

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE OF PLUNDERED MINISTERS RELATING TO SUSSEX.

By FREDERICK ERNEST SAWYER, Esq., F.M.S.

(Continued from Vol. XXX.)

The Christian pastor, bowed to earth
With thankless toil, and vile esteemed.
KEBLE, *Christian Year*.
"Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity."

PART II.

BEFORE resuming this subject, it will be useful to glance again at the administration of ecclesiastical matters under the Long Parliament. The assistance of the Scotch troops against Charles I. was only obtained on condition of the English Parliament taking the Covenant and introducing Presbyterianism. The Scotch Commissioners stirred up the Parliament to reform the Church, and accordingly the latter passed an Act, entitled "An Act for the Calling an Assembly of learned and godly Divines, &c." In forming this assembly, one or two representatives were nominated by the Members of Parliament for each County; the Sussex members accordingly nominated "MASTER Benjamine Pickering, of Easthoatley, and MASTER Henry Ney [Nye], of Clapham."¹ In addition to these, Dr. Francis Cheynell, of Oxford (who afterwards received the Vicarage of Petworth), was a member, and John Maynard (Vicar of

¹ *House of Commons Journal*, 1642, and *Collection of Orders, &c., of Parliament*. Edward Husband, pp. 141 and 209.

Mayfield) was subsequently added by the Parliament, being termed "a superadded Divine." Sussex thus contributed four members to the Assembly (which is better known as the "Westminster Assembly"), and of these Henry Nye did not appear at all, whilst the others gave constant attendance.² Benjamin Pickering was inducted to the living of East Hoathly on December 24th, 1620.³ Sir Wm. Burrell gives no particulars as to Henry Nye, who was presumably Vicar of Clapham (Sussex). Francis Cheynell and John Maynard were both ejected in 1662 for Nonconformity, and Calamy gives their biographies.⁴

The Assembly was only permitted by the Long Parliament to advise and report, and one of its special functions, as already has been seen, was to examine the ministers nominated by the Parliament, or the "Committee of Plundered Ministers," or their local committees, and occasionally to ordain these ministers. The Assembly of Divines first sat in July, 1643, and continued to sit under that name until February 22nd, 1649.⁵ In process of time the Presbyterian majority met with great opposition from the growing sect of Independents (to which Cromwell belonged), and the result was the ultimate downfall of Presbyterianism. This took place some years before the Restoration, and the attempt of an alien race to force an alien religion on an unwilling nation failed, and it was consequently not unnatural that the Presbyterian preachers, who had been for some time in growing unpopularity, met with ejection in 1662.

The "Committee of Plundered Ministers" was assisted in the various counties by local committees. In an "Act for the Punishment of Scandalous Clergymen and Others," it was provided that the Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper might issue commissions as after:—

² Neal, *History of the Puritans*, iv., 47.

³ Add. MSS. 5697.

⁴ *Nonconformist Memorial*, Vol. III. See also as to Cheynell, S.A.C. XIV., 23; XVIII., 101; XXIV., 208; XXV., 209. And biography by Dr. Samuel Johnson in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1751, and notices in Neal's *History of the Puritans*. As to Maynard, see S.A.C. XXVI., 70.

⁵ *Penny Cyclopædia*—article on WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.

“*For the Countie of Sussex.*”

*Richard LORD Buckhurst, SIR Gregory Norton, *Sir William Morley, *SIR Thomas Pelham, KNIGHTS; *SIR Thomas Eversfeild THE ELDER, Henry Gerding, William Michelburne, *Herbert Hay, *John Baker, William Newton, Peter Farneden, *Edward Apsley, Henry Peck, Edward Higgons, *Herbert Boord, Thomas Jeffry, Henry Carleton, *James Temple, John Ailwyn, *Anthony Stapeley, *Herbert Morley, Edward Goring, Thomas Chase, Nicholas Wolfe, Richard Smith, Thomas Baker, *John Downes, George Oglander, ESQUIRES,”⁶ to enquire by the oaths of twelve lawful men of the following offences :—

“Not preaching the word of God six times at least in the space of one whole year by any Ecclesiastical person or persons under the age of Sixtie years, having cure of Soules, and not being thereunto letted or hindered by sicknesse or imprisonment, or of Blasphemy, wilfull and corrupt perjurie, and subordination (sic) of perjurie, Fornication, Adultery, common Alehouse or Tavern haunting, common drunkennesse, common prophane swearing and cursing.”⁷

It seems probable that the persons just referred to constituted the original Committees in Sussex, and that several other members were from time to time added by the Parliament.

With these remarks and quotations, we continue the proceedings respecting the various parishes.

BRAMBER.

On June 17th, 1645, the Committee “Ordered that Mr. ——— Minister of Bramber in the countie of Sussex doe make his psonall apparance before this Comittee

⁶ Those marked thus * were members of the Long Parliament, and sat for the following places :—Lord Buckhurst (disabled 1644), *East Grinstead*; Sir William Morley (disabled 1642), *Chichester*; Sir Thomas Pelham, *Sussex*; Sir Thomas Eversfield (disabled 1644), *Hastings*; Henry Hay (“Recruiter”), *Arundel*; John Baker (“Recruiter”), *East Grinstead*; Edward Apsley (“Recruiter”), *Steyning*; Herbert Borde (died), *Steyning*; James Temple (“Recruiter” and regicide), *Bramber*; Anthony Staply (regicide), *Sussex*; Herbert Morley (King’s Judge), *Lewes*; John Downes (regicide), *Arundel*. See List of Long Parliament in *Carlyle’s Life and Letters of Oliver Cromwell* (1871 edit.).

⁷ Husband’s *Orders, &c., of Parliament*, p. 134. This was one of the Acts presented to the King at Oxford in 1643, and to which his assent was refused.

on the first of July next to answer to all such matters as shall be objected agt him vpon an Informacon pferred agt him vnto this Committee whereof he is not to fail at his pill." (Add. MSS. 15,669, p. 92). On Aug. 9th they "Ordered that — Davenport be sumoned to make his apparance &c" on Sept. 3rd (p. 132). The death of Mr. Davenport stopped further proceedings, and on Nov. 29th a resolution "Ordered that the rectory of Bramber and Buttolph in the county of Sussex void by death & in the gift of Magdalen Coll. Oxon^s shall stand sequestred to the use of John Cheese Minister of the word," and referred him to the Assembly of Divines for examination (p. 215).

Burrell gives the following vicars of Bramber :—

"Lawrence Davenport Ind 2 Apr 1623. bur at Charlwood
9 Sep 1645

Jn Cheese Ind 19 Dec 1645 d 1658

Jn Cowdrey Ind 1658 Bur 9 July 1627"⁹

In "*The Contrebuttion of the Clergie &c towards the repair-
inge of St. Pauls Church*" in 1634 occurs "Lawrence
Davenport, parson of Bramburye xs per ann. for five
yeares."¹⁰

HOOE.

The Committee on June 28th, 1645, resolved, "Whereas the pishoners of Hooe in the county of Sussex have peticoned the Coittee y^t Mr. Wm. White minister of y^e word may be noiated to y^e sequestracon of y^e Vicarage of y^e said Church, It is ordered y^t y^e Coittee of Parliam^t sitting at Lewes be desired to inquire & informe themselves concerning y^e life & conversacon of y^e said Mr. White & his good affection to the Parliam^t & to satisfy this Coittee thereof" (15,669, p. 97). On Aug. 9th they "Ordered that the Vicarage of Hooe in the county of Sussex sequestered to the use of — Ward and by him relinquished shall stand sequestered to the use of William White minister of the word," and referred Mr. White to the Assembly (p. 131).

⁸ S.A.C. XXVI., 249.

⁹ Add. MSS. 5698, p. 373.

¹⁰ *Sussex Daily News*, Oct. 17, 1876.

Sir Wm. Burrell gives the following as Vicars of Hooe:—
 “ Jn Gilmore Bur 19 Jany 1625
 Robert Jeames Ind . . . Bur 10 May 1646
 Jn Moore Ind
 Jn Bushnell Ind 1658 July
 Wm. Watson Ind 8 Nov 1660
 Hen Fisher¹¹ Ind 1663 Bur 8 Sep 1680.”¹²

From this it seems probable that Robert Jeames was the Vicar who was sequestered.

ROTHERFIELD.

In the case of this parish we are able by the aid of Walker's MSS. to show clearly the nature and style of the charges brought against the clergy who were summoned before the “Committee of Plundered Ministers.”

On Feb. 25th, 1644, articles being preferred against John Large, Rector of Rotherfield, the Committee for Sussex were requested to examine witnesses for the defence, and to report to the London Committee (15,669, p. 19). Mr. Large then put in his defence, and this most interesting document, which is almost unique, was as follows:—

The humble defense and answeare of JOHN LARG, clerk, parson of Retherfield in the County of Sussex unto certaine Articles or Exceptions presented to the hono^rable Committee of Lewes by some few of the parishioners of Retherfield aforesayd wherein (as he humbly conceiveth) he is unjustly charged of malignancy to Religion and State.

To the first place This Defendant humbly desireth to give notice to this hono^rable Committee that the Articles above named have beene presented against this Defendant not soe much through his demeritts, as through a secret plotte and Combination of John Russell Edward Russell and John Calle who having a minister to theyre kinsman wanting a Living (Brother unto two of them and Nephew to the third) they have used his helpe and assistance in drawing up these Articles against this defendant; and by importunity or perswasion have drawn in John Cheeseman into theyre Confederacy: aiming and entending by the ruin of this defendant to bring in theyre kinsman into his place: whereby (as this Defendant humbly conceives) the Testimonyes of John Russell Edw: Russell John Calle and John Cheeseman w^{ch} they have delivered upon all or any of these Articles are all become of no validity against this defendant as being all partyes and Confederates against him: All w^{ch}

¹¹ S.A.C. XXX., 116, 117.

¹² Add. MSS. 5697, p. 145.

particulars before named this Defendant shall be able to prove by sufficient Testimony from the Confession of some of the forenamed Partyes; and humbly craveth liberty to produce his witnesses for prooffe of the practise.

This being promised This Defendant proceedeth to his answere of every Article in particular.

1. To the first This Defendant confessith that the Lords Abargavenny successively have bene patrons of the church of Retherfield; but that this Defendant was not presented by the sayd Lord (as in the article is presented) but by a Cittizen of London, to whom the advowson thereof was lawfully passed long before as by the said advowson and this Defendants Institution will appeare: furthermore he denyeth any intimate Correspondency wth any Papists whose erroures he is known to hate, and publicly to refute in all his sermons as occasion is offered; and if at any time he hath bene where such were it hath bene in regard of some earnest businesse wth others in theyre company being ever carefull not to give any cause of offence in this kind: The like alsoe he sayth concerning scandalous Ministers, whose Companies he never liked nor desired, nor did ever admitte any whom he knew to be such to come into his Pulpitte.

2. To the second he answeareth That ever since his coming to the said Parish he hath constantly had two sermons preached by himselfe or Curate every Lords day, except between November and february; when notwithstanding his Accusers in the midst of Sommer seldome or never came in the afternoones to hear the sermons: And that for the space of about three monthes in the shortest dayes of winter he hath usually preached but once a day; but not thereby to spare his own paynes (as his Accusers would suggest by this Article) but as he conceived for the more benefitte of his Parishioners many of w^hm dwelling three or foure miles or more from Church and being not able in those very short dayes to come againe thither in the afternoone, this Defendant therefore hath at those times ioyned both his Sermons for the day together and seldome or never preached lesse then neare 2 hours whereby those w^{ch} dwelt farre off might have benefitte of the whole dayes exercise as well as those neare adioyning; And yet notwithstanding this double taste in the morning, whensoever he hath seene any considerable number at church in the afternoone, he hath not omitted preaching to them those times alsoe: And in his Sermons hath delivered nothing but sound and orthodox doctrine and that also in such a manner as he conceived agreeable to the peoples capacities who doe all (except the accusers) generally professe to have received noe little comfort and edification thereby.

3. To the third he answeareth That the monethly fasts¹³ have ever bene solemnly observed by this Defendant and never omitted at any time since the beginning; but that he hath usually (as is sayd in the former Article) delivered all his meditations for the day together, and preached soe much the longer in the forenoones; the reason whereof hath bene

¹³ These were an institution of the Long Parliament. See *House of Commons Journals*.

because he hath found himselfe in the mornings more fresh and able to performe a double exercise, then to reserve parte thereof till the afternoones when by fasting all the day he hath found himself many times faint and feeble; w^{ch} course and reason of his this Defendant never heard disliked by any untill the exhibition of these Articles against him; and now doth striue wth his owne weaknesse, and preacheth twice those dayes: Neither did he ever knowe or heare of any abuse of those dayes unreproved (as suggested in the Article) or to his power unpunished.

4. To the fourth this Defendant answereth That he hath evermore kept all dayes and in such a manner as hath bene appoynted by Order of the honorable house of Parliam^t: except onely one, w^{ch} he never knew or heard of untill the day was past wherein the Thanksgiving should have bene performed; And then alsoe would have appoynted another day for the same, but that he was advised that he might not doe it of himself without the direction of those in Authority.

5. To the fifth he sayth That never any warrant or any other thing sent from the Parliam^t and directed to be read by the minister coming to his hands or knowledge, hath at any time bene left unpublished And sayth that he hath been ever forward (both by his ready Contribution to all Taxes and by his carefull furnishing those Armes wherewth he is charged) to do his best endeavoure for the safety of this county and kingdome; and hath alsoe advised others to doe the same.

6. To the sixth this Defendant answereth That, that unjust aspersion of being a Neuter or a close enemy to the State expressed in this Article is onely the uncharitable Judgment of those few persons who are his accusers and in noe wise the opinion of the Parishioners concerning him as is here suggested; As it appeareth by a generall Certificate and Testimoniall under the hands of above two hundred of the chiefe Inhabitants (there being but few more housholders in all the parish) amongst whom alsoe almost half those witnesses w^{ch} were produced against this defendant sayth That having bene but a small time in the Countrey he hath little or noe friendship or acquaintance wth any but those of his owne Parish amongst whom he knoweth not any for ill affected as is here suggested: And alsoe sayth that he hath endeavoured often to gaine the friendship (and frequent Company) even of his accusers; striving evermore as much as in him lay, to live peaceably wth all men.

7. To the seaventh this Defendant answereth That beside the generall Testimoniall of the Parishes mentioned in his Answere to the last foregoing Article wherein is testified the solemne taking and giving of the Covenant: This Defendant sayth alsoe that he did publiquely reade both the Covenant and the Exhortation made by the Assembly of Divines unto the Parishioners in the pulpit, and appoynted to them the next Lords day after for theyr subscribing: At w^{ch} time to this Defendants noe little Comforte and as he hoped to the content of the whole parish generally subscribed theyr names thereunto; not any one to his knowledge making the least shew of unwillingnesse: All whose hands are kept upon Record as an undoubted Testimony of the Truth hereof which this defendant is able to produce.

8. To the eighth this Defendant confesseth that in his prayers he hath

usually used such like terms and Phrases as in this Article are expressed: w^{ch} he never heard disliked or blamed by any man before the exhibition of these articles and that now he hath left out whatsoever therein might be taken amisse. But wthall he addeth that he hath never omitted dayly to pray for the grave Senators of o^r land assembled in the high court of Parliament and for a blessing upon all theyre proceedings w^{ch} his accusers have purposely overpassed in this article.

9. To the ninth he professeth That in his most secret desires, he hath ever beene a hartly well wisher unto Reformation, but that he hath beene fearfull of himselfe to innovate or alter any thing established without direction and order from those in Authority: And that he hath often to this purpose professid both to his accusers and others, That whensoever there should come any orders from the honor^{ble} house of Parliam^t or from any others in authority deputed by them concerning these or any other indifferent things in the Church: this Defendant would be one of the first and forwardest that would carefully endeavoure to observe theyre directions.

10. To the Tenth he says That about a month after this Defendant came into the country Mr. Goffe¹⁴ of East Grinstead mentioned in the article came unto Retherfield having formerly some acquaintance with a gentleman of that Parish and proffered to preach on the fast day; and the next day being to travaile about businesse further into the country as he affirmed for that he would not reach home in time convenient to his owne Cure, he desired an exchange for the next Lords day following wth this defendants Curate to whose request upon the Instance of the foresayd Gentleman wth whom he had some acquaintance this Defendant yeilded: But neither was the sayd Mr. Goffe at that time sequestred neither did this defendant know him then to be obnoxious or offensive unto any: And as for those passages in his sermon; mentioned in the Article the Defendant doth not remember any such; neither doe the witnesses produced thereupon (as he humbly conceiueth) agree in theyre relations upon all particulars And as touching Mr. Dawson mentioned in this article, he was sonne unto one who was formerly neighbour to this defendant in Hertfordshire, who coming to teache schoole at Wadhurst, and hearing that this defendant lived soe neare him he came over and proffered himself to preach, w^{ch} he did onely once but neither doe these accusers in this Article any way disallowe his doctrine then delivered; and alsoe at that time soe farre as this Defendant knoweth he was a man of unblamed reputation howsoever afterwards he was reported to degenerate and to followe idle courses.

To the LAST he answeareth That Mr. John Rickner the curate was not a man of this defendants choyse or bringing into the Parish but that he had served in that place 3 yeares before this defendants Induction (as all the Parish can testify) during the life of the former Incumbent: And that when this Defendant came first unto the Parish, divers of the chiefe Inhabitants having had so long experience of him, and approving his life and doctrine, desired this Defendant to continue him in the same place w^{ch} he had in the time of his Predecessore: to whose reasonable

¹⁴ See *post*, under EAST GRINSTEAD.

request (as he conceived) this Defendant condescended and hath continued him soe ever since : But neither hath this defendant to his best remembrance ever heard him invective in that kind as is expressed in the Article neither did these Accusers or any other ever make any complaynt concerning him to this Defendant : who would not have continued him in that place if he had found him iustly offensive unto any.

All w^{ch} Allegations expressed in this Answere being cleared by sufficient Testimony this defendant humbly prayeth that he may not be exposed as a Pray to those his few accusers who for their owne private ends have sought his Ruine : But that what imperfections soever shall yet appeare in this Defendant before this wise and hono^rable Committee may be considered as erreours incident to humane frailty and in noe wise proceeding from obstinacy or Contempt : And wthall this Defendant humbly desireth the direction of this grave Committee concerning such things as they shall iudge materiall for the time to come : whose Orders and Admonitions this defendant shall ever carefully endeavor to observe : hoping thereby to live far from any such future trouble or accusation that he may wth quietnesse and diligence attend the duties of his calling. And this defendant shall ever pray &c.

ENDORSED : " Dr. Large's answer to the articles exhibited ag^t him & for w^{ch} his living was sequestered."

The following certificate accompanies the copy of defence :—

I. John Scotchburn¹⁵ Vicar of Frant which was formerly part of Rotherfield parish in Sussex among other papers received this from M^{rs}. Cogger widow of Thomas Cogger executor to D^r Large who was deprived of Rotherfield Living, And it appears by D^r Large's other writings to be his own hand as M^{rs} Cogger and her daughter can attest. I received this paper of M^{rs} Cogger but last January.

Witness my hand

JOHN SCOTCHBURN

Vicar of Frant

September the 4th
1712.

(Walker MSS.)

On May 10th, 1645, "the cause against M^r Large parson of Rotherfield," was appointed for 3rd June, (15,669, p. 71), but on the 15th they appointed 24th June, and "M^r Large is to have convenient notice" (p. 83). On May 24th, a petition of John Large, for a copy

¹⁵ Burrell gives John Scotchburn as inducted to the living of Frant on May 25th, 1702, and buried there Apl. 1st, 1741. He succeeded Thomas Cogger, who was inducted on May 10th, 1671, and buried on Sept. 7th, 1701. Add. MSS. 5697, p. 416. The will of Thomas Fabian, dated Feb. 10th, 1651, refers to his "cosen John Large, minister of Rotherfield," and "Ann Cogger, niece to the said John Large" (S.A.C. XXVIII., 189).

of examination of witnesses, as *he was not allowed* to be present during the examination,¹⁶ was read and referred to the Sussex Committee “to state if he were warned & were present” (p. 80), and on the same day the Committee “sumoned witnesses ad testificand agt John Large” for June 24th (p. 82). A partial examination no doubt took place then, for there is an order on that day for Mr. Large to have copies of the examinations and no further witnesses to be called (p. 94). On July 5th some additional articles were appointed to be heard on the 15th July, and warrants were issued for summoning witnesses (p. 101). Nothing further is stated about the case, but Mr. Large was eventually sequestered, as appears by the following notes in Walker’s MSS. :—

“Mr Large Minister of Rotherfield in Sussex a living of 3 hun. pound a year was also summoned by Cheynel to appear before him to answer to such crimes as he was accusd of, accordingly he came and brought 2 lawyers along with him, the better to secure himself against Cheynills subtily. He was accus’d of being a profane Sabbath breaker in collecting tithes on the L^{ds} day and of being superstitiously inclin’d for breaking a cake over a brides head: to the first he answer’d that his parish was 7 miles long and that after evening prayer when some of his parishioners, y^t lived at a great distance were at Church his servant without his knowledge or concent, did indeed ask a man for some moneys he ow’d but that being no act of his, he hoped he was not to answer for it as to the other he told Cheynel y^t he had indeed broake a cake as was usuall in his parish for the minister over a brides head; yt twas a custom which had long prevailed in his parish and w^{ch} he thought might be inoffensive in itself neither good nor bad, as many other received customs were: when he had made this or the like answer his friends he brought along with stood up in order to second his vindication, but were forbidden to speak and the crimes layd to his charge were judg’d notorious enough by those saints to deprive him of his living tho’ they had not one thing to object against his morals being a person of an unblemished life and conversation.”—(*Walker’s Sufferings, MSS., Vol. IV., Ltr. 876.*)

In his published work, Walker says of Mr. Large, “his judges would not permit his counsel to speak, but sequestered him” (Vol. II., p. 279).

Further explanations are given in the following letter addressed to the Rev. Joshua Thornton :—

¹⁶ S.A.C. XXX., 114.

“ Hamsey, near Lewes in Sussex.

Oct. 8, 1712.

Rev^d Sr

I have at y^r request waited on M^{rs} Cogger who lives in Southover juxta Lewes: She owns her self Neice to D^r Large (made a d^r wⁿ y^e great duke of Tuscany visited this Realme our 2 celebrated universitys) more dignify'd by having been a confessor in y^e days of y^e great Rebellion. The story is short is this (as she informs me) D^r Cheynel y^e Theologist of Chichester and Vintner or Winter¹⁷ whom they call'd Dr alsoe tho' I doubt whether ever a graduate, were travelling together & consulting how to sequester M^r Large they acknowledged to each other y^t they could not attack his moralls but resolv'd on y^e charge of Insufficiency they were in a lane wⁿ they held this conference Mr Couch y^e father of this M^{rs} Cogger Rector of Horsmanden in Kent was leading his horse on y^e other side a thick hedge up a hill & overheard Cheynel and Vintner holding this dialogue (who was B^r in law to M^r Large) M^{rs} Cogger adds y^t one Cawley came in his Rectory wⁿ he was sequestered but whether y^e son of Cawley y^e Regicide she knows not. S^r I am an old man & y^e ways are grown deep and dirty or I would have travell'd farther into this affair but I have engag'd a friend of mine & in y^e neighborhood of Rotherfeild to make y^e nicest search & enquiry into & will send w^t he can get well attested to Mr Rich: Wilkins Mr Walkers Bookseller as soon as possible. I am sorry there was not a more early & timely care to preserve y^e minutes to memoirs of our martyrs & confessors in those days of rebuke and blasphemy. We were on y^e brinks of y^e same precipice very lately: we are yet scarcely safe G^d deliver me from my self & from y^e tender mercys of y^t Enthusiastical Brood y^t has once already sacrificed Ch.: & state

I am Rev^d Sr in all humilyty

Yr fireind & B^r

JO: SHORE.¹⁸

Pardon this scrawl having had company ever since I rec^d y^r letter. ora pro nobis.

Addressed—To the Rever'd Mr Joshua

Thornton Rect' of Sutton

nigh Arundell

Sussex.”

by bag.

(Walker's MSS. Biographical Letters and Papers, Vol V.)

This letter appears to have been enclosed in the following letter:—

“To Mr. Walker.

Rev^d Sr.

Having rec^d an acc^t from a Neighbour of mine, M^r Thomas Newcomb, of your intention to publish an acc^t of the sufferings of the

¹⁷ See notes under COWFOLD *post*.

¹⁸ John Shore was inducted to the living of Hamsey in 1674, and continued until May 5th, 1722.—Add. MSS., 5698, p. 102.

Clergy of the church of England in y^e time of the troubles & the great Rebellion in England &c. And being willing to give you w^t assistance I could in so good a work: At the aforesaid M^r Newcombs request M^r Amey [vicar of Eartham neare Chichester¹⁹] and I my self [who am Rector of Sutton neare Chichester] but nearest Petworth did joyntly concurr in giving you the best account that we could of the sufferings of the Clergy in the West end of the County of Sussex viz^t in and about Midhurst and Petworth and Chichester. But I must beg leave to acquaint you that in the relation w^{ch} we gave you of the sufferings of Mr John Sefton [one of y^e four Residentiaries of Chichester] upon a more narrow enquire, I have found one circumstance thereof not to have been grounded on good authority The particular circumstance w^{ch} I mean was this. That the s^d Mr Sefton did abscond for a considerable time in a Lodge [or Watch-House] belonging to the Warren called the Gumber in Slindon parish neare Chichester w^{ch} I supposed was not inhabited But upon farther enquire into that affair I find that, that Lodge was then inhabited, and that he only resorted thither as he did to his other friends Houses and did not suffer so much hardship there, as was at the first represented.

I desire therefore that y^t Mistake may be corrected before it be made publick.

For one thing more also [in the acc^t w^{ch} we gave you as abovesaid] I must crave your excuse. And that is for the fabulous acc^t given you of y^e sufferings of Mr Large the then Rector of Retherfeild [a parish of great extent in the Eastern parts of Sussex about 40 miles distant from M^r Amey and myself] w^{ch} I had often heard a Gentleman of my acquaintance relate according to the acc^t w^{ch} we then gave you of it, But I have [this present summer] found it to be altogether groundless frivolous and false acc^t as appears by this inclosed copy of Mr Larges his answer to the Articles exhibited against him, w^{ch} were of his own hand writing. This inclosed copy of M^r Large's answer I rec^d the 4th day of September 1712 of M^r John Scotchburn now vicar of Frant very neare Tunbridge Wells who saith he rec^d it in January last past from M^{rs} Cogger widow of Thomas Cogger his immediate predecessor in the said vicarage of Frant And that the said Thomas Cogger was Executor to the said D^r Large; by w^{ch} means all D^r Larges papers came into his hands And altho I had heard that the Articles for which he was sequestered were exhibited against him at Petworth. Yet I find by D^r Larges answer [of his own hand writing as aforesaid] that the Committee met at Lewes in Sussex to do it.

I find also by the said Answer to the said Articles that the right name of the said parish is Retherfield²⁰ & not Rotherfield and that it is a Rectory.

By an account w^{ch} I have very lately rec^d from the Reverend M^r Jo Shore of Hamsey near Lewes in Sussex w^{ch} at my request he went to M^{rs} Cogger for she was now dwelling neare him viz^t in South over near Lewes aforesaid And who also owns her self Neece to D^r Large. I find

¹⁹ Inducted 1664, continued until Aug. 2nd, 1714.—Add. MSS., 5699, p. 483.

²⁰ This appears to be a blunder, though in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, Vol. I., p. 339, it is spelt "Retherfeld."

that he was made Doctor wⁿ the great Duke of Tuskany came into England and went to see our two Universities. And that it being resolved on by the Rump party to sequester M^r Large as his title then was Two of the leading and ruling if I may not more properly call them Over-Ruling men among them, D^r Francis Cheynell²¹ the then parson of Petworth upon the sequestration or eject^{mt} of Bp King who held the parsonage of Petworth in Commendam wth his Bishoprick And Vinter or Winter whose Xtian name I think I have heard was George; And I suppose he was the parson of Cowfold not far from Horsham in Sussex, But I dont doubt but that you have had a more particular acc^t of him from some other hand living nearer to him. The two persons before named D^r Cheynell & Vinter M^{rs} Cogger affirm'd to M^r Shore that her father M^r Coach Rector of Horsmonden in Kent as he was leading his horse up a hill on the other side a thick hedge did over-heare them consulting to sequester M^r Large w^{ch} both of them acknowledging in her fathers hearing that they could not do for immorality They therefore resolved on the charge of insufficiency And adds that this conference was held in a lane And to aggravate M^r Larges misfortune if I rightly understand M^r Shores relation of M^{rs} Coggers of her Unckle D^r Large's sufferings which I do also send you the aforesaid Vinter was Brother in Law to D^r Large. But in D^r Large's answer to the articles Exhibited against him w^{ch} I here send you to peruse I dont find any answer at all to any Article of Insufficiency as objected ag^t him Or at least that seems not to have been objected against him by his accusers in his own parish.

But for your farther satisfaction in that affair I here also send you M^r Shores letter to me upon that subject. And if it be thought worthy to record the dangers wth w^{ch} some of our Bretheren were threatened, tho' not actually sequestred. Aquila Cruso²² my predecessor in the Rectory of Sutton near Petworth in Sussex in w^{ch} Rectory I have been inducted full 30 years as my father was likewise before me more than 20 years a small living of about 80^l p ann. though he had lost a prebendary of Chichester of 30^l p ann. value called the Lecture prebend (if I mistake not the name) by the iniquitie of those times in the Common Ship-wreck of the church. Yet not content with depriving him of so considerable a branch of his small Revenue for his subsistence having nothing else to subsist & live upon besides this Parsonage of Sutton (of w^{ch} I am now possest) Three noted Tryers²³ whose names for the credit of there Families I forbear to mention were sent to him being then resident in the Parsonage House of Sutton, to examine his sufficiency who beggin leave of them To give them an acc^t of his faith in writing or to write a letter as my informant called it.

He brought a short acc^t of it written in Greek & Hebrew, w^{ch} none (!!) of his Tryers being able to read, They withdrew from him and tooke w^t he had written along with them. And I dont doubt but D^r. Cheynell

²¹ See *ante*, note 4.

²² Aquila Cruso, B.D., was "Prebendary of Wattering" (Wittering).—Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, II., p. 13. Buried Nov. 13th, 1660.—Add. MSS., 5699, p. 242.

²³ In March, 1653, Cromwell appointed a "Board of Triers" to examine all ministers.—*History of England*, Macfarlane and Thomson (1870), II., p. 618.

of Petworth saw it before they went to bed that night. My Parsonage house in Sutton being but 3 miles from Petworth, And my neighbour who gives me these particulars relating to M^r Cruso tells me, that it was thought they suffer'd him to continue in his Living, because he was then about 70 years of Age, & could not live much longer. Neither could they with any colour of truth fix a charge of insufficiency upon him whose faith soar'd in a sphere above their capacity. William Langley a person of about 73 years of Age a knowing and observing man a small farmer or yeoman gives me this acc^t.

The papers of the aforesaid Mr Aquila Cruso descending to me from my father as they did to my father Mr Thomas Thornton Administrator to his immediate predecessor the s^d Aquila Cruso upon acc^t of the Dilapidations, None of the kindred being willing to accept the administration as well knowing it would not satisfie & defray the charge of his dilapidations.

And finding among his other papers the summons sent him from the Commissioners appointed by Oliv^r Cromwell for ejecting whom they were pleased to call Scandalous Ignorant & Insufficient Ministers I have herewith sent you the same if you think it worthy of your perusal But I never found or saw any copy of such articles so exhibited ag^t him as is here said to be sent him together with this summons for his appearing before the said Commissioners at Billingshurst the 14th day of May 1655. Neither do I find that he did ever send or give any other answer to any such articles saue onely w^t is here annexed to his summons w^{ch} I myself know and do attest to be M^r Cruso's own handwriting And w^{ch} Mr Cruso being 70 years of Age and at that particular time labouring under great infirmities of body as by a copy of a letter now in my custody dated July the 10th 1655 sent to Mr Richard Knowles one of those Commissioners and then a Justice of the Peace I find he did and sent to y^e commissioners by two of his parishioners viz^t James Fford and Thomas Standen w^{ch} I think is a sufficient testimonial from his parishioners of his sober life and good learning and that they desired he might be continued to be their minister And utterly disowned their exhibiting any articles of charge ag^t him. And to do justice to his memory if I may be allow'd to cast in my mite I must say y^t he left behind him a general good character for a man of great learning and several of his sermons & papers were sent up to London to his relations by his immediate successor my father, to be printed w^{ch} whether printed or not I never heard

But whether Mr. Cruso's summons to appear before the Commissioners for ejecting Ministers may be of any other use to you I know not save only to shew the general form of their summons to convene Clergymen before them in order to sequester their Churches and Livings.

I must crave leave to add one circumstance as an aggravation of D^r Large's sufferings w^{ch} is That being sequestred he was succeeded by Mr. Cawley as Mr Shore saith in his letter that M^{rs} Cogger owned to him. And M^r John Scotchburn the present vicar of Frant a parish formerly taken out of Retherfield parish acknowledged to me in September last past that the parson who succeeded D^r Large in the Rectory of Rether-

field wⁿ sequestred was Mr Cawley²⁴ as he had been well informed since his settling there. And that he not only continued there untill the Kings restoration But by an agreement made then with D^r Larges continued there one year after the Kings return And was afterwards made Archdeacon of Lincon And that his father was one of y^e Regicides.²⁵ And I had heard a considerable number of years since from other persons towards the western part of this County of Sussex That M^r Cawley son of the Regicide of that name came to Bp King at Chichester and tooke Episcopal orders from him ; at the Kings return and that he continued in a great Living in the Eastern parts of Sussex, and that this Retherfield was the same living There is another instance of one M^r Bradshaw who died possess'd of the small rectory of Egden not worth full 30^{li} per Ann about 2 miles from Petworth & as far from my church of Sutton But not living long there before his death was not so well known abroad as he might otherwise have been. Concerning whom I have been credibly informed That he had been possess'd of a living of much better value in Barkshire but w^t the name of it was or for w^t cause dispossess'd of that living my informer could not tell me who having shewed more than ordinary zeal for & in the cause of the church and the King, was one while so hotly pursued, that he was forc'd to abscond the greatest part of one summer in a Wood and Associate himself with a Collier in Kent, And was reduced to such streights for a subsistence that he was forced afterwards to get his Bread and livelyhood by keeping a small Alehouse a small distance off from the great road w^{ch} leads from Guildford to London between Ripley and Cobbam

John Munger an antient man in Sandy Chappell 5 miles off told me in the month of March last past That he knew the same Mr Bradshaw when he dwelt there and kept the said Ale-house by Thomas Gibson a maltster near Egden told me the same and some others.

Whether you may think this instance worthy of your cognizance I cant tell; But not remembring that M^r Amey or myself gave any account of it among other instances formerly given you & haveing thought it necessary to rectifie some mistakes in our former acc^t I have adventured to give you some account of this too: Leaving it to your discretion to make w^t use of it you judge proper. And having nothing more of this kind to trouble you with at present begge leave to subscribe

Str. Your most humble servant

JOSHUA THORNTON.²⁶

Sutton neare Petworth
in Sussex. October the 18.
1712.

²⁴ His name is not mentioned in the Burrell MSS. John Large appears to have been reinstated after the Restoration, and was buried at Rotherfield, Feb. 7th, 1672-3.—Add. MSS., 5697, p. 570.

²⁵ William Cawley, Esq. (who represented Midhurst in the Long Parliament), was one of the Regicides. See *List of Long Parliament* in Carlyle's *Life and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (1871 edit.).

²⁶ Burrell gives in the Vicars of Sutton—Thos. Thornton, A.M. (Vicar, 1666), bur. Feb. 4th, 1681; Joshua Thornton (Vicar, 1682), bur. Sep. 30th, 1735.—Add. MSS., 5699, p. 246.

The letter enclosed was as follows :—

Rev^d Sir,

How far our Church stands indebted to you for your attempt, is not in my power to express. But y^e encouragem^t you give for further Intelligence has embolden'd me to transmit unto you the following particulars whereof you may make w^t use you see proper.

[Then follows the paragraph about Henry Shepherd. See Vol. XXX. KINGSTON.]

Mr Calamy after his manner censures M^r Wood for saying that D^r Cheynell was little better than distracted towards the close of his life²⁷ He might have said perfectly distracted, by Intervals at least ; w^{ch} is a thing y^t was notoriously known for truth in this countrey (tho' the distemper might run in the blood) I have heard it affirmed by several persons of good credit & particularly by old M^r Zacheus Montagu late Rector of Radmill close by me who had personal acquaintance with the doctor & he gave me this special Instance of his distraction that he appeared one day stark naked in a Balcony I think it was in Lewes town tho I am not certain of this circumstance. He was y^e man y^t behav'd so egregiously at Mr Chillingworth's grave²⁸ upon whose monum^t in Chichester Cloysters there was something inscrib'd at first that expressed Cheynells scurvey treatment of that most worthy person ; w^{ch} was afterwards eras'd by the procurem^t of y^e D^rs son. A very honest and well principled Gent : lately deceased in this neighbourhood M^r Mountagu²⁹ told me that D^r Cheynel had conceived a personal grudge against M^r Chillingworth ever since they were Contemporaries and Antagonists in y^e University, where M^r Chillingworth being his over match, used to maul and baffle him. This M^r Montagu had been himself a man of the times and of considerable note among the parties when he had a congregational church in the cliff by Lewes a Gentlewoman of good repute in that town M^{rs} Panton by name applied herself to him to be admitted to the Sacram^t of w^m he demanded an account of her faith. What acc^t will you have said she ? Shall I repeat the Apostles creed ? No said he but I must have another account in writing under your hand *that I may produce it before Gods tribunal (!)* or else how shall I be able to justify your admittance ? this M^{rs} Panton affirmed for truth to the Rev^d M^r Thomas Whalley³⁰ late Rector of the Cliff (from whose mouth I had it) who was a very honest man a solid scholar and divine and father to M^r Sam Whalley now beneficed in your county and surrogate at Totness.

²⁷ Calamy says, *Nonconformist Memorial*, Vol. ix., "Tho' he had been somewhat deranged, he was perfectly recovered before he left Petworth." Burrell however, says Dr. Cheynell "died crazed about 3 years after the loss of the living." —Add. MSS., 5699, p. 190.

²⁸ S.A.C. XIV., 23.

²⁹ No doubt the same person as Zacheus Montagu, Vicar of St. Thomas-at-Cliffe. S.A.C. XXVI., 26.

³⁰ S.A.C. XXVI., 27.

Six and twenty years ago I officiated at a place called Twineham, Sussex, & boarded with two ancient yeomanly people of a good character. They sometimes talked much of the famous M^r Vinter, w^m they knew originally, & what they said of him was partly confirmed by others. In the beginning of the Rebellion he acted the zealous Loyalist preaching strenuously for church and King till matters going as they went, he changed notes and tacked about to the strongest side, upon the Restoration my Landlady affirmed that she heard him deliver himself thus in Cowfold church close by Twineham. It is said the common prayer must be read again in our churches but I do assure you that if there was a gallows erected in that place and the Common Prayer book laid in this desk I would chuse to be trussed up on that Gallows before ever I would read the common Prayer. Being a leading man among the party many of the neighbouring ministers consulted him in that Juncture about y^e Articles of conformity from which he zealously dissuaded them all, Severall followed his advice and by name M^r Fish who wants not his red letters in M^r Calamy's calendar.³¹ Yet M^r Vinter himself conformed kept Cowfold and together with it got in time the fat benefice of Retherfield³² where in his old age in King James 2 Reign he was preparing for another turn even to Rome itself if times had held and previous to it began to give out He never knew before y^t y^e Papists had such good reasons for their Religion. This the Gentlemen of Mayfield parish next adjoining told me for truth in M^r Vinters lifetime.

Upon your revoking the pretended reasons for M^r Large's ejection out of that living and assigning no others I went to his widow a grave judicious matron who after her former husbands death married M^r Montagu aforementioned and now lives about a mile and a half from me W^a I proposed the question to her she told me that M^r Large was a person every way unexceptionable and that they had no colour of reason for his ejection^{mt} besides the temptation of his benefice concerning which this story was currant. Soon after a certain gent meeting wth one that had done the execution asked him why they turned out D^r Large? For his bad living said the other. No replied the Gentleman, but it was for his good living, alluding to the sole Inducement from the richness of the Prize.

I shall trouble you no further but beg your excuse for this interruption who am

Yo^r very humble servant & Brother

Ri: OWEN.³³

Iford near Lewes in Sussex

May 23. 1716.

To the Rev^d D^r John Walker.

(Walker's MSS., &c., Vol. V.)

³¹ Robert Fish was ejected from the living of Nuthurst, Sussex, in 1662, and afterwards taught a school at Ockley.—Calamy *Nonconformist Memorial*, Vol. III., p. 324.

³² George Winter (? Vinter) was inducted to the living of Rotherfield April 3rd, 1673.—Add. MSS. 5697, p. 570.

³³ Vicar of Iford, June 29th, 1709, ob. Feb. 27th, 1732.—Add. MSS., 5698, p. 129.

In the list of Vicars of Rotherfield, Burrell gives "Jn Large. Ind.—B 7 Feb 1672-3—Geo. Winter. Ind. 3 apl 1673." The *Par. Reg.* records:—"Burials. . . . wife of Jn Large minister Feb 27. 1650 : Jn Large D.D. Feb 7. 1672-3." (*Add. MSS.* 5697, pp. 570 and 571). It is evident that Dr. Large must have re-married, as it appears from the above letter of the Rev. Richard Owen that Dr. Large's widow married Mr. Montagu.

ICKLESHAM.

On June 28th, 1645, it was "Ordered that Michael Suep minister of Iclesham in the county of Sussex doe attend the Coittee on the 10th of July next to answeere the Articles agt him & that warrants shall issue for sumōning pties & witnesses on both sides" (15,669, p. 99). Accordingly on that day it was resolved that "This Coittee taking into consideracon the differences between M^r Suep minister of Icclesham in the county of Sussex and divers of his pishoners they find that it chiefly ariseth in regard he is not in orders & therefore could not officiate as Curate there but for that he is now attending upon the Divines for ordinacon and hath already passed their exaicon & hath pmised that he will officiate according to the Directory³⁴ this Coittee doe dis-misse the said cause" (p. 109).

The authorities (from these resolutions) seem to have been very careless in appointing unordained clergy.

Burrell does not mention Suep, but gives Tho^s Bunbridge as Vicar in 1620 & Jn Harris in 1691.³⁵

LEOMINSTER (OR LYMINSTER).

The only reference to this parish is in a resolution on June 14th, 1645, "Ordered that this Coittee will respitt any proceedings about the Church of Lymster in the county of Sussex for one month upon y^e Lre from y^e Coittee in the said County & in regard it is informed the said Church is in y^e guift of Eaton Colledge it is ordered that y^e lre & peticon therein inclosed be deliued to him (sic.) in the meantime" (15,669, p. 89).

³⁴ An ordinance of the Long Parliament, on August 11th, 1645, established a Directory for Public Worship. See *A Collection of Orders, &c., of Parliament*, Edward Husband.

³⁵ *Add. MSS* 5697, p. 151.

Sir Wm. Burrell states that the Patron was "Eton College The Bishop nominates." He gives the following Vicars:—

"Tho ^s Hearne Ind	1605	Bur 26 Mar 1632
Geo. Edgeley Ind		1634
Jn Gouge Ind		1669 & 1674." ³⁶

In the *Contribution of the clergie towards the rebuilding of St. Paules Church* in 1634 occurs "George Boylee, vicar of Dorington [? Durrington] and vicar of Leominster tenn shilling p ann for five yeeres 00^l 10^s 00^d"³⁷

WIVELSFIELD.

The Committee on April 5th, 1645, resolved "Whereas Thomas Moore of Wivelsfield in the county of Sussex Esq^{re} hath made his Comp^{it} that some of the s^d parish haue uppon false informacon to the Committee for the s^d County procured one James Nicholls to be by them placed in the cure of the church there wch doth solely (as hee alleadgeth) belong to him to provide for being the undoubted patron thereof This Committee doe desire the Committee for the s^d County to make a narrative of the true facts of the case depending or wch hath depended before them in the pmisses and to certify the same to this Committee wth convenient speede" (15,669, p. 52). On May 3rd the cause was adjourned to the 24th, and from then to June 3rd (pp. 66 & 80). On the latter date it was ordered "This Comittee having taken into consideracon the cause betweene M^r Moore Impropriator of the Church of Wieuelsfield in the county of Sussex & the pishoners of the said pish concerning the minister settled there by the Coittee for the said county for the settling of whom the said M^r More claymeth right this Coittee thinke not fitt to make any determinacon therein as yet & doe therefore dismisse the cause for the time" (p. 86).

Sir Wm. Burrell gives no particulars of Vicars at this period. A previous volume states that the pulpit was "filled by a *Presbyterian jack-maker, drummer, and maltman in turns!*"³⁸ We cannot say which of these occupations James Nicholls followed. The rectory was originally the property of St. Pancras Priory, and on the dissolution of the monasteries was granted to an

³⁶ Add. MSS. 5697, pp. 166-167.

³⁷ *Sussex Daily News*, Oct. 17, 1876.

³⁸ S.A.C. IV., 259 *et seq.*

ancestor of Mr. Moore.³⁹ After the restoration (in 1661) there were disputes between the Bishop and Mr. Moore (or More), which are fully set out in Vol. IV. of the Collections.

ARDINGLY.

The Committee on June 24th, 1645, on consideration of "the petition of M^r Braine to whom the rectory of Erthingly in the county of Sussex is sequestred," setting out the opposition and affronts he received, referred the matter "to the Committee for the s^d County sitting at Lewes," who were desired to examine the same calling on the parties complained of and then to certify (15,669, p. 93). The following draft letter appears in the minute book:—

"To the R^t Woth

*Spence*⁴⁰ *Esq* these p^{sent}

The Committee for Plundered Ministers (whereof I haue the chaire) haue beene very sensible not onely of the sad condicon of M^r Braine, minister of Erthingly in the county of Sussex, settled there by sequestration of this Committee but of the authority of Parliam^t, much vilified & contemned by certaine turbulent persons by whom his Ministry and the publick exercise thereof is scorned & disturbed, yea his person affronted. They haue therefore commanded me to recommend his case vnto yoⁿ & in their name to desire yoⁿ to secure & p^{tect} the s^d M^r Braine from such riotous & abusive practices by such wayes and meanes as to yo^r wisdome shall seeme meete soe that yoⁿ shall doe herein as it shall tend to the quiet of the s^d place and the encouragem^t of the s^d minister in the comfortable discharge of his duty there soe will the Committee look vpon it as an acceptable service vnto them

Yo^r friend & servant"

[no signature] (*Ib.* p. 93)

Julii 1
1645

³⁹ *Ib.*

⁴⁰ Spence was presumably Chairman of the Lewes Committee, and a Justice of the Peace. In an Ordinance of the Long Parliament, on March 21st, 1643, adding names to the Committee for Sussex, "Robert Spence Esq." is mentioned. See Husband's *Orders, &c., of Parliament*, p. 10.

On July 29th "It is ordered that Mr Brayne to whom the rectory of Ardingly in the county of Sussex is sequestred doe shew cause before this Committee, wherefore Mr Bladworth from whom the same is sequestred should not have a fift pt⁴¹ of the pfitts of the said rectory, on this day fortnight (p. 121). The Committee on Aug. 19th considered Mr. Brayne's allegations, but Mrs. Bladworth not being present the cause was adjourned to 27th Oct., and unless good answer was made by that day the 5th to be discharged" (p. 142). The opposition to Mr. Braine continued, and the following letter occurs in the minute book :—

"To the right wr^{ll} Spence Esq^r these p^{sent}

Sir

I was formerlie comaunded to trouble you from the Comittee for plundered ministers wth the case of Mr Braine minister at Ardingly whome the violent & outrageous behavior of diuers ill affected psons hath not only much hindered & discouraged in the exercise of the ministry but hazzarded his pson also, the violence of them is for still soe high that the Comittee now heare of little reliefe the minister hath as yet receiued & have therefore comanded me to comend his case againe to y^r care & assistance wth all desireing you that such psons whome you shall finde still contemners of the authoritie of Parliam^t in h^{rn} contynued disturbances of him you would please to retorne ther names this Comittee

I am

Yor ffriend & servant "

August 19th 1645

[no signature] (p. 146).

A resolution on Oct. 11th explains the matter somewhat. Brayne then complained again of being opposed by his parishioners which the Committee "conceive doth chiefly arise by the great opposicon of S^{er} Wm Culpeper," the Justices of the Peace were requested to assist Mr Brayne (p. 191). The Committee on Nov. 8th ordered there should be no disposition of the rectory

⁴¹ See S.A.C. XXX., 120, and foot-note. See also note 71 *post*.

until Mr. Bladworth's petition was considered, and on the 15th, "Upon complaint made to this Cottee by M^r Bladworth that notwithstanding he hath made small demands in the behalfe of his wife & children of y^e fift pt of y^e profits of y^e rectory of Ardingly in the county of Sussex of M^r Rotherham & M^r Braine to whose use the said rectory hath beene sequestred who have notwithstanding refused to pay the same It is ordered that the remaining profits of the said rectory be secured for y^e payment of the said fift pt & vntill the same be paid unto them" (p. 208). The views of the Committee appear to have been variable, for on Nov. 29th they appointed the cause for Jan. 6th, 164 $\frac{1}{2}$ (p. 218), and on Jan. 8th "The cause betweene M^r Brayne to whom y^e Rectory of Ardingly in y^e county of Sussex is sequestred and the wife of George Bladworth concerning her claime of a fifth pt for y^t appeareth by y^e sd M^r Bladworth his owne confession that hee neuer had inducon to y^e sayd liveinge this Comittee see noe cause why shee should haue a fift pte" (15,670, p. 6). On Jan. 17th, Bladworth (referring to the Order of Nov. 8th) complained that he had attended several days, and had not been heard, and it was arranged he should be (*Ib.*, p. 9), but on March 21st the Committee resolved, "Whereas upon informacon is giuen that S^{er} Wm Culpeper of y^e rectory of Ardingly al Erthingleigh in the county of Sussex to wch he formerly psented George Bladworth who was sequestred therefrom before he had inducon therein is willing to admit of Ralph Rotherham thereto the same being now left by M^r Brayne to whom the same stoode sequestred and y^e said M^r Rotherham is certified from divers godly divines to be of a pious conversacon. It is ordered that the said M^r Rotheram shall officiate the said cure & haue y^e pfitts of the said rectory notwithstanding y^e former order of this Cottee for hearing therein" (p. 45). A further order on March 26th recites that the rectory "was heretofore sequestred from Richard Taunton by Order of this Cottee who is sithence deceased," and the facts mentioned in the last order, and that Mr. Bladworth had petitioned that under the circum-

stances he might have the living, but the Committee confirmed the order (p. 50).

From the above resolutions we may gather what a confused state of affairs in a parish which evidently had three vicars at one time.

Burrell gives the following Incumbents of the Rectory :—

“ Rich^d Teynton als Tanton, instituted 25 July 1625 voted out of his parsonage by y^e Com^{co} of House of Commons Augt 16, 1643 & ejected 29 Nov. follg by a Company of Dragoons sent by Capt. Simon Everinden from Lewes.

John Winge brought in by the Assembly of Divines Oct 29, 1643, took possession 29 Nov. 1643.

Ralph Rotherham Ind 20 May 1662.”⁴²

Among the incumbents of West Hoathly occurs the name of R^d Teynton in 1617-1620 & Sep 1643.⁴³

Wing could not long have occupied the living, and it would seem as if Rotherham did not get inducted until 1662. The sequence is Taunton (sequestered and died)—Wing (?)—Brayne (appointed, never inducted, then sequestered)—Bladworth (instituted and left) Rotherham (appointed — ? when inducted).

Richard Taunton was one of the *Century of Malignant Priests* and Col. White states as follows :—

“43. The Benefice of *Richard Tanton*, Parson of the Parish Church of *Ardingly* in the county of *Sussex*, is sequestred, for that hee is a common drunkard and Ale-house haunter,⁴⁴ and in his Sermons hath wished, *That every knee might rot that would not bow at the name Jesus*,⁴⁵ and hath read in the said Church, Declarations in his Majesties name for raising of horse and money to maintaine warre against the Parliament, and against the *Militia*; and hath stirred up his Parishioners to joyne with the King’s forces, and hath affirmed *That he would bear out his Curate in refusing to deliver the Sacrament to such of his Parish, as would not come to the Railes to receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper*.”⁴⁶

BEPTON.

On Sep. 11th, 1645, “ This Committee doe appointe to take into consideracon the articles transmitted from the

⁴² Add. MSS. 5698, pp. 8 and 12.

⁴³ *Ib.*, p. 114.

⁴⁴ Walker says this charge was made by the Puritans with great recklessness in many cases. See also under PULBOROUGH. S.A.C. XXX., 128.

⁴⁵ This was declared an offence by an Act (chap. I.) presented to the King at Oxford in 1643, but which never received his assent. See Husband’s *Orders, &c., of Parliament*, p. 120.

⁴⁶ “The Century” was compiled by Col. John White, and ordered (on 17th Nov., 1643) by the House of Commons to be printed.

Comitee of Parliamt for the county of Sussex against M^r Riggs of Bepton, Clarke, on the fifteenth day of October next whereof the sd M^r Riggs is to have convenient notice" (15,669, p. 163), and on Oct. 21st the Committee "ordered that the cause concerning M^r Geourg Riggs minister of Bepton in the county of Sussex be for psent laid aside & that no further proceedings be had agt him therein without new sumons" (p. 200). On Nov. 15th, "Vpon complaint made by M^r Riggs, minister &c that vpon ptence or colo^r of some Order of sequestracon made of the said rectory from him his cure & profits of his said benefice are detained & kept from him This Comitee doe declare that vpon their hearing of the cause against him there did not appeare vnto them sufficient ground to sequester the said benefice from him" (p. 207).

The Burrell MSS. contain no reference to the ecclesiastical history of Bepton, and the parish registers do not go back farther than the beginning of last century.⁴⁷

Depositions were taken at Midhurst on Oct. 18th, 17 Chas. II. (1665), in an action as to tithes, in which George Riggs clk was plaintiff and John Shotter & Alice Shotter Defendants.

The first interrogatory put to the witnesses was :

"Imprimis doe you the parties plt and defend^t and doe you know that the plt is the true and lawfull Rector & parson of the Rectory and Parsonage of Bepton in the county of Sussex. If yea, how long hath he beene Rector and Parson of the said parish, declare your knowledge or belief therein."

"Richard Pannell of Bepton in the county of Sussex, yoman aged foure & forty yeares," being sworn and examined (amongst other witnesses), deposed "that the plt hath beene Rector or parson of the pish of Bepton in the county of Sussex for thirty yeares last past and upwards."⁴⁸

TROTTON.

On July 26th, 1645, "Upon the humble peticon of Robt Thomlinson from whom the rectory of Trotton, in the county of Sussex is sequestred It is ordered that he shall have liberty to be heard in what he shall further

⁴⁷ The writer is indebted to the kindness of the present rector of Bepton, the Rev. Charles A. Nicholl, for searching the registers.

⁴⁸ *Exchequer. Depositions by Commission, 17 Chas. II., Michs, No. 18, Sussex (Public Record Office).*

say for his defence to the matters depending agt him before this Coittee on the xith day of September next whereof the minister to whose use the said rectory is sequestred is to have convenient notice" (15,669, p. 117). What further transpired, as to this petition is not stated, but on March 21st, 164 $\frac{2}{3}$ the Committee "Ordered that the Rectory of Trotton in the county of Sussex sequestred from Robert Thomlinson by Order of this Co^{tee} to the use of — Story shall stand sequestred to the use of Walter Thomlinson⁴⁹ sonne of the said Robt Thomlinson minister of the word. ref." (15,670, p. 46). The resolution is repeated, and further says: "M^r Story is since removed from there to the cure of the Church of Stedham in the sd county" (*Ib.*, p. 48).

The Burrell MSS. give "Robert Tomlinson" as Rector in 1642, and "Walter Tomlinson min^r 26 Aug 1655." The *Par. Reg.* records the burial of "Ann wife of Robert Tomlinson Rector of Trotton July 18, 1642."⁵⁰

In the "*Contrebuton of the Clergie &c towards the repairinge of St. Paules Church*" in 1634 occurs "M^r Tomlinson parson of Trotton, xx^s 01[£] 00^s 00^d."⁵¹

PLAYDEN AND IDEN.

The only resolution is one on Sep. 14th, 1645, ordering the Committee for Sussex to "receive the articles that shalbe exhibited agt the seull ministers of Playden & Iden in the county of Sussex and to take their respective answeares" and to examine witnesses and certify (15,669, p. 163).

It seems probable from the following notes that the proceedings against these ministers proved abortive or were abandoned.

Playden. Vicars. "Tho^s Burton Ind 18 May 1641 ob 26 (? 23) Nov 1684." The *Par. Reg.* records the baptism of numerous children of his, and the burial of "Tho^s Burton Rector of Pleyden d 23 Nov: Nov 26, 1684."⁵²

Iden. Vicars. "R^d Martin, 1617-1620. Bur 5 Jan 1643. Jn Woodhall 1643 signs as min^r — Inst 24 Jany 1648⁵³ Bur 18

⁴⁹ Matriculated at Magdalen Coll. Oxon. May 8, 1635. See S.A.C. IX., 364.

⁵⁰ Add. MSS. 5699, pp. 668 and 666.

⁵¹ *Sussex Daily News*, Oct. 17, 1876.

⁵² Add. MSS. 5697, pp. 195, 196.

⁵³ Is not 1648 a clerical error for 1643?

July 1688." The *Par. Reg.* records the burial on July 24, 1620, of "Eliz wife of Richard Martin parson of Iden d to Dr Bird Preby of Canterbury under y^e great So window in y^e Chancel." The inscription on Richard Martin's tomb states that he died on "Jan 1. 1643 aged 69."⁵⁴

Depositions were taken at Battle on Mar 26th 1660 in two actions in which "John Woodall clk" was plaintiff and in one of which Matt. Robbins" was defendant and in the other "W^m Pix" the subject matter of both being "the parsonage of Iden."⁵⁵

COWFOLD.

The only resolution relating to this place is on Sept. 11th, 1645, "Ordered that the Rectory of Cowfold sequestred to the use of Simon Jefferson since deceased shall from henceforth stand sequestred to the use of John Watts M^r of Artes a godly and orthodox divine." John Watts was referred to the Assembly in the usual way. (15,669, p. 164).

The name of the predecessor of Simon Jefferson does not appear, but, as in the "*Contrebuton of the Clergie &c*" in 1634 occurs "Thomas Hudson vicar of Cowfould £00 11s 00d"⁵⁶ possibly the latter was sequestered.

Burrell does not mention any vicar at this period but gives "Geo. Vinter BD Ind 7 Jany 1651-1680. Hon Col Jn Downes Esq Patron of Rectory."⁵⁷ The *Par. Reg.* records the burial of "Mary ux. of Geo Vinter Minr Sep 11. 1661."⁵⁸

Calamy describes Vinter⁵⁹ as, "a most remarkable apostate and always turned with the times."

ST. CLEMENT'S, HASTINGS.

We have only one reference to this place in the proceedings. On Nov. 29th, 1645, "Ordered that Car rector of Hastings in y^e County of Sussex be sumoned to ansvere y^e articles exted agt him on the 15th day of January next & y^t warrants shall issue for sumoning

⁵⁴ Add MSS., 5697, pp. 155, 157.

⁵⁵ 40th Report of Deputy Keeper of Public Records (1879) app., p. 82.

⁵⁶ See note 51.

⁵⁷ John Downes, Esq., regicide, and "recruiter" sat for Arundel in the Long Parliament.

⁵⁸ Add MSS., 5698, pp. 76, 77.

⁵⁹ See notes *ante* under ROTHERFIELD.

both pties and witnesses in the said cause" (15,669, p. 219).

On Sunday July 9th 1643 when Colonel Morley marched on Hastings Wm. Car fled (as described in a previous volume).⁶⁰ Walker refers to the same event, and says "quære if he was not Totally sequestred."⁶¹

Barrell gives the names of the following rectors:—

"Edw Bennet Ind	— 1637.	Bur 26 Dec 1638.
Carr Ind		1643.
Jo Brook Ind		Bur 22 Dec 1652." ⁶²

It seems most probable that Carr (or Car) was sequestered.

PEASMARSH.

On Sep. 8th, 1645, "It is ordered that the Rectory of Peasmarsh in the county of Sussex sequestred from John Giles shall stand sequestred to the use of John Cosh a godly & orthodox Divine. Referr him to the Assembly to be exaied." (15,669, p. 164). The order (drawn up in full, on another page) recites the sequestration on 15th Novr., 1644. from John Giles, "for seual great misdemeours" (p. 171). Another order on Oct. 8th, recites the sequestration to Wm. Cosh, and gives him all tithes and profits, "arreare and due since the publicacon of the said order of sequestracon" (p. 186). On Dec. 6th, "Upon the humble peticon of John Giles from whome y^e Rectory of Peasmarsh in y^e County of Sussex is sequestred It is ordered that hee be referred & hee is hereby referred to y^e Justices of peace for the sayd County for y^e recovery of such tythes of the sayd Rectory as they shall upon examinacon find to be due of right vnto him who are desired to pceed therein according to the ordinance of Parliam in that behalf for paymt of tythes" (p. 229). A further petition was presented by John Giles, and on Feb. 28th, 164 $\frac{5}{8}$, there is an order for him to be satisfied and paid the profits of the Vicarage due since the sequestration "during such time as he officiated the said cure" (15,670, p. 23).

⁶⁰ S.A.C. V., 78. See also *Mercurius Rusticus*, p. 161.

⁶¹ *Sufferings of the Clergy*, II., p. 413.

⁶² Add MSS., 5697, p. 125.

Burrell⁶³ mentions the following vicars :—

“ Jo Wilson Ind	1634. 1631.
Wm. Fraunces Ind	1647.
Gyles Ind	1654.
Saml Eldred AM Ind	14th Sept. 1662.”

In a note as to Fraunces, he adds, “ He came in on the seq^d of the lawfull Incumbent by the Parlt and continued to April 1650.”⁶³

It is not easy to reconcile this list with the resolutions, but perhaps as John Giles was leniently treated (being allowed to retain the vicarage long after sequestration) he may have been restored.

EAST DEAN (NEAR CHICHESTER).

On Oct. 11th, 1645, “ It is ordered that Thomas Palmer minister of East Deane in the county of Sussex doe make his psonall appearance before this Comittee on the 21st day of October instant to ansvere to all such matters as shalbe obiected agt him before this Comittee whereof he is not to faile at his p’ill ” (15,669, p. 188). Mr. Palmer probably thought it more prudent to “ bolt,” and on Dec. 13th the Committee “ Ordered that the Vicarage of East Deane in the county of Sussex seques-tered to M^r Palmer who hath since deserted the same shall stand sequestred from him to the use of Henry Duncanson Minister of the word. Referred him to y^o Assembly ” (p. 225).

The list of vicars given by Sir Wm. Burrell (which is rather confused) comprises :—

“ Marcus Harry A.M. Ind 20 July 1630. seq^d 28 July. Oct. 26. 1644.

Humphrey Hull (Vicar of Friston 1641)

Halsey Rector 1640 sequestred. 1640 & 1660

Thos. Palmer Inst 29 Sept 1644

Arth Donkinson (Vic. 1646)

1653 Aug 27 Wm Wallace. qu Vicar

Heigham Hills

Bur 26 Jany 1673.

Germain intruded Halsey restored 1660.”⁶⁴

Calamy states that William Wallace was ejected in 1662 from East Dean.⁶⁵

Any attempt to reconcile these somewhat conflicting statements, or to put the list in correct order, seems hopeless.

⁶³ Add MSS., 5697, p. 187.

⁶⁴ Add MSS., 5697, p. 386.

⁶⁵ *Nonconformist Memorial*, Vol. III.

The following notes are from Walker's MSS.⁶⁶

“ East Dean.

Mr. Halsy Rec' of East dean Sussex a very Honest and Industrious man; was turn'd out of his living of 30^l p^r Annu upon a p^rtence of Insufficiency: he had a Family of nine children which must have been all starv'd had he not had some few Houses in London w^{ch} preserved him and his family from want; notwithstanding which a daughter of his complained to a gentleman now living that she was glad to feed on half an egg; the poor man came with tears in his eyes and fell on his knees to Cheynell (y^t monstrous composition of Saint and villain)⁶⁷ and desired the favour of him to lett him teach an English school at a penny a week for each child for the support of his family: but was by the monster denyd so reasonable a request. Mr Halsy liv'd in extreme want during the Rebellion but at y^e King's coming in was restored to his living and one Germain a notorious Repub: outed y^t had enjoy'd it during the Rebellion.”

Depositions were taken at Chichester on Oct. 4th, 18 Chas. II., in an action in which Richard Halsey, clerk, was plaintiff, and Owen Ludgater defendant. Richard Keyse, “aged three score & 6,” deposed that he had known plaintiff for thirty years, “and further deposeth that the Comp^{lt} hath officiated as pson or Rector of the said pish of East deane for thirty yeares except for about fiteene yeares of the said tyme the said comp^{lt} was sequestred dureinge the tyme of the late wares.”⁶⁸

FRAMFIELD.

On Oct. 14th, 1644, the vicarage was sequestred from John Willard, by his consent. On Jan. 4th, 164⁴/₅ the Committee appointed John Safford (or Stafford), Minister (15,669, p. 6), and on Feb. 4th they referred

⁶⁶ In Bodleian Library, Vol. III. See also *Sufferings of the Clergy*, II., 275.

⁶⁷ Bishop Hoadly said of Cheynell, “he was exactly orthodox, and as pious honest and charitable as his bigotry would permit.” Neal, *History of the Puritans*, IV., 395.

⁶⁸ *Exchequer. Depositions by Commission, 18 Chas. II., Michs. Sussex, No. 9 (Public Record Office).*

him to the Assembly (*Ib.*, p. 1). The resolutions having been printed in a previous volume, need not be here repeated.

Burrell gives "John Willard" as Vicar in 1620 and 1639, and "John Stafford" [not Safford] in 1644 and 1650.⁶⁹

WADHURST.

On March 11th 164 $\frac{1}{2}$, "It is ordered that the Committee of Parliamt sitting at Lewes in the county of Sussex be desired to examine the articles that shall be exhibited against M^r Breuer" and to take his defence and report (15,669, p. 31). A petition of "divers of the pishioners of Wadhurst" was on July 26th referred with the articles to the Sussex Committee (p. 119). The cause was eventually heard on July 9th, 1646, and Mr. Beauer (or Beaver) stated that his parishioners were mistaken in charging him with "delivering seuall erronious doctrines in the Pulpitt," he was accordingly ordered to make a public declaration of his opinions on some Lord's day, and procure a certificate (15,670, p. 148), which he did on Sept. 10th, and was dismissed. The minute states that the alleged error was in his "opinion of certaine points in Divinitie" (p. 422).

Burrell states that a vicar (unnamed) was ejected, and that Jacobus Wilcocky was vicar in 1653, and bur. 29th Feb., 1661.⁷⁰

EAST GRINSTEAD.

The Committee on Sept. 30th, 1645, "ordered that the cause betweene the minister of Greensteede in Sussex & y^e wife of M^r Gough from whom the same is sequestred concerning the fift pt claymed by her be adiourned till Thursday fortnight" (15,669, p. 178). On Nov. 15th they ordered that Mr. Pretty, to whom the Vicarage was sequestered, should show cause "wherefore he doth not pay vnto the wife of M^r Gough from whom the same is sequestred the fift pt of y^e pfts of the said Vicarage

⁶⁹ Add. MSS., 5697, p. 410.

⁷⁰ *Ib.*, p. 607.

according to a former order of this Committee in that behalfe" (p. 206). Various adjournments took place, and in the meantime, on Feb. 17th, 164⁵/₈, the Committee "ordered that the Vicarage of the Church of East Greensteede sequestred from Gough to the use of Samuel Pretty who is againe returned into the County of Wilts from whence he was driven by the Kings forces, shall stand sequestred to the use of Stephen Watkins Minister of the word" (15,670, p. 21). On April 9th, 1646, "The cause betweene M^r Pretty and M^{rs} Goffe comeing to heareing concerning y^e 5^t pte by her claymed of M^r Pretty to whom y^e vicarage of East Greenstede in the County of Sussex stood sequestred from her husband y^t is acknowledged y^t shee hath 13^l a yeare temporall estate notwithstanding w^{ch} and notwithstanding y^e allegacon of M^r Pretty⁷¹ y^t her husband was psented to y^e sayd Vicarage by y^e Earle of Dorsett since his delinquency w^{ch} is matter of tytle and y^t shee hath but one child this Committee doe thinke fitt y^t y^e former Order of this Committee for y^e sd M^r Pretty his pay^{mt} of a fift pt vnto her shall stand & y^e same is confirmed accordingly" (p. 59). On July 12th, 1647, there is an order for "Robert Pickering, John Budgen, sen., Edward Banister, Thomas Wickens, John Crips & William Driver pishioners of East Grinsted," to pay their tithes forthwith to "Steeven Wattkins, or appear on 23rd July" (15,671, p. 123). On Aug. 27th, the Committee resolved, "Whereas the Vicarage of the pish Church of East-greenstead in the countie of Sussex is & standeth sequestred by this Co^{tee} from Richard Gough to the use of M^r Samuell [*sic. qu.* Stephen] Watkins who hath since relinquished the same It is ordered that the sd Vicarage shall from henceforth stand sequestred to the use of George Blundell a godlie & orthodox divine & that he doe forthwith officiate the cure of the sd Church as Vicar & preach" (p. 216).

⁷¹ Puritan historians take great credit to their party for allowing a fifth to the wives of the sequestered clergy, but it was evidently paid with the greatest reluctance, and after proceedings. See HORSTED-PARVA, XXX., 120; also SEAFORD-CUM-SUTTON, *Ib.*, p. 131.

In the *Contrebuton of the Clergie &c. towards the repairinge of St Pauls Church* in 1634, occurs "Allane Carr, vicar of East-grinstead £00 10s 00d."⁷²

Burrell gives amongst the vicars—

"Jas Jnians Ind —	2 Sep 1637
R ^d Goffe Vicar	1643 " ⁷³

Richard Goffe was one of the *Century of Malignant Priests*,⁷⁴ and is thus described:—

"88. The Benefice of *Richard Goffe*, Vicar of the Parish Church of *East-Greensted* in the county of *Sussex*, is sequestred, for that he is a common haunter of Tavernes and Ale-houses, a common swearer of bloody oathes, and singer of bawdy songs and often drunke, and keepeth company with Papists and scandalous persons, and hath confessed, *That he chiefly studied Popish Authours*, highly commended *Queene Maries* time, and disparaged *Queene Elizabeths*, as an enemy to learning, and hoped to see the time again that there should be no Bible in mens houses. And hath openly preached, *That such as goe to other Parish Churches then their owne, are in the state of damnation, and that after the bread and wine at the Sacrament is consecrated it is no more bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ.* And in a funerall Sermon at the buriall of a woman said *That she being regenerated in Baptism did live and die without sin*: and hath expressed great malignity against the Parliament, saying, That he hoped to see it confounded and that he cared not a figg for the Parliament."

The last remark, as Walker says,⁷⁵ was in the opinion of the Parliament the worst of all.

East Grinstead appears, from the resolutions, to have had four vicars within four years, three of them Puritans, and some time after there must have been a fourth Puritan, as we find Christopher Snell ejected from the living in 1662.⁷⁶

⁷² *Sussex Daily News*, Oct. 17th, 1876.

⁷³ Add. MSS., 5697, p. 446.

⁷⁴ See note 46.

⁷⁵ *Sufferings of the Clergy*, II., 257.

⁷⁶ *Nonconformist Memorial*, Calamy, Vol. III.