

ST. JAMES GARLICKHITHE.

BY THE

REV. HENRY DANVERS MACNAMARA, M.A.

*Read at a Meeting of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society,
on the 12th March, 1895.*

THE principal object of my address to you to-day will be to hand to the Secretary of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society a complete list of parish books of the united parishes of which I am rector.

These are the parishes of St. James Garlickhithe (which is now the principal parish), St. Michael Queenhithe, and Holy Trinity-the-Less.

In the course of making the list, one or two suggestions have occurred to me, which I thought might be interesting to the society. At the same time I would ask you to believe that I am only mentioning a few of the many objects of interest in these books. The time at my disposal has not enabled me to do more than give a very cursory glance at their contents. It is possible that I may ask your indulgence to allow me to give another contribution at a future time.

The present parish of St. James Garlickhithe is a combined parish, consisting of

- (1) St. James Garlickhithe,
- (2) St. Michael Queenhithe,
- (3) Holy Trinity-the-Less.

All these churches were destroyed in the Great Fire. St. James Garlickhithe and St. Michael Queenhithe were rebuilt after the fire by Sir Christopher Wren. The church of Holy Trinity-the-Less, though rebuilt, was not the parish church ; the parish of Holy Trinity-the-Less being united to that of St. Michael Queenhithe.

The church of St. Michael Queenhithe was destroyed in the year 1875, under the Union of Benefices Act, and the church of St. James Garlickhithe became the parish church of those parishes.

The first book to which I wish to draw your attention, although it happens not to be the earliest made, is the register book of Holy Trinity-the-Less. This is a very interesting document, both for itself, and, as I hope to show you presently, by reason of its contents, although I admit *primâ facie* a mere list of names does not form a promising field for a paper before a learned society.

The register book commences in 1547, and, as far as it goes, is interesting as showing that neither the first visitation of the Plague in 1547, nor the two visitations of the sweating sickness which have left their mark in our Prayer Book in the Office of the Communion of the Sick, were very fatal in the parish.

The point to which I wish to draw your attention, and which is a very interesting one, arises from the connection of Henry Machyn, the well-known diarist, with the parish.

Henry Machyn's Diary was published by the Camden Society in 1848. It is called the "Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen of London, from 1550 to 1563." Thirteen very eventful years.

The preface, which deals somewhat with Machyn's life, observes that :—

“The writer was a citizen of London, of no great scholarship or attainments, as his language and cacography testify, sufficiently prejudiced no doubt, and not capable of any deep views either of religious doctrine or temporal policy, but the matters of fact which he records would be such as he either witnessed himself or had learned immediately after their occurrence, and the opinions and sentiments which he expresses would be shared by a large proportion of his fellow citizens.” (Preface, p. 5.)

The editor, Mr. John Gough Nichols, observes that the diary had been made known by Strype, and, in point of fact, for some period it forms a valuable portion of Strype's book. (Preface, p. 6.)

The editor then speculates as to whom Machyn was. The editor says (Preface, p. 11) that by some he has been taken for a Herald, or at least a painter employed by the Heralds. The editor thinks he was an undertaker. The editor truly observes that this parish was what he calls Trinity-the-Little by Queenhithe, and suggests that in the vicinity of Painter Stainers' Hall, in Trinity Lane, would live many of the workmen with whom he had to do.

The editor concludes (Preface, p. 12) :

“And the circumstance of the Diary, closing at a time when the Plague was prevalent in London, renders it not impossible that the author was a victim of that deadly scourge.”

So much for the editor's speculation as to Henry Machyn.

What I am going to say will prove, I think, the extreme advantage of a list such as the London and Middlesex Archæological Society has now asked for, and to which I believe I am—and, if I am, I am

proud to be it—the first contributor. If this list had existed Mr. J. Gough Nichols would have known where to look for further particulars as to Henry Machyn.

In the middle of important things, such as the burning of three men and a woman for heresy, the obsequies of several worthy people, and details of the war with France, appears the following entry (Diary, p. 153) :

“The xxv day of September was browth a bed with a whenche be-twyn 12 and one at midnight, where-of my gossep Harper, servant unto the quen(s) grace, was dyssessed of rest in ye nest, and after he whent to ye nest a-gayn.”

I suppose the doctor's “nest” was his bed. The next entry refers to the christening of the child :

“The xxvij of September was crystened Katheryn Machyn the doythur of Hare Machyn, the godmother's names Masteres Grenway, Master Altherman(s) wyff, and Masters Blackwelle and Master Grenuelle godfather, and at byshoping the godmother's name Masteres Johnsun in Ive lane.”

There seems no doubt that the diarist is, in these entries, speaking of his wife and of himself under the name of Harry Machyn.

Upon turning to my Holy Trinity-the-Less register I find duly entered that on the

“27th September, 1557, Katheryn, daughter of Henry Machyn, was christened.”

This is the first step to identify the diarist with this parish.

The Diary, to which, however, I shall again presently have to refer, closes on 3rd August, in the year 1563.

In the previous month of June, Machyn notices the fact that the plague was in London, and the manuscript, which is very imperfect, says that :

“Those, in whose house the plague had been, were not to come to church for a certain space after that the plague had been,”

and adds :

“and so a cross was set up at either door of blew and a writing under.”

The fact that the cross was of blue marked that the plague to which he was referring was then at Westminster, and not in the City ; had he been writing of the City he would have mentioned that the cross was red, the fact being that in Westminster, blue wands were carried before the officers, and in London, red wands ; and the cross upon the door which was blue in Westminster was red in London.

In passing I may observe that the City Police bear a red badge, and the Metropolitan Police blue, though whether this is only a coincidence or not I am not sure.

By the following month, viz., July, the plague had come into the City, and Machyn duly notes the fact that :

“Fires were ordered to be lighted in every street and lane on Wednesdays and Fridays to cesse the plague in the City if it please God so.”

On the 4th August, Machyn notices there was a mandate from the Lord Mayor that a man should be hired to kill dogs found in the streets. This was a very usual precaution in the plague time, it being supposed that dogs and cats, being domestic animals, carried the infection from one house to another. Whether this is true is not so clear, but the same practice prevails all over the Levant during plague time, and our City parish books are full of entries as to the killing of stray dogs.

The last entry in the book appears to be upon the 8th day of August.

We now turn to the Registers to show us what the condition of the plague was in the parish.

Apparently it must have begun shortly after the commencement of the month of July. During the preceding year, between the months of July and December, seven persons died in all in the parish of all diseases. Between the 1st of July and the 1st of December in the year 1563, sixty-five died, between nine and ten times as many as in the previous year. Some of the parishioners were more severely visited than others. In thirteen houses there were more than one death. Six in the household of a parishioner named Naylor died, five in that of Griffin, and four in that of Sturton, the latter being, as I believe, a person of some position in the parish. On the 11th of September, among the entries of burials, there is the following entry :

“John Sonne, the son of John Sonne, and servant of Henry Machin.”

There can, I think, be no doubt that this was a servant of the diarist, and that he brought the plague into his master's house. The register next shows that on the 11th November, Henry Macham, Taylor, Clerk of the Parish Church of Trinity-the-Less was buried. There is not the slightest doubt that this entry records the burial of the diarist. The unfortunate loss of the vestry, minute, and account books, makes it impossible for us to know if Machyn's house was shut up for the fixed period of forty days or six weeks. The plague was still in the parish on the 11th November. This

is evidenced by the death of more than one of the same family, both before and after the death of Henry Machyn.

This seems to me to solve some of the doubts expressed by the editor, as in Machyn's Diary we find the christening of Katheryn Machyn duly entered on the date recorded by the diarist; we find the burial of his servant on the 11th of September, and we find his own burial on the 11th of November, with the further information that he was Clerk of the Parish Church.

This last piece of information is of genuine interest. Henry Machyn was no doubt a member of the Clerks' Company. There seems no question that he was not a herald. Whether he was an undertaker or not is a fact which it would be difficult to prove; I do not think he was. He had abundant access, from being a parish clerk, and of necessity a member of the Clerks' Company, to all the information he gives as to funerals in the City, most of which he would, in his capacity of a member of the Clerks' Company, attend.

There is abundant reference to the Company of Clerks throughout the Diary, and in 1560 and again in 1562, Machyn describes the dinner which he calls the Clerks' dinner on one occasion at Carpenters' Hall, and on another at their own Hall. Throughout the book are notices of the presence of the Clerks' Company at funerals, at which it was usual for them to attend, and to take a prominent part in the service, sometimes in their gowns and sometimes in surplices.

It is clear that he was a member of the Company in 1551, as he mentions the fact of the King's Receiver, Chester, in 1551, taking possession of the Hall of the

Company of Clerks, and makes his observations both upon the Corporation itself and upon Mr. Chester, whom he

“prays God will give ill speed to.”

From the quasi-religious duties of the Parish Clerks an attempt was made to treat and support their Company as a religious guild. The attempt, fortunately, failed and the duties of the Clerks, such as assisting at funerals, continued.

I think it therefore most likely that in the fact that he was the Parish Clerk of Trinity-the-Less, Queenhithe, we have come to the reason of Machyn's knowledge of funerals, his interest in them, and the extent to which he participated in them.

But before I quit the register, as I must do presently, in order to come to some of the general topics of interest in the other books, I must mention one or two details in which he refers to the parish, regretting as I do that I cannot always treat them as complimentary.

He duly records the fact that in 1556, in the reign of Philip and Mary, three altars were consecrated in the church by the Suffragan of Norwich.

In the following year he gives an account of a shooting match (Diary, page 132) in which the parish took part, on the 19th April, 1557, in Finsbury Fields. The shooting match was followed by a regular parish entertainment. Unfortunately, in the course of this the diarist is not so explicit as it would have been wished. It appears that the Parson whose name was Sir Thomas Chambers, took in hand the entertainment of the wives of the Parish, and entertained them first at the “Barleybrake,” which probably was a publichouse

at Finsbury. At this house the diarist, no doubt being wrong in his spelling, says that the Parson "entered into Hell," and during the time he was at the "Barley-brake" apparently continued in the fire! Afterwards, having revived, he went to Hogston, where he and the wives of the Parish apparently indulged in bread and beer, and claret and ale. On their way home they came to the "Swan," in Whittington College, to one, Master Fulmer (a victualler), and there finished up with further "good cheer." The diarist adds at the end that, which all must be thankful for, "and paid for it." Mr. Gough Nichols adds a footnote to the effect that the paragraph is clearly written as printed, and seems to commemorate some wild merrymaking of the diarist's parish. But Sir T. Chambers had other wild work.

To go out of chronological order I go to two years later, 1559 (Diary, page 205), when the same Sir Thomas Chambers, having apparently returned from Winchester (in circumstances suspiciously like that which must have happened at the parish entertainment) was carrying a bottle with him that he had brought from Winchester. Sir Thomas Chambers, after arriving at his parish at Queenhithe, met a young servant man, with whose mistress, to use the diarist's words, Sir Thomas Chambers "had dealt naughtily" the Friday before. When the young man reproached him for this Sir Thomas Chambers hit him on the head with the bottle. For this assault he was taken to the Wood Street counter, and afterwards to Bridewell. When he was there—he was visited by many of his parishioners—probably to jeer at him—to whom he said he would not tarry long, and desired them to get another priest to serve his turn.

From the above you will observe that my predecessor in the parish of Queenhithe, Sir Thomas Chambers, does not seem to have distinguished himself. With respect to him I will only say that up to the dissolution of the monasteries the gift of the living of Holy Trinity Queenhithe, was in the monastery of St. Mary Overie. On the suppression of that monastery Henry VIII gave the presentation of the living to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury. Sir T. Chambers was presented to Holy Trinity by them. No doubt he was some unsatisfactory "mass priest." After leaving Holy Trinity he was presented by the same Dean and Chapter to St. Mary Bothaw. He only remained there a short time. Probably he went from bad to worse. There is one and only one other item (although there are many others in the Diary to which I should wish to refer you) with which I propose to trouble you with.

In 1557-8 (page 165) Machyn refers to the death of Master Arthur Sturton, Squire, who was the receiver of all copes of gold taken out of all churches in King Edward VI time, and which copes were delivered back in Queen Mary's time to certain parishes "again to them that could know them," if they had not been given to other places in the realm of England. Machyn adds but

"Trinity parish had not their cope of cloth of gold again."

You will remember that I noticed the fact that in the family of Sturton there were four deaths of the plague in the year 1563, and no doubt the family of that name residing in Holy Trinity-the-Less was the same family as that of the Receiver of Copcs. But I cannot help thinking that Machyn was remiss (if he;

as parish clerk, could not get his own cope) in not getting somebody else's, for it was quite obvious there was a general scramble, and the principle of first come first served prevailed.

Time does not permit of me saying more about the Machyns, but you will easily have gathered from what I have said that in dealing with the parish of Queenhithe and the adjoining parishes, much could be got illustrating his Diary from my books.

I do not like to leave the Holy Trinity register books without saying a few words about the epidemics of the plague. As you all know, after the year 1563 the principal plagues were in 1593, 1603, 1625, and 1665. The earlier book only extends as far as 1653, and for the last plague I have to go to the later register. The short details connected with the plagues are as follows :—

I have already mentioned that in the year 1563 sixty-five died in the plague time between July and December.

In the year 1593 sixty-six, or one more, died within the same period.

In 1603, within the same period, 112 died.

In 1625, between the same periods, 128 died, and

In 1666, between the same periods, eighty-one died.

Probably the parish was as full in the year 1666 as it could hold. Parishes in the City generally increased in population during the reign of Queen Elizabeth and King James, were stationary in King Charles I reign, slightly diminished in the time of the Commonwealth, and increased again in the time of King Charles II until the fire of London, so that

we can from these facts collect that the plague of 1665, which has the name of the Great Plague of London, was less formidable in this parish than were either of the two preceding plagues of 1625 and 1603, and this is, I believe, the general experience throughout the City, although, as will be presently seen, this plague in the adjoining parish of St. James Garlickhithe, was very severe.

This register commences in 1535, one of the two oldest books in the City. It is described as the "Book of Registrie belonging unto St. James by Garlickhithe."

The first entry of marriage is dated 26th January, 1535, of Thomas Mannering and Margaret Jordan. The first christening is dated 18th November, 1535, Edward Butler. The first burial 7th January, 1535.

This book is particularly interesting because it is one of the few registers which commence prior to the injunction of Henry VIII prescribing that all parishes were to keep registers of marriages, christenings, and burials.

Although no injunction was issued until 1538 there is reason to believe that an order had been issued as early as 1534.

This book, as all the earlier books were, is written on paper, and the entries are in those columns commencing with the marriages, the middle column for christenings, and the third column for burials.

Quite at the close of Queen Elizabeth's reign a further order was made directing that all registers were to be written on vellum. In consequence of this order the whole of the registers in the City were recopied into vellum books. In some few instances

the original paper books have been preserved, but in most instances they have been destroyed. The practice, however, continued for a long time of first writing the memoranda on paper and writing up the parchment book at stated intervals. In this way in the parish of St. James Garlickhithe, there are concurrent books, one on paper, the other on parchment. The earlier paper book continues to the year 1621, the last entry of marriage being on the 4th March, 1621, between Richard Wilkinson, scarf maker, and Katherine Allen, spinster, both of the parish. The last christening is that of Herbert Colebrooke, baptised on the 24th March, 1621. The last burial is of Mary, the servant of Edward Smith, cooper, dated 6th March, 1621.

In the year 1550 it appears that there were 10 marriages, 14 christenings, and 14 burials. In the year 1600 there were 5 marriages, 28 christenings, and 23 burials.

In the year 1594 is the first entry in the margin relating to a burial in the church, and the entries continue for some time in the same way. This is varied occasionally by the word "cloister."

The handwriting varies a good deal, and is very good up to the end of the 16th century.

It is curious to note the immense number of persons who were buried in the church. This was caused by the desire of the parish to increase the revenue by the burial fees.

It will be remembered that in 1593 the second recorded series of plagues broke out in the City of London. The plague had been, in fact, introduced into the City in the autumn of 1692, and the burials

already began to be heavy from the 16th August, in 1592, up to December, and there are 31 deaths recorded during that period.

There were no deaths recorded after January, 1593.

The burials then commence again in the next year in the month of June, and up to the 21st December there were 125 deaths recorded ; the majority of these took place in August, September, and October.

In the year 1594 the plague stopped, and as against 125 deaths between June and December, 1593, there were only 20 deaths during the whole of 1594.

The plague broke out again in 1603, and in this year it appears to have begun earlier, as there are several entries in the month of April. There appear to have been 144 deaths between the middle of August and the end of the year. During that time a little letter "p" is placed opposite the name of the entry, but the words "church" and "plague" appear together, recording the well-known fact that some of those who died of the plague were buried in the church.

The entries also continue in the year 1604, and there for the first time appears in August the words, "new Churchyard," which had, no doubt, to be provided in consequence of the great mortality. The word "plague" occurs in 1605, and again in 1606, towards the latter part of the year, and also in the year 1608, 1609, 1611, and there is one in the year 1618.

In the year 1625 the plague again visited the parish.

There is no heading to the burials in 1625. Between 27th June, 1625, and the 23rd March, 1625, there were 156 deaths.

If the register is carefully looked at it will be seen that one of the pages has been cut out with a knife. It is interesting that in one of the books reference is made to the excising from the register of some sheets.

There is no doubt that the plague was going on intermittently from the year 1625 to at least the year 1650, but it was comparatively light ; in some years more burials and in some less are recorded.

In the year 1665—the great year of the plague—the parish was very severely visited. In it there were no less than 284 deaths. In 1666 there were only five deaths, but these and the few deaths in 1667 were in a measure due to the entire destruction of the parish at the Great Fire, and the subsequent dispersion of the parishioners.

Up to that date it does not appear that the cause of death was, as a rule, entered, but after that entries began to be made, and there are such remarks :—Died of Consumption, Dropsy, Gripe of the Guts, Yellow Jaundice, Lethargy, King's Evil, Convulsions, Small Pox, Rising of the Lights, Worms, " Stopage of the Stomake " and the Tooth. What the " Tooth " may mean I do not know. The small-pox about this time appears to have been pretty prevalent.

In the year 1674 there is an entry of a person dying of Cancer of the Tongue, but Consumption, Stoppage of the Stomach, and Convulsions appear to have been the most common complaints.

The parchment book goes as far as the year 1692. The other end of the book contains the marriages during the time of the Commonwealth in 1653, before a Justice of the Peace. These entries go on during 1654, 1655, 1656, and the last is dated the 23rd April,

1657. The entries are prefixed by the usual notice referring to the Act of the Commonwealth, and the notice is dated 21st September, 1653. (I have not time to deal with the more modern books.)

The next book that I take will be the first Vestry Book.

This book commences in the year 1615, and ends in 1693.

The book commences with a recital that on the 25th October, 1615, there was a vestry meeting at which it was decided to record the vestry proceedings in a book. A list is then given of the persons who were to compose the vestry, numbering 29 in all, commencing with the name of Mr. Alderman Gore, merchant tailor. The parson's name was Mr. Edward Marbury, and the two churchwardens James Munger and Roger Fuller. It appears that it was afterwards necessary in 1640 to increase the number of the vestry, so as to secure the presence of a quorum.

In the usual payments on page 219 of the No. 2 Account Book, commencing 1627, will be found an entry of 4s. 6d., paid for six quires of Dutch paper for enlarging the Vestry Book, and 8s. 6d. paid for new binding the new Vestry Book with brass bosses and clasps. These clasps are still on the book. The entry of this is in 1665.

The book contains the ordinances and the manner in which the business of the vestry was to be conducted, as follows :—

“(1) Every man was by an order thereafter contained :—

“(2) Every vestryman shall act when lawfully warned, and in default he shall pay the fine of 7d. to the poor-box.

“(3) The vestrymen to behave reverently and decently towards one another in speeches. A fine of paying —— to the poor-box. [The amount is not given.]

“(4) Every vestryman is to bear or account for such purpose as he shall be duly chosen to, or be excluded from the vestry.

“(5) Every vestryman is to pay seasonable dues.

“(6) Three or four candidates were to be put up for election to supply a vacancy, and the one who had the majority of voices was to be elected.

“(7) That the vestry was to be composed of not less than the parson, two churchwardens, and 13 others.

“(8) The churchwardens to provide sureties.

“(9) The collectors for the poor were to keep the money collected, and render an account of it.

“(10) The successor of any person leaving the parish to pay the same poor-rate as his predecessor.

“(11) That all strangers were to pay the same for weddings, christenings, and burials.

“(12) That the articles were fully agreed upon on the 15th October, 1615.”

It will be noticed that in Section 8 the senior churchwarden is described as the “auntient,” and he was the person who had the parish property in his hands.

The signatures of Marbury and of Fuller and Munger, the rector, and two churchwardens, appear. Here it may be mentioned that it has always been the right in the City for the parishioners to elect the churchwardens, and the rector and churchwardens are a Corporation.

The first part of the book contains a number of wills covering some thirty or forty pages.

On 7th March, 1621, there is an entry relating to the repairing the chancel of the church, and in 1624 (on page 23) there is a petition to the Bishop of

London reciting that it was necessary to spend £400 in addition to the sum which had then been collected for the repairing of the church.

The Bishop's name was George Montaign. He was Bishop of London from 1621 to 1628.

It appears from one of the entries that the parish clerk was also a schoolmaster, and had payments made him called "exhibitions" apparently for the education of parish scholars. It dawned upon the parish that he was continuing to receive these payments though he had no scholars. The parish also found out the clerk had bettered himself by marriage with a rich lady, and thereupon the vestry naturally determined to stop these payments, but it cost two meetings before they arrived at a conclusion.

In the year 1627 it appears that the churchwardens refused to give the usual bond or security, and then the vestry passed a resolution to the effect that no man could be churchwarden unless he pays £5 or gives a bond.

In the same year we find that a further sum of £200 was borrowed towards repairing the church, and the money was borrowed from a Mr. Dredge, merchant tailor, at six per cent.

In the year 1637 there is an entry relating to a rate to be laid upon the parishioners for the payment of the debt and interest on the money borrowed for the repairing of the church. It appears that at this time there was a sum of £600 still due in respect of the repairing of the church, and this resolution may be taken as an early instance of a "Church Rate" being levied.

In 1640 a committee of investigation numbering twelve was appointed to view and examine the parish, and to report on the condition of the church and the poor. Seven of them were to be a quorum. On the 8th February the committee reports :—The first two clauses of the report refer to leases—the (3rd) to clerk's wages ; (4) To a dinner to be arranged ; (5) That the Communion wine was to be paid for out of the Communion money ; (6) Relates to the housing and entertainment of the poor ; (7) Prescribes that leases were not to be granted for longer than a certain period, but the period is not stated ; (8) The vestry books were to be kept with alphabets and numbered throughout ; (9) A roll was to be made of the tenements ; (10) That a scribe was to be employed. Nos. 8 and 10 do not seem to have been carried out.

In connection with clause 5 there is an entry in 1640 that every householder should pay *3d.* a head once a year at Easter towards buying the Communion wine and bread. Strangers were to pay *6d.* a head.

Troublous times were now coming to the church in the City, though to some extent the church brought it on herself. Mr. Marbury, who had been rector for so long, was also rector of St. Peter's, Paul's Wharf. In 1642 the Parliament made him resign one or the other. He resigned St. James Garlickhithe, and Mr. Richard Freeman was appointed by the Bishop of London, who was then patron of the living.

In 1644 there is an entry showing that the internal fittings of the church had to be altered, and the arrangements were left to the churchwardens. This

included the "reading place," the pulpit, and pews. There is an entry of this date also as to building a gallery.

In 1645 it appears that the parish had a disagreement with the Governor of Bridewell concerning one Parrott, and, the Governor of Bridewell apparently having threatened to take proceedings against the parish, it was ordered that the churchwardens should defend the parish by course of law against "them who do or shall impose upon us."

Continual reference is made to "Dunghill Stairs." This was apparently a property belonging to the parish which had been let on lease, and it was a continual source of trouble to the parish.

In 1647 there is an entry from which it appears that there had then been for some time past a suit relating to Dunghill Stairs to which Mr. Marbury, the parson, was a party. The parish authorised the payment of parish monies towards continuing the suit.

In consequence of an ordinance passed in the year 1647 Richard Freeman, who refused to discontinue the use of the Book of Common Prayer was deprived by an ordinance of the Parliament, and violently ejected from the living.

In 1648 there was an order to view the property of the parish. On the 13th December, 1648, there was a further entry relating to the Dunghill Stairs, from which it appears that the people got sick of this litigation, and tried to have the suit wound up.

In the year 1649 there is an entry of a payment of 10s. a week for nursing a parish child. In 1649 there

is an entry of a Voluntary Church Rate, amounting to £9 in all. The churchwardens gave £1 each.

In the year 1649 there is an entry about a child who was found in the parish, and five persons were ordered to go to the Lord Mayor and see him on the subject.

In the year 1649 there is an inventory of the parish Parsonage House.

There is a long entry in the year 1649 relating to Dunghill Stairs lawsuit, Dunghill Stairs, in which details are given showing that the property had been leased for 40 years, colourable

“to one Thomas Taylor, In trust for the use of Edward Marbury for the benefit of the Parish.”

Something must have been wrong with Thos. Taylor, because it is recited that the parish got no benefit out of the lease.

“In the end, by the blessing of God and with good endeavours and the wise and faithful proceedings of the Churchwardens, the Parishioners regained the property for the proper and primitive use, to the great honour and just praise of the Churchwardens, and to all who had any hand in the recovery of the said tenement out of the hands of unlawful and perfidious [spelt pffidious] men to the true intent of the donor, and the hearty thanks of the Parishioners present were given to the Churchwardens for the efforts they had made.”

It would seem from the next entry that a judgment was obtained by consent, and that the parish entrusted to their old friend, Mr. Marbury, the settlement of the terms upon which the matter was to be closed.

It appears that there was a meeting on the 10th November, 1650, at which it was stated that the

parish had been "for a long time without a clergyman." Some difficulty was experienced in getting the inhabitants to assemble for a vestry. Those that did assemble were told that they had the power of nominating their own minister, and they nominated one Mr. Lawrence Wise.

On the 22nd November, 1650 (that was a fortnight afterwards), a further meeting was held, at which it appears a benefaction had been given to Mr. Marbury, and it was arranged that a pension of £5 was to be given to him in his great need.

This entry is very interesting. Mr. Marbury had been evicted, as I have said, from his living, but it is clear the parishioners bore him no grudge.

In 1650 there is an entry prescribing that the bells should be sold, and new bells bought, and that a new steeple was to be built. The parish afterwards had great trouble in disposing of the bells.

It appears that Mr. Zachary Crofton, a well-known man, was elected minister, December 26, 1651. Entry to the effect that no person was to receive Holy Communion, practically unless he was approved of by minister and parish meeting. At a meeting held January 28,

"Resolved—That Bread and Wine for Lord's Supper to be paid by collection at Holy Communion."

At a meeting held February 18, a grant was made to Mr. Crofton to bring his family from Cheshire.

"June 10, 1652—Catechising was ordered to be held in Ye Gallery."

"June 19.—Four bells handed as a pledge to a Mr. Hetherley as a security for a debt, £72, for him to sell."

Hetherley appears to have refused, and, August 9, the bells were pledged to Mr. Geo. Banks and Elizabeth his wife, for money due to him, on same conditions as before.

September 23, 1653. The Churchwardens were empowered to sell the bells, previous transactions having been unsuccessful.

October 4, 1654. Bells still unsold.

March 16. It seems at this time the parish got rid of Mr. Crofton, who received £20, and the parish decided to get a new minister. This is not an inappropriate place to say something about Mr. Zechariah Crofton. He was a very well-known man, and was one of the "Sweetmeats" with which the troublous times of the great rebellion presented the City, and the entry of February 18, 1651, is interesting, as showing from whence he came. My parish has the merit of introducing him to the City from Cheshire.

After he had been some time in this parish, where he certainly was not a peacemaker, he went to the parish of St. Botolph, Aldgate, and in the meantime got himself appointed lecturer in divers parishes. When he was Incumbent of Aldgate he tried to get himself appointed Rector of St. Bartholomew by the Exchange. Failing in that, he had to continue in Aldgate until the Restoration. As the old Incumbent was still alive, Mr. Crofton was then ejected, and is claimed by the Puritans as a martyr.

In this connection it is interesting to say that Mr. Freeman is claimed by the Church Party as a martyr also, and it is a curious coincidence that the date of Mr. Freeman's ejection happens to be St.

Bartholomew's Day, which was also the date of his restoration to his living.

May 2, 1655. It appears that many were invited to preach; the names were to be written on a sheet of paper, to be ballotted for. John Inge was chosen.

June 1. At a meeting of parishioners it appears Mr. Crofton had been making a disturbance, and the parish decided to take action in the matter.

November 16. A long letter was received from Mr. Crofton, complaining that the parish owed him money. Resolutions were passed for a settlement of his claim.

September 27, 1658. Mr. Inge's death reported.

On the Restoration Mr. Freeman, who had survived the rebellion, got his living back again, and continued until his death.

The Vestry Book contains no reference to politics, and there is a gap between June 19, 1665, and February 15, 1676. In the entry dated 1664, probably July 26, there is the following entry:—

“This Vestry Book was now embossed.”

1676. There appear the usual orders relating to levying of money and appropriation of £500 towards rebuilding of church.

Copy of warrant for first £500 appears on page 154.

February 13, 1681. The entry relates to a quarrel between the Rector James Burk and the parishioners, it appearing that James Burk, and probably the churchwarden, had declined to mortgage certain premises towards raising further funds to complete the church, and that Chancery proceedings were to be taken to compel them to do so.

July 19, 1682. An entry appears that Mr. Thomas Osborn, then churchwarden, was to pay Sir C. Wren's two clerks 40*s.* apiece, for their care and kindness in hastening the building of the church, and to induce them to do the like for the more speedy finishing of the steeple.

In Account Book (p. 284b) there is an entry "to Mr. Philips and Mr. Scargrowe, £4;" same time, "at Black Swan, 1*s.* 3*d.*, and spent on them 2*s.*" May we not infer that these two gentlemen were Sir C. Wren's clerks? (Return for year ending Easter, 1683.)

The Account Book is full of interesting memoranda. .
