were not considered a threat to the government.¹¹⁸ In the end all the accusations against the Quakers, that they were covert papists especially, did them no real harm. There was always the fear that Rome would use any ploy to gain power and influence in England and Ireland. Whether true or not did not matter, for the myth of popery was sufficient to whip up almost any story at anytime at this period. And yet the instincts of the critics were surer than they thought, for Quaker teaching struck at the very heart of received Christianity as then understood. No church, Rome or any of the Established Churches, could accept or even understand the stance of the Quakers with regard to God, Christ, the scriptures, ministry, worship and order. They were so convinced that this could not be right or even intended that the only conclusion lay in the Quakers being a cover for other purposes.

However, the Established Church had more difficulties with the Quakers than merely the suspicion that they were hidden Catholics. In company with the other churches in the country, the Established Church, in sermons and tracts by bishops and clergy, attacked what were the unacceptable beliefs and practices of the Quakers. Preaching at the consecration of the bishop of Kildare, Henry Jones made a strong case for episcopacy. In this context he was scathing on the Quakers, particularly regarding their stress on equality and community which he thought only led to confusion:

Let Quakers and such see this, among whom (in divine things) is no distinction of offices or persons, no, nor of sexes,all with them depending (in divine duties) on uncertain impulses whensoever and from whomsoever....God is not the

118. For example, the Quakers had a school in Dublin in 1680 (F.L.D., MM 11 F1, Testimonies of denial and condemnation, 1662-1722, f. 53). In 1680 John Ray set up a printing press in Dublin and became the first official printer to the city of Dublin in 1681. Ray 'was nearly, if not quite a Quaker'. Mary Pollard, *Dublin's trade in books* (Oxford, 1989), pp 8, 95. Ray was member of St. Luke's Guild from 1678. Robert Munter, *A dictionary of the print trade in Ireland 1556-1775* (New York, 1988), p. 227. See Ch. 6, notes 106-112.

author of confusion...and what greater confusion than for a body to be all in a heap and lump without head or foot or distinction of members.¹¹⁹

The Established Church of course needed clarity and obedience,¹²⁰ and the Quakers refused to conform to this expectation. Rather than the Book of Common Prayer, the Quakers had their own forms and styles of worship which the Established Church resented:

Avoid all conceited tones...such as we meet with in the discourses of Jacob Behman and Van Helmont; in the inscriptions and pages of the books of the Quakers which they call the bosom of God, the outward openings of inward shuttings, Godded with God, Christed with Christ, beams of approaching glory, these swelling words of vanity are unknown to the scripture and contrary to the simplicity that is in Christ.¹²¹

This type of language was resented as not in keeping with the beauty of the Book of Common Prayer and because it harked back to the civil war atmosphere and renewed old memories; it even engendered fear that such turmoil was about to happen again.¹²² The Quakers had developed an inner authority which threatened the control of the Established Church. Richard Parry, preaching in Christchurch, referred to 'our new-quaking luminaries, who do so highly magnify and extend the Light within them'.¹²³

The Quakers were harassed by the Established Church, especially in the period immediately after the Restoration. In 1672, when Holms and Fuller wrote the history of Quakers from 1660-1671, they noted that Quakers were suffering for the following reasons: meeting together to worship their way; pleading freedom of conscience; refusing to pay tithes and maintenance of the clergy; refusing to pay for the repair or building of the churches; refusing to go to church and for reproving the

119. Henry Jones, *A sermon preached at the consecration of Ambrose, bishop of Kildare* (Dublin, 1667), pp 4-5.

120. Jeremy Taylor, *A sermon preached at the opening of the parliament of Ireland, 8 May 1661* (London, 1661), p. 11.

121. Joseph Teate, *A sermon preached at the cathedral church of St. Canice, Kilkenny, 27 Feb. 1669* (Dublin, 1670), p. 27; Cotton, *Fasti*, ii, 305, 295; Athen. Oxon., ii, 791.

122. Teate, *A sermon preached...*, p. 28.

123. Richard Berry, *A sermon on the Epiphany, preached at ChristChurch in Dublin* (Dublin, 1672), p. 24; Cotton, *Fasti*, ii, 205; v, 137.

people either in church, in the markets or streets; refusing to swear and take off their hats; working on holy days.¹²⁴ What the Established Church resented most of all was the Quaker refusal to pay tithes and the dues necessary for the building and upkeep of churches, or steeplehouses as Quakers called them. So while the Established Church had basically the same theological difficulties with the Quakers as the Independents and Presbyterians, it had these additional grievances.

Tension between the Established Church and the Quakers was heightened in 1688 when John Burnyeat and John Watson published a defence of Quakerism.¹²⁵ Burnyeat and Watson said Quakers were 'truly reformed Christians' and they rebutted the accusations which the Established Church minister, Lawrence Potts, made when one of his congregation, Robert Lacky, became a Quaker.¹²⁶ Apparently there was pressure also put on Lacky by a J.T. (possibly Joseph Teate) not to become a Quaker on the grounds that Quakers did not take oaths, did not believe in the Trinity and denied that the Scriptures were the word of God. These points were refuted by Burnyeat and Watson, and they justified their stand on the three issues.¹²⁷

124. Holms and Fuller, *A brief relation...*, p. 45.; Besse, *A collection of the sufferings*, ii.

125. *The holy truth and its professors defended in a letter written by Lawrence Potts, priest of Staplestown near Caterlough, to Robert Lacky a parishioner and formerly a hearer of the said priest, occasioned by his forsaking and embracing the blessed truth herein vindicated* (Dublin, 1688). Burnyeat was born in Cumberland in 1631 and became convinced in 1653; he visited Ireland in 1659, America in 1664-7, returning to Ireland in 1670-1, where he met Penn; he settled in Dublin in 1683, and was imprisoned there for two months that year. He travelled in Ireland and England and America and wrote tracts to the meetings he visited. *An epistle from John Burnyeat to Friends in Pennsylvania* (Dublin, 1685). He wrote his own autobiography, *The Truth exalted* (London, 1691); he died in 1690. F.L.L., *Biographies of Quakers*; *The names of Friends deceased in...Ireland* (F.L.D. YMFI, f.6). John Watson (1651-1710) came to Ireland in 1658 and was convinced by John Burnyeat at the Friends meeting in New Garden in the early 1670's. He held meeting in his own house from 1678, and was jailed in Nenagh for two years for non payment of tithes; he visited Quakers in Ireland and England. F.L.L., *Biog. of Quakers*; Besse, *Sufferings*, ii, 481-2.

126. Lawrence Potts was Chancellor of Leighlin from 1687-1703. *Fasti*, ii, 394, 402. He was proctor for the chapter during the Convocation of the Established Church in 1704. B.L., Add MSS 4815, f. 77.

127. Burnyeat and Watson, *The holy truth and its professors defended*, *Advertisement to the reader*.

However, they explained that the real reason Lacky became a Quaker was the Light Within 'that let him see the evil or defects in himself and others'.¹²⁸ Potts wrote to Lacky telling him he had confused religion with the behaviour of some people; Burnyeat and Watson took this point up:

Many of the people of your church are of a loose conversation...many of your clergy also...and yet they [are] suffered to abide in their places and offices without being either excluded or silenced...We have often observed how that in your church there have been and still are both swearers, liars, drunkards and men given to other profaneness, and yet little zeal appearing to excommunicate or exclude them. But when any for conscience sake could not pay the priest his wages, though it were for some small matter, oftentimes such a one should soon be prosecuted and excommunicated; so that by your practices you are more zealous for your gain and interest than for excluding evil and promoting righteousness in your church.¹²⁹

Burnyeat and Watson were unimpressed by the quality of life in the Established Church. Moreover, they rejected Potts's view that tithes were scriptural; on the contrary, they were under the old law and old priesthood, both superseded by Christ. And yet the Established Church ministers asked money of those 'for whom you do no work...How many thousands do you compel in Ireland to pay you that are not of your work'.¹³⁰ This was plain speaking, for the Quakers asked to be judged by the quality of their lives and not by doctrine and theology, or by the payment of tithes or dues.

Apparently Potts declared that Quakers had no right to preach because they were not sent officially in the name of the church. This of course was quite alien to the Quakers, who asserted that their commission came from Christ and they 'do wait upon him to receive our ability daily'. Now this touched the whole area of training for ministry, ordination and placement, all rejected by the Quakers, as having no warranty from scripture.

128. Burnyeat and Strettell, *The holy truth defended*, p. 1.

129. Burnyeat and Strettell, *The holy truth defended*, pp 2, 5.

130. Ibid, pp 7-14.

Prove your way of being bred up at schools and learning your tongues and taking your degrees there and observing your ceremonies in your ordination and coming forth according to your traditions and then looking for a benefice the greatest you can get....and while you stay in a parish take such lordship upon you that none of your church or hearers may have licence to speak or preach but such as are so ordained as you are.¹³¹

Potts also accused the Quakers of disregarding the sacraments. In reply Burnyeat and Watson asked: what was a sacrament ?; and they repeated their well known stance which while not accepted by the Established Church in Ireland was clearly presented and cogently argued by Quakers at this time in their evolution. Indeed Burnyeat and Watson's work ended with a summary of Quaker beliefs.

A much more widespread debate opened between the Established Church and Quakers when Penn and the bishop of Cork clashed in 1698. In that year Penn was in Ireland visiting Quakers, inspecting his Irish estates and encouraging Friends to go to Pennsylvania. He was accompanied by his son, William, and two friends, Thomas Story and John Everett. In his journal, Story tells of the big crowds who came to hear Penn, of the tensions between Quakers and the other churches in Dublin.¹³² A Dublin Baptist, John Plimpton, published at least three tracts that year against the Quakers,¹³³ in which he accused them of denying the scriptures and the person of Christ in favour of the Light Within. In response to Plimpton's *Ten Charges* Penn, Story, Anthony Sharp and George Rook issued a broadside in March called *Gospel truths*¹³⁴ in which Quaker beliefs were summarised as follows: belief in God

131. Burnyeat and Strettell, *The holy truth defended*, p.16.

132. *The life of Thomas Story carefully abridged by John Kendall* (Philadelphia, 1805). Story was born in Carlisle c.1663 and was a member of the church of England until 1689; he travelled in England, Ireland, Scotland and America. F.L.L., *Biography of Quakers*. Also, Penn wrote to the yearly meeting in London, telling of his Irish visit: *The papers of William Penn*, (ed.), Mary Maples Dunn and Richard Dunn, 5 vols (Pennsylvania, 1981), 5, 456. Also, *Some account of the life of Joseph Pike of Cork*, xxx-xxxi. Little is known of Everett, except that he travelled to Ireland with Penn in 1698. *The Papers of William Penn*, 5, 454, n. 1.

133. *Ten charges against the people called Quakers*. Also, *A Quaker no Christian* (Dublin, 1698). No copies of these works are extant. He also wrote *Quakerism the mystery of iniquity discovered in a brief dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker*, by way of supplement to my former papers exhibited in Dublin against them (Dublin, 1698). Penn, Everett and Story replied to these in the same year: *The Quaker a Christian being an answer to John Plimpton's disingenuous paper entitled 'A Quaker no Christian'* (Dublin, 1698), and Penn, *Truth further cleared from mistakes* (Dublin, 1698).

134. *Gospel truths to clarify the orthodoxy of Friends* (Dublin, 1698). Rook was a timber merchant in Dublin. Grubb, *The Quakers in Ireland*, p. 29.

and 'the three that bear record in heaven'; the incarnation; redemption and justification by Christ alone; obedience to the Light Within which was the key to all spiritual growth and worship; all other forms of outward worship 'being but formal and will-worship which we cannot in conscience join nor can we maintain and uphold it'; this message Quakers taught 'without money and without price'; all excesses in fashion and customs of the world were rejected; while they did not practise sacraments, neither did they judge those who used them; finally they honoured the government as an ordinance of God.

By the summer Penn was in Cork visiting the friends and his estates there. In the course of the visit he called to see the bishop of Cork, Edward Wetenhall, and gave him a copy of the *Gospel truths*. The bishop indicated that he would like another meeting to discuss the tract. He was disappointed when Penn called to see him later on in the year while he was away on visitation, and therefore replied in writing.¹³⁵ Wetenhall felt that on the basis of *Gospel truths* the Quakers could not be called Christian at all. He went through the broadsheet and found so many doctrines absent that he had to declare Quakers outside the Christian faith.¹³⁶

At this time the bishop of Cork was in a difficult position. He had suffered far more than the Quakers during the revolution and doubts about his adherence to the new monarchy prevented his promotion to Cashel.¹³⁷ Doubts had also been cast about his orthodoxy, by his own Dean Pomeroy and by some members of the church of Ireland.¹³⁸ Indeed he had expressed doubts privately regarding the person of the Holy Ghost and so he must have been interested in the Quaker approach to the Trinity.¹³⁹

135. From the bishop of Cork and Ross, 26 Aug. 1698. *The papers of William Penn*, 3, 556-7; *The testimony of the bishop of Cork*. No copy of this tract is extant but a copy was printed in Penn's reply, *A defence of a paper entitled Gospel truths against the exceptions of the bishop of Cork's Testimony* (London, 1698), p.6 ff

136. Penn, *A defence of a paper*, pp 6-11.

137. Bonnell to Strype, 21 Feb. 1691 (U.L.C., Baum. Papers, Add 1, f.67).

138. Pomeroy to Archbishop of Cashel, 9 Aug. 1697 (P.R.O.N.I., T 2954/1/8, Pomeroy Papers); Bonnell to Strype, 6 April 1693 (Baum. Papers, Add 1, f.75).

139. Bonnell to Strype 1694 (Baum. Papers, Add 1, f.77).

In any event, Wetenhall was ready to enter into debate with the Quakers, perhaps in some measure to justify himself in public. There is no doubt that he admired the Quakers for their consistency and convictions,¹⁴⁰ and indeed said as much in his *Testimony*. However, there were reasons why the Quakers aroused antagonism and Wetenhall outlined them, which proved that social jealousies aroused by Quaker success and conviction could be as potent in argument as doctrinal differences:

1. Is it not your main end and study, by pretended mortification and renouncing the world while there are no sort of men alive that more eagerly pursue it nor have more effective, wily or secret ways of getting wealth than yourselves ?. Is it not, I say, your main aim and end to make yourselves a party considerable and such to which for reasons of state peculiar privileges must be granted ?.

2. Are not, to this purpose, many of your distinctive characters such as your different garb, (for it is plain, not a few of your peoples' clothes, as to material, are more costly than ours) your way of speaking, yes, even your looks and gestures, assumed rather to make yourselves remarkable and at first sight known to other people, than out of any persuasion, sense of duty or conscience or obligation ?.¹⁴¹

The bishop's work was published in July 1698 and Penn replied in the same year. He argued that the broadsheet was merely a summary of Quaker beliefs and in no way meant to include everything. Penn knew that Wetenhall had several books written by Quakers, in particular Penn's own works and those of Barclay, and so he confessed to be all the more surprised at the angle the bishop took in his reply. For example, Wetenhall took Penn to task on how the Quakers were a divisive force and wounded the unity of the church. This Penn rejected and queried the bishop on the divisions within all the churches, especially just then on the question of free will and grace, Arminianism, and the doctrine of the Trinity.¹⁴²

140. Edward Wetenhall, *The Protestant peacemaker* (London, 1682), p. 9; *Of gifts and offices* (Dublin 1678), pp 165-7.

141. Penn, *A defence of a paper*, pp 16-17.

142. *Ibid*, pp 36-42.

Penn expanded the scope of *Gospel truths* and refuted the bishops's accusations against the Quakers on the resurrection of the body, the sacraments, and Quaker use of language. It was in every sense repetitious and Penn acknowledged that all this had been said and argued before. But he pointed out the real source of their differences:¹⁴³

that which has affected our minds most and engaged us in this separation was the great carnality and emptiness both of ministers and of people, under the profession of religion: they hardly having the form of godliness but generally speaking denying the power thereof.

Moreover, the Established Church's insistence that divine revelation was confined to the first age of Christianity also caused division. These differences convinced the Quakers that they were right, that they were a church 'with less pomp and gaudiness in our worship, as well as in our clothes, than is the custom of some other churches'.¹⁴⁴ The following year Wetenhall wrote a reply to Penn and the tone was much more virulent.¹⁴⁵ The bishop had a bad temper,¹⁴⁶ and certainly in this reply he expressed his anger and even contempt of the Quakers. He accused the Quakers of denying four key doctrines: faith in Christ, justification by Christ, (citing Penn's answer to Jenner in 1671), the resurrection of the body and the return of Christ to judge the world.¹⁴⁷ Returning to a point made strongly in his 'Testimony', he was even more critical of Quaker's wealth:

The bishop has long observed and all men may observe as notorious the Quakers' eager pursuit of wealth and their effective, wily and secret ways of getting it...Minding worldly gain and being so intent on it day and night...most days in the week without a prayer to God, either in public assembly or family...flying in all directions to get and keep

143. Penn, *A defence of a paper*, p. 97.

144. Penn, *A defence of a paper*, p. 58.

145. Edward Wetenhall, *A brief and modest reply to Mr. Penn's tedious, scurrilous and unchristian defence against the bishop of Cork* (Dublin, 1699). Prior to this George Keith wrote a defence of the bishop of Cork. *Some of the many fallacies of William Penn detected in a paper called Gospel Truths, signed by him and three more at Dublin, the 4th of the third month, 1698 and in the late book called A defence of the Gospel truths against the bishop of Cork's Testimony...* (London, 1699).

146. Bonnell to Strype, 6 May 1695 (Baum. Papers, Add 1, f.81).

147. Wetenhall, *A brief and modest reply*, p. 7.

money....There is nothing to be eaten which is better than the ordinary, that comes into our markets here, which the people observe not presently bought up by the Quakers. They are still the earliest and best shopmen every market day for such commodities.¹⁴⁸

The bishop rejected the Quaker belief in the Light Within and saw it as against revelation and competent interpretation of the scriptures. He gave three examples from Cork where Quakers had really shown how misguided this Light Within was in practice. A man called John Knight went into a church in Cork, stood naked in the church proclaiming the truth; John Workman in Ross fasted for forty days claiming it as a miracle; when Betty Wheadons spoke at meetings in Cork it was known that even Penn had to hide his laughter. This sort of singularity was despised by the bishop, as was the Quaker mode of dress and address.¹⁴⁹

The bishop, in company with all Established Church clergy, had a point when he asked Penn what would happen if all rents and tithes were abolished. The church would disappear and popery, atheism and irreligion take over the country. The bishop's reply to Penn was much stronger in tone and criticism than his *Testimony* but Penn decided not to answer it; perhaps it was too personal an attack. In any event it was left to others in Ireland to respond to the bishop.

And so in 1700 two Quakers, Thomas Wright and Nicholas Harris, replied to Wetenhall.¹⁵⁰ Their work was essentially a point by point refutation of Wetenhall and it was evident that the Quakers resented the bishop's tone of contempt, especially towards Penn himself. They acknowledged that prior to this debate the bishop had good relations with the Quakers and particularly with Penn, to the extent of preventing publication of a tract against

148. Wetenhall, *A brief and modest reply*, pp 9, 21.

149. Wetenhall, *A brief and modest reply*, pp 15, 20, 24.

150. Thomas Wright and Nicholas Harris, *Truth further defended and William Penn vindicated, being a rejoinder to a book entitled a brief and modest reply to Mr. Penn's tedious, scurrilous and unchristian defence against the bishop of Cork* (n.p., 1700). Thomas Wright, 1640-1724, came to Cork in the 1650's and was convinced there by Edmund Burrough and Francis Howgill. Nicholas Harris, 1663-1741, was convinced in Dublin c.1691; settled in Charleville in 1693. (F.L.L., *Biographies of Quakers*).

Penn. Wetenhall allowed Quakers in Cork to register their marriages in the bishop's court in Cork. Indeed from 1682, he advocated concessions to dissenters in general.¹⁵¹

All the more difficult was this new and negative attack on the Quakers. There was antipathy between Penn and the bishop, probably because of the bishop's own difficulties in his church, and because both were powerful personalities and had very definite ideas. Wright and Harris boasted that :

No bishop in these three kingdoms has the big and scornful look and deportment of Mr. Penn especially when he is in the humour for it.¹⁵²

They also objected to the accusation that Quakers were too wealthy:

We appeal from the bishop, our partial judge, to our neighbours who know and are better acquainted with our way of dealing than he; and how may we not with much more reason return his charge of worldiness upon himself and that not without proof, as he has done by us; what else made him leave the old bishopric and friends of Cork for a new one and strangers in the north of Ireland was it not because the latter was worth some hundreds per annum more than the former?.¹⁵³

They defended the actions of John Knight (in 1674) and John Workman; both were true stories and within the Quaker tradition. Going naked and fasting, though not for everyone to practise, were found in the Old Testament and it was right for some to follow this example. But they did not accept the story of Penn laughing at a meeting in Cork, 'we let the bishop know whatever the custom of laughing be in his congregation, we have no such in ours'.¹⁵⁴ In addition to these points the two writers repeated the arguments of Penn on the theological issues raised by Wetenhall. They corrected the bishop's use of

151. Wright and Harris, *Truth further defended*, pp 174-77; O.C. Goodbody, '17th century Quaker marriages in Ireland' in *J.F.H.S.*, 50, no. 4 (1962), p. 248. Also, E. Wetenhall, *The Protestant peacemaker or a seasonable persuasive to all serious christians* (London, 1682).

152. Wright and Harris, *Truth further defended*, pp 66, 4-15.

153. *Ibid*, pp 65, 138-9. Wetenhall was translated to the diocese of Kilmore in 1699.

154. *Ibid*, pp 101, 158.

Penn's tract against Jenner in 1671, accusing him of misquoting Penn on the question of justification by Christ.¹⁵⁵

Wetenhall had chided the Quakers for being inarticulate in comparison with the writers of the Established Churches. This was a valid point from his stance but unfair on the Quakers who never pretended to theological training. Rather, they relied on the light and spirit within to instruct and train them, a far more valuable education than 'arts, parts, wisdom and learning of this world'.¹⁵⁶ By the time this work was published Wetenhall had moved to Kilmore and the debate was over. A small contribution to the controversy was added in 1701 when Peter Hewitt, chancellor of St. Finbarr's in Cork, published a book refuting No. 10 of *Gospel Truths*, on the question of sacraments.¹⁵⁷

Hewitt repeated the bishop's arguments and defended the different customs in the Established Churches on either sitting, kneeling or standing for the communion service which Penn had criticised. Hewitt berated Penn for his theological arguments which he found weak and shallow; again this points to the impossibility of two such divergent views reaching any consensus. It was a question of toleration of different ideas and Penn was better placed to be open:

We believe Christ to be the end and substance of all signs and shadows under the gospel to his people...therefore in reverence to the substance and not in disrespect to the visible signs declined the use of them, though at the same time we do not condemn those that conscientiously practise them.¹⁵⁸

155. Wright and Harris, *Truth further defended*, p. 15.

156. Ibid, p. 155.

157. Peter Hewitt, *A plain answer to that part of William Penn's book against the late bishop of Cork, wherein he attempts to justify the Quaker's disuse of water baptism and the Lord's Supper, showing the weakness and error of all his objections and refuting them particularly page by page* (Dublin, 1701).

158. Penn, Everett, Story, *The Quaker a Christian*, p. 9.

The Quakers had slowly transformed themselves since the Interregnum and early Restoration period and had settled into a peaceful, well organised and cohesive body, with increasingly defined convictions and modes of living, reinforced by a firm discipline and method of overseership. It was in its own way as much a church as any in terms of organisation and discipline, but its convictions were outside the mould and so caused deep friction in society generally. Another factor was their success in trade and business which made them indispensable and yet envied.

Indeed Quakers saw their business as a contribution to the country and used it as the basis for being exempt from taking oaths. In their representations they asked for the protection of the law without having to take the oath and suggested a form of words they could in conscience accept. In so doing they insisted they did not want places of honour or power in the state. They wanted to preserve their liberties and properties, maintain their families, pay taxes and rents, 'support our poor', and improve and promote manufactures, and in this way 'strengthen the Protestant interest in this kingdom'.¹⁵⁹

Gradually, through the consistency of their stance, they won respect and acceptance, and as Bonnell said, 'truly we looked upon it to be a reward from God to them for the peaceableness of their behaviour in all things'. Though full acceptance was still to come, by the end of the century the worst of their sufferings were over and Quakers could look forward to a period of relative peace.

159. Marsh's Library MSS, Z. 1.1. 13, f. 96 (no date, but after 1709, probably c. 1712-3).

WILLIAM KING AND THE PRESBYTERIAN TRADITION IN IRELAND

When Peter Manby, Dean of Derry, became a Roman Catholic in 1686 he published the theological difficulties which led him to change faith.¹ William King, then Chancellor of St. Patrick's Dublin, replied to Manby and in the course of his work criticised Presbyterians, Independents, Quakers and Anabaptists for their separation from the Established Church. He argued that dissenters had moved beyond parliamentary and canonical rights and 'proceed on their own heads in spite of their lawful governors'; they were in fact and by their own choice private persons, excluded from membership of the true church.²

Joseph Boyse, minister of the English Presbyterian Church at Wood Street in Dublin replied to these remarks.³ He complained that King 'bitterly censured the whole body of nonconformists' and excluded them from the catholic church. This was a point which Boyse argued at length both in this work and elsewhere. Dissenters believed they belonged to the catholic church, that they were not outside it, and that they could not be excluded from it. In support of this argument, Boyse cited Article 68 of the 1615 Irish Articles which defined the catholic church 'to be the invisible body of elected saints in heaven and earth'. Out of this catholic church all particular churches were founded and had their validity by a common rootedness in 'the invisible body of elected saints'. Of

1. Peter Manby, *The considerations which obliged Peter Manby, Dean of Derry, to embrace the Catholic religion* (Dublin, 1687).

2. William King, *An answer to the considerations which obliged Peter Manby, late Dean of Londonderry in Ireland, to embrace what he calls the catholic religion* (Dublin, 1687), pp 6, 29. King's autobiography in Latin was translated in C.S. King (ed.), *A great Archbishop of Dublin, William King, D.D., 1650-1729: His autobiography, family, and a selection from his correspondence* (London, 1906). King was born in 1650 in Aberdeen, of Scottish Presbyterian parents, and moved to Tyrone in 1658; he had very erratic schooling and went to T.C.D. in 1667. He was ordained for the Tuam diocese in 1674 and moved to St. Werburghs in Dublin in 1679. In 1688 he was appointed to replace the Archbishop of Dublin who had fled to London. He was named bishop of Derry in 1690. Cotton, *Fasti*, ii, 23, 118, 102; iii, 308, 320-1, 329, 332; iv, 32, 24.

3. *Vindicae Calvinisticae or some impartial reflections on the Dean of Londonderry's considerations... and Mr. Chancellor King's answer thereto in which he no less unjustly than impertinently reflects on the protestant dissenters. In a letter to a friend* ([Joseph Boyse], Dublin). For details of Boyse, see ch. 4, n. 31.

course, King could not accept this and Boyse accused him of 'pure Bellarmine'. For just as Bellarmine argued that a particular church, the Roman Church, was the catholic church, so King claimed that the Established Church was the catholic church.⁴

Boyse maintained that in view of this stance dissenters had no choice but to separate; indeed it was their duty to do so. Convocation did not represent them and if dissenters surrendered this point someday the Roman church could assume the role of 'principium unitatis'. He also pointed out that the so called liberty dissenters enjoyed in Ireland was at a price: loss of promotions, loss of estates and sometimes imprisonment. On another level, the differences in theology and practice between dissenters and Established Church members were too great to breach. King had accused the dissenters of being close to papists by separation, but Boyse rejected this arguing that the Established Church was much closer to Rome.⁵ :

Is it that we bow to the east and to the altar? Do we use vain pageantry in consecration of churches and utensils, baptising them with saints names ? Do we frisk from place to place in reading our service, use the sign of the cross, kneel at the sacrament which never obtained in the church before transubstantiation ? Have we absolution for sins to the uncensured ? Is private communion our manner ? Do we have organs, singing boys, unscriptural confirmation, preaching deacons, reading over the dead, holy days, surplices, responsals and twenty more appendants of worship ? The Romish church has all these; whereas we worship God without all this stuff added to the gospel institutions and are content with that for decency.

Besides, the terms laid down for unity with the Established Church were very severe and unacceptable: ministers had to be re-ordained, solemnly declare the Covenant not binding, agree not to change anything in either liturgy or church discipline. Boyse reminded King that Ussher's model of episcopacy had been offered at the Savoy conference and was refused by the bishops. This type of intransigence brought religion into ridicule.

4. Boyse, *Some impartial reflections*, To the reader (no pagination).

5. Ibid, To the reader

Surely union of ministers and the communion of saints needed to be placed on a much more comprehensive basis, such as the 1615 Irish Articles and the doctrinal articles of the Church of England.

Boyse found King's basis for the catholic church too narrow. King claimed the catholic church professed the religion of Christ and lived under lawful governors. But Boyse asked what this meant in practice for the colonies, for the reformed church in France, and whether every national church had lawful governors. No, the true basis for the catholic church lay in the gospels where it was a question of lawful pastors rather than lawful governors.⁶ For the laws of Christ determined who were lawful pastors: those who had the necessary qualifications for the office, who were ordained by presbyters, with the consent of the people they were about to serve. In the light of this, all bishops and ministers of the Established Church were actually illegal.⁷

Developing this point, Boyse rejected the view that bishops were instituted by Christ as the centre of catholic unity. To accept that would be to 'unchurch all the established churches that want a diocesan prelacy'.⁸ Indeed confessions of various reformed churches were true parts of the catholic church, though Boyse excluded Quakers 'because we know not their opinions', and Fifth Monarchy men for 'I know no distinct churches constituted of them'. Variety of confessions did not detract from the unity of the catholic church; besides, Boyse argued that so called uniformity prior to the reformation was marked by schisms and divisions.⁹

Boyse insisted that Presbyterians and Independents had lawful pastors:¹⁰

6. Boyse, *Some impartial reflections*, p. 2.

7. Ibid, p. 6.

8. Ibid, p. 10.

9. Ibid, p. 12.

10. Ibid, pp 17-18.

Particular churches are the chief integrating parts of the church-catholic. These churches consist of one or more pastors and a christian flock associated under his or their oversight for personal communion in faith, worship and holy living....But the people do not owe them them a blind obedience nor have pastors any power but for edification. Much less can such bishops pretend to an higher power whose very office Christ never instituted, whose pretended relation to their diocese is founded on the people's consent to it.

Boyse called the pastors of Presbyterian/Independent churches 'bishops'; each was in charge of a church and had no claim to wider jurisdiction. In this context it was quite wrong for Established Church bishops to claim such rights, 'assuming the sole power of church government and depriving the pastors of particular churches of an essential part of their of their office'. People had the right to choose their own pastors and not have one imposed by bishop or patron. Nevertheless, while Boyse argued that in the realm of church order and practice bishops were not to be obeyed, in so far as they were the King's officers bishops could command obedience to the law of the country.

Boyse outlined English Presbyterian views on how bishops emerged in the church. It was not a different order or office; rather it reflected how a pastor, for reasons of age, gifts or learning, stood out among his peers. These were 'scriptural bishops' rather than diocesan bishops,

from whence it follows that the ordination of pastors in presbyterian churches is valid because either they are ordained by diocesan bishops who had the power to ordain on account of that office they have in common with scriptural bishops, though they have none as diocesan; or they are ordained by a concurrence of scriptural bishops to whose office the power of ordination was annexed by divine institution.¹¹

It was offensive then for King to accuse Presbyterians and Independents of not being true churches simply because they did not obey the Established Church. For a church to be a church it was necessary that it be lawfully constituted: a society of christians, united under one or

11. Boyse, *Some impartial reflections*, p. 47.

more pastors as Christ appointed, for personal communion in faith, worship and holy living. While the method of the pastor's appointment was in dispute, this in itself did not form part of true churchness, 'for that a particular church have a lawful pastor is not absolutely necessary to its being a church'. Such views indicated the very real disagreements between King and Boyse on the question of ministry and church order.

Boyse reminded King that the Reformation was a work authorised by Christ in order to be rid of the Roman church and its practices. He regretted that the first reformers initial motivations had not been carried through to full conclusion. Sadly this had not happened and presbyterians were persecuted by the Established Church. Boyse advocated Ussher's view that all convocations and church councils were for the unity of the church and ensured the work of the reformation. He was convinced that only a comprehensive view could express the real meaning of the catholic church. Boyse suggested that all churches own each other as true churches, maintain occasional communion in order to witness to charity, pastors accept each other as true ministers of the gospel and rejoice in one another's work, help one another in their ministries, speak well of each other and band together to defend the reformed religion. Indeed, whatever their differences, Presbyterians and Independents in Dublin and the south of Ireland maintained unity 'by the amicable consultations of their associated pastors'; this was a rather loose form of unity, in contrast with the very defined church order and discipline of Scottish Presbyterians in the north and parts of the south of Ireland.¹²

These proposals reflected how English Presbyterians already exercised accommodation between different traditions in Ireland. While the Established Church tried to accommodate some of their views, this was based on the

12. Boyse, *Some impartial reflections*, pp 53-58, 63-4.

assumption that the underlying structures of the Established Church would not be changed, even if Ussher's model was to be used.¹³ In the panic of the times, some form of accommodation was proposed if only to allow protestants in general band together against the danger of popery. But as Boyse pointed out, to ask non-conformists to take the act of Uniformity, the Oxford oath, the oath of canonical obedience and accept re-ordination, was to ask too much and would concede all their closely held convictions.¹⁴ Boyse would write a great deal more in his time but in this reply to King he set forth the basis principles he would defend until his death in 1728.¹⁵

While there were some efforts at accommodation between the protestant churches in the pre 1688 period in Ireland,¹⁶ after the revolution and the accession of William and Mary the situation and tone had quite changed. William King was appointed bishop of Derry, a diocese where Scottish Presbyterians were by far the most numerous and were very strong in their opposition to the Established Church. Within this context King's hope of at least some accommodation was tempered by his criticism of presbyterian forms of worship.¹⁷ King went into some detail in this regard. For example, he was critical of the form of music used in presbyterian services, by which the minister led the congregation line by line, singing the psalms in metre form. The Established Church, on the other hand, allowed musical instruments and this seemed 'more requisite in northern countries where generally people's voices are more harsh and untunable than in other places'.¹⁸

13. [William King] *The present state of the church*, [1688] (T.C.D., MSS 1995-2008, no. 69a Correspondence of William King), ff 1-14. For the question of re ordination and use of Established Church liturgy, ff 7, 13-14. Also, Edward Wetenhall, *The Protestant peacemaker, or a seasonable persuasive to all serious christians* (London, 1682); Andrew Carpenter, 'William King and the threats to the Church of Ireland during the reign of James II' in *I.H.S.*, xviii, no. 69 (Mar. 1972), pp 22-28.

14. Boyse, *Some impartial reflections*, p. 26.

15. King wrote a reply to Boyse but James Bonnell would not let him print it (Baumgartner Papers, Add. I, f. 78).

16. Feb. 1687, *The Mather Papers*, p. 66; Bonnell to Strype, 21 Jan. 1688 (Baum. Papers, Add 1, f. 64). Also, see above, footnote 13.

17. William King, *A discourse concerning the inventions of men in the worship of God* (London, 1694).

18. King, *A discourse concerning the inventions of men*, pp 17-18.

Again, forms of prayer so valued by the Established Church and enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer, were rejected by the presbyterians. The minister prayed out loud, extempore, and the congregation remained silent. King condemned this as out of keeping with the scriptures.¹⁹ He also criticised the lack of scripture readings in the presbyterian church. Only short texts of scripture were used and the rest of the time was given to preaching. This setting aside the scriptures in favour of preaching was wrong 'unless you call your sermons (as some Quakers are said to do) as much the word of God as the Bible'. Whereas there was an organised structure for readings in the Established Church throughout the year, with catechism and Sunday school classes, the presbyterian church had no such organisation for scripture readings, and King thought their catechism was far too difficult.²⁰

Presbyterians contended that they read the scriptures at home, claiming that everyone could read since the invention of printing. King rejected this view, arguing that the scriptures were intended to be read in church, that some could not afford to buy a Bible and some could not read. And in a comment that condemned the Established Church itself, King claimed that the reformation had succeeded in England and Wales because the people in church had the Bible read to them in their own language:²¹

I am persuaded that if ever the native Irish be brought to the knowledge of God's word it must be by having it read to them publicly in a language they understand and not by thrusting Bibles privately into their hand, of the ineffectiveness of which we have had an experiment 150 years.

King then treated the long and vexed question of outward forms of worship in church:

19. King, *A discourse concerning the inventions of men*, p. 50. This was an old criticism. Henry Leslie, *A discourse of praying in the spirit* (n.p., 1659).

20. Ibid, pp 67- 85, 92.

21. Ibid, pp 87 - 101.

sitting has crept into some of our churches, chiefly by the occasion and countenance of those who have miserably fallen from us. While we do not have to follow every external thing Christ did, we follow the general rules of decency and reason....if other dissenters think bodily worship such as bowing, kneeling etc unlawful and unnecessary, because they are acts of the body and unfit on that account to be offered to God who is a spirit, why may not the Quakers omit the sacrament and the words of the mouth which are outward things ?...The principle and reasoning are the same in all these and will justify the silent meetings of the Quakers, the extravagaza of those that pretend to be above all ordinances, as well as the irreverence of other dissenters.²²

On these points presbyterians were quite intransigent, and refused to go to Established Church services because of the forms of worship there. Yet the very things which prevented presbyterians from worshipping in the Established Church were insisted on by King. He criticised the Directory which did not allow the people any response or assent to worship, by standing, kneeling or bowing; this made the congregation spectators. By way of excuse some dissenters said that standing and kneeling were tiring, but this was an evasion of the issue. In fact the issue was clear, at least to the presbyterians, and King seems to have been unable to grasp the real divide in theology and practice between the Established and Scottish Presbyterian Churches.

The question of frequency of communion was also a source of contention. Whereas the reformers ordered that no communion services were to be held without full participation by the people, King thought dissenters had erred in the other direction. The Established Church held communions at least three times yearly, monthly if possible and even weekly in large cities and towns. But the dissenters had no such fixed times, leaving it to the minister to decide when a communion service was to take place. So while sabbath observance was obligatory, communion was a rare event.²³ King chose not to recognise

22. King, *A discourse concerning the inventions of men*, pp 115 - 131.

23. Ibid, pp 156-161.

the long established presbyterian custom of large communion services, held in different parts and attended by numbers of ministers and often thousands of people.²⁴

King addressed his criticism of presbyterian forms of worship first of all to the Established Church clergy in Derry, encouraging them to read their services well, and try to win the people; they had the advantage in that their appointment was not made by the people so they could speak out freely. King advised them to avoid disputes, and be aware that while the church was busy with papists, deists and socinians the enemy within was hard at work.²⁵

He then addressed the presbyterian ministers of Derry and asked them to examine his views with an open mind. He specifically asked them if they could agree on some issues: the Lord's prayer, kneeling at service, frequency of the communion service, reading at least a chapter of scripture at service. He also asked them to consider occasional conformity as lawful, for some in the diocese went to no church at all since they had no presbyterian minister resident in their area. King argued that English dissenters allowed this was a precedent they could respect.²⁶

King recognised the differences between English Presbyterians, Independents and Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland. He was also aware of the well defined church order of Scottish Presbyterians and thought there was a possibility of some agreement between Scottish Presbyterians and the Established Church. Both had similar forms of church organisation: districts, provincial churches and national churches. The crucial difference between them lay in the fact that presbyterians were governed by a college of equal presbyters, and the Established Church had presbyteries governed by bishops.

24. Livingstone, *A brief historical relation*, pp 78-9; Westerkamp, *Triumph of the laity*, pp 66-7, 70-1.

25. King, *A discourse concerning the inventions of men*, p. 163.

26. Ibid, pp 169-74.

From his time in Dublin King knew that Independents denied Christ instituted any other church than a single, particular church. For them classical, provincial and national churches were human inventions; contact with neighbouring churches was only in terms of charity and good relations and not in any governing sense. In view of this, King argued, agreement would be easier to achieve between the Established Church and Scottish Presbyterians; they might even agree to observe the excommunications levied by the bishop's court against members of their churches.²⁷

Voicing his hopes for some form of mutual agreement, and aware that they had not enough meeting places or ministers to cater for their numbers, King hoped to win some form of compromise.²⁸ Yet his criticism of presbyterian forms of worship was the area of greatest disagreement and King seemed unable to recognise how deep and strong this was at the the time. This was clearly brought out when Robert Craghead, who had been a minister in Ireland for a long time, wrote a firm, negative response.²⁹ He dedicated his work to the mayor, aldermen and burgesses of Derry, indicating the control presbyterians had in the city. Craghead's work was basically a point by point defence of presbyterian form of worship so criticised by King.

For example, he maintained that the singing of psalms in metre rather than prose was correct and that the use of instruments in church expired with the old testament.³⁰ Contrary to King's view, Craghead argued that hundreds in Derry knew the catechism. Moreover, presbyterian ministers had been criticised for reading and preaching too much scripture; he also insisted that even the very poor had a Bible, in fact 'will punish themselves rather than want a

27. King, *A discourse concerning the inventions of men*, pp 176-7.

28. Bonnell to Strype, 26 Dec. 1693 (Baumgartner Papers, Add. 1, f.77).

29. Robert Craghead, *An answer to a late book entitled A discourse concerning the inventions of men in the worship of God, by William, Lord Bishop of Derry* (Edinburgh, 1694). Craghead was born in Scotland in 1633 and educated at St. Andrews; he was ordained for Donoughmore, Co. Donegal until he was ejected in 1661; he stayed on in Derry, though moved to Glasgow during the 1688 revolution and subsequent wars; he died in 1711. McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 45, p. 9; Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 88-94.

30. Craghead, *An answer to a late book*, pp 6, 17.

Bible'.³¹ Bowing and kneeling at the Lord's supper were not required by scripture; Christ ordained that the people sit at table, though it was permitted to kneel at prayer; anything else was 'will-worship', just a human invention. Craghead explained that their tradition was to have the communion service once or twice a year, if there was a settled congregation. One of the reasons they could not have it more frequently was harassment of ministers and families by the bishop's courts. Besides, Craghead was not sure that scripture intended there be a communion service each sabbath. The great differences in outward worship required by the Book of Common Prayer, as well as the whole issue of bishops and church government, prevented presbyterians from joining the Established Church for worship, even occasionally.³²

Craghead ended his work by praising the ministers who insisted on predestination and 'God's previous concurrence', as against free will and universal redemption. As pastors they ministered to their people more than half a day every fortnight and in particular taught predestination and adoption.³³ Craghead admitted that people had doubts and attributed them to the 'innate atheism of our depraved natures'; this led them to ask: 'is there a God, is there a Christ, is there an eternity, can there be a resurrection, is there a heaven and a hell?'. The solution was to 'labour to have your calling and election made sure'.³⁴ In ending thus Craghead used the opportunity to teach his people and help them maintain their adherence to the strict doctrine of predestination, and indeed to presbyterian theology and forms of worship.³⁵

31. Craghead, *An answer to a late book*, pp 78-9, 86.

32. Ibid, pp 91-4, 112-18, 133-4, 139.

33. Ibid, p. 140. Thomas Hall of Larne wrote a tract for his people: *A plain and easy explication of the assemblies shorter catechism* (Edinburgh, 1697). Since 1646 he had been catechising his congregation and preaching on 'God's previous concurrence'. See pp 1, 38, 76, 79, 93; Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 95-101.

34. Ibid, pp 152-9.

35. The following year he wrote a tract on the same theme: *Advice to communicants* (Edinburgh, 1695).

This was not the only reply that King received, for Boyse also wrote a tract in defence of presbyterian forms of worship, from the perspective of the English Presbyterian tradition.³⁶ By this time Boyse was already involved in the Sacramental Test controversy and regretted that King's book had forced him to enter into another debate.³⁷ But they were old disputants and Boyse felt that silence on his part indicated assent to King's views.³⁸ He was, however, of a different spirit and practice of presbyterianism, and was known in Dublin as 'a good ingenious man...of some latitude'.³⁹

Like Craghead, Boyse answered King point by point though in much more detail and with greater clarity than Craghead. He also was more ready to meet King part of the way and try to reach some form of consensus. For example, contrary to Craghead, Boyse accepted that the prose version of the psalms used in the Established Church was as much the word of God as the metre version. He objected to the version of the psalms used in the Established Church rather than their use of prose. However, Boyse thought that organs should only be used in parish churches to help keep the congregation in tune, but should not be used in cathedrals.⁴⁰

With regard to prayer, Boyse affirmed that they used the Lord's prayer, yet he also argued that extempore prayer was not mindless, but called for serious preparation by the minister beforehand. In 1660 the Savoy conference was ready to accept a form of worship that left scope for free

36. Joseph Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse of William lord bishop of Derry, concerning the inventions of men in the worship of God* (n.p., [1694]).

37. See ch. 9.

38. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, Preface.

39. Bonnell to Strype, 15 Mar. 1694 (Baumgartner Papers, Add I, f.78). Boyse, *Works*, i, 13.

40. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, pp 69-74, 77, 114. Boyse wrote some hymns for his congregation in Dublin, *Sacramental Hymns* (Dublin, 1693). In the Preface to this work Boyse cited the practice of the reformed churches abroad which 'seems to reproach our own, who exceed us in the frequency of this duty as they have the advantage of us in the variety and sweetness of their tunes, their skill in fingering them and their doing it without the interruption of reading every line'. Edward Wetenhall also was critical of line singing of the psalms. *Of gifts and offices in the public worship of God* (Dublin, 1678), pp 412, 422, 425. There is a symbolic aspect to Boyse's *Hymns*. He had two versions for each hymn. The first was set in common metre, the 100th psalm; the second allowed another metre. A.W.Godfrey Brown, 'Irish Presbyterian Theology in the early 18th century' (Ph.D., Q.U.B., 1977), p. 152.

prayer, but this was blocked by the bishops. Both Presbyterian and Independent dissenters used formal prayer for baptism and communion services and had a formal dismissal at the end of services. But if formal prayer alone was used this would lead to dullness and sloth in both the minister and congregation.⁴¹ Contrary to King's view, Boyse argued that the Directory was quite specific about what topic to preach on, and that it had more emphasis on the mysteries of religion than the Established Church. The latter quoted Seneca and Cicero more frequently than apostolic writings and stressed morality rather than religion. What amazed Boyse and all the ministers he spoke to was the view that King had of northern ministers:

Perhaps the ministers in the north of Ireland and those in Scotland (speaking generally) outstrip all others that we know of in the christian world as to their unwearied diligence in catechising those under their charge.

They divided their parishes into communicants and examinable persons. The communicants were visited once a year and were examined for their progress in knowledge and practice before being admitted to communion. In addition, the parish was divided into districts and once a year the examinable persons in each district were given times and places for catechising. It was the custom for all dissenters here and in England to catechise each sabbath and once every summer go through the whole catechism. Boyse asked if the Established Church clergy did anything like this. Ministers in the north of Ireland read scripture to their congregation each sabbath except in the wintertime, so that there were about five meetings when scripture was not read, though even then a concordance was used; all dissenters, north and south, used concordances at services. Boyse admitted that he did not approve of the practice of omitting the scripture reading in the winter and said that this did not happen in Wood Street. Yet,

41. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, pp 80-6, 112-3.

I am credibly informed by such as live in the north that most families of dissenters read the scriptures daily. On the Lord's day before and after public worship as well; that is why they can drop it in the winter.

The people brought the Bible to service and had it explained to them; but the Established Church congregation brought the Book of Common Prayer to service and so they were near to practising popery.⁴²

Bodily worship was a contentious issue and Boyse pointed out that it was linked with Laudianism. Dissenters in England and in the south of Ireland did not sit at public prayers. Boyse learnt from ministers in the north of Ireland that 'the better sort' generally stood; though they recommended kneeling, people travelled so far to come to meetings that ministers did not insist; the meeting house was often so crowded that it would have been impossible to kneel anyway.⁴³ With regard to the frequency of the communion service, Boyse indicated there was great variety of practice, but generally in Dublin and in churches of the English Presbyterian tradition they held a service once a month or every six weeks to two months. In the north it was held once a year or twice in large towns. It was a special form of service, for two thirds of the communicants were strangers from other parishes, and the services were big gatherings. Services were held in different parts of the north all through the year and it was customary to travel long distances to them. Thus, people could go to communion services between four to fifteen times a year if they so wished and were allowed.

Presbyterians in the north maintained this kind of practice, for numbers increased the solemnity of the occasion. Ministers came from the surrounding parishes to help and brought their people with them. Although Boyse preferred his own church practice of monthly communion, he pointed out that either way both churches communicated more frequently than the Established Church. With this in

42. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, pp 88-95.

43. *Ibid*, pp 97-9.

mind, and the conviction that all protestant churches were part of the catholic church, Boyse hoped that King would urge his people to join presbyterians for communion, in the same way as dissenters were urged to attend the Established Church occasionally for worship.⁴⁴

Boyse argued that in matters of church government King made too facile a link between presbyterians and the Established Church. Ussher taught that church government was for unity and for consultation, much in the same way as the Heads of Agreement reached between presbyterian and Independent divines in 1691.⁴⁵ The latter agreed that for big issues ministers of several churches should meet and whatever they concluded should not be ignored lightly by particular churches with their elders and members. However, Boyse acknowledged that in matters of church government there were differences between the Independent and the Presbyterian Churches. For while presbyterians accorded synods a governing power, the Independents gave them a consultative power. In practice, however, someone excommunicated from one Independent church could not join another church since the pastors were bonded together in association and supported one another's decisions. The same applied to excommunication by the bishop's court, at least among English Presbyterians, and in view of this Boyse asked that the bishop accept marriages solemnised by a non conformist minister.⁴⁶

In the appendix at the end of the work Boyse made thirteen suggestions calling for: the renewal of the Established Church, asking it to reconsider the stance of Ussher and Bedell with regard to exercising power with presbyters in the diocese, (using Ussher's Model of Episcopacy); better preparation for ordination; reform of the clergy in parishes, especially in Down and Connor,⁴⁷ and the

44. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, pp 104-8.

45. 'An essay of Accommodation', being a scheme for uniting Presbyterians and Congregationals, drawn up c. 1680. Occasional Paper, no. 6, 1957 (Dr. William's Library, London); Watts, *The dissenters*, pp 290-1, 293.

46. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, pp 108-11.

47. For the situation in Down and Connor, see Ch. 4, n. 55.

suppression of pluralities and non residence. He also asked that dissenters be relieved of the Act of Uniformity, since taking it led to ministers being forced to accept re-ordination. Instead, he asked that the obstacles to communion with the Established Church be removed: excommunication of all who attended meetings other than those of the Established Church; of all who criticised the Book of Common Prayer and the ceremonies in worship; of all who did not accept bishops as a different order in the church.⁴⁸

However valid such observations were to Boyse, and they were made in a spirit of moderation, they could not be accepted by King or indeed any member of the Established Church at that time. It was too difficult and dangerous, posing threats to the position and survival of a weak and fragmented Established Church. King said as much when he replied to Boyse.⁴⁹ He did not want a wide debate and had intended his first book to be distributed in the diocese only; a reprint appeared in London without his authorisation and through this public debate had grown. Once this occurred he had no choice but to reply to Boyse, lest silence imply either assent or defeat.⁵⁰

In this second work King outlined the sources for his views on presbyterianism, based on the three years he had spent in the diocese. Underlying King's approach was the conviction that as a bishop he had the right and responsibility to sit in judgement on the presbyterians. So he examined them on their catechism, their prayers and on why they did not come to church, either to their own or the Established Church. He claimed that of the 30,000 presbyterians in the diocese only one in ten went to church. There were nine meeting houses in the diocese and about three hundred attended each of them. What happened to the rest who worshipped nowhere?⁵¹ This was the heart

48. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse*, pp 117-20.

49. William King, *An admonition to the dissenting inhabitants of the diocese of Derry concerning a book lately published by Mr. J. Boyse* (London, 1694).

50. 15 Mar. 1694 (Baumgartner Papers, Add I, f. 78).

51. King, *An admonition*, pp 1-4.

of the problem as far as King was concerned. He knew the presbyterians had neither enough room nor enough ministers for all their people and so he wanted them to come to the Established Church for worship. Boyse had given him some hope that this could be acceptable, but Boyse was of a different tradition from the northern presbyterians who could not accept occasional communion in any way or for any reason.⁵²

Replying directly to Boyse, King picked out the things they had some agreement on: the psalms sung in prose were lawful, musical instruments were sometimes permissible; set forms of prayer were valid; omission of scripture reading was a defect; frequency of the communion service was positive, as was the value of kneeling at prayer. King then went into some details about the number of meeting houses in the diocese in comparison to the greater number of the parish churches, about the infrequency of the communion service among presbyterians. He had spent time getting these figures from his curates,⁵³ though his friends advised him not to push so hard, and to be sure his facts were accurate;⁵⁴ Capel, the Lord Lieutenant, thought him too persistent and hotheaded.⁵⁵

From his reply to Boyse, on the issues of worship and church order, it was clear that King was unable to grasp the reality of the situation in his own diocese. He saw the Established Church as the norm and the Presbyterian Church had to conform. There was no middle, negotiating ground. Within that tight framework, King could not accept Boyse's view that decisions regarding outward forms of worship could be left to different congregations and that no fixed form of liturgy was necessary. Matters of church discipline and order, such as the right of the people to

52. Bonnell to Strype, 6 May 1695 (Baumgartner Papers, Add I, f. 81).

53. T.C.D., MSS 1995-2008, nos 357, 358, 359, 369.

54. Foley to King, 10 Oct. 1693 (T.C.D., MSS 1995-2008, no. 302; Foley to King, 12 May 1694, (T.C.D., MSS 1995-2008, no. 354).

55. Bonnell to King, 29 Nov. 1694 (T.C.D. MSS 1995-2008, no. 397).

choose their ministers, were minimised in importance by King who thought that if they worshipped together all would be solved gradually.⁵⁶ He underlined the duties he thought he had as bishop, giving him unique rights:⁵⁷

Mr. Boyse has no such relation to those he takes on him to advise. He has yet owned no proper church beyond his single congregation. He has owned no ecclesiastical jurisdiction to whom on earth he and his congregation are accountable by the laws of Christ. He can claim no authority over any other congregation than his own, or challenge so much as to be a minister of Christ to any other, if they please to question it, without a new ordination, as appears from those Heads of Agreement produced by himself.

King ended his reply by indicating that he did not wish to debate further with someone who represented a single church. Nevertheless, the following year Boyse responded to King in a further work which he dedicated to presbyterians in Derry.⁵⁸ Boyse got his material to answer King's *Admonition* from ministers and elders in the north. King had accused the presbyterians of being ignorant of their catechism, prayers and creed.⁵⁹ Boyse discovered that this was not true; rather the people did not wish to answer King's questions since he was not their pastor. Thus King took the people's silence for ignorance.⁶⁰ Boyse then proceeded to defend the frequency of communion services among the presbyterians, using their own testimonies as proof. Areas in the diocese were cited in detail, with the times that communion services had been held. Boyse noted that King refused his own tenants the right to have meeting houses or ministers on his land, so preventing communion services there.⁶¹

Again, the theology of sacrament was divisive, for both saw the meaning of signs differently: King saw them as signifying/conveying grace, valid for both sacraments and

56. King, *An admonition*, pp 28-37. King was willing to omit the cross at Baptism and having godparents at baptism of presbyterian children, pp 40-1.

57. Ibid, p. 38.

58. [Joseph Boyse] *A vindication of the remarks on the bishop of Derry's discourse about human inventions from what is objected against them in the admonition annexed to the second edition of that discourse* (n.p., [1695]).

59. Boyse, *A vindication*, pp 1-3.

60. Ibid, p. 124.

61. Ibid, pp 125-34.

outward signs of worship, like the sign of the Cross at Baptism and bowing to the altar. Boyse saw sacraments as representative signs, as much from us to God as God to us, and only valid within a sacramental context; there were no other signs. In the light of this, Boyse could only call King's view popish. It was further clarification of the differences which would prevent conformity.⁶² In an effort to reach some agreement, Boyse wanted King to consider expanding his view of the catholic church, for from 1687 this had been a source of contention between them. Only this could bridge the gaps between them, for it would mean King accepting several churches, of different traditions and practices, as true reformed churches. However, Boyse did not hold out much hope for this, since King refused both dissenters and papists the right to have meeting houses on his lands.⁶³ At the end of his previous work, Boyse had made thirteen suggestions to King for the renewal of the Established Church. These King resented and refused to admit that any of Boyse's suggestions were necessary. Boyse took this up again by remarking that he hoped the example of Down and Connor diocese just then would not be taken as typical of the entire Established Church.⁶⁴

Nothing daunted, King wrote a second admonition in 1696 in reply to Boyse.⁶⁵ The admonition reworked the theme of the previous one, urging presbyterians to come and worship in the Established Church, since they had not sufficient meeting houses and ministers for their people, who were scattered all over the country. In this way, everyone could worship on Sundays and have communion at least four times a year. King had gathered further information and facts on the numbers of communion services and again he accused the presbyterians of having very few services for the people.⁶⁶ One of the reasons for this was the practice

62. Boyse, *A vindication*, pp. 139-44.

63. *Ibid*, p. 134.

64. *Ibid*, p. 125.

65. William King, *A second admonition to the dissenting inhabitants of the diocese of Derry concerning Mr. Joseph Boyse's Vindication* (London, 1696).

66. King, *A second admonition*, pp 1-22.

of elders admitting people to communion, and if there were no elders then communions would be few. Sometimes meetings were not held because some of the ministers were fighting in the Scottish rebellions, such as Pentland Hills and Bothwell Bridge. Both examples referred to the fanatic fringe within the Scottish Presbyterian Church which was always hard to contain. And, wary of the presbyterian stress on the Word of God, King accused some ministers of preferring to preach to their congregations rather than administer the Lord's Supper.⁶⁷

There was another problem. Whenever communion services were held they were so big that the government saw them as a threat to peace. For this reason King refused to allow meeting houses on his land; the huge meetings held there were a real drain on his tenants:⁶⁸

Coshering and exacting of tenants by way of meat and lodging is against the laws of this kingdom; and the popish priests lived by such ways but were not near so oppressive to their neighbours as your meetings are....Your sacraments especially are attended with a most oppressive coshering...4 or 5,000 meet together from distant places and stay several days. And indeed none that live near the meeting house can call their meat or drink or grass or houses their own during these times or dare refuse them.

Rather than have such large communion services, King wanted the presbyterians to come to his church for worship. He could not see that this would not work, that it could never be a solution. He was asking for an impossible change; since their beginnings in Ireland presbyterians were well used to large gatherings, saw them as mini revivals and part of their tradition. In any event, at the level of theology and practice, presbyterians could never accept the Book of Common Prayer even in a mitigated form. It was strange that King who came from a presbyterian background could not grasp this.

At the end of his second admonition King summarised his criticisms of the presbyterians in the diocese. His final point addressed the differences between Scottish and

67. King, *A second admonition*, pp 25-30, 36.

68. Ibid, pp 28-30, 115-19.

English presbyterians in matters of church government, or more concretely, between the Scottish presbyterians of Derry and the English presbyterians as represented by Boyse. There was nothing new in this. For Boyse, reacting to his situation in Dublin where ministers of the English Presbyterian Church, Scottish Presbyterian Church and the Independent Church met monthly in a loose association, held the view that a particular congregation had within itself all the rights and duties of a church; they were not accountable to another or to a synod; the association of ministers was to build up union and communion between themselves. Ussher was invoked to support this view. Scottish Presbyterians in the north, on the other hand, were very highly organised and hierarchised and the lines of authority and responsibility were clearly laid down.⁶⁹

King addressed Boyse's claim of belonging to the catholic church and he denied that in his work against Peter Manby he had unchurched all dissenters. But he insisted that preaching the word of God and the due administration of the sacraments were true marks of the catholic church and required a lawful ministry.⁷⁰ He reminded Boyse that he accepted occasional communion, especially if people have nowhere else to go for worship. However, King rejected Boyse's view of the meaning of signs/sacraments and found they reflected the views of 'the late systems of divinity and interested writers rather than scripture'; he was referring to the influence of Socinianism at this time. For all signs were not wrong, even Quakers used them. In that context the use of signs in the Established Church was perfectly valid.⁷¹

Whether or not Boyse used new arguments from new schools of thought, the old differences remained: the ceremonies of the Established Church were unacceptable to the presbyterians, both Scottish and English, though the English tradition could just about accept occasional

69. King, *A second admonition*, pp 124- 32.

70. Ibid, p. 149 ff

71. Ibid, pp 169, 279.

communion. Boyse had explained in his *Vindication* that he wrote then because a quick answer was needed and at that time the dissenters in Derry were not able to do this.⁷² However in 1697 Craghead responded to King's second admonition, concentrating on the issue of dissenters joining the Established Church for worship.⁷³ Craghead insisted that they had always objected to joining the Established Church for worship and there were books written about this which were burnt in the recent war, 'at least in this part of the nation'. A book was needed now so that ordinary people could answer for themselves when asked why they did not come to the parish church for worship. Craghead hoped this would help understanding with the Established Church, for 'we cannot see with their eyes, nor they with ours'.⁷⁴

Two points of doctrine and practice prevented presbyterians going to the parish church: Canon 36 of the Established Church which stated that only the Book of Common Prayer could be used for worship; and the place and power of bishops in the Established Church. Craghead insisted that the apostles were of one ministerial order and cited scripture to prove that this was so in the time of Christ and in the early church. According to the Fathers of the early church the difference between bishops and presbyters arose out of custom and not by divine law or appointment. Every local church had a pastor, sometimes called bishop, but he had no jurisdiction over others personally; this was exercised by presbyters in synod. Ussher himself said it was so in the time of Patrick, that every church in Ireland had its own bishop and this really meant pastor. Craghead admitted that at some point presbyters, of their own free will, allowed bishops to emerge into positions of power; while he left this point

72. Boyse, *A vindication of the remarks*, p. 134.

73. [Robert Craghead], *A modest apology occasioned by the importunity of the bishop of Derry who presses for an answer to a query stated by himself in his second admonition concerning joining in the public worship established by law* (Glasgow, 1696).

74. Craghead, *A modest apology*, To the Christian reader.

unfinished in the text, the logical conclusion to his thought was that this power was taken back, as a necessary reform, at the time of the reformation.⁷⁵

With regard to the liturgy imposed by the Established Church, this was indeed a novelty, since for the first 600 years of the church no such constrictions existed. Ussher pointed out that the Roman liturgy was only imposed in the 12th century; up to that time the Celtic Church had enjoyed freedom to have its own forms of liturgy. Thus imposed liturgies came with the arrival of papal jurisdiction in Ireland. Going into some detail, Craghead listed the objections sent to Charles II regarding the Book of Common Prayer especially: its use of the Apocryphal books; saints days; versions of scripture; formal prayers; doctrine of the catechism; over participation of the congregation in worship; the sign of the cross at Baptism; kneeling at communion; parts of the communion service; godparents at baptism; the doctrine that children are saved by baptism.⁷⁶ These points were similar to those raised by the presbyterians in their debate with Henry Leslie in 1636,⁷⁷ and represented a consistent stand taken by presbyterians throughout the 17th century with regard to the Book of Common Prayer. By 1696 they had become well established and deeply held convictions.

The communion service was the most divisive issue and Craghead repeated the familiar contention: Christ sat at table at the Last Supper and kneeling was not a table gesture in any country. Kneeling came with 'popish transubstantiation', and such kneeling before images of Christ's body was idolatry, for Christ was only represented in the bread and wine. This was the teaching of the Fathers and indeed of Ussher.⁷⁸ With regard to other ceremonies, such as the use of the cross at baptism, these

75. Craghead, *A modest apology*, pp 1-10, 15-16, 21-23, 30-34, 38.

76. Ibid, p. 48 ff

77. Reid, *A history of the Presbyterian Church*, i, Appendix iv, pp 523-43.

78. Craghead, *A modest apology*, pp 51-63.

were without any warrant of scripture, and ministers should only impose what Christ commanded. Anything beyond that was mere human invention.⁷⁹

As for re-ordination, which the Established Church required of dissenting ministers,⁸⁰

This we judge a rejecting of us altogether and a manifest injury to the church of God. For first our ministers of the presbyterian persuasion are elected and ordained to the rules of scripture, the people's electing and the Presbytery ordaining. It were good if you were able to say as much for yourselves.

Craghead pointed out that, in the light of these points, a great deal more 'than a few harmless, indifferent ceremonies' separated them. Even if presbyterians went to the Established Church just for the preaching part of the service, it would still be wrong for it would give the impression of a 'profligate conscience'. Once some presbyterians did go to the parish church when they had no meeting and they regretted it very much afterwards.⁸¹ They should not be forced to worship against their wills and he cited Jeremy Taylor's *Case of conscience* to support this. Besides very few of the presbyterians were far from a meeting house and more and more congregations had their own ministers. This was in contrast to some of the parish churches which had no ministers, but the Established Church would not accept that a presbyterian minister could take a service there.⁸²

Craghead ended on a conciliatory note and said that he believed that if presbyterians were deprived of worship for a very long time, then they could hear the gospel preached in the parish church but they could not join in the act of worship. This seems to have happened, as King complained of those who left the service once the prayers

79. Craghead, *A modest apology*, pp 64-66.

80. Ibid, p. 82.

81. Ibid, pp 94-8.

82. Ibid, pp 99-102.

began. Nevertheless he asked King 'Be not so tenacious of your own traditions, customs and inventions as to scatter the flock of Christ'.⁸³

In 1697 Craghead wrote a further response on behalf of the dissenters of Derry and dedicated his work to the mayor of the city, James Lennox.⁸⁴ The purpose of the book was very clear:⁸⁵

The necessity of undeceiving many poor weak people who are taught that the difference between the worship of others and ours is only some harmless ceremonies, but conceal from them that some ceremonies are made worship to God without his command and others that are religious worship tendered to creatures, which is due to God only and therefore are not harmless.

Craghead accused King of falsely polarising positions between the Scottish Presbyterian Church and the Established Church. For example, presbyterians read the psalms in prose, but sung them in metre; they accepted that formal prayer could be lawful for some christians; the people were taught the great mysteries of religion; scripture was used extensively in services; they knelt in prayer but affirmed that Christ instituted the Sacrament while sitting at table.⁸⁶

Parishioners were obliged under pain of excommunication to come to communion at least three times a year. Apart from the fact that worship in a Established Church was unacceptable, Craghead thought this was far too harsh especially on doubting christians. This highlighted a difference that one of King's clergy pointed out to him:

not one in five of their flock ever received the holy communion, though [had] a competent knowledge...they have an odd notion that it is means of confirming the adult in grace but not of conveying it.⁸⁷

83. Craghead, *A modest apology*, p. 105. King did not reply to this tract, but in 1702 an episcopal minister from the diocese of Derry dedicated a reply to King (n.n.), *Remarks upon the book called A Modest Apology* (n.p., 1702).

84. Robert Craghead, *An answer to the bishop of Derry's second admonition to the dissenting inhabitants of this diocese especially as to the matter of fact relating to the public worship of God, wherein his misrepresentations are again discovered* (n.p. 1697).

85. Ibid, Dedication to the mayor.

86. Ibid, To the reader, pp 44-5, 82-3, 91, 93, 125, 139.

People had to know that they were elected by God and so sure of being predestined and saved before they could take communion. On the other hand, in the Established Church communion was a means of growing in grace, growing into election by responding to sacrament. For Craghead it was essential that his own people and the bishop understood the Scottish Presbyterian point of view which obtained in Derry. In this context he felt that Boyse had not really answered the bishop adequately.

Craghead found King's facts quite inaccurate and out of context. Presbyterian congregations were scattered and so the ministers tended to be peripatetic. This could give the impression that church order was haphazard and careless but the opposite was the case. Strong church order had been well established during the hard years since the Restoration and this had served them well. Ministers helped each other out, either when one had to be away ministering to scattered congregations or when a communion service was being held. When a congregation could not have a service this did not mean there was no worship; some worshipped at home and others met in smaller groups within an area. Again this was a well established tradition among presbyterians since the 1630 period in Ireland.⁸⁸

In fact Craghead claimed that very few were deprived of worship,

considering the pains the people take in the summer time to travel abroad for opportunity of worship; making the congregation so numerous that no meeting house can contain them and therefore the ministers are often constrained to preach in the fields lest the people should be disappointed.⁸⁹

87. Scott to King, 11 June 1694 (T.C.D., MSS 1995-2008, no. 359). Craghead wrote two tracts related to these points: *Advice to communicants* (Edinburgh, 1695); *Warning and advice both to the secure and doubting christian or more diligence to be sure of salvation* (Edinburgh, 1701).

88. Craghead, *An Answer to the bishop*, pp 1- 11.

89. *Ibid*, p. 12.

The people supported their ministers, in addition to having tithes and dues to pay to ministers of the Established Church. So they knew and held to their principles,

they are free...to declare they cannot in conscience countenance a ministry obtruded on people, without a call or consent, nor a liturgy of men's devising.⁹⁰

Craghead insisted that Boyse's views on occasional communion, which King misunderstood as ordinary and regular communion with the Established Church, were not those of the presbyterians in Derry. Worship with the Established Church could not be accepted, on any basis. The Book of Common Prayer and the ceremonies of the church were too alien to the presbyterians, harking back to the days of popery and superstition, and so were theologically impossible for them to consider.

Craghead did not spend much time on this point, as it was too obvious, at least to him, to need fuller treatment. But he took trouble to explain his churches point of view with regard to preparation for communion, which they took very seriously 'that they may know to whom they dispense those holy mysteries'. Craghead insisted that this preparation was necessary; catechising and preaching were needed beforehand and people were examined carefully. This took time; so did the communion services, with so many coming for the service. Had they small congregations, such as King had, then all this could be done more quickly. As it was, 4 or 5,000 could be present at a service and even though only 500 might communicate, the rest had to be cared for, be preached to and so prepared for communion another day.⁹¹

Another reason for the infrequency of communion services was the constant harassment presbyterians had from the Established Church over many years:

90. Craghead, *An answer to the bishop*, p. 14.

91. Ibid, pp 15, 22-25, 50-8.

I have been for a long time that my nearest neighbour durst not come into my house to hear a chapter of the Bible read and expounded to them; and at length forced to leave the congregation, my habitation and family altogether, not knowing of any hiding place from the rage of persecution. Sometimes the sacrament was administered at night, in great danger; sometimes ministers were pulled out of their pulpits with the consent of the bishop. So infrequent communion was due to this harassment both before and since the revolution,[1688].⁹²

Drawing his work to a conclusion, Craghead outlined several further issues which were key to the Scottish Presbyterian Church. King had been critical of elders and so Craghead described their office in detail, pointing out that vestiges of their role were found in the lay chancellors, church wardens and officials of the Established Church. The elders were essential for good government and they assisted the minister while never usurping his office and authority.⁹³ Once again Craghead refuted the old accusation that presbyterian ministers did not read the scriptures to their people, or teach the mysteries of religion through preaching and catechising; and he upheld the value and importance of free, extempore prayer as a real spiritual gift valued in their church and used by the people as a way of judging the kind of minister they wanted. King had criticised the disturbance created by huge crowds at communion services. Craghead countered this with the view that people were very happy to give hospitality to communicants, in fact 'freely invite them to their houses, observing the gospel rule not to forget to entertain strangers'; and with regard to the question of bodily worship, Craghead repeated the view that sitting at communion was the wish of Christ.⁹⁴

Several letters of ministers, written to Craghead, were included in the work as proof of what Craghead had said about the communion services, refuting King's views expressed in the *Second Admonition*. Boyse too had written

92. Craghead, *An answer to the bishop*, pp 29-33.

93. Ibid, pp 44-6.

94. Ibid, pp 61-66, 69-76, 90-2, 94, 95-102.

to Craghead, indicating that he would not answer King any further, but he stated once again his difficulty with King's definition of the catholic church.⁹⁵

So ended the long series of debates in which the three parties sought to define and explain their point of view. In matters of theology and practice the two strands of Presbyterianism, Scottish and English, had most in common, though they diverged on the matter of church government and occasional communion. The understanding between them allowed Boyse to enter into debate with King, yet the northern ministers felt he had not represented their view completely and so Craghead responded to King twice. This contribution brought into relief the convictions Scottish Presbyterians had on predestination and election by God, a fact which directed and guided their consciences and persuaded them they had to stand fast against any diminution of this doctrine. This was not new. Presbyterian ministers had argued long and hard with Henry Leslie, bishop of Down and Connor, in 1636. What offended them then in the Book of Common Prayer and the ceremonies of the Established Church was just the same in 1694, only more so as the age of Ussher and comprehension was well and truly over.

King still had to come to terms with the fact that the Presbyterian Church in his diocese was not going to conform or be controlled by the Established Church. It was a church, separate and defined, having gathered strength and organisational experience from 1660-1688, in spite of harassment and suspicion from the governments of the day. It emerged after 1688 into its own space and began to take a more public stand, speaking with a confident voice. If the age of Ussher and his spirit was over, the age of self confidence and assurance had come and convinced the church that it could grow and thrive. The struggles were by no means over, but the hesitancies of the post Restoration period were over and the members of the church

95. Craghead, *An answer to the bishop*, pp 142-50.

PRESBYTERIANS AFTER THE 1688 REVOLUTION

The Sacramental Test controversy.

While King and Boyse were engaged in controversy over affairs of church order and worship, Boyse had entered into the Sacramental Test debate. This debate began after the revolution when Protestant dissenters in Ireland sought full toleration. In 1691 the Oath of Supremacy been abrogated and Protestant dissenters were limited by the Acts of Uniformity of 1560 and 1665. Despite efforts on their part from 1692 onwards, Protestant dissenters failed to have toleration granted them by Parliament in Ireland. They particularly resented the possibility of a Sacramental Test being linked to a Bill of Indulgence.¹ Boyse summarised their stance:²

There are two things desired by dissenting Protestants in reference to a Bill of Indulgence: First, that it give them a full security for the free exercise of religion according to their consciences. Secondly, that there be no such clauses annexed to it as may disable them from serving their King and their country.

Dissenters contended that such a Bill was necessary to preserve the Protestant interest in Ireland and they claimed it was a reasonable request in so far as they had defended the Protestant interest in the recent revolution and were supportive of the government established by William and Mary. To impose the Test Act in the light of this would be unjust. Besides, such a Test debased the Sacrament; it forced the consciences of some and excluded others from all office and position in the state. Since

1. Beckett, *Protestant dissent in Ireland*, pp 31-9, 40-52; Maguire, 'Government attitudes to non-conformity in Ireland, 1660-1719' pp 273-4.

2. [Joseph Boyse], *The case of the Protestant dissenters of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence represented and argued* (Dublin, 1695).

the Established Church had all its revenues and privileges enshrined in law, it could be in no danger from dissenters should full indulgence be granted:³

The dissenting Protestants of this kingdom have never expressed any unpeacable turbulancy towards their neighbours much less have they shown the least dissatisfaction to the government.

Here Boyse was speaking very obviously of the Presbyterians of the English tradition in Dublin and the south of Ireland. Northern presbyterians would not have been seen in such a positive light. Indeed Boyse seems not to have grasped or understood the Established Church's stance on Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland; to that degree his contribution to the debate was limited and unrealistic.

Josias Pullen, bishop of Dromore, replied to Boyse in the same year.⁴ The bishop agreed that no one would want to deny the dissenters the right to free exercise of religion, but to pass a Bill without any restrictions would create a multiplicity of sects. This was an old argument. The Established Church persisted in calling the dissenters 'sects'. To have accepted them as churches would have undermined their position and neutered the Sacramental Test debate. Besides, the fear of popery justified their stance:⁵

For a general Indulgence has always proved instrumental to the advancing the popish interest among us and has therefore been vigorously promoted by popish emissaries in England and that by express orders from their superiors abroad who have experimentally found it to be the most effectual method of introducing popery into a country and have expended very considerable sums of money for the purchase of toleration to dissenters.

3. Boyse, *The case of the Protestant dissenters*, p. 3.

4. [Josias Pullen], *An answer to a paper entitled 'The case of the Protestant dissenters of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence represented and argued* (Dublin, 1695). All the bishops, with the exception of Edward Wetenhall, supported the Sacramental Test, though William King said 'he thought a virtuous man of any profession would do less harm in office than a vicious man of our own church'. Bonnell to Strype, 18 Oct. 1692 (Baumgartner Papers, Add I, f.74).

5. Ibid, p. 1.

In addition, an Indulgence such as Boyse wanted would lead to an increase of presbyterians from Scotland. 'If they are turbulent at home will they be any better in Ireland?'. Scottish Presbyterians were 'sworn to extirpate prelacy' and treated the episcopal clergy in Scotland severely. Moreover, a general indulgence would mean that all control over dissenters in Ireland would be lost. Memories of how the Established Church suffered during the civil war period were still alive enough to evoke fears of what an Indulgence might introduce into the country. Pullen wondered why the dissenters were not content with what they had achieved since the revolution; this was a tacit permission to exercise their religion publicly, build meeting houses, even in corporate towns, and receive the royal bounty.⁶ The message was clear:⁷

'No motives ought to prevail on us to make such large concessions to them as will in all probability shake the very foundations of the established church

Boyse replied quickly to Pullen, rejecting his suggestion that sects would increase if the Indulgence was granted with the Test. The three 'sects' involved were Presbyterians, Anabaptists and Independents, and among the two latter there were 'but about six congregations that I know of in the kingdom'. Thus the Established Church was really concerned about the Scottish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland. Boyse did not grasp this fact and simply asked for a spirit of tolerance; he even wondered if occasional communion between the churches could not be practised by those who were likely to be :⁸

the most judicious as well as the most moderate persons and most likely to be the happy instruments of healing those breaches which persons of narrower judgements on either hand do unhappily widen.

6. Pullen, *An answer to a paper*, pp 2-4.

7. *Ibid*, p. 6.

8. [Joseph Boyse], *The case of the dissenting Protestants of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence vindicated from the exceptions alleged against it in a late answer* (Dublin, 1695), p 11. Boyse objected to dissenters being called sects; all dissenters saw themselves as churches in their own right. *Ibid*, p. 2.

Indeed he argued that since there was no possibility that dissenters would become Catholics, the Test should be applied only to Catholics, which was the original intention of all such Tests.⁹ On both counts Boyse missed the point. Scottish Presbyterians would not consider occasional communion, and the debate at this time had little to do with Roman Catholics.

Pullen responded again immediately with a defence of his position.¹⁰ He argued from history that any toleration of sects led to an increase of them, and he used the Anabaptists in Holland as an example: about fifty groups there called themselves Anabaptists but they were all sects, with different ideas and practices. The same applied to Catholics. Whenever there was an Indulgence, as in 1671/2, Catholics benefited from it. Pullen cited a letter from Bramhall to Ussher in 1654 on this point, and used it to justify his own view.¹¹ In the light of this evidence Pullen could not see that toleration would widen the basis of Protestantism in Ireland. On the contrary, only the Catholics would gain, for each church or sect would advance their own cause and splinter the Protestant interest even more. Pullen cited the example of Houston and his followers in the north of Ireland who:¹²

in the times of the greatest danger most scandalously separated themselves from the main body of the Protestants in the north of Ireland and publicly owned their acting on a different bottom from them.

Since 1690 many thousands of Scots had come over to Ireland and, with the exception of the Highlanders, all were presbyterians, with ministers who were 'all zealous for the Covenant'. Moreover, they came from a country where church government had become officially presbyterian; if their power and numbers increased in Ireland the Established Church would be in great danger.

9. Boyse, *The case of the dissenting Protestants*, pp 2, 8.

10. [Josias Pullen], *A defence of the answer to a paper entitled The case of the dissenting Protestants of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence from the exceptions lately made against it* (Dublin, 1695).

11. Pullen, *A defence of the answer*, pp 2- 5.

12. *Ibid*, p. 5.

Pullen voiced this fear and claimed that Cameronians had landed in Ireland recently and were quite numerous in the country. He also accused Boyse of being unaware of the real situation in the north.¹³ There tempers were turbulent and unpredictable. Episcopal ministers had received harsh treatment in Scotland and Pullen cited a number of examples to prove his point.¹⁴ The same happened in Ireland, in Letterkenny and Derry. How could any government allow toleration for such people, 'bigoted covenanters' whose zeal against popery could not hide their hatred of episcopacy ?¹⁵

Central to the Established Church stance on the Sacramental Test was the fear that Scottish Presbyterians could overpower the Established Church in Ireland. They had become the established church in Scotland when the bishops there refused to support the new monarchy. So the only possible path forward for the Irish bishops was the Test clause. Pullen reminded Boyse that this was not new, for the Oath of Allegiance which debarred dissenters from offices had not been revoked. The fact that it was not enforced did not mean it was void:¹⁶

their present quiet enjoyment of employment is not so much owing to their legal qualifications as to the kindness and leniency of the ecclesiastical governors.

Bishop Anthony Dopping of Meath joined the debate at this point.¹⁷ He maintained that dissenters had freedom of worship and freedom to trade and that this was as far as the church and government should go. Indeed the Test was needed in order to have some definite legal control over dissenters, especially in the north:¹⁸

'Tis well known that the British are already possessed of one fourth part of the kingdom, that they have spread themselves into other provinces and that there are frequent colonies coming out of Scotland to carry on the plantation of the

13. Pullen, *A defence of the answer*, pp 8-9.

14. Ibid, pp 15-21.

15. Ibid, pp 22- 24.

16. Ibid, p.27.

17. [Anthony Dopping], *The case of the dissenters of Ireland considered in reference to the Sacramental Test* (Dublin, 1695).

18. Ibid, p. 2.

party; that the commons are generally fond of the Solemn League and Covenant and retain affection for it, (though the nobility and gentry are otherwise affected); that by the 2nd Article of the Covenant they are bound to endeavour without respect of persons the extirpation of prelacy as well as popery.

Thus, toleration was impossible and foolish to consider, and Dopping argued that the Sacramental Test was a good and necessary thing in contrast to the Covenant which had led to the civil war. Both good government and church order required this Test. Either way the church could not lose: it could find out who their enemies were, or gain new members.

Edward Synge, then rector of Christchurch in Cork, wrote a short tract which, although not published at the time, was certainly circulated in the north.¹⁹ His basic contention was that one or other side, dissenters or Established Church, had to be wrong. In view of this, Synge asked the nonconformists where the Established Church was deficient and what was wrong with ceremonies and rites according to the Book of Common Prayer. In the case of doubt or uncertainty surrounding these questions, was it not more prudent to believe in the lawfully Established Church which had the authority to regulate laws and rites for worship? As a concession and in addition to attending worship in the Established Church, nonconformists could hold their own meetings and assemblies for their own growth and devotion, as long as they did not act separately. Some already had practised occasional communion, so there was no reason why this could not become constant communion. This in itself would remove the need for toleration.²⁰

Synge raised the query that Pullen and Dopping had adverted to, the motivation behind the plea for toleration without the Sacramental Test. If it was to practise their

19. Edward Synge, *A peaceable and friendly address to the non conformists written upon their desiring an act of toleration without the Sacramental Test* (Dublin, 1732); D.N.B. Synge was born in Cork and educated at Oxford; ordained in Trinity College Dublin, he served in Meath and Cork; bishop of Raphoe, 1716, and archbishop of Tuam in 1718. Cotton, *Fasti*, i,264*,342,337;ii,104*,119; iii,354*;iv,16.

20. Ibid, pp 6-12.

own religion, then dissenters could take the Test and conform occasionally. But this was rejected particularly by the Scottish Presbyterians in the north and led Synge to suspect that something more than mere toleration was planned; perhaps it was hoped that through toleration something like the overthrow of the Established Church in Ireland in 1641 or more recently in Scotland could be achieved ?.²¹

As the debate developed it was clear that exchanges between Boyse and the bishop/clergy of the Established Church would not make much progress on the issue of the Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland. Boyse, representing the English Presbyterian tradition in Ireland, had a spirit of latitude which created the possibility of some consensus. Boyse was quite open to occasional communion.²² What was much more crucial was the stance of the Scottish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland with regard to the Bill of Indulgence and the Sacramental Test. Their attitude became clearer when John McBride published his response to Synge and Pullen in 1697.²³ It was an echo of what Craghead told King regarding the impossibility of common worship between the Established and Presbyterian Churches in Derry.

In his address to the reader, McBride stated that Scottish presbyterian doctrine conformed to the Irish Articles of 1615, 'declared in the Convocation anno 1615, excepting in what relates to prelacy and ceremonies'. Although the Scottish presbyterian church had different forms of church government, doctrine and worship, this did not mean it was not a true reformation church. In the light of their underlying unity as true reformation churches, McBride asked if a limited form of toleration

21. Synge, *A peaceable and friendly address*, pp 12-13.

22. Some dissenters in Dublin did take occasional communion. John McBride to Robert Wylly, 7 July 1704 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, No.186).

23. John McBride, *Animadversions on the Defence of the answer to a paper entitled The case of the dissenting Protestants of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence* ([Belfast], 1697); Mc Connell, *Fasti*, no. 180, p. 72; Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 109-25.

could not be granted to the Presbyterians and Independents alone in Ireland. In this way they would be united against their common enemy, Roman Catholicism.²⁴

McBride argued that the Sacramental Test was unjust on several counts. From the point of view of doctrine, it was 'will-worship':²⁵

Know that the most part of Presbyterians and Independents in Ireland are otherwise minded, who all judge and declare that the table gesture in receiving the sacrament and not the adoration is the most agreeable to the first pattern given us by Christ and his apostles and practised in the primitive church.

He pointed out the contradiction inherent in asking presbyterians to kneel at communion and yet deny transubstantiation:²⁶

Not to kneel in receiving, by this test, is made equally criminal with believing transubstantiation, the idolatrous worshipping of the bread and all the abomination of the Mass with papists and with denying and condemning both ceremony and substance with the Quakers.

This latter point was contradictory in another way in that Quakers did not believe in sacraments at all, whereas presbyterians held to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Yet both were to be punished for not accepting the Sacramental Test.²⁷

McBride refuted Pullen's accusation regarding Houston and his followers in the north. Houston had been well silenced by the presbytery; neither were there Cameronians in the north. He also countered the accusation against Liston in Letterkenny, saying it was no worse than the state of the Established Church in Down and Connor and probably elsewhere in the country.²⁸

24. McBride, *Animadversions*, pp 5-7. Quakers were not included either.

25. Ibid, p. 87.

26. Ibid, p. 45.

27. Beckett, *Protestant dissent in Ireland, 1687 - 1780*, pp 131 -5. Quakers negotiated their own form of oath. The case of the people called Quakers (Marsh's Library Dublin, MS Z 1. 1. 13, f. 96).

28. McBride, *Animadversions*, pp 20-1, 34, 80-1.

Turning to Synge's work, McBride accused the Primate, Michael Boyle, of insisting on re-ordination and so of rejecting the validity of orders in another reformed church. This was offensive and prevented any possibility of unity. Since the Scottish Presbyterian Church had never joined with the Established Church in either government or worship they could not be accused of creating divisions. Rather they needed to be seen and accepted as a reformation church in its own right. With regard to ceremonies, what was not commanded by God was forbidden by God, and so the cross at Baptism, the ring in marriage and the surplice were all contrary to God's commands. The Directory required no ceremonies at all; it decreed procedures that were to be used for peace and good order at a service; they had no religious significance at all.²⁹

The question of occasional conformity was clear cut for McBride. He saw it as twofold, total conformity and partial conformity. The first spoke for itself; the second was a contradiction, for if a person saw no wrong in going to the Established Church occasionally, then 'they are but fools to suffer for non conformity'.³⁰ So he asked Synge to trust the presbyterians in the north, that they had no desire to overthrow the government or the church. This was the basis for peace and unity, not Tests, as history showed so well.³¹

Synge answered this work the following year.³² He insisted that for the Established Church to require re-ordination was not a rejection of the orders of another church. It did not deny the validity of the first ordination, but it made the minister 'part of the whole, ancient universal church throughout the world'.³³ Ceremonies were the circumstances of worship, not worship in itself. As the

29. McBride, *Animadversions*, pp 98, 101, 109-10.

30. Ibid, pp 111-13.

31. Ibid, pp 115-17.

32. Edward Synge, *Defence of the peaceable and friendly address against the answer lately given to it* (Dublin, 1698).

33. Ibid, pp 10-12.

lawful church of the land the Established Church had the right to regulate ceremonies for worship. It was difficult in any country to reach agreement on ceremonies, so they 'are the matter wherein we ought to show our conformity and obedience to the commands of lawful authority'.³⁴ Synge accused McBride of ignoring the validity of the Established Church's fear of what the Scottish Presbyterians could do in Ireland in terms of unsettling and even unseating the church, as they had in Scotland. McBride thought it could happen in the future but saw it as too hypothetical.³⁵

Not so for the Established Church which wanted the Sacramental Test for two reasons: to control the growing power of Scottish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland and to control the access of Roman Catholics to offices in the state and the army. By 1695 the threat from the former was much more real than from Roman Catholics. It was an old problem which needed to be solved with new urgency and adequate legislation. The presence of dissenters in Ireland after the Restoration had posed problems continually for the government which wanted to ensure that dissenters could not gain control of the country. Indeed Ormonde knew that the legislation already on the statute books was intended only for Roman Catholics and therefore debatable whether or not it could be applied to dissenters.³⁶

With the Sacramental Test no such confusion would obtain and dissenters could either be drawn into conformity or easily identified as non conformists. One solution to the difficulty lay in cancelling the proposed Bill of Indulgence and returning to the tacit agreements of the early years of the Restoration, when no formal toleration was granted but dissenters could practise their religion privately and not seek to extend or increase their congregation. It was a policy of containment, but it could not work as simply as that, for congregations expanded and

34. Synge, *Defence of the peaceable and friendly address*, pp 39, 43, 46.

35. Ibid, pp 48-56.; McBride, *Animadversions*, p. 117.

36. Ormonde to Boyle, 11 July 1682 (Bodl., Carte MSS 50, f. 194).

meeting houses were built. Some recognition of this was made when, after the 1688 revolution, dissenters were allowed to meet, to build meeting houses and receive the royal bounty.

The Test then was trying to put back a process that had been evolving for thirty years. The English Presbyterians and the Independents had grown in self definition but not in significant numbers; they were not a threat to the Established Church. On the other hand, the Scottish Presbyterians in the north and in some other parts of Ireland had grown in numbers and organisational strength and were certainly as big a threat as Roman Catholicism and probably even more so then in the eyes of the bishops. Thus the Established Church neither wanted nor could afford to grant Scottish Presbyterians full toleration without the Test. The risk was too great and the position of the Established Church too precarious without the full protection of the law. This was granted in 1704 when the Sacramental Test came into force in Ireland, as a clause in the Popery Act. From the manner in which it was introduced into the Popery Act it was evident that the Test clause was intended specifically for the Scottish Presbyterians.³⁷

The Marriage controversy.

From the period of the Restoration presbyterians were always tentative regarding the public celebration of marriages. However, by 1673 the meetings expressed the

37. 2 Anne C 6 (Ireland); James McGuire, 'Government attitudes to religious non-conformity in Ireland 1660-1719', in C.E.J. Caldicott, Hugh Gough, J.P. Pittion (ed.), *The Huguenots and Ireland, Anatomy of an emigration* (Dublin, 1987), pp 272-76; H.M.C., *Buccleugh and Queensbury*, ii, pt.i, 201, 209-10; Beckett, *Protestant dissent in Ireland*, pp 42-7.

wish to make marriages more public in order to counteract the Established Church's accusation that they were invalid:³⁸

Because the prelates here call marriage by nonconformist ministers fornication and are persecuting some here on that account, they appoint Mr. Robert Rule the moderator to write to the several meetings about this and to show them that this meeting inclines to solemnise marriage publicly and to proclaim publicly among ourselves, besides public proclamation with the curates; only we would be at uniform practice with our brethren in this matter.

The Route, Antrim and Tyrone meetings responded to this query by saying that nearly all the ministers did proclaim and solemnise marriages publicly. This was a signal to the Laggan and it decided to proclaim marriages in public too.³⁹ The fact that marriages were celebrated within the presbyterian church and not according to the Book of Common Prayer was a source of irritation and potential danger to the Established Church and indeed the government. Bishop Hackett of Down and Connor complained of the abuse such marriages were:⁴⁰

These nonconformists likewise perform all parochial duties here and defraud the ministers of their dues (not content with preaching only as they are in England), and what is of most wicked consequence, after they have married persons, the couple on discontents part and pretend they were not legally married.

Essex also was concerned about presbyterian marriages and the unrest they could lead to if not checked. Even if such marriages could not be prevented, for they 'scruple to our ceremonies of marriage', yet he thought that presbyterians should be required to give a formal account of how their marriages were contracted.⁴¹ This arose at a time when nonconformists were allowed to worship in public on Sundays, so obviously the church and government felt some things had gone too far. Such freedoms came and went, depending on the political climate; in a time of

38. Nov. 1673, Laggan minutes, p. 73. Bishop King was impatient with the government for not declaring against clandestine marriages (T.C.D., MS 750/12. Letters of William King, 1699-1703, pp 44, 78, 85, 111).

39. 6 Jan. 1674, Laggan minutes, p. 86; Dundonald (Kirkdonald) Session of committee book, 1678-1716; marriages were proclaimed from at least 1678.

40. Hackett to Essex, 29 Oct. 1672 (*Essex Papers*, p. 38).

41. Essex to Arlington, 12 Oct. 1673 (*Essex Papers*, pp 124-5).

persecution all would go underground: worship, marriages, discipline, communion services. Thus, after the turbulent period of the early 1680's and in the light of James II's Indulgence, meetings asked in 1687 whether or not it was safe to proclaim marriages in public again.⁴²

After the revolution presbyterian marriages were a greater threat than ever to the Established Church. In 1702 John McBride defended marriages celebrated in the presbyterian church and asked that they be accepted as legal and valid.⁴³ He based his defence on the fact that presbyterians had been in the north of Ireland for a long time, that they were truly peaceful though dissenting from the government and ceremonies of the Established Church. The issue of their right to celebrate marriages within their church was challenged by the Established Church but:⁴⁴

our manner of marriage is both lawful and peaceable, seeing the civil magistrate has not for about eighty years found any disadvantage to the public thereby, and therefore has not evidenced their dissatisfaction with any upon that account; all our marriages hitherto having had the same effects in law, as if they had been solemnised according to the rites of the established church, which also has confirmed their marriages, by granting administrations and probates of wills...

McBride indicated that the government and most conforming clergy and laity were positive towards the presbyterians, but that the bishops were opposed to them. He appealed to moderate opinion, asking whether or not marriage really needed the ceremonies of the Established Church; if fines were imposed, was this not in itself an admission that the marriages were valid ?. He pointed out that Quakers and Catholics were not persecuted on this point and that this was unjust and discriminatory.⁴⁵ While it was true that presbyterians had no authority from the government to hold marriages within their church, yet in Spain, France and

42. 3 May 1687, Antrim minutes, p 298. Also, 1 Nov. 1687, Antrim minutes, p. 332.

43. John McBride, *A vindication of marriage as solemnised by presbyterians in the north of Ireland* (n.p., 1702).

44. Ibid, p. 53.

45. Ibid, To the reader.

Italy dissenters' marriages were accepted as valid. Presbyterians could not accept marriage according to the Book of Common Prayer since it taught that marriage signified the unity between Christ and the church. This was popish and could not be tolerated, for it made marriage a sacrament. The exchange of rings was also a useless, popish ceremony.⁴⁶

McBride refuted the old accusation that presbyterians held clandestine marriages. Marriages were proclaimed on three consecutive Sundays in church, and none went forward without full parental consent on both sides; normally marriages were celebrated in the meeting house but not at fixed times nor during a communion service. The Established Church asserted that marriages were clandestine if not celebrated before a curate and according to the Book of Common Prayer. For McBride this was pure Trent and so had to be rejected, as was the dispensation that could be bought from the Established Church; this was seen as simony and certainly popish.⁴⁷

McBride accepted that presbyterians sometimes concealed their marriages because the Established Church courts hounded them. If the civil power accepted marriages by ministers of the different churches, why could the Established Church not do likewise?⁴⁸ They accepted baptism, why not marriage? At least let the Established Church follow the monarch who granted them dispensations to practice their religion in peace and liberty, without the need for secrecy. However, just as the Established Church could not accept protestant dissenters as having churches in their own right, neither could it recognise their marriages. To do so would undermine its position and invalidate all their arguments.

Two years later Ralph Lambert replied to McBride on behalf of the Established Church.⁴⁹ He argued that the

46. McBride, *A vindication of marriage*, pp 7, 28-9, 31, 40-1.

47. Ibid, pp 47-50.

48. Boyse, *Remarks on a late discourse of William lord bishop of Derry*, p. 111.

49. [Ralph Lambert], *An answer to a late pamphlet entitled A vindication of marriage as solemnised by presbyterians in the north of Ireland* (Dublin, 1704); Cotton, *Fasti*, iii, 121, 274; v, 241, 238, 250, 9.

Established Church had the right to require obedience to its laws since it was the established church in Ireland. He reminded McBride that his presbyterian colleagues in England and in the south of Ireland observed the marriage laws of the country. The fact that Quakers and Roman Catholics were not prosecuted did not make their forms of marriage valid either. The law simply had not caught up with them.⁵⁰ Lambert also refuted the accusation that the theology and ceremony of marriage within the Established Church was popish. By stressing the word over sacrament, presbyterians devalued the place of sacraments in the church and gave the Quakers some justification for rejecting sacraments altogether.⁵¹

Lambert insisted that the Established Church had the right to require adherence to its laws; in Scotland the episcopal ministers there had to conform to what was set down:⁵²

Now if the presbyterian ministers of Scotland do think this and other laws are a warrant to them to solemnise all marriages even of persons differing from them in religion, sure our author will grant that we have as good a reason to insist on the laws of this kingdom for our warrant; for he who upon occasion finds so hospitable a refuge among them can never believe any of their practices unjust nor that church blameable which imitates them.

Neither would length of time in Ireland give presbyterians the right to their own forms of marriage, 'that which was wrong from the beginning will not grow right or legal by any length of time, no not in eighty years'. Besides the Act of Uniformity passed in 1666 established the forms of marriage obtaining in Ireland and nothing in this regard had changed. For the sake of good government and of justice in society and within marriage, Lambert asked the presbyterians in the north to conform to what in fact was the civil law in the country.⁵³

50. Lambert, *An answer to a late pamphlet*, pp 11-13, 57-8.

51. Ibid, pp 15, 20, 28-34, 43.

52. Ibid, p. 53.

53. Ibid, pp 56- 60.

A year later Edward Synge wrote a further reply to McBride,⁵⁴ Synge was weary of the accusation 'popish' which McBride used of the Established Church. In turn, he accused presbyterians of using vague language about his church, out of ignorance and prejudice: 'obscure notions of mystical rites...significant ceremonies, sacraments of human institution...all of which they call popish'. This was a diversion from the real issue, which was conformity to the established laws of the land regarding marriage. This had nothing to do with Rome.⁵⁵ Church and state in Ireland saw it as their duty to enforce the marriage laws in order to retain an ordered society; rejection of such laws was a threat not just to the church but to the government especially in the times they lived in. It was clear then that any marriages not celebrated according to the laws of the land were null and void.⁵⁶

He repeated that the Two Acts of Uniformity had enacted such laws and that bishops were merely executors of this law in the land. Synge pointed out, as Lambert had, that the [English] presbyterians in the south of Ireland

'are for the most part married according to our established liturgy. And yet I am persuaded they are persons of as much conscience as those in the north'.⁵⁷

Quakers and Roman Catholic marriages were equally at fault; they were not being treated differently, but it was difficult to enforce everything all at once. However Synge felt that a Roman Catholic marriage would be upheld in court over that of a Scottish Presbyterian.⁵⁸

Synge was clear that the issue was one of obedience to the law of the land rather than a dispute over ordination, word and sacrament. The issue of Trent, however good the

54. [Edward Synge], *A defence of the established church and laws in answer to a book entitled A vindication of marriage as solemnised by the presbyterians in the north of Ireland* (Dublin, 1705). On the 20 August 1703, the Irish bishops asked Synge to reply to McBride (B.L., Add.MSS 6117, f. 7v.).

55. Synge, *A defence of the established church*, Preface.

56. Ibid, pp 17, 22, 29, 41.

57. Ibid, p. 55. Also, p. 198.

58. Ibid, p. 287.

marriage laws of that Council were, was not relevant to this question. Any directives the Established Church gave for marriage took their value from the need for order and decency, much in the same way as the Directory laid down some rules for worship. With regard to marriage as a sacrament, Synge explained that he saw sacrament in the large and narrow sense; marriage belonged to the theology of sacrament in the larger sense, while Baptism and the Lord's Supper belonged in the narrower sense.

For Scottish Presbyterians the difficulties regarding marriage lay at the level of theology and ceremony, as well as the level of civil law executed by the Established Church. At the same time it was impossible for the Established Church to accept the Scottish Presbyterian church as a church in its own right; to do so would threaten the position and rights of the Church. Thus, from the Established Church point of view, the basis of the debate on marriage was similar to that on the Sacramental Test: both were ways of controlling the Scottish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland who were seen as a real menace. The other dissenters in the country, English Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers, and for the present even Roman Catholics, could not be considered a serious threat.

In 1701 presbyterians sent a petition to the the Lord Lieutenant.⁵⁹ They complained that some in the Established Church were trying to deprive them of:

what we have so peaceably enjoyed, as appears by them pursuing both ministers and people in their courts for their nonconformity to the rules and ceremonies of the church, ministers for solemnising marriage clandestinely as they please to call it, and make void such marriages by obliging persons so married to confess publicly themselves guilty of the damnable sin of fornication...

59. The humble petition of the presbyterian ministers and people in the north of Ireland, 1701 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 51, no. 48; P.R.O.N.I., T.525, no.48; this has 1708 as the date of the petition, but see Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii, 484; John Stevenson, *Two centuries of life in Down* (Reprint Belfast, 1990), pp 161-3.

Again they argued from the length of time they had been in Ireland, that they were:

a considerable body of Protestant subjects in this kingdom now about eighty years, who though dissenting from the established church in some things yet in all revolutions continued loyal and peaceable, suffering for our loyalty in the the time of the usurpation.

They repeated they were unable to conform to the marriage service according to the Book of Common Prayer and that until recently there had been no friction : the courts recognised wills made by presbyterians, and the Established Church minister received 'his accustomed dues as if they were married by himself'. Now they suffered harassment from the civil magistrates who questioned the validity of their marriages. This threatened to make it impossible for their children to inherit family property. Unless this present attitude on the part of the Established Church changed, presbyterians would be ruined and society in general would suffer, for there were many conformists, clergy and laity, 'descending of parents so married of whom we are well assured there be several in this kingdom'.

Both the marriage and Sacramental Test controversies taught presbyterians in the north of Ireland that they would get nowhere unless they could win toleration without the Sacramental Test. And so in the wake of the Popery Act of 1704, a petition was sent to England, asking for toleration without the Test and acceptance of their marriages in law. The Lord Lieutenant gave them no hope of either since

our northern dissenters resolve to adhere to the confession of faith of north Britain and the southern prefer the Articles of England as the dissenters in south Britain have done.⁶⁰

Thus while dissenters in the south of Ireland took occasional communion and had their marriages celebrated according to the rites of the Established Church,⁶¹ such

60. McBride to Robert Wodrow, 2 Apr. 1709 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 190).

accommodation was not possible for Scottish Presbyterians. With no hope of either the Sacramental Test being removed or of having their marriages recognised, Scottish Presbyterians were isolated from the body of dissenters in the south of Ireland. This spirit and tradition of independence, fed by a theology and practice developed over many years, ensured that antagonism between Scottish Presbyterians and the Established Church continued unabated.

The appeal to history

William Tisdall, vicar of Belfast, responded to the 1701 presbyterian petition to the Lord Lieutenant.⁶² He accused Scottish Presbyterians of being anti-royalist and indeed against any government that interfered with their religious belief and practices; they had held this stance from the time of James I, and their loyalty only began with William III.⁶³ Tisdall showed that he had read a good number of presbyterian historical documents and used them to prove his point. For example, he was critical of the presbyterian policy of consistently representing their grievances either in Dublin or Whitehall:⁶⁴

most evident to any person who is conversant in the histories of presbyterian policy that the manner of framing, subscribing, applying and publishing their addresses either to the King or Parliament was the mainspring of their grand political machine...whatever the subject of their addresses were, there was constantly an occasion taken of insinuating their own great merit and unequal returns made to them, the

61. This led to them being further questioned as to why they would not conform entirely. *The church of England defended, with the dissenters' reply or cases of conscience proposed to the dissenting ministers of Dublin by certain young students who were of their communion and have lately joined with the established church* (n. p., 1709); Bishop Hoadley, *The reasonableness of constant communion with the church of England represented to the dissenters* (Dublin, 1709).

62. William Tisdall, *A sample of true blue presbyterian loyalty in all changes and turns government, taken chiefly out of their most authentic records* (Dublin, 1709) *Fasti* for T.; Daniel Defoe, *The parallel* (Dublin, 1705). D.N.B.; David Nokes, *Jonathan Swift. A hypocrite reversed* (Oxford, 1985), pp 64-70, 134, 178, 186, 217, 381.

63. *Ibid*, pp 4-5, 15, 17-19, 21-22.

64. *Ibid*, p. 23

trumpet of their loyalty sounded loud and shrill in the preamble to their address, that the soft notes of their persecution and grievances might sound the more mournful and moving to the people; their boldest demands were urged in submissive terms according to the notion they had of their own powers or the difficulties of the public, and they were represented sometimes so modest and reasonable that the granting of them might seem only a debt and the refusal of them a great injury.

Tisdall had real historical resources to call on, for from almost the beginning of their presence in Ireland presbyterians ensured that histories had been written.⁶⁵ After the Restoration there was a concerted effort to continue this process, and it took a persistent attempt on the part of all the meetings from 1672-77 to reach the decision that Patrick Adair should write it.⁶⁶ The meetings were urged to send all their records and written memories to Adair, and this was the basis of his history of the church.⁶⁷

By the end of the 17th century the Scottish Presbyterian Church in Ireland had a sense of its own origin, root and identity; it had written its own story and had lived through a long period of testing. It had not only retained its own organisation and way of life but also developed and strengthened them to such a degree that when the 1688 revolution came the camouflage could slip away and a strongly built church be seen quite clearly. McBride gave expression to this in his sermon to the first public synod held in Ulster since the Restoration,⁶⁸ and the Established Church rightly viewed this with suspicion and fear.⁶⁹

65. John Livingstone, *A brief historical relation of the life of Mr. John Livingstone...written by himself*, (ed.), Thomas Houston (Edinburgh, 1848); Andrew Stewart, *A short account of the Church of Christ* (Wodrow MSS, Octavo 75, Nos 2, 3). Printed in part in Patrick Adair, *A true narrative of the Presbyterian church in Ireland*, ed. W.D. Killen (Belfast, 1866), pp 213 -321.

66. Antrim minutes, pp 32, 71, ; Laggan minutes, pp 26, 181, 191, 198, 225, 264, 306.

67. Laggan minutes, p. 306; Laggan minutes ii, p. 28, 48, 71, 79, 82.

68. John McBride, *A sermon preached before the provincial synod at Antrim, June 1 1698* (n.p., 1698).

69. Tennison to Canterbury (Lambeth Palace, London. Gibson Papers, MSS 930, f.200); [Theo Harrison] to John Strype, 16 July 1698 (Baumgartner Papers, Add. 5, f. 251); Copy of petition from the bishop of Down and Connor to the Lords Justices in Ireland, Sept. 1698 (P.R.O.N.I., T. 525, No. 12).

To the bishop of Down and Connor, Edward Walkington, it was evident that presbyterians had resumed their way of worship and organisation, interrupted by the war, and 'not content to assemble themselves in their several meeting houses...they proceed to exercise jurisdiction openly and with a high hand over those of their own persuasion'. They celebrated marriages, the communion service in great numbers, held sessions and synods, and had a philosophy school at Killylea.⁷⁰ In all it was a resumption of the way of life and government they had retained and developed since the Restoration, but now lived openly. From this position of strength the presbyterians in the north grappled with the two big issues blocking their further growth in freedom: the Sacramental Test and the right to celebrate marriages within their church and have them recognised in law.

In another work three years later, Tisdall further examined the loyalty presbyterians claimed to have shown the monarchy prior to William III.⁷¹ He saw a change in tone and attitude after 1689 in Ireland. Prior to that date the presbyterians kept a low profile and 'entered into plots and associations...wrought by night in their mines to come at the great pillar which supported our establishment'.⁷² But this changed after the revolution and presbyterians were holding synods and courts, sending out ministers to new congregations, appointing elders from among the powerful trading families, celebrating their own marriages and establishing their own schools, interfering with Established Church burial services, circulating books, refusing the oath of abjuration and denying the validity of episcopacy.⁷³ Presbyterian trading families had great power and employed their own members rather than

70. Petition from the bishop of Down and Connor, 1698 (P.R.O.N.I., T. 525, no 12). The bishop got little response, other than a perfunctory examination of McBride by the Lords Justices in Dublin. The attitude of the Lords Justices could be explained not only by their moderate views of dissenters but also by the manner in which the petition came to them. The bishop appealed to the Lord Chief Justice of England who then sent the petition to Dublin.

71. [William Tisdall], *The conduct of dissenters of Ireland with respect to both church and state* (Dublin, 1712).

72. Ibid, p. 10.

73. Ibid, pp 15- 26, 30, 35-45, 46, 50, 52-79.

people of other churches; they held influence by being burgesses and aldermen as well as post masters. Their growing power was viewed with alarm.⁷⁴

Tisdall claimed that the Established Church had allowed this to grow under its feet and had not perceived the potential strength of presbyterian discipline and church order. He looked back on the history of presbyterians in Ireland, to Calvin and Knox, to the Solemn League and Covenant as well as the subsequent Covenants and covenanting movements after 1660.⁷⁵ He noted similarity with Roman Catholicism, even comparing Calvin and Loyola, who both set out to subvert the Church of England:

By the fundamental principles of both presbyterian and popish policy there is no allegiance due to any Christian prince who does not profess and will not maintain what either call the true religion.⁷⁶

This accounted for the fanaticism inherent in presbyterianism, in Covenanters/Cameronians, 'the hope of the Kirk militants'. Tisdall feared that were Scottish Presbyterians allowed to flourish in Ireland the authority and rights of the Established Church would continue to be weakened.⁷⁷ History had warned the church and government of what could happen, and Tisdall was convinced that presbyterians, united in principle and practice, could overcome the Established Church if they were left totally free to practise their religion. The Established Church simply had not got the strength and unity to survive without the protection of the law.⁷⁸

McBride responded to Tisdall and asserted once again the loyalty of presbyterians since they came to Ireland early in the 17th century.⁷⁹ He described the period in Ireland

74. Tisdall, *The conduct of dissenters*, pp 19, 96-100; Brewster, *A discourse concerning Ireland*, pp 24, 33-4.

75. William Tisdall, *A seasonable enquiry into the most dangerous political principle of the Kirk in power* (Dublin, 1713), pp 3-4, 9.

76. Tisdall, *A seasonable enquiry*, p. 7.

77. William Tisdall, *The nature and tendency of popular phrases in general* (n.p., 1713), pp 19, 24.

78. Tisdall, *The conduct of the dissenters*, p. 28.

when Ussher was Primate as an idyllic time, when presbyterians and the Established Church could co-exist in peace and mutual understanding.⁸⁰ This had changed with the advent of Laud when presbyterians were forced into dissent. But McBride rejected Tisdall's manner of calling all dissenters Scottish in origin, pointing out that during the Interregnum there were Anabaptists, Independents and Quakers in the country..⁸¹ He defended the stance taken by Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland during that period, claiming they were always loyal to the monarchy and had suffered for it; if the Declaration of Bangor had to be passed in 1649, against Montgomery of the Ards, it had no bearing on presbyterian loyalty to the Crown. Their record was clear and well documented and it continued after the Restoration.⁸²

A more detailed refutation of Tisdall was published by James Kirkpatrick, and he reiterated presbyterian claims of loyalty to the King at all times since their arrival in Ireland.⁸³ Kirkpatrick was quick to point out to Tisdall that loyalty was not synonymous with conformity to the Established Church in Ireland. True loyalty was honouring and supporting the just authority and power of the monarch, 'the original compact between prince and people'. Church and state were two distinct powers, the keys and the sword, and they served each other. He cited Ussher's speech of 1622, and declared:⁸⁴

I never read a presbyterian writer who made larger demands on behalf of the church than those mentioned by the learned Ussher in the approved speech, and who was not cordially satisfied to make the same concessions with him to the civil magistrate.

79. [John McBride], *A sample of jet black prelatick calumny in answer to a pamphlet called True blue presbyterian loyalty or the christian loyalty of presbyterians in in Britain and Ireland in all changes of government since the reformation; most particularly of the presbyterians in Ulster since their first plantation there* (Glasgow, 1713).

80. McBride, *A sample of jet black...calumny*, pp 11- 16.

81. Ibid, p. 22.

82. Ibid, pp 87,151-73, 193-203, 214.

83. James Kirkpatrick, *An historical essay upon the loyalty of presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland from the reformation to this present year 1713* (n.p., 1713); McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 173, p. 70; Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 156-68.

84. Ibid, p. 39.

Ussher was never accused of disloyalty 'for asserting the inherent power of the church'. Indeed the church of England, in the Second Book of Homilies, held that the church could excommunicate the civil magistrate; yet it rejected the presbyterian church's claim to do so. He then turned to the early history of the presbyterians in Ireland, in more detail than McBride, citing the work of Livingstone and Adair, and refuting Tisdall's accusations regarding presbyterian loyalty from the earliest times.⁸⁵ He also dealt with the period since the revolution, denying Tisdall's claims that presbyterians were disloyal and only sought to increase their power and influence through holding synods and sessions, education of their own people, use of elders and celebration of marriage, and extending into new areas of Ireland.⁸⁶

He declared that ministers did not take the Solemn League and Covenant at ordination; neither did elders when they were appointed. But Kirkpatrick reiterated the presbyterian view that episcopacy was only a human ordinance, and that there was no distinct order between bishops and presbyters; he regretted that while presbyterians accepted the validity of episcopal orders, the Established Church did not accept the validity of presbyterian orders.⁸⁷

A consistent thread runs through the presentations made by McBride and Kirkpatrick. They felt justified in their position because they claimed to be a separate Church, rooted in the tradition of the reformation as it had occurred in Scotland, and in communion with other true Reformation Churches. From that viewpoint all they argued for and sought had its own validity. But the Established Church, viewing itself as the lawfully established church of the land, and therefore rightfully requiring conformity, could not understand let alone accept this view. The presbyterian stance was further complicated by

85. Kirkpatrick, *An historical essay*, pp 161-66, 225-255, 288, 371-78, 383-5.

86. Ibid, pp 393-406, 413-35, 488-94, 504-6, 512.

87. Ibid, pp 540-1, 544-8.

the Covenanting movements both in Ireland and Scotland which ensured that the Established Church could not trust it. Besides, by this time the theological differences between the two churches were very great and comprehension was impossible. At a communion service (c. 1709) in Anahilt, Co. Down, Alexander Mc Cracken preached:

The yoke of [the Book of] Common Prayer, of kneeling, the sign of the Cross, surplice....that is the Devil's yoke and they that bear it are in the way of hell.⁸⁸

Such remarks summed up the real differences in theology and practice between Scottish Presbyterians and the Established Church, and these went very deep. Nevertheless, some bishops continued to describe the differences as exterior, over mere rites and ceremonies. But Peter Browne, bishop of Cork, recognised that presbyterians differed from the Established Church on almost every aspect of religion: theology, rites, sacraments, orders, discipline, government and jurisdiction.⁸⁹ The archbishop of Armagh, Narcissus Marsh, realised that there were real differences within the Established Church itself and he had to tread a path through their own divisions:

But for the use of the surplice I confess 'tis not generally practised through this province nor does it yet seem seasonable to require it in all places at once but may be introduced by degrees as I endeavour to do it in mine own diocese. For the parishioners will be apt to mutiny if the thought of paying for a surplice should be laid on them in these calamitous times.⁹⁰

Perhaps the real price for insisting on the surplice would be defection from the Established Church and Marsh understood that well. Better not to insist than risk division; better to seek comprehension than confrontation. It was an echo of Ussher and his spirit, but this time it applied to members within the Established Church only. Too

88. Tisdall, *The conduct of dissenters*, p. 41. For McCracken, McConnell, *Fasti*, no. 182, p. 77; Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 304-9.

89. Peter Browne, *The doctrine of parts and circumstances in relation laid open* (Dublin, 1715), p. 84; A.R.Winnet, *Peter Browne. Provost, bishop, metaphysician* (London, 1974), pp 86-90.

90. [Narcissus Marsh], *State of the Province of Armagh, 1706* (Gibson Papers MSS 929, f. 41); T.Croskery and T.Witherow, *Life of A.P.Goudy* (Dublin, 1887), p.8; Sheridan, *St. Paul's Confession*, p. 11.

much had happened since the early 17th century and both Presbyterian and Established Churches were too well defined to allow the old spirit of moderation to prevail between them. That belonged to a former age which had gradually passed away since the Restoration.

ACHIEVEMENT

During the Interregnum and in the early years after the Restoration there were several religious groups in Ireland trying to establish themselves in the country. Not all of them went into the future and a backward glance from the perspective of the early 18th century indicates which groups in fact survived. In 1711 both houses of Convocation in the Established Church published a statement on religion in Ireland.¹ As Convocation had not met since 1661, for none was convened in the Parliaments of 1692, 1695-7 or 1698-9, the *Representation* of 1711 was the first public, formal and comprehensive examination of the state of religion in Ireland for almost fifty years.²

It was of necessity a subjective view, influenced by lack of support from the government and threatened by the evident strength of some churches. But although the *Representation* was cast in a mind-set basically pre-Interregnum in expectation, nevertheless it indicated the perceived growth of both Quakers and presbyterians of all traditions in Ireland in the second half of the 17th century. Besides, the reaction it evoked provided a forum for debate and controversy, thereby describing the various strands of presbyterianism in Ireland in the early 18th century.

Although the *Representation* made no mention of presbyterians by name, in effect it subsumed under 'Independents' the three churches in Ireland: Scottish Presbyterians, English Presbyterians and Independents. In no way could the Established Church recognise that these

1. A representation of the present state of religion with regard to infidelity, heresy, impiety and popery, drawn up and agreed by both houses of Convocation in Ireland [1711].

2. T.C.D., MS 1062, ff 70v, 393, 451, 669. In 1703 the Irish bishops asked the Queen for permission to meet and after some time (to discover precedent and procedure) this was granted (B.L., Add MSS 36771, ff 1, 3, 15, 31).

were or had become churches in their own right in Ireland. To them they were 'sects', originating at the time of the Interregnum, from the time of Cromwell, and Convocation used the emotive terms: 'Independents, Anabaptists, Muggletonians, Quakers etc', which certainly would have evoked old fears and old memories.³

The *Representation* voiced the conviction of the Established Church that all 'sects' had been treated too leniently and that the Scottish Presbyterians were by far the most powerful group; as such they were singled out for detailed criticism. Indeed in 1711, in a separate Representation, the Irish House of Lords protested that Scottish Presbyterians in Ireland had misrepresented the Established Church to the Queen.⁴ The Lords detailed the Established Church's grievances with the presbyterians in the north of Ireland, and the measure and tone of the protest indicated the strength of Scottish Presbyterians at this time. That Presbyterians could so disturb the Established Church in 1711 was proof indeed of the tenacity of their hold in the north of Ireland.⁵ The position of the Established Church was defensive, fearful that the 'schism which formerly in a manner was confined into the north has now spread itself into many other parts of this kingdom'.⁶ The appointment of a minister to preach in Drogheda created a huge reaction from the Established Church, as did the opening of a meeting house in Monaghan.⁷ Fearing there was no possibility of either suppressing or indeed of forcing conformity on Scottish Presbyterians, Convocation urged a policy of containment, before 'presbytery and fanaticism' destroyed church and state.⁸

3. *A Representation*...., pp 7, 14.

4. *Representation of the Lords spiritual and temporal in Parliament* (Wodrow MSS, Folio 35, no. 109; also P.R.O.N.I., T. 525, no. 24); 7 Nov. 1711, J.I.H.L., ii, 1703-25. In 1701 the Presbyterians in the north of Ireland petitioned the Lord Lieutenant and Council. Wodrow MSS, Folio 51, no. 48; also, P.R.O.N.I., T. 525, no. 48.

5. Presbyterians in the north outnumbered the Established Church; congregations of 600-700 Presbyterians compared with 6 or 7 at the parish church. Richard Choppin to Thomas Steward, 8 July 1712 (Magee College, MS 46, ff 142-3); Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 175-7, 324-7.

6. *Representation of the Lords spiritual and temporal*.

7. Wodrow MSS, Folio 35, nos 72-74; Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 190; Bodl., Rawlinson MSS, c. 984, f. 169 in *Anal. Hib.*, ii (Jan. 1931), pp 40-42; H.M.C., *Portland MSS*, v, pp 339-40; Thomas Gogarty (ed.), *Council book of the Corporation of Drogheda*, 2 vols (Cork, 1988), i, 302-3; Nokes, *Jonathan Swift*, p. 93.

It was clear that Presbyterianism struck at the heart of the Established Church by condemning the doctrines and practices of the Established Church, judging its public worship popish and superstitious, its doctrines erroneous and unsound, and the Act of Uniformity unjust.⁹ In addition they implemented full presbyterial government, in sessions, presbyteries, classical synods and provincial synods; they exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction as in a court of law and proceeded to give sentence from which there was no appeal.¹⁰ Presbyterians had well filled seminaries which according to the Established Church allowed them to evade the abjuration oath. Convocation complained that despite government censorship, Presbyterians published papers and pamphlets; in particular they had the Solemn League and Covenant and the Directory reprinted and circulated. No wonder all this grated on Convocation, for such behaviour would be considered Praemunire if any member of the Established Church so acted. In this context, the Test Act was the only obstacle preventing Presbyterians taking over the corporations and civil offices.¹¹

Symbolically, indeed, the Presbyterians had taken their place, in their own right as it were, for they had built meeting houses 'in the form of churches' in many towns and cities and often not far from the cathedrals.¹² To the Established Church, then, the Presbyterians in the north were a real menace. It asked that the Regium Donum be discontinued and any further expansion of the Presbyterians be prevented. On their own evidence,

8. *Representation of the Lords spiritual and temporal*. The House of Lords also asked that the Regium Donum be discontinued.

9. *A representation of the present state of religion*, p. 9.

10. John McBride's sermon in 1698 was well known, in which he had outlined the rights and duties of church assemblies. McBride, *A sermon preached before the provincial synod at Antrim, June 1 1698* (n.p., 1698), pp 7-15; Lambeth Palace London, Gibson Papers, MS 930, f. 200; P.R.O.N.I., T. 525, no. 12.

11. *A representation of the present state of religion*, pp 10-11; 19 Feb. 1704 (National Library Scotland, MS 3740, f. 175); 7 July 1704 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 186); John Mc Bride to Robert Wodrow, 2 Ap. 1709 (Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, no. 190).

12. Ibid, p. 11.

Convocation really feared that the Presbyterians had the potential and desire to destabilise the Established Church.¹³ And although the conditions for such an event did not really exist in Ireland at this time, the fear that what had happened in Scotland could occur in Ireland was enough to create alarm. It was disconcerting to be faced with the evident growth of Scottish Presbyterianism in the north of Ireland, the fruit of consistent and persistent adherence to church order, discipline and worship since the Interregnum.

Such strong criticism of Presbyterians in general on the part of the Established Church had to be countered, and so two addresses were sent to the Queen, one from the Scottish Presbyterians and another from those in Dublin and the south of Ireland. In both addresses the development of the churches can be perceived, as well as their differing contexts and traditions. The tone of the address from the Scottish Presbyterians was confident and strong.¹⁴ Each point raised by the Established Church, in either the address from the House of Lords or the *Representation* from Convocation, was answered directly and shrewdly.

For example, aware of the position that Daniel Williams held in London and of course that he was an English Presbyterian, the address pointed out that Williams had been minister in Drogheda. When he went to Dublin in 1667 he was succeeded by Mr. Toy who stayed there until 1688.¹⁵ It was in response to a request from the 'remains of that congregation' that the Scottish Presbyterians sent a minister to Drogheda.¹⁶ Thus, it was not a new area of ministry but a continuation of one that had been interrupted by the war.¹⁷ With regard to new

13. *A representation of the present state of religion*, pp 12-13.

14. *The humble address and apology of the Presbyterian ministers and gentlemen on behalf of themselves and the rest of their persuasion in the north of Ireland* (1711). Francis Iredell was sent to London with the *Humble address*, with detailed instructions. Witherow, *Historic memorials*, pp 151-4.

15. Toy went to Dublin in 1688. New Row Baptismal Register, f. 11. He signed and approved Boyse's *Sacramental Hymns* in 1693. He had been in Dublin prior to his appointment to Drogheda (Bodl., Carte MSS 45, f. 295).

16. *The humble address*, p. 21.

congregations, Presbyterians protested that they only went to new places at the request of the people; and new calls were a direct consequence of the war, when lands were taken by new families who wanted their ministers to settle with them in the new areas. In fact they had been responding to calls from congregations since 1660, but because their organisation was secret then this was unknown.¹⁸

Convocation had accused Scottish Presbyterians of harassing members of the Established Church. While they accepted the fact on a small scale, Presbyterians argued that differing theologies meant inevitable indiscretions by 'some few of the meaner sort...while the clergy were performing the office for the burial of the dead, which practice is not approved by us'.¹⁹ Besides they claimed that Presbyterians in the north were harassed by the Established church: leases were not renewed; in some cases leases had conditions, forbidding either the building of meeting houses or the maintenance of such that had been built. They were forbidden to marry according to their own rites, nor did they have power over corporations which the Established Church claimed. They also denied that the oath of abjuration was an issue, for most took it; those who did not declared it was due to 'their scrupling some expression only, not the substance of the oath'.²⁰

Most of all, the Sacramental Test was deeply resented, being so linked to the ceremonies of the Established Church. Their refusal to take the Oath of Allegiance was connected to this, for by taking the Oath they could be forced to take the Test, or sent abroad without any religious support.²¹ However, contrary to what the Established Church said, Presbyterians did not have their

17. The port towns of Londonderry, Portrush, Larne and Belfast were controlled by Presbyterians; a move to Drogheda, within that context, was viewed with suspicion. R.J.Dickson, *Ulster Emigration* (London, 1966), p. 4.

18. Laggan minutes, pp 1-2, 15, 50-1, 107 and others; Antrim minutes, 1671-91, pp 169, 305, 398; Wodrow MSS, Folio 26, nos 121-2.

19. *The humble address*, pp 22-3, 25.

20. *Ibid*, pp 22-4.

21. *Ibid*, pp 35-6.

own seminaries and schools in the north and had to send their future ministers abroad to study. There were a few schools (since 1660), but nothing sufficient to their needs. They denied that they had used the Regium Donum in any improper way, or that ministers took the Solemn League and Covenant at ordination.²²

They defended their right to hold synods, arguing that they were for the good of the church and that civil affairs did not intrude. They met to preserve order and correct scandals. 'These meetings are commonly called synods and judicatories being so termed in these churches where they have civil sanction'. Since such were established by Parliament in England, the Presbyterians in the north could justly hope for understanding in Ireland.²³ On account of their having been in Ireland over 100 years and in view of their record in serving the Crown, they asked for freedom and toleration to exercise their religion.²⁴ It was an old claim, repeated again and again since 1660.

Central to the whole issue was the Presbyterian rejection of the model of episcopacy in the Established Church. Knowing this was insurmountable, the Presbyterians asked for:²⁵

mutual forbearance...with a spirit of moderation, free from all bitter invectives...being cordially agreed with all the Reformed churches at home and abroad in all doctrines held in common and in all that essential to the Reformation'.

In other words, they were asking to be accepted as a separate church, in its own right, fully within the Reformation tradition. But there was no possibility either theologically, economically or politically that this could be acceptable to the Established Church. In its eyes Presbyterians had to remain a sect, to be led to conformity.²⁶ Only in this way could it be contained and

22. *The humble address*, pp 26-7; 32-3.

23. *Ibid*, p. 28.

24. *Ibid*, pp 29, 37.

25. *Ibid*, p. 24.

controlled. Such a stance was evidence enough of the real and perceived position of the Presbyterians in the north of Ireland in the early 18th century. They were too strong a body to be trusted with toleration.

Scottish Presbyterians defended their own colleagues in ministry in Dublin, pointing out that it was a Dublin presbytery which initiated the process leading to Thomas Emlin's removal from Dublin.²⁷ They also singled out the Independents, who were called heretics by Convocation, terming them 'sound Protestants...agreeing with the Established Church in the substance of her doctrinal articles and in all the fundamental points of Reformed Christianity'. And regarding their own relations with the Independents:²⁸

seeing the difference between us and them is so inconsiderable that there is not any minister commonly reputed to be of that persuasion but who cheerfully owns himself a member of some presbytery and who does not cordially join with us in the substance of our confession of faith.

It was a statement of support and communion and echoed the lived experience of the three churches over fifty years.

The Established Church had accused all Presbyterians of active hostility and in so doing they had offended the English Presbyterians and Independents in Dublin and the south of Ireland. These made a separate representation to the Queen,²⁹ quite different in tone and content from that of the Scottish Presbyterians. What the Established Church had said about Presbyterians in general came as a surprise

26. Convocation wanted to send a letter to dissenters in 1709 'earnestly inviting them to unite with us and to declare on what terms they would be willing to join with us'. Harrison to Strype, 14 Sept. 1709 (Baum. Papers, Add 5, f. 174).

27. *The humble address*, p 31.

28. *Ibid*, p. 32.

29. *Humble address of the Protestant dissenting ministers of Dublin and south of Ireland*. This was signed by Nathaniel Weld, Independent minister from New Row; Joseph Boyse, English Presbyterian minister from Wood Street; Richard Choppin, also from Wood Street; Alexander Sinclair, Scottish Presbyterian from Plunkett Street (originally Bull Alley); Ralph Norris, Independent minister from Cooke Street; Thomas Steward, also of Cooke Street.

to them, for English Presbyterians and Independents considered they had reasonably good relations with the Established Church.³⁰ So much of what the Established Church had accused Presbyterians of in general simply did not apply to them: bad treatment of members of the Established Church; ruining those who conformed; employing apprentices on certain conditions; filling corporations with their own members; imposing public penance on those who married according to the rites of the Established Church.

English Presbyterians and Independents could not be identified with Scottish Presbyterians, either in numbers, tradition or practice.³¹ However, they insisted that all three dissenting churches rejected bishops as anti-scriptural. For them bishops and presbyters were one and not a distinct order; yet, contrary to the Presbyterians in the north, the dissenting ministers in Dublin and the south refused to enter into conflict 'with the present episcopacy as it is part of the legal constitution or with those laws by which it is established'.³² In other words, they obeyed the law of the land and conformed to the requirements of the Established Church. In this context they denied that they had called the Established Church idolatrous or superstitious. But Boyse had entered into prolonged conflict regarding the office and order of episcopacy from at least 1687, and this debate was carried on in Dublin and in the north of Ireland.³³

Nevertheless, there was a split in their stance: in theory they did not accept episcopacy as represented in the Established Church; in practice they obeyed it as the lawful church of the land. It gave latitude and the possibility of co-existence in the country, but that their representation to the Queen had to be so muted and even

30. *The humble address....Dublin*, p. 40.

31. *Ibid*, pp 41-2.

32. *Ibid*, p. 43.

33. See Ch. 8, pp 183-88; Ch. 4, pp 83-7.

neutered indicates the weakening position of the English Presbyterians and Independents at this time. With regard to new congregations, they explained that these were formed only on request and were very few:

And as those new congregations are few (not exceeding three or four in the three Provinces of Leinster, Munster and Connaght) so they were wholly occasioned by new families of Protestant dissenters fixing their habitation in such places.³⁴

Such a statement from the English Presbyterians and Independents showed how unfounded the fears of the Established Church were in their regard and how different in size and impact they were from their colleagues in the north of Ireland. It seems the Established Church considered all Protestant dissenters of the presbyterian tradition as one, either to make their case sound even more alarmist or out of actual ignorance.

The most trenchant criticism of the Established Church was reserved for the Quakers. Whatever about the various presbyterian traditions in Ireland, they at least held some traditions and practice of Christianity in common with the Established Church. The Quakers had gone beyond that and thereby put themselves outside the received tradition. Since they had rejected the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper they were no longer Christians; they rejected ecclesiastical authority and the authority of scripture and 'allow no Christ except that within them'.³⁵ This was a judgement from the exterior and Convocation noted in puzzlement that Quakers had made great progress in Ireland and wondered how this had happened in view of such an unprincipled form of life.

To them the Quakers, freed from the constraints of external religion, were able to band together and promote their common economic interests. Under the guise of annual and quarterly meetings Quakers set rates for goods and the rise and fall of commodities; the Established Church

34. *The humble address....Dublin*, p. 44.

35. *A representation of the present state of religion*, p. 8.

resented that Quakers were 'exempted from all those legal services both troublesome and chargeable to which those of our communion are liable'³⁶ and so were able to pursue gain unrestrainedly. With their agents in Ireland and England they were able to anticipate anything that could affect them adversely. They had more in the bank than any other sect in Ireland, by common contributions, and so they were able to win exemptions and privileges. Since they were not pressurised to take oaths, many were attracted to join them.³⁷ All this apparent lack of religious belief and practice, linked with growing wealth and freedom, made the Quakers seem a real threat to the fabric of a Christian society. If allowed to prosper in Ireland, this would surely lead to infidelity and atheism.

No formal response was made by the Quakers to this trenchant condemnation of their beliefs and practices. Contrary to the presbyterians, they did not have a tradition of formal, public representation of their grievances to the monarch or the government. Rather they tended to use, as the Established Church pointed out, agents and contacts close to the monarch or government, a procedure developed by Fox and Penn.³⁸ However, the accusations of the Established Church underlined the steady growth of the Quakers as a strong, cohesive body in Ireland. Whatever interpretation was put on their structures and way of life, they had reached a place in Ireland which was specifically their own. It was similar to what the Scottish Presbyterians had achieved in the north of Ireland. Through organised meetings, discipline, worship and way of life they had established themselves as a strong religious force in the country.

36. Richard Caulfield (ed.), *Council Book of the Corporation of Cork from 1609-1643 and 1690-1800* (Surrey, 1876), p. 306: 13 Mar. 1703. Richard Pike, son of Joseph Pike, asked to be dispensed from oaths. In view of 'several services done to this city (by his father, Joseph Pike and father-in-law Francis Rogers) Richard Pike junior is admitted free of this city as others of his religion and the oaths dispensed with'.

37. *A representation*, p. 9.

38. See Ch. 6, n. 54-56; prior to 1660 Quakers did make representations to Parliament. See *A narrative of the cruel and unjust sufferings of the people...in Ireland called Quakers* (London, 1659).

By its criticism of the Quakers and the different presbyterian traditions in Ireland, in particular the Scottish Presbyterians in the north, the Established Church acknowledged the position these groups had achieved in Ireland.³⁹ From being small, hesitant groups in the mid 17th century, Quakers, Independents and English Presbyterians had become rooted in the country by the turn of the century; Scottish Presbyterians had a longer history in the country and after the initial set backs under Strafford and Bramhall and later under Fleetwood, they rooted themselves slowly in the north and in a few places in the south of Ireland. In particular, the Quakers and Scottish Presbyterians exercised firm discipline and organisation which enabled them to develop in a consistent and coherent way, to such a degree that it was basically these two groups which drew the greatest criticism from the Established Church in 1711.

English Presbyterians and Independents, however, were different. This was due partly to numbers, especially of the Independents, and partly to theology.⁴⁰ Whereas Scottish Presbyterians worked for some form of religious toleration, English Presbyterians in Ireland were hopeful of some form of accommodation within the Established Church, though they wanted to be accepted as a church, separate and authentic.⁴¹ Besides with such small numbers, there was a great deal of overlap between Independents and English Presbyterians in Dublin and the south of Ireland. With so few churches they learned to exchange ministers, to cooperate with one another, and in practice English Presbyterians in Ireland were Independent churches.

39. The *Representation* also dealt with the Huguenots (briefly) and Roman Catholics, pp 13, 15-17.

40. In 1695 Boyse said of the Independents that there were 'but six congregations that I know of in the kingdom', whereas the English Presbyterians had seventeen congregations in five presbyteries. *The case of the dissenting Protestants of Ireland* p. 2; Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism in Dublin*.

41. J. Boyse, *Sermon before the societies for the reformation of manners*, Jan. 6 1697, p. 368.

It is evident that each of the four dissenting groups, Quakers, Independents, English and Scottish Presbyterians, rooted themselves in the country, and through controversies both within and between one another reached some clarity and definition about themselves. They developed a form of life, worship, discipline and theology within each of their traditions. And in addition to this, both the Scottish Presbyterians and the Quakers developed detailed organisational structures which they executed consistently. Lived sometimes from conviction and sometimes from social/internal pressure, such structures enabled the Scottish Presbyterians and the Quakers to become strong cohesive bodies in the country. Moreover, the political implications of a strong Scottish Presbyterian church in Ireland were very great for the government and for the Established Church in Ireland. On this point the Quakers differed for they had neither the numbers to warrant any danger nor did they aspire to political power or control.

On the other hand, the English Presbyterians and Independents did not have the same approach to church order and structure. English Presbyterians hoped to be accommodated within the Established Church, as a church in its own right. Theirs was the tradition of Ussher and Baxter, of moderate episcopacy within a spirit of wide comprehension. By the same token, they hoped for some form of agreement with the Independents and several times came very near to it in England. Certainly Samuel Mather was willing to work towards this; both churches recognised they had to work together in Ireland anyway and mutually support one another. At the level of practice they managed to reach consensus; at the level of theology differences lay under the surface, only needing a different context for them to be expressed.

The period 1660-1712 was a highly formative, refining and defining time for the Quakers, Independents, Scottish and English Presbyterians in Ireland. In varying degrees of strength and influence, each of them witnessed to diverse forms of religious experience and practice in Ireland at that time. The passage to self-awareness and definition was difficult and uncertain, but each succeeded in making their mark and contributed to the development and tradition of Protestant dissent in Ireland.

Public Record Office of Northern Ireland

- MS. 100/1/1/1 Transcripts of the minutes of the Dublin Yearly Meeting, 1694-1700
- MS. 100/1/1/2 Transcripts of the minutes of the Dublin Yearly Meeting, 1701-1707
- MS. 100/1/1/3 Transcripts of the minutes of the Dublin Yearly Meeting, 1708-1714
- MS. 100/1/1/4 Transcripts of the minutes of the Dublin Yearly Meeting, 1715-1721
- MS. 100/1/1/5 The Yearly Meeting Minutes Book, 1694-1700
- MS. 100/1/1/6 Dublin Yearly Meeting
- MS. 100/1/1/7 Extracts from the Yearly Meeting and Dublin Yearly Meeting
- MS. 100/1/1/8 Transcripts of the Dublin Yearly Meeting (selected)
- MS. 100/1/1/9-10 Quaker Papers

Queen's Theological College

West Irish Baptist Mission, 1710-1718

Presbyterian Church in Ireland Historical Society Library

The register of the Minutes of Conference, 1690-1700

Donald McDonald's minutes of conference book, 1690-1700

Diary of Dr. John Cook, 1690-1700

London Library

Queen's College Library

MS. 100/1/1/1-10 Quaker Papers, 1690-1700

MS. 100/1/1/1-10 Quaker Papers, 1690-1700

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

Belfast

Public Record Office of Northern Ireland

- D/1759/1A/1 Transcripts of the minutes of the Antrim Meeting, 1654-58
D/1759/1A/2 Transcripts of the minutes of the Antrim Meeting, 1671-91
D/1759/E/1 Transcripts of the minutes of the Laggan Meeting, 1672-79
D/1759/E/2 Transcripts of the minutes of the Laggan Meeting, ii, 1679-95, 1672-1700
CR4/12/B/1 The Templepatrick Session Book, 1646-1743
T.1062/45 Lurgan Men's Meeting
T. 780 Extracts from the Commonwealth and Carte Manuscripts
T. 525 Transcripts of the Wodrow Manuscripts (selected)
T. 2954/1/1-10 Pomeroy Papers

Union Theological College

Burt Kirk Session Minutes, 1676-1719

Presbyterian Church in Ireland Historical Society Library

The register of the session of Carnmoney, 1686-1748

Dundonald (Kirkdonald) session of committee book, 1678-1716

Diary of Mr. John Cook, 1698-1705

Londonderry

Magee College Library

MS. 46 Correspondence of Thomas Stewart, 1699-1749

MS. 29 (Kinnear MS.) Sermons, 1658-1704

Trinity College Dublin

- MS. 556 Acta de Synodo Ecclesiae, 1707-8
- MSS 668/1-668/3 Convocation, 1703-4
- MS. 750 William King's Letter Book, 1696-8
- MS. 750/2 William King's Letters, 1698-9 (microfilm)
- MS. 750/12 Letters of William King, 1699-1703
- MS. 808 General Convention, 1660
- MS. 865 King's treatise on church government
- MSS 883,i, Presbyterians in Larne, 1683
- MS. 1038 Acts of the Irish Convocation, 1661-3; 1665-6
- MS. 1062 Convocation 1704 ff, Bishop Reeves' Collection
- MSS 1995-2008 Correspondence of William King
- MS. 2203, Misc. Autographs, 59 Protection for Quakers
- MS. 2929 Transcripts of the Baumgartner Papers

Marsh's Library Dublin

- MS. Z 1.1.13 The case of the people called Quakers
- MS. Z 4.2.17 Dopping to Wetenhall, 1696
- MS. Z.3.1.1 Complaints against Samuel Winter
- MS. Z 4.4.8 Letters of Robert Boyle to Marsh

Representative Church Body Library Dublin

- MS. Gg. 2/7/3/20 Seymour Manuscript
- MS. Gg 2/7/3/27 Inquisition, Down and Connor, 1657
- MS. Libr. 14 Vestry book of St. Katherine and St. James, Dublin,
from 1657
- MS. J. 7 Survey of Killaloe, Edward Worth, 1661
- MS. Libra/23A Visitation of Ossory 1679

Unitarian Church, St. Stephen's Green West, Dublin

Registers, Eustace Street Congregation: New Row Baptismal Register,
1653-1737

Friends Library Dublin

H.Y.Meetings A 10	Half Yearly Meetings 1676 ff
H.Y.Meetings A11	Appendix. Paper of William Edmundson on mixed marriages
MM 11 A1	Men's Meeting Dublin 1677 ff
MM 11 F1	Testimonies of denial and condemnation, 1662-1722
MM 111 F1	Testimony of a general meeting..Munster
MM 1V M2	Moate Meeting
MM V G1	Mountmellick Monthly Meeting
QM 1 C1	Half Yearly Meetings...1692-1710
QM 11 F1	Testimonies of disunity
QM 11 Z1	Summary of the proceedings of several Half Year's Meetings held in Dublin for...Ireland,1704
YMF1	The names of Friends deceased...Ireland
YMG1	National Sufferings, 1655-93
Sharp MSS	

Edinburgh

National Library Scotland

Wodrow MSS	Folio, Quarto, Octavo series
MS. 3740	Unrest in the north of Ireland, 1704

University Library Cambridge

Baumgartner Papers	Strype correspondence
Add. MSS 711	Notebook of Anthony Dopping
Mm vi 49	Letter of Bonnell re Quakers, 1690

Bodleian Library Oxford

Carte MSS	
Rawlinson MSS	
Clarendon MSS	

Lambeth Palace Library London

MSS 929, 930, 942 Gibson Papers

Dr. William's Library London

MS. 24. 67 Letters re Daniel Williams, Nathaniel Mather

Friends Library London

Caton MSS Transcripts ii

Spence MSS Transcripts iii

A.R.Barclay MSS Transcripts

Swarthmore MSS Transcripts ii, vii

British Library London

Landsdowne MS. 446 Commission for Down and Connor, 1693

Landsdowne MSS 821-3 Correspondence to Henry Cromwell, 1655-9

Landsdowne MS. 1152a Scottish rebels in Ireland, 1684-5

Landsdowne MS. 1228 Proposals/ addresses of ministers, 1658

Egerton MS. 1762 Congregational churches in Dublin, 1654-5

Egerton MS. 2168 Letters, papers of William Penn

Egerton MS. 2429 William Penn's address to James II

Sloane MS. 2902 Papers of Abraham Hill, 1697

Add MS. 4763 State of Derry diocese, 1670

Add MS. 4815 List of members of Lower House of Convocation,
1704

Add MS. 6117 Irish bishops, 1703

Add MS. 19833 Civil List, 1654

Add MS. 32471 Instructions for Sir John Clotworthy and
William Aston, 30 March 1660

Add MS. 34777 Resolutions of Convocation, 1711

Add MS. 36771 Irish Convocation, 1703

Add MS. 39318 To Friends in Ireland...T. Upsher, Dublin 1699

Stowe MSS

Printed Sources

- Acts of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, 1638-49* (Edinburgh, 1691).
- An act for keeping and celebrating the 23rd day of October as an anniversary of thanksgiving, 27 Sept. 1662.
- The agreement and resolution of several associated ministers in the county of Cork for the ordaining of ministers (Cork, 1657).
- The agreement and resolution of the ministers of Christ associated within the city of Dublin and province of Leinster (Dublin, 1659).
- Airey Osmund (ed.), *Essex Papers*, Camden Society, New series xlvii, 167-79 (London, 1890).
- Analecta Hibernicae*, ii, (Jan. 1931). Bod. Rawlinson MS c 984.
- Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, 4 vols (London, 1813-20).
- Book of Common Prayer and ceremonies of the Church* (Dublin, 1668)
- Book of Common Prayer with 1634 and 1711 canons* (Dublin, 1795).
- Berwick, Edward, (ed.), *Rawdon Papers* (London, 1819).
- Biographies of Quakers* (Friends Library London).
- Birch, Thomas (ed.), *A collection of the State papers of John Thurloe*, 7 vols (London, 1742).
- Brady, John (ed.), 'Remedies proposed for the Church of Ireland (1697)' in *Archivum Hibernicum* xxii (1959).
- Bullingbroke, Edward, *Ecclesiastical law, statutes, constitutions and canons of the Church of Ireland*, 2 vols (Dublin, 1770).
- Burke, Bernard, *A genealogical history of the dormant.....and extinct peerages of the British Empire* (London, 1883).
- Calendar of ancient records of Dublin, in the possession of the municipal corporation* ed. Sir J.T. and Lady Gilbert, 19 vols (Dublin, 1889-1944).
- Caulfield, Richard (ed.), *Council Book of the Corporation of Cork from 1609-1643 and 1690-1800* (Surrey, 1876).
- A collection of letters, consisting of ninety three, sixty one of which were written byJames Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1764).
- Constitution and canons of the Church of Ireland, 1634.*
- Convention of Ireland, 1660.*
- Correspondence of Robert Wodrow*, ed. Thomas McCrie, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1842-3).
- Cotton, Henry, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae*, 6 vols (Dublin, 1845-78).
- Declaration of the Presbytery of Bangor, 7 July 1649.*
- Directions for preachers 1662*, Reprinted 1685.
- Dunlop, R.T., *Ireland under the Commonwealth, 1651-59* (Manchester, 1913).
- Eustace, P.B. and Goodbody, O.C., *Quaker Records Dublin. Abstract of wills, I.M.C.* (Dublin, 1957).
- Fair warning or xxv reasons against popery* (London, 1663).
- The form of church government to be used in the church of England and Ireland, 29 August 1648.*
- Fox, George, *Journal of*, 2 vols (London, 1901).
- From our Half Yearly Meeting at Dublin, Sept. 9-11, 1691.*
- Gogarty, Thomas (ed.), *Council Book of the Corporation of Drogheda*, 2 vols (Reprint, Cork, 1988).
- Goodbody, O.C., *Guide to Irish Quaker Records, 1654-1860, I.M.C.* (Dublin, 1967).
- Grubb, Isobel, *Friends books in Marsh's Library, Dublin* (Friends Library London).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission
2nd, 4th, 6th Reports
Hastings ii
Egmont ii

Portland iii,v
 Buccleugh and Queensbury ii
 Ormonde i,ii,iv,v,vi,vii
 Hanly, John (ed.) *The letters of Oliver Plunkett, 1625-1661* (Dublin, 1979).
 Hill, George (ed.) *The Montgomery Manuscripts, 1603-1706* (Belfast, 1859).
Humble address and apology of the Presbyterian ministers and gentlemen ...in the north of Ireland, 1711.
Humble address and apology of the Protestant dissenting ministers of Dublin and the south of Ireland, 1711.
 J.Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, 2 vols (London, 1811).
 Latimer, W.T., 'The old session book of Templepatrick presbyterian church' in *R.S.A.I. Jn.*, vol 25 (1895); vol 31 (1901).
 Mathews, A.G., *Calamy revised* (Oxford, 1934).
 The Mather Papers in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, viii, 4th series (Boston, 1868).
 McConnell, James, *Fasti of the Irish Presbyterian Church, 1613-1840*. Revised by S.G. McConnell (Belfast, 1951).
 MacLysaght, Edward (ed.), *Calendar of the Orrery State papers*, I.M.C. (Dublin, 1941).
 McNeill, Charles (ed.), *The Tanner Letters*, I.M.C. (Dublin, 1943).
 Moody, T.W. and Simms, J.G. (ed.), *The bishopric of Derry and the Irish Society of London, 1602-1705*, 2 vols, I.M.C. (Dublin, 1968, 1983).
 Morrice, Thomas, *Collections of the State Papers of the 1st Earl of Orrery*, 2 vols (Dublin, 1743).
A narrative of the cruel sufferings of the people ...in Ireland called Quakers (London, 1659).
The National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant....renewed at Lesmahago, 3 March 1688.
A necessary representation of the present evils and dangers to religion, laws and liberties. Presbytery at Belfast, 1649 (n.p., 1649).
News from Ireland (London, 1650).
 Nuttall, G.F., *Early Quaker Letters* (London, 1952).
Observations upon the articles of peace....Representation of the Presbytery at Belfast.
 Penn, William, *The papers of William Penn*, ed. Mary Maples Dunn and Richard Dunn, 5 vols (Pennsylvania, 1981).
The Registers of the privy Council of Scotland, Third series.
Records of the General Synod of Ulster, 3 vols (Belfast, 1890-98).
A representation of the present state of religion (Dublin, 1711).
 Russell, C.W., and Prendergast, J.P., *The Carte MSS in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. A report* (London, 1871).
 Scott, Hew, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scotianae*, 7 vols (Edinburgh, 1920).
 Singer, S.W., *The correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, 1687-90*, 2 vols (London, 1828).
A testimony of tender advice and counsel...half yearly meeting Dublin, 1698).
A true and exact copy of...the fanatics New Covenant ...taken from Donald Cargill at Queensferry, June 3 1680 Reprinted at Dublin, 1680).
Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, calendared by Robert Steele, 2 vols (Oxford, 1910).
The visitation of the rebellious nation of Ireland (1655).
 Warner, G.F. (ed.), *The Nicholas papers*, Camden Society, 4 vols (London, 1920).
 Wood, Herbert (ed.), *Parish registers of St.Catherine, Dublin, 1636-1715*, Parish Register Society of Dublin, v (Exeter/London, 1908).

Contemporary/near contemporary writings

- Baily, John, *To my loving and dearly beloved Christian friends in and about Limerick*, 8 May 1684 (n.p.).
- Barcroft, John, *A faithful warning to ...Great Britain and Ireland* (Dublin,1720).
A brief narrative of the life of John Barcroft (Dublin,1730).
- Baxter, Richard, *The Quakers catechism* (London, 1655).
The true history of Councils enlarged and defended (London,1682).
The second part against the schism, being animadversions on a book famed to be Mr.Ralphson's (London,1691).
The certainty of the world's spirits (London,1691).
- Barry, James, *A reviving cordial* (London,1699).
The doctrine of particular election asserted...(n.p.,1715).
- Bernard, Nicholas, *The farewell sermons*, (London,1651).
The judgement of the late Archbishop of Armagh (2nd ed. London,1659)
Clavi trabales, or nails fastened by some great masters ...(London,1661).
- Berry, Richard, *A sermon on the Epiphany* (Dublin,1672).
- Besse Joseph, *A collection of the sufferings of the people called Quakers*, 2 vols (London,1753).
- Blackwood, Christopher, *The storming of Antichrist* (London,1644).
- Boyse, Joseph, *Works of..*, 2 vols (...),1728).
Vindicae Calvinisticae, or some impartial reflections..(Dublin,1687).
Sacramental hymns (Dublin,1693).
Remarks on a late discourse of William...bishop of Derry (n.p.,1694).
A vindication of the remarks on the bishop of Derry's discourse...(n.p.,[1695]).
The case of the Protestant dissenters of Ireland, ([Dublin,1695]).
The case of dissenting Protestant dissenters vindicated ([Dublin],1695).
The difference between Mr. E[mlin] and the Protestant dissenting ministers of Dublin (n.p.,1702).
A vindication of the true deity of our blessed Saviour (Dublin,1703).
A sermon on the death of... Elias Travers (Dublin,1705).
The office of a scriptural bishop (Dublin,1709).
A clear account of the ancient episcopacy... (London,1712).
Remarks on a pamphlet published by William Tisdall (n.p.,1716).
A true narrative of the proceedings of the dissenting ministers of Dublin against Mr. Thomas Emlin (London,1719).

- Bramhall, John, *A fair warning to take heed of the Scottish discipline* (n.p.,1649).
A sermon preached 23rd April,1661 (Dublin,1661).
Works of ..., (ed.), John Vesey (Dublin,1676).
- Brewster, Francis, *A discourse concerning Ireland* (n.p.,1697/8).
- Browne, Peter, *The doctrine of parts and circumstances* (Dublin,1715).
- Bruce, Michael, *The rattling of the dry bones* (n.p.,1672).
Six dreadful alarms (Edinburgh,1675).
- Burnyeat, John, and Watson, John, *The holy truth...defended* (Dublin,1688).
- Burnyeat, John, *The truth exalted* (London,1691).
- Burrough, Edmund, *To the churches of Christ in Ireland* (1656).
To you that are called Anabaptists in Ireland(1657).
A vindication of the....Quakers (London,1660).
The everlasting gospel of repentance (London,[1660]).
The memorable works of a son of thunder and consolation (London,1672).
- Burston, Daniel, *The evangelist evangelising* (Dublin,1662).
Christ's last call (Dublin,1666).
- Calamy, Edward, *A funeral sermon preached upon the [death] of Mrs. Elizabeth Williams* (London,1698).
An historical account of my own life, with some reflections on the times I have lived in, 1671-1731, 2 vols (London,1830).
An account of the ministers ...who were ejected or silenced after the Restoration in 1660 (n.p.,1713).
A continuation of the account, 2 vols (London,1727).
Memoirs of the late....Mr.John Howe (London,1734).
- Campbell, John, *Mr. Campbell's letter to a parishioner* (Belfast,1711).
- Campbell, Richard, *A directory of prayer* (London,1696).
The Church of England defended, with the dissenters reply, or cases of conscience proposed to the dissenting ministers of Dublin... (Dublin,1709).
- Cook, John, *Diary of the reverend John Cook begun 1696*.
- Cooke, Edward, *A paper from Quakers showing the wickedness of the young priests lately come over into Ireland* (n.p.,c.1658).
- Corbet, John, *The ungirding of the Scottish armour* (Dublin,1639).
- Coxe, Samuel, *Two sermons preached at Christchurch, Dublin, beginning the Convention of Ireland* (Dublin,1660).
- Craghead, Robert, *An answer to a late book...*(Edinburgh,1694).
Advice to communicants (Edinburgh,1695).
A modest apology occasioned... by the bishop of Derry (Glasgow,1696).
An answer to the bishop of Derry's second admonition (n.p.,1697).
Warning and advice both to the secure and doubting (Edinburgh,1701).
- T. C[risp], *Babel's builders* (London,1681).
- Defoe, Daniel, *Memoirs of the life and eminent conduct of Daniel Williams* (London,1718).
The parallel, (Dublin,1705).
- Delemaine, Alexander, *A volume of spiritual epistles: being the copies of several letters written by the last of the two prophets and messengers of God, John Reeve and Ludowick Muggleton* (London,1820).
- Dopping, Anthony, *The case of dissenters of Ireland considered* (Dublin,1695).

- Drury, Edward, *A discourse occasioned by Mr. Boyse's ordination sermon entitled 'The office of a scriptural bishop'* (Dublin, 1709).
- Eaton, Samuel, *The Quakers confuted* (London, 1653).
The perfect pharisee under monkish holiness (London, c1653).
- Eccles, Solomon, *Begin: In the year 1659...*
Signs are from the Lord (London, 1663).
The Quaker's challenge, (London, 1668).
- Edmundson, William, *An epistle to Friends...* 1698
An epistle containing wholesome advice and counsel (n.p., 1701).
Journal of the life of.. (Dublin, 1715).
- Emlin, Thomas, *Humble enquiry into the scripture account of the Lord Jesus Christ* (London, 1702).
The works of Mr. Thomas Emlin, 3 vols (London, 1746).
- Eyres, Joseph, *The church sleeper awakened* (London, 1659).
- Faldo, John, *Quakerism no Christianity* (London, 1673).
- Samuel, Foley, *A sermon preached at the primary visitation...* Dublin (London, 1683).
Two sermons preached in ... 1681, 1682 ([London], 1683).
An exhortation to the inhabitants of Down and Connor (Dublin, 1695).
- Fox, George, William Morris, George Perrot, *Several warnings to the baptised people* (n.p., 1659).
- Fox, George, *The Protestant Christian-Quaker, a sufferer by relics of popery* (London, 1680).
- French, Matthew, *A collection of Mr. Boyse's several scurrilous and abusive reflections* (Dublin, 1709).
Mr. Boyse's Partiality Detected (Dublin, 1709).
An examination of Mr. Joseph Boyse's Postscript (Dublin, 1709).
An answer to Joseph Boyse's ordination sermon (Dublin, 1709).
- Fuller, Samuel, *A serious reply to twelve sections of abusive queries proposed to.... the Quakers, concluding the works of Joseph Boyse* (Dublin, 1728).
- Gilbert, Claudius, *The libertine schooled* London, 1657).
A pleasant way to heaven (London, 1658).
A sovereign antidote against sinful errors (London, 1658).
A pleasant walk to Heaven (London, 1683).
- Gowan, Thomas, *Ars sciendi, sive logica, novo methodo disposita* ([London], 1683)
Logica elentica (Dublin, 1683).
- Gowan, Thomas, *The power of presbyters in ordination and church government.....* (n.p., 1711).
- Hall, Thomas, *A plain and easy explication of the Assembly's shorter catechism* (Edinburgh, 1699).
- Hamilton, William, *Life and character of James Bonnell* (London, 1717).
- Harrison, Thomas, *Topica Sacra* (Kirkbride, 1712)
Threni Hybernici (London, 1659).
- Henry, Mathew, *Funeral sermon for Mr. Burges* (London, 1713).
- Hewett, Peter, *A plain answer to... William Penn's book against the late bishop of Cork* (Dublin, 1701).
- Heylin, Peter, *Respondet Petrus, or the answer of Peter Heylin to.... Dr. Bernard's book* (London, 1658)
Aerius Redivivus or the history of the Presbyterians (London, 1670).

- Hollingworth, Richard, *Certain queries modestly propounded to...Samuel Eaton and Timothy Taylor* (London,1646).
- Holms, Thomas and Fuller, Abraham, *A brief relation of the sufferings of... Quakers in Ireland, 1660-71* (n.p.,1672).
- Howie, John, *Faithful contendings displayed* (Glasgow,1780).
Biographia Scotiana, or a brief historical account of the most eminent Scots worthies (Glasgow,1827).
Sermons delivered in times of persecution in Scotland (Edinburgh,1880).
- Huntington, William, *The coal heaver's cousin rescued from the bats. The works of James Barry* (London,1788).
- Jenner, Thomas, *Quakerism anatomised and confuted* (n.p.,1670).
- Jones, Henry, *A sermon preached at the consecration of Ambrose....bishop of Kildare* (Dublin,1667).
A sermon of Antichrist, preached at ...Dublin (Dublin,1676).
- Keith, George, *Some of the many fallacies of William Penn* (London,1699).
- King, William, *An answer to the considerations which obliged Peter Manby...to embrace...the catholic religion* (Dublin,1687).
State of the Protestants of Ireland under King James government (London,1691).
A discourse concerning the inventions of men (London,1694).
An admonition to the dissenting inhabitants... of Derry (London,1694).
A second admonition to the dissenting inhabitants...of Derry (London,1696).
- Kirkpatrick, James, *An historical essay upon the loyalty of Presbyterians* (n.p.,1713).
- [Lambert, Ralph], *An answer to a late pamphlet entitled A vindication of marriage...by presbyterians* (Dublin,1704).
- [Lambert,Ralph], *A serious and humble address to the archbishops and bishops of Ireland*, (London,1705).
- Lawrence, Richard, *The interest of Ireland* (Dublin,1682).
- Ladyman, Samuel, *The dangerous rule, or a sermon preached at Clonmel* (London,1658).
- Leslie, Henry, *A discourse of praying in the spirit*, (n.p.,1659).
- Lightburn, William, *A thanksgiving sermon*, (Dublin,1661).
- Livingstone, John, *A brief historical realtion of the life of Mr. John Livingstone*, ed. Thomas McCrie (Edinburgh,1848).
- Loftus, Dudley, *Proceedings observed* (London,1661).
- Manby, Peter, *The considerations which obliged Peter Manby, Dean of Derry, to embrace the catholic religion* (Dublin,1687).
- Mather, Samuel, *A defence of the Protestant religion against popery* (n.p.,1672).
A testimony from the scriptures against idolatry...in two sermons (Dublin,1672).
Irenicum or as essay for union (London,1680).
The figures or types of the Old Testament (n.p.,1683).
- Mathews, George, *An account of the trial ofThomas Emlin...*(Dublin,1839).
- Mathews, Lemuel, *A pindarique elegy upon the death of Jeremy Taylor* (Dublin,1667).
- [McBride, John], *Animadversions on the Defence of the answer to a paper entitled 'The case of the dissenting Protestants'* ([Belfast],1697).

- A sermon preached before the provincial synod of Antrim* (n.p.,1698).
- A vindication of marriage as solemnised by presbyterians in the north of Ireland* (n.p.,1702).
- A sample of jet black prelatick calumny* (Glasgow,1713).
- Moor, John, *Three discourse concerning transubstantiation, invocation of the saints and angels, worship of images. Some queries offered to the ...Quakers, particularly those in Queen's county* (Dublin,1707).
Held in G.P.A.-Bolton Library, Cashel.
- Morris, William, *To the supreme authority...the Commons assembled in London* (London,1659).
- Tithes no gospel ordinance* (n.p.,1680).
- Murcot, John, *Several works of John Murcot* (London,1657).
- Parke, James, *The way of God and them that walk in it* (n.p.,1673).
- Parr, Richard, *Life ofJames Ussher* London,1686).
- Penn, William, *The great case of liberty of conscience...defended* (n.p.,1670).
- The new witnesses proved old heretics* (n.p.,1672).
- A defence of a paper entitled 'Gospel Truths'* (London,1698).
- My Irish journal*, ed. Isobel Grubb (London,1952).
- Penn, William, Everett, John, Story, Thomas, *The Quaker a christian* (Dublin,1698)
- Truths further cleared from mistakes* (Dublin,1698).
- Penn, William, Story, Thomas, Sharp, Anthony, Rook, George, *Gospel Truths to clarify the orthodoxy of Friends* (Dublin,1698).
- [Joseph, Pike], *Some account of the life of Joseph Pike of Cork, written by himself* (London,1837).
- Plimpton, John, *Ten charges against the people called Quakers* (Dublin,1698).
- A Quaker no christian* (Dublin,1698).
- Quakerism the mystery of iniquity....* (Dublin,1698).
- Pressicke, George, *A brief relation of some of the most remarkable passages of the Anabaptists in High and Low Germany,1521* (n.p.,1660).
- Certain queries touching the silencing of godly ministers* (n.p.,1661). *An answer to Griffith Williams,...bishop of Ossory* (n.p.,n.d.).
- A case of conscience propounded* (n.p.,1661).
- Pullen, Josiah, *An answer to a paper entitled 'The case of the Protestant dissenters'* [(Dublin,1695)].
- A defence of the answer to a paper entitled 'The case of the Protestant dissenters'* (Dublin,1695).
- Ravillac redivivus, being the narrative of the late trial of Mr. James Mitchell a conventicle preacher* (Reprinted Dublin,1678).
- Remarks upon the book called 'A modest apology...'* (n.p.,1702).
- Richardson, John, *A short history of the attempts to convert the popish natives in Ireland* (London,1712)
- A proposal for the conversion of....Ireland* (2nd ed. London,1712).
- Rogers, John, *Ohel or Beth-shemish* (London,1653).
- Rust, George, *A sermon preached atdeath of Hugh, Viscount Montgomery of the Ards* (Dublin,1664).
- Rutty, John, *A history of the rise and progress of the people called Quakers in Ireland* (Dublin,1751).
- Sheridan, William, *St. Paul's confession of faith* (Dublin,1685).

- Shields, Alexander, *A hind let loose or a historical representation of the testimonies of the church of Scotland* (n.p.,1687).
The history of the Scotch Presbytery, being an epitome of 'The hind let loose' (London,1692).
An informatory vindication of a poor, wasted, misrepresented remnant...true presbyteruan church in Scotland (n.p.,1707).
The life and death of ...James Renwick (Edinburgh,1724).
- Sicklemore, James, *To all the inhabitants of Youghal who are under the teachings of James Wood* (n.p.,1657/8).
- Sleigh, Joseph, *Good advice and counsel given forth by Joseph Sleigh* (London,1696).
- Smyth, Edward, *A sermon preached at Christchurch, Dublin* (Dublin,1698).
- Stanhope, Arthur, *The bishop of Waterford's case* (Dublin,1670).
Episcopal jurisdiction asserted (Dublin, 1670/1).
- Stockdale, William, *Great cry of oppression or a brief relation of some ...sufferings of...Quakers in Ireland, 1671-81* (Dublin,1683).
- Story, Thomas, *A journal of the life of Thomas Story* (Newcastle, 1747).
- Strettell, Amos and Burnyeat, John, *The innocency of the Quakers manifested*(Dublin,1687).
- Synge, Edward, *A peaceable and friendly address to the non conformists* (Dublin,1732).
Defence of the peaceable and friendly address (Dublin,1698).
A defence of the Established Church and laws in answer to.... 'A vindication of marriage' (Dublin,1705).
An answer to all the excuses (Dublin,1697).
- Taylor, Jeremy, *A discourse on the liberty of prophesying* (London,1647).
Rules and advices (Dublin,1661).
A sermon preached at the consecration of two archbishop and ten bishops (Dublin,1661).
A sermon preached at the opening of Parliament ...8 May 1661 (London,1661).
- Taylor, Timothy and Eaton, Samuel, *The defence of sundry positions and ...the congregational way justified* (London,1646).
- Teate, Faithful, *Nathaniel or an Israelite indeed* (London,1657).
The soldier's commission (London,1658).
The uncharitable informer charitably informed (Dublin,1660).
- Teate, Joseph, *A sermon preached at...St. Canice's Kilkenny* (Dublin,1670).
- Tennison, Richard, *A sermon preached at the Primary visitation of ...archbishop of Armagh* (Dublin,1679).
A sermon preached ...Dublin (Dublin,1692).
The testimony of Abraham Fuller (n.p.,1687).
- Tisdall, William, *A sample of true blue presbyterian loyalty* (Dublin,1709).
The conduct of dissenters (Dublin,1712).
A seasonable enquiry into ...the kirk in power (Dublin,1713).
The nature and tendency of popular phrases (n.p.,1713).
- Ussher, James, *The reduction of episcopacy* (London,1687).
- Vesey, John, *A sermon preached at Clonmel assizes* (Dublin,1683).

- Walker, Patrick, *Some remarkable passages of the life and death of Mr. Alexander Peden...* (3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1728).
- Ware, Robert, *Foxes and firebrands or a specimen of the danger...of popery...* (2nd ed. Dublin, 1682).
- The hunting of the Romish fox* (Dublin, 1683).
- Weaver, John, *The life and death of Samuel Winter* (London, 1671).
- Weld, Nathaniel, Boyse, Joseph, Choppin, Richard, *Seasonable advice* (Dublin, 1722).
- Wetenhall, Edward, *Collyrium, a sermon preached in..Dublin* (London, 1672).
- Of gifts and offices* (Dublin, 1678).
- The Protestant peacemaker* (London, 1682).
- A practical and plain discourse* (Dublin, 1683).
- A specimen of loyalty towards James II* (Dublin, 1686).
- An earnest and compassionate suit for forbearance* (London, 1691).
- Sermon touching divine right* (London, 1691).
- The case of the Irish Protestants ..sated and resolved* (London, 1691).
- A sermon preached at Whitehall before the Queen* (Cork, 1691).
- Pastoral admonitions* (Cork, 1691).
- A letter to a friend* London, 1691).
- A sermon setting forth the duties of the Irish Protestants* (Dublin, 1692).
- A brief and modest reply to Mr. Penn's ...defence* (Dublin, 1699).
- Whitehead, George and Penn, William, *A serious apology for the principles and practices of the ...Quakers, against ..Jenner and...Taylor* (n.p., 1671).
- [Whittington, Charles], *Remarks upon some passages in Mr. Boyse's sermons, vol 1* (Dublin, 1709).
- Williams, Daniel, *Practical discourse on several important subjects, 2 vols* (London, 1738).
- Williams, Griffith, *The great AntiChrist* (n.p., 1660).
- Seven treatises* (London, 1661).
- The chariot of truth* (London, 1663).
- A true relation* (London, 1663).
- The persecution of John Bale* (London, 1664).
- Several sermons* London, 1665).
- Four treatises* (London, 1667).
- Winter, Samuel, *The sum of diverse sermons* (Dublin, 1656).
- Wood, James, *Shepardy spiritualised* (London, 1680).
- Wright, Thomas and Harris, Nicholas, *Truth further defended and William Penn vindicated....* (n.p., 1700).

Later Works

- Acheson, R.J. *Radical puritanism in England 1550-1660* (Longman, 1990).
- Adamson, Ian, *The identity of Ulster* (2nd ed. Belfast, 1987).
- Alexander, George, *Historic memorials of the First Presbyterian Church* (Belfast, 1887).

- Allen, Robert, *Scottish ecclesiastical influence upon Irish presbyterianism from the subscription controversy to the union of synods* (M.A., Q.U.B., 1940).
- Aylmer, G.E., 'Unbelief in 17th century England' in Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (ed.), *Puritans and revolutionaries* (Oxford, 1978).
- Armstrong, James, *A discourse on presbyterian ordination.....with an appendix containing a summary history of the Presbyterian Church in the city of Dublin* (Dublin, 1829).
- Atkinson, E.D., *Dromore, an Ulster diocese* (Dundalk, 1925).
- Bailey, Francis, (ed.) *An account of the the Rev. John Flamstead visiting Kilkenny in 1665* (London, 1835).
- Baillie, W.D., *A history of congregations in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 1610-1982* (Belfast, 1982).
- Barkley, J.M., *The Westminster formularies in Irish Presbyterianism,, being the Carey lectures, 1954-56* (Belfast, 1956).
- A short history of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (n.p., 1959).
- The eldership in Irish Presbyterianism* (n.p., 1963).
- Blackmouth and Dissenter* (Belfast, 1991).
- Barnard, T.C., *Cromwellian Ireland* (Oxford, 1975).
- The English Republic 1649-1660* (Longman, 1987).
- 'Crisis and identity among Irish Protestants, 1641-1685' in *Past and Present*, no.127 (May, 1990).
- Baumann, Richard, *Let your words be few. Symbolism and silence among 17th century Quakers* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Berg, Joannes van den, *The idea of tolerance and the Act of Toleration* (Dr. William's Library, 1989).
- Beckett, J.C., *Protestant dissent in Ireland, 1687-1780* (London, 1948).
- 'The government and the Church of Ireland under William III and Anne' in *I.H.S.*, ii, no. 7 (1941).
- 'William King's administration of the diocese of Derry, 1691-1703' in *I.H.S.*, iv, no. 14 (1944).
- Confrontations in Irish history* (London, 1972).
- Benn, George, *History of Belfast*, 2 vols (Belfast, 1877).
- Berman, David, 'The Irish counter-Enlightenment' in Richard Kearney, *The Irish mind* (Dublin, 1985).
- A history of atheism in Britain from Hobbes to Russell* (Crom Helm, 1988).
- Bigger, F.J., 'Alexander Peden, "the Prophet" ' in *U.J.A.*, ix, no. 3 (1903).
- Bolam, C.G., *The English Presbyterians* (London, 1968).
- Bolton, F.R., *The Caroline tradition in the Church of Ireland* (London, 1958).
- 'Griffith Williams, bishop of Ossory, 1641-72', in *Butler Society Journal*, ii, no.3 (1987).
- Bossy, John, *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1985).
- Brady, Ciaran and Gillespie, Raymond, (ed.), *Natives and newcomers* (Irish Academic Press, 1986).
- Brailsford, M.R., *The making of William Penn* (London, 1933).
- Brooke, Peter, *Controversies in Ulster Presbyterianism* (Ph.D., Cambridge, 1981).
- Ulster Presbyterianism* (Dublin, 1987).
- Brown, A.W. Godfrey, 'Irish presbyterian theology in the early 18th century ' (Ph.D., Q.U.B., 1977).
- Brown, Terence, *The whole Protestant community* (Field Day Pamphlet, no.7, 1985).
- Buckley, Elia, 'William Penn in Dublin' in *Dublin Hist. Rec.*, no.3 (June-Aug. 1944).

- Buckroyd, Julia, *Church and state in Scotland 1660-81* (Edinburgh, 1980).
- Cameron, John C., *Alexander Peden the prophet of the Covenant* (Reprint, Kilkeel, 1988).
- Cameron, Thomas, *Peden the prophet* (Reprint, Edinburgh, 1981).
- Calderwood, David, *The history of the Kirk of Scotland*, 7 vols (Edinburgh, 1849).
- Campbell, John, *A short history of the non subscribing Presbyterian Church of Ireland* (Belfast, 1914).
- Capp, B.S., *The Fifth Monarchy men* (London, 1972).
- Carroll, Kenneth, 'Quakerism in the Cromwellian army' in *J.F.H.S.*, 54, no.3 (1978).
 'Early Quakers and "Going naked as a sign" in *Quaker History*, no.67 (1978).
 'Quakers and Muggletonians in 17th century Ireland' in David Blamires, (ed.), *A Quaker miscellany for E. Milligan* (London, 1985).
 'Thomas Loe, friend of William Penn and apostle to Ireland' in J.W. Frost and J.M. Moore (ed.), *Seeking the Light* (London, 1986).
- Carpenter, Andrew, 'William King and the threats to the Church of Ireland during the reign of James II' in *I.H.S.*, xviii, no.69 (Mar. 1972).
- Carslaw, W.H., *Life and letters of James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1893).
- Christian discipline of the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland* (Dublin, 1971).
- Cole, Alan, 'The Quakers and the English revolution' in Trevor Aston, (ed.), *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* (London, 1980).
- Coleman, J., 'Some early Waterford clerical authors' in *Waterford Arch. Soc. Jn.*, vi (1900).
- Cressy, David, *Coming over. Migration and communication between England and New England in the 17th century* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Croskery, Thomas and Witherow, Thomas, *Life of A.P. Goudy* (Belfast, 1887).
- Cowan, I.B., 'The Covenanters. A revision article' in *Scottish Hist. Review*, xlvii (1968).
 The Scottish Covenanters (London, 1976).
- Dickson, David, *New foundations in Ireland, 1660-1800* (Dublin, 1987).
- Dickson, R.J., *Ulster emigration to colonial America, 1718-95* (London, 1966).
- Donaldson, Gordon, 'Covenant to Revolution' in Duncan Forrester and Douglas Murray, (ed.), *Studies in the history of worship* (Edinburgh, 1984).
- Dow, F.D., *Radicalism in the English Revolution, 1640-1660* (Blackwell, 1985).
- Drummond, A.L., *The Kirk and the continent* (Edinburgh, 1956).
- Dwyer, Philip, *The diocese of Killaloe from the Reformation to the close of the 18th century* (Dublin, 1878).
- Edwards, R.D., 'The history of the laws against Protestant non conformity in Ireland from the Restoration (1660) to the Declaration of Indulgence (1687)' (M.A., U.C.D., 1932).
- Edwards, R.D. and O'Dowd, Mary, *Sources for early modern Irish history, 1534-1641* (Cambridge, 1985).
- Elliott, Marianne, *Watchmen in Sion: The Protestant idea of liberty* (Field Day Pamphlet, no.8, 1985).
- Ellison, (ed.), 'Bishop Dopping's visitation book, 1682-5', in *Riocht na Midhe*, iv (1971).
- Emerson, N.D., 'Christchurch Cathedral under the early Stuarts' in *Blotter, calendar and yearbook, Christchurch Cathedral* (Dublin, 1955-6).

- Eversley, D.E.C., 'The demography of Irish Quakers, 1650-1850' in J.M.Goldstom and L.A. Clarkson (ed.) *Irish population, economy and society* (London,1981).
- Firman, N. 'Perceptions of the Quaker movement in the 1650's' (Ph.D.,Univ. of East Anglia,1985).
- Fitzpatrick, Brendan, *17th century Ireland. The wars of religion* (Dublin,1988).
- Ford, Alan, *The Protestant reformation in Ireland 1590-1641* (Frankfurt,1985).
- Gillespie, Raymond, 'The Presbyterian revolution in Ulster, 1660-1690' in W.D.Shields and D.Scott, (ed.), *The Churches. Ireland and the Irish*, Church History 25 (Oxford,1989).
- Gillespie, Raymond, and H. O'Sullivan (ed.), *The Borderlands. Essays in the history of the Ulster-Leinster border* (Q.U.B.,1989).
- Goodbody, O.C., 'Ireland in the 1650's' in *J.F.H.S.*,xlvi (1956-8).
- Gordon, Alexander, (ed.), *Freedom after ejection. A review (1690-92) of Presbyterian and Congregational non conformity in England and Wales* Manchester,1917).
- Gordon, Alexander, *Historic memorials of the Remonstrant congregation of Templepatrick* Belfast,1899).
- Gordon, Alexander and G.K., *Historic memorials of the First Presbyterian Church of Belfast* (Belfast,1887).
- Greaves, R.L., *Deliver us from evil* (Oxford,1986).
- Greaves, R.L. and Zaller, Robert, *Biographical dictionary of British radicals in the 17th century*, 3 vols (Harvester Press, 1982-4).
- Grubb, Isobel, *Social conditions in Ireland in the 17th and 18th centuries* (M.A., Univ. of London,1916).
- The Quakers in Ireland* (London,1927).
- 'Anthony Sharp. An unpublished memoir' in *Friends Quarterly Examiner*, vol 59 (1925).
- '17th century Quaker marriages in Ireland' in *J.F.H.S.*, 50, no. 4 (1962).
- Haire, J.L.M., *Challenge and conflict. Essays in Irish Presbyterian history and doctrine* (Antrim,1981).
- Harrison, R.S., 'Dublin Quakers in business, 1880-50' (M.Litt.,T.C.D.,1986).
- Henderson, G.D., *Religious life in 17th century Scotland* Cambridge,1937).
- Heron, A.I.C., (ed.), *The Westminster Confession in the church today* (Edinburgh,1972).
- Healy, John, *History of the diocese of Meath*, 2 vols (Dublin,1908).
- Hewison, J.K., *The Covenanters. A history of the church in Scotland from the reformation to the revolution* ((Glasgow,1913).
- Hill, Christopher, 'Puritans and "the dark corners of the land " ' in *T.R.S.H.*, 5th series, xiii (1963).
- The world turned upside down* (Penguin,1978).
- God's Englishman* (Penguin,1983).
- The experience of defeat* (Penguin,1985).
- A turbulent seditious and factious people. John Bunyan and his church* (Oxford,1988).
- Hill, Christopher, Reay, Barry, and Lamont, William, *The world of the Muggletonians* (London,1983).
- Hill, Jacqueline, 'Popery and protestation, civil and religious liberty: The disputed lessons of Irish history, 1690-1812' in *Past and Present*, no. 118 (1988).
- Holifield, E.Brooks, *The Covenant sealed* (Yale,1974).
- Holmes, James, *Increase Mather. A bibliography of his works*, 2 vols (Ohio,1931).
- Holmes, R.F.G., *Our Presbyterian heritage* (Belfast,1985).
- Houston, Thomas, *The life of James Renwick* (Reprint, Edinburgh,1987).

- The letters of James Renwick* (Paisley, 1845).
- Howie, John, *Sermons delivered in times of persecution in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1880).
- Hutton, Ronald, *The Restoration* (Oxford, 1985).
- Charles II* (Oxford, 1989).
- Irwin, Charles, *History of presbyterianism in Dublin and the south and the west of Ireland* (London, 1890).
- Jessop, A., *The coming of the friars and other essays* (London, 1889).
- Jones, R. Tudor, *Congregationalism in England, 1662-1962* (London, 1962).
- Jones, S.K., *Dr. Williams and his library* (Dr. Williams Library pamphlet, 1948).
- Kelly, Patrick, 'Archbishop William King 1650-1729' in Ciaran Brady (ed.), *Worsted in the game* (Dublin, 1989).
- Kiernan, V.G., 'The Covenanters. A problem of creed and class' in Frederick Krantz (ed.), *History from below* (Blackwell, 1985).
- 'The later Covenanters' in Terry Brotherstone (ed.), *Covenant, Charter and party. Tradition of revolt and protest in modern Scottish history* (Aberdeen, 1989).
- King, C.S., *A great archbishop of Dublin, William King, D.D., 1650-1729* (London, 1906).
- Knox, R.A., *Enthusiasm* (Collins, 1987).
- Knox, R.B., *James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh* (Cardiff, 1967).
- Lawlor, H.J. (ed.), 'Diary of William King' in *R.I.A. Proc.*, xiii, 5th series (1903).
- Lawson, Jean, *Life and times of Alexander Peden and James Renwick* (Glasgow, c.1905).
- Leadbeater, Mary, *Biographical notes of Friends in Ireland* (London, 1823).
- Lecky, Alexander, *The Laggan and its presbyterianism* (Reprint Belfast, 1978).
- Linklater, Mark and Hesketh, Christian, *For King and conscience. John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, 1645-89* (London, 1989).
- Lockhart, Audrey, *Some aspects of emigration from Ireland, 1665-1775* (New York, 1976).
- 'The Quakers and emigration from Ireland to the North American colonies' in *Quaker History*, 77, no. 2 (Fall, 1988).
- Loughridge, Adam, *The Covenanters in Ireland* (Rathfriland, 1987).
- Loupes, Phillipe, 'Bishop Dopping's visitation of the diocese of Meath 1693' in *Studia Hibernica*, no 24 (1984-88).
- Lunham, Thomas, 'Early Quakers in Cork', in *Cork Hist. Soc. Jn.*, 2nd series, x ((1904).
- McAdoo, Henry, 'The religion of a layman: James Bonnell (1653-1699)' in *Search. A Church of Ireland Journal* (Spring, 1991).
- Marshall, Alan, 'Colonel Thomas Blood and the Restoration political scene' in *The Historical Journal*, 32, no. 3 (1989).
- Marshall, John, 'The ecclesiology of the Latitude men, 1660-89' in *Eccles. Hist. Jn.*, 36, no. 3 (July, 1985).
- Matthews, A.G., *Calamy revised* (Oxford, 1934).
- Maxwell, Perceval, M, 'The adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant by the Scots in Ulster' in *Scotia: American-Canadian Journal of Scottish Studies*, ii (1978).
- Maxwell, W.D., *A history of worship in the church of Scotland* (Oxford, 1955).
- MacCurtain, Margaret, *Tudor and Stuart Ireland* (Dublin, 1972).
- McGuire, James, 'Why was Ormonde dismissed in 1669?' in

- I.H.S.*, xviii, no.71 (Mar.1973).
- 'The Church of Ireland and the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688' in Art Cosgrove and Donal McCartney (ed.), *Studies in Irish history* (Dublin,1979).
- 'The Irish Parliament of 1692' in Thomas Bartlett and D.W. Hayton, *Penal ear and golden age: Essays on 18th century Ireland* (Belfast,1979).
- 'The Dublin Convention, the protestant community and the emergence of an ecclesiastical settlement in 1660' in Art Cosgrove and J.I. Maguire (ed.), *Parliament and community* (Belfast,1983).
- 'Government attitudes to religious non conformity in Ireland, 1660-1719' in C.E.J. Caldicott, Hugh Gough, J.P. Pitton (ed.), *The Huguenots and Ireland. Anatomy of an emigration* (Dublin,1987).
- Mc Kinney, C.W., *Killinchy* (1968).
- MacLysaght, Edward, *Irish life in the 17th century* (Reprint Irish Acad. Press,1979).
- McSkimin, Samuel, *History and antiquities of....Carrickfergus*, (ed.) E.J. McCrum (Belfast,1909).
- Millar, Patrick, *Four centuries of Scottish psalmody* (Oxford,1949).
- Miller, David, 'Presbyterianism and "modernisation" in Ulster' in *Past and Present*, 80 (Aug.1978).
- Mitchison, Rosalind, *Lordship and patronage* (London,1983).
- Mullen, Julia, E, *History of New Row Presbyterian Church, Coleraine* (Antrim,1976).
- Munter, Robert, *A dictionary of the print trade in Ireland 1556-1775* (New York,1988).
- Murray, R.H., *Revolutionary Ireland and its settlement* (London,1911).
- Nelson, John, 'The Belfast Presbyterians, 1670-1830' (Ph.D.,Q.U.B.,1985).
- Nokes, David, *Johnathan Swift. A hypocrite reversed* (Oxford,1985).
- Nolan, William, 'Patterns of living in Co. Tipperary from 1770-1850' in William Nolan (ed.), *Tipperary: History and society* (Dublin,1985).
- Nutall, G.F., *Visible Saints* (Oxford,1957).
- O'nOgain, Daithi, 'An tOr bui. Staidear an ghne de sheanchas Thiobraid Arann' in William Nolan (ed.), *Tipperary: History and society* (Dublin,1985).
- Peacocke, Irvine. J., 'Anthony Dopping, bishop of Meath' in *Irish Church Quarterly* (1909).
- Phillips, Alison (ed.), *History of the Church of Ireland*, 3 vols (Oxford,1933-4).
- Pollard, Mary, *Dublin's trade in books* (Oxford,1989).
- Porter Classon, *Regium Donum and ministerial maintenance* (Belfast,1884).
- Power, John, 'Waterford clerical authors, from the work of Rev. Thomas Gimlette' in *Irish Literary Enquirer*, no.3 (Dec,1865).
- Power, P.C., *History of South Tipperary* (Mercier Press,1989).
- Reay, Barry, *The Quakers and the English revolution* (London,1985).
- 'Quakerism and society' in J.F.McGregor and Barry Reay (ed.), *Radical religion in the English revolution* (Oxford,1986).
- Reid, J.S., *The history of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, 3 vols (Belfast,1867).
- Rogers, Edward, *Life and opinions of a Fifth Monarchy man* (London,1867).
- Rogers, P.G., *The Fifth Monarchy men* (London,1966).
- Rupp, E.G., *Religion in England, 1688-1791* (Oxford,1986).

- Schlenker, Boyd, S., *The life and writings of Francis Makemie* (Philadelphia, 1971).
- Scott, Walter, *Old Mortality* (Penguin, 1982)
- Seymour, St., J.D., *Succession of parochial clergy in the united dioceses of Cashel and Emly* (Dublin, 1908).
 'Faithful Teate' in *R.S.A.I. Jn.*, series 6, vol x (1920).
 'Two letters relative to early Quakerism in Limerick' in *North Mun. Arch. Soc. Jn.*, iv, no. 2 (1919).
 A puritan minister in Limerick' in *North Mun. Arch. Soc. Jn.*, iv, no. 3 (1919).
The Puritans in Ireland (Oxford, 1921).
Irish witchcraft and demonology (Reprint London, 1989).
- Simpson, Robert, *Life of the Rev. James Renwick* (Edinburgh, 1843).
- Smellie, Alexander, *Men of the Covenant* (Reprint, Banner of Truth, 1975).
- Stevenson, David, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates* (Belfast, 1981).
The Covenanters (Belfast, 1988).
- Stevenson, John, *Two centuries of life in Down* (Reprint, Belfast, 1990).
- Stewart, A.T.Q., *The narrow ground: Aspects of Ulster, 1609-1969* (London, 1977).
- Thomas, Roger, *Daniel Williams, 'Presbyterian bishop'* (Dr. Williams Library pamphlet, 1964).
- Toon, Peter, *God's statesman. Life and work of John Owen* (Exeter, 1971).
- Tyacke, Nicholas, *The fortunes of English Puritanism, 1603-40* (Dr. Williams Library pamphlet, 1990).
- Urwick, William, *Independency in Dublin in the olden times* (Dublin, 1862).
Early history of Trinity College Dublin, 1591-1660 (London, 1892).
- Vos, J.G., *The Scottish Covenanters* (Reprint, Pittsburgh, 1980).
- Waddell, H.C., *The Presbytery of Route Belfast*, 1960).
- Wallace, Dewey D., *Puritans and predestination* (Univ. of North Carolina, 1982).
- Watts, Michael, *The dissenters* (Oxford, 1985).
- Weir, A.J., *Letterkenny: congregations and ministers and people, 1615-90* (Presbyterian Historical Society Library, Belfast).
- Westerkamp, Marilyn, *Triumph of the laity. Scots-Irish piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760* (Oxford, 1988).
- Wilson, Walter, *The history and antiquities of dissenting churches and meeting houses in Westminster and Southwark, including the lives of their ministers*, 4 vols (London, 1808-14).
- Winnet, B.R., *Peter Browne. Provost, bishop, metaphysician* (London, 1974).
- Witherow, Thomas, *Historical and literary memorials of presbyterianism in Ireland*, 2 vols (London/Belfast, 1879-80).
- Wodrow, Robert, *The history of the sufferings of the church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution*, 4 vols (Glasgow, 1836).
Analecta. Materials for a history of remarkable providences, mainly relating to Scotch ministers and christians, 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1842-3).
- Wood-Martin, H.G., *History of Sligo county and town*, 3 vols (Dublin, 1882-92).

Young, R.M., *Historical notes of old Belfast and its vicinity*
(Belfast, 1896).

PROTESTANT DISSENT AND CONTROVERSY
IN IRELAND, 1660-1711

Phil Kilroy

This thesis examines how Quakers, Independents, Scottish and English Presbyterians fared in Ireland between 1660-1711. Each group is studied through controversies that arose within and between them, which served to sharpen their self-perception and clarify their position within the Protestant tradition in Ireland. Printed controversies provided the core material for this study. Most of these are accessible, though some are held in obscure collections and a few are unique copies. The fact that they are scattered in various libraries in Ireland, Scotland and England symbolises the very real exchange and communication between these three countries in the second half of the 17th century.

Rather than an abrupt change at the Restoration there was a slow, gradual growth in awareness and articulation as to where dissenting groups stood in the country, what strengths and weaknesses they had and how these could be addressed. There was a constant effort at containment of differences in order to survive, and of disownment when this was no longer possible. By 1711 the Scottish Presbyterians and the Quakers had consolidated structures which held their membership together and affected their way of life, of worship, discipline and belief. However, both Independents and English Presbyterians developed a more singular, individualised form of church order, worship, discipline and theology. This was due as much to their situation in Ireland as to their respective theological positions.

These contrasting forms of religious experience created a broad and rich tradition of religious dissent among the Protestant community in Ireland at this time and can be seen as the outcome of the Interregnum. For the civil war period in general marked either the foundation or further growth of dissenting groups in Ireland. Prior to that, dissent had been barely comprehended within the Established Church, under the leadership of James Ussher. After 1660 it was well and truly outside and could not be contained. The passage to self awareness and definition was difficult and uncertain for the Quakers, Independents, Scottish and English Presbyterians. But each succeeded in making their mark and contributed to the development and tradition of Protestant dissent in Ireland in the second half of the 17th century.

S BENNETT & SONS
- Bookbinders -

Tel. 985252