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Abstract

This is a social and cultural study of preaching in the post-Reformation period, approached through the themes of space, identity and affectivity. Firstly, it reveals a high level of material investment in the spaces for preaching and shows how this expressed a reformed conceptualisation of sacred space and time. Secondly, lay support for preaching is investigated as a social institution and this is contrasted with a case study of conflict caused by preaching. This reveals how preaching could foster both broad and narrow varieties of godly identity, and how these interacted with one another and a sense of local identity and community. Thirdly, sermons delivered in the Pennine area are examined to show how affective responses were encouraged in hearers. By studying preaching in these ways, new light is shed onto the experience of religion at the parish level. It is argued that a wide cross-section of the population supported the preaching of the Word of God in some way and willingly participated in sermon-centred piety. The boundary between a ‘the godly’ and others is seen to be permeable, fluid and plural, and religious conflict explained by contest over the positioning of this boundary. It is proposed that attending a sermon could be an affective experience. The ‘plain’, didactic sermons delivered in the Pennine parishes contained imagery and sensory language, with attention brought onto the body, sickness and healing. Furthermore, the divine presence in worship was located in the unfolded Word, leading to the possibility of a numinous experience during the sacred time of preaching. Finally, some answers are provided to the long-standing conundrum of how preaching ministers were able to fulfil their pastoral roles and maintain the parish as a unit, while at the same time admonishing their hearers, preaching predestination and nurturing the more religiously committed of their flock. It is proposed that this balancing act was less of a feat when the broader appeal of preaching-centred worship, as revealed in this study, is considered. Preaching-centred worship offered the opportunity for pious material expression, social participation and interaction, and contained affective aspects that could be appreciated at various levels.
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General Introduction

Overview

In a sermon delivered to his fellow preachers, Hugh Ramsden, the minister of Methley, pronounced that ‘to preach Christ is to preach him with savory language, not deadly and idly, but with such sweet and savory language as that the hearts of the hearers may be affected with it’. Ramsden was preaching in the post-Reformation period, a time when most people in England knew that they were Protestants, but what that should mean was open to debate and persuasion. Preaching played a key role in this, being the primary means by which the clergy hoped to convert individuals so they became more sincere, committed Protestants, or faithful members of Christ. As Ramsden stated, preaching was intended to both educate and move the hearer and there was a wealth of contemporary thought and advice on how to do this. This prescriptive material has recently received attention from historians and literary scholars, but how it was carried through into practice at the level of the parish, and how preaching actually happened there, remains a lot less clear. There is a lot more to be uncovered. Ramsden was delivering his sermon at an exercise, a meeting at which several ministers would preach to an audience consisting of their fellow clergy and the more religiously committed laity. Institutions such as this were part of a larger culture of preaching that was created and maintained by lay actions and social organisation. This research project investigates how this came into being and aims to further understand preaching as a common event and experience in the lives of early modern people.

Having preaching as the central organising theme for a research project allows interesting questions to be asked while loosening the circularity of using an established nomenclature of religious categories. The two big questions asked in this study are how preaching fostered local and religious identities and in what ways preaching was an affective, embodied and numinous

---

1 WYAS (W): WYW 1352/3/1/2/11, sermon on Col. 1: 28, 29.
experience. Investigating these issues sheds light on several issues in Reformation historiography. A key problem addressed is how doctrinally Calvinist, preaching clergy, with their mission to admonish their flock to bring about repentance and nurture those who showed signs of being the elect, were also able to fulfil their pastoral role to the whole of their parish. Historians such as Keith Thomas and Christopher Haigh have presented preaching as fundamentally incompatible with the relationships necessary for the pastoral ideal of the minister as peace maker. Haigh saw this as key to the ‘failure’ of preaching-centred Protestantism and proposed that the demands of the laity eventually forced Protestant ministers to adopt a more inclusive, ceremonial form of worship. Others have challenged such a negative view. Patrick Collinson pointed out that preaching ministers did a lot more than preach, and Eric Carlson highlighted the pastoral ideal of the sensitive preaching minister, balancing admonition with gentle persuasion. Arnold Hunt’s recent work tackles this issue. He does not minimise the problems faced by preachers, but by examining three series of manuscript sermons, he shows how preaching ministers adapted to the expectations of their flock by employing a mixture of old and new ideas, learnedness and low brow homeliness in their sermons.

Julia Merritt has raised the query of how some Calvinist ministers did not shy away from teaching the doctrine of predestination, and ‘acknowledged the distinctive role of the godly’ within their flock, but somehow managed to do this while retaining the support of the whole of their parish and without fracturing the parish community. Merritt likens this to walking a tightrope, and this study will engage with this ‘tightrope conundrum’. Clearly more work at the level of parish preaching is needed to fill out this picture and this study will take the scholarship forward by investigating support for preaching as a social institution and how preaching ministers used affective techniques to make their preaching more appealing to a wide cross section of society, even while they used a mainly didactic style.

---


6 Hunt, The Art of Hearing, ch. 5, especially p. 244.

The study is structured around three themes: space, identity and affect. They are outlined very briefly here, with fuller introductions and discussion of the research questions at the start of the three sections. Part I of the study will investigate preaching as a spatial, material and embodied experience. The broad changes to church interiors for Protestant worship in the Reformation are well known. However, as Mary Morrissey has pointed out, the physical context of preaching has been neglected. This study will provide much needed detail to reveal the scale, variety and meaning of changes in places of worship for preaching. Chapter one explores a surge in church fabric investment for preaching-centred worship and how this changed the experience of being in that space. The whole span of 1580 to 1660 is considered, but the findings are particularly significant for the Jacobean period. Preaching-centred Protestantism has been traditionally presented as iconophobic, and associated with a neglect of church fabric, which was only ‘rectified’ in the Laudian era of the 1630s. This narrative has been challenged in recent years, most powerfully by Julia Merritt’s study of church fabric investment in Jacobean London. However, a national picture of material investment for preaching-centred worship is still a long way off and this study will contribute towards this. How parishes responded to the Laudian programme of Archbishop Neile will also be explored, as this further reveals the attitudes and priorities of those who supported preaching. This leads on to a focus on sacred space in chapter two. It is well known that most Protestants understood their place of worship to be, in a sense, the house of God, but what ‘in a sense’ meant for contemporaries remains somewhat obscure. To help illuminate this, the ways in which a Reformed conceptualisation of sacred space and time was communicated at a local level through sermons and consecration events will be examined. Through these questions, Part I of the

---


9 Older works based on firm categories, such as Horton Davies, Worship and Theology in England from Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534–1690 (Combined edition, Cambridge, 1996) have been superseded by more nuanced studies, such as Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, Altars Restored, The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700 (Oxford, 2007). However, the latter has the communion table as its focus and even Arnold Hunt’s comprehensive work did not cover the material and spatial aspects of preaching. Morrissey’s work on Paul’s Cross sermons deals with the physical setting, in her Politics and the Paul’s Cross Sermons, 1558–1642 (Oxford, 2011), ch. 1.


study will therefore challenge the notion that preaching-centred Protestantism was antithetical to material expression and a sense of the numinous in worship.

Part II of the study situates preaching in its social context. Chapter three investigates how the actions and organisation associated with preaching could be a way in which senses of identity and community were created. It is premised on the view that what people did and who they did it with was a way in which identity was created and signalled, a stance supported by French and Barry who propose that in the early modern period, identity largely meant identifying with others.\textsuperscript{12} Preaching was undoubtedly linked with a godly identity. The Lancashire preacher, William Harrison, declared that attendance at sermons was ‘an apparent sign of God’s elect’, and the prodigious sermon-going of Nehemiah Wallington has been held up as archetypal godly behaviour by modern historians.\textsuperscript{13} Investigation of communal actions for a godly purpose is a way to shed light on both local and godly identities, and particularly how they interacted. This study probes the boundary of godly identity to see how permeable and mutable it was and how it interacted with local identity, questioning the convention that presents them as incompatible. However, as Patrick Collinson observed, ‘most places exposed to puritan preaching were likely to experience a cleavage at some point in the community’ and so, for balance, the potential of preaching to create identities that led to community fracturing must also be examined.\textsuperscript{14} To do this, chapter four switches emphasis to the messages communicated through preaching and changes scale to allow an in-depth case study. The familiar explanation for religious conflict posits a godly minority in opposition to a religiously lukewarm or conformist majority, with friction arising over Sabbath observance, moral behaviour and the preaching of predestination. Close attention to the evolution of religious identities in Leeds reveals that conflict could be within progressive, Calvinist Protestantism, and thus further complicates interpretations of godly identity as lived experience.\textsuperscript{15}

Part III of the study examines ways in which preachers encouraged an affective response in their hearers. In older scholarship, Calvinist preaching at grassroots level was presented as wholly didactic and probably the last place to look for affective worship. This stance was informed by a traditional dichotomy between worship that entailed affective and sensory experience and worship

\textsuperscript{12} Henry French and Jonathan Barry, (eds), \textit{Identity and Agency in England, 1500 – 1800} (Basingstoke, 2004), introduction.
\textsuperscript{15} Variation within post-Reformation Calvinism was highlighted by Peter Lake in his ‘Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635’, \textit{Past & Present}, no. 114 (Feb., 1987), pp. 32–76.
that engaged the intellect and was concerned with the acquisition of knowledge. This division has been applied in various contexts, such as between pre- and post-Reformation religion, and between the more ceremonial-centred and preaching-centred Protestantism. For Keith Thomas and the revisionist historians who followed him, preaching-centred Protestantism was considered to be unpopular because it lacked affective properties, in contrast to its sensory, affective and magical predecessor. Where affectivity has been located in post-Reformation religion, it has primarily been in its ceremonial variants. In other words, Protestantism was affective because it was not fully reformed. However, an alternative has been set out by Arnold Hunt, Mary Morrissey and Matthew Milner, who claim preaching had affective properties. Much remains to be uncovered here, and chapters five and six add to the emerging picture. Rather than using prescriptive sources, as has been the focus to date, this study uses the sermons actually delivered in the region and evidence of the preachers’ delivery. Chapter five will focus on the imagery and the interaction between the didactic and affective aspects of sermons. Chapter six will focus on the way that the body, healing and intercession were associated with preaching. Rather than arguing that post-Reformation Protestantism had affective, sensory and numinous qualities despite preaching, this study posits that Protestantism had these qualities because of preaching.

**Approach, method and terminology**

The study is positioned within the broader field of the social and cultural aspects of Reformation history, with interest centred on the lived experience of early modern people at the parish level. It uses an interdisciplinary approach that allows historians to access the ‘view from the pew’ from various angles. Because of this, there is no single overarching theory, but the study proceeds through a mainly empirical mode, supported, where appropriate, by the applied theories that historians have found useful in their practice. It explores space and material culture at both the scale of how people moved about for preaching geographically, and at the level of how individuals filled a

---


space with objects to facilitate their worship and arranged their bodies within that space. It focuses on relationships in various forms: between inhabitants of a locality, as dispersed networks, and relationships between centres of power and the locality. Finally, it analyses texts for their persuasive, affective properties. These approaches will all be used from a basis that remains empirical, rather than theoretical.

Any attempt to understand the experience of preaching encounters the methodological issue that, as John Craig points out, the evidence for sermon reception is elusive and has to ‘be gleaned from a myriad of sources’. Many of the sources originate from the ‘producer side’ of the relationship, from the preachers themselves. Arnold Hunt’s solution to this was to focus on using the advice literature aimed at preachers and their hearers, and he made a survey of this material in his *Art of Hearing*. This study, in contrast, will focus on other areas, such as the physical setting of preaching, the social organisation for preaching and the imagery used in sermons. A wide range of sources will be used to do this, and, where possible, connections will be made between them. The archival sources include parish material such as churchwardens’ accounts and pew plans, which require a degree of inference to reveal motivations and attitudes. These have been underused in studies about preaching, and an investigation of them throws up some surprising results. They are used with the premise that how early modern people chose to distribute their resources, what they did, and who they did it with, can tell us something about how they understood themselves. This material also lends itself to quantitative analysis, and a range of techniques have been employed in interpreting the data. The study will also make extensive use of other materials from the diocesan archives, including court records, administration records, and wills. Sources that bear incidental relation to preaching have also been used, such as letters, diaries, personal notes, autobiographies and biographies, secular court material, polemical literature and ballads. Finally, a full survey of the surviving sermons from the Pennine area has been made, including both print and manuscript sources. Where possible, these have been read in full to derive a fully contextualised reading of the text, although parts of the content have then been ‘mined’ for the purpose of the study. The sermon sources come in various kinds, such as a preacher’s own drafts, written up fair copies after the event, and polished print versions. Complex though these sources are, they provide an insight into the array of ideas, teachings and imagery that filled the air while hearers sat in their pews, and from which parishioners selectively absorbed and adapted to their own understandings. Sermon notes taken by hearers give a sense of this process. Those taken contemporaneously may be almost

---

18 John Craig, ‘Sermon Reception’ in McCullough, *TOHEMS*, p. 179.
20 See Morrissey, ‘Interdisciplinarity’ for more on using sermons as sources.
illegible, such as the notes taken by a member of the Fairfax family on the eve of the Civil War, or they may be so abbreviated that little coherent sense of the sermon comes through, such as the notes taken by John Lister of Halifax in the 1650s. Notes written up after repetition are usually much more legible, although they may represent the product of communal sermon repetition. A rare treasure is the chance to match up a draft of a sermon in the preacher’s hand with notes taken by a hearer of the same sermon, and the regional approach of the study has allowed this to be done for one particular sermon. Finally, not all the sources used in this study have been found in the archives. Material remains of buildings, interior fabric and paintings have also been used.

The study operates at two scales: the local and regional. This multilevel approach means that trends can be detected and geographies plotted, while in-depth case studies allow variety to be fully appreciated. The relationship between the local and regional is probed, and, wherever possible, set into a wider, national context. This multilevel approach aims to circumvent the twin problems of broad surveys with little contextualising and microhistories being a series of detailed portraits with no connecting narrative.

The term used in this study to denote the plural for the people who supported preaching has required serious consideration. As godly identity is one of the areas under investigation, to follow convention and use the term ‘the godly’ would create a circular analysis. Another option would be to use ‘Calvinists’, as most of the individuals who supported preaching were, broadly, of a Calvinist theology. However, this has been rejected as it creates a sense of doctrinal certainty and stability which may not always be justified. A slightly looser term is needed. The term ‘progressive Protestant’ has been selected to denote the more reformed (and, largely, Reformed) strain of early modern Protestantism. This was based on Calvinist theology, which prioritised preaching as the means of salvation and the central act of public worship. This probably approximates to what Alec Ryrie denotes as ‘earnest’, Protestants who subscribed to Reformed doctrines in his study, Being Protestant. The term ‘progressive Protestant’ also has the advantage of encompassing much of the parish based preaching of the 1640s and 50s, without becoming overly concerned with the different forms of Church governance that arose at that time.

21 Otley Parish Archives, sermon notes from the Otley Exercise; WYAS (B) WYB 263, sermon notes from the Otley Exercise; WYAS (C) SH:3/S/3–7.
22 See chapter five. John Lister lived 1602–1662.
23 This term was first used by Patrick Collinson in Godly People, p. 2.
Boundaries and scope

Setting out with a gaze relatively unconstrained by nomenclature means that the net was cast wide in the early stages of research, so as wide a range of parish preaching experience as possible has been captured. However, of necessity other boundaries have been imposed or encountered. The decision to focus on parish based preaching places a de facto limit on theological grounds, as the surviving sermons from the post-Reformation Pennine parishes were mainly Calvinist. A geographical area has been selected to make the project manageable. The area, which is denoted for shorthand here as the Pennines, covers the southern part of the West Riding of Yorkshire and south-east Lancashire, approximating to an area bounded by the modern cities or towns of Blackburn, Bingley, Leeds, Doncaster, Sheffield and Manchester. In the post-Reformation period, this was the area covered by the deaneries of Manchester, Blackburn, Doncaster, Pontefract and part of New Ainsty. This area has been selected because earlier work has highlighted it as an area in which a lot of preaching happened and it was therefore likely to be rich in sources. It was also chosen because it is an area that has tended to be overlooked in the historiography in favour of cities such as York and Chester, and the North as a whole is underrepresented in national studies of early modern religion. The two principal existing works covering post-Reformation religion in the Pennine area are those by Ronald Marchant and R. C. Richardson, for Yorkshire and Lancashire respectively. Both studies take ‘puritanism’ as their object of analysis, so preaching is included as a by-product rather than a primary focus and Marchant’s work was largely confined to the clergy. In contrast, this study has preaching as its main object of interest and the slant is towards the lay experience.

The scale and location for much of the analysis is at the parochial level, both urban and rural. This includes both parish churches and chapels-of-ease. This allows sources that were created in the process of parish governance to be used in the study and includes a variety of clerical positions and institutions that were funded through the parish, even the post of lecturer, which in the Pennine area tended to be an assistant within the parochial structure rather than a civic role. A focus on the parish also allows a range of religious commitment to be considered without drawing boundaries. Many of the sources inevitably originated from the more religiously committed, but the aim is not to draw a false boundary between them and the broadest audience of the whole parish.


Lecturers were employed at Halifax, Leeds and Manchester parishes.
conventicles outside of the parish church and in separatist sects, however, is not generally included in the study.  

The chronology of the study has been partly led by source availability, but there are good reasons for selecting the period 1580 to 1660. The start date represents the time at which most early modern English people had come to think of themselves as Protestants, so the period can be called the ‘post-Reformation’. It also marks the time when the preaching ministry began to grow, with university educated clergy moving into the pulpits of Northern England, although this took some time and preaching did not immediately become a common experience. An end date of 1660 has been chosen to make the project manageable, and also to incorporate the 1640–1660 period that has previously tended to be separated historiographically from the earlier decades. There is much useful evidence from these last two decades and there are continuities to be explored.  

The study ends with the Restoration because after this time it is more difficult to make a study of preaching that ignores the denominational groupings that clergy and people organised themselves into, and a study of preaching starts to look like a study of Dissenters.  

There are some areas that might have been further explored, but the decision was made to only touch on them for the purposes of this study. Firstly, there is the theme of gender. Men far outnumber women as subjects in this study. It is undeniable that all the preachers were men, and many of the actions taken to support them were taken by men. Women did feature in the latter role, although the sources that reveal this are also mainly written by men as hagiographic accounts of their wives or mothers. There was not enough source material for gender to be a major theme in this study, although it is touched upon. Likewise, the tendency for preachers to portray themselves as weak and suffering has feminine characteristics, but to make a specific claim about this would be to push the source material too far. The second area stems from the approach being cultural and social. Preaching, as a public voice, inevitably interacted with regional and local politics, and this study intends to reveal some of the processes that determined who could speak and what messages they could convey. However, the high politics surrounding central government is not the focus and will only be touched upon where it interacts with the local, social and cultural interests of this study.  

In the same way, this study will not deal directly with the Civil Wars and the religious politics of the


28 Tyacke and Fincham make a case for reuniting the 1640–60 period with the period before it in their Altars Restored. p. 1. For recent parish based work that includes the 1640s and 50s, see Valerie Hitchman’s unpublished PhD, ‘Omnia bene or ruinosa? The condition of the parish churches in and around London and Westminster c. 1603–1677’, University of Chichester (2008).
various forms of Church government that arose in its aftermath. To do so would be to change the 
nature and scope of this study, which is firmly grounded on investigating the practice and experience 
of preaching as a phenomenon. 29

29 There is an extensive scholarship on the impact of preaching in the Civil War, from Christopher Hill, 
Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England (Panther edition, 1969) through to Christopher Durston 
and Judith Maltby, (eds,) Religion in Revolutionary England (Manchester, 2006). For a related, local study that 
does engage with the Civil War, see William Sheils ‘Provincial preaching on the eve of the Civil War: some West 
Riding fast sermons’ in Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts, (eds), Religion, Culture and Society in Early 
Modern Britain (Cambridge, 1994).
Part I. Space
Introduction and Historiography

This part of the study investigates the spaces that were created for preaching-centred worship and how these spaces were experienced and understood. It is important to understand the background to church fabric at this time, so this introduction begins with an outline of late-sixteenth century progressive Protestant thought on places of worship. It will then go on to set out the historiographical debates and problems and how the research questions engage with them.

Background to post-Reformation developments in church fabric and sacred space

Calvin’s views were very influential on English Protestantism.¹ He advocated restraint in the setting of worship, maintaining that

What is bestowed upon the adornment of churches . . . is wrongly applied if that moderation is not used which both the nature of sacred things prescribes and the apostles and other holy fathers have prescribed.²

The need for restraint was further endorsed in the Second Helvetic Confession, which stipulated that

The places where the faithful meet are to be decent, and in all respect fit for God’s Church. Therefore spacious buildings or temples are to be chosen, but they are to be purged of everything that is not fitting for a church. And everything is to be arranged for decorum, necessity and godly decency . . . all luxurious attire, all pride, and everything unbecoming to Christian humility, discipline and modesty are to be banished from the sanctuaries and places of prayer of Christians . . . let all things be done decently and in order in the church, and finally let all things be done for edification.³

The returning Marian exiles maintained this view, but the Elizabethan Settlement introduced some ambiguity. The Injunctions of 1559 echoed the relatively moderate Protestantism of the first year of

³ Benedict, ‘Calvinism as Culture?’, pp. 34,5.
Edward VI’s reign, which allowed a more Lutheran materiality in worship. The Royal Orders of 1560 and 1561 were a further check on iconoclastic impulses, requiring the preservation of tombs, screens, bells and coloured glass in churches. These conservative edicts were in contrast to the much stronger anti-idolatry message of the Second Tome of Homilies, in which the longest sermon was that ‘Against the Peril of Idolatry and Superfluous Decking of Churches’. This three-part sermon justified the prohibition of images in worship, but extended the definition of idolatry to include an inordinate love of worldly things and thus condemned ‘sumptuousness’ in church décor. The homily blamed the corruption of the Roman Church since the time of Pope Gregory for such worldliness and materiality, and contrasted this with the purity and simplicity of the early Church. The Homily preempted or countered Catholic criticism of the bareness of Protestant churches by pronouncing that true adornment was spiritual in nature,

For it is a Church or Temple also that glittereth with no marble, shineth with no gold or silver, glistenereth with no pearls or precious stones: but with plainness and frugality, signifieth no proud doctrine nor people, but humble, frugal and nothing esteeming earthly and outward things, but gloriously decked with inward ornaments.

Although this appeared to condemn all material concern in worship, the guiding principle of moderation was applied. The homily stressed that the warning was not ‘against Churches and Temples, which are most necessary, and ought to have their due use and honour’ but was ‘against the sumptuousness and abuses’ of them. This qualifier was reinforced by the positioning of the homily between two others that reminded hearers of the importance of the church building. The ‘Homily for Repairing and Keeping Clean and Comely adorning of Churches’ maintained that, ‘God

\[\text{\footnotesize
This is the view of Margaret Aston in her England’s Iconoclasts: Laws Against Images 1536–1563 (Oxford, 1988), p. 299.}
\]

\[\text{\footnotesize
Idem. pp. 312, 14.}
\]

\[\text{\footnotesize
Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory, (Oxford, 1683), pp. 105–169. This was issued in 1563, but the footnote references here apply to the the Roman lettered 1683 edition.}
\]

\[\text{\footnotesize
For more on the wide and narrow interpretations of idolatry, see Arthur F. Marotti ‘In Defence of Idolatry: Residual Catholic Culture and the Protestant Assault on the Sensuous in Early Modern England’, p. 36,7, in Lowell Gallagher, (ed.), Redrawing the Map of Early Modern Catholicism (Toronto, 2012).}
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Fincham and Tyacke point to the balancing effect of these three homilies in their Altars Restored, p. 43.}
\]
will have his Temple, his Church, the place where his congregation shall resort to magnifie him, well edified, well repaired, and well maintained'.

In addition to these counterbalancing messages, there were potential variations in how phrases and terms were construed. For instance, as the above quote shows, the verse ‘let all things be done decently and in order in the church’, (1 Cor. 14:40), was used to support the restraint in church interiors in the Second Helvetic Confession, but it was also used by Laudian clergy to promote elaborate décor and ceremonial worship in the 1630s. Likewise, ‘comely’ could be used to mean some degree of ornament, as in the 1561 Royal Order to provide a table of the Ten Commandments for ‘some comely ornament and demonstration’. However, it was also used in a behavioural sense by William Perkins, who maintained that ‘comelinesse is when the worship of God is performed with meete and convenient circumstances of time, place, person, gesture’. It is therefore not surprising that, beyond the obvious removal of images, there was a ‘considerable lack of uniformity’ in approaches to church interiors during Elizabeth’s reign, even before edicts and ideas were interpreted at the local level.

The position on sacred space was equally complex. The official stance of the English Church was set out in ‘Homily of the Right use of the Church’. The homily began by reiterating the Reformed doctrine that it was impossible to contain the majesty of God within any material building. This was the doctrine taught by Calvin, who rejected the notion of church buildings as ‘God’s proper dwelling places, when he may more nearly incline his ear to us’ and considered the literal understanding of the Temple as a physical building to be a ‘stupidity’. However, the homily then went on to cite precedents from the Old and New Testaments for considering the church building to also be the ‘House and temple of the Lord’. Church buildings were presented as a place to ‘resort together unto, there to hear Gods holy Word, to call upon his holy Name, to give him thanks . . . and duly and truly

---


12 This text was the subject of a sermon given by the Laudian cleric, John Cosin, at the consecration of St John’s chapel, Leeds, in 1634.


14 William Perkins, *A warning Against Idolatry of the last times. And instruction touching Religious or Divine worship* (Cambridge, 1601) p. 200

15 The quote is from Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, p. 337

16 ‘Homily of Right Use’, p. 95; Andrew Spicer, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe*, (Manchester, 2007), p. 7. This was also the position to which the Westminster Confession subscribed in 1646, Peter Williams, ‘Metamorphoses of the Meetinghouse: Three Case Studies’ in Finney, *Seeing*, p. 479.
celebrate his holy sacraments’. This was supported with scriptural proofs and two key verses that would come to be commonly used in sermons with relation to places of worship. These were the promise of Christ in Mat. 18:20 to be present ‘wheresoever two or three be gathered in my name . . . there am I in the midst of them’, and the instruction from Ecc. 4:17, ‘When thou dost enter into the house of God take heed to thy feet’. How these texts could be interpreted to create a sense of divine presence during preaching will be explored in chapter two.

It has been shown that, at the start of the post-Reformation period, the position of the English Church on places of worship was largely of a Reformed stance, but with some ambiguity that allowed the ‘house of God’ to have both spiritual and material meaning. This would become more complex still during the period covered by this study, as, from the start of the seventeenth century, a much more defined, tangible notion of sacred space began to be developed among some clergy and leaders of the Church. This distinct attitude towards church fabric had it greatest development in the 1630s Laudian programme, which also sought to reduce the centrality of preaching in public worship. Parishes were required to reconfigure their church interiors to reflect this change of emphasis. In contrast to the earlier investment designed to support preaching, the changes demanded by the diocesan authorities in the 1630s focused attention on the east end of the church and the communion table. This reflected Archbishop Neile’s Arminian theology, in which prayer and sacraments had a larger role to play in salvation than preaching. Associated with these Laudian changes was the notion that the church and objects of worship were intrinsically holy, which encouraged more decorative interiors and the restriction of access to the areas deemed holiest. How historians have interpreted these issues, and the problems requiring further research will now be discussed.

**Historiographical issues and problems**

The dominant narrative in older Reformation scholarship, such as that by Horton Davies and John Phillips, was that progressive Protestants (or, in their terminology, ‘puritans’) were not interested in the material setting of worship. Their churches were characterised as ‘austere, scrubbed and

---

17 ‘Homily of the Right Use’, p. 96.
domesticated simplicity’, or even presumed to be in a neglected state. 20 John Purvis went as far to skip the Jacobean period in his survey of church fabric in Yorkshire with the explanation that,

From the beginning of the seventeenth century the records show an increasing preoccupation with puritanism and its effects, but this is concerned far more with the matter of behaviour in church and attitude to services there than with anything concerned with the fabric. 21

Where historians, such as Wilbur Jordan, did consider post-Reformation church fabric investment they assumed that it was either a practical measure to deal with overcrowding, compliance with demands from above to rectify previous ‘neglect’, or simply labelled it as Laudian. 22 In 1986 Patrick Collinson famously argued that the degree of ‘iconophobia’ exhibited by Protestants varied with time, with 1580 a watershed after which all religious imagery was rejected. 23 The orthodoxy, however, was soon to be challenged. In 1991, the year in which Tessa Watt’s study of cheap print showed that later Protestantism was not as iconophobic as presumed, Diarmaid MacCulloch postulated that closer scrutiny would reveal what he memorably termed a ‘minor building revolution’ in church fabric starting at the end of the sixteenth century. This was shortly followed by the impressionistic overviews by George Yule and Andrew Foster that there was a pre-Laudian phase of church fabric investment. 24 These overviews were fleshed out by Merritt’s more detailed work

20 Davies, Worship and Theology, p. 10; Phillips, The Reformation of Images, ch. 9.
on Jacobean investment in London churches. This was followed by and Fincham and Tyacke’s study which took a longer time range and geographical remit, although most of their cases were drawn from the Southern Province. Reformed church fabric investment in Scotland has recently been explored by Andrew Spicer and Margo Todd and a local study of Exeter has been carried out. Therefore, a national picture of non-Laudian church fabric investment is still lacking, particularly for the North of England, and this study goes some way to amend that.

There is also debate about the motivation and nature of the Laudian changes to church interiors. A lot depends on the choice of source material. Marchant, Foster and Yorke all used the diocesan archive to create an overview of Archbishop Neile’s campaign from the point of view of the enforcer. They present the programme as coercive, but the view from the centre reveals little about how coercion actually worked in practice. The alternative view posits voluntary enthusiasm for Laudian changes from a previously suppressed cohort of parishioners with preferences for ceremonial worship and elaborate décor. Alexandra Walsham argues ‘it is hard to deny the potential appeal to certain elements of the churchgoing populace of a fresh liturgical emphasis on the Eucharist at the expense of the sermon’. Peter Lake, working from a wide range of sources, also argues that a group existed within the parish of St Katherine Cree in London which supported ceremonial worship and lavish decoration and readily accepted the Laudian instructions as part of a


wider, voluntary project to beautify the church. Two nuanced arguments further complicate the picture. Antony Milton presents a variation on the voluntary argument, pointing to the short term opportunism of involvement, while Fincham and Tyacke stress that Calvinist, as well as anti-Calvinist, clergy, and a wide range of laity, supported the beautification of churches. This complicated picture suggests that a closer look is needed at the motivations and nature of 1630s changes to church fabric.

The traditional historiographical view of sacred space and time, following the line set by Keith Thomas’ Religion and the Decline of Magic, is that the iconoclastic, word-centred nature of Protestantism drastically reduced a sense of the numinous in worship. Eamon Duffy and Ronald Hutton charted the removal of sacred objects and rituals from worship and the reduction of feast days down to the twenty-seven Holy Days in the 1552 Prayer Book. David Cressy presented a calendar of patriotic, secular celebrations replacing the holy time of the ritual calendar. Framing the Reformation in such terms of loss has been challenged in two ways. Firstly, a theme of continuity across the Reformation divide has shown that there were concerns about idolatry in late medieval religion and Protestantism continued to impart some sense of the sacred despite its emphasis on the Word. Christopher Marsh points out that church buildings retained a special character for Protestants, and that ‘well before the 1630s, [they] clearly did believe that God inhabited His church

28 Peter Lake, ‘Order, orthodoxy and resistance, the ambiguous legacy of English puritanism, or just how moderate was Stephen Denison?’ M. J. Braddick and J. Walter, (eds), Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland (Cambridge, 2001).


30 Duffy, Stripping; Ronald Hutton, The Rise and Fall of Merry England; the Ritual Year 1400–1700 (Oxford 1994); David Cressy, Bonfires and Bells, National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England (London 1989).

in a special (though complicated) sense’. Margo Todd makes a similar point that when Scottish Calvinists paid for new pews or inscribed their names on furnishings, they did so ‘using holy space and religious language to explain who they were’, just as their medieval predecessors had done. These arguments all propose that early modern Protestants continued to regard their parish church as holy, but exactly how this was formulated is unclear and the arguments rely heavily on inference. The issue tends to get historiographically conflated with the area of church fabric investment, as there is an assumption that material investment was coterminous with a notion that such fabric was considered to be sacred.

The alternative, minority argument posits that the Reformation saw a relocation and intensification of a sense of the sacred space and time because of, not despite, its Reformed nature and focus on the Word. Matthew Milner makes a bold claim that all the sense of the sacred that had been dispersed through numerous objects and actions in pre-Reformation religion was relocated and concentrated into the Word, so that it became the single sacred object. For Milner, post-Reformation preaching was ‘as much an exercise in comprehension as an experience of a sacred object’, and a ‘virtuous habit’ that built up, or edified, the believer. Likewise, Alexandra Walsham argues for a ‘liturgical reconceptualisation’ of the sacred in the form of the Word, stating that ‘sacred awe was accorded to actual utterance, to the physical act of expounding Holy Writ.’ Mary Morrissey has further elucidated how this was understood to occur through the ‘English Reformed Theory of Preaching’ that dominated the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church. This, she argues, presented preaching as both a means of acquiring knowledge and an opportunity to receive grace. Grace was made available through the joint action of the Holy Spirit, the preacher and the hearer, even if no new doctrine was imparted, or the content fully comprehended. This highlighted the importance of preaching as an event, and Arnold Hunt has taken up this topic, revealing the contemporary debates centred on the difference between hearing the Word preached and reading

32 Marsh ‘Sacred Space in England’, pp. 289, 308–10. Marsh infers a sense of sacred space from the high number of pew disputes compared to disputes concerning other forms of seating.

33 Todd, Culture of Protestantism, pp. 326, 59.

34 Milner, The Senses, p. 265.


37 Morrissey, ‘Scripture, Style and Persuasion’ pp. 689, 90.
Despite all this recent scholarship, how these ideas were communicated to the laity in the parishes, and how they were received, remains an area to be developed.

The recent scholarship on preaching interacts with work on whether, and if so, how, a Protestant sense of sacred space developed. Andrew Spicer and Will Costner propose that the Second Helvetic Confession was the moment when the hard-line of Calvin and Zwingli was softened. The Confession contained a formula for a Reformed sense of the sacred based on the true worship that happened in a church, rather than the material building being intrinsically sacred. Much of the work so far has been based on scholarly debates between Calvinists and anti-Calvinists, and this has resulted in ideas about space being only obliquely handled. As such, how this Reformed conceptualisation of sacred space was communicated at the parish level, and how it interacted with the developing notion that the buildings and objects used in worship could be intrinsically holy, remains unclear. The issue is brought into further sharp relief when the subject of consecration is considered. Andrew Spicer has made a study of the development of consecration in the early seventeenth century, which he places within a ‘widespread desire to distinguish between the sacred and profane’, at least partly motivated by Catholic criticism that Protestant churches had no ‘distinction of places’. Again, how the Reformed conceptualisation of sacred space was related to the growth in consecration requires illumination.

Several of the problems and lacunae outlined above form the basis for this research project. The intervention that this study will make is possible because church fabric is approached as a facet of preaching, rather than classifying such developments chronologically, as Jacobean. This builds on the tentative proposal adduced by Merritt that the investment she studied seemed to be most prominent in parishes served by preaching ministers. This approach also allows a longer period to be studied, including the 1650s, which is another period traditionally thought of in negative terms regarding church fabric. That too is beginning to be challenged by studies such as that by Valerie Hitchman for the area around London.

The first part of chapter one asks how important the material and spatial aspects of parish-based preaching were for progressive Protestants, and why? John Craig has noted, ‘the


39 Spicer, Calvinist Churches, p. 11.

40 Andrew Spicer, “God will have a House”: Defining Sacred Space and Rites of Consecration in Early Seventeenth-Century England” in Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (eds), Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (Ashgate, 2005), p. 214.


42 Hitchman, ‘Omnia bene or ruinosa?’.
reorganisation of the interiors of parish churches over the course of the sixteenth century lay at the heart of the experience of attending sermons in the parish church 

This study concurs with this view, but significantly expands upon it by bringing to light a second phase of re-ordering and investment in church interiors, starting around 1600. The scale and extent of this surge in investment has not previously been realised by historians because the main sources, namely churchwardens’ accounts and pew plans in the Pennine area, have largely lain unused in favour of testamentary sources. Twenty-seven sets of churchwardens’ accounts and twenty-five pew plans/lists survive to some degree for the Pennine area, far more than has previously been realised. The motivation behind the investments revealed in these accounts will be explored, including the hypothesis that pressure from above was a dominant force. The findings reveal a grassroots impulse to provide a space for preaching that challenges the received wisdom concerning the importance of the material setting of worship to progressive Protestants. Moreover, it will be argued that the interior configuration of churches and chapels was an expression of the theology being preached by the Calvinist ministers. The findings also question some of the larger axioms of Reformation historiography concerning which forms of religiosity have been assumed to garner ‘popular’ support.

The second part of chapter one focuses on the changes to church fabric during the primacy of Archbishop Neile in the 1630s. This study, working from the premise that how those parishes that had supported preaching responded to this programme reveals further information about the meaning of preaching for them, posits a different explanation. It is proposed that a performance of compliance, even enthusiasm with the Laudian programme was part of a negotiation in which the priority for parishioners was to retain their preaching clergy. This explanation arises from focusing on the relationship between parish and the diocese. In addition, the significance of the Laudian demand to relocate pulpits is highlighted, and it is proposed that this was as significant an issue for parishes as the reconfiguration of communion tables, although it has rarely received attention to date.


See Appendix 1 for a summary of all cwa, pew plans and consecration documents. Andrew Foster estimated that a total of twenty-five surviving cwa for the whole Diocese of York in his ‘Churchwardens’ Accounts in Early Modern England and Wales’ p. 78. Some of the accounts in the Pennine area are small fragments.
Chapter Two will address these issues by probing if, and if so, how, the spaces created for preaching were regarded as sacred, or the ‘house of God’. Rather than locating a notion of sacred space in conservative elements of Protestantism, or in continuities with the Catholic past, it will seek to understand how a specifically Reformed version of sacred space that was associated with preaching was communicated. It will show how this communication was aided by some degree of ambiguity between the literal and figurative, material and spiritual in the language of the preachers. It will bring to the fore two ways in which the sacred was constructed: through behaviour and the marking of time.\footnote{These developments are outlined by Coster and Spicer, ‘Introduction: the dimensions of sacred space in Reformation Europe’ in their \textit{Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe}, p. 13. For an example of a post-structuralist approach to sacred space, see John Eade and Michael Sallnow, \textit{Contesting the Sacred: the Anthropology of Christian Pilgrimage} (London, 1991).} It will be proposed that the Reformed (non-intrinsic) and intrinsic conceptualisations of sacred space were largely incompatible, and what appears to be a gradual, seamless shift between them was not so. This separation will be highlighted by exploring the consecration events that occurred in the Pennines, and how an attempt to create a bridge between them failed.
Chapter One
The Spatial and Material Aspects of Preaching

This chapter investigates the ways in which people in the Pennine area invested in church fabric between the late sixteenth century and the Restoration. It reveals an early seventeenth century surge in investment associated with preaching.

Building and rebuilding chapels and the refurbishment of parish churches

A significant area of church fabric investment was the building of new chapels and the rebuilding and substantial enlargement of existing chapels. From the late medieval period, the geographically large and populous parishes in the Pennines had been served by chapels-of-ease, but many of these fell into disuse in the second half of the sixteenth century. This situation was more than reversed between 1580 and 1660, however, when fifteen existing parochial chapels were rebuilt, or substantially repaired and enlarged, and nineteen new ones constructed (see Appendix 1). The cumulative total of building activity is shown in Figure 1. The graph clearly shows a peak period of building activity between the years 1602 and 1632. This evidence challenges the orthodoxy that there was very little church building activity at this time.

Figure 1. Cumulative number of chapels built and rebuilt in the Pennine area (excl. private).

---

46 William Sheils and Sarah Sheils ascribe this decline to the loss of funding from the 1548 Chantry legislation, ‘Textiles and reform: Halifax and its Hinterland’ in Patrick Collinson and John Craig (eds), The Reformation in English Towns 1500–1640 (Basingstoke, 1998).
At the same time as the chapel building programme, there was a notable investment in the fabric of existing parish churches and the larger, parochial chapels that functioned as parish churches. This can be seen impressionistically in the surviving churchwardens’ accounts, but a systematic analysis has also been carried out using the original Sheffield churchwardens’ accounts, which survive as a complete run for the full eighty years under consideration. Sheffield is an appropriate subject for this exercise, as it was a particularly strong centre of preaching. It had been an early adopter of progressive Protestantism following the 1559 Settlement, and with the institution of Thomas Toller as vicar in 1597, the style of worship became more progressive still. Toller was presented several times for non-conformity, including an appearance before the High Commission. The source used to reveal investment in the large parish church of Sheffield is the book of written-up annual accounts that were presented to the ‘Twelve Capital Burgesses’, the body that oversaw the funding for the parish. The income for the parish was from rents, and in addition to expenditure on church fabric the funds were also used to pay the wages of three assistant ministers, maintain the highways and relieve the poor. To analyse this data, the expenditure on fabric has been placed into six categories: hard fabric (roof, windows, walls, floor); bells; clock; pews, lofts and pulpit; painting and other decorative work; and an ‘other’ category covering items such as organs, books, utensils and textiles. Together these six categories comprise the total expenditure on church fabric. The detailed expenditure on each category for the full eighty years is given in Appendix 2, and is presented visually here, in Figure 2. To set this data into context, the expenditure on fabric is also shown as a proportion of total parish income in Figure 3. This gives an indication of how much fabric expenditure was a priority compared to other uses for the funds.

47 Examples of the large chapels that functioned as parish churches include Elland and Heptonstall in Halifax Parish, Bradfield in Ecclesfield Parish and Padiham in Whalley Parish.

48 SA: CB. 161, Sheffield cwa.


50 Patent of the Twelve Capital Burgesses and Commonality of Sheffield 1554, translated from Latin in George Tolley in ‘We of our Bounty: a History of the Sheffield Church Burgesses’ (The Memoir Club, 1999), p. 76.

51 The income from rents went through long periods of stability, punctuated by sharp increases, with income rising from approximately £30 a year at the start of the period, to £150 in the 1650s. The largest of these increases can occurred as a result of the land survey following the death of Gilbert Talbot, the Seventh Earl of Shrewsbury in 1616. The total expenditure by the churchwardens tended to closely follow the rent income.
Figure 2. Expenditure on church fabric in Sheffield Parish 1580 – 1660. Data sourced from Sheffield cwa, SA: CB 161.

Figure 3. Total fabric expenditure at Sheffield as percentage of total rental income (rolling 5 years). Data sourced from Sheffield cwa, SA: CB 161.
The findings firmly contradict the narrative of Elizabethan and Jacobean neglect, made good in the 1630s by the Laudian programme. Instead, it can be seen that expenditure on hard fabric was fairly constant throughout the period, with a dip in the 1640s, as would be expected due to the Civil Wars. As a proportion of parish income, the results are even more striking. The graph in Figure 3 shows a significant sustained peak throughout the Jacobean period, which coincides with a peak in expenditure on the sort of fabric that was most associated with preaching, such as pews, lofts and the pulpit. This sort of expenditure could be very substantial indeed. The amount spent on lofts and pews at Sheffield in 1609 came second only to that spent on the major structural project of a new bell frame in 1652. The graphs also show lesser peaks in the 1590s and the 1650s, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of income. These lesser peaks were more associated with hard fabric expenditure, and challenge the traditional narrative that presents the late Elizabethan and 1650s as periods of neglect. These findings are broadly corroborated by the other twenty-five sets of churchwardens’ accounts that have been examined for this study, especially those with a long-run, such as at Ecclesfield, Bradfield, Halifax, Wragby and Wakefield, Padiham and Whalley. Although there is less churchwarden account evidence for the Pennine area of Lancashire, there is evidence that parishes and chapels there experienced the same surge in material investment, such as pewing of churches in the early seventeenth century and the 1657 collection of 13s by the inhabitants of Halliwell (Bolton) to aid repairs in their neighbouring parish of Deane.

Another piece of quantitative evidence supports the link between investment in church fabric and preaching. Bradfield was a large, parochial chapel within the parish of Ecclesfield, near Sheffield. It had its own income from rents and kept its own, very detailed, churchwardens’ accounts. These survive for the years 1606, 1617–37, and the 1650s. The accounts are almost complete for the middle period, during which a strong preaching culture developed at the chapel, and the sums spent on hospitality and fees for visiting preachers and exercises were all recorded. The Bradfield accounts are unusual in recording so much information about preaching expenses, and this detail allows a meaningful comparison to be made between the money spent on preaching and money spent on church fabric. The results, in Figure 4, show peaks of money spent on preaching just

---

52 Ecclesfield cwa, SA: PR54/13/1; Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14 (a precise transcription made by J. G. Ronksley, there are some original Bradfield cwa in ULBLSC: Wilson MS 295, vol. 2 and 232; Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1; Wragby cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 99/1/1/1 and WDP 99/70; Wakefield cwa, YAS: MS 815, (John Walker’s transcription); Padiham cwa, LCRO: PR2863/2/1; Whalley cwa, LCRO: PR8.


55 These will be examined in detail in chapter three.
preceding or coinciding with peaks spent on fabric, with the exception of the uniquely large amount spent on re-roofing the chapel in 1635.

All this evidence points to a strong link between preaching and investment in church fabric. It is proposed that, far from preaching-centred worship leading to disregard and neglect of church fabric, it actually encouraged material investment. The investment in church fabric was most prominent in the Jacobean period, but to some degree was also evident over the whole period, with the exception of the 1640s. This finding is clearly contrary to what would be expected from the traditional picture of post-Reformation neglect, punctuated by Laudian attention in the 1630s. The nature of the investment shows that it was related to preaching, and this will now be further examined.

**Shape, size and form of the new and rebuilt chapels**

A variety of solutions were employed to provide a space conducive to preaching. In some cases, new chapels were built with broad naves, with the ratio of short to long walls being about seventy percent, as seen at Ringley (Oldham), Salford (Manchester) and St John’s (Leeds) Chapels. Floor plans

---

**Figure 4.** Annual expenditure on fabric and preaching at Bradfield Chapel 1617–1637.
for these chapels are shown in Figure 5. A relatively square shape would have advantages for audibility, and encourage a sense of being assembled in a room. The disadvantage of this design was that the roof needed more support once a certain size was exceeded. St John’s overcame this with a double pitched roof supported by pillars running down the centre of the nave.

The other style used for the new chapels was a simple, rectangular plan, without an externally defined chancel, as seen at the surviving buildings at Attercliffe, Idle, and Bramhope, shown in Figure 6. This longitudinal plan was similar to the domestic buildings of the Pennine area and this shape was a way of maximising capacity and natural light, with minimum construction expense. This building shape, however, had the potential to be experienced as a linear space, with a focus on the

---

56 The measurements for these chapels are derived from their consecration documents.
57 The size of the new chapels ranged from nearly 600 m² for St. John’s in Leeds, down to just under 100m² the small chapel at Great Houghton in Darfield parish.
east end. This potential was minimised by the use of multiple entrances in the south wall and the positioning of the pulpit on one of the long walls, as seen at Bramhope and Idle, and (originally) at Attercliffe. As Christopher Stell has noted, this configuration offset the tendency to experience the chapel as an east-west aligned structure. So, while working within traditional forms, and constrained by financial and structural factors, the chapel builders aimed to create a space suitable for preaching with a focus on hearing the Word of God, rather than observing a ceremony or sacramental rite at the east-end of the chapel.

![Figure 6. Photographs of chapels at Attercliffe (top), near Sheffield, built 1629 (this was originally longer and with two doors); Idle (bottom left), near Bradford, built 1630; Bramhope (bottom right), near Leeds, built 1649. Author’s own photographs.](image)

Before moving on from the external fabric of the chapels, it is worth thinking about why some of the new chapels, such as those at Ringley and Salford, had chancels. The traditional narrative

---


associates the presence of a chancel with High Church, ceremonial worship. There can be no doubt that the primary purpose of these new chapels was to provide a space for preaching-centred worship. The patron of Ringley chapel was Nathan Walworth, who was so addicted to sermons that when a friend failed to supply him with promised sermon notes, he described himself as ‘lyke a great bellyed woman yt long and am lyke to miscarye for want of my longinge’. The founder of Salford chapel, Humphrey Booth, left money in his will to ensure ‘that there might be ever have a Godly learned, able, fitt zealous and painfull man for a preaching minister’ to serve the chapel. His son went on to install the famed preachers Richard Hollingworth and Thomas Case as ministers there. The likelihood is that the chancel was designed as a communion room. Progressive Protestants in the Pennine area held the view that, ‘the Lord’s Supper ought to be administered and received often’. A chancel provided a conveniently shaped space for the progressive Protestant celebration of communion, with recipients sat in a square configuration around the table, such as at Ecclesall Chapel (Sheffield), which was described in a Visitation Court Book as ‘square pewed’.

Interiors: pews, lofts and pulpits
A re-orientating of attention could also be encouraged by the interior of churches and chapels. While the more innovative configurations that began to appear in Scottish churches at this time did not arise in the Pennine area, the spatial experience of being in the chapel or church was altered with the non-Laudian investment in interior fabric. The trend was to lessen the experience of the

---


62 J. S. Fletcher (ed.), *The Correspondence of Nathan Walworth and Peter Seddon of Outwood*, Chetham Society vol. CIX (1880), p. 13, hereafter referred to as *Walworth Correspondence*

63 Will of Humphrey Booth, printed in the appendix of J. J. Barber, *A History of the Church of the Sacred Trinity, Salford* (1966), pp. 98–101, the wording is as printed by Barber. Booth had earlier constructed a gallery in Manchester Parish Church, in 1617. W. Willis, (ed.), Richard Hollingworth, *Mancuniensis, or a History of the Towne of Manchester*, (Manchester, 1839), p. 111. The original 1656 MS is in the CLA.

64 This was expressed by a preacher at the Halifax Exercise, BL Add MS, 4933a, f. 116. The view that progressive Protestants placed high value in the sacrament is advanced by Arnold Hunt in his ‘The Lord’s Supper in early Modern England’, *Past & Present*, no. 161 (Nov. 1998), pp. 39–83; Christopher Marsh discusses the use of the chancel as a communion room, in ‘Sacred Space in England’, pp. 293, 4.

65 BI: V. 1636/CB, f. 149v.

church as a linear space with a focus on the east end and to increase the feeling of being gathered in a room, with attention directed towards the pulpit. Where lofts were installed, the focus on the east was reduced further still.\textsuperscript{67} This reconfiguration played a practical, didactic role in sermon-centred worship, but it is proposed here that it also held a theological significance.\textsuperscript{68} The evidence is largely derived from the twenty five pew plans that survive for the area, especially those that were the product of local initiative.\textsuperscript{69}

The Pennines evidence shows that pulpits were positioned well within the body of the church. This is in contrast to the traditional view, typified by the works of Addleshaw and Etchells, which presents the typical position for the post-Reformation pulpit as further east.\textsuperscript{70} Where there were pillars in the nave, the pulpit was often attached to one of these, with equal preference for northerly and southerly pillars, such as at Salford and Colne (Whalley) Chapels respectively.\textsuperscript{71} This meant that the pulpit was often positioned about six pews into the nave, which was equivalent to a quarter or third of the way in from the east end of the nave. The pulpit at Sheffield was relocated as part of the wider reordering of the interior in 1609. As this relocation also involved the relocation of stairs, it is probable that the new position for the pulpit was in the vicinity of the bell loft, which occupied the centre of the nave.\textsuperscript{72} In smaller, narrower chapels, without pillars, the pulpit was placed on the north or south wall, a good distance down the nave.\textsuperscript{73} At Blackley (Manchester), Denton (Manchester) and Mary-le-Ghyll (Barnoldswick) the pulpit was fully half way down the north wall, and at Bramhope it was just east of the mid-point. At St John’s, Leeds, the pulpit was placed out from the north wall, in line with the eighth pew, which placed it exactly one third of the way into the nave, as seen in Figure 7. It can clearly be argued that, although not placed completely centrally, the general aim was to position the pulpit amid the people. This held doctrinal significance for

\textsuperscript{67} Halifax installed two new staircases for the lofts in 1621. See also Saddleworth chapel, CLA, Raines Lancashire MSS, vol. 13, f. 260, 1.

\textsuperscript{68} The practical didactic function is emphasised by Spicer in ‘Accommodating of Thame Selfis’ and Marsh in ‘Sacred Space in England’, p. 292.

\textsuperscript{69} Such as Luddenden (1631), WYAS (W): WDP 39/156, and Sowerby (1622), BL: Y.M. EP.7.1 (a). Pew plans were also drawn up following completion of the Laudian changes demanded by Neile’s regime, which are less useful for the purpose of this study.

\textsuperscript{70} Addleshaw and Etchells, Architectural Setting, p. 76; Marsh, ‘Sacred Space’, p. 295.

\textsuperscript{71} Salford pew plan, CLA: Booth 2/2/3/1; Colne pew plan, LCRO: DDB 74/22.

\textsuperscript{72} This position for the bell loft is known from the 1635 instructions to remove it, issued by William Easdall, BL: Chancery Act Book 26, f. 36.

\textsuperscript{73} Denton Chapel, existing fabric; Luddenden pew plan, WYAS (W): WDP 39/156.
progressive Protestants, and was part of their construction of sacred space, as will be discussed in chapter two.

Figure 7. Mid-nineteenth century view of St John's, Leeds, looking west from the quire. Source: print image at St John's Chapel. Author’s own photograph, courtesy of the Churches Conservation Trust.

To varying degrees, the attention of worshippers was redirected from the east end onto the pulpit. The occupants of box pews naturally faced more than one direction, and bench seats, or stalls, were arrayed in a variety of directions. Seats east of the pulpit in the nave faced west, towards the pulpit, as still seen today at Mary-le-Ghyll, and on an old plan of St John’s, Leeds, prior to its nineteenth-century alterations. Some seats in the nave could also face north and south, as the pew plan for Blackley Chapel shows seats placed longitudinally along the long walls. As chancels filled up with seats, they naturally faced west, south or north. A copy of a pew plan for Blackley chapel, dated 1603, shows no pews in the chancel area, while a later one for 1631 shows it to be full of pews of various sizes and orientations. Likewise, plans for Idle (Calverly) and Sowerby (Halifax) show the same multi-direction for seating at the east end of the chapel. Pewing of the chancel could also


75 J. Booker, A History of the Ancient Chapel of Blackley in Manchester Parish (Manchester, 1854), pp. 57,8.
occur at substantial parish churches, such as Whalley, which had west facing pews at the ‘chancel back’. The tendency for elite parishioners to erect their pews in the chancel shows that it still held social significance, and this is reflected in the legal disputes that arose concerning seating in the chancel, such as at Littleborough in 1628. At Rastrick (Halifax), John Hanson, one of the local landowners who instigated the rebuilding of the chapel, added an ‘owtshot’ to the north side of the chancel for his pew. From this position he could face the pulpit positioned against a window in the south wall of the nave. A similar aisle north of the chancel existed at Luddenden chapel, which was rebuilt in 1624. There was possibly one example of a more experimental seating configuration at Heptonstall (Halifax), a chapel known for radical, even antinomian preaching. When Archbishop Neile’s commissioners inspected it in 1635, they demanded the removal of ‘the ranke before the pulpitt’, which suggests that the prime seats in the chapel were directly gathered around the pulpit, a development found more commonly in Scotland. Overall, although the reduction in eastwardness was never complete, it is clear that facing east in a church or chapel was far from the norm, and instead a feeling of being gathered around the pulpit was encouraged.

The pricing of pews is another way to discover where attention was focused in the church. Many pew plans and lists provide only the name of the parishioner, with no fee, but such sources still suggest the centrality of the pulpit, as the location of pews are listed in respect to it, as seen with the Chorley pew plan of 1635. Where pew fees were noted, they show a dual focus on the east and the pulpit as areas of prestige. A north-south differential can be seen for the pew rents at Blackley Chapel, where the pulpit was positioned centrally against the north wall. At Ecclesall Chapel, seats in the ‘closett or pew wherein the pulpit stands’ were charged at 5s and 3s, compared to 12d for the most easterly pews and an average of 9d. Detailed pew rents were recorded for St

76 LCRO: DDB 74/22.
77 Methley pew plan, printed in S. H. Darbyshire and G.D. Lumb, (eds), The History of Methley, Thoresby Society, vol. 36 (1937), pp. 43–46; Elland pew plan, WYAS (W): WDP 79/3/1/1; Chorley pew plans, LCRO: DDSH 7/6; Littleborough pew plan CLA, Raines Collection, Bundle 13, no. 152 (original documents) and C6, Raines Lancashire MSS vol. 22, p. 175, (transcript).
80 Heptonstall pew plan, WYAS (W): C991.
81 LCRO: DDSH 7/6.
82 Copy of Blackly pew plans, GMCRO: M441.
John’s Chapel in Leeds in 1647 when they were used to provide the minister’s wages. Pew rents in the northernmost row, nearest the pulpit, were priced at nearly three times more than those in the southernmost row, declining in value from £13 14s 9d for the northernmost row, to £4 5s for the southernmost row. The most prestigious seats were in the Alderman’s pew, which was not in the most easterly position, but was three pews west from the screen in the second row from the north, so it was positioned to give a good sightline to the pulpit, while allowing the occupants to see and be seen by all. At St John’s, the northern half of the quire, separated from the nave by a carved screen, was also pewed. The seats there were among the cheapest in the chapel, equivalent to those in the most southerly row, suggesting that the restricted view of the pulpit caused by the screen made these seats less desirable. These three examples are all from times (1606/31, 1622, and 1647 respectively) during which preaching-centred worship was not under pressure from the Laudian campaign, so the data is reflective of the priorities of progressive Protestants. The St John’s example, in particular, shows that sight of the pulpit, as well as proximity to it, was important.

Lofts and galleries further added to the reduction in eastward focus. Many parish churches, such as Manchester, Sheffield, Wakefield, Leeds and Halifax, constructed lofts, as did larger parochial chapels, such as Bradfield and Heptonstall. Lofts were major investments; at Bradfield, the installation of a loft in 1629 was the single largest interior fabric expense in the period 1617 to 1637. In part, lofts were a response to growing populations and were opportunities for the expression of social status. However, they also enabled a greater number of people to be nearer the pulpit for audibility and sight of the preacher. They disrupted the east-west alignment of the church interior and encouraged a feeling of being assembled around the pulpit. This can be seen at Rotherham, where a loft was built across the junction of the nave and chancel, facing west. Where a loft was placed along the longitudinal walls, the seating within it frequently faced north or south, as seen at Halifax. Sowerby Bridge Chapel (Halifax) was substantially increased in height in 1632 to allow the installation of lofts on three sides of the chapel, creating a square around the pulpit.

---

84 Pew rents at St John’s, Thoresby Society Archives, SD VI.
85 WYAS (L): Thomas Wilson MSS, WYL160/204/2, f. 64.
87 Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14, 1629.
Two other factors potentially affected seating. There is only occasional direct evidence of gendered seating in the Pennine evidence, as most of the pew plans and lists tended to list the pews by male householders. Seating at Salford, Methley, near Leeds, and Tong, near Bradford, was gendered, with specific pews assigned to women, but these were dotted about the church or chapel and not clustered to any particular side.\(^{91}\) Allotting seats for gender did not significantly affect the general focus on the pulpit. Role also had an impact on seating, with special seats for churchwardens, bell ringers and precentors to lead psalm singing all recorded at Halifax Parish Church.\(^{92}\) The pew plan for Holmfirth Chapel, dated 1635, intriguingly shows the prime seat next to the pulpit being reserved for those who could sing. The pew was officially allotted to the heirs of John Kay, but this was conditional upon ‘provided always they shall be songe men all’.\(^{93}\) The requirement that the ‘song men’ be physically close to the pulpit reflected the association of these two forms of worship, as psalms usually preceded and succeeded a sermon.

**Sowerby chapel case study**

All these points can be illustrated together in a case study. In 1620, the inhabitants of Sowerby chapelry in the parish of Halifax decided to partially demolish and rebuild their chapel on a larger scale.\(^{94}\) The rebuilding at Sowerby produced a rare and valuable source: before and after plans of the church interior were drawn up to organise the seating in the new chapel. The annotated pew plans are shown in Figure 8.\(^{95}\) The old chapel had been built in the later sixteenth century and the plan shows that it was set up for Protestant worship, with the pulpit positioned about a third of the way down the south wall from the east end and the communion table placed out from the east end, allowing the reformed configuration for communion. The inhabitants chose to increase the size of the chapel by making it broader in the north-south dimension, rather than increasing its length, and so made the new chapel more square in shape. This was a better shape for preaching and reduced the linearity of the space. In the new chapel, the pulpit was moved out from the wall to occupy a position closer to the centre of the main body of the chapel in what appears to be a free standing

---

91 Barber, *History of the Church of the Sacred Trinity*, p. 11; Methley pew plan, Darbyshire and Lumb, *The History of Methley*; Tong pew plan, WYAS (B): Tong/12b/1&2, Tong pew plan.
93 Holmfirth pew plan, this is inserted into the Register of Archbishop Richard Neile, Bl: Reg. 32.
94 The background to the rebuilding is given in a cause paper, Bl: CP.H.1742.
95 Sowerby pew plans, Bl: Y.M.EP.7 1 a and b.
position, as pillars were not marked on the plan. The communion table was also moved further into
the body of the chapel. The old chapel had a few pews facing west and south, but in the new chapel
the number of non-eastward facing pews increased to represent about a third of the total seating.

Movement within the new chapel would also have been experienced differently. The plan for
the old chapel shows that it was accessed through the traditional great door in the south wall
towards the west end, so for worshippers travelling to and from their pews, the principal axis of
travel would be east-west, thereby reinforcing the chapel as a linear space. The plan for the new
chapel shows that three doors on the south wall now provided access to ‘alleys’ for parishioners to
reach their pew. These new access points, along with the increased north-south breadth of the
chapel, would lead to lines of travel for many worshippers that were now equally north-south and
east-west. This meant that the space would be experienced more as a two dimensional grid than a
linear space, and the focus of interest was not on the east end. There is no suggestion of sacrality
associated with the communion table and anyone seated in the north-east of the chapel would have
brushed past the table on their way to their pew. Being in the new chapel was now much more akin
to being gathered within a room, with the pulpit, and the preacher within it, as the focal point.

Figure 8. Before and after plans of the rebuilding of Sowerby Chapel, 1620. Source: BI:
Y.M.EP.7.1a. Author’s own photographs, used with the permission of the Borthwick Institute for
Archives.
The 1620 changes at Sowerby chapel show a second phase of reconfiguration to support a more progressive Protestant worship centred on preaching. Not every locality may have gone this far in remodelling their place of worship: the preacher at Sowerby who inspired the rebuild was the exceptionally skilful John Broadley. However, this was exemplary of the configuration that other churches and chapels were moving towards. It emphasised the chapel as place of assembly centred on the exposition of the Word of God, with the pulpit as central to that space. How the pulpit was further made the centre of attention will now be considered.

**The pulpit as an object**

Investment in pulpits and their accoutrements frequently went beyond the minimum required by the Canons, and indicates a voluntary enthusiasm to decorate and make a feature of these objects.  

When chapels were newly built or rebuilt, the provision and adorning of a pulpit was a priority. When the small chapel of Ecclesall in Sheffield parish was rebuilt in 1622, Thomas Stone was paid 15s to construct a pulpit, making it by far the most expensive item in the new chapel. The annual funds available for expenditure at Ecclesall were minimal, at £1 3s, yet nearly a quarter of this was spent on a pulpit cushion in the first year. The accounts show the importance of the cushion, as they itemised the cost of its components, such as the sheepskins for a base, hair for stuffing and the silk tassels. The following year, silk for two more tassels was bought, plus more hair to further plump up the cushion. Linen for the communion table was not bought until the year after that, and it would be 1626 before the chapel bought its own Communion Book and communion cup. This shows that adorning the place from which the Word was expounded was the priority for the inhabitants. Evidence from other locations concurs with this finding, such as the rebuilding of the chapel at Rastrick, where the accounts itemised the creation of a pulpit but there is no mention of a communion table.

Parish churches also upgraded their pulpits during this period and there was a marked increase in the money spent over time. This is seen at Sheffield, where just under £2 was spent on a new pulpit in 1611, but £12 was spent on its replacement in 1630. The range of styles for post-Reformation pulpits in the Pennine area is shown in Appendix 3. While some pulpits were quite plain, such as that at Bracewell, others could be very decorative and were constructed by skilled craftsmen. Elaborate pulpits existed in places well known as preaching centres, such as Rotherham,

---

96 Pulpits became a legal necessity with the Settlement of 1559, and the Canons of 1604 further required a pulpit cushion to be provided.


98 Rastrick cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 52/115.

99 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161.
St John’s, Deane, and Woodkirk. The degree of plainness or ornamentation does not appear to directly correlate with type of worship conducted in the church, but, rather, was probably a reflection of the funds available at the time of construction. Alternatively, ornamentation could be designed to show patronage, as seen in the pulpit remains at Radcliffe, Marr and Braithwell in Appendix 3.

The height of the pulpit was important; as Susan Wabuda points out, this placed the minister between heaven and earth, although very few original bases survive to give a definite idea of elevation. The original wine glass base of the pulpit at Rotherham raises it by 1.2 m, and the triple-decker pulpits at St Mary-le-Ghyll, and Bramhope are more elevated still. The pulpit stairs were rebuilt at Sheffield in 1616, which could mean it was further elevated after its relocation in 1609. As will be discussed in chapter six, the ascent of the minister into the pulpit communicated his authority and special role as the voice through which God spoke.

There is no evidence of pulpits being coloured, even where other objects in the church were painted, such as the font at Wakefield, which was painted with ‘oyl colours’ in 1607. However, pulpits were frequently adorned with rich fabrics that attracted visual attention. Cushions and cloths were purchased regularly throughout the period, and they were often bought together, such as at Wragby, near Wakefield, in 1609. Wakefield Parish invested heavily in textiles, with cloths and cushions bought in 1607, 1630, 1637, and 1654. The 1630 ‘new quishion for the preacher’ cost a substantial £2 8s. The pulpit cloth at Sheffield was lined just before the visit of Mr Northropp in 1615, suggesting that his visit might have occasioned the improvement. The colour and type of the textile was occasionally given: purple, green, velvet and silk, and ‘tufted taffeta’ are all mentioned, and cushions could be ornamented with silk tassels, fringes and buttons. Cushions and cloths also required some maintenance. The chapel wardens at Padiham purchased four pounds of flocks to re-stuff the ‘thick sett chuchshion for ye pulpitt’ five years after it was first bought. This maintenance, costing 15s, was a substantial outlay for the chapel, which had an annual income of


101 Wakefield cwa, YAS: MS 815.

102 John Craig has also made this point, see his ‘Sermon Reception’ in McCullough, TOHEMS p. 187.

103 Wragby cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 99/1/1/1 & WDP 99/70; Wakefield cwa, YAS: MS 815; Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161, 1615.

104 Rochdale cwa, CLA: C.6, Raines Lancashire MSS, vol. 1, f. 63–7; Wakefield cwa, YAS: MS 815.
only £4. Hence maintaining the appearance of the pulpit cushion, as the place on which the Word rested, was a priority for the inhabitants.

Many of the churchwardens’ accounts show regular replacement of the hourglasses that were held in frames next to the pulpit. Ecclesiologists, such as C. J. Cox and Norman Pounds, have emphasised the use of the hourglass to regulate the length of sermons. However, hourglasses also served to draw the eye towards the pulpit and their turning was part of the spectacle of preaching. At Halifax, both the hourglasses and their supporting iron frames were painted, making them even more eye-catching. The sand running through the glass acted as a visual reminder of the limited time in which an individual had to progress in grace, and this symbolic meaning was reflected in hourglasses being used on funeral monuments, such as that of the wife of the parish clerk at Halifax, as seen in Figure 9. Hourglasses were therefore part of the visual drama of preaching.

![Figure 9. Monument to the wife of Edmund Brearcliffe, 1628. Author’s own photograph, courtesy of Halifax Minister.](image)

Pulpits were increasingly surmounted by canopies during this period. These could be expensive and decorative objects. The churchwardens at Sheffield mended their pulpit canopy in 1623, and shortly after buying a new pulpit in 1630 they installed a new canopy at the substantial cost of £1 12s.

---

105 Padiham cwa, LCRO: PR2863/2/1, 1636.
108 Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1, 1628.
110 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161.
The canopy of the pulpit at St John’s is adorned with angels’ heads and topped with crests, drawing the eye heavenwards. Canopies fulfilled a practical, acoustic purpose, but they also framed the preacher and helped to define the space from which he expounded the Word. The pulpits at Great Houghton and Bramhope had canopies, although the small size of these chapels meant that an acoustic aid was probably not necessary. At Bradfield, a canopy was made at the same time that a door was fitted to the pulpit, making the space more defined and set apart from the profane world.\footnote{Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14, 1629. See Wabuda ‘Triple Deckers’, p. 149.}

So, with ornamentation, cloths, cushions, hourglasses and canopies, pulpits were made to draw attention to the place from which the Word was expounded. Other aspects of church and chapel interiors were also expressions of sermon-centred piety, and these will now be considered.

**Light, whitewashing, painting and other decorative work**

In contrast to the received wisdom that ‘puritans’ created dark churches by bricking-up the windows and blocking light with large, dark lofts, the Pennine evidence suggests that parishes with a preaching tradition were very aware of light in the church or chapel.\footnote{This view was maintained by Vickers, ‘Changes in seventeenth century Yorkshire parish church furniture’. For an alternative view see Spicer, *Calvinist Churches* p. 54.} Light and bright church interiors were obviously functionally important for worship that involved reading text. The term ‘sun side’ was used for the south side of the interior in several of the pew plans, such as that those at Thornton and Tong Chapels.\footnote{WYAS (B): 81D85, hereafter referred to as Thornton pew plan; Tong pew plan. This was also the case for domestic buildings, see Ford, ‘A Dialect in Architecture’, p. 13.} Figure 2 and Appendix 2 show that glazing remained a priority at Sheffield throughout the period, even when money was spent on little else. Pulpits were positioned next to windows for practical reasons, as can be seen at Bramhope, where a small window was specifically created at just the right height to illuminate the text for the preacher.\footnote{See Appendix 3 for a photograph of this.} Windows continued to be an opportunity for patronage, as the account of the rebuilding of Rastrick chapel makes careful note of who donated each window.\footnote{Rastrick cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 52/115.} They were also a continuity with the past, as the ‘old great window’, which had been in the quire of the pre-Reformation chapel at Rastrick, was refurbished for use in the new chapel, and relocated to the south wall. Thus an important remnant...
from the past was deliberately positioned to backlight the pulpit, perhaps surrounding the preacher with sunlight refracted through remnants of coloured glass.116

Lofts inevitably interfered with the fall of light within the church to some degree, and the parishioners made an effort to minimise this impact. New gable roof extensions with windows were installed at the same time as lofts, increasing the volume of the loft space and ensuring it was well lit. Such gables existed at Halifax, Saddleworth, Elland, Heptonstall and Birstall.117 These projecting gables can be understood as a diminutive version of the ‘T plan’ extensions from the long walls of Scottish churches, which allowed extra seating to directly face the pulpit.118 Lofts were also plastered and painted so they were not dark objects. Over £3 was spent on plastering the lofts at Sheffield in 1611, and the churchwardens’ loft at Halifax was plastered, limed and both pairs of stairs serving lofts painted in 1621.119

The whitewashing of walls during the Reformation has commonly been understood negatively as an obliteration of religious imagery.120 However, the continued practice of whitening the interior of churches in the post-Reformation period can not be explained in the same way. Newly built chapels were whitewashed at a considerable expense, showing that it was a positive choice and priority for the chapel builders. Eight horse-loads of lime were used when Rastrick was rebuilt and ‘shooting the walls’ at the new chapel at Attercliffe (Sheffield) cost more than £4.121 A great deal of effort was spent on keeping existing churches white and bright too. The interior of Sheffield was whitened in 1606, 1618, 1634, 1636, 1640 and again in 1659. The same picture was true for Halifax, which was whitewashed in 1620, 1627, 1632 and 1637, with the frequency of the operation leading the churchwardens to buy a special pipe for the application of lime.122 It was particularly important to keep the area around the pulpit clean and bright, as shown at Rochdale in 1657, where the churchwardens paid ‘for repairing some paint over the pulpit that was defaced by rain in winter’.123

---

116 Fragments of medieval coloured glass have been reused as panes in the south chancel window at Methley.

117 CLA: C6, Raines MSS, vol. 13, f. 260,1; Butler, Yorkshire Church Notes, pp. 100, 172, 200, 218; and material remains at the old St Thomas Becket Church, Heptonstall.

118 See Yates, Preaching, Word and Sacrament.

119 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161; Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1. Lofts were also plastered at Wakefield in 1608, cwa.

120 Aston, England’s Iconoclasts, p. 318.


122 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161; Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1.

123 Rochdale cwa, CLA: C.6.
Part of the positive choice for whiteness must have been the practical reasons of increasing the light levels for reading, and as John Craig points out, it was a way of minimising distraction during sermons.\textsuperscript{124} However, the white wall could be used didactically. Alexander Cooke referenced the whiteness of the walls around him in one of his sermons at the Halifax Exercise. In refuting the Catholic objection to the doctrine of Justification, he expounded ‘Papists say it is against Philosophy to say one is righteous by the righteounes of another, wall white by the whiteness of my paper’.\textsuperscript{125} Surely, at this point he flourished his sermon notes and pointed to the whitened walls inside Halifax Parish Church? Likewise, the Pauline metaphor of the whited wall (Acts. 23.3) could be recycled in sermons, such as one given by Hugh Ramsden in his church at Methley. Here the whiteness of the walls illustrated a thin covering of inner corruption, as Ramsden pronounced ‘take away holiness from a man and what is he but a whited wall and a painted sepulchre’.\textsuperscript{126} The whited wall could also be a teaching aid through providing a blank canvas on which to inscribe the Word of God. In churchwardens’ accounts, expenditure for painting text frequently followed shortly after that for whitening, as occurred at Ecclesfield in 1620.\textsuperscript{127} These scriptural ‘images’ were mainly executed in black paint, but they could also be in red, as was the case at Sheffield in 1607.\textsuperscript{128} Wakefield was customarily slightly more elaborate in its décor and paid for the church to be painted with ‘oyle cullors’ in 1606. This was refreshed in 1623 at a substantial cost of £2 8s, when ‘Posies’ were painted onto the walls, and again in 1632, when the craftsmen, Machin and Kirke, were paid £1 11s 7d ‘for worke about collouringe the churche’.\textsuperscript{129} As with the whitewashing, the scriptural texts could need regular repainting. The 1638 letter of Nathan Walworth concerning Ringley Chapel, illustrates the financial burden of this, as he wrote

\textsuperscript{124} Craig, ‘Sermon Reception’ p. 185.
\textsuperscript{125} Ralph Thoresby copied the notes of Elkanah Wales on sermons given by Alexander Cooke into the fly-leaves of his copy of the printed book, \textit{Pope Joan}. This book is held at York Minster Library, Special Collections, shelf mark: Y/CMA 115.9 COO. This source will hereafter be referred to as ‘YML Cooke sermon notes’. Wales’ original sermon notes are in two volumes in the BL: Add MS 4933 a & b.
\textsuperscript{126} WYAS (W): WYW 1352/3/1/2/11. This volume contains the manuscript sermons of Hugh Ramsden, hereafter referred to as Hugh Ramsden sermons. The quotation is from his sermon on Col 1:22.
\textsuperscript{127} Ecclesfield cwa, SA: PR54/13/1, 1620.
\textsuperscript{128} Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161.
\textsuperscript{129} Wakefield cwa, YAS: MS 815.
but I heare by some, all is not well, the wrytiings and sentences are much defaced, and look scurviyle, if it be so, it can not be helped now, it must be helped an other yeare, and lett it alone till then.\textsuperscript{130}

This deterioration had occurred just twelve years after the building of the chapel. Walworth was obviously unable to immediately fund the repainting, but that it was noticed and remarked upon by him and others shows that these textual images were an important aspect of the chapel fabric.

In summary, the spatial and material setting of preaching was an integral, significant part of the experience of preaching-centred worship. There were practical reasons for the configurations and materials chosen, but the placing of the source of the Word at the centre of attention and creating a feeling of being gathered around it during worship was key.

\textit{The motivation for the investment}

The evidence so far has shown that there was substantial investment in church fabric for preaching-centred worship, especially in the early seventeenth century. The motivation for this will now be considered through two, linked, questions: was it enforced from above or was it a local initiative, and was it a restorative measure, putting right the results of previous neglect, or a voluntary expression of progressive Protestant piety?

There is some evidence of action from above for the Jacobean church fabric investment. In 1602, Archbishop Whitgift wrote to his bishops and the Archbishop of York requiring them to ensure the churches in their dioceses were maintained.\textsuperscript{131} Fincham and Tyacke suggest that this letter had some impact in the Southern Province, while Merritt argues that the official initiative soon lost momentum with the death of Elizabeth and that ‘there is little evidence that ecclesiastical authorities went out of their way to mount a sustained campaign to restore church fabric’.\textsuperscript{132} There has been no previous attempt to explore the impact of Whitgift’s letter in the Northern Province. In this study, the State Papers, Archbishop Matthew Hutton’s Register and printed version of his correspondence have all been checked and no sign of a response to Whitgift’s demand can be found.\textsuperscript{133} This is not surprising, given that Hutton’s priorities lay elsewhere, such as the conversion of Catholics, moral behavioural issues for the laity and the careful management of non-conformist

\textsuperscript{130} Walworth Correspondence, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{131} NA: State Papers Domestic. Accessed through State Papers Online, URL: http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?id=GALE|MC4304680587\&v=2.1\&u=hudduni\&it=r\&p=SPOL\&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript British History Online, Calendar of State Papers Domestic. 21 June 1602.

\textsuperscript{132} Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored, p. 90; Merritt, ‘Puritans, Laudians’, p. 944.

\textsuperscript{133} Calendar of State Papers, accessed through British History Online, Bl: Reg. 31; J. Raine, (ed.) The Correspondence of Dr Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York Surtees Society, 17, (London, 1843).
clergy.\textsuperscript{134} The articles for Hutton’s ordinary visitation of 1604 have not survived, but the court book for that visitation reveals a level of church fabric issues similar to earlier visitations, with a sprinkling of decayed chancels, such as those at Woolley and Barnsley.\textsuperscript{135} This suggests that there was no step change of scrutiny in response to Whitgift’s letter. In Lancashire, there seems to have been an awareness of material decay at this time. Bishop Richard Vaughan conducted a visitation in 1604, and found problems with two churches and five chapels in the Deanery of Manchester.\textsuperscript{136} This, however, was no different from the previous visitation, as the correction book for 1601 recorded that the chapels in Manchester Parish were out of repair.\textsuperscript{137} The conclusion must be that Whitgift’s initiative had little impact in the Pennine area.

Whitgift’s initiative was superseded by the Canons of 1604, which expanded on the basic requirements of the Homilies, in that, as well as churches being kept clean and in good repair, windows were required to be glazed and floors paved.\textsuperscript{138} In Lancashire, Bishop George Lloyd conducted his primary visitation in 1605, with articles inquiring after the standard equipping and reparation of churches. To this was added the enquiry of whether the church was ‘profaned’, unroofed or used for other purposes, or and whether it was ‘not conveniently decked or defaced’.\textsuperscript{139} The resulting presentations show the chapel at Ashton was still in decay, and Haslingden had no covering for the communion table, but the articles generated no sudden surge in presentations for disrepair. Lloyd’s second visitation in 1608 revealed that the ‘body’ of Manchester church was out of repair, but no further details were recorded.\textsuperscript{140} The primary visitation of Archbishop Toby Matthew in 1607 made similar enquiries to that of Lloyd, with an additional question about the maintenance of bells and stalls. Two cases of general disrepair, plus nine cases of decayed chancels, were returned in response to these articles in the Pennine area of Yorkshire.\textsuperscript{141} These slightly later visitations suggest a moderate increase in episcopal interest in church fabric in the early Jacobean period.


\textsuperscript{135} BL: V. 1604/CB. f 60, 63v.

\textsuperscript{136} CCRO: EDV 1/13. Bolton and Blackburn Parish Churches, chapels at Ashton, Denton, Saddleworth, Haslingston and an unnamed chapel in Bolton parish.

\textsuperscript{137} CCRO: EDV 1/12b Correction Book 1600–1602.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall}, 1604, (Bibliographic number 10069.3) p. 53.

\textsuperscript{139} Kenneth Fincham, (ed.) \textit{Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church} Volume 1. (Woodbridge, 1994).

\textsuperscript{140} CCRO: EDV 1/12b, f. 109v.; EDV 1/15, f. 132v.

\textsuperscript{141} Vickers, ‘Changes in seventeenth century Yorkshire parish church furniture’, p. 38.
The Elizabethan period has been presented as one of great neglect and decay in church fabric by contemporaries and modern scholars.\textsuperscript{142} At the start of the period, the ‘Homily on Repairing and keeping Churches Clean’ stated that ‘it is a sin and shame to see so many churches so ruinous, and so fouly decayed, almost in every corner’.\textsuperscript{143} This complaint was echoed later in the Elizabethan period, in 1590, when a group of preaching ministers in Lancashire complained that ‘the Churches generally lye ruinowse, unrepaired and unfurnished’.\textsuperscript{144} The rhetorical aspect of these complaints has not always been borne in mind by historians, however, and the reality was a great deal more complex. There is evidence of some neglect. Chapels-of-ease fell into disuse during the second half of the sixteenth century due to lack of funding. For example, in 1600, Rastrick chapel was reported to be ‘for moste p[ar]te of fiftye yeares nowe laste bene p[ro]faned and conv[er]ted to other uses’ and, as mentioned above, several of the chapels in the parish of Manchester were noted as ‘out of repaire’ in the 1601 episcopal visitation.\textsuperscript{145} There is also evidence of decayed chancels in some parish churches and larger chapels. The chancel of Huddersfield Parish Church was found to be ‘in greate decay’ in the visitation of 1595.\textsuperscript{146} Purvis ascribes this particular form of neglect to lay impropriation of rectories, which suggests that there was not necessarily a lack of local interest in church fabric. Where local residents had control, the picture was more positive for the late Elizabethan period. The lay elite of the chapelry of Elland took control of their chancel in 1583 and claimed it for their seating, noting in the chapel accounts that ‘the hie queare or chancell called St Marie Queare hath been at all times repaired by the parishioners and not by the vicar.\textsuperscript{147} As discussed at the start of this chapter and shown in Appendix 2, the Sheffield the churchwardens made regular payments for on-going repairs and maintenance throughout the 1580s and 90s. Thomas Wastner was paid an annual retainer of 5s to keep the windows in good repair, while the bellman was also paid a basic rate of 2s 6d. The bellman also had to keep the church clean, and the clerk was paid for washing linen, maintaining the clock and supplying candlelight. This basic upkeep of the church was punctuated by occasional major projects, such as the £33 spent on organs, organ loft, bell frame and repair of the steeple and battlements in 1592/3.\textsuperscript{148} This same pattern was also
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seen on a smaller scale at the neighbouring, less well endowed, parish of Ecclesfield, where the churchwardens made regular payments to maintain the bells and clock. This general maintenance was again punctuated by larger projects, such as the £15 spent in the late 1590s on major fabric repairs and new bells.¹⁴⁹ These examples suggest that churches did not ‘generally lye ruinowse’, but there were specific problems with the chancels of some parish churches and some smaller chapels-of-ease. The Jacobean restoration of the latter more than put right this previous neglect, as they were often expanded at the same time.

So there is evidence of some pressure from the authorities and some necessary repairs due to neglect. However, these factors do not explain the scale of the investment in fabric that began at the start of the seventeenth century. Only local and voluntary motivations can explain the surge in investment. As with voluntary investments in the pre-Reformation period, these were likely to have been driven by a combination of pious, practical and social impulses.¹⁵⁰ There is clearly some evidence for overcrowding, leading to the need for more accommodation. The 1649 petition for a new loft at Manchester complained of the parishioners being ‘press to crowd and thrust near together in very uneasy manner’.¹⁵¹ One of the churchwardens responsible for the re-pewing of the church at Methley thought it appropriate to commemorate his actions with a plaque that read, ‘John Holland was my name, who gave six pounds to this same’.¹⁵² Social and pious motives cannot be separated here, as the acts of patronage and expressions of status were given a greater significance or potency by their religious context.¹⁵³

With the exception of the Laudian changes in the 1630s, the nature of the church fabric investments in the Pennine area shows that they were largely intended to support preaching-centred worship. The existence of social factors do not diminish the pious motive. The need for extra accommodation was testament to generally high attendance for preaching-centred forms of worship.¹⁵⁴ The willingness to express social status in church fabric, as seen at Rastrick, reflected the high regard for the space where preaching happened. This all leads to the general conclusion that

¹⁴⁹ Ecclesfield cwa, SA: PR54/13/1. The annual income at Ecclesfield was only £8 - £13, compared to £40 for Sheffield.
¹⁵¹ GMCRO: M71/4/2/1 & 2.
¹⁵² Methley Parish Church and Darbyshire and Lumb, *History of Methley* p. 37.
¹⁵³ This view is advanced by Christopher Marsh in ‘Sacred Space’ and Margo Todd in *The Culture of Protestantism*.
¹⁵⁴ Martin Ingram advances an argument for generally high levels of attendance in his *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage. in England, 1570 –1640* (Cambridge, 1987).
parishioners in the Pennines willingly invested in church fabric that specifically supported preaching-centred worship and thought that such fabric was important as it tangibly expressed aspects of that worship. The social organisation behind that investment will be explored in chapter three, but first it will be helpful to examine how parishes reacted to demands to reconfigure church interiors in the 1630s.

**The 1630s: Preaching undermined**

The primary visitation of Archbishop Neile in the autumn and winter of 1632 uncovered many cases of what he considered to be defects in church furnishing. In addition to this, Neile commissioned his staff to travel throughout the dioceses of York and Chester outside of the visitation system, to identify churches and clergy that did not conform to his requirements. As a result, a total of 664 places of worship were ordered to carry out some sort of work, sixty-five per cent of the total. In the Pennine area, it was mainly through visits by his chancellor, William Easdall, and his subsequent use of the diocesan chancery court, that Neile’s programme of church fabric alteration was fully implemented. The demands typically included the removal of the communion table to the east end and its railing, re-ordering of pews to make them uniform and face east, paving of the church and some repairs. This reconfiguration supported ceremonial worship centred on the east end of the church, and such changes have been labelled as Laudian. This is the term that will be used here, although it is meant in a broad sense, as shorthand for a particular style of worship.

This part of the chapter will examine the changes made in Sheffield and Halifax, two parishes with a strong preaching tradition that also have a long run of original, detailed churchwardens’ accounts. The two dominant historiographical interpretations of why parishes appeared to readily conform to the Laudian programme have already been set out in the introduction. They can be summarised as coercion and voluntary enthusiasm. A third interpretation will be proposed here. It is informed by the position of Michael Braddick and John Walter on power relationships in the early modern period. They propose that parties in a relationship of power and subordination undertook the performance of legitimising behaviours and feigned acquiescence respectively. This ‘public
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157 As discussed in Lake, ‘The Laudian Style’.

transcript’ of the relationship, as Braddock and Walter term it, allowed the subordinated party to gain some amelioration of their position, while the benefit for the powerful party was a lessened risk of open resistance. This interpretation can be summarised as negotiation and the proposal here is that preaching parishes, by co-operating in some of the ideals of ‘the beauty of holiness’, were able to negotiate some compromises in other areas.

Preaching-centred worship, which by the 1630s had long been the norm at Sheffield, was very much in contrast to William Easdall’s ideas about correct worship, and he took legal action against laity and clergy in the parish. Ronald Marchant studied the progress of the legal case, and a full account of it is to be found his Puritans and the Church Courts.159 A summary will be outlined here. A visit by Easdall in 1635 found many defects with the worship being carried out at Sheffield and he initiated an ex officio suit against the previous year’s churchwardens for not reporting the non-conformity of the ministers at the 1634 archidiaconal visitation. The faults included the substitution of large parts of the Prayer Book service with preaching and psalm singing, having Sunday afternoon sermons rather than catechetical sessions, and not keeping records of visiting preachers. In addition, sermons were repeated in private houses and extra parochial meetings held for psalm singing and scripture reading. Toller was unrepentant and neither appeared before the Chancellor when summoned, nor demonstrated his conformity as required. This resulted in Toller being forced to resign from his position as vicar, but he was immediately reinstated as one of the assistant ministers. Another of the assistant ministers, Thomas Rawson, was also admonished by Easdall. A commission was created to investigate practices at Sheffield more deeply and the case only reached its conclusion in March 1636. At that point the 1634 churchwardens were ordered to pay the costs of the case, which amounted to £13.

At the same visit in 1635, Easdall ordered the current churchwardens to make extensive alterations to the church interior. This included re-ordering pews to make them uniform and face east and removal of the west-end loft, the bell loft that blocked part of the chancel arch and the partition between the chancel and nave. The last of these was to be replaced with an open work screen and set further back into the chancel. The communion table was to be moved to the east end and railed, while the pulpit was to be relocated to the side of the chancel arch. In addition, the organ was to be mended and a skilled organist employed.160 Marchant insightfully surmised that Easdall used the case against the 1634 churchwardens to impel the current churchwardens to comply with


160 The schedule was set out in BI: Chancery AB 26, f. 36r.
these demands promptly. This looks very like the coercive measures of Andrew Foster’s interpretation.

There is more to be said here, however. In the years preceding Easdall’s visit, the churchwardens had been continuing with the longer term programme of investment in fabric. Expenditure on hard fabric, such as walls, roof and windows exceeded £11 in the years 1629 and 1632, and £7 in 1634. This was more than matched by expenditure on furnishings and objects. New lofts were installed in 1629 at a cost of nearly £11. The following year a new clock was purchased for more than £14. A new pulpit and canopy were bought in the early 1630s for a total cost of nearly £14. The church was whitened in 1634 at a cost of over £4, repeating the earlier whitennings of 1606 and 1618. These were all expensive projects, but were not out of the ordinary in the context of the preceding thirty years. They show that the church was not in a state of disrepair, but had been set up for preaching-centred worship, thereby revealing the ideological nature of Easdall’s claims that it was in a state of ‘neglect’. Reading Easdall’s demands across the grain show that, prior to his visit, the church was set out with a feel of being gathered around the pulpit. The chancel was partitioned off as a completely separate communion room, resulting in the nave being a broad, rectangular preaching space with several lofts. As mentioned above, the pulpit was probably set near the centre of this, under the bell loft. Furthermore, it can be seen that the changes demanded by Easdall were not particularly onerous in financial terms. The re-ordering of pews cost just over £7, the removal of the lofts and setting up of a communion rail both cost less than a pound each. This rebuts the idea of the Laudian programme being unpopular due to the financial shock for parishes quite unused to expenditure on fabric. The difference was qualitative, not quantitative.

This all points to coercion being the strongest factor in the relationship between Easdall and Sheffield. There is no sign of a previously submerged cohort of ceremonialist parishioners and very little beyond the minimum demanded by Easdall was carried out. However, at a large scale, the exchange can be seen as a form of negotiation, as both sides eventually achieved what they wanted. The parishioners wanted to remove themselves from Easdall’s scrutiny so they could continue to worship, to some degree, in their preferred style. After the case of the 1634 churchwardens was concluded, this appears to have been the case. Easdall wanted to make an example of Sheffield to send a message to other preaching parishes and needed a public show of conformity by the parish. The public submission on church fabric alterations allowed Easdall to symbolically position the parish
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161 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161.

162 An engraving of the parish church in 1819 shows the bell tower to be central, Hunter, Hallamshire, p. 140.

163 This view is supported by Foster, ‘Churchwardens’ p. 90.
within the hierarchy of the Church and State, and the hierarchical nature of power was further
signalled in the painting of the king’s arms in the church in 1636. The compliance with the fabric
changes acted as a proxy for the submission of the preaching ministers, which was entirely lacking.
Submission to the fabric changes was the ‘public transcript’ of the relationship from the side of the
parish, and Easdall was able to show some magnanimity in return. He allowed Toller to continue as
assistant minister and left the other assistants alone. He even made one compromise in the fabric, in
allowing the bell ringers’ loft to be elevated, rather than dismantled. This must have been enough to
allow the clear line of sight from the nave into the chancel that was so important to him. Such a
concession was probably also a practical measure, as to remove the loft completely would have
entailed a major redesign of the church.

Swift compliance with the fabric changes does not mean that the spatial and material setting
of worship was of little importance to the progressive Protestants at Sheffield. Compliance was no
small thing. The dismantling of the lofts and moving of pews and pulpit were not just an onerous
physical task that entailed some expense. The alterations dismantled a particular expression of piety
that had been created over several decades, where the pulpit, and the Word preached, was placed
in the midst of the people. The new configuration expressed a different theology to which neither
the clergy nor leading laity subscribed, with the reconnection of the chancel and the focus on the
east end creating a setting for ceremonial style of worship. Of particular significance is the relocation
of the pulpit back to the pre-Reformation position, at the junction of the chancel and nave and the
insistence that services be read from a desk within the chancel. The Word was no longer among
the people, expressing the promise of Christ to be present when believers were gathered in his
name. The full significance of this change has not been fully appreciated by historians to date, as
attention has usually been paid to the moving and railing of the communion table. Here it is argued
that the moving of the pulpit and pews was an even more significant and unpalatable change for
progressive Protestants. This is confirmed in the action of the Sheffield churchwardens in returning
the pulpit to its former, more central position as soon as they were able to during the Civil War
years.

Halifax had been a centre for preaching since the arrival of John Favour as vicar in 1593.
Favour had initiated and convened the Halifax preaching exercise, and, like Toller, had been
presented for non-conformity, although, in Favour’s case, this had not reached the level of the High
Commission. From 1629 the Vicar of Halifax had been Henry Ramsden, a learned Calvinist who had

164 This will be further explored in chapter two.
166 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161, 1644.
been a famed preacher in London before returning to his native town.\textsuperscript{167} Ramsden made his views on worship clear in his sermon ‘The Generation of Seekers’, in which he placed preaching above prayer as the means by which union with the divine was sought.\textsuperscript{168} Several of the chapels-of-ease in the parish, such as Luddenden, Heptonstall and Sowerby, were also served by preaching ministers.

As with Sheffield, at the start of Neile’s primacy the church at Halifax was in good repair.\textsuperscript{169} In 1632, just before the primary visitation £30 was spent on the roof, and £40 on a new bell. Following these works, the church was whitened again for a cost of nearly £10. The interior of the church was set up for preaching. The chancel was divided from the nave by a partition and there were at least three lofts, including the churchwardens’ loft installed in 1621. The pulpit had been upgraded in 1621 and was placed well within the nave. In 1627 the parish had engaged in a decorative scheme that involved whitewashing the church, painting the font and partition studs, and painting the Ten Commandments and other scriptural passages on the walls.\textsuperscript{170}

At Neile’s primary visitation, the churchwardens disingenuously declared the old, faulty bell as the sole defect in fabric.\textsuperscript{171} Easdall appears to have not been convinced. The correction court, in the Spring of 1633, was held in Bradford, but Easdall appears to have visited Halifax at this time as well, as the churchwardens of Halifax had to pay his significant expenses of £1 11s in addition to the court charges.\textsuperscript{172} From viewing the church at this visit, Easdall demanded the re-ordering of the pews, and alterations in the quire. The total amount spent on re-pewing and altering stalls within the church between 1633 and 1635 was a massive £132. The exact work done about the quire was not itemised in the accounts, but probably involved replacing the partition with a screen and setting up the chancel for Laudian worship, with a railed altar against the east wall. Easdall visited Halifax again in May 1635, when he charged the churchwardens with ‘the pulling downe of all the lofts in the body of the church of Halifax and making the same decent and cleane’.\textsuperscript{173} At this visit, Easdall initiated an \textit{ex officio} action against one of the churchwardens, Abraham Parkinson, concerning a brawl with

\textsuperscript{167} Four sermons by Henry Ramsden were posthumously printed as \textit{A Gleaning in Gods Harvest: Foure Choyce Handfuls} (1639), hereafter referred to as \textit{Gleaning in Gods Harvest}.
\textsuperscript{169} Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1.
\textsuperscript{170} A table of the Ten Commandments was not an optional feature, being required since the 1561 Royal Proclamation, so the works here were probably an upgrading of existing tablets.
\textsuperscript{171} BI: V1633, CB f.136r. A new bell was cast in Dec 1632, between the visitation in the Autumn and the correction courts the following Spring.
\textsuperscript{172} Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1, f. 71.
\textsuperscript{173} BI: Chancery AB 26, f. 40 v.
another churchwarden at their monthly meeting. These meetings were held at a table in the chancel after Evensong, so Easdall’s action pressed home his ideas about the chancel being a sacred space, where reverent behaviour was appropriate. There was another episcopal visitation in 1636, at which only behavioural offences were presented, signalling that church fabric was a matter to be dealt with elsewhere.

Halifax’s response to the Laudian regime was quite different to Sheffield’s, as the parish appears to have voluntarily embraced the ‘beauty of holiness’ in addition to alterations required by Easdall. The additional works all took place in the year 1636. Twenty-nine books of ‘leafe gould’ and ‘fower hundred and odde stars for the chancel’ were bought. The stars were probably set against a blue background, as scaffolding for painting the ceiling was also erected at this time. Other, unspecified works in the quire cost over £8. The Ten Commandments were framed and a border made for the King’s Arms. The lofts were decorated with a ‘crest all along the foresses’ and the pulpit was given a very expensive canopy, costing £5. This would suggest a canopy at least as ornate and imposing as the one surviving at St John’s, Leeds today.175

So how can this voluntary embellishment be explained? Did a previously submerged ceremonialist party come to the fore at this time, as Walsham argues? The evidence does not support this interpretation. Firstly, Ramsden was still the vicar 1636 and very active in affairs. That he did not suddenly adopt ceremonialist practices, such as kneeling, is suggested by the necessary purchase of a hassock for his successor, the Laudian cleric, Richard Marsh, who was instituted in 1638. Secondly, in 1636, several of the twelve men who acted as churchwardens for the parish were progressive Protestants. These included John Lister, who kept a series of sermon notes, and Richard Best was part of a family with whom the Presbyterian preacher, Oliver Heywood, would later lodge.176 Abraham Illingworth and Richard Midgely were also both part of families engaged in supporting progressive Protestantism.177 There were churchwardens who had commercial reasons for not objecting to the adornment of the church. John Hargreaves supplied building materials to the church and was involved with the casting of the new bell. James Foxcroft was the owner of the Cross Inn, at which Easdall stayed during his visits. There is no evidence for their religious views, but when

174 BI: Cause paper CP.H. 2054.
175 See photograph in Appendix 3.
John Hargreaves had previously been churchwarden there had been no notable veer towards decorative embellishment. Finally, there was still a commitment to preaching in the parish. In 1637 a visiting preacher, Mr Holland, was paid for a sermon and in 1638, the Halifax parishioner, Ann Snydall, left money in her will for an anniversary sermon to be delivered by the future Presbyterian, William Alte. So it seems that there was neither a long term ceremoniological party coming to power, nor a sudden conversion of progressive Protestants into ceremonials.

What happened in 1637 provides a clue to understanding the sudden phase of decorative expenditure. There was a great difficulty in persuading twelve men to stand as churchwardens. Ramsden had to issue a warrant to bring the men to him and then had to arrange for the commissioners to come to Halifax to swear them in, in contrast to the usual procedure of the churchwardens travelling to the commissioners. While this appears coercive on Ramsden’s part, his actions can be interpreted as him attempting to hold parish government together in the face of adversity. This is shown in that he also took action to get the churchwardens released from an excommunication, indicating his allegiances lay with his parishioners. These events can be interpreted as a reaction to the conclusion of the case against the Sheffield churchwardens in March 1636. Just as Easdall had intended, news of the law suit and its outcome had spread, and parishioners in Halifax were reluctant to put themselves in a similar position by standing as churchwarden. They did not want to have to choose between reporting their minister for non-conformity or being prosecuted for failure to do so.

This points, just as with Sheffield, to the prime concern being to preserve the one essential element in preaching-centred worship: the preacher himself, and casts a different light on the voluntary adornment of the church in 1636. It is proposed that it was carried out as the basis for accommodation and negotiation between parish and Easdall. It was part of a package of appeasement that included shows of lavish hospitality to Easdall and his retinue. In 1635 the parish had paid £5 11s for the Chancellor’s bill at the Cross Inn. This represented a huge sum for hospitality, even with a large retinue. A further 19s was spent on ‘ringing for Easdall’s arrival’ at the same visit, which, in addition to demonstrating the new bell, performed the pomp and respect demanded by the Chancellor. To put this in perspective, when Hugh Ramsden (brother to Henry) first arrived as vicar in 1628, he too was greeted with ringing, but at a more usual cost of 2s, so the ringing for Easdall was on a much bigger scale, and probably included food and drink. This show of
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voluntarism and hospitality were elements in the parish’s campaign to build a positive relationship with Easdall, through which the minister and parishioners were able to negotiate various outcomes.

Several concessions were won by the strategy. Although Easdall had demanded the removal of all the lofts, the churchwardens’ accounts show that there were still lofts (plural) remaining in 1636. The adornment of these with crests probably ensured their retention. The pulpit was allowed to remain deep inside the nave, unlike Sheffield where it was moved east to the chancel arch. Again, it was embellished, in this case with the expensive canopy. Significant here, also, was the positioning of the reading desk on the pillar opposite the pulpit, thereby symbolising equality between liturgical prayer and the Word preached. This separation of the Word read and the Word preached was also seen at Wakefield, where, in 1634, the churchwardens were instructed to ‘make a decent and convenient seat or place for the minister to read service in and to take away that pulpit which heretofore they have used for that purpose’. The replacement pulpit, now only used for sermons, was probably very ornate as it cost £18 8s, the most spent on any pulpit in the Pennines during this period. Thus, some of the spatial and material elements that supported preaching-centred worship were retained at Halifax, in contrast to Sheffield. Most importantly, the preaching minister, Ramsden, was not censured in any way.

It is also important to note that the decorative features installed in 1636 did not include any imagery that could be considered idolatrous, other than in the broadest sense of overt materiality. In this respect, the adornments at Halifax are similar to those surviving today at St John’s chapel in Leeds, which will be discussed further in chapter four. To set these non-figurative decorations into context, they should be contrasted with decorative schemes in other churches. At the parish church of Rochdale, where the future Bishop of Elphin, Henry Tilson, was minister, coloured glass windows of the Twelve Apostles were installed in 1633. In the private chapel of Sir Arthur Ingram at Temple Newsam House, eighteen wooden panels depicting Old Testament characters were installed in 1637. The gilded frames, stars, and crests at Halifax were non-figurative ways of showing participation in the ‘beauty of holiness’, while keeping a safe distance from ‘popish’ imagery.

This chapter has shown that material and spatial setting was important to those who placed preaching central to public worship, and a notable surge in voluntary church fabric investment can
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181 Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1, 1636, f. 81; Leeds parish was also instructed to remove its lofts, BI: Chancery AB 25, f. 301v; f. 40.

182 BI: Chancery AB 25, f. 221r; Wakefield cwa, YAS: MS 815.

183 CLA: C6, Raines Lancashire MSS vol. 1, f. 23; Temple Newsam House, Leeds. I would like to thank the staff of Leeds Museums and Galleries at Temple Newsam for their assistance.
be detected once the preaching ministry began to expand in the Pennine area. The investment reconfigured the way in which the place of worship was experienced, with the position of the pulpit and the pews around it of central importance for progressive Protestants. Having the source of the unfolded Word in the midst of the people, and a sense of being gathered around it, was a spatial and material expression of the promise of Christ to be present when the faithful gathered in his name. The Laudian demands were designed to do away with this and replace it with the expression of a different theology of grace and an alternative view of where holiness was encountered. Exactly how progressive Protestants considered preaching as an encounter with the divine is the subject of chapter two.
Chapter Two

Preaching and Sacred Space

In chapter one it was established that from the end of the sixteenth century there was a significant investment in the spaces and material fabric of preaching-centred worship. This chapter will consider the ways in which those spaces were understood to be sacred, or ‘the house of God’. As discussed in the introduction to this section, in Reformed thinking, a church could be considered holy for the worship that occurred there, rather than the building and objects within it being regarded as intrinsically sacred. How this concept operated at the parish level has remained unclear, so this chapter will explore how sermons, actions and consecration events communicated the immanence of the holy in preaching. Although the response to this message is more difficult to access, evidence for this will also be examined.

The meanings of the house of God

Reformed ideas about sacred space had to be accommodated into a mosaic of existing local concerns, economic and social realities, assumptions and customs. The early-seventeenth century investment in church fabric did not start from a clean slate and nor did it expunge all pre-Reformation markers of holy space, which still abounded in the churches and chapels. This might be expected where a Catholic family held influence, such as Addingham, home of the Vavasour family, where ‘piktors’ in the church were only finally removed in 1650. However, even in churches where preaching-centred worship dominated there were reminders of the old religion. In 1606, the large chapel of Bradfield had a window containing an image of a ‘yellow cup and a popish wafer’ and the east window there had images of St Edward, St Lawrence and St Edmund. Similar ‘cup and chalice’ images were observed at Dewsbury parish church in 1618. Methley Parish Church retained representations of the Trinity on gentry tombs and had images of saints in the windows. Kildwick, near Bingley, had an image of God on a cloud in the window shortly before it became a centre for radical, antinomian preaching. Pre-Reformation pulpits could contain reminders of the old theology, even as they were used to expound the new. As late as 1606, the pulpit at Dewsbury Parish Church still bore the inscription: ‘of your charity pray for the soules of Thomas Sotehyll et Margery’. These
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184 Addingham cwa, WYAS (B): BDP1/7/1/2.
objects survived partly because of the cost of replacement and partly due to elite protection, supported by the Elizabethan Orders of 1560 and 1561.\textsuperscript{185}

Such material survivals were a reminder that the holiness of the space had been established long ago by the ancestors of those now present. Thus there was a subconscious assumption that places of worship were in some sense holy, simply because they had always been held to be so. A Reformed conceptualisation of the ‘house of God’ had to somehow coexist with this undercurrent, and this was made possible by preachers employing a degree of ambiguity and plural meanings. Within one sermon, the ‘house of God’ could mean the building in which worship occurred, the assembled followers of Christ, or the inner dwelling of the Holy Spirit in the individual. Preachers slipped between these connotations with ease, engendering an ambiguity that allowed as many listeners as possible to find some way of fitting Reformed ideas into their framework of understanding.\textsuperscript{186} This multitude of meanings was encapsulated in the writing of scriptural passages on the interior walls of the church. As the Word became part of the structure of the church building, a house of God was created in a very tangible way that reinforced more spiritual connotations.

The first step in communicating this message was relatively uncontroversial. It was widely accepted that as God was omnipresent, so he must be within the place of worship. This principle was established in the \textit{Homilies}, and was repeated by preachers such as Hugh Ramsden, minister of Methley in the 1620s. In a sermon on Col. 1:15, ‘who is the image of the invisible god, the first begotten of every creature’, he reminded his listeners that they were always in the sight of God, so ‘if the apostle would have us carry ourselves decently in church because the angles are there, how much more because the dreadful presence of god is there’.\textsuperscript{187} Other preachers went further than pronouncing God’s omnipresence and taught that God was more present in the church than elsewhere, especially if the occasions demanded it, such as memorials to those who had provided material support for the Church. One such sermon was given by William Ainsworth at Lightcliffe Chapel (Halifax) in 1648, entitled, ‘A Pattern for Pious Uses’.\textsuperscript{188} The sermon was a memorial to Nathaniel Waterhouse, who had endowed various charities in Halifax, including a monthly sermon and wages for preachers. The sermon was also dedicated to another, living, benefactor, William

\begin{footnotes}
\item[188] William Ainsworth, \textit{Triplex Memoriale or the Substance of Three Commemoration Sermons} (York, 1650).
\end{footnotes}
Rooke, who had built Wibsey Chapel (Bradford), and whose father-in-law, John Hanson, had taken a leading role in the rebuilding of Rastrick chapel. The purpose of the sermon was to laud the example of Waterhouse, and so, by extension, Rooke, and encourage charity among those present. A material rendering of ‘the house of God’ was therefore very much to be expected. The religious context, however, was Presbyterian Halifax, and so no hint of intrinsic holiness or good works theology would be tolerated. Ainsworth, therefore, faced a difficult balancing act. His choice of text for the sermon was, Nehemiah 13:14 ‘remember me oh my god, concerning this, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done for the house of my god, and for the offices thereof’. Ainsworth gave an extended exegesis of what was meant by ‘the house of God’, working his way through five different spiritual meanings: the whole world, the Kingdom of Heaven, the soul of every sanctified man, the Church Militant and the humanity and flesh of Jesus Christ. Finally he arrived at ‘the material house or building consecrated to God’s service’. Ainsworth maintained that the verse from Nehemiah should mainly be understood in this material sense, and backed this up with the proof text, Mat. 21:13 ‘my house shall be called a house of prayer’. He expanded on this through the usual objection and reason format, posing the question ‘but doth god dwell in Temples made with hands?’ which allowed an answer of studied ambiguity. He began with a reiteration of God’s omnipresence,

true he dwells not there to be circumscribed, and contained there, though yet he dwells there too, positively and definitively; for he that fills all places with his omnipresence cannot be denied to be in any place.\(^\text{189}\)

He then built on this to explain how God dwelt in the church ‘positively and definitively’, giving a variety of reasons why this was so:

but he dwells, not for all that, in these material temples, after the manner of men, but after a more divine and incomprehensible manner, viz. by the immensity of his essence, by his spirit, by his ordinance, and by his Name, which comprehends all these. And thus he dwells in the sanctuary and thus it comes to be the house of god.\(^\text{190}\)

This presented the Reformed notion that a church building was holy because of the worship that occurred there (his ‘ordination’ and ‘Name’). It used Reformed language, but in such a way that a hearer could understand this as indicating a more permanent, intrinsic divine presence in the chapel, as God’s ‘essence’ and ‘spirit’ dwelt there. In an earlier section, the ‘house of God’ could be

\(^{189}\) Idem. p. 54

\(^{190}\) Idem. p. 55. Ainsworth's sermon echoes parts of the Homily on repairing churches, and also a sermon delivered by Jeremiah Dyke cited in Spicer ‘God will have a house’, pp. 215,6.
understood as both the church building and the Church of believers on earth, as Ainsworth reminded his listeners that

But it is an argument of atheisme and unfaithfulness to neglect and forget the House of God, much more to pull it down, to detain the Ministers dues, and that which is given to pious uses, which is the crying sin of many people.

God will remember these too, but not for good as the Benefactors of the Church, according to their works, as in Haggai 1:4,6. Where they have their plagues multiplied for the Temples sake; and Dan 5: 2,3. Where Belshazzar is smitten suddenly of God for prophaning the sanctuary vessels.\footnote{Idem. p. 47.}

So both meanings of the house of God were held in play simultaneously. This was not a problem for those used to hearing plural meanings and doctrines derived from scriptural text in sermons. Biblical language was by its very nature as the Word of God believed to hold many layers of meaning, metaphor and mystery. Ainsworth did not explain any further to his hearers how God dwelt in a church through his ‘essence’, ‘spirit’, ‘ordinance’ and ‘name’, but other preachers did and the next section will unpick how this difficult concept was communicated. This entailed the linking of ideas about sacred space with behaviour and sacred time, and specifically relating them both to preaching.

The construction of sacred space through behaviour and time

Hugh Ramsden, the minister of Methley, gave a series of sermons to his more committed parishioners. He began by rebutting the Catholic claim that lack of material adornment made Protestant churches were profane by quoting the promise of Christ in Mat. 18:20,

to which I answer that tempell is prophane which hath not the image of christ in, provide it be a true image. But hath not christ promised that where 2 or 3 are gathered together in his name that he will be in the midst of them.\footnote{Hugh Ramsden sermons, WYAS (W): WYW 1352/3/3/1/2/11. Col. 1:15.}

This was to promote the notion of Christ being present during true, Protestant worship, and also to refute the Catholic criticism that Protestant churches were profane as they lacked images.

John Angier gave a series of sermons to his parishioners at his chapel of Denton in 1637, which he later published under the title, A Helpe to Better Hearts for Better Times: Indeavoured in Several Sermons.\footnote{John Angier, A Helpe to Better Hearts for Better Times: Indeavoured in Several Sermons, (London, 1647), hereafter referred to as HTBH.} In his sermons he highlighted Christ’s promise of Mat. 18:20 and emphasised the idea of

\footnote{Idem. p. 47.}

\footnote{Hugh Ramsden sermons, WYAS (W): WYW 1352/3/3/1/2/11. Col. 1:15.}

\footnote{John Angier, A Helpe to Better Hearts for Better Times: Indeavoured in Several Sermons, (London, 1647), hereafter referred to as HTBH.}
worship as assembly, drawing the contrast between ‘gods house’ as the ‘assembly of saints’ and the ‘ale-house’ as ‘the society of sinners’. This feeling of assembly was embodied, as the pulpit was placed fully half way down the nave. However, Angier aimed to impress upon his hearers that there could be no mechanical summoning of the divine, but that Christ’s promise was conditional on correct worship. ‘In My Name’ Angier explained, meant true worship, as ‘gods worship is the name of the Lord, the name of Jehovah, therefore carefully and fervently to be performed’. In some respects, this was part of a long tradition of exhortatory guides on worship, but Angier was particularly concerned with behaviour during preaching. Angier told his hearers that ‘in the ordinances God is specially present’. He conceptualised the body of Christ as the Word, and the Word as the body of Christ, stating that Christ’s body could only ever be present as the Word, and ‘we must prepare to receive the Word . . . but diversly dispensed, to the ear in a sermon, to the eie and hand, mouth and stomack in the Sacrament’. While the body of Christ could thus be received in both communion and preaching, Angier went on to insist that preaching was the primary of these two ordinances,

If the Sacrament be but a signe and representation of the body and blood of Christ, as it must needs be granted, then the word will require more reverence, for the Word, so farre as by Scripture it can be proved to be the Word of Christ, is not a signe or representation, but his very Word.

He pronounced that man could speak to God in prayer, speak of God in reading the Word and singing psalms, but only preaching of the Word allowed man to hear God himself speak. The preached Word was,

his very word... “he that heareth you heareth me”: not an image of me, but me speaking in you, as he speaketh in a speciall case, Mat. 10.20 It is not you that speak, but the spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.

194 HTBH p. 71.
196 HTBH, pp. 20, 22.
197 Such as John Downname’s Christian Warfare, first printed in 1608. See Ryrie, Being Protestant, for more on this tradition.
198 HTBH, p. 20.
199 Idem. pp. 102,3; 300–05.
200 Idem. p. 305.
201 Ibid.
To some degree, Angier was exploiting the blurred distinction between the Word and scripture here. His aim was to combat both any remnants of unreformed thinking and the recent Laudian churchmanship that placed intrinsic holiness in the ritualised performance of the sacrament. The notion that Angier was setting before his listeners was that more than just grace was available through hearing a sermon. Preaching was the most immediate way to encounter the Word, and this was God’s presence on earth. It redrew the doctrine set forth by Calvin, that ‘the Word preached lives in hearts of those called’, into a more concretely imagined process.

Angier spent the remainder of his sermons elaborating on what correct worship meant in practice. His sermons methodically prescribed behaviours and mental states that aided true worship, dealing with the failings of wandering thoughts, lack of preparation, weariness, sleeping and slothfulness. The right affections and spiritual disposition created an image of God in man, so that God was more likely to be present, as ‘god is a spirit and doth converse with our spirits’, or conversely, ‘if they [our spirits] be absent, God also will be absent’. Any deviation from the standard so set was a profanation of God’s worship, and thus his name. He warned that ‘despising of holy things is attended with profanation of them: the holy using of holy things ceaseth when despising begins’. Thus a progressive Protestant version of the sin of profanation was presented: worship could be profaned, but not things.

Preparation was key to correct worship. Angier set this preparation into the longer period of sacred time that was the Sabbath. To mark this, he called for a change of disposition

shall we make no difference between Gods day and our own? . . . we difference the same by change of apparell: and shall we not difference Gods day from other daies by change of spirit?

Angier criticised those who went to church with ‘the same affections where with they go about other occasions’.

Arriving at the place of worship was important, and Angier highlighted the threshold of the church in several places by reiterating the biblical verse ‘keep thy foot when thou goest into the house of god and be more ready to hear than to offer the sacrifice of fools’ (Eccles. 4.17).

\[\text{idem. p. 301.}\]
\[\text{HTBH, pp. 72, 75, 178.}\]
\[\text{idem. pp. 22, 89.}\]
\[\text{idem. p. 208.}\]
\[\text{idem. epistle to reader and pp. 7, 59, 70, 74.}\]
Smith points to the spiritual significance of the language of thresholds. He claims that using a vocabulary of ‘in-comings, outlettings and indwellings’ could transform ‘any person, object or event into an intimation of glory imminent or immanent’. This could lead an individual to feel they were ‘irradiated with the holy and divine nature’. Angier emphasised that worshippers should arrive in good time with the correct demeanour, described as ‘we should come into such places with a respect of those holy ends we come for, and all our carriage, til we depart thence, should express so much’. In various places in his sermons, Angier used this verse both literally, in the sense of entering the chapel, and figuratively, signifying the soul commencing worship. Holding both literal and figurative meanings in play simultaneously encouraged a sense of the numinous in worship by obscuring the boundary between the material and spiritual.

Once in the chapel, Angier tacitly acknowledged the way actions and posture of the body influenced the mind, as he insisted

endeavour after a reverent carriage of body, there is that nearnes between soul and body, that they are helps and hinderences one to another. An irreverent behaviour will, 1. Increase the irreverence of the minde, provke and procure fleighty thoughts. 2. Beget the like irreverent behaviour in others, which will reflect upon our hurt.  

This instruction acknowledged the mutual reinforcing of behaviour, positively or negatively. The impact of one’s behaviour on others was a particular side-effect of placing pews to face the pulpit wherever possible, as this also meant that a significant proportion of the auditory could see one another. This also meant that the chapel was a place where one could be seen to behave in a godly fashion. Reverent carriage would ‘Content the Spirit of God, when he seeth his Temple in a comely habit, and he will delight to be more there.’ Here, Angier used the term ‘temple’ in the sense of the spirit dwelling in the heart or soul of the worshipper, yet he was clearly talking about conduct and disposition during worship in a material temple, the chapel, so a duality of meaning was again invoked.

Sleeping and drowsiness during worship were serious breaches of the behavioural code. Twice Angier referred to the biblical warning of Acts 20, in which a young man who slept during a sermon died shortly afterwards, and he blasted his hearers with the stark warning ‘Hell was made for sermon sleepers’. He threatened that God would sleep through the pleas of such offenders, even

209 HTBH, pp. 77, 83, 209, 625, 6.
210 HTBH, p. 109.
211 Ibid.
when they begged him for the relief of sleep during sickness. Drowsiness was nearly as bad as sleeping, as ‘our eyes do but half see, and our ears but half hear’. The key to not being sleepy in church was thorough preparation and moderation of the worldly appetites. The faithful had to make an effort to master their bodily senses and thus prevent sleepiness and drowsiness. The sequence of benefits from doing this was clear: ‘leave sleeping, and fall into hearing, and from hearing to believing and repenting’.212

Wandering thoughts were also a problem, as ‘some let their mindes go loose all Sermon while’.213 Angier again linked the state of the mind with the senses, particularly sight, noting ‘the thoughts depend on the eyes’, and he reminded his hearers that when Jesus spoke, all eyes were fastened upon him. He exhorted his hearers to ‘watch thine eie: a rolling eie, a wandring heart, if thou give libertie to thy eie, that will set the minde at liberty’. He admonished those who ‘suffer their eyes to wander and rove, and to delight themselves with variety of objects’, including those who ‘gaze about us, to see whom of our friends we can espy, or who comes in, or what apparell others weare’.214 On a practical level, this failing was another side-effect of the interior arrangement of pews facing towards the pulpit. The separation of the genders may have been partially motivated to overcome this distraction.215 The communal aspect of worship meant that even inattention for pious reasons was detrimental; Angier insisted that ‘when we meet for publike ends, private actions are unsuitable’. Private prayer during the sermon was a sin, as ‘not onely is the minde withdrawn in the sight of God, but the body also in the sight of men’. Even thinking about a different sermon was to be avoided.216

Angier specifically mentioned holy time in his prescriptions. He warned his hearers ‘in sleeping this day and this sermon, thou dost sleep all thy time and all thy sermons, for no time is thy time but the present, no sermon is thy sermon but the present sermon’.217 The message from Angier was that true worship, as an ordinance of God, could be profaned and true worship centred on the Word. Listeners were told how to be in a state of readiness to receive the Word in the same way that a state of readiness had long been required to partake in communion. The behavioural

\[ \text{212 Idem. pp. 457, 531, 545, 481.} \]
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\[ \text{214 Idem. pp. 174, 200, 82–87.} \]
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standards were set very high, demanding a noticeable change in conduct from the everyday: a period of preparation to bring about the required mental state, and the carriage and conduct of the body when arriving at the chapel and during worship. The behavioural construction of sacred time was pinned to the space of the chapel, thereby creating a Reformed conceptualisation of sacred space.

So how was this vision of true worship and its attendant divine presence, received? It is important to remember that the prescribed forms of behaviour and spiritual disposition were always ideals to be aimed towards. Falling short of the ideal was inevitable, and Angier’s depictions of these failings should not be taken to indicate failure for this message to make any impression at all. Part of the problem was the inherent difficulty of aligning the doctrine of God’s unlimited bounty with the frequency with which the spirit did not manifest itself for worshippers. If God was not present at an assembly, it was because the hearers fell short and profaned the worship in some way; they were ‘the cause of Gods absence in worship, that the godly can not see him, feel him, have communion with him’. Such complaints did not mean that the majority made no effort at all to conduct themselves in the required manner, but that to consistently be attentively earnest was very difficult. This difficulty shows up in the evidence from the ecclesiastical courts, which have many records of individuals absenting themselves, misbehaving and falling asleep during sermons. Christopher Haigh interpreted such records as proof of the unpopularity of preaching. However, the same evidence can be read another way: that such behaviour was presented to the court because it was considered egregious. This is illustrated by a 1613 cause taken by Anthony Goodwin, the minister at Rawmarsh, near Rotherham, which shows that remaining in one’s allotted seat during the ‘time of divine service’ was the expectation and the offender leaving his seat was a significant transgression. Goodwin complained that, during the Sunday service, ‘William Westerne suddenly stoode upp in his seat, or stall, within said church’ and proceeded to argue with the minister. He then ‘came out of his seate or stall in threatening and quarrelinge and brawlinge manner, to the seate or pew of the said Mr Goodwin, situate in the said church’. Western therefore flouted the expectation that all would remain in their seats during a service. Of course, this immobility led to the opposite problem of falling asleep. This did not always happen during preaching, however. Angier criticised those who

218 Idem. p. 178.
slept during services until the sermon, which indicates that for some, at least, preaching was the most interesting part of the service. Earnest sermon-goers stuck pins into themselves in attempts to stay awake, but others engaged in similar behaviour for more mischievous ends. Maria Beckett of Leeds was presented in the visitation of 1615 for ‘chiding and misbehaving of her selfe in tyme of divine service and by prickinge them that satt next her wth pinnes’. Such behaviour was relatively rare and clearly considered to be a transgression from the norm.

There is no doubt that the demands made by preachers such as Angier were hard to achieve, but they were supported by other reminders that the time and space of preaching was holy. A concern for time was not necessarily specifically tied to preaching, but there was clearly a strong awareness of time in the post-Reformation period. Eighteen out of the twenty-six sets of churchwardens’ accounts that have been examined for this study contain some form of payment for a clock. Sheffield spent over £30 on its clock over the whole period and at Royston and Whitkirk a regular stipend was paid for clock maintenance. A new clock was bought shortly after the preaching minister, John Favour, arrived in Halifax, and at Wath, near Rotherham, a dial was installed in the churchyard in 1628, the year that the number of visiting preachers significantly increased there. The concern with time was visually prominent; the clock house at Halifax was painted in 1624, while at Wakefield, images of death and time were painted upon the walls of the church. Hour glasses were also ubiquitous. All this points to progressive Protestants having an acute awareness of time.

Bells were another marker of time. They performed several functions within a parish and expenditure on their upkeep and repair often formed a major, regular component of overall disbursements. When new chapels were constructed for preaching-centred worship, the installation of a bell was a priority. When Rastrick chapel was rebuilt, the loan of a bell from a Mr Ramsden was highlighted in the accounts. Within three years the inhabitants resolved to buy their own bell and collected over £5 for the purchase. When the small chapel of Ecclesall was rebuilt, twice as many people contributed to the installation of the bell than contributed to the general rebuilding of the chapel. When Sowerby chapel was rebuilt in 1620, a particularly fine belfry was installed, being a
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cupola of eight ornamented columns topped by crocketted pinnacles.\textsuperscript{226} Margo Todd describes how, in Scotland, a bell would be tolled three times at half hour intervals before a sermon, with listeners expected to be in their place by the second bell. It is not known whether the Scottish system of three warning bells was practised in the Pennines, but payments were specifically made for ringing a sermon bell at Ecclesfield, Rochdale and Whitkirk.\textsuperscript{227} Sermon bells and other time-keepers clearly informed worshippers of the approaching sermon time, and so formed part of the preparations prescribed by Angier.

The immediate approach of a sermon was marked by the preacher’s arrival. This could be something that was deliberately arranged to be seen. John Favour was aware that his parishioners watched his entrance into the church. In a letter he stated that he was stopped as he arrived at the church ‘in the vewe of a multitude of people gazing’, which suggests that the preacher’s entrance was a notable moment for worshippers.\textsuperscript{228} The sermon time was signalled by the preacher opening the Bible, or notes, on the pulpit cushion and the turning of the hour glass to start the sermon. The repeated expenses for hourglasses show their regular use: at Bradfield at least nine hourglasses were bought during a twenty year period. All these actions helped to reinforce the message that preaching was a time separated from the profane.

The reverent behaviour prescribed by Angier was also encouraged through the employment of dogwhippers, with expenses for such officers recorded in the churchwardens’ accounts for Whalley, Bolton, Ecclesfield, Wath and Halifax.\textsuperscript{229} Finally, the common practice of singing psalms before and after a sermon could ward off drowsiness by increasing oxygen intake and stirring the emotions. Calvin instructed that psalms were a suitable way to stir up the heart,

Surely, if the singing be tempered to that gravity which is fitting in the sight of God and the Angels, it both lends dignity and grace to sacred actions and has the greatest value in kindling our hearts to a true zeal and eagerness to pray.\textsuperscript{230}

\textsuperscript{226} The elaborate bell-cote and the east window from the 1620 Sowerby chapel were preserved at Field House, Sowerby, when the chapel was replaced in 1765.

\textsuperscript{227} Todd, \textit{Culture of Protestantism}, p. 29; Ecclesfield cwa, SA: PRS54/13/1; Rochdale cwa, CLA: C.6 and Whitkirk cwa, WYAS (L): RDP106/52.

\textsuperscript{228} Walker, \textit{Early Registers of Halifax Parish Church}, p. 123.
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we should labour to drinke deepe of the spirit and expresse it in singing and making melody in our hearts to the lord, there must be a sweet and loud sounding joy in our hearts when we sing psalms.\textsuperscript{231}

So there were various ‘helps’ to achieve the state of readiness prescribed by Angier by marking the approach of holy time.

There is also evidence that hearers knew what was required of them, even if they did not always achieve it. Angier’s own hearers reflected his words back to him in a letter. Twenty-four parishioners from his early ministry at Ringley chapel wrote to him some years after his move to Denton.\textsuperscript{232} They described their worship as their ‘assembly’ and complained of the lack of God’s presence since Angier’s departure, as they had experienced

the throwing down of that hopeful beginning of his house, which we thought he would have builded us into, when as he [God] was pleased to cause his glory to shine on our publick and private assemblies, and for a short time to set up his standard in our house of Worship.

Here the parishioners used the dual meaning of ‘house’ as the collective of true believers and the physical place in which they met. The parishioners lamented the lack of God’s presence in their worship since Angier’s departure through the imagined voice of a vengeful God,

Let very few or none of his people be converted; let this people have little of my presence in their house of publick meeting, let not of my ambassadors be set over them for their profit; let them be decreased by death by schisms by scandals; yes let their public assemblies be broken up, and let help and healing be looked for in vain, let them look for light but behold obscurity, for brightness but walk in darkness.\textsuperscript{233}

The idea of ‘assembly’ was obviously significant to the parishioners, echoing the language of Angier’s sermons. These phrases strongly suggest that the twenty-four parishioners and their families did indeed believe that, when a suitable preacher was officiating in the chapel, God was especially present in some way. John Harrison, the Leeds chapel builder, thought so too. On his death bed he lamented how ‘the wandring of mine eyes have obstructed the hearing of mine ears, so that many

\textsuperscript{231}HTBH, pp. 9, 81.
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\textsuperscript{233}Idem., p. 65.
times when thou knocked at the door of mine heart by thy Holy Spirit, I have not opened to thee’. These words may have been stylised somewhat by his amanuensis, but they reflect the sort of words spoken by Angier and suggest that, for some hearers, the message was internalised.

Finally, the scriptural verses chosen to adorn the whitewashed walls of churches reminded worshippers that they were in the house of god, even while they also carried a spiritual message. The walls of the church at Hemingbrough were painted with the verses of Eccles. 4:17 and Haggai 2:10, ‘the glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts’. The decision to use these verses illustrates the duality of literal and figurative senses of scripture in which worshippers in the post-Reformation period were steeped. Such evidence is patchy, but it suggests that the regular hearing of sermons such as Angier’s impressed the idea that the divine could be present during true worship and the church truly become ‘the house of god’.

Consecration

The problem to be addressed here is the relationship between the Reformed, non-intrinsic conceptualisation of sacred space and the development of consecration ceremonies in the early seventeenth century. As discussed in the introduction to this section, they seem antithetical. So, the question is, did progressive Protestant clergy have to modify their stance as a result of lay demand to mark church buildings as sacred, or was there something more complex happening?

This study has brought to light more instances of consecration than have been previously noted, including documentary sources for nine formal consecrations for chapels: Headingley (Leeds), Luddenden, Wibsey, Attercliffe, Hunslet (Leeds), Ringley, St John’s, Salford, and Meltham (Kirkburton). It is proposed that three phases of how new or rebuilt chapels were marked as places of worship can be identified. One of the earliest chapels to be rebuilt was Rastrick in 1602. The chapel was almost entirely rebuilt from the foundations upwards, and so there were grounds for consecration, if that had been desired. There is no record of a formal consecration event occurring, however, the detailed account of the rebuilding highlights a special visit by the famed preachers, John Favour and Robert More as the confirmatory end point of the rebuilding project. The account relates that, following the rebuilding,

---


236 This study adds new data to the list published by Andrew Spicer in ‘God will have a House’, pp. 228–30.
The chapel was prepared for this auspicious visit with further improvement to the fabric, as

note that before his comynge, the greate windowe next the pulpitt which was the queare window in the olde chapel, being of wood, was taken downe and a newe windowe of stone there made and glassed at the charges of Johanna the wief of John Hanson.

This visit was thus presented as a mark of the true worship that was conducted in the chapel. It reflected the Reformed notion that correct worship, particularly the preaching of the Word, was the act that set the building apart from the profane, rather than any ceremonial rite that conferred holiness to the building in a mechanical fashion.

A similar ‘proto-consecration’ by visiting preachers marked the inauguration of Ringley chapel in 1626, eight years before it was officially consecrated by Bishop Bridgeman. The visit by several well-known preachers was recorded in a letter by Nathan Walworth, who noted with satisfaction the high level of attendance at the event. He was, however, perturbed by the absence of three particular ministers: Mr Murray, Mr Horrox and Mr Rathband. These were all very progressive Protestant preachers, and the conclusion is that Walworth would have seen them as adding weight to the event. The noted absence of the three preachers suggest that substantially more than this number were expected to attend.

The inaugural preaching events at Rastrick and Ringley did not leave any official records in the diocesan archives, and we only know about them through the chance survival of the sources described here, so there may have been many more similar events arranged which signalled the separation of a new chapel from the profane as a place of worship. Such events reflected the Reformed position that it was the worship carried out there that was sacred, rather than any sort of holiness being intrinsic to the building. These events were instigated at the grassroots level among the preachers and laity themselves. The bishops possibly approved, but were not directly involved.

The next phase of development was also very much centred on preaching, but it was termed a consecration and was done under the direction of the bishop. Archbishop Toby Matthew did not feel it necessary to personally perform the consecration himself and delegated it to preaching ministers.

---

237 Rastrick cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 52/115.
238 Spicer, ‘God will have a House’, p. 215.
239 Walworth Correspondence, p. 12.
240 Idem. p. 11.
This implies that Matthew did not hold the notion that bishops possessed an exclusive instrumental power deriving from their own consecrations.²⁴¹ Matthew delegated the consecration of Headingley chapel in 1619 to the same pair of famed preachers, Favour and More, who inaugurated the rebuilt chapel at Rastrick.²⁴² There is no record of the rite used at Headingley, so it is possible that they continued their former practice that centred on preaching. Matthew displayed the same attitude in 1624. The inhabitants of Luddenden chapelry had earlier petitioned the Crown for the consecration of their rebuilt chapel, a move that can be seen as part of their larger campaign to reduce their ties with the mother church of Halifax.²⁴³ The petition was successful and Matthew was instructed by the Crown to proceed with the consecration. The bishop conceded to this by commanding

jointly and severally the Bishop of Chester, the Bishop of Sodor and Man, Charles Greenwood, Rector of Thornhill, Hugh Ramsden Batchelor of Divinity, our chaplain Rector of the parish church of Methley and Nathaniel Walsh, clerk, MA, preacher of the word of God, to consecrate and sanctify or that one of you consecrate or sanctify with the usual and accustomed Benediction the church or chapel.²⁴⁴

The bishops at the top of this list were mentioned for form’s sake only, as in the event the consecration was performed by the parish ministers, Greenwood and Walsh, the latter being the curate at Luddenden Chapel. In delegating the consecration, Matthew was following the line of his predecessor, Grindal, who authorised a consecration when he was Bishop of London.²⁴⁵ This commission in the Bishop’s Register is the formal record that a consecration event took place, but there is no record of the form or content of the event. It is significant that Matthew’s language suggests some ambiguity about the exact nature of the act being performed. He terms it ‘to consecrate or sanctify’ and he left it up to the ministers involved to use whichever form they felt appropriate. Being performed by preaching ministers, the consecration probably centred on preaching of the Word of God. Anthony Milton notes that the orders of consecration sermons given

²⁴¹ See K. Fincham, Prolate as Pastor: the Episcopate of James I (Oxford, 1990) for more on this view of the role of a bishop.
²⁴² The consecration at Headingley is mentioned in a commonplace book kept by Richard Shanne of Methley, BL: Add MS 38,599, f. 51 r. This chapel was built on land donated by Sir John Savile, a supporter of progressive Protestantism.
²⁴³ BL: Reg. 31, f. 230, 1. Copies of the petition and consecration commission are also in WYAS (W): WDP39/103.
²⁴⁴ Ibid.
by the Calvinists Joseph Hall, Jeremiah Dyke and John Brinsley were ‘careful to place exhortations to the repair of churches in the context of severe warnings of the dangers of popish abuses, and an overwhelming emphasis on the importance of the Word preached.’ The forms used at Headingley and Luddenden were probably in a similar, Reformed vein.

After Matthew’s death in 1628, consecration came to be an act to be performed only by a bishop and once Richard Neile arrived as primate in 1632, there was a step increase in the number of consecrations. There was a catch-up programme to consecrate new chapels that had already been in use for several years. Neile commissioned his suffragan, the Bishop of Sodor and Man, to consecrate the chapels of Wibsey, Hunslet and Attercliffe, all in October 1636. Neile’s primary concern here seems to have been to regularise the status of these chapels with respect to the mother parish, particularly in financial matters. At the same time, Bishop Bridgeman of Chester belatedly carried out the consecration of Ringley Chapel in 1634. Two new chapels were also consecrated shortly after their construction: Neile personally consecrated the large new chapel of St John’s in Leeds, in 1634, and Bridgeman consecrated Salford Chapel in 1635. Finally, the deposed Bishop of Elphin, Henry Tilson consecrated a chapel in Meltham in 1651.

By the time of Neile’s primacy, there were established forms of ceremony and rites to be followed for consecration, initiated by the chapel builder making a formal petition to the bishop. Letters surrounding the consecrations at St John’s and Ringley chapels show how both the lay patron and bishops were eager to see new chapels consecrated, but they also both used the business of consecration as an opportunity to negotiate details such as the nomination of the minister and his stipend. Both Neile and Bridgeman tried to limit secular influence in this, as it made the clergy dependent on the good will of lay patrons. They also both used the prospect of departing for distant parts of their diocese to force the submission of the patron to their conditions, which suggests that the bishops thought the patrons were eager to proceed. However, in the end, both Harrison and Walworth held out and appear to have won their battles, which suggests that it was

246 Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 70.


the bishops who had the greater desire to see the chapels consecrated. At Ringley, the stipend was not settled until after the consecration. Walworth’s representative in the negotiations with Bridgeman was his friend, Peter Seddon. Seddon wrote to Walworth describing the consecration and advising him on tactics regarding the stipend,

for your Denyal to disclose what you would do persuaded the ould crafty B[ishop] B[ridgeman] that indeed you would do nothing while you lived for so I heard him say and therefore he being so far engaged in the action alreadie by the acceptance of our tender of the 100l s . . . my advice is if you give Lo[rd] B[ishop] B[ridgeman] anie thanks let it be verbal not real but spare your money for better purposses and do not grass a fat sow behind.249

By ‘do not grass a fat sow behind’, Seddon’s meaning was that Bridgeman had no further leverage to force Walworth to offer a higher stipend. Consecration in the 1630s, therefore, was not just about defining sacred space, but was a means by which the balance between ecclesiastical and lay power was negotiated. This was quite different from the voluntary inaugural events and less formal preaching focused consecration events earlier in the century.

It is useful to compare the ceremonies devised by Neile at St John’s, and Bridgeman at Ringley and Salford to show variation in emphasis, bearing in mind that Bridgeman was less committed to the ‘Laudian Style’ than his superior, Neile. Both bishops conducted perambulations, and this added to the visual and ritual aspects of the ceremony. Bridgeman combined his perambulation of the church yard at Salford with psalm singing, which added a more progressive element. The symbolism of physical thresholds was used to highlight the moment of transfer from profane to sacred use. Bridgeman paused at the church yard gate at both Salford and Ringley, where he publically received the founder’s petition and surrender. Neile paused at the chapel door or porch at St John’s for the same purpose. In all cases this exchange was marked with the bishop blessing the founders and cursing those who would harm them or the building they had created. This was a very public declaration and exchange, as we are told at Ringley and Salford that there were great crowds gathered at the church yard gate to observe the ceremony. No doubt the presence of the bishop at a small chapel was quite a spectacle; the account of the ceremony at Ringley details how the bishop donned his full regalia in a local house before the event. Both Bridgeman and Neile then entered the church alone and shut the door, in order to take possession of the building, acting as God’s representative. At Ringley, Bishop Bridgeman used the words ‘I do accept this surrender and have entered’. The bishops then reopened the door and invited all to enter.

Once inside the chapel, the bishops took slightly different courses, demonstrating different degrees of ‘eastwardness’ and ceremony. Neile’s proceedings were more elaborate and Laudian

---

249 Walworth Correspondence, p. 33.
than Bridgeman’s. After first kneeling in the middle of the chapel, facing east towards the
communion table, Neile conducted a further perambulation of the interior, a form developed by the
ceremonialist, Lancelot Andrewes. His circuit paused at the font, pulpit, desk and communion table
and he blessed each of these ‘hot spots’ of sacrality. This progression reflected his view of the
Christian journey, from baptism, through learning of the faith through preaching, to the high point of
communion. The pre-eminence of the last of these was demonstrated by Neile genuflecting in front
of the table, treating it as an altar. In contrast, after he entered Ringley chapel, Bridgman knelt ‘at
the upper end of the table with his face down the chapel’ to pray for those assembled. In other
words, he faced westwards, towards the congregation. From this account, it also seems that the
communion table at Ringley was positioned in the more progressive Protestant fashion, aligned east-
west and away from the wall. Furthermore, Bridgeman did not genuflect towards the table. Both
Bridgeman and Neile then read the sentence of consecration from a specially provided chair at the
east end and conducted the Prayer Book service. Therefore, although both bishops appeared to
direct their focus on the east end of the chapel, Neile’s consecration was qualitatively different from
Bridgeman’s: it was more ceremonious and ritualistic and treated the objects as if they were sacred.
Neile’s actions could clearly be categorised as ‘Laudian’. Bridgeman’s actions suggest that he was
trying to combine divergent strands of Protestantism. To further explore Bridgeman’s attempt at a
hybrid, the consecration prayer he used will now be considered.

The consecration prayer used by Bishop Bridgeman at Ringley has not survived, but the one he
used a few years earlier for the chapel at Hoole, near Chester, was transcribed into his Act Book. Parts of Bridgeman’s consecration rite for a private chapel at Crewe in 1635 have also survived and a
comparison of the two suggest that he kept to the form devised at Hoole. Therefore, there is good
reason to assume he also used the Hoole form at Ringley, where there was a sizeable group of
progressive Protestants. As with the ceremony, the Hoole prayer is an attempt to combine
elements of Reformed and Laudian understandings of sacred space, although, as these were not
really compatible, the result is an eclectic mixture of ideas rather than a stable mid-ground. The
Hoole prayer steps between the Reformed conceptualisation of holy space, where the chapel was
principally a place to hear the Word of God and the greatest danger was idolatry, and the Laudian
view of intrinsic holiness, where the chapel was a place in which prayers were offered up in
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exchange for sacramental grace, and the greatest failing was that of sacrilege. The emphasis was on
the latter, Laudian side of the divide, as would be expected for a bishop under the watchful eye of
Archbishop Neile. However, there are several places in the prayer where he clearly sent a Reformed
message that even John Angier would have been happy with.

Bridgeman used standard wording that presented churches and chapels as places where man
could be especially heard by God, as

The courts of thine audience, where thou dost sitt to heare our prayers and supplications unto
thee. They are that royal exchange, where thou and wee do meet and barter, and (as it were)
converse and trade together, for thou bringest thy graces; wee bring our devotions hither.

This is thy outhouse. Thou art that good husbandman wch thy sonne speakes of who so
beautifies those upp roome where thy saints do lodge as thou dost not despise these mean
recepticles of thy servants. Accept therefore this poor habitacon, wch wee offer upp to thy
majestie . . .oh be thou present with us in thy m’cy that we may serve thee always here
according to our dutie, and what is wanting in the ye glory of this place, do thou supply it by
thy continual grace on those wch here shall call upon thee.

Now therefore, arise O Lord and come into this place of rest. Let thine eyes be open
towards this house night and day. Let thines eares be ready towards the prayers of thy
children wch they shall poure forth unto thee in this place and let thy heart delight to dwell
here perpetually.253

This mainly reflected the Arminian framing of the chapel as a place where prayers were offered up
and grace received in an exchange that centred on the altar.

Bridgeman also included the same rhetoric found in the Homilies concerning the history of
holy places since the original Jewish Temple.254 He stated that places had been set aside as holy
‘even through all the ages of the world’, and drew a parallel between the construction of ‘many
churches and chapels in every town’ with the Israelites’ construction of synagogues as copies of the
Temple. By positioning the building of churches and chapels in such a long tradition, he implicitly
included the churches built by the Catholic ancestors of those present at the consecration. This
continuity with the past was part of a wider move which valued medieval remains and deplored
their sacrilege.255 However, Bridgeman also set out the Reformed position that while the fabric of
the building was capable of being ‘impiously demolish[ed]’, it was the worship inside it that could be
profaned. He added new parts to the prayer that had a clearly Reformed basis. He made pleas
against, ‘unpreparedness in coming to it, from all wicked and wondering thoughts while wee are in

253 Bishop Bridgeman’s Act Book, CA: EDA 3/1, f. 244.
254 ‘Homily of Right Use’, p. 95. See Spicer, ‘Holiness and the Temple’ for more on this motif.
255 For more on the contemporary concern with sacrilege, see Margaret Aston ‘English Ruins and English
History: The Dissolution and the Sense of the Past’, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol. 36
(1973), pp. 231–255.
it, and from forgetfulness or negligence of practising thine holy word when we go from it’ and also against,

cold or careless or turbulent or any those otherwise irreverent behaviour in this thine house, whereby thy glorious presence, (when thou comest here amongst us) may be abused; thy grace (which God shall offer us) may be abused and subtracted, the worship which wee should yield to thee, may be polluted, or this place (or thy service in it) any way prophaned.

Bridgeman thus made it clear that it was God’s presence during worship, not the consecration rite itself that made the building holy. There was nothing that a cleric as reformed as Angier would have objected to here. Bridgeman also performed the same balancing act concerning the clergy. He made the plea that the chapel would not be served by ‘a ministry in this place either unable to teach, or idle when thou dost enable them’, and that the preaching that would occur in the chapel should be effective,

Open to the minister always a doore of utterence, and to his hearers a door of entrance, that he may speake thy word sincerely, as receiving it from thee, affectionately as feeling it within himself effectually piercing the soules and consciences of thy people, and that they may hear thy word with love and revererence, remember it with care and conscience, and practice it with zeale and diligence.

Such a preaching ministry must, however, not be ‘false or erroneous in their doctrine’, and certainly not ‘schismatical’. Finally, his statement about the divine presence was a masterpiece of ambiguity. It could be interpreted as supporting either the Reformed, Calvinist position or an anti-Calvinist stance,

Yet seeing it have ever bene thy delight to be among the sons of men, o merciful and gracious god, be now and ever with us in this place, bless all that shall resort unto it: fulfill them wth thy heavenly grace, when they are in it, and so direct and guide them by thy holie spirit, as from henceforth never any man may come into it, but may be that better for staying here, and go away the holier out of it.

This left it open to the hearer to interpret as either suggesting that grace was available just from being in the chapel, because it was intrinsically holy, or whether grace was available from correct worship.

Bridgeman’s consecration prayer can therefore be seen to be an attempt to cover both intrinsic and non-intrinsic formulae for the holiness of the new chapel. It was not a very successful combination. Wickham Legge declared Bridgeman’s consecration prayer at Crewe, to be ‘a very curious order . . . the whole order has hardly any pretensions to liturgical shape’. Wickham Legge

256 Wickham Legge, English Orders, xl.
therefore dismissed it as an oddity, but this very oddness arose from Bridgeman’s attempt to include all theological variants on sacred space. Seddon’s letter to Walworth after the consecration reveals that, although he saw ‘nothing but Godly Lawful and Expedient without any superstition’ during the consecration, ‘some Calumniaters have spoken against this way’, and hence found things to object to in the consecration. 257 The attempt to combine both Reformed and Laudian ideas in the consecration, it seems, pleased few.

This chapter has shown how the Reformed conceptualisation of sacred space was communicated to parishioners, and how it could be constructed as a subjective reality through behaviour. If worshippers could sufficiently prepare themselves, adopt the right disposition and cultivate the affections, they were told that they would experience the presence of God in the form of the Word amongst them in their assembly. This was a difficult behaviour to maintain and was always an ideal to be aimed towards, and the signalling of the sacred time of worship was intended to help in this. The church building where sacred time occurred was marked as set apart from the everyday by preaching inaugurations and consecration events that centred on preaching conducted by Calvinist parish ministers. This was a very different approach to the Laudian ideals of Archbishop Neile. When attempts were made to combine the two formulae, the result was a melange of ideas that appealed to few. While the two theologies were distinct in theory and in the minds of those clergy who preached on the subject, it is less certain whether the majority of the laity found them so incompatible. This is because progressive Protestant preachers had deliberately used ambiguity and multiple meanings in their sermons in order to make their message acceptable to as wide a range of hearers as possible, as seen in various connotations of the phrase ‘the house of God’. Therefore, although the ambiguities of contingent, parish based religion to some degree obscured the stark difference between the two versions of sacred space, there could be no smooth trajectory from the Second Helvetic Confession to the Beauty of Holiness, because they arose from fundamentally different ideas.

257 Walworth Correspondence, p. 32.
Conclusion for Part I

Through an exploration of space and material fabric, this part of the study has shed new light onto the embodied and sensory experience of post-Reformation preaching. It has shown that, far from being of no interest to progressive Protestants, the material and spatial aspects of worship were highly significant. They articulated the doctrines being taught by the preacher in a visual and tangible way and played an essential role in the Reformed construction of sacred space and time.

The voluntary move to create and re-configure spaces for preaching was a notable phenomenon in the Pennine area from the start of the seventeenth century onwards. A key aspect of this spatial configuration was placing the source of the Word in the midst of the people and arranging the seating to create a feeling of being assembled around it. The feeling of assembly was encouraged by a reduction in the east-west alignment of the church interior. Proximity to the preacher was prestigious, as was a clear line of sight to him. The adornment of pulpits reflected this focus. Light was both a practical and symbolic feature, and white walls also provided the opportunity to make the church or chapel a ‘house of God’ in a literal sense by applying the Word to the fabric of the building. This configuration of the church interior, rather than reflecting a lack of interest in fabric, was an embodiment of the scriptural promise of Christ to be among his followers when they assembled in his name. This study adds to the national picture of Jacobean church fabric investment, alongside Julia Merritt’s study of London. It affirms her suggestion that investment was particularly noted in parishes characterised by progressive, preaching-centred worship. The findings here thus contribute to the still emerging post-revisionist picture of early modern Protestantism as less iconoclastic than previously assumed. They add the new insight that the spatial and material configuration of churches was not just a practical solution for preaching, but expressed Reformed doctrine and piety.

The Laudian changes to church fabric in the 1630s have been examined from the point of view of the parish and its relationship with the diocesan authorities, rather than from the centre outwards, as has conventionally been the case. The findings have clearly shown that the complaints of Neile’s officers about neglect were not neutral statements of fact, but ideologically motivated, as Jacobean investment for preaching-centred worship could in some cases exceed what was subsequently required under the Laudian programme. This refutes the truism that Laudian changes

259 As mentioned above, Adam Morton’s ‘Images and the Senses’ makes a perceptive review of the broader field of material culture in the Reformation.
were unwelcome due to parishes being unaccustomed to such expenditure. Instead, the theological impact of the enforced changes can be appreciated, especially the enforced removal of the pulpit from the midst of the people, a change which has been overlooked until now.

The study also goes some way to explain why some parishes that had supported preaching-centred worship appeared to have voluntarily adopted the ‘beauty of holiness’. A key element here is the distinguishing of enforced and voluntary works, and the insight this provides to the complex motivations behind them. Firstly, the extent of Jacobean ‘beautifications’ meant that the installation of ornamental features in the 1630s did not necessarily appear as a totally new phenomenon, and not all forms of adornment held the same risk of idolatry to progressive Protestants. In the case of non-figurative ornamentation, such as exuberant wood carving and plaster reliefs, stars and gilding, much rested in the context, rather than the object itself. Ornaments deemed acceptable when placed in a setting used for progressive Protestant worship could take on idolatrous meaning in a setting used for ‘popish’, ceremonial worship. This insight means that sumptuously carved, but non-figurative interiors, as seen at St John’s in Leeds, and recorded for Halifax and Wakefield, need not be interpreted as ‘Laudian’. Secondly, the importance of church fabric in relation to the other pressures exerted by the diocesan authorities in the 1630s should be borne in mind. A show of willingness on changes to fabric may have seemed a small price to pay when cases such as the events at Sheffield were held up as examples of what could happen to both minister and laity if they showed resistance. Indeed, the evidence shows that Easdall applied a heavy hand in his dealings with Halifax, resulting in a reluctance for men to take up the role of churchwarden. This coercive pressure was set against the primary desire of progressive Protestants to retain their preaching minister. Preaching could happen despite changes in fabric, but it could not happen without the preacher. There is no need to posit an intra-parish coup by ceremonialists, anti-Calvinists and Church Papists at Halifax to explain the voluntary adornments of 1636 there. Nor is it necessary to posit an explanation of progressive Protestants making a sudden theological volte-face to Arminianism and abandoning all fear of idolatry.

A Reformed conceptualisation of sacred space based on Christ’s promise to be present when his followers gathered for correct worship (‘in his name’) was communicated at the parish level in ways that made it acceptable to existing attitudes and understanding. The Reformed conceptualisation of the divine presence in worship, was, by its nature, time bound and not intrinsic to the church fabric. However, preachers blurred the literal and figurative, material and spiritual in their sermons to give this abstract concept some moorings with existing, background assumptions.

260 Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored, ch. 5.
261 The role of the preacher will be further investigated in chapter six.
about the sacredness of the church building. The notion of ‘the house of God’ was useful in this respect, as it could have several connotations. Preachers also emphasised the qualifier in Christ’s promise in order to urge better standards of conduct during services, and, if these prescriptions were followed, the resulting behaviour could further strengthen the subjective construction of sacred space and time. This was all a very fragile, complex construction and it is not possible to say with any certainty how widespread this notion was accepted among the laity. The lament of John Harrison that he had not tried hard enough to create a suitable frame of mind for worship shows that the need to make an effort in this matter was known and accepted. Likewise, the letter from the parishioners at Ringley to John Angier shows their expectation to feel a holy presence during their assembly for worship. It is also important to bear in mind that the prescribed behaviours were presented as ideals to be aimed for, not a mechanistic invoking of the sacred. It was through engaging in the attempt that a sense of holy space and time was constructed in the mind of the worshipper.

The relationship between the Reformed sense of sacred space and the alternative of intrinsic holiness promoted by Laudian clergy has also been illuminated to show that there could be no seamless drift from one to the other, although (unsuccessful) attempts at hybridisation did occur in consecration ceremonies. This study points to the importance of inaugural preaching events as a forerunner to Reformed, preaching-based consecration events approved of, but not performed by, Calvinist bishops.

The spatial configuration and material fabric of preaching-centred worship was important as it enabled an embodied, sensory and numinous experience. To some degree, these characteristics were post-intellective, as a certain amount of doctrinal knowledge was necessary for the significance of the spatial and material features to be recognised. However, the educational and intellectual bar did not necessarily have to be very high for this, and the frequency with which preachers mentioned Matthew 18:20 and Ecclesiastes 4:17 meant that some idea of the significance of space was probably quite widespread. The embodied, sensory and numinous aspects of preaching were a means to broaden its appeal as a form of worship beyond the most religiously committed, as the materiality of worship gave abstract ideas an anchor in the sensory, lived experience. Being gathered communally for a common purpose was a way in which a sense of community could be fostered among many degrees of religious commitment. Parishioners sat in the same place, even if some listened harder than others. How preaching fostered identities and a sense of community will be explored in the next part of this study.
Part II. Identity

Introduction and Historiography

This part of the study will consider the social aspects of preaching. During the early modern period, ‘the level of most collective social behaviour’ was the parish, so much of what follows will be centred on the historiography of the parish in the Reformation.¹ It is a significant body of work, so developments relating to the topics of identity and community will be the focus of this introduction.

The institutions of the late medieval parish have been considered to be a way in which a sense of local identity and community was fostered. Katherine French highlighted the role of communal fundraising within the parish, such as church ales, as events that ‘brought the laity together in different ways for a common goal . . . fostered neighbourliness, shared experiences, and spiritual well-being that added to a sense of community membership and local identity’.² A question that has concerned many social historians of the early modern period is whether, and in what ways, this continued after the Reformation. The dominant interpretation in the twentieth century was one of decline in neighbourliness, local identity and a sense of community in previously cohesive parishes. This was considered to be the result of a ‘defoliation’ of social institutions based on the parish.³ Since the 1990s, however, a more nuanced understanding has presented the Reformation as a process of relocation and transformation, rather than straightforward decline. Ronald Hutton and David Cressy argued that pre-Reformation communal activities and religious festivals continued

---


² French, ‘Parochial fundraising’, p. 117.

in changed forms. Felicity Heal showed that, rather than disappearing, informal charity, reciprocal neighbourliness and hospitality became more selective in the post-Reformation period. More recently, two collections of essays have confirmed the transformation of community as a major area of current interest. The emerging picture is that a sense of local community was not extinguished by the Reformation, but its boundaries were redrawn and more clearly defined. One of the ways in which this has been explored is through the increasing administrative role of the parish. Nick Aldridge has argued that inclusion in the Easter Rates list, which paid for the minister’s wage, constituted a kind of ‘roll call of parish members’. As such, he claims, a sense of belonging was not left to arise spontaneously, but was the result of collective action. Steve Hindle has made a similar case that the communal activity of the parish perambulation created local identity, and he has shown how this practice developed out of the pre-Reformation Rogationtide procession. Aldridge’s and Hindle’s arguments are premised on the notion that a sense of identity and community could be formed by communal activity, with a key feature being the symbolic, public noting or recording of the activity. This study will investigate whether this thinking can be applied to post-Reformation preaching as a social institution, as support for preaching also required social organisation and communal action.

While local identity has been assumed to be constructed through actions and associations, religious identity tends to be thought about on quite a different basis. ‘Godly’ was a positive attribute that Protestants of various stripes wished to claim as their own, so writers tended to position themselves and their sympathetic readers as the bearers of godly identity. This set up a

4 Hutton, *Rise and Fall*; Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*.
7 For the redefining of the boundaries of local society and neighbourliness, see Wrightson, “‘Decline of Neighbourliness’” and Steve Hindle, ‘Hierarchy and Community in the Elizabethan parish: The Swallowfield Articles of 1596’, *The Historical Journal*, vol. 42, no. 3 (Sept. 1999), p. 841.
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polarity of ‘the godly’ and everyone else in the early modern imagination. How this rhetorical construct of godly identity related to the lived experience of being godly is a thorny problem. To varying degrees, the binary view of the rhetorical construct has been adopted by modern historians interested in social studies of Reformation religion. It is assumed that in any local circumstance, a clearly defined godly minority will become apparent in the sources, but far less attention is paid to how this godly minority might have come about and how the boundaries of it were drawn and maintained. Historians are well aware of the problems in working with religious identity in an ontological way. One solution has been to multiply the categories beyond the binary of ‘the godly’ and ‘others’ and as far back as 1986, Eamon Duffy elaborated on the multitude of religious types identified by commentators in the seventeenth century and in a much more recent work, Alec Ryrie abandoned the term ‘godly’ altogether, claiming that the distinction dissolved when piety and practice were the main focus. Approaching the same issues from slightly different angles, Alexandra Walsham and a collection of essays edited by Nadine Lewycky and Adam Morton demonstrate how religious identity operated within the contingencies of everyday life.Eric Carlson has shown how, once they were forced outside of the boundary of orthodoxy, those more progressive Protestants, who came to be called Dissenters, were still integrated socially and economically with their mainstream neighbours. All these works show that the reality of religious identity was less clear cut than the literary constructs suggest. This study engages with these problems and, by investigating preaching as a social institution, explores how local and godly identity interacted.

The study will be based on the premise that ‘godly’ and ‘community’ were both ideals, always in the process of being aimed towards, rather than a description of settled existence. Creating community and being godly were always acts of becoming, or a process. One way of becoming godly was to support preaching, and chapter three will explore this. Previous studies, such as those by Richardson, Jordan and Cross, have been based mainly on testamentary sources, which provides a picture of individual support for preaching. They also emphasised the role played by bishops,

---

government officials and wealthy lay patrons in the expansion of the preaching ministry from the 1580s onwards. This, however, is only part of the picture, as preaching was also organised through the parish, and this study, in contrast, will use a wider range of sources, including churchwardens’ accounts, to give a fuller picture of support that included communal and corporate actions that have not been fully investigated before outside of London. Such actions provided a space for preaching, funds to maintain a preaching minister and support for the mobility of preachers and their hearers. Chapter three will show that support for preaching was more widespread than previously presented, and this communal action had the potential to foster both a sense of community alongside a ‘dilute’ godly identity that was fluid and permeable and potentially inclusive. In so doing, it throws light on how individuals and groups might have started to think of themselves as godly (or not), and how this might change with time and circumstances.

Chapter Four will switch scale from region-wide to a case study in order to investigate how the boundary of godly identity was fought over, as a result of a particular preaching style and messages delivered from the pulpit. It will engage with recent scholarship that has highlighted the varieties of progressive Protestantism and the social and political ramifications of this. This chapter will capture how preaching led to divergent strands of progressive Protestantism in Leeds, and how the conflict surrounding this created different social and political ideas. It will be argued that this was a conflict within progressive Protestantism, rather than the conventional narrative of conflict between ‘the godly’ and others.

---


16 Recent work on this variety include David Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War-England* (Stanford, 2004); Peter Lake, ‘Order, orthodoxy and resistance: the ambiguous legacy of English puritanism or just how moderate was Stephen Denison?’, in Braddick and Walter, *Negotiating Power*, pp. 217–9.
This chapter will explore support for preaching and how this could foster a sense of identity and community. It will firstly examine the lay actions and organisation to create new spaces for preaching-centred worship and the maintenance of a preaching minister. It will then investigate the lay actions that helped to develop a wider network that supported mobility for preaching.

**Social participation in chapel building**

Chapter one revealed how chapels were built and rebuilt during the period to provide spaces for preaching-centred worship. As discussed, antiquarians usually presented chapel building as the work of individual benefactors, and this has rarely been challenged. Some chapels were indeed the product of individual endeavour. Robert Dynley and Sir Edward Rodes built chapels at Bramhope (Otley) and Great Houghton (Darfield) for their families and tenants, while John Harrison and Nathan Walworth built chapels at Leeds and Ringley (Prestwich) for public use. Individual patrons rarely acted alone however, and family networks and wider patronage were important in these projects. John Hanson was one of the main forces behind the rebuilding of Rastrick Chapel. His daughter married Sir Walter Stanhope, who rebuilt Horsforth Chapel (Guiseley), and the daughter of that marriage wed Robert Dynley. John Hanson was aided in his project by the support of a commission of pious uses headed by John Favour, the Vicar of Halifax, and powerful men such as Sir John Savile, Baron of the Exchequer, and Sir John Savile of Howley. This commission helped to resolve the complex legal history of the ownership of Rastrick Chapel.

Building a chapel for preaching, however, usually engendered wider local support. Sir Walter Stanhope called upon his neighbours to assist with the project to rebuild Horsforth Chapel in 1612. Stanhope began by making an initial agreement with eight other local men that

\[
\text{all those whose names are underwritten are contented to pay such somes of money towards the building of apende to the chapel of Horsfourth at the west end there of above sett upon their heads within this booke.}^{19}
\]

---

17 Rastrick cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 52/115.
18 WYAS (B): SpSt 11/4/2/2.
19 WYAS (B): SpSt/11/4/2/3.
This core group probably represented the most religiously committed from the chapelry. It included other landowners, such as Michael Green, Richard Lister and John Craven. However, two of the men, Peter Smyth and John Matthew, signed the agreement with a mark and were assessed for small contributions in subsequent rates, indicating that they were less wealthy. After drawing up the initial agreement a rate was organised, which raised £80. Thirty five male names were listed as contributors to the rate. Of these, the top eight raised nearly half of the total, with contributions ranging from £3 6s to £10. The remaining names were rated for lower sums, of between £1 and £2.\textsuperscript{20} This suggests that most of the substantial freeholders contributed to the rebuilding of the chapel. The Horsforth example, therefore, shows how support for rebuilding a chapel spread out from an individual to a core group, then to a wider section of local society. The document shows that there was a plan to spread the rate further still to include eighteen tenants, but as only three of these had sums against their name, for a few shillings each, it had yet to occur at the time the document was last amended.

The same pattern of funding occurred at Salford. Although received wisdom presents Humphrey Booth as the individual patron of Salford Chapel, archival documents show that in fact he only donated the land on which the chapel was built. Money for the building was raised from a much wider base of thirty-five people, donating between £2 and £20 each, to raise over £191. Significantly, this sum was supplemented by £39 from ‘sundry other contributions given too small to be particularised’, which suggests that participation reached wider still.\textsuperscript{21} The rebuilding of Sowerby Chapel was seeded by the gift of George Foxcroft, who bestowed £10 towards the future rebuilding in his 1619 will.\textsuperscript{22} However, when the inhabitants of Sowerby began the process the year afterwards, they employed a very ‘democratic’ model of fundraising. Evidence from a later pew dispute describes how the inhabitants elected twelve ‘most sufficient men’ and the ‘power and authoritie from the minister, churchwardens and inhabitants of the said chappellrie’ was bestowed upon them.\textsuperscript{23} The twelve men oversaw a rate that was organised by township, in contrast to Horsforth, where the rate was organised by land ownership.\textsuperscript{24} Thus decision making and organisation at Sowerby was very much a communal affair.

\textsuperscript{20} WYAS (B): SpSt 11/4/2/20.
\textsuperscript{21} CLA: Booth 2/2/3/45/i. (Hollingworth’s Mancuniensis lists only the top eight contributors, p. 117).
\textsuperscript{22} Findings of a commission of pious uses in the front of Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1.
\textsuperscript{23} The term ‘democratic’ is not intended anachronistically. Evidence from a pew dispute, Bi: CP.H.1742.
\textsuperscript{24} The importance of the township for this part of West Yorkshire is seen at the neighbouring chapel of Sowerby Bridge, where the seating plan was arranged by township.
So, participation could be very wide, but how voluntary was it? Rates were a compulsory, collective method for raising money. However, the compulsion mainly arose through neighbourly pressure, as the expense of a law suit largely prevented legal action against non-payment.\textsuperscript{25} Martin Ingram considers that rates were a commonly accepted method of fund raising and refusal to pay was rare and usually based on perceived unfairness, rather than objection in principle. Christopher Marsh and Steve Hindle go further and propose that rates should be seen as part of the ‘ethos of participation’ and that ‘rates can actually be treated as expressions of majority commitment and communal responsibility within a parish’.\textsuperscript{26} This attitude would be encouraged in cases such as Sowerby, where the decision to conduct a rate was taken by representatives elected by the inhabitants.

Textual accounts of chapel building portray a widespread willingness to participate through various means. The contemporary anonymous manuscript that details the rebuilding of Rastrick Chapel shows that, even though John Hanson maintained control, a wide range of people contributed to the project.\textsuperscript{27} Skilled craftsmen were employed, aided by two large-scale ‘commondays work made by most of the inhabitants of Rastrick’. The inhabitants undertook the unskilled tasks of mixing the mortar, pulling down the old walls and carrying stones, and were supplied with ‘muche ale gyven’ for their efforts. Those who contributed specific elements were listed, such as William Savile, who was noted as donating an ‘ash wch came downe the river’ and a Mr Pilkington, who donated an oak tree. There was also the opportunity for non-landowners to participate, as the loan of a draught by John Malinson to transport items was noted. A similar picture was created in the anonymous account of the building of the new chapel at Attercliffe. This account opens with a description of how the initiative of a small group grew into a communal project,

\begin{quote}
In the yeare of our Lord God 1629 certaine of the chiefe of the inhabitantes being by God’s providence mett together, they had a conference about building a chappell; who afterwards made the rest of their neighbours aquainted with the motion, and finding them willing set uppon the worke.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

In recounting how the building proceeded, six craftsmen plus their overseer were named. Communal voluntarism was again emphasised as the ‘people’s free-will offering’ and their support by providing

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{26} Ingram \textit{Church Courts}, pp. 109, 10; 116; Hindle, ‘Swallowfield Articles’, p. 847; Marsh, \textit{Popular Religion}, p. 68.
\item\textsuperscript{27} Rastrick cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 52/115.
\item\textsuperscript{28} Hunter, \textit{Hallamshire}, pp. 240,1.
\end{itemize}
food and drink. The day when the roof was raised was presented as a day of great generosity, mutual help and effort,

a little before Christenmas the walls being raised to the height, the rooife was laid on: at the rearing wherof the people came so willingly and gave so liberally, that for bread and cheese and beere and ale ther was such plenty as the like had not bene before; everyone had inough, and much was spared and sent to the poore.  

As with Rastrick, those who donated specific materials and furnishings were noted. The wealthy Stephen Bright ‘beautified the quier with sentences of scripture at his own charge’ and provided a bell and a bible. Others glazed windows, beautified pillars and donated iron bars and hair. The carriage of stone and timber for the construction was yet another opportunity for wider communal action, as

Neighbours of other towns helped us with carriage of slate, free stone, timber and lime. They that had draughts within us, led wall-stone and timber: many gave horse loads of lime. Mr Spencer and Robert Carr suffered the stone through their ground, which was a great furtherance.

The communal aspect of the building projects did not mean that social hierarchy was absent. Indeed, chapel building projects were an opportunity for the wealthy to express status through the patronage of particular objects, furnishing and the arrangement of seating. However, these accounts of chapel building were a way of recording participation in a godly endeavour by a very wide cross-section of local society. As Jeremy Lake proposes in his study of eighteenth century chapel building in Cornwall, ‘such a process became a collective commitment that drew all members of a society together in a way that meetings held in scattered locations could never do’. It mattered to inhabitants of the chapelry to be symbolically included in a community that actively sought to bring a preaching ministry to itself. Administrative bodies, such as commissions of pious use, were producing new public records of benefaction at this time, and so early modern people were increasingly aware of the value of the documentary records associated with charity. Pious Uses Commissions sat in Halifax and Leeds in 1619 and both generated a great deal of records. The recording of the participation in godly endeavour should therefore be understood as more than a

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
simple factual account, but something that held symbolic value. The textual accounts, such as those at Attercliffe and Rastrick, and even the lists of names kept at Horsforth, Salford and Sowerby, were a way of circumscribing local community by recording participation in a pious endeavour. In Reformed doctrine, good works were understood as the fruits of election as a child of God, and so participation in these works was a way of positioning oneself within the potential cohort of the saved. This also worked at a communal level, as the building of a chapel for preaching placed the locality in the broader map of where God’s Church was to be found. Through the very act of recognition and recording of such works, a sense of community that was both godly and local could be forged.

**Social participation in support for funding the preaching ministry**

Once the chapel was built or rebuilt, arrangements had to be made to find a wage for the preaching minister.\(^{32}\) There are two narratives to be challenged here. Firstly, that low, or non-existent funding in the Pennine chapels was an indication of the unpopularity of Protestantism. Christopher Haigh developed this picture by extrapolating between the 1590 survey in Lancashire, which reported that 17 chapels had an average wage of £3 18s per annum for the curate, and the Parliamentary Survey of 1650, which recorded that 80 out of Lancashire’s 101 chapels had endowments of between £0 and £4. Haigh concatenated these two snapshots, to propose a long term lack of support for Protestantism, and preaching in particular.\(^{33}\) This study will show that between these two snapshots, a variety of means to fund the wages of a preaching minister were used. The second narrative to be challenged derives from an antiquarian focus on the gentry and the use of wills as sources, which created the received wisdom that it was principally elite, individual patrons who endowed ministers’ wages. This was true in some cases; in 1639, five years after building St John’s Chapel, John Harrison finally signed the deed bestowing land rents to fund the preacher’s wage of £80.\(^{34}\) However, again such individual action was only part of the whole picture. As with chapel building, it is proposed that communal endeavour to fund a preaching minister could be a way of fostering a sense of identity and community.

---

\(^{32}\) The focus here is on developments within the parochial system. This compliments the work of Patrick Collinson on urban lectureships in *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Basingstoke, 1988), pp. 41–6.


\(^{34}\) Thoresby Society Archives: MS box II 3, ff. 18–28.
One method of providing a stipend for a preaching minister at a new chapel was through enclosing common land, and this occurred at Rastrick and Wibsey.\textsuperscript{35} This tended to involve only a small amount of social interaction. At Ringley Chapel, twenty inhabitants paid £5 each towards buying lands in order to endow the wages of a minister at the new chapel. The principal patron, Nathan Walworth, matched this endowment with rents from his own lands in order to raise the stipend to £20.\textsuperscript{36} Pew rents involved more social interaction, and were also an articulation of both community and hierarchy, as the well-to-do took a lead on seating arrangements and paid for the most prestigious seats.\textsuperscript{37} At Blackley Chapel in Manchester, pew rents were organised in 1631 by a commission consisting of William Rathband, the preaching minister, Ralph Assheton, Esqu. and Humphrey Booth and another seven men.\textsuperscript{38} At St John’s in Leeds, the initial funding by rents collapsed in the turmoil of the Civil War, and by 1647 was replaced by communal funding from pew rents. At Blackley and St Johns, the cheapest annual rents ranged down to 2s, a sum that made occupation of a seat within the means of most householders. At Thornton Chapel (Bradford) in 1620, seats were distributed to householders ‘according to their pay’.\textsuperscript{39} Therefore funding a preacher’s wage by pew rents was a means by which the majority of the chapelry could be included, while it was also an expression of the hierarchical nature of local society. The latter was not as static as might be supposed though. The original document recording the occupants of each seat at St John’s over time shows that placings in the more expensive seats were very volatile, with names crossed out and replaced more frequently than for the cheaper seats. Paying for a preacher by pew rents expressed both the extent of community and the internal dynamics within it.

The means of funding a preacher’s wage that involved most social interaction and organisation were rates and collections. These could be organised by the churchwardens, representing the corporate body of the parish or chapelry. At Birch chapel, a ‘subscription list’ of 1636 listed the names of ninety-seven individuals organised by township.\textsuperscript{40} Their payments ranged from 25s down to 1s. In 1627, a similar ‘subscription list’ was drawn up for a preacher to serve the

\textsuperscript{35} Joseph Horsfall Turner \textit{The History of Brighouse, Rastrick and Hipperholme}, (Bingley, 1893), p. 167, transcript of deed; Bradford Cathedral Archives: Sir John Maynard’s Valuation of the Tythes of Bradford, 1638.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Walworth Correspondence}, pp. 26, 90.


\textsuperscript{38} GMCRO: MS f. 942.72 R121 vol. 41 (nineteenth century transcript).

\textsuperscript{39} WYAS (B): 81D85.

\textsuperscript{40} J. Booker, \textit{History Ancient Chapel of Birch} CS OS 47, (1858) p. 143.
chapels in the large parish of Whalley. The document shows that £20 was collected from fifty-seven households in the parish, with contributions ranging from 10s down to 3d. This evidence shows that participation spread extensively through the social ranks of the local population, and some paid almost nominal amounts. As Nick Aldridge has argued, this was a way of registering belonging. The payments were not entirely voluntary, as in practice a ‘subscription list’ was probably not much different from a rate. Sometimes the rates were ‘primed’ by contributions from leading inhabitants. At Burley Chapel in Otley parish, the Vavasour family made a gift of £4 towards the preacher’s wage on the condition that the local inhabitants raised £16 as well. Likewise, at Denton Chapel in 1618, Richard Holland donated £100 in order to realise £20 a year for the preacher’s wage and this was matched by £20 raised by the rest of the local inhabitants. This elite priming was a means of applying pressure, as it made payment by others harder to resist. This pressure was not straightforward though, as events at Horsforth Chapel show. This case is interesting, as it shows that reluctance to pay a preacher’s wage may not mean that preaching was unpopular.

As mentioned above, the rebuilding of Horsforth chapel was funded through a rate, and this proceeded smoothly enough. Stanhope and his core group then organised another assessment that aimed to raise a stipend of £20 per annum, a wage that had a chance of attracting a preaching minister. Stanhope described how he drew up the rate, in that he

\[\text{did write and sett downe a booke to the same effecte thinking all the saide inhabitance would have therunto consented and everye mans severall rate sett downe in the same booke as thereby maye appeare.}\]

The document he drew up was entitled ‘The names of all the inhabytanes of Horsforth and what everyone is ratide to paye to the new stipende or wage towards a preacher at the chapell there’. This list of approximately ninety names (the document is slightly damaged) covered every household in the chapelry including tenants, and the rates ranged from 26s down to 8d. This indicates that, whereas only the more well-to-do inhabitants had been rated for the chapel building, everyone in
the chapelry was expected to fund the stipend. The stipend rate ran into trouble, however, when a group within the chapelry refused to pay the rate. In his defence for the subsequent legal action taken by the rector, Robert More, Stanhope explained how, after some refused to pay, all refused to pay,

But to day the same there is divers p[er]sons denieth for to be put to such rates will not yield, such p[er]sons is a breach to all once saide procesdinge in the same, sainge those that did subscrib to the saide booke did it but conditionlye that everyman shall paye such saide rates and sesemente as is the same are sett downe.  

His solution to this dilemma was to set an example, and he went on to describe how he had

beine f[o]rward before in procureinge the saide stypend, and thinking if he should take occasion to be discontented with the saide minister it would give ewell examples to others not agreed to the stypend as aforesaide, did pey him one quarter wages to se if it would bringe others to yield to the same assessment.

Stanhope therefore hoped to 'prime' the collection of funds by setting an example, and even went so far as to promise a refund to those who paid if an agreement with the new preacher could not be reached. In the end a compromise was reached. More agreed to pay an extra £6 13s towards the wage if the locals raised £20, and Stanhope ‘and others of the beste sorte’ made up the deficit.

At one level, this illustrates the argument of Ingram, that perceived fairness and universality were important for a successful rate. Once a group within the chapelry refused to pay, the whole system collapsed. It also illustrates the leadership required by elites, as Stanhope expressed the expectation that he would lead by example. The interesting aspect to this case, however, is in the initial reason for refusing to pay the rate. Stanhope claimed that this was due to the preacher’s non-conformity, which, if taken at face value, would appear to support the idea of a popular ‘Prayer Book Protestantism’, as argued by Judith Maltby. However, Stanhope was being disingenuous in his defence. Firstly, it is clear from the documents that the intention all along had been to install a preaching minister, and in the West Riding at this time, practically all preaching ministers were non-conformists to some degree, so that would have been expected. The real reason for the refusal is to be found in the actions of the parish minister, Rector Robert More. A letter from one of the leading inhabitants of the chapelry shows that relations between Horsforth and the mother parish were already fraught, with the freeholders of Horsforth having previously accused More of ‘infringeing

46 WYAS (B): SpSt 11/4/2/3, deposition of Walter Stanhope.
47 WYAS (B): SpSt 11/4/2/3.
ancient custom’ in his overly thorough collection of tithes. On completion of the chapel rebuilding at Horsforth, More imposed a preacher called Tomlinson, against the wishes of the inhabitants. This, and the tithing dispute, was the reason for refusal to pay the rate for the stipend. A letter signed by two inhabitants in the chapelry, who were also members of the original core group that initiated the building of the chapel, explained that the ‘the election of the minister as well as other covenants’ was the problem. It was important to the inhabitants to elect their own preacher. This shows that the chapelry had a strong sense of local identity, and the godly endeavour of rebuilding of the chapel and plans to install a preacher had strengthened that. These were people who wanted a progressive Protestantism and would have been happy to pay for a preacher of their own choice.

The importance of local choice in installing a preacher was not unique to Horsforth. A similar problem arose when the Vicar of Halifax attempted to impose a preacher on the chapelry of Illingworth. Local progressive Protestants objected, as recounted by Jonathan Priestley in his memoir,

In Doctor Favour’s time, he being vicar of Halifax, there came a wandering clergymen to the doctor who wanted a place. Illingworth, being then destitute, he sent him thither to preach, and would have the people to receive him as their minister. My Grandfather sent to the doctor to desire him to give them leave to make a choice of one themselves; when he would not be persuaded, he spoke to the doctor after this manner: “sir I charge you here in the presence of God, as you will answer it in the day of judgement, for those souls of Illingworth that may perish eternally for want of a godly minister, and the faithful preaching of the word amongst us, that you do not impose this man upon us.” At which words the good doctor Favour did desist, and said they should have their own choice of a minister.

The circumstances of the Civil War and growth of Independency enhanced the ability of the local lay elite to take control of appointments, and the laity in established parishes as well as chapelries took control of the appointment of preaching ministers. This can be seen in the diary of Adam Eyre, a substantial yeoman in Penistone parish. Adam Eyre and his friends offered the

49 WYAS (B): SpSt 11/4/2/3, letter from George Rawdon to Mr Wayde.
52 ‘A Dyurnall or catalogue of all my accons and expences from the 1st of January 1646 -7 Adam Eyre’, printed in Charles Jackson, (ed.) Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, Surtees Society vol. 65 (Durham, 1877), p. 41, hereafter referred to as Adam Eyre Diary. For more on lay choice of ministers, see David Lamburn, “‘Digging and Dunging’: some aspects of lay influence in the
unsatisfactory minister, Christopher Dickinson, the sum of £40 if he would leave, thereby allowing them to install a better preacher. When a replacement minister was proffered, they took the view that the decision rested with them. Adam Eyre described the following exchange in his diary of June 1647. He was visiting a friend’s house, when, just after playing bowls,

Ther[e] cam[e] a man from Mr Copley to offer us a minister, and promised to send him tomorrow sennit; and Capt. Rich and I promised for our parts to do nothing prejudiciall to him, but did conceive that the major part of the election rested in us; but however hee should preach, and wee would beare his charges, but would not admitt of him til further tryall. The man’s name was Wood, and these things passed between us in the parlor at Burdett’s, in the presence of Jo. Miclethwayte.

Manchester in the 1650s was dominated by the Presbyterian system of church governance, in which lay action in appointing preachers was more formalised. In his autobiography, Henry Newcome described his extensive correspondence with the elders of Manchester before his appointment there. He was first approached by a group of ten lay people who claimed to be acting for the ‘godly party’. The follow up letter was signed by twenty-three laymen. The final letter informing Newcome of his election as minister was signed by 130 parishioners. This gradual spreading out of support for a minister echoes the earlier, informal garnering of popular support for a preacher at a new chapel.

The final part of this argument uses the case study of Ecclesall to illustrate just how widespread involvement could be in actions associated with preaching.

**Ecclesall case study**

The best example of widespread, voluntary involvement in the provision of space and wages for preaching comes from the collection of documents relating to the ‘re-edification’ of Ecclesall Chapel in Sheffield Parish in 1622. The surviving evidence is particularly extensive and builds a picture of

---

53 For more on this see, Andrew Hopper, ‘Social Mobility during the English Revolution: the case of Adam Eyre Social History, vol. 38, no. 1 (2013), p. 32.

54 Adam Eyre Diary, p. 41.


56 Ecclesall cwa, ULBLSC: Wilson MS 295. vol. 148. These survive as full transcripts made by Joseph Hunter from original documents collected by John Wilson of Broomhead. The names probably equate to households,
lay voluntarism in bringing preaching to the locality. Separate collection lists were drawn up for rebuilding the chapel, installing a bell, paying the preacher’s wage, and pew rents. The titles of the documents emphasised the voluntary nature of the project, such as the list entitled ‘the names of the severall p’sons who did voluntarily contribute to the reedifying of the said chappell’. The emphasis throughout was on collective, voluntary action and local control, to the extent that local inhabitants explicitly expected to choose their own preaching minister. The document relating to the minister’s wages is entitled

a voluntary contribucon given by certain p’sons and granted to be paid yearly for the mainten’nce of the preaching minister now elected or hereafter to be chosen for serving at the said chapel.

The man chosen for the job, Edward Hunt, probably met with popular approval, because, as the table shows there were very few who were tardy in contributing to his wage. Full details of the Ecclesall information is given in Appendix 4. Table 1, below, summarises the information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>Number of contributors (out of a total of 181)</th>
<th>Contributors unique for this collection</th>
<th>Total Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Re-edification’</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>£4 9s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>£3 8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats in the chapel</td>
<td>79 (4 unpaid, 3 half-paid)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>£8 3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher’s wage</td>
<td>60 (10 unpaid, 2 half-paid)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£7 17s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This demonstrates the very broad social involvement in the overall project. The total number of people involved reached 181, which probably represented all the households in the chapelry. Not everyone was involved at every stage, and this implies some degree of choice, so that the emphasis on the ‘voluntary’ in the sources was not just rhetoric. That is not to say that the amount assigned to each contributor was entirely an individual choice. Annotations to the lists indicate the few instances in which individuals did not fully pay, which suggests that a ‘suggested contribution’ was assigned to those on the list. Most, however, paid their allotted share in full.

as they specify the inclusion of a son and although the names are overwhelmingly male, there are some widows.
The collections allowed people of all economic status to participate in the project. Half the contributions to the chapel rebuilding and the bell were for 3d or 4d, so that those who had very little to spare could still be included and were noted as having done so. The three different collections, plus pew rentals, offered four separate opportunities for participation. Those donating less were more likely to participate in just one collection, while those who gave larger sums of money to the chapel rebuilding also paid for the bell. The bell collection was a second chance for the poorer inhabitants to claim their place on the record of belonging. This was particularly symbolic, as a bell would be heard across the chapelry and act as an auditory reminder of belonging.\textsuperscript{57} The additional support for the bell also illustrates the process seen at Rastrick and Attercliffe, where participation could grow after initial success. Elite leadership of the project at Ecclesall seems to have been minimal. Three men who styled themselves ‘Gentlemen’ appeared on the lists. They made contributions to the rebuilding and the bell, but did not go onto contribute to the preacher’s wage or hold seats in the chapel. This suggests that they were not resident in the chapelry, and were simply showing support for the project and lending it some legitimacy in a hierarchical world.

The Ecclesall data throws up some interesting points. Thirty-one out of the seventy-nine people who contributed to the preacher’s wage fund did not go on to pay for a seat in the chapel. This is known for certain because the seats were all individually named, not rented by pew or stall. So this means that such people did not get to sit down to hear the preacher for whom they were paying. As many of these cases were for those making the smallest contributions, such as Anthony Offerton who paid 1s 6d, a plausible explanation is that some of those who paid for the wages could not afford the additional expense of a seat. This challenges the view that support for preaching was mainly a preserve of the middling sort and also suggests that it was more important to people to hear preaching than to be sat comfortably when doing so.

The data at Ecclesall thus paint a very different picture from the traditional view of a few wealthy patrons, or a small minority, being the main support for the preaching ministry. The overwhelming impression is one of local, broad based, voluntary participation organised in a very communal, horizontal way.\textsuperscript{58} In some way, even if indirectly, most of the inhabitants of Ecclesall participated; even through the donation of a few pence, an individual knew they had been involved in the work of bringing the Word to their locality, and this action was publically recognised and symbolically recorded. In this way, preaching afforded an opportunity which fostered local identities at Ecclesall and helped to build a sense of community. At the same time, involvement in this godly

\textsuperscript{57} Cressy, \textit{Bonfires and Bells}, p. 70.

\textsuperscript{58} Spierling and Halvorson, ‘Introduction: Definitions of Community in Early Modern Europe’, in their \textit{Defining Community}.  
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endeavour was very widely dispersed among the inhabitants, encouraging a sense of godly identity which was not mutually exclusive with local identity.

**Creating a network for preaching**

So far, the emphasis has been on local communal action in support of preaching. However, preaching inherently encouraged mobility in both clergy and laity and travel was an important part of the broader experience of preaching. As Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales state, it ‘became an important spiritual activity in its own right’.\(^{59}\) The preacher, Henry Newcome, described how another preacher’s prodigious travelling acted as an inspirational example for him

> Old John Heywood of Saddleworth came again to me to bespeak me to the exercise there for some month. I had intended to have excused it, because of my weak body and the great distance etc. but I found the good man so heartily and resolutely importunate that I did yield to him. And in discourse with him he told me how many years he had trudged about in that work and that Mr Angier once asked him whether he was better in the world or worse since he took that pains, and he said he was better.\(^{60}\)

In a similar way, John Angier’s travel for preaching was remarked upon by his biographer with specific mention of him ‘travelling and preaching many exercises abroad on week days.’\(^{61}\) Travel was therefore very much part of the godly identity of preaching clergy.

The Church authorities expected to exert some control over visiting preachers. Only certain clergy were licensed to be a ‘preacher throughout the diocese’, and the Canons required parishes to keep a record of visiting preachers. These control measures were very variably enforced. The sources reveal that there was a great deal of short term movement around the Pennines for preaching and many of the visiting preachers were not licensed, nor were records kept of their visits other than expenditure in the churchwardens’ accounts. This lack of compliance may have been partly due to principled non-conformity, but it may also have been for practical reasons. It was expensive to become a licensed preacher. The accounts of the Warmsworth minister, Samuel Bower, show how he paid £3 in various fees to the clerk, porter and butler at the bishop’s court when he applied for his preaching licence.\(^{62}\) Archbishop Toby Matthew’s educational standards for ordination also prevented some travelling preachers, such as Matthew Booth, from applying for a licence to


\(^{60}\) *Autobiography of Henry Newcome*, vol. 1, p. 88. This was in 1658.

\(^{61}\) *Life of John Angier*, p. 71.

\(^{62}\) Diary or cash and memorandum book of Samuel Bower, SA: CD/474.
peach, because they were not graduates. This muted control from above allowed a culture of mobility for preaching to grow from a grass roots level.

Some idea of the distances travelled by preachers can be gained. Barnsley and Bingley churchwardens’ accounts show a mixture of local and long distance travel. This is illustrated in Figures 10 and 11. In the 1620s, Barnsley welcomed preachers from Penistone, Wath, Woolley and Darfield, all within half a day’s journey, and also three visits by licensed preachers from further afield.63 Visiting preachers at Bingley in the 1650s travelled from a thirty mile radius, ranging from the nearby chapel of Baildon, to Wakefield thirty miles east and Bracewell and Slaidburn thirty miles west. Bingley also received a visit from an itinerant Scottish preacher, whom the churchwardens accompanied on his journey as far as Leeds.

Figure 10. Local visiting preachers, and journeys to hear preaching, at Penistone (1647) and Barnsley (1622–1649).

63 Barnsley cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 121, Add Box 8, (transcript).
The preaching destination *par excellence*, however, was Bradfield. Between 1617 and 1637, the chapel received over one hundred visits from preachers. As the map in Figure 12 shows, many were from the Deanery of Doncaster, particularly the Sheffield area. However the chapel also received visits from preachers who had travelled from Leeds, Wakefield, and London and one who was travelling from Cambridge to ‘the North’. That such an extensive network could have been built up by a relatively small chapel high in the Pennines points to the surviving data being just a fragment of widespread culture of travel and visiting for preaching.
Inter-clerical networks brought parishes and chapelries into contact with one another, which in turn facilitated further mobility around the Pennines. This can be illustrated through reconstructing the careers of a group of preaching ministers. Matthew Booth, John Towne, Roger
Attay and Samuel Newman were part of a network of preachers that moved around parishes and chapelries on the east side of the Pennines. Their movements are shown in Figure 13. Booth started his career as the curate of the recently built Scammonden Chapel (Halifax) in 1625, before moving to the nearby Slaithwaite Chapel (Huddersfield). In 1629 he became curate at the larger chapel of Bradfield, which by then had developed as a centre for preaching, hosting many visiting preachers and exercises. In 1633 Booth was censured by Archbishop Neile for non-conformity and moved to Penistone parish, although the Bradfield churchwardens’ accounts show that he was a frequent visitor back at his old chapel in subsequent years, so the boundary between these two neighbouring parishes was fluid. By 1642, Booth was back in his original parish of Halifax, serving as the curate at Heptonstall. This did not stop him from revisiting his older locations, as Adam Eyre heard him preach at Penistone in 1647, and, finally, he visited Bradfield again in 1656. Clearly Booth spent his whole life cementing his ties with various parishes and chapelries up and down the eastern side of the Pennines between Halifax and Sheffield. John Towne’s forty year career shows a similar movement up and down the Pennines. In 1613 he was in Clitheroe and moved to become one of the assistant ministers at Sheffield in 1618, via a stop at Bradfield in 1617. Whilst at Sheffield, he frequently returned to Bradfield as a visitor, during the time when Booth was curate there. At some point before 1623, Towne also travelled back up the Pennines to preach at the Halifax exercise. By the 1650s he was back further north, closer to his roots, as the minister at Kildwick, from where he frequently preached at the neighbouring parish of Bingley. Another preacher in the same circle was Roger Attay, who was possibly semi-itinerant. He was a curate at Bradfield before Booth’s time and returned there to preach on several occasions. In 1630 he was the curate at Rastrick. He preached at the Otley Exercise in 1641, and visited Penistone to preach in 1646. The fourth minister in this group was Samuel Newman, who was a school master at Heptonstall in Halifax parish in 1623, before moving in 1625 to be the curate of Midhope, a small chapel-of-ease in the larger chapelry of Bradfield. In 1635 he became the curate at Woodkirk, near Morley. Woodkirk had long been a centre of preaching. The former curate there, Anthony Nutter, was part of the Halifax Exercise and had attracted sermon-gadders from nearby parishes in 1619. Newman was censured by Archbishop Neile and finally moved to New England in 1638.64

64 These lives have been reconstructed using a wide range of sources including: Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14, 1629. Bingley cwa, WYAS (B): BDP7/7/9/1/1, Adam Eyre Diary, BL: Add MS 4933 b; WYAS (B) WYB 263; Bl: V1619, CB; V1623, CB; V1633 CB, CP.H.4912; Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi America, or The Ecclesiastical history of New England (1702); Edith Horsfall, The Parish Registers of Heptonstall in the County of York, (Leeds, 1925); John Watson, The History and Antiquities of Halifax (1775); Hunter, Hallamshire; Marchant, Puritans and the Church Courts; Como, Blown by the Spirit.
Figure 13. The careers of four preaching ministers 1613–1653.

Networks such as these arose through personal relationships between ministers. Their careers have been reconstructed from a wide selection of sources, including diaries, sermon note books, ecclesiastical court records and parish material such as churchwardens’ accounts and registers. The information provides a series of snapshots that illuminate a preacher’s location at a particular moment, but there must have been much more movement between these moments that has not left a trace, suggesting that the networks were larger, more complex and informal than can be known today. It certainly shows a different aspect of preaching mobility to the much more organised, formal institutions seen in John Fielding’s study of preaching in the Diocese of Peterborough.65 The action of the laity as individuals and corporate bodies in supporting these networks was substantial, as the following section will show.

Individual lay action supporting preaching mobility
Lay actions brought a preaching minister to a locality. Progressive Protestants were motivated to encourage new and visiting preachers because, as biographical accounts show, it increased their chances of a conversion experience. Jonathan Priestley’s wife was converted at Illingworth by Mr

65 Fielding, ‘Conformists, Puritans and the Church Courts’.
Odcroft, who was visiting from Thornton. John Angier’s visit to Gisburne was the event of the conversion of the wife of the ‘Mr L’ who had sent for him. Oliver Heywood’s grandfather was converted when he heard Thomas Paget, the minister of Blackley, preach at a fair in Bury. Joseph Lister described how the text of Mr Briscoe’s sermon at the Halifax Exercise ‘fell upon me like a thunder-bolt’. 66

By travelling to hear preaching, the laity could act as scouts for preachers to invite back to their home parish or chapel. Adam Martindale described how, when he was preaching at St. Helen’s in 1646, an inhabitant of Gorton Chapelry (Manchester) heard him and

earnestly invited me to goe thither and bestow my paines there, in order to a closure if God saw good. I did soe and they were wonderfull civil to me gratified me for my paines liberally . . . I consented to their terms, upon condition that I might have the universall consent of the chappellrie testified under the hands of the inhabitants. 67

Sometimes people travelled substantial distances to collect preachers. Oliver Heywood’s father travelled to Amsterdam to persuade Robert Parke to return as the minister for Bolton. 68 Such preaching ‘scouts’ were not always men. John Shaw, the preaching minister of Rotherham, depicted in his biography of his wife, Mistress Shawes Tombstone, how she acted to bring a preaching minister to her parish, being

very instrumental (though young) to procure thither; and after her father’s death contributed towards his maintenance out of her portion to and beyond her abilities . . . till they got a faithfull and powerful preacher. 69

A similar virtuous role was ascribed to Alice Heywood of Little Lever. Her biographer describes her as ‘the centre of news for knowing the time and place of week-days sermons’. 70 She, too, used her contacts to bring preachers to the locality,


67 Richard Parkinson, (ed.), The Life of Adam Martindale, written by himself and now first printed from the original manuscript in the British Museum CS OS, 4 (Manchester, 1844), pp. 59, 60, hereafter referred to as Autobiography of Adam Martindale.


69 John Shawe, Mistris Shawes Tomb-stone. Or the Saints Remains (1658). The time in question would be around 1630.
And as she did reverence to them [preachers], so they respected her. She had a friendly correspondence with the best ministers in the country, who were ordinarily willing to condescend to her request for preaching, which good exercises she was very forward to promote. And she prevailed with my father Angier and Mr Gee for their pains at Bolton or Cockey.\textsuperscript{71}

Visiting preachers were clearly virtuous recipients of hospitality, and the act of bringing them to a locality and hosting them during their visit clearly indicated a godly identity in the host. In a biography of his mother, Alice Heywood, Oliver Heywood described her hospitality to preachers,

She intirely loved al godly ministers, and accounted their feet beautifull that brought the glad tidings of the gospel of peace, she would have put them in her bosome, and was even ravished when any of the lords embassadours came under her roofe, an opportunity or entertaining such, was more worth to her than great wordly gains. I have often heard her say that every bit of meat wch a good minister eat at her table she thought nourisht her.\textsuperscript{72}

Such hospitality, especially for women, may have been informed by the biblical role of the shunamite.\textsuperscript{73} Biographies such as these were not straightforward accounts of lived experience, as they were designed to present the subject as saints, and they are principally useful in revealing the normative ideals that were promoted at the time of their publication. However, the events they describe were unlikely to be fabrications, and so they can also be used empirically to understand aspects of their subjects’ lives. Alice Heywood is depicted here as experiencing her hostess role as part of her piety, with a spiritual and emotional response to having preachers under her roof and a symbolic exchange of earthly and spiritual food. This was presented as proof of a prodigious state of grace, affirming and enhancing her godly identity.

The provision of hospitality to preachers was something noted in other personal accounts. In his autobiography, Henry Newcome mentioned being hosted by a Mr Worthington in Manchester when he visited there to preach with Mr Angier and he also described how he was accompanied on the last part of his journey to his new ministry at Manchester by parishioners ‘with pomp and

\textsuperscript{70} Autobiography of Oliver Heywood, Vol. 1, p. 48. Alice Heywood was born in 1594.
\textsuperscript{71} Autobiography of Oliver Heywood, Vol. 1, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid.
ceremony’. In his journal, Adam Eyre recorded having dined with both Matthew Booth and Roger Attay after they had preached at Penistone. Dining with preachers was a way of confirming an individual’s godly identity, but, as the next section will show, there was also a role to be played by the corporate body representing the parish or chapel that has not been explored until now.

**Corporate lay action for preaching mobility**

Individual lay support for preaching overlapped to a degree with the actions of the corporate body of the church or chapel. Wardens made arrangements for securing a new preaching minister and hospitality for them on arrival. The churchwardens of Sheffield paid a man called Branson 13s 4d for travelling to ‘Brimmingham’ to bring back a minister for his trial sermon in 1603. Likewise, when Mr Payne ‘first came to Sheffield’ in 1607, the churchwardens paid for his meals for three days. Even less wealthy chapels, such as Padiham, recorded a series of expenses connected with the appointment of the new curate there, Robert Hill in 1627. They paid an unnamed man ‘for going towards Wigan ref Mr Hill’, James Whitehead was reimbursed for Mr Hill’s ‘table and drinkes’, and the chapelwardens bought ‘3 cans of ales for Mr Hill for the first day of his coming’. The chapelry of Ringley chose ‘two good men’ to travel down to Boston to accompany John Angier on his journey back north to become their new preacher, which implies being selected for such a task was a mark of worthiness. Churchwardens could also be instrumental in obtaining preachers at short notice on an occasional basis. Didsbury and Chorley Chapels, and Whalley Parish Church all record small expenses for sending someone to procure a preacher on an incidental basis, in 1645, 1628, and 1653 respectively. These were small expenses of a few pence and so were probably the price of a meal and drink for the messenger.

More significantly, churchwardens paid fees and provided hospitality for visiting preachers. This data has rarely been analysed to date, and the Pennine sources reveal the large scale of this corporate action for the mobility of preachers. There are over 250 records of visiting preachers being

---

75 *Adam Eyre Diary*, p. 60.
76 Sheffield cwa, SA: CB. 161, f. 115.
77 Padiham cwa, LCRO: PR2863/2/1.
78 *Life of John Angier*, p. 56.
paid a fee, or provided with a meal and or drink in the Pennine area. These are detailed in Appendix 5, and are summarised below in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees, per sermon (from 133 data points)</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>4s 11d</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner/drink, cost per preaching event (from 120 data points)</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>£1 6s</td>
<td>3s 7d</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of fees and hospitality for visiting preachers. Data from various cwas listed in Appendix 5.

It is important to think about the methodology in analysing this information. A decision was made to split the data into two sets, fees and hospitality, because they require slightly different inclusion criteria. The fees data is per sermon while the meals data is per meal, which may have included multiple preachers. In both cases, the surviving data is certainly an underestimation, even beyond the obvious factor of the low survival rate of churchwardens’ accounts from the period. This is because rigorous criteria has been applied to what can be included in the data set from the accounts that are available. Even if the context points to this being the case, entries have only been included where there is a clear reference to preaching or a sermon. Also, where a fee was recorded for an unknown number of sermons, the entry has not been included. Where an entry is for a single preaching event, but for multiple preachers, it has only been pro-rated for fees where the number of preachers is known. One particular methodological issue has been deciding what to do with expenditure on wine. Sometimes this was a payment in-kind, such as ‘pottle (sic) of sacke sent to Mr Fetherston for bestowing his paynes in preachinge’ by the Bingley churchwardens in 1651. At a cost of 2s 8d this was equivalent to an average fee. However, other cases are less clear cut, such as wine customarily provided for a visiting preacher at Barnsley. Here, it is not clear whether this was presented to the preacher as a payment, part of a post-sermon meal, or, indeed, intended for his consumption during the sermon.\(^80\) The decision has been taken to include this data in the hospitality subset, rather than fees subset.

The results show that the range of fees was very large, from a single entry of 1d paid to someone who did not even merit the title ‘Mr’ at Bradfield, to the £3 paid to a Mr Bridges in Sheffield in 1646.\(^81\) Even unnamed preachers could be highly esteemed; a minister ‘from Leeds’ was

\(^80\) Bingley cwa, WYAS (B): BDP7/7/9/1/1.

\(^81\) The £9 collected in Manchester parish for the famed Mr Byfold of Chester to preach there has been statistically ignored as an extreme outlier. This collection was mentioned in letter reproduced in the *Historical
paid the large sum of 7s for preaching at Bradfield in 1623.\textsuperscript{82} The average fee per sermon for a preacher from the data set is 4s 11d, but this is skewed by a few large payments at the upper end, particularly several payments made to preachers in Sheffield in the 1640s and 50s. This is an interesting observation in itself, and although space does not permit an investigation here, it would be fruitful to inquire why preachers were paid so much more in this later period. With this sort of data, it is statistically more appropriate to take the median value, which is 3s. It can be said with confidence that the fee for a sermon from a visiting preacher was usually between 2s and 5s. For meals, expenditure per event ranged from 3d to £1 6s, with a mean of 3s 7d. There are fewer outliers in this data set than the fees data, so the mean is a more reliable indicator, with a median of 2s 6d. In a parish or chapelry receiving a heavy influx of preachers, this expenditure could form a significant proportion of the annual outgoings. The richest source of data is the Bradfield churchwarden accounts. In the peak year of 1628, the churchwardens spent £3 6s on hospitality for preachers, one sixth of their total annual expenditure. Almost every visiting preacher dined with the churchwardens, or a subset of them. As four churchwardens were newly appointed every year, this meant that between the years 1617 and 1632, when preachers were regularly visiting the chapel, a significant proportion of the ‘substantial’ men of the chapelry would have experienced the after-sermon meal. As discussed above, being one who sat down to a meal with a preacher was a marker of godliness, as well as indicating a certain standing in the local community.

Women could be part of the corporate hosting of preachers. At Bingley in the 1650s Jane Wright and Martha Wallis were recorded as supplying food and drink for preachers. Jane Wright was the widow of Stephen Wright, and daughter of the previous vicar, Samuel Oley. So, Jane Wright’s family connections gave her a godly identity, but her hosting of preachers was funded by the corporate body of the parish. Martha Wallis’ hosting of visiting preachers was paid for by the churchwardens. She also provided the communion wine and may have been the local inn keeper. A similar situation developed at Barnsley, where Anne Donne supplied the wine that was given to visiting preachers. At Bradfield, the accounts do not mention who provided the post-sermon meal, but in later accounts, Ann Bromhead, wife of the dogwhipper, provided meals after ‘catechising’ sessions, so it is possible that she had also provided the post-sermon meal in earlier years.\textsuperscript{83} None of


\textsuperscript{82} Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14, 1629. This may have been the renowned anti-Catholic polemicist, Alexander Cooke.

\textsuperscript{83} Bingley cwa, WYAS (B): BDP7/7/9/1/1; Barnsley cwa; Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14, 1629; J. Horsfall Turner, \textit{Ancient Bingley: or Bingley, its History and Scenery}, (Bingley, 1897), p. 124, 31, 41. Jane Wright was
these women had saintly biographies composed about them, yet they were closely involved with the godly endeavour of supporting the wider preaching network. They became involved via the corporate body of the churchwardens, and as such engaged in an activity that was at once godly, local and part of a network.

Some visiting preachers were itinerants. Itinerants could be part of the established Church, licensed to preach across the diocese, such as three of the visiting preachers at Barnsley. One of these, Thomas Micklethwayt, was described as a ‘stranger’ when he preached there in 1622. He was the Rector of an East Yorkshire parish, who employed a non-conformist minister to cover his parochial duties while he travelled. 84 Other unnamed travelling preachers were described as ‘poor’, or lumped together with payments to the migrant poor. This was the case at Wragby, where in 1621 and again in 1626, the churchwardens recorded that 12s had been spent on ‘diverse preachers and poore men with passes’. 85 For some, itinerancy was a life-stage, before settling into a more permanent ministry, or indeed, even before ordination. The ‘Mr Turton, a young man’ who preached at Barnsley in 1622, was probably the Richard Turton ordained deacon by Archbishop Matthew in 1627, so he was still a layman studying at Cambridge when he preached at Barnsley. 86 In 1618, a Mr Warde preached at Bradfield accompanied by his father, so he was probably a young man. Some preachers, however, continued as itinerants throughout their lives. At Littleborough in 1621, ‘an ancient wayfaring ministr’ was paid 1s for his sermon. 87 Such itinerants may have been on the margins of orthodoxy and not always welcomed by the incumbent ministers. Adam Martindale preached against itinerants, as he thought they could be competitive and turn the ‘chappell into a cock-pit’, and the Presbyterian Bury Classis censured an itinerant lay preacher of Rochdale, John Bullock, in 1657. 88

The progress of some itinerants can occasionally be traced, as shown Figure 14. A Mr Hill preached extensively in the area between Wakefield and Sheffield. He preached at Wragby in 1627 possibly related to the previous vicar, Samuel Oley. Oley’s daughter married a Stephen Wright. The sexton and clerk at the church were also called Wright.

84 Barnsley cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 121, Add Box 8; Bi: CPH. 2046. Thomas Micklethwayt that was licensed to preach through the diocese in 1604.
85 Wragby CWA, WYAS (W): WDP 99/1/1/1 & WDP 99/70.
(where his payment was lumped in with that to the poor), at Wath-Upon-Dearne in 1628 and again 1629. In 1634 he was at Bradfield, and in 1638 he visited Ecclesfield. He was also cited as preaching in Sheffield in the 1635 action against the churchwardens there.\(^8^9\) He preached just one sermon at each location and moved on. The itinerant preacher, Mr Barfoot, was making his way back to Lancashire after conducting a preaching tour in the Kettering area in 1618-20. He preached at both Ecclesfield and Bradfield in 1621, where he was paid the handsome fees of 4s, 4d and 3s, 8d, which suggests that he was of some renown. At Bradfield he also dined with the churchwardens. Five years later, he appears to have been travelling around Lancashire again, as the churchwardens of Padiham bought some books from him, which also suggests that itinerants were active in the circulation of literature. Other itinerants travelled even greater distances. The Constable’s account for Bradfield in 1646 record payment of 5s to ‘a poore minister which came from Ireland and preached here’.

Unnamed Scottish ministers preached at Bury in 1618, Wath-Upon-Dearne in 1621 and Bingley in 1659.\(^9^0\)

\(^8^9\) Wragby, Wath, Bradfield and Ecclesfield cwa, SA: PR54/13/1; Bl: CP.H. 2087.
\(^9^0\) Fielding, ‘Conformists, Puritans and the Church Courts’, p. 151, Ecclesfield, Bradfield and Padiham cwa, LCRO: PR2863/2/1; Richardson, Puritanism in North-West England p. 99; Wath cwa; and Bingley cwa, WYAS (B): BDP7/7/9/1/1.
Figure 14. Movements of itinerant preachers.

These different scales of travel show that, through the corporate body of the churchwardens, the parish or chapelry was associated with supporting a network of preaching that spread out very far indeed.

**Exercises**

The culture of visiting preachers could develop into more organised events involving several preachers, known as exercises. Exercises had an uneven existence throughout the eighty years under consideration. They were initiated by the Earl of Huntingdon and Bishop Chadderton of Chester in the 1580s, but this officially sponsored format lasted only a few years.\(^91\) Exercises were revived by grass roots initiative after 1600, expanded to become a common practice by the 1620s, and were then quashed by Neile’s regime in the 1630s. They were revived to become a common feature of parish life again in the 1650s. Inter-clerical relationships were important in the setting up of exercises, and these relationships were nurtured through the meetings. However, churchwardens,

---
\(^91\) Richardson, *Puritanism in North-West England*, p. 65.
as the corporate body of the parish and controller of common funds, provided an important support structure. Their records reveal that exercises were more widespread and common than has previously been realised. Exercises were held in over thirty-five places in the Pennines, and a full list of all the places where exercises were held is given in Table 3 below. This list includes organised, regular meetings, such as the Halifax Exercise. This was instigated by the Vicar of Halifax, John Favour, and it reached its greatest extent during his lifetime, meeting in many locations across the West Riding of Yorkshire.92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years of exercise (where known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Halifax Exercise, held at:</strong></td>
<td>1609 – 1625. Reconstituted with gift of Nathaniel Waterhouse c. 1645. 1653 – 1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Otley exercise, held at :</strong></td>
<td>1641–1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley, Farnley, Thornton, Idle, Calverly, Adel, Bingley, Pudsey, York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>1584–1590s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padiham</td>
<td>1584–1590s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1615, 1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>e. 17th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downham</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1623–1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowerby</td>
<td>pre 1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackrod</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough</td>
<td>1646, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addingham</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestwich</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleworth</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Exercises in the Pennine area. Data from cwa, biographical material, diaries, sermon notes and verses.

The sources also reveal the many sporadic, locally organised exercises. These are interesting because they show a parish attempting to position itself on the map of godly religion.

Preachers would travel considerable distances to attend established events. Oliver Heywood commented on the Halifax Exercise that, ‘not only neighbour ministers preached in their turns, but strangers far and near were sent for to preach it’.93 The ministers participating in the Halifax Exercise were recorded in the sermon notes of Elkanah Wales for the earlier period and the sermon notes of John Lister of Over Brea for the later period, and these sources confirm Heywood’s statement, with

92 BL add MS: 4933 a,b; The sermon notes of John Lister of Over Brea, WYAS (C): SH:3/S/1–8.
93 Autobiography of Oliver Heywood Vol. IV, p. 16.
sermons by ministers from various West Riding and Lancashire parishes recorded. As Jonathan Priestley noted in his memoirs, it was ‘at that time kept up and maintained by the most eminent Ministers that could be got in Yorkshire and Lancashire, some of them coming twenty miles to preach’. 

Because of such travel, the hospitality received at parishes was important. From a total of thirty-nine events where expenditure was recorded, the average expenditure by churchwardens per exercise over the whole period was just under 5s. This was mainly for food and drink, but occasionally for fees. A good example is the Bradfield Exercise, as the wealth of data there makes it possible to chart its rise and fall. It began in 1623, reached its peak activity year in 1628, when eight exercises were held, and held its last meeting in 1632. It never became a regular event and tended to use Holy Days for its gatherings. The exercise at Bradfield was always concluded with a meal for the ministers, ‘some others in their company’, and churchwardens. The highest number of preachers recorded at the Bradfield Exercise was seven, and on this occasion 7s was spent on the meal, which suggests the preachers, one or two of their companions, the minister and the churchwardens all dined together. This does not exclude the possibility of a wider celebratory meal including others paid for by other means.

In hosting such exercises and meals, the parish was confirming its identity as a godly community. Attendance as a hearer at an exercise signalled godly identity, but so could supporting the event, both at an individual and corporate, communal level. As with chapel building, there could be several motivations for instigating an exercise, alongside the godly desire to hear more preaching. Patrick Collinson pointed out the economic benefits of holding a preaching exercise, but perhaps more relevant here was the renown of an exercise as the ‘means of the moment’ for a parish or chapel to gain esteem. The inhabitants of Sowerby who wrote a poem on the death of their minister, John Broadley, lamented about the demise of ‘our exercise’ and the churchwardens at Bradfield used the same possessive pronoun when recording expenses for exercises. Hosting an exercise was a matter of local pride. The idea of Matthew Milner that ‘like acquisition of a relic or a

---

94 Newton, ‘Puritans in the Diocese of York’. appendix: Index of preachers and their locations, taken from BL: Add MS 4933, a and b.

95 ‘Memoir of Phebe Priestley’, p. 264.


saint’s shrine, appointment of a renowned and adept preaching minister put a parish on the map’ is borne out by the evidence seen in this study.  

The example of Nicholas Assheton, and the interest he showed in establishing an exercise at his local chapel of Downham, is revealing. In his diary for July 1617 he noted the initial failure to establish the exercise, as he wrote ‘I heare that as wheras ther was an exercise granted to be at Downham by ye byshopp, it was upon contrarie l’rest letters stayed’. The second attempt a month later was more successful, with a Mr Peele preaching in the morning and a Mr Brooke in the afternoon, although a third preacher, Mr Maurice failed to attend. Another exercise was organised for 25 November, which was St Katherine’s day. From this point onwards the exercise seems to have become more established. The final mention of it in Assheton’s diary was during May 1618, when he recorded talking with the vicar ‘about the exercise’ as they travelled to Blackburn together. Assheton’s interest in preaching perplexed antiquarians, as he also recorded attendance at fairs, races and alcohol induced revelry. A typical entry in Assheton’s diary reads, ‘to Worston. Tom Starkie &c verie merry and well all. All at supper. Wee were all temperately pleasant’. The trip to Worston, however, followed attendance at the new exercise held at Downham on St Katherine’s Day. Assheton thought a combination of preaching and social activities suitable to a ‘festival day’, and it should be noted that he made the conscious decision to record the merriment at the supper as ‘temperately pleasant’. His diary shows that he was attentive to the sermons he attended, as the entry for Sunday 20 July recorded that ‘P~son preached 28 Matt. 18 to end, but handled 18 only’. On the same day, he returned to church for the afternoon sermon by a visiting preacher. Assheton’s mixture of sermon attendance and socialising is cast in another light if seen in the context outlined above of post sermon meals that included expenses for wine. His life, probably like most, was a mixture of godly and worldly pursuits, and his motivations for supporting the exercise at Downham were probably also mixed, including religious interest alongside local pride. Assheton is an example of how, in the lived existence, a very wide a range of people supported preaching, not just those

98 WYAS (C): WYC/1525/10/1/8/2/1, hereafter referred to as ‘Sowerby verses’; Bradfield cwa, SA: RC.167.14, 1629; Milner, The Senses p. 310. The ‘Sowerby verses’ exist as a late seventeenth century manuscript copy of a verse lament written a few years after John Broadley’s death in 1625 by one of his parishioners. There are 144 verses all together. The style is simple four line, rhyming stanzas. It is a valuable insight into how a moderately educated layperson felt about their loss of their minister, expressed in the biblical language that the preacher himself had imparted.

99 F. R. Raines, (ed.), The Journal of Nicholas Assheton of Downham in the County of Lancaster, Esq. CS (Manchester, 1848), hereafter referred to as Journal of Nicholas Assheton.

100 Journal of Nicholas Assheton, pp. 28, 68, 99.

about whom godly biographies were composed. Godliness was not confined to the ideal lives presented in holy biographies, but leaked out through association with godly activity.

**Lay travel for preaching**

Travel by the laity was another way in which a sense of godly identity was developed and strengthened. The faithful were encouraged to spend time with their ‘spiritual father’ and travelling with him was one way of doing this. Mr Mellor, who preached at Bradfield in 1621, 1628 and 1636, had three people with him, while Mr Attay and Mr Tormor had a ‘company’ with them when they visited Bradfield. At Bingley in 1659, 2s was ‘spent when Mr Kennion preached and on those with him’. Sometimes, the travelling companion was a servant or assistant, noted as ‘his man’, but they were also lay followers of the preacher. A visiting preacher might also be accompanied for part of their journey by individuals as a mark of respect. Nicholas Assheton accompanied the Vicar of Whalley, Mr Omerod, who was on his way to preach at the neighbouring chapel of Clitheroe.

Gadding to sermons was slightly different. It was an activity undertaken by all ages and genders and could spring from an assortment of motives. It was part of a godly childhood. Joseph Lister recalled that, as a boy, his mother took him to ‘many funeral sermons, lectures and monthly exercises’. As a child in the 1630s, Oliver Heywood was taken by his mother to hear ‘Mr Horrocks at Dean, Mr Harrison at Walmsley, Mr Johnson at Ellinborough, and sometimes to go to Denton to hear Mr Angier’ (these journeys are shown in Figure 11). The first three of these locations were all about five miles distant, while the last was a longer journey of about twenty-five miles, so would have involved an overnight stay. As he grew to maturity, Heywood would ride ‘before’ his mother to hear sermons and take notes for her. Even the journey to the local chapel or church was an integral part of preaching-centred worship. Jonathan Priestley recalled the regular two mile journey he took to and from Sowerby Chapel with his uncle as a child in the 1630s,

he constantly heard Mr Rathband’s ministry at Sowerby, and took me along with him as soon as I was able to go, and as we came home examined me what I had learned, and what I could

---


103 Bradfield, Bingley, cwa; *Journal of Nicholas Assheton*, p. 101.

remember, and asked me how I had understood such and such things, and would open them
to me in words suitable to my understanding.\(^{105}\)

Gadding was sometimes motivated by ‘push factors’, such as inadequate preaching by the local
minister, and in this case it was largely undertaken by the more religiously committed. This was the
case at Bradford, where Nathan Bentley’s preaching at the parish church drove many of his
parishioners to travel to the outlying chapels for sermons.\(^{106}\) It was also the case for Adam Eyre, who
recorded his local travels to hear sermons, as he regarded the minister at his own parish of
Penistone to be inadequate. Between January 1646 and January 1647 he travelled to neighbouring
parishes and chapels on nine Sundays, visiting Kirkburton to hear Mr Clark preach, and visiting
the chapel of Holmfirth (Kirkburton) five times where he heard Gammaliel Appleyard and Mr Soothill
preach. One Sunday he travelled to hear Mr Broadley at Cawthorn Parish Church, then on to its
dependent chapel of Silkstone to hear Mr Spoford. He also travelled to Midhope, to hear Mr Shirt,
and Denby Chapel, where an ‘old fellow’ preached. These journeys are shown in Figure 10.\(^{107}\) He did
not always travel alone, being accompanied by Mr Poole when he visited Kirkburton.

Alternatively, ‘pull factors’ also operated in gadding and these could generate a wider
participation. The chance to hear famed preachers drew the ‘multitudes of hearers’ to the Halifax
exercise. The effect of this spread out further, as people then travelled to hear the same preachers
once they were back in their own parishes and chapels. Oliver Heywood’s memoir of Elkanah Wales,
Curate of Pudsey, stated that

his ministry was very effectual upon multitudes of others, who from all the region round
about flocked to hear him, many of whom owned him as their spiritual father, and had their
fleece wet when others were dry . . . and the great success his ministry had at Leeds where
he preached frequently at the monthley exercise . . . and upon those strangers who heard
him almost constantly at Pudsey.\(^{108}\)

Oliver Heywood’s grandfather travelled the seven miles to Blackley Chapel each week to hear
Thomas Paget preach, having previously experienced a conversion by his sermons. Parishioners
could take pride in the ability of their minister to attract a wider auditory. The verse lament written
by inhabitants of Sowerby for their preacher John Broadley celebrated how, ‘Our fountaine full did
overflow, to others in their need’.\(^{109}\)

---

\(^{105}\) ‘Memoir of Jonathan Priestley’, p. 10.

\(^{106}\) BL: CP.H. 5431.

\(^{107}\) Adam Eyre Diary, passim.

\(^{108}\) BL. Add MS 4460, Thoresby MSS, f. 35,6 v.

Extreme examples of such popularity were the mass followings achieved by charismatic preachers on the margins of orthodoxy. Roger Brearley of Grindleton attracted large crowds from a wide radius with his message of human perfectibility. One of his disciples, William Aiglin, recalled when I remember that first mighty call of that great watchman, and did see them all from every quarter come . . . and mighty store of wise and learned multitudes of men came hastening to that place apoynted then, for cost they carde not, length of way was then no burden, wandering every day to those faire courtes.\textsuperscript{110}

Aiglin also recounted, however, that many of those who initially flocked to Brearley ‘fell away and went wandering’, which suggests that such mass popularity was a temporary phenomenon. This popularity was probably at least partly driven by Brearley’s reputation as a healer, and this will be further considered in Chapter Six. Another, less well known charismatic preacher, John Cross, also attracted large crowds to his preaching at Scammonden (Dean Head) Chapel in Halifax Parish. The depositions made against him at the diocesan court claimed that many of his hearers ‘did forsaike theire ordinary trades and callinge to follow him whether he list to goe’.\textsuperscript{111} As with Brearley, this was a short term mass popularity.

Gadding was usually mixed with other motivations. Almost every journey Adam Eyre made to hear preaching was combined with business and sociability. When he travelled to hear Gammaliel Applyard preach at Holmfirth, he also visited his father-in-law and cousin, or friends Mr Burton and Godfrey Cuttill. On one such occasion, he also settled a bill for a ‘flitch of bacon’.\textsuperscript{112} Nicholas Assheton combined travel to hear a preacher at Slaidburn, a journey of about thirteen miles, with a visit to his brother.\textsuperscript{113} Travel for preaching was an activity woven into the fabric of everyday life. This was especially the case in the Pennines, where the chapel structure of parishes created multiple levels of loyalty and identity and several places of worship could be visited without leaving the parish.\textsuperscript{114} Phoebe Hoyle lived equidistant from the chapel of Illingworth and the parish church of Halifax and travelled to both depending on who was preaching.\textsuperscript{115} When the split of loyalties involved financial matters, conflict could arise between chapel and parish, and this happened when

\textsuperscript{110} Lambeth Palace Archives, MS 3461, hereafter referred to as the ‘William Aiglin lament’, ff. 235,6.
\textsuperscript{111} BI : CP.H. 1300.
\textsuperscript{112} Adam Eyre Diary p. 15, 29, 37.
\textsuperscript{113} Journal of Nicholas Assheton, p. 87 Like Eyre, though, such local sermon gadding would have been greatly facilitated by riding, rather than walking.
\textsuperscript{114} See R. N. Swanson, ‘Fissures in the bedrock: Parishes, Chapels, Parishioners and Chaplains in Pre-Reformation England’, in Lewycky and Morton, Getting Along? for more on this.
\textsuperscript{115} ‘Memoir of Phebe Priestley’, p. 264.
a preaching minister arrived at Luddenden Chapel in 1624.\textsuperscript{116} The inhabitants of Luddenden tried to change their financial relationship with the mother parish, and a legal dispute ensued that continued for several years. Outside of such structural matters though, the chapel system offered a great deal of informal flexibility for hearing a range of preachers. Gadding was an activity that involved more than a regular core of participants, as the numbers involved could expand and contract depending on local events and circumstances.

This chapter has shown that support for preaching and its associated activity was something undertaken by a wide cross-section of the population. This made the boundary of godly identity in the lived existence multi-layered, permeable and elastic. Godly identity could bleed out to a much wider constituency than has previously been assumed and was not necessarily antithetical to local identity. The communal endeavour to bring a preaching ministry to a locale created bonds within local society. These could be tested, as the next chapter will show, but they also formed the basis of the longer term co-operation between those who eventually took themselves outside of parochial religion as Dissenters, and those who remained within the religious unit of the parish.

\textsuperscript{116} Halifax cwa, WYAS (W): WDP 53/5/1/1; BI: Reg. 31, petition of Luddenden Chapelry f. 230,1; CP.H. 1750 & CP. H. 1782 (cause papers arising from the dispute).
Chapter Four
Preaching: Identity and Conflict

The argument of the previous chapter was that preaching was an activity that many and varied people were involved with in some way, and this involvement could foster a sense of local as well as godly identity. The conventional historical interpretation, however, is that preaching tended to cause conflict within a local society and could fracture a sense of community. This will be explored here as another outcome of the capacity of preaching to create identities. To examine this further, the broad ranging approach used in chapter three would not be very illuminating. Region wide studies of preaching-related conflict tend to rely on the ecclesiastical court records, which offer only snapshots of incidents with little context. Such incidents have been stacked up to make the case that preaching was unpopular and divisive.117 This approach, however, does not really tell us that much. It does not show how conflict came about, and also ignores the absence of conflict that made the incidents stand out in the first place. In light of this, chapter four will probe how preaching could bring about conflict by using an in-depth case study of Leeds. Some of the events covered here have been touched on by historians previously, but this study uses fresh sources and approaches and makes new links and interpretations. It will be argued that the conventional interpretation of conflict arising between conformists and ‘the godly’ can obscure more appropriate readings of the evidence. Instead, it will be shown how conflict arising from preaching could be between progressive Protestants.

In line with a major theme in this study, the starting point is the material culture of preaching. St John’s chapel in Leeds was built by the wealthy cloth merchant John Harrison between 1631 and 1634. John Taylor, the ‘Water Poet’, viewed the chapel in 1639 and described it as

With exquisite art of carving and masonry, with painting, gilding, embellishing, and adorning, with . . . admirable and costly Joyners and carvers Workmanship in the Font, Pulpit, Pewes, chancell, Communion Boord, and all other things and ornaments of such a House Consecrated and dedicated to the Service of God.118

Its interior has long been a puzzle for historians, who have wondered at its apparent combination of ‘puritan’ and Laudian characteristics. The striking pulpit, positioned deep within the board nave with seating positioned to face it, led Douglas and Powell to declare that preaching must have been the

117 Haigh, ‘Taming of the Reformation’ and Plain Man’s Pathways.
118 John Taylor, Part of This Summers Travels, or News from Hell, Hull and Halifax (1639), p. 23.
The pulpit is presently not in its original position, which was further west, as shown in the reprint of a mid nineteenth century plan in P. J. Douglas and K. Powell, *St John’s Church Leeds, a History* (London, 1993), pp. 7–9. I would like to thank the staff at The Churches Conservation Trust, Leeds, for their assistance.


Harrison’s religious identity has also confounded easy categorisation. His life has been subject to various hagiographic treatments as Leeds’ first great benefactor. Authors have bewailed a lack of information for his earlier days and have relied upon his ‘Sayings’, written down around 1650 and reprinted by the antiquarian, Whitaker. This study will bring to light new material that shows Harrison’s involvement in the conflicts that disturbed Leeds in the 1610s and 20s. Close examination of that conflict reveals both common ground and diverging ideas about what it meant to be a progressive Protestant in the early seventeenth century. It also explains some of the features of St John’s chapel.

Religious conflict in Leeds: old narratives and new sources

As outlined in the introduction, religious conflict in the early seventeenth century has usually been interpreted as a clash between a conformist majority and a ‘godly’ minority. At first sight, the

122 In his hagiographic pen portrait of John Harrison, Ralph Thoresby calls John Harrison a ‘noble benefactor’ and ‘pious and ever famous magistrate’. R. Thoresby, Ducatis Leodiensis, or the topography of the ancient and populous town and parish of Leeds (1715); T. D. Whitaker, Loidis and Elmete (Leeds, 1816), appendices; Margaret Hornsey continued the tradition of lauding Harrison’s ‘piety and benevolence’ in her ‘John Harrison, the Leeds Benefactor, and his Times’ Publications of the Thoresby Society, vol. 33 (1932), pp. 130–2.

123 Many illuminating studies have been based on this interpretive framework, such as Patrick Collinson, ‘The Shearman’s Tree and the Preacher: the Stranger Death of Merry England in Shrewsbury and Beyond’ in
narrative of the events in Leeds between 1615 and 1622 appears to fit this interpretation. The traditional narrative pitches John Metcalf, a merchant and town bailiff who supported traditional festivities, against Alexander Cooke, the Vicar of Leeds, and his godly supporters.\textsuperscript{124} Using the 1622 Star Chamber complaint taken by Metcalf against Cooke, and the report of the First Commission for Pious Uses in Leeds, the conflict has been explained as arising from Cooke’s accusation that Metcalf had embezzled charitable funds, while Metcalf disliked Cooke’s non-conformity and his particularising from the pulpit.\textsuperscript{125} Things came to a head with street battles over rush-bearing festivities in which weapons were wielded and several people were physically hurt. Thus far, the story seems to fit the cultural clash interpretation perfectly. This study, however, shows that the dispute between Cooke and Metcalf was only one aspect of the conflict, and the full role played by John Harrison, the chapel builder, is revealed.\textsuperscript{126} It will be demonstrated that both Harrison and Cooke were progressive Protestants, who placed preaching of the Word as central to worship and salvation. They differed on how preaching should be done and where (and how firmly) the boundary of godly identity should be drawn. The ensuing conflict hardened these differences and expanded them into the politically charged area of ideas about authority. Through his preaching, Cooke was able to mobilise a new ‘higher register’ of authority based upon righteousness, while Harrison’s reaction against this led him into a pointed defence of traditional hierarchies of authority based on role and social position. In this, the Crown was adopted as the legitimising badge for Harrison’s view.

The older brother of Alexander Cooke, Robert Cooke, was Vicar of Leeds for twenty five years and had delivered a preaching ministry in the town. On his death in 1615, a dispute over the advowson broke out and unfolded through a series of legal actions.\textsuperscript{127} A group, which declared itself

---

\textsuperscript{124} The first account of the dispute was that by Ralph Thoresby in 1724. He refrained from mentioning Harrison’s involvement and later historians have followed suit, such as G. C. F. Forster, ‘Parson and People: Troubles at Leeds Parish Church’ University of Leeds Review (1961), pp. 241–248; Newton, ‘Puritans in the Diocese of York’; Andrew Cambers. Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England 1580–1720 (Cambridge, 2011).

\textsuperscript{125} NA: STAC 8/215/6, Metcalf and Jackson c. Cooke (June, 1622); A Symington, (ed.), Old Leeds Charities: the first and second Decree of the Committee of Pious Uses in Leeds 5 July 17th James I 1620, 18 December 13th Charles II (1661), (Leeds, 1926).

\textsuperscript{126} The only work to note Harrison’s involvement to date is K. D. Murray’s PhD study ‘Puritanism and Civic Life in York, Newcastle, Hull, Beverley, and Leeds, 1590–1640’, Durham, 1990. He was more interested in the secular aspects of the case.

\textsuperscript{127} See Forster, ‘Parson and People’, for a fuller discussion of the background to the advowson dispute.
to be both religiously ‘well affected’ and the representative voice of ‘the parish’, claimed the advowson as the property of the parish. This group had the backing of the powerful Sir John Savile of Howley and they nominated Alexander Cooke as the vicar. In opposition to them was a small group of individuals who were the remnant or heirs of the original purchasers of the advowson in the sixteenth century. They regarded it as their private property, and to underline their claim, they nominated a different minister. Harrison, whose father-in-law, Thomas Foxcroft, had been one of the original purchasers, sided with this group, although this allegiance has been obscured by historians since Thoresby onwards. After a series of legal manoeuvres from both sides, the case was finally settled by a ruling in Chancery in 1617, which found for the pro-Cooke party. The ruling placed the advowson under the management of a new trust of leading townsmen and preaching ministers. Unsurprisingly, given his position in the dispute, Harrison was not included in this new trust, despite being an obvious candidate due to his social prominence and previous association with charitable trusts.

The matter did not rest there. By 1618, an anti-Cooke party had coalesced enough to send a petition to Queen Anne, ostensibly from ‘diverse of the richest and greatest traders of the said towne’ and claiming to speak for ‘many thousands’. The petition demanded the removal of Cooke as vicar and complained that he had been installed due to the undue influence of Sir John Savile. The petition criticised Cooke’s ‘schismatical disposition’ which ‘still doth stir such grief and make such factions among the parishioners’. The petition only survives as a printed transcript, with no names attached, however, various features point to Harrison’s involvement in it. Firstly it was clearly drawn up by the larger cloth merchants and clothiers, a group of which Harrison was a leading member. Secondly, the make up of the new advowson trust was specifically criticised in the petition, which points to Harrison’s ongoing ire at his exclusion from this trust. The petition seems to have escalated the conflict, as the violent clashes over rush-bearing followed shortly afterwards. The evidence from Metcalf’s Star Chamber suit shows that Cooke blamed Harrison, as well as Metcalf, for these tumults. Metcalf’s complaint recounts how, during the fight, the vicar reached for a halberd and ‘shaking it and saying in the presence of diverse people there “I wish I had Harrison and Metcalf...”’

---

128 WYAS (L): RDP68/20/A9 & Bi: RDP68 Bi: Bishopthorpe MSS, Correspondence and papers of Archbishop Thomas Herring, bundle IV, item 20 (both sources are contemporary copy of the 1615 Bill of Complaint from Leeds parishioners to the Court of Chancery), ff. 1, 4. In this, Thomas Foxcroft was described as ‘an honest Religious and substantial freeholder’.

129 As seen in the findings of the First Commission of Pious Uses, Symington, Old Leeds Charities.

130 Whitaker, Loidis and Elmet, appendix. The Queen held the manor of Leeds at this time. Hornsey, ‘John Harrison, the Leeds Benefactor’, p. 133.
heare that I might drive this street of Twentie and the more".\textsuperscript{131} This denouncement of Harrison by Cooke has been omitted in all subsequent accounts of this event.

The principal new piece of evidence that places Harrison at the centre of the conflict, however, is the Bill of Complaint that Harrison himself submitted to the Court of Star Chamber in April 1621, over a year before Metcalf’s similar Star Chamber action. In his complaint, Harrison claimed that for the previous four years various inhabitants of Leeds had been composing and circulating mocking ballads, or libels, about him.\textsuperscript{132} Again, the significance of this source has not been realised before now.\textsuperscript{133} Two such libels were presented as evidence in this complaint, and these are transcribed in full in Appendix 6. Harrison named twenty-one people whom he considered to be guilty of composing and circulating the ballads, a list that included the vicar and his principal supporters.\textsuperscript{134} The libels make reference to Harrison standing against Savile and Cooke in the advowson dispute and mock his continuing anger at the outcome and his attempts to get the ruling overturned. Verses in the first libel makes this clear,

You rage and maline him that did saye  
The parish had right and would have a daie  
Would not this yield matter to make a stage play  
For rapr witt good neighboures  

You sent Robin Benson to London in poste  
And for his newes you were at great cost  
But what doe you nowe when all is lost  
But see your owne follie good neighbours  

The end and begyninge all is but one  
Rashnes begune it by councell of John  
Fye of such councell that after breedes none  
And makes men buy witt good neighbours  

Had wee bene thankfull to God above  
And to th’old knight whome wee did prove  
Did us protect and defend with love  
Then had wee bene wise good neighbours  

Have wee not had old Cooke to preach  
Non worse then unthankefull wch maie us teach  
To requite good turnes if it bee in our reache

\textsuperscript{131} NA: STAC 8/215/6.  
\textsuperscript{132} NA: STAC 8/176/27, Harrison c. Kay (April, 1621).  
\textsuperscript{134} NA: STAC 8/167/27.
Then whose fooles and knaves good neighbours . . .

The continuing legal actions of Harrison were referred to in the second libel as well,

Hee that old matters takes in hand
And saith hee will make an end
But leaves them to the lawe at length makes worse
But naught doth mend . . .

These criticisms of Harrison’s continuing rancour and legal actions show that he was the major opponent of Cooke and Savile from the advowson dispute onwards. In contrast, Metcalf’s conflict with Cooke only emerged later, with the embezzlement in the charitable funds and rush-bearing events in 1619. Harrison was therefore the central figure of the opposition to Cooke, and his role in the conflict has been suppressed from the writings of Thoresby onwards. The libels were a significant event in Harrison’s life; they caused a shaming and loss of social prestige at a time in his life when he was just emerging as a leading citizen of the town and taking up a public role as the Chief Constable of Skyrack and bailiff for the manor.  

Another plank of the argument that Harrison was the major opponent of Cooke is the literary output of John Walker, a Leeds based author who published two books during the conflict, one in print and the other as a manuscript. Both books were to some degree stock anti-Puritan polemic in the popular form of an extended dialogue between a ‘Protestant’ and a ‘Puritan’, but they were rooted in real events in Leeds and would have been read as a criticism of Alexander Cooke and his supporters. There is substantial evidence that Walker was acting as Harrison’s mouthpiece in these outputs. Firstly, there is the timing of their creation. The English Pharise or Religious Ape was


136 John Walker, The English Pharise or Religious Ape (1616); BL: Harley MS 38a, ‘The English Hipochritte & Popish Pharisee unmasked’, a manuscript pamphlet by John Walker ‘of Little Britaine in Yorkshire’. I have dated the latter work to 1621 by cross referencing its content to a work by Alexander Cooke. Hereafter these sources will be referred to as English Pharise and ‘English Hipochritte’.

In this chapter ‘Puritan’ and ‘Protestant’ (with capital letters) will denote the literary stereotypes in Walker’s books. Walker seems to have been influenced by works such as Oliver Omerord’s, Picture of a Puritane (1606). The second half of Omerod’s work is a dialogue between a Protestant and Puritan, and Omerod’s work opens with the the ‘Protestant’ offering to shake hands with a ‘Puritan’ and being refused, likewise, Walker’s work opens with the ‘Protestant’ greeting the ‘Puritan’ and being cold shouldered. For more on these literary constructs see Patrick Collinson in ‘Antipuritanism’ in John Coffey and Paul Lim, The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 27, 8.
published in 1616, right in the middle of the advowson dispute. 'The English Hipochritte and Popish Pharisee unmasked' was written in 1621, just as Harrison was making his Star Chamber complaint. This later manuscript work includes a scene in which the ‘Puritan’ enemies of his ‘Protestant’ protagonist ‘discover’ the libel in the parish church,

yet amongst this flatteringe fraternitie, one stoupinge gallant tooke occasion as I verie credibly heard, to spot a paper full of poysone, but comminge short of the field with goliah, he pluckt in his head like a hedgehogge, who like a serpent lurking in a hedge bottom and spyinge one coming towardes her, made spedie hast into coverts, to go and tell lyinge news unto her fellowes.\(^\text{137}\)

Walker also gives the background to the libel. He recounts how, just before the libel was publicised, the ‘Protestant’ had written to his ‘Puritan’ opponents, wanting to engage them in doctrinal debate, as ‘how for reprehendinge the doctrine and manners of certaine precissions by letters, though no answer could possibly be had of them’.\(^\text{138}\) The same desire to engage in doctrinal discussion is mockingly referenced in the libel against Harrison,

Hee that canne Cardinall Confute  
And Bellarmyne himself  
And yet takes councell of a knave  
And of a popish elf . . .

Harrison’s attempt to engage in doctrinal dispute was particularly held up for ridicule because the vicar, Cooke, was a famed anti-Catholic polemicist.\(^\text{139}\) The ‘knave’ here probably refers to Harrison’s association with John Metcalf, and the ‘popish elf’ (who is also referred to as a ‘mynion’ elsewhere in the libel) was possibly the author, John Walker. Walker, indeed, described himself in the first book as ‘no scholler at all . . . I am only a poore man’ and in the later book as a ‘lay man unlearned’ and cites ‘out of the mouths of babes and sucklinges, hast thou ordained Strength’.\(^\text{140}\) The scriptural

\(^{137}\) ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 44v. The ballad that was ‘found’ here was unlikely to have been composed against Metcalf. There is no evidence to show that Metcalf had any interest in religious matters, and would have been unlikely to have written letters inviting a discussion about doctrine. Walker second pamphlet was written at the same time as Harrison’s failed attempt to sue his defamers and so was likely to have been part of his campaign against Cooke.

\(^{138}\) ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 44v.

\(^{139}\) Alexander Cooke, Pope Ioane a dialogue between a Protestant and a Papist. Manifestly proving that a woman called Joane was Pope of Rome (1610); Worke for a Masse Priest (1617); More Worke for a Masse Priest (1621); Yet More Worke for a Masse Priest (1622); The Abatement of Popish Braggs, Pretending Scripture to be Theirs, Retorted by the Hand of Alexander Cooke (1625).

\(^{140}\) English Pharise, Epistle Dedicatoire, and ‘English Hipochritte’ ff. 1r, 2v.
references, phrasing and motifs used by Walker show a strong correlation with Harrison’s later private jottings.\footnote{141} Other evidence points to Walker being aligned with those who wanted to secure the wool staple for Leeds. The ‘stapling crew’, which consisted of Harrison and Metcalf, were castigated in a libel mentioned in Metcalf’s Star Chamber suit. It refers to an attempt by leading clothiers to control the quality of wool and cloth traded in Leeds in order to achieve the status of the wool staple for the town. This attempt at control sparked resistance among the smaller clothiers. A scene in Walker’s \textit{The English Pharise} directly references this controversy, from the point of view of the pro-staplers.\footnote{142} In this scene, the ‘Protestant’ attempts to remove a speck of dirt from the ‘Puritan’s’ cloak, with the result that the cloth is destroyed because, being cheap ‘linsey woolsey’, it could not withstand being rubbed. Finally, attempts can be made to identify John Walker. It was a fairly common name, but his literacy narrows the field so that the obvious candidate is the man who would later emerge as a prominent cloth merchant in Leeds. Harrison was closely associated with this John Walker and named him as a trustee in his will.\footnote{143} Taken all together, there is a very strong case for arguing that Walker was writing on behalf of Harrison and acting as his mouthpiece in the campaign against Cooke, and this arm’s length, indirect action against Cooke will be shown to be characteristic of Harrison’s style. Harrison’s support for Walker’s authorship is an important plank of the argument, as various opinions about preaching are expressed in Walker’s books and these will be taken as more or less synonymous with the views of Harrison.

\footnote{141}{This can be seen from comparing \textit{English Pharise} ‘English Hipochritte’ with, ‘Mr Harrison’s Sayings’, printed in Whitaker, \textit{Loidis}, appendix, p. 10, and John Harrison’s own handwritten notes BL: Add MS 4275, f. 270. For instance, both sources pair Puritans with Papists, criticise preachers who dwell exclusively on sin without mentioning God’s mercy, and both use the sun and moon as metaphors. Harrison’s own jottings state ‘the clay must not contrast with the maker’ and likewise in his second work, Walker states ‘he must be made a minister, that pleaseth the maker’, f. 43r.}

\footnote{142}{\textit{English Pharise}, p. 120. In the libel against Metcalf, STAC 8/215/6, Harrison was identified as one of the ‘the Stapling Crew . . . who make a prey on clothiers poore’. Other evidence of the dispute includes petitions and letters. See WYAS (L): WYL178/1, Pawson MSS. c.1625 Box 3, Petitions. ‘The Clothiers Petition presented with 10,000 hands consisting of 4 Heads’. This is a petition against the actions of the ‘Staplers’. The issue was closely associated with moves to incorporate the town of Leeds, see also BL: Harley MS 1327, f. 9. Contemporary copy of a petition ‘for the staying of a corporation’ signed by the small traders and clothiers. Sir Henry Savile also expressed the opinion that the new Leeds Corporation unnecessarily oppressive of small traders, J. P. Cooper, (ed.) \textit{Wentworth Papers 15997–1628} (London, 1973), p. 311.}

Preaching and religious identity

The question arises, given his strong dislike for the preacher, Alexander Cooke, what sort of Protestant Harrison was. There is substantial evidence from various points in Harrison’s life that indicate he was a progressive Protestant, who supported preaching-centred worship. Harrison had come to maturity under Robert Cooke’s ministry and seems to have been fully integrated into the religious life of the town at that time. He was appointed as a trustee for several charitable endowments in the 1610s and, according to evidence given in Chancery, Harrison had shown a ‘general liking’ for the preaching ministries of Robert and Alexander Cooke during these early years. Furthermore, Harrison would later house the Calvinist preacher, Richard Garbutt, when he first came to Leeds in 1625. Harrison nominated Garbutt’s successor, another Calvinist preacher, Robert Todd, as the first minister at St John’s, and when Todd offended Archbishop Neile by contradicting the Laudian, John Cosin, Harrison supported his curate and secured his restitution. Although it may have been edited by his heirs, Harrison’s deathbed ‘extempore’ prayer expressed key tenets of Calvinist doctrine. It pointedly refuted the allegation that he had built St John’s chapel from any notion of merit or good works. He thanked the mercy of God ‘for assisting me by thy good Spirit in the exercise of hearing, reading, and meditating on thy word’, and regretted the occasions when he had failed to sanctify the Sabbath and or listen properly to sermons. The more revealing source, however, is the handwritten jottings of Harrison, preserved in the Thoresby manuscripts, which have not been brought to light before now. In these, Harrison attempted to express his thoughts about preaching. He set out a preference for a style of preaching in which condemnation of sin was matched with hope of salvation. This accords with the style of preaching advocated in John Walker’s works. At the start of ‘The English Hipochritte’, Walker declared himself to be a ‘Reformed Protestant . . . readie to proove by the Word of God’ that ‘Puritans’ were enemies of the
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144 WYAS (L): RDP 68/20/A9; Symington, Old Leeds Charities.
145 Richard Garbutt, One Come from the Dead to Awaken Drunkards and Whoremongers, being a Sober and Severe Testimony against the Sins and Sinners, (London, 1675), hereafter referred to as One Come from the Dead. This publication consists of two sermons, one against drunkenness and one against ‘whoremongers and adulterers’. Internal evidence suggests that the sermon against drunkards was probably composed while he was still at Cambridge, but it reveals his preaching style and may have been repeated at Leeds.
146 WYAS (L) WYL 178/1, Pawson MSS, f. 69, (Harrison appeal for Todd). The reason for Todd’s censure is revealed in Durham Cathedral Library Archive, Hunter MSS. vol. 9, item 12, 17, 18. Todd would later be part of a revived preaching exercise in the area (1641/2), as revealed in WYAS (B): WYB 263.
148 BL Add MS 4275, f. 270.
true Church, and he proceeded to do this using the same sort of scriptural proofs that were found in progressive Protestant sermons of the time. In contradiction to this, there is some evidence that in the late 1630s, Harrison flirted briefly with the Laudian regime, as he received a flattering letter from a Laudian cleric, William Brough, who congratulated him for building St John’s chapel and suggested it was an intrinsically holy place. His association with Brough aside, however, Harrison appears to have held Calvinist beliefs and his piety was centred on hearing the Word preached, not ceremony or ritual. That he sustained a prolonged conflict with a Calvinist preacher, therefore, presents an interesting problem for the dynamics of religious identity, and looking deeper into their disagreement should be revealing.

**Preaching style**

Three of Cooke’s sermons survive in the form of detailed notes taken at the Halifax Exercise by another preacher there, Elkanah Wales. The self-selecting audience at the exercise were likely to be committed and informed progressive Protestants, so the preachers could expound on matters and doctrines that were less suited to the parish pulpit. The exercise worked systematically through the Pauline letters of the New Testament, with each preacher taking one or two verses sequentially for their text. The doctrine and use format was used, along with questions and answers, or objections and reasons, so the sermons were both educational and exhortatory.

The first recorded sermon by Cooke dates from shortly after he became Vicar of Leeds. At this time, the exercise was working its way through Paul’s first letter to Timothy, which dealt with the law and who should be permitted to teach the gospel. This was a very apt subject for Cooke, given his recent experience of the advowson dispute, and he used his exposition on the text 1 Tim. 1: 13, ‘whereas before I was a blasphemer’ to make several points. Firstly he stated that ministers should have a calling and ‘a man, therefore may not choose a wicked man for a minister, lay hands on no man suddenly’. An essential duty of a preacher was to make men feel their sins, and Cooke condemned those ministers who did not do this, but ‘let them hardly think their state damnable, but not desperate’, along with those who installed such ministers. Here, Cooke was following the lead of
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149 ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 2r.
150 Ralph Thoresby’s transcript of Elkanah Wales’ sermon notes survive in the fly-leaves of the printed book, *Pope Joan*, at York Minster Library, Special Collections, shelf mark: Y/CMA 115.9 COO. Wales’ original sermon notes are in two volumes in the BL: Add MS 4933 a, b.
151 For more on this, see Hunt, *Art of Hearing* p. 252.
152 This sermon must have been given before 1619, as Mr Boyse is noted as preaching a sermon later in the list and Boyse died in that year.
John Favour, who instructed that ‘a minister must not be so gentle as to slide over the peoples sins’.  

Cooke expanded on the prevalence of sin in subsequent sermons. When preaching on Rom. 5: 18,19, which concerned original sin, Cooke told his listeners to be vigilant as, ‘All men have that in them by nature wch is truly and properly sin, Adams sin, actual before he have wit to do good or evil, he is ill’. He dwelt particularly on the sin of ignorance, and insisted that those who were ignorant due to their ill-attendance at sermons would be damned. It was also not enough to avoid doing wrong, believers must be wary of the sin of omission, ‘flee will, do good, forebearance of evill is but one part of our duty. Sin of omission is as ill as sin of commission. He that layst his talent in a napkin was condemned’. When preaching on Rom. 6: 12,13, which concerned original sin, Cooke insisted ‘even in the best and honestest men, there is sin, a fountain of sin, he takes order that it do not reigne though it be there’.

There is indirect evidence that Cooke did not tone down his efforts to force listeners to acknowledge their sinfulness when back in his own pulpit in Leeds. In his Star Chamber suit, John Metcalf recounted how Cooke had called his parishioners ‘irreligious atheists, whoremasters, drunkards, epicures, infidells, and abbey lubbers’. 154 Cooke defended himself with the justification that it was his duty to point out to ‘diverse of the said parish their loose and disordered course of life’, echoing the stance of his sermon on Timothy. John Walker also complained about Cooke’s preaching style, with his ‘Protestant’ (Harrison) complaining to the ‘Puritan’ (Cooke) that

thou preachest long sermons, and often: therein I blame thee not: it is the manner only that marres all . . . thou preachest Christ in accusing and condemning judgements with a fiery spirit of iniquity. And heere thou makest the verie fiery of heaven to shake. 155

Walker directly addressed Cooke’s particularising during sermons

witnes the words of our perverse precisions, who not contented by division at their newe moones, commonly called exercises, to say in ye open pulpit, they must not preach – as some do – but by the Lawe, Lay mens sinnes more close unto them. 156

Walker here was criticising the transfer of the style of preaching used at exercises to the ‘open pulpit’ of parish preaching. He accused Cooke of ‘powring in the in the wine of Gods judgements,
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153 BL: Add MS, A4933 a,b.
155 English Pharise, p. 16, 124–8, 83.
156 ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 42r.
reserving the oyle of Gods mercies unto thy self’. Instead, Walker stated, a true teacher of Christ would use humble, meek and patient words. His later work continued this theme, as he complained about the reaction of Cooke and his followers to such gentle preaching,

but if any minister of the Gospel . . . chance but to preach the mercies of God amongst this holy companie forsooth, even then at his coming downe out of the pulpitt, they, [Cooke’s followers] threaten and despite him, as rich men do the pore: they most solemnly avowe he shall never preach where they domenire anymore.

Walker held scripture in high regard and considered Cooke’s style of preaching to not pay enough respect to the Word. He recounted an instance when

A Puritan preacher who desired to preach in the place of a reformed Minister was answered that, if he had an intent to preach Christ crucified, he should be welcome, otherwise not. Whereupon the Puritan plucked a penned sermon out of his bosome and desired his friend to read it and so he did. Without doubt he, finding no doctrine tending to his text, told him another text in such a place would be more agreeable to ye matter in hand. ‘Why?’ saith the Puritan, ‘if it please you I will preach my sermon upon that text you appoint me’. Now, here’s the jest, that the Puritan preachers, through the pride of their own imaginations, should become so idle as to think their railing sermon should fit any parte of the Bible.

In other words, Walker accused ‘Puritan’ preachers of Cooke’s ilk of thinking more of their own skill and fluency in preaching than honouring the words of scripture and staying close to the text in their exegesis. This, according to Walker, was a form of idolatry, with the ‘Puritan’ ‘setting up an idol of thy owne imagination’ with his impassioned, extemporary preaching, playing fast and loose with scripture.

Walker’s views are almost exactly mirrored in Harrison’s hand written notes in which he expressed his own views on preaching. The notes are disjointed with much crossing out and restarting, as Harrison struggled to find the scriptural words to express his views, slightly paraphrased for legibility they read,

if I was able to worship at Gods sanctuary I might have liberty to make choice of my minister, I would not chose an angrey Jonah whose sermon must be long, . . .[Jonah 3:4], the same man desires to be contentious and bold of his performing to defend the . . . over against his creator [Jonah 4:9]. . .

158 ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 42r.
159 Idem. f. 48.
160 English Pharisee, p. 80. The accusation is repeated on p. 116.
But I would choose a mild and gracious Isaac who will teach his auditors that the clay must not contrast with its maker [Isa:45:9]. But submitt to his will saving naught nor be such the converse [Isa: 64:8, 9]. . . .

Neither would I chose one who would spend his hour upon the curses against Canaan and pass by the blessings of Sion, [Jacob : 9: 25: 26], who would turn every Lords day to an ashwedeness by repeating the curses of Mount Ebal and neglecting the blessings of Mount Gerizim [27:12]. . . .

Neither would I choose an high pres[es]ed son of thunder who would ere and ever be caling for the fork of . . . to dig upp the waters of Marah . . . I would not choose a man who with his wynd can erod the mountains and tear the earth and never appear with a still and soft voyce [Kings: 19:11] . . .

But I would choose a she[p]herd who in immitation of that good shephard will lay downe his life for his sheepe and lead them to greene pastures’. . . 161

Harrison’s ideal preacher was not arrogant, and balanced the damning of sin with a message of salvation. Cooke clearly did not fit the bill for Harrison’s preferred style of preaching, but did other progressive Protestant ministers? An obvious place to look might be the preacher Harrison installed at St John’s, Robert Todd. Todd had a reputation as ‘a great textuary and very scriptural preacher’, so possibly refrained from the extempore preaching that Walker/Harrison found so deplorable in Cooke. Unfortunately, the only surviving notes of Todd’s sermons are from the substantially later period of 1641, and these are not extensive enough to say much about his preaching style.162

Another preacher, however, appears to offer a close fit with Harrison’s preferences. Richard Garbutt arrived in Leeds in 1625 to fill the position of parish lecturer as Cooke was aging and unable to preach twice a day. Garbutt lived as a member of Harrison’s household for some time on his arrival and so a concordance in religious views between host and minister can be assumed. Garbutt employed a ‘painful’ (painstaking) approach to preaching, in which ‘his Matter came from him with much gravity, earnestness, Seriousness, and Weightiness of Spirit’. He had taken a vow to not seek worldly advancement while still at Cambridge and his will shows him to be very humble.163 All this

161 BL: Add MS 4275, f. 270.

162 Bryan Dale, Yorkshire Puritanism and Early Nonconformity, Illustrated in the Lives of the Ejected Ministers 1660 and 1662 (Bradford, 1909), p. 156; WYAS (B): WYB263. These sermon notes are in the same (almost illegible) hand as the ‘Otley’ Sermon notes in the archives of Otley Parish Church. Todd’s sermon was given 17 November 1641.

163 Garbutt’s vow of humility, arrival in Leeds, residency with Harrison and preaching style are all mentioned in the preface to One Come from the Dead. Garbutt wrote the vow out in his own hand in a
suggests that Garbutt’s style of preaching was far from extempore. He preached pointedly against sin, as seen in his sermon against drunkenness in which he called drunkards ‘the children of the devil’, and ‘egregiously, notoriously, diabolically naught’. However, he balanced this admonitory tone with preaching on the comfort of salvation. In his sermon treatise, *A Demonstration of the Resurrection of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, he set out to prove that the resurrection was a certainty, and that Christians need not fear death nor grieve for loved ones. As Christ had risen, so would his members,

First, that Christ is risen. Secondly, not so only, but risen as the first fruits, to sanctifie and hallow unto his father all the faithful that sleep in Christ, assuring the by his Resurrection, of their blessed Resurrection at last too.

Garbutt, therefore appeared to strike the balance between condemnation and comfort, as desired by Harrison.

**Handling of predestination**

Both sides in the conflict were Calvinists and subscribed to the doctrine of predestination, but they disagreed in how this should be handled in this life. At various points in his works, Walker revealed his Calvinism, making reference to the decrees of regeneration, adoption and sanctification. However, he did not see benefit in probing the implications of predestination too far. Cooke, on the other hand, espoused a more experimental Calvinism, which attempted to detect God’s decrees of election and reprobation in this life. In his sermon on Romans 5: 18, 19 at the Halifax Exercise, Cooke preached on the powerlessness of man to change his status as elect or damned, noting it was a great query betwixt papists and us, whether a man be justified by a right in himself, or wrought by him, or by the right of Christ communicated and imputed to us? Papists say the former, we the later.

Cooke set out the doctrine of limited atonement. He set up the question and answer,
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notebook of 1620, see BL: Sloane MSS, 3787, f. 2; Bl: wills in the York Registry, vol. 41, f. 374. Garbutt’s 1630 will states that ‘he would have no thinge provided for his funeral but wine and some cake’.

164 *One Come from the Dead* pp. 86–90.


166 *English Pharise*, p. 170.
Whether all that have benefit of Christ, be as many as those yt have life by Adam? No. Only the elect which have faith: hence learne that justification of life is not for all, was never intended to save all, but only those yt received the Word of God by faith, but all have not faith.\textsuperscript{167}

This was standard Reformed doctrine of limited atonement, but most preachers were circumspect in how they handled it for their auditories. In the self-selecting auditory of the Halifax Exercise, such an explicit handling was acceptable, however, it seems that Cooke did not adapt his tone when back in his parish. In fact, the evidence points to him encouraging the view that the elect could be identified in this life. Metcalf’s complaint to Star Chamber accused Cooke of holding private conventicles and breaking off in mid-service and dismissing the bulk of the parishioners, before continuing to preach only to a select band of followers.\textsuperscript{168} Thus, a semi-separatist group was emerging within the parish under his ministry. Walker considered Cooke to have arrogated to himself knowledge of who was saved and who was not, and this was something that only God could know. Walker depicted Cooke as guilty of pulling ‘that peculiar rod forth of Gods owne hands’.\textsuperscript{169} In his later work, Walker was even more condemning of this judgement. For him, Cooke’s group of followers ‘judge all sortes of people damned, only their owne sect excepted . . . [and were] so farr void of shame, as that in their common speeches, some of them blush not to say they can point out such as shall be saved or dammed. The worrying aspect from Walker’s point of view was that such a belief was spreading, as ‘infinite multitudes . . . [were] dayly withdraw[n]’ into this behaviour.\textsuperscript{170}

Preachers invited to the parish by Cooke also displayed a tendency to declare the fate of a human soul. As shown in chapter three, preachers were encouraged to be mobile and visit other parishes to deliver sermons. Cooke’s fame as a preacher attracted others to the town, as the libel against Harrison celebrates

\begin{verbatim}
Did not many preachers both learned and wise
Oft resort hither and devise
To make us love and not despise
Our pastor and teacher good neighbours . . .\textsuperscript{171}
\end{verbatim}

The arrival of visiting preachers could spark underlying tensions into open dispute. Walker recounted an occasion when a preacher, visiting at Cooke’s invitation, explicitly expressed an opinion about the

\textsuperscript{167} ‘YML Cooke sermon notes’.
\textsuperscript{168} NA: STAC 8/215/6.
\textsuperscript{169} \textit{English Pharise}, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{170} ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 40v; \textit{English Pharisee}, Epistle Dedicatorie.
\textsuperscript{171} NA: STAC 8/176/27.
eternal fate of a biblical character. Walker was outraged that the preacher ‘affirmed before the company of many hundred persons, that this yong man is a damned soule in Hell’. A churchwarden had the same reaction as Walker and demanded to see the preacher’s licence, only to be insultingly called ‘a cadaverous knave’ by the preacher from the pulpit. Harrison’s anger at the preaching of Cooke and his colleagues was referenced in the verse of the libel, which pilloried Harrison’s religious pretensions,

But since note you are all overrunne
I’le leave you to the vicar of hartburne
And goe to Poules and there take a turne
Meane tyme bee more wise good neighbours . . .

So, if Walker and Harrison abhorred the preaching of so stark a predestinarian message, was there an alternative within Leeds? The notes of Todd’s 1641 sermon appear to take doctrine of limited atonement a step further than Cooke, as he insisted that ‘not all who say they believe are called . . . an effectual vocation presupposed a vocation’. This suggested that the elect was an even narrower grouping than those who had faith. In fact, by 1641, after many years of Laudian dominance in the Church, Todd was advocating separatism, identifying the elect as ‘such a one yt separates from ye church to Christ and really unites’. For Harrison, who had already fallen out with Todd by then, such separation was an anathema. He wrote a letter of reproof to Todd, in which he censured ‘may not ambition, covetousness, or the like things alter you from what you have formerly been’, which implies that the curate had undergone a change in his style of ministry from when Harrison first nominated him to the chapel. The Todd of 1641 was not a preacher to Harrison’s tastes.

In contrast, Richard Garbutt again appears to fit with Harrison’s preferred stance on the preaching of predestination and salvation. Garbutt was involved with a development in Calvinism known as Hypothetical Universalism. His mentor at Cambridge had been Samuel Ward, and Garbutt had travelled with him to the Synod of Dort, where the hypothetical universalist formula was
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172 English Pharise, p. 97. The visitor was preaching on Mark 10: 21, in which verse a young man asked Christ the way to eternal life.

173 Ibid.

174 WYAS (B): WYB263.

175 Whitaker, Loidis, appendix, ‘Harrison’s sayings’ and letter to Mr Todd, pp. 10–12.
presented by Calvinists as a way of reaching out to the Arminians.\textsuperscript{176} This throttled back form of Calvinism, which held that, hypothetically, Christ’s sacrifice was for all men, also placed more emphasis on mans’ actions, although salvation was still entirely at the will of God. Significantly, Hypothetical Universalism also held that, theoretically, the elect could fall from grace. This meant that no one could be sure who was among the elect and God’s people on earth were potentially coterminous with the national, public Church, rather than a visible, self-separating minority. Like any Calvinist, Garbutt described humanity as made up of the saints and worldlings in his sermons and treatises.\textsuperscript{177} However, he did not dwell too deeply on the vexed point of who belonged to each group. In his work on the resurrection, he hinted at a universalist theology, recalling that the Apostles had been filled with ‘Grace of tenderest love and affection to the salvation, if they could, of the whole world’.\textsuperscript{178} He compared the Church and God to a field containing both good corn and weeds, and exhorted his ‘beloved’ to belong to the former. He comforted them with the assurance that

\begin{quote}
a good Faith, and a good Conscience, will not fear that which it knows can neither hold it, nor hurt it; it knows that Christ is risen as the first fruits; and it knows that it belongs to those first fruits.\textsuperscript{179}
\end{quote}

Again, in his exposition against drunkards and whoremongers, Garbutt dwelt upon the split between the children of God and the children of the Devil. Inclusion as one of the former was signalled by being of ‘good conscience’, and widely accepted norms of good behaviour. He elaborated,

\begin{quote}
They [the Worldlings] count it strange (sayes the Apostle) that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot. And the saint on the contrary thinks it as strange that the Worldling does in many things that he does, that he is so loose laced and gives himself that scope and liberty in many things as he does, that he can run fearlessly run into that excess of riot, in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquettings, &c.\textsuperscript{180}
\end{quote}


Anthony Milton goes as far as to claim that English Reformed Protestants were uneasy about classifying themselves as Calvinists, \textit{Catholic and Reformed}, p. 407.

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{A Demonstration of the Resurrection}, pp. 143–6; \textit{One Come from the Dead}, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Idem.} p. 51, see also references to universality on p. 112.

\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Idem.} p. 154.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{One Come from the Dead}, p. 13.
Garbutt was also careful to distinguish between those who occasionally became drunk, citing Noah and Lot as examples, and the habitual drunkard, who was the child of the Devil. Garbutt was therefore fairly broad and inclusive on those who had a ‘good conscience’, and any respectable, moderately pious, self-regulating Protestant would find themselves on the right side of his divide. John Harrison would certainly have counted himself among such a group, whereas Cooke had made entry into the circle of virtue dependent upon behaviours that separated a minority out from this broader swath of the ‘good’, creating a new community outside of the parish. In fact, what we see here is a conflict between broad and narrow versions of godly identity.

Furthermore, Garbutt was highly critical of separatism. His sermon, *A Preservative Against Judgements* was preached in Leeds during a time of plague.\(^{181}\) The language strongly calls for unity in the parish, denouncing schism and faction. He included all parishioners in the need for reform, exhorting, ‘let us forsake, every one of us, those sins’. He illustrated the wrong doing that was schism with the biblical example of Corah, Dathan and Abiram, who rebelled against Moses and Aaron and who ‘took too much upon themeselves . . . they think themselves too good to be under any, they are first here in a schism, first in a faction, they might if they would be Princes of the Assembly’.\(^{182}\) He quoted the words of Moses in response to their challenge,

> Ye take too much upon you, ye Sons of Levi; what seemeth it but a small thing unto you, that God hath separated you from the rest of the Congregation, to bring you near to himself, to do his service in the Tabernacle, but seek you the Priesthood also?\(^{183}\)

Thus it seems that Garbutt was working to pull Cooke’s faction back into line, even during the elderly vicar’s lifetime.\(^{184}\)

Peter Lake and Anthony Milton have observed that there was an ‘increasing process of elaboration and diversification in English Calvinists’ from 1590 onwards.\(^{185}\) They have focused on high level theological debates, but this study shows that a similar divergence was happening at grassroots level too. Preachers in Leeds, while operating within the broad umbrella of Calvinism, chose to interpret the doctrine of predestination in different ways and this had different outcomes for a sense of godly identity and community. The sort of Calvinist preaching preferred by Garbutt could be as unifying as that by Cooke tended towards separatism. Garbutt managed to restore the
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\(^{181}\) *A Preservative Against Judgements*. This sermon by Garbutt, delivered in Leeds, was appended to the 1669 edition of *A Demonstration of the Resurrection*.

\(^{182}\) *Preservative Against Judgements*, pp. 215, 170.

\(^{183}\) *Idem*. p. 171.

\(^{184}\) Cooke’s final printed work was published in 1625; he died in 1632.

\(^{185}\) Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 412–26; Lake, ‘Calvinism and the English Church’, p. 44.
circle of virtue as potentially coterminous with the parish, after Cooke’s attempts to redraw the boundary of godly identity on a narrower scale. Their different approaches were underpinned by divergent ideas about the legitimisation of authority.

**Ideas of authority**

The traditional conceptualisation of authority was built on an idealised hierarchy that flowed down from the Crown, through the magistrate, father, husband and employer, all in their allotted places and callings.\(^{186}\) The hierarchy of the Church was integrated with this and the subversion of religion and subversion of government were seen as the same thing.\(^{187}\) This hierarchical scheme was tempered by the normative idea that obedience by the subordinated party was reciprocated by a demonstration of good lordship and charity by those in power.\(^{188}\) The literature of the day commonly complained that this relationship and wider customary values, such as hospitality, were breaking down, leading to threats of disorder. Felicity Heal points out that ‘by the first decade of the seventeenth century it seems that any writer on society who did not allude . . . to the decay of hospitality, was failing to observe one of the conventions of the genre’.\(^{189}\) However, there were certainly real stresses in early seventeenth century Leeds, leading to what Robert Tittler describes as a ‘vividly perceived threat to social stability wrought by the rapidity of social and economic change’.\(^{190}\) The old manorial structure of governance in Leeds was inadequate to cope with a rapidly increasing population. Since the middle years of Elizabeth’s reign, there had been petitions for the

---


town to be incorporated, and this would finally happen in 1626.\(^191\) As already mentioned, there was discord within the cloth industry, as the larger merchants sought to control the quality of wool and cloth traded in the town in their campaign for Leeds to achieve the wool staple.\(^192\) This proved unpopular with the smaller traders and cloth workers who accused the merchants of engrossing wool and controlling the trade for their own ends.\(^193\) While it would be crudely deterministic to interpret religious strife as an expression of social and political issues, in this stressful, rapidly changing environment, any dispute would inevitably use the language of idealised order. Preaching, as a key means by which ideas were communicated, could either bolster the traditional view of order and authority, or, as happened with Cooke, it could challenge it.

In the midst of all the stresses affecting Leeds, Harrison was emerging as a public office holder within the traditional hierarchy of authority. He had been made Chief Constable of Skyrack and held a part of the lease of the bailiwick of Leeds. He was also in the process of becoming a substantial land-holder.\(^194\) In his Star Chamber Suit, Harrison made an appeal to the Crown to support his position against Cooke and his supporters. He emphasised the risks of ‘sedition, discord and debate’ in the spreading of libels, thereby aligning himself with the forces of order in the form of the Crown.\(^195\) Likewise, Walker dedicated ‘The English Hipochritte’ to King James, that he might ‘stand in the gap for god, for the comfort of his church’ and protect it from the damaging influence of ‘Puritans’.\(^196\) Walker saw Cooke and his followers as a threat to traditional authority, both ecclesiastical and civil. Their non-conformity with the rites and ceremonies of the Church and their semi-separation from their fellow parishioners was taken as symptomatic of a more general


\(^{193}\) See petitions in note 142, p. 124.

\(^{194}\) NA: STAC 8/167/27; WYAS (L): WYL160/213/49 (1612) and WYL/160/215/54 (1622). In these deeds, Harrison, Metcalf and Ingram divided the bailiwick between themselves.

\(^{195}\) Walker’s 1621 manuscript work, *The English Hipochritte* was dedicated to the King. For a discussion on the equation of libels with sedition, see Alastair Belamy, ‘Raylinge Rymes and vaunting verse’: Libellous politics in early Stuart England, 1603–1628’ in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Basingstoke, 1994).

disobedience. The ‘Puritan’ of his books was accused of ‘transcending himself above all power, striving against principalities and powers, speaking against dignities, and not paying taxes’. Walker made reference to Cooke’s disregard of the royal sanction given in the ‘Book of Sports’ when he had attempted to prevent rush-bearing festivities on St Bartholomew’s day in 1619. Walker asserted

there is a time to laugh and a time to leape or dance . . . yet notwithstanding, even against this lawfull edict where it is not used upon ye Saboth day, but only upon som other holy day, such is the pvercenes of our pressions [perversness of our precisions] as not contented.\(^{197}\)

Metcalf’s Star Chamber complaint tells how children in the rush-bearing party carried royal portraits, making a pointed reference to the Crown’s sanction of their festivities.\(^{198}\) Walker called for the disobedient ‘Puritans’ to submit themselves to the king, as ‘supreme head and governor over all causes ecclesiastical, as civil’ and quoted St Peter’s instructions that ministers should ‘submit yourselves unto all manner ordinance of man’.\(^{199}\) Thus the ‘Crown’ held a multiple significance as the metonym of the whole superstructure of order and hierarchical authority, as a symbol that could be used to legitimatisen local actions, and as a body to which appeals could be made concerning order. How these ideas about the Crown informed Harrison’s configuration of his chapel will be discussed below.

Sermons delivered at the Halifax Exercise did not entirely negate the traditional view of order and authority, but they promoted a ‘higher register’ of authority above this, based upon righteousness. The leader of the exercise, John Favour, was very interested in how the moral law was applied and selected the first letter of Paul to Timothy for the Exercise to work through in order to tackle this. Favour himself preached on verse eight, ‘the law is good if man use it lawfully’. In his sermon he made it clear that the civil law should follow the moral law and stated that ‘Doctors of Law should lay an imputation against him yt in ther psons vilified the law’.\(^{200}\) Mr Gosnal preached on 1 Tim. 5: 20, which dealt with the rebuking of ‘elders’. Gosnal’s rendering of ‘elders’ slipped between chronologically older persons and those in positions of power within the Church. Gosnal exploited this ambiguity, and he clearly had both the ecclesiastical and civil hierarchy in his sights when he referred to the text in which King David was subjected to Nathan’s reproof, and when Herod was
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\(^{197}\) ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 12v.

\(^{198}\) Peter Lake states that ‘puritans’ were seen to represent a popularity that was anti-monarchical. Peter Lake, ‘Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice’, in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, (eds), Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 95.

\(^{199}\) English Pharise, p. 27.

\(^{200}\) BL: Add MS 4933b, f. 162v. Favour held a doctorate in the civil law.
rebuked by John the Baptist. He opined, ‘one Elder must proceed with another, yea an inferior with a superior . . . but elders cannot endure to heare their faults touched’. Another participant in the Exercise, John Barlow, the stipendiary lecturer at Halifax, clearly held social position in lower regard than virtue, as he had previously preached in a funeral sermon for a pious woman that ‘she, in respect of her birth and pedigree, shall of me receive no praise . . . we are all of one blood . . . and they are most honourably descended that are borne againe by the word and spirit’. These messages suggest that the views on authority expounded at the Halifax Exercise may have been more radical than has previously been proposed.

In preaching on Romans 5: 18,19, at the exercise, Cooke took this radicalism a step further and clearly set out an alternative scheme of authority, based on righteousness,

There is a justice in law when law cannot proceed against a man, though in quality not just, as if a malefactor have gotten a pardon, thus a man pardoned, acquitted from Sin etc. . . . is just in law, before God. Yet we hold there must be an inherent righteousness, no man ever justified, but he was really sanctified, faith purifyeth the heart, we hold a necessity of inherent Righteousnesse.

Thus, Cooke questioned the authority of the civil justice system to pardon a man who was guilty in the eyes of God. Instead, the basis of authority, he proposed, should be righteousness.

Righteousness thus needed to be defined, and this was done by another preacher at the exercise, Anthony Nutter, who was the curate at Woodkirk, near Leeds, and chaplain to John Savile. Nutter extolled,

there is no way to gett to be righteous in god’s sight, but relying onely upon Christ . . . it may be such live civilly are not so ill as others, yet god will find much ill in us or those yt say we are justified by works.

Thus living a good life and doing good works was not the same as righteousness. Elkanah Wales of Pudsey, near Leeds, placed knowledge of the Word as central to righteousness, ‘gett knowledge of

---


203 The view of the Halifax Exercise as a conservative institution was advanced by Newton in his PhD, ‘Puritans in the Diocese of York’, and Como in Blown by the Spirit, ch. 8.

204 ‘YML Cooke sermon notes’. My reading of this quote assumes an outraged, incredulous tone to the first sentence, rather than Cooke stating this situation as normative.

205 BL: Add MS 4933b, f. 180r.
righteousness, how can we do it except we know it . . . this we must seek out of the word’.

Therefore, righteousness came only from God, but God revealed himself to man on earth only as the Word, and the Word was unfolded by the preacher. This placed the preacher at a key place in a scheme of authority that made no mention of official hierarchies, civil justice, worthiness and good works. The findings point to the Halifax Exercise not being quite the force for conservatism that Newton and Come have presented it to be.

Cross-referencing with Walker’s *English Pharise* reveals an instance that may have informed Cooke’s criticism of civil authority. Walker recounted an event in which a constable (representing civil authority) thwarted a ‘Puritan’. The ‘Puritan’ was determined to arrest an unnamed ‘poor man’ for an unspecified offence, and made several unsuccessful attempts to do so. This resulted in the ‘poor man’ travelling to London to obtain a pardon, or a *Supersedeas* from the courts there. As he returned to Leeds, the ‘Puritan’ was waiting to arrest him again, but a constable was conveniently on hand to intervene and notice that the ‘poor man’ was in possession of the pardon, which nullified the ‘Puritan’s warrant. Harrison, as the Chief Constable at this time, would have been instrumental in the constable’s timely presence, as could Robert Benson, a lawyer and another member of the anti-Cooke party. In fact, the libel against Harrison refers to their co-operation, mocking Harrison that he ‘sent Robin Benson to London in poste, and for his news you were at great cost’. This shows how Harrison, and others on his side in the conflict, saw value in legal rulings as sufficient in themselves. Meanwhile, Cooke and his followers deplored such morally neutral legalism. Such actions were considered by Cooke to be a continuation of the advowson dispute that Harrison would not allow to rest.

Another threat to traditional order presented in Walker’s books was extra parochial meetings for preaching, particularly as they provided a chance to speak publicly for those who would not normally have a voice. Walker claimed that Cooke and his supporters gathered ‘to the number of an hundred, or more, or lesse . . . . multitudes become publick speakers in the Church’. This was judged by the author as against the rule of both ‘god and man’, especially as he considered such speakers to be ‘pregnant wits of indiscretion’. Walker went further in his attack on extra-parochial preaching, deploying a host of literary motifs of disorder, darkness and feminisation. Such preachers were accused of creeping into houses after dark, for dark sermons concerning dark doctrine, ‘when all
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206 BL: Add MS 4932, Sermons of Elkanah Wales, f. 156v.


208 *English Pharise*, p. 76. John Walker described himself as a ‘poore man’ in his introduction, so the ‘poore man’ in the story may have been himself, acting under the protection of Harrison. This story echoes a mention in the libel against Harrison that ‘sent Robin Benson to London in poste’.
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honest men in the towne are in bed’. Walker also portrayed sexual deviance as the inevitable outcome of female mobility and travel to hear preachers, highlighting the case of a woman who travelled ‘tenne miles or more to heare thee speake’ and soon afterwards was found to be pregnant with her brother’s child.209

The basis of Walker’s (and therefore Harrison’s) loathing for extra-parochial preaching is that it led to schism and separation, which were abhorrent to one who cherished a national Church as part of the great hierarchy of order. To form a religious group outside of the parish was to sever links between the Church and Crown.210 Walker used the term ‘common communitie’ to describe the group made up of ‘Puritans’, indicating that they had formed a recognisable community through their religious practices.211 This community was signalled in various ways, such as the wearing of hats in church and refusing to kneel during prayer. William Kay, who was the chief composer of the libel against Harrison, and one of the feofees for the advowson, was presented for wearing his hat in church in 1633, along with at least ten others.212 Walker’s, and by inference, Harrison’s, concern may have been exacerbated by the emergence of a separatist group in the neighbouring chapel of Woodkirk, home to Sir John Savile. Ecclesiastical court records show that lay people preached at the Woodkirk conventicle, and the group that had formed around Cooke may have been perceived to be on a continuum with these separatists.213

The same ideals of order that Walker used to attack ‘Puritans’ were turned against Harrison by Cooke’s supporters. The libel presented Harrison as a buffoon dazzled by his public office and ridiculed his social ambition and pomp as one who ‘walkes and proudly sitte that all may see and cye him’. The libel made reference to Harrison’s official roles as Chief Constable and Bailiff, mocking that ‘an ape [was] an ape, though [he] were a guilt badge’. Harrison’s lack of social finesse was noted by the libellers, with his choice of uneducated friends and vocabulary mocked, so that he was compared to a comic figure from the London stage, Doctor Dodepoll, and

209 *English Pharise*, p. 102–5, 13. Walker also linked ‘Puritans’ with madness, uncertain or concealed identity and sturdy beggars. He compared them to wandering stars, or comets, which were symbols of disorder.


211 ‘English Hipochritte’, f. 11r.

212 WYAS (L): RDP 68/20/A10; BI: V1633, CB, f. 85rv. Jonathan Murray incorrectly identified Harrison among the hat wearers, as one of them was named John Harrison, but the court scribe was careful to add the suffix ‘de Burley’ to this. The anti-Calvinist Bishop, Samuel Harsnet, had issued an order against the wearing of hats in church in 1629, Kenneth Fincham, (ed.) *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church Vol. 2* (Woodbridge, 1997), p. 35.

213 BI: CP.H. 4912.
Hee that hath got some store of land
Would govern all a town
And yet’s ill bred and manners wante
A knave a very clowne

The libel also accused Harrison of disreputable methods of obtaining land,

Hee that byes lands and purchance
Gette by deceipte and shift
And useth cunninge not to paye
With nought but tricks and drift.

This was more than a literary device and refers to real incidents in Leeds at this time. A third complaint to the Star Chamber reveals a less attractive side to Harrison’s character. Richard Gaile was a cousin of Cooke. He was a clothier who also had occupation of some disputed parcels of land in Hunslet, Leeds. Christopher Pawson had a rival claim to the land, and in 1620, he sold a lease for the land to Harrison, following which, according to Gaile, Harrison had ‘grievously threatened to undo your subject [Gaile] and to breake his back’ unless Gaile left the land. Subsequently, an armed band made up of the Pawson family and others arrived at the disputed land and tried to forcibly remove Gaile’s wife, allegedly beating her in the process. When Pawson came to give his demurrer to the court, he claimed to have been acting in a purely legal manner, with a warrant from the High Sheriff of Yorkshire against Mrs Gaile for trespass. He also emphasised that he was acting under the instructions of Harrison, and insisted that ‘the said John Harrison [was neither] to have or receive any benefit or profit either by the said lease or by the said suit, but his name is used in trust according to the usual forme and manner of proceeding’. The use of civil office and manorial officers on behalf of Harrison’s interest is notable here, and points to co-ordination between Harrison and John Metcalf and Sir Arthur Ingram. Ingram was part of a political grouping opposed to Sir John Savile, Cooke’s supporter. Metcalf and Harrison had taken on the lease of the bailiwick of Leeds in 1607 and had then sold part of the rights to Ingram in 1612. They had both retained official roles with the bailiwick, such as Metcalf’s right to collect the market tolls, and could therefore mobilise the lesser manorial officers, such as Pawson, who was a deputy grave, and John Sawer, who was a...

\(^{214}\) NA: STAC 8/167/27.

\(^{215}\) NA: STAC 8/158/21. The parish registers show that Richard Gaile was cousin to Alexander Cooke. (Gaile was Cooke’s birth name), S. Margerison, (ed.) Leeds Parish Church Registers, 1572–1612, Thoresby Society 1 (Leeds, 1891).
deputy bailiff. Harrison was Chief Constable of Skyrack, Metcalf was High Constable of Leeds and Ingram was High Sheriff of Yorkshire. So between them, they had a grip on the public enforcement of justice in the area, hence they had acquired the trespass warrant and the band of officers to carry it out.

This suit shows how Harrison operated at arms’ length to cause upset to the relatives of Alexander Cooke, and the pro-Cooke libellers observed what seemed to them to be the misuse of office, and lack of ‘good lordship’. Harrison was presented as an example of all that was wrong with authority based on civil role, acting within the law, but for his own ends and with little moral virtue. This was exactly the sort of behaviour excoriated by Cooke in his sermon on Romans. 5: 18,19.

Enmity between preachers and magistrates was not inevitable; in fact they frequently cooperated to maintain social order. This co-operation can be seen in Cooke’s successor, Richard Garbutt, whose sermon, A Preservative against Judgements, was an echo of Walker’s own views on hierarchical order. The sermon opened with a discourse on the rebellion against Moses and Aaron in the Old Testament, and proclaimed there was ‘no spirit prouder commonly than the spirit of Equality, the Spirit of Parity’. Such a call was considered to mask the true ambition of the lowly to have superiority over their betters, as ‘for all their fair words of parity, they longed for the High Priests garments on their own backs’. He used the metaphor of the fir tree wanting the Cedar to be cut down to its size to illustrate his point. He demanded that all should show obedience to the magistrate and extolled the benefits of monarchy, presenting the king’s ruling power as necessary for the peace in which people could carry out their lives and business. Garbutt also expressed the reciprocal duties of this hierarchical scheme, reminding his listeners about the ‘duties of children to parents, and parents to children, and in generall of all inferiours to superiors, and superiors to inferiors’. Garbutt’s preaching reflected a conservative support for order based on social and official position that chimed with Harrison’s views. This conceptualisation of authority would be reflected in the fabric of Harrison’s chapel.
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216 WYAS (L): WYL160/213/49, is a 1612 agreement between John Metcalf, John Harrison and Sir Arthur Ingram.
217 BI: V1619, CB, f. 33. Metcalf’s response to the visitation court reveals his status as High Constable.
218 A Preservative Against Judgements, pp. 171,2.
219 Ibid. p. 186.
220 One Come from the Dead, p. 44.
221 This preaching of the conservative social order had a long history, see Alan Fletcher, Preaching, Politics and Poetry in Late Medieval England (Dublin, 1998), p. 143.
The material fabric of St John’s Chapel

St John’s chapel can now be placed into the context of other churches in the area where preaching-centred worship was dominant, such as Halifax and Wakefield. As chapter one has shown, around the time that St John’s was completed, the churchwardens at Halifax installed a decorative interior at their church. Likewise, the churchwardens’ accounts for Wakefield show that they too installed a decorative interior, with a plasterwork ceiling, carved screen, and gilded font. They spent over £25 on painting the church. Both Halifax and Wakefield were parishes with a long preaching tradition, and they installed these decorative features with preaching ministers still in place. This comparison sets the embellished interior of St John’s into context: it was what a chapel created for preaching-centred worship looked like in the 1630s. As with Halifax and Wakefield, none of the decorative features contained figurative images that might be deemed overtly idolatrous. If Harrison’s favoured preacher, Garbutt, had survived to be installed at St John’s, as his successor was, he would not have been dismayed at such material expression in a place of worship. In one of his sermons, as part of his message concerning care for the ‘living temples of God’ (human bodies), he told his listeners that ‘filthiness and nastiness does not become the very material temples of God’.  

The impulse to beautify the place in which the Word was heard also fits with the high regard with which Walker, and by implication, Harrison, had for the sanctity of scripture. It is not surprising then, that Walker defended the actions of a minister who ‘submitted himself’ as he approached the pulpit. For Walker, the pulpit was a ‘place of sanctity’, which suggests he considered it to be holy in some way. This could be read as part of the reverencing of the Word as a sacred object. Harrison reflected this in the sumptuous decoration applied to the pulpit, with carved angels, eagles representing St John the Evangelist, fruit and floral carvings and crests. This study therefore proposes that St John’s is not a Laudian church, and that such a term should be used more restrictively.

Harrison’s view of religion and authority, hardened through the conflict with Cooke, can be seen in the material fabric of St John’s chapel. The puzzle of the imposing royal arms can now also be explained. Their construction in 1620 can be seen as part of Harrison’s campaign against the perceived threat to order he saw in Cooke’s preaching ministry and the semi-separatism that it encouraged. The arms were part of Harrison’s appeal to the Crown to support his case, as they were constructed just before he was about to take his suit to the Court of Star Chamber. In the same way that the anti-Cooke party had carried royal portraits during the rush-bearing events, Harrison had
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222 One Come from the Dead, pp. 43,4.
223 English Pharise p. 150.
the arms made to signify the Crown’s legitimisation of his position.\textsuperscript{224} It is possible that Harrison intended to install the arms in Leeds Parish Church, as Cooke’s influence was not absolute. Whether or not this happened, the macro-structure of St John’s appears to have been specifically designed to act as a framing device for the arms. The twin naves direct the eye to them, the father, King James, overlooking the north nave, the son, Prince Charles, overlooking the south. They are the closest object to the angels adorning the roof beams. The interior expresses the importance of the Crown to Harrison as a symbol of authority and order.

\textbf{Figure 16.} Twin Male faces on the west side of the screen at St John’s Chapel. Author’s own photograph, courtesy of the Churches Conservation Trust.

Below the Arms of King James, are two small, human faces (Figure 16). They are realistic representations of males in contemporary dress and have no signifiers of royalty. They look similar, but different. Given the dominant scheme of father and son above them, it is proposed that the heads represent Harrison’s father and himself. This interpretation is supported by other contemporary paired father and son imagery. There are twin male heads on the gentry pew at Rug chapel in Wales and on the panelling of the wall of the main living room at Chastleton House in Oxfordshire. The most famous contemporary father and son paired images is the portrait of William and Robert Cecil.\textsuperscript{225} The pairing of father and son was a way to show lineage and patronage. In 1601

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{224}] Cust, ‘Anti-Puritanism and Urban Politics’ discusses how factional parties appealed for royal support by presenting themselves as the only option for good order.
\item[\textsuperscript{225}] The double portrait of the Cecils is at Hatfield House, with thanks to Tara Hamling for pointing this out. The screen at Cartmel Parish Church, Cumbria, was also constructed in the 1630s. It bears a realistic male
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the elder Harrison had made the unprecedented gift of £10 to the poor in his will, and John Harrison had built on this charity with his various endowments, including the chapel itself.\textsuperscript{226} They reminded everyone that Harrison had a lineage of charitable giving.

The heads, however, performed another function; they were part of a visual mnemonic of authority. Peter McCullough proposes that the interior fabric of the Chapel Royal ‘distilled perfectly the theory that religious and political, ecclesiastical and civil were not only joined, but inseparable’. He asserts that the configuration of the Chapel Royal was designed to reinforce the idea that ‘God’s power and blessings were sent down upon a godly monarch, and through her or him given to the magistrates, while they in turn learned from the Word preached’.\textsuperscript{227} Similar notions were expressed in St John’s chapel. A series of angels, from the celestial to the grotesque, stand at the junction of the walls and roof, representing the space between heaven and earth. Immediately below this are the Royal Arms. The male heads are positioned below the arms of King James, marking the position of the magistrate receiving civil authority from the Crown. The heads face west, and their gaze is in line with the pulpit, both vertically and horizontally. This expressed Harrison’s sermon centred piety, as his image looked towards the pulpit, but, given his experience with Cooke, it was also was a reminder of the correct relationship between civil and ecclesiastical authority and the relationship between patron and preacher. Even as the preacher looked down upon his listeners, Harrison could symbolically look the preacher in the eye, or even slightly down on him.\textsuperscript{228} The pews below placed the whole congregation together, focused, at least to some degree, on the pulpit. This was the united, national Church promoted by Garbutt. St John’s was an articulation of the socio-religious position arrived at by Harrison through his dispute with Cooke, who died while it was being built. As

\textsuperscript{226} Cross, \textit{Urban Magistrates and Ministers}.


\textsuperscript{228} The faces are at an elevation of 10’, so would be eye to eye with the preacher in the pulpit (the rim of the pulpit presently stands at 8’, although its base has been altered). The political message of spatial configuration is pointed out by McCullough for the outdoor preaching place at Whitehall Palace, where it was important for the King to be sat ‘at very nearly the same level plane’ as the preacher. John King \textit{Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis} (Princeton, N.J., 1989), p. 164, quoted in McCullough, \textit{Sermons at Court}, p. 46.
it was being completed, Harrison was restored to what he felt was his rightful place in the religious landscape of Leeds. His nephew succeeded Cooke as Vicar and, in 1634, Harrison was finally named as one of the advowson trustees.\textsuperscript{229} His success would not last, but that, along with Harrison’s subsequent religious identity, is something to be dealt with elsewhere.

This chapter has shown how the style and message of preaching was a way in which religious identities were created. For most of the period between 1590, when a preaching ministry arrived in Leeds, and John Harrison completing his chapel in 1634, the boundary of godly identity was not so clearly defined that division in the local population resulted. John Harrison had no reason not to consider himself one of the godly, as he supported the preaching ministry and was a worthy parishioner engaged with charitable causes. The first years of Alexander Cooke’s ministry were different. The preacher encouraged a redrawing of the boundary of godly identity to exclude people such as Harrison, and at the same time a new and challenging notion of authority based on righteousness was promoted, which questioned the validity of civil justice if it operated outside of the moral law. This stance posed what appeared to Harrison as a threat to order based upon the traditional hierarchy of authority. Through the writings of Walker, Harrison pushed back with a different version of godly identity that was more inclusive and based on customary values of what it was to be a good man. To aid his campaign, he called upon the weapons he had to hand: his own social and civil position in the hierarchy of authority, with the symbol of the Crown at the head of this. Ultimately, his chapel was an expression of Harrison’s particular form of progressive Protestantism and views on authority.

\textsuperscript{229} WYAS (L): RDP 68/20/A10, Leeds advowson trust deed.
Conclusion to Part II

This part of the study has placed preaching in its social context. It has shed fresh light on how local and godly identities operated in the lived experience, and also on the nature of religious conflict.

Making a whole out of the two very different pictures painted in chapters three and four is not easy. There are obvious methodological problems in comparing a geographically and chronologically broad survey with a much more focused case study. There is also the issue of source type. By their very nature, churchwardens’ accounts tend to paint a picture of consensus, while legal sources lend themselves to themes of conflict. What both chapters do show is that preaching as a social institution and a means of communication had great potential to create religious identities and a sense of community. Godly identity could be coterminous with the regular, participating members of the parish that supported preaching, or it could be narrower and more exclusive. Which of these dominated in any local setting depended upon the people involved, principally the minister.

By using sources that have rarely been examined in relation to preaching, chapter three has shown that support for preaching could be a communal endeavour, and can therefore be regarded as one of the new symbolic institutions of the post-Reformation parish. Creating a space for preaching and securing a preaching ministry involved a broader cross-section of the population than has been commonly perceived. This communal endeavour for preaching could help to foster a sense of local identity and community. This conclusion challenges the orthodox interpretation, which associates preaching with the fracturing of community.

The more difficult issue arises with the idea of godly identity. It could be argued that this was always only a rhetorical construct, created in literature to either position the subject or exhort the reader to greater religious effort. Furthermore, as shown in the introduction, a great deal of Reformation historiography proceeds on the basis that the binary of the rhetorical construct was also the lived reality. This study challenges this interpretive framework by proposing that in the lived experience, godly identity was never a completed project; it was always something to be aimed towards. As such, it had to compete with all the other imperatives of local social and economic life and was therefore variable over time and dependent on circumstances. Involvement with godly actions was one way a little ‘godliness’ might rub off onto an individual, especially if it brought them into contact with preaching clergy. This suggests that godly identity could be manifested in a dilute, permeable and mutable form.

An interesting question arises in how this ‘dilute’ godly identity interacted with other identities. It has been demonstrated that it was compatible with local identity and community, as it was symbolic local action that created it in the first place. It has also been seen how both individuals
and the corporate body of the parish were instrumental in developing a growing network that supported the mobility of preachers throughout the Pennines. In contrast to the conventional interpretation, which sees godly networks as an alternative to local community, it has been shown how they interacted through the local corporate body of the churchwardens being instrumental in creating the network. Therefore, a godly network of preaching support was not antithetical to local community. It illustrates the point made by Aldridge that ‘primary loyalty to the home parish did not exclude secondary loyalties being excited elsewhere’. While the parallels should not be overdrawn, if it is accepted that late-medieval fund raising fostered a sense of community, then support for preaching in the post-Reformation period can therefore be thought of in approximately the same way. Preaching was the mode of the moment through which individual and local pride was expressed, as the installation of a preaching minister or a visit from a high profile preacher placed the parish on the religious map of the wider area.

The argument, therefore, is that in the lived existence, godly identity could be permeable, dilute, and dynamically constructed by action. It did not necessarily have a permanent, defined boundary upon which everyone agreed. By taking part, even just to the extent of contributing a few pence to a minister’s wage, or by providing the food eaten in the post-sermon meal, the culture of preaching involved far more people than is traditionally assumed to be the case. Establishment of a preaching ministry did not necessarily lead to fracturing of the local community, but as chapter four has shown, this could be the result if a minister attempted to redraw the boundary of godly identity more narrowly and definitively through the messages preached from the pulpit. This redrawing made the lived experience of godly identity more similar to the binary of its rhetorical construct. The chapter shows that it was this redrawing of boundaries that caused conflict to arise, rather than any inherent divide between preaching-centred worship and festive, traditional culture, as convention holds. This tension could exacerbate differences within progressive, Calvinist Protestantism over the style of preaching and how predestination was handled. These differences within progressive Protestantism were not inevitable and only developed into fully divergent identities in the dialectic of a conflict fuelled by local issues and personalities. Once this process of divergence was underway however, it pulled ideas about the legitimisation of authority into the maelstrom and laid the seeds for larger scale conflict.

Conflict more easily catches the imagination of historians, but it would be wrong to extrapolate out from seven years of conflict in one town to claim that preaching always caused fracturing of local communities. Leeds had a preaching ministry for twenty-five years before Alexander Cooke became vicar, and for many years after his active period. During these years there
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was no evidence of preaching especially causing conflict. In fact, the purchase of the advowson in 1590, which was the action that first brought the preaching ministry to Leeds, fits rather well with the findings of chapter three, as it brought a wide cross-section of the parish into the communal action of organising its own minister. Communal action and conflict were two sides of the ability of preaching to form identity.
Part III. Affectivity

Introduction and Historiography

The intention to both educate and move hearers was central to progressive Protestant preaching. This stemmed from the prescription of Saint Augustine that ‘the eloquent divine, then, when he is urging a practical truth, must not only teach so as to give instruction, and please so as to keep up the attention, but he must also sway the mind so as to subdue the will’. In various forms, such advice was communicated in the literature aimed at preaching ministers in the post-Reformation period. It was also communicated visually, as seen in the funeral monument of one of the principal preachers in the West Riding, John Favour, which depicts him with a hand upon his breast, signalling his heartfelt sincerity (see Figure 17).

Figure 17. Monument to John Favour, (d. 1623). Author’s own photograph, courtesy of Halifax Minster.

Reformation historiography, however, long held the presumption that progressive Protestant preaching was an intellective activity, and this was presented as something to be either celebrated or condemned, depending on the point of view of the historian. More recently, a post-revisionist interest in the process and experience of religious change in the localities has led to preaching being studied more closely, and this has thrown up new insights that challenge the old presumptions. Question that are currently driving research is how widespread support for preaching-centred worship was and the various ways in which sermons might appeal to early modern people. Two extreme positions can be roughly outlined here. One stance is that an emotional response followed intellective engagement, so only those hearers who had already internalised Reformed doctrines were likely to be moved by preaching. Such a view informs the linked question of how post-Reformation clergy faced the problems – or in Julia Merritt’s phrasing, walked the tightrope – of combining a preaching ministry with a pastoral role. The alternative view highlights examples of theatrical preaching and sensational sermons to argue that they had a broad appeal as part of ‘popular culture’. Neither position seems to fit with what has been discovered in this study so far, as it has been shown that preaching had broad support, but sermons followed the ‘doctrine and use’ format that was designed primarily to impart knowledge. This appears to support Alec Ryrie’s argument that a ‘broad base’ of early modern society earnestly espoused Reformed Protestantism. However, Ryrie implies that little of the appeal in Reformed Protestantism lay in hearing sermons, and in fact he presents preaching as problematic for Protestants, because it tended to be boring. How preachers may have encouraged a broader appeal while educating their hearers in Reformed doctrine therefore requires further investigation, and this part of the study will seek to answer this question.

Much of the recent scholarship has focused on contemporary treatises about preaching and advice literature on how to preach. However, this study will use the content of sermons delivered in parish pulpits to discover how didactic preaching could have appeal to a broad range of hearers through its affective qualities. It will be shown how sermons could appeal at different registers due to the preachers’ intention to embed learning with affective features such as imagery, sensory language and a focus on the body. As with the other parts of this study, the aim is to challenge the
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2 See Walsham, “The Disenchantment of the World” Reassessed’, for an overview of the background to this scholarship. Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic; and Haigh, ‘Puritan Evangelism’ are examples of this older view. An early alternative voice was that of William Haller in his The Rise of Puritanism (New York, 1938). The 1957 edition is used here, p. 81.

3 See general introduction p. 2; Merritt, ‘The pastoral tightrope’.

idea of clear boundaries: in this case, the boundary between those who clearly enjoyed sermons and those to whom the appeal of preaching is less apparent.

Firstly, it will be helpful to survey recent scholarship on sermons and preaching. The sermons given in the Pennine parishes might be considered to be ‘plain’, in the sense that they aimed to impart Reformed doctrine and apply it to the lives of hearers by unfolding and making clear the meaning of scripture, without undue reference to later authors or overly elaborate prose. ‘Plain’ preaching was previously positioned as the clear opposite of embellished, witty, ‘metaphysical’ preaching, but what is meant by ‘plain’ has undergone something of a reassessment in recent years. ‘Plainness’ is now conceptualised as a widely approved-of virtue in early modern communication. As such, it was something that clergy of differing theological backgrounds sought to claim for their sermons and what was meant by this changed over time. The promoters of ‘plain’ preaching demanded that all signs of art be avoided, but as Peter Auski argued, this hiding of art was a form of rhetoric in itself, as it was intended to persuade the hearers that the authentic voice of the divine was speaking through man. Deborah Shuger has elucidated the emotional power of what she terms the ‘passionate plain style’ of preaching. She noted that the artful and deliberate avoidance of explicit rhetorical devices enhanced the notion of the preacher as a vehicle for the power of God’s Word. Bryan Crockett has concurred with this, describing the ‘plain’ style advocated by William Perkins as an ‘artful, dramatic, deception’ in hiding the learning of the preacher from his audience. He cites Perkins’ exhortation that ‘the minister of the word doth in the time of preaching so behave himself that all, even ignorant persons and unbelievers, may judge that it is not so much he that speaketh as that Spirit of God in him and by him’. This artful hiding of learning has led Crockett and Huston Diehl, to propose that, rather than being in opposition to one another, the theatre and preaching were in a symbiotic relationship.

Modern scholarship on preaching has also highlighted sermon delivery. Arnold Hunt has made extensive investigations into the contemporary advice literature for both delivery and
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reception of sermons. He proposes that preaching was an affective and interactive event, with the preacher’s voice, appearance and gesture contributing to this. Kate Armstrong has explicated the training in Ciceronian rhetoric common to all preachers, which taught the use of ‘decorous voice and gesture [to] reflect and intensify the emotional content of the speech’. Armstrong points out how preachers were advised to use their voice to signpost the different parts of a sermon, such as an increase in volume for the exhortation.

The bringing to light of contemporary prescriptive advice is very useful and reminds us that the surviving text of a sermon is only one component of the event of preaching. However, what has remained less clear is how far prescription was transferred into practice. Ian Green proposes that many ministers would have been reliant on preaching manuals, but there is little hard evidence for this. There are a sprinkling of eye witness accounts of preaching styles and audience response, such as the much cited instance of ‘roaring John Rogers’ of Denham acting out the agonies of hell in his pulpit. Such theatrics were probably not common, however, and in his preaching manual, Richard Bernard expressed the general expectation that preachers would project a sense of gravity through ‘comely’ words and gestures. This uncertainty means that it is problematic to draw general conclusions about the experience of preaching from scattered anecdotes, which, in any case, may tell us more about the intentions of the author than the events being recounted.

One way forward with this problem is to examine the content of the sermons themselves. Literary scholars have led the way in showing how preaching could evoke an affective response through close study of the sermons delivered at the Royal Court and other elite settings. From this growing body of work, Peter McCullough’s study of a sermon by Lancelot Andrewes and Bryan Crockett’s study of a sermon by Thomas Playfere stand out as particularly useful for thinking about the affective aspects of preaching. McCullough shows how Andrewes was able to use words in an
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8 Kate Armstrong, ‘Sermons in Performance’, p. 131.
9 *Idem.* pp. 131–6
11 Originally described by Oliver Heywood in his *Life of John Angier*, p. 50.
iconographic way that presented them as objects of meditation. Bryan Crockett shows how Playfere built emotional intensity during the sermon using the poetic technique of spinning out image after image and metaphors, breaking down the ‘familiar habits of perception’ until the mind and emotions of the listener were filled to overflowing, bringing his audience to a point of catharsis. These were sermons given to an elite audience, however, and neither would be considered to be examples of ‘plain’ preaching. For sermons given to a less elite audience, much of the work to date has concentrated on sermons given in London. Mary Morrissey has made close readings of the rhetoric in sermons given at Paul’s Cross. In her analysis of a sermon given by Daniel Featley, she shows how not all Calvinist ministers rejected the use of a more elaborate style of preaching. Alexandra Walsham has also pointed out that the ‘Jeremiad sermons’ given at Paul’s Cross employed devices such as the cross examination of England, daring metaphors, old country proverbs, and vivid similes to appeal to popular tastes. She argues that ‘this was a mode of discourse which primarily sought to arouse and exercise its hearers’ emotions rather than challenge their intellects’. There has been much less work done for non-elite, ‘plain’ sermons delivered in the parishes. As already noted, Arnold Hunt has examined three sets of manuscript sermons given in parish settings. He reveals how preachers adapted to the expectations of their flock and increased the appeal of their sermons with an eclectic mix of old and new theology peppered with homely sayings. Likewise Ian Green has shown how a preacher could deliver different sorts of sermons. Two studies from non-British material are also worth a mention here. As part of a comparison of the emotional aspects of religion in Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed Germany, Susan Karant-Nunn has examined the sermons of Calvin, Beza and other Reformed clergy for their affective qualities. Her study is limited in that it mainly describes how each of the preachers handled Christ’s passion and death in their sermons. Working at the microscopic scale of the phoneme, Ann Kibbey has proposed that the acoustic properties of the words preached by the New England minister, John Cotton, lent them a coherence beyond their lexical sense. Kibbey argues that in this way, words came to be treated as material shapes and this had great consequences for how the sermon hearers viewed their world. These studies show that there is no single approach to studying the affective properties
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of sermons. This study will aim for the middle ground between the broad survey and the microscopic, examining passages within the context of the whole sermon wherever possible.\footnote{16}

Chapter Five will show how an affective response was encouraged through the use of figurative language and imagery in sermons. This could take the form of straightforward sketching of graphic scenes, the use of word-play, extended metaphors and the use of particular word groupings as a shorthand for complex ideas, or in other words, the use of words as emblems. It will be proposed that progressive Protestant preachers, rather than aiming to produce a directionless affective response, used these techniques primarily to press home their doctrinal messages. Because the imagery applied the doctrine directly to their lives, hearers were encouraged to see themselves as part of a spiritualised universe and part of the great drama and mystery of salvation. Chapter six will then consider how preachers encouraged an affective response in the way they presented themselves and their role in the pulpit. It will be shown that preachers used long-established associations between cure of souls and cure of bodies to make their preaching more compelling.

Scholarship on the links between post-Reformation religion and the body and healing has, to date, mainly emerged from the field of history of medicine.\footnote{17} From the point of view of Reformation historiography, the frequency with which ministers also practised physic has been noted, but the theme remains undeveloped.\footnote{18} This study will make some initial investigations into how the interconnectedness of the body and soul was one way in which preaching was an affective, and in some sense, an embodied event as the consciousness was brought onto the body through the words and actions of the preacher.

There are some methodological issues to think about. While the Pennine area is relatively rich in manuscript and printed sermon sources, these represent only a tiny proportion of the sermons delivered in post-Reformation parishes, so no claims to typicality can be made. The sermon evidence comes in a variety of forms and these all give only a partial picture of a preaching event. Chapter five includes an analysis of two sources of the same preaching event and sheds light on how manuscript sermon sources might be interpreted. The other issue is that sermon sources do not directly reveal


\footnote{17} Eric Carlson has pointed to a link between preaching and physic in his ‘The Boring of the Ear’, p. 265.

\footnote{18} Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic, p. 328; Haigh, Reformation & Resistance p. 238.
audience response. This study works from the premise that sermon sources reveal the linguistic landscape that hearers were exposed to on a regular basis, although the degree to which that was absorbed varied greatly. The taking of sermon notes indicates that at least some of the audience were keen listeners, and a range of other source types, such as letters, diaries and verses indirectly suggest that the words spoken by preachers found their way into the consciousness of a wider cross-section of hearers.
Chapter Five

Knowledge and Affective Language in Preaching

This chapter will examine the affective content of sermons. Preaching aimed to build up, or edify, hearers as faithful followers of Christ, and this required the acquisition of scriptural and doctrinal knowledge. A hearer’s ability to recall the content of a sermon was also beneficial as it increased the opportunities for saving grace to be bestowed, even some time after the preaching event. It was therefore paramount that listeners were able to embed new knowledge and preachers employed various affective techniques to make this more likely. This chapter will propose that knowledge and emotion were not separable elements in preaching. For the most religiously committed, an emotional response to preaching was founded upon knowledge, and was therefore secondary. However, the response of the consumer is never limited by the intentions of the producer, so this chapter will also consider how the affective aspects of sermons might have increased their appeal to a wider cross-section of society than just the most religiously committed, allowing preaching to be something that was appreciated by hearers at various levels and in different ways.

Learning how to preach

William Perkins considered it ‘the dutie of al men is to studie for the knowledge of God and of themselves, and to increase therein’. For him, an emotional response would follow as an outcome of knowledge as ‘the worship or service of God is, when upon the right knowledge of god, we freely give him the honour that is proper to him, in our heart according to his will’. The Halifax Exercise was an institution that set the standards for preaching in the area and provided an opportunity for preachers to learn from their peers. In a sermon given at the exercise, Mr Saxton, a minister from Doncaster, preached on the dangers of allowing emotion to guide the believer, rather than knowledge, maintaining that

he that regardeth instruction is in that way of life, but he that refuseth correction goeth out of the way . . . the counsells of our own hearts give not heed to the commandments of god, thus did Eve trust the devil rather than god and so they fell.

On the other side of the Pennines, the preacher Christopher Hudson made it clear to his listeners at the Blackburn Exercise that the knowledge he was imparting was no ordinary knowledge,

19 Perkins, A warning Against Idolatry, pp. 175, 78, 201.
20 BL Add MS 4933 a, f. 3, sermon dated 1609.
of all reasonable creatures, none so excellent and happy as those who have the knowledge of
the true God and sanctified understanding . . . reason itself, though never so excellent, yet
without saveing knowledge it is only blindness.\textsuperscript{21}

The dispensing of knowledge, however, was of no use unless listeners were able to receive it.
Progressive Protestant authors, such as William Perkins and Richard Bernard, advocated the use of
plain language and this was repeated at the Halifax Exercise. Mr Wolphet told his fellow preachers
‘neyther must we come with excellency of wordes. Paul spoke the word playnly, if we do not so we
doe preach our vanities’.\textsuperscript{22} The ability of the Lancashire minister, John Angier, to preach plainly in
digestible chunks was also celebrated,

He did not concern himself with controversies in the pulpit, but preached the most plain,
practical, experimental truths, and often inculcated the essentials of religion, still teaching the
people knowledge

[he knew] that a minister must have respect, not only to what he is to say, but to the time he
is to speak it or write it in; all things cannot be spoken at one time; Christ taught as people
were able to hear; people, yea the best people have but a measure of attention, memory or
affection . . . his sermons were not long nor full of heads, but well compacted and methodical
(which is a help to memory) and under those few particulars he had pertinent and plain
inlargements.\textsuperscript{23}

This methodical way of preaching was common throughout the Pennines. A text was divided to
derive doctrines, which were tested against objections before being applied to the lives of hearers as
‘uses’. The Halifax preacher, John Barlow, extolled the benefits of the method as ‘it is good for the
memory and the common people do profit most by that way of teaching: therefore it is not amisse
for their better edification, to descend and stoope to the capacities of the simple, unlearned’. The
laity expressed a preference for this structured style of preaching. When Richard Garbutt first
arrived in Leeds, he initially preached in the style to which he was accustomed after many years as a
fellow at Cambridge, but the parishioners asked him to switch to their preferred ‘doctrine and use’
format. Joseph Lister recalled how he was taught at school ‘to understand the minister’s method,

\textsuperscript{21} LCRO: DP353, volume of MSS sermons by Christopher Hudson, hereafter referred to as ‘Christopher
Hudson Sermons’. The quote is from ‘The fearles fear’, a sermon on Job 28:28, given at the Blackburn Exercise,
1630.

\textsuperscript{22} Newton, ‘Puritans in the Diocese of York’, appendix.

\textsuperscript{23} Life of John Angier pp. 70,1.
and by degree got the gift of memory’, recalling the ‘heads and particulars of a sermon’ on the homewards journey and repeating these to his mother once he arrived.  

However, a preacher also had a duty to make his sermons striking and memorable. Advice on how to do this had been available since before the Reformation. In the late sixteenth century, Andreas Hyperius advised the

expounding of common places, to the manners and conditions of the people that are present, and to the state of the whole Citie: namely so that examples, similitudes, comparisons, Item reprehension of vices and enormities, be in such sorte prepared and handled, as that is most lykely, they shall best perceiue them.

Elkanah Wales, the preacher at Pudsey, was celebrated for his ability to apply his teaching to the lives of his hearers, with his

admirable art in pressing practical truths home upon the conscience and exemplifying things by pertinent and familiar similitudes . . . [few] equalled him in proper and pertinent enlargements upon any subject, as had an excellent faculty in opening scriptures as he quoted them and shewed his learning in making things plain, not obscure.

Joseph Lister described the resulting scene at Pudsey as ‘what tears and groans were to be seen and heard in that chapel. . . I am sure it was a place of weepers’, which suggests that Wales’ technique was successful. The plain, homely preaching of John Broadley, the minister at Sowerby Chapel, was lauded after his death in a long verse lament composed by his parishioners. The verses describe how,

In plainness and in power both
He published the word
Which by the spirit evidence
That such are sent of god

He did not use a language strange
Of Hebrue greeke or lattine
His matter and his method both
Was plaine and eke devine

24 John Barlow, An Exposition of the Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to Timothy, the first Chapter (London, 1624), p. 209; One Come from the Dead, preface; Autobiography of Joseph Lister, p. 5.

25 Fletcher, Preaching, Politics and Poetry, p. 60.

26 Cited in TOHEMS, appendix 1, p. 523.

27 BL: Add MS 4460, f. 35.

His sermons was not fraught with froth
He sought himself no praise
In cannan’s language was he learned
And spake the scriptures phrase.

He took a text he made it plaine
With branches of division
His doctrine soundly grounded was
And ratified by reason

His uses was most excellent
Wherein he was most large
He feared not the face of man
His duty to discharge

The word of god he did apply
Unto each state and person
The power of preaching doth consist
In use and application

He did not use a Statly Stile
Nor factions of the braine
But sought to make each darksome place
Unto his people plaine.

Full close he kept unto his text
Without transagitation
He did not rest the scriptures brest
Nor force it out of fashion . . .

This source makes it clear that Broadley’s parishioners, or at least some of them, knew he was learned, and appreciated that, but his ability to preach in a plain style, with homely ‘uses’, was his most celebrated attribute. Conversely, overt displays of worldly intellect and wit were regarded as vanity and pleasing only to fools, as Robert Heywood, of Heywood, near Bury, expressed in his manuscript verse ‘Observations and Instructions Divine and Morall’,

Some doe a sermon much commend
Well coucht for oratory style;
Witt and invention is their end:

How doth mans heart it self beguile!
For, le[s]jt the preacher conscience press
Then he is but a brainesick asse . . .

29 ‘Sowerby verses’, WYAS (C): WYC/1525/10/1/8/2/1. See note 98 on p. 111 for more on the verses.
30 J. Crossley, (ed.) Observations and Instructions Divine and Morall in Verse by Robert Heywood CS OS, (Manchester, 1869), p. 50. Robert Heywood was a lay man from Bury who wrote in the 1630s.
This rejection of ‘witt and invention’, however, was not absolute. Preachers used metaphors, rhyme and word play to make their teachings more memorable. Christopher Hudson preached to the governors of Clitheroe Grammar School 1633 with the aim to bring about a reconciliation after a disagreement. Hudson was not coy in showing his learnedness in this case, as the main point of the sermon was to promote the benefits of education. Although it was something of a conceit, he began his sermon with a visualisation of words as objects, possibly with the intention of capturing the attention of his listeners and provide them with a framework for understanding the substance of the sermon to follow. He asked his hearers to imagine his text – ‘and I saw that there is an excellency in wisdom’ – consisted of a door and a house. He presented ‘I saw’ as the door, opened by the handle, ‘and’. His educated audience may even have understood this as a visual pun, as the Hebrew letter for ‘and’, Vav, was indeed shaped like a handle. The opening door was associated with the opening of young eyes to spiritual sight, or the ‘Eye of Faith’, which he described as what Solomon ‘saw when his eyes were opened with the eye salve of the Holy Ghost’. Hudson then went on to signpost how he would deal with the remainder of the text by identifying ‘rooms’ in the house, as ‘Now in the Roomes of this house we may note their {Collation \Prelation.’ By these words he meant the pairing of ideas, and this set up the main theme of the sermon, which was that knowledge was light, folly was darkness. Thankfully, he did not to take this rather strained metaphor any further, but the point here is that he used words in an iconographical way so they could be imagined as objects. In the same sermon, Hudson also used rhyme to make a phrase more memorable. In an attempt to appear self-effacing, he apologised for his overlong discourse on a particular point with the familiar Latin proverb ‘amare & sapere vix deo conceditur’, which he rendered as the rhyming couplet ‘what man is able to be wise and love, tis scarcely granted to the Gods above’. In a very different sort of sermon delivered at Manchester, Thomas Case also drove home the teaching point ‘content not yourself with bare notions’ with the mnemonic device of ‘Notions are good, but Motions are better’. The words Notions and Motions were both written in larger letters by the note taker of this sermon, which suggests that his rhyming device was successful in impressing the point onto the memory.
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32 GMCRO: M/35/5/3/7. These are fair copy notes of five sermons in a volume inscribed with the words ‘Marie Booth her Booke’, hereafter referred to as ‘Marie Booth sermon notes’. The quotation here is from the sermon by Thomas Case on 3. Hebrews 13:4 ‘Exhort one another daily while it is called today’.
**Seeing by hearing: hearing pictures**

In addition to the occasional use of puns and rhymes, one of the main ways in which preachers made their teaching striking and affective, and therefore memorable, was through imagery and sensory language. Bartholomäus Keckermann particularly advised ‘let similitudes be drawn from things relating to the senses and placed in the midst of common life’.  

At the most basic level, preachers used metaphors and painted textual pictures. In a sermon to the Blackburn Exercise, Christopher Hudson used imagery to illustrate and embed a complex idea about the way in which the faithful should feel fear. This laudable, ‘Filiaall Fear’, which God would put into the heart of his faithful to prevent them from parting from him, was different to the sort of fear he termed ‘Diffident doubting which is servile and carnall’. Hudson used the imagery of a tree to illustrate this for his audience,

> the filiaall fear is ingendered of faith, and lives still with it, making us careful to hold fast all the means of our salvation. Even as a man that climbs a high tree, doubts not but firmly believes that keeping fast hold on the branches, he shall come downe safe againe, and therefore dare not let his hold go, lest he fall. So it is with those who climb the Tree of Life, using with faith the means that God hath appointed.

This imagery provided a ‘hook’ for the doctrine Hudson was attempting to impart. It had the added benefit of the tree in question being ‘high’ and this then being equated with the ‘Tree of Life’, suggesting progress as the believer rose up through the branches, moving away from base and carnal nature and towards God, with progressively more to lose in falling.

Extended allegories could verge upon a meditation on words, which was an echo of advanced devotional practice in the late-medieval period, as described by Margaret Aston. In 1632, Cornelius Glover preached to his parishioners at the Leeds chapel of Hunslet on Heb. 6: 7, ‘For the earth that drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing of God’. Such a verse allowed Glover to stay close to scripture, while he plied his hearers with image after image of the Word as rain and the hearers as the earth. He spoke of ‘drinking’ in the Word, which he described as the ‘dew of heaven . . . and what a blessing have we that hath it showering amongst us’. Glover first used the allegory to derive the doctrine of universal preaching,

---

as raine wthout any difference comes down upon the just and unjust, as christ saith Mat. 5:45, so likewise ministers must speake the word unto one as wel as another, unto the wicked as wel as to the righteous. Ezekiel must speake whether they would heare or whether they would forbeare . . .

He then went on to use the allegory to explain the doctrine of predestination. The action of rain, as it ‘softens and mollifies the earth’ was compared to the action of the Word of God, which ‘softens and mollifies the hearts of men’. The ability for this to happen, however, depended on the status of the hearer regarding salvation, as the Word made the faithful flourish in piety, increased faith, love, zeal, and patience and brought forth fruits, just as the rain made the earth fruitful, ‘wthout wch ordinarily the earth doth not yeald nor increase, grasse doth not grow, trees do not flourish’. Conversely, the failure to bring forth fruits in the reprobate was because the rain of the Word ‘falls not upon earth but upon rock, I mean upon a heart that is as hard as a rock that will break before it bend’. He summarised this in stark terms, as ‘good earth drinketh, and success follows, while bad earth is fruitless, to be burned and cursed’. This allegory strengthened the notion that the minister was not to blame if his preaching failed to have its desired effect, as fault lay with the predetermined nature of the hearer.

Glover drew analogies between the nature of rainfall and preaching. Firstly he made the point that the Word had been made for man, just as in the Genesis story the earth had been created before rain. This proved that the Word was ‘that ordinarie means that god hath appointed to make us faithful’. Extending this point to show how the Word was from God, not something in control of man, Glover expounded that, as with rain, the Word comes down from above, and is the lords gift wch he bestows upon us . . . falls drop by drop, so likewise word of god. Sermons, what are they but so many showers . . . and every word in a sermon what are they but so many drops distil themselves into our hearts . . .

Even the mechanics of rainfall provided a useful analogy. Just as rain came down, but could not return back to the sky unchanged, ‘the word of god shal not return to him voyde, but it shal once uplift that for wch it is sent.’

The ability of rain to purify the air and soil and dispel mists was drawn upon to provide a concrete image of how the Word could purify the heart and affections of man. This evoked the sacrament of reconciliation, especially as Glover chose that moment to cite John 15:3 ‘Ye are clean saith our saviour through the word I have spoken to you’. The dispelling of mists was also a means of making sight clearer, and so through the Word, ‘we may see the things wch otherwise we could never see’.
After his exposition on these doctrines, Glover provided some uses. The need for rain to soften the earth was paralleled to the need for the Word, as naturally our hearts are hard, our natures full of corruption, our lives full of unfaithfulness. For if it were not so but that we were of melting hearts and bleeding spirits, of pure natures and fruitful lives, what need should we have of a word that is unto raine . . .

By an internal logic, the existence of the Word proved its need, and thereby confirmed that the hearers were sinful, full of hardness, and filthiness. The obverse of this was ‘the goodness of god to us in giving us his word’, which reminded the hearers of the Calvinist tenet of man’s state of utter helplessness and unworthiness. Just as water was essential for life, the Word should be desired above all worldly things, as ‘what more acceptable then the wels of sweet water to a thirsty soul?’, and, just as water was needed frequently, so believers should hear the Word frequently.

In this way, Glover constructed a whole sermon on the extended metaphor of the Word as rain and water. This made the content very accessible to all levels of education and aided memory, as the doctrines taught were linked to well known physical aspects of rain. The pleasing imagery of droplets falling, wetting the earth, making it fruitful and flourishing, dispelling mists and purifying the air, induced a virtual sensory experience, as recommended by Keckermann. This was particularly powerful, as, in the early modern period, fluids and flow were regarded as essential to both individual and communal health, so an extended meditation on the fluid of rain could induce feelings of well-being. The theme also allowed a sacrament (Baptism) and a miracle (Exodus 17:6, when Moses struck the rock and life-giving water issued forth) to be called to mind. Such a form of preaching challenges the narrative that Protestantism saw the abrogation of sensual, affective worship. Keith Thomas’ argument that ‘the Anglican Church had rejected holy water, the sign of the cross, and all the paraphernalia of the Roman Catholic exorcists, but they had nothing to put in their place, save a general injunction to prayer and repentance’ is clearly too narrow a view of the experience of preaching-centred worship. Glover’s sermon shows how older loci of holiness, such as water, were appropriated and reconceptualised in progressive Protestantism. The significance of water, or more specifically in Glover’s sermon, rain, was to be understood figuratively, rather than literally and physically. As a result, rather than reducing a sense of the sacred, preaching created a spiritualised universe.

38 Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic, pp. 32, 315.
Seeing by hearing: learning how to see in new ways

Imagery was also used in more advanced ways. Hearers were asked to see in a new way, with spiritual eyes, and this meant seeing a new significance in the Word as a manifestation of divine mystery. A manuscript sermon series will be investigated to reveal how imagery worked on multiple levels in the interplay of knowledge and affect. The sermons were penned by Hugh Ramsden during his time as Rector of Methley, near Leeds. Ramsden was a native of Halifax, and had wealthy, powerful patrons in the Savile family, who also originated from there. He had been a fellow at Merton College, Oxford, for seven years while Sir Henry Savile was warden, and Savile’s nephew, also Henry Savile, was the principal landowner of Methley, and was probably instrumental in Ramsden being made rector there. Ramsden was not an absent rector, as his children were baptised in Methley, but he combined his pastoral duties with other activities that set him at the heart of the learned, mainstream preaching ministry in Yorkshire; he was a chaplain to the Archbishop of York and preached at the Halifax Exercise.

Sometime after 1623, when he was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, Ramsden wrote a series of eighteen sermons on Colossians, entitled ‘A Discourse upon the first and part of the second chapter to the Colossians, by Hugh Ramsden, Batchelour in Divinity’. The sermons work systematically verse by verse, from Col. 1:15 to Col. 2:4. and are written in full prose, rather than just notes. The text contains signs of editing and restarting, indicating that they were probably written as final full drafts to aid preparation before delivery. This explanation is also indicated by the sermons being of varied length, covering between four and twenty pages each. Such variation would probably have been avoided if the sermons had been written up after delivery with the intention of future publication. The sermons were mostly structured in the usual doctrine and use format, but this didactic style was interspersed by more expansive, fulsome and exhortatory sections, and occasional uses of vivid imagery. In this way, Ramsden built both knowledge and emotional engagement in tandem. This was in line with the minister’s self-avowed intention to preach with ‘sweet and savory

---

39 The right to present was held by the Duchy of Lancaster.

40 ‘Hugh Ramsden sermons’, WYAS (W): WYW 1352/3/3/1/2/11. The source is complex. There are two earlier draft sermons (erroneously noted as being on Col. 1:5 and 1:6). Part of the first sermon in the series proper (verse 15) is in another hand, changing part way through to the hand that is used for the remainder of the series, which is presumed to be Ramsden’s own. The volume also contains a copy of a communion sermon by Ramsden, copied out in Wilson’s hand.

41 There were already several printed sermons and treatises on Colossians in circulation, including a much reprinted one Nicholas Byfield, An Exposition upon the Epistle to the Colossians (1617, 1625, 1627, 1628, 1649).
language’. Most of the sermons are written in what appears to be Ramsden’s own hand, with the exception of part of the first sermon. The subsequent owner of the manuscript, was Thomas Wilson of East Hardwick, a village a few miles from Methley, so Ramsden presumably left the manuscript in Methley when he left to become the Vicar of Halifax in 1628. Wilson later bound the sermon series with other material into a single volume, around 1660.

From internal evidence, the intended audience for most of the sermons appears to be Ramsden’s own parishioners. It is not clear how exclusive the parish audience was. The church was re-pewed in 1626, which suggests at least a low key, general support for Ramsden’s ministry. The only group that can be excluded for certain were the several Catholic recusant and Church Papist families in the parish, who made up the steady trickle of non-communicants reported in the visitation court records. The tone of the sermons suggest that the audience were probably the more religiously motivated in the parish, probably those who were willing to return to hear a sermon on a Sunday afternoon. Saint Paul had written his letters to the Colossians to affirm and instruct new Christians in their faith, and consolidate them as a group of believers in a hostile world. Therefore, in a project, to use Kaufman’s term, to ‘groom’ a ‘godlier’ group in his parish, Ramsden could stay very close to scripture as his aims matched those of Saint Paul. The sermon series built up the necessary knowledge of scripture and Reformed doctrines that would allow those that stayed the course to begin to see themselves as ‘professors’ of the true faith and children of God. Some of Ramsden’s teaching appears to encourage the idea of a church within a church, such as the statement that ‘the church is nothing else but a company of people gathered together by a gracious and blessed call. There is a church which is not the body of Christ and there is a church which is the body of Christ’. However, Ramsden was also at pains to point out that all must receive the benefit of preaching as the fate of souls could not be known. He instructed his hearers that ‘we should help those yt are uncalled allready to the fellowship of grace in two ways. First by so me suspention of Judgement. Secondly by hearty prayers for them’. He thus allowed some permeability to the boundary of godliness, and this shows how a minister could preach predestination and nurture a godlier sub-group in the parish, yet also maintain a whole parish ministry. This aim also explains why

Ramsden left the manuscript in the parish when he left, as it functioned as an ongoing resource for those keen to become godlier.46

Ramsden’s first sermon began by introducing his hearers to the idea that they must learn to ‘see’ in a new way. It was therefore very appropriate that Ramsden decided to start his sermon series at verse 15 (‘who is the image of the invisible god, the first born of every creature’), as this facilitated an exposition on sight and images. The theme of images was also an appropriate place to start because it allowed the fundamental Genesis story, of man being made in God’s image, to be dealt with. It also chimed with a wider discourse at this time, in which, as Stuart Clark has shown, doubt was cast on the veracity of physical vision.47 The first doctrine Ramsden expounded was ‘the Christian is affected and ravished by the beauty of Christ’, and the reason for this was given as ‘because he hath spiritual eyes and therefore is able to behold such a glory in the son of god, as no natural eye in the world can be hold’. Christians, therefore, could learn to see Christ in a metaphysical way, rather than rely on material images. Ramsden provided some basic teaching about different types of image,

first of all consider what an image is, in every image there is a similitude, or else it is not an image, but in every similitude there is not an image. There is a threefold representation of images. First such as represent a thing in qualitie not in substance, secondly such as represent a thing in qualitie and substance, but receive not their substance from that which they represent. Thirdly such as represent a thing in qualitie and substance and receive their substance from that which they represent, as christ doth from his father . . .

In every image one may see the foot step of god, but in men and angels one may se[e] the very face of god; what difference is there in the difference that is found in man and the image that is found in jesus christ. There is a doble image, similitudinace and substantial, man is the similitudinace image of god; but jesus christ is the substantiall image of his father. . . jesus christ is the comprehensive image of god . . . so he is the looking glass the father beholds himself in . . . 48

Therefore, man was an image of God, but the only true image of God was Christ, and Christ was the only way to know God in this life. Ramsden’s teaching here is reminiscent of that of St. Augustine, in which knowledge was equated with sight in a very physical way. At the time in which St Augustine

46 Two of the sermons appear to have been given to an audience containing clergy (those on verses 21 and 28/29). A feasible explanation here is that Ramsden composed the series around a schedule dictated by his commitments to preach to his peers at the Exercise, as the records of the Exercise show that a minister might be called to preach two or three times in the course of working through a chapter. See also Green, ‘Preaching in the Parishes’ p. 145.


was writing, the theory of sight held that an object was ‘seen’ by a physical image of it being impressed upon the mind of the viewer. Thus, to know God was to see God, and to see God was to have his image impressed into the mind or soul, thus literally creating an image of God within man, partially restoring man as an image of God, as he had been before the fall.\footnote{Margaret Miles, ‘The Eye of the Body and the Eye of the Mind in Saint Augustine’s “De trinitate” and “Confessions”, The Journal of Religion, vol. 63, no. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 128, 131,2; McKim, Calvin’s Institutes, 1.15.4, p. 24.} As God could not be glimpsed directly, Christ was the ‘looking glass’ through which man could see, and therefore have knowledge of, God. Ramsden continued,

then it follows that god will set his love on none but on those whome he finds his image graven upon; he that would be aquainted with god and would see[h] his face must see it through this glasse, but what glasse is this, not the glasse of a naturall contionce, but this glasse is jesus christ the naturall and substantial image of his father . . .

God would only love those who had his image within them. Thus in a tight circle of logic, the ability to see Christ through the Gospel was a sign of God’s love and predestination to life. This was all part of the great mystery of salvation and Ramsden introduced the theme of mystery in his first sermon, as ‘the misterie of Christ is a bottomless misterie, for the angells search to this day into the misterie of Christ, but can not search to the bottom of it’. In this, Ramsden was echoing the voice of St. Paul and he continued to develop the theme of a profound mystery being explored in subsequent sermons.

The ability to see true images of the divine through Christ meant that the material images used in Catholic worship were discredited. Protestant churches, Ramsden stated, were not profane, as they held the image of God in the form of Christ, who was present through the Word, as has already been discussed in chapter two. This was the only true image and

hence we may learne what image of god we are to worship and adore; not that image of god which is painted in glass windows or carved of wod and stones and covered over with gould, but that god incarnate which is god . . .

Ramsden reiterated that this image of God was not visible in the physical sense,

behold I goe forward, but he is not there, and backwards but I can not perceive him, on the left hand, where he doth worke, but I can not behold him, he hideth himself on the right hand that I can not see him . . .
Ramsden pressed home the point that, just as God was not ordinarily visible, he was also present everywhere. This was a cue to switch to a more exhortatory style, with vivid, but straightforward mental imagery, in contrast to the long and difficult teaching on images. He painted two scenarios from everyday life, to embed the idea of God’s invisible omnipresence,

And to the whoremonger that saith bolt the chamber door, locke it and make it fast that no eye see us, if he knew that the invisible god stood by his bed side with a javelin in his hand, ready to thrust both him and his whore through he durst not commit that wickedness. . .

And the drunkard that is the scorners of the world that sits in the alehouse spending so many hours of grace, if he knew but that the invisible god sits at his elbow writing him in ye book of his remembrance every minute of his misspent time, every idle word, more strictly than the alewife chawkes the pots behind ye doore, he would not sit there . . .

These earthy scenes also personified sin, even more so because of the resonance between the punishment and the sin: the thrusting javelin for the sexual sin and the chalked-up tab of the ale house drinker. The aim was to feel the reprimand viscerally.

The text of the next verse (Verse 16) allowed the sermon to set Christ in a cosmological framework. In this sermon, Ramsden cast Christ as the creator, which was a little unusual, but this was possibly seen as an extension of the teaching about similitude between God and Christ established in the first sermon. This positioned Christ as the source of all grace and set the groundwork for the next three sermons, which all dealt with the primacy and centrality of Christ. In the sermon on verse 18, Ramsden introduced the image of Christ on the cross as the moment at which the Church was created,

The church hath her originall and beginning from Christ as the woman was taken out of the side of man, for the church out of the bleeding side of Christ hanging on the cross . . . In these respects Christ is the beginning of the church first in regard of that blood which he shed upon the cross, out of which vivificall blood issued out the church

This visualisation appropriated the material imagery of the late-medieval period for progressive Protestantism. Devotion to such material images is widely considered to have been part of the affective piety of pre-Reformation religion, so to reference them in a sermon could evoke a similar affective response.\(^{50}\) Figures 18 and 19 show two representations of Eve emerging from Adam and the prominence of the opening in the side of Christ in the same place. It is interesting to note that in the Flemish painting, Eve emerging from Adam’s side is assisted by the leader of the (then Catholic)

Church, thereby making the same link as Ramsden. All this corporeal imagery set up the next section of the sermon series, which dealt with Christ’s death on the cross as the means of atonement for Christians.
Figure 18. The Creation of Eve, anon. Antwerp, 1530. Author’s own photograph, courtesy of Musée des Beaux Arts, Reims.

Figure 19. Fourteenth century medieval Crucifixus Dolorosus. Author’s own photograph, courtesy of the Dom Museum, Mainz.
The text of verse 20, ‘and having made peace through the blood of his cross by him to reconcile all things unto him, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven’, allowed the introduction of the difficult doctrines of Atonement, Reconciliation and the Covenant with God. Here, the words ‘Blood of the Cross’ were dealt with as a meditation, being repeated many times,

...continued...

Ramsden went on to use the words ‘blood of the cross’ seven more times in a short space of time. Repeated in this way, the phrase ‘blood of the cross’ became something other than a visualisation. Like a gong being struck in the consciousness of hearers, it became a textual emblem, or shorthand, that encapsulated the complex doctrines of atonement and reconciliation. Knowledge of these doctrines could be recalled via this emotive, short phrase. The sermon on verse 21 moved onto the theme of the resurrection, with the emphasis on the body of Christ being a real, living thing through his brotherhood (the Church), so that, as he had risen, so must they, as they were of the same body. The distinction between the corporeal and spiritual bodies, individual and collective, was blurred by this point in the sermon series, so that the prospect of ‘seeing’ the non-visible was enhanced.

The main teaching for the middle part of the sermon series was the embedding of experimental Calvinism, where the doctrines of suffering, perseverance and regeneration were expounded and the worshipper encouraged to be constantly aware of their spiritual state. The signs that a person was truly reconciled with God were presented, along with warnings of God’s wrath for those who were not, so the boundary between the child of God and the natural man began to be more clearly drawn. Hearers were reminded of Christ’s humanity and told that, as part of Christ’s mystical body, the faithful would join Christ in his suffering, and persevering despite this was the mark of the true members of Christ. This was part of a larger theme of suffering along with Christ that ran throughout the sermon series. Again, there are some continuities with late-medieval affective religion to be considered here. Thomas Rogers’ translation of Thomas À Kempis’ *Imitatio Christi*, which he adapted for Protestantism in 1580, was a very popular text, being reprinted every other year up until 1609. Scholars, such as J. Sears McGee, Elizabeth Hudson and Max von Habsburg have proposed that this work was mainly popular with conservative Protestants, who were less likely...

---

51 See Ryrie, *Being Protestant* p. 241, for more on the theology of the cross.
to be concerned about the potential idolatry of dwelling on the humanity of Christ. In contrast, they see progressive Protestantism as emphasising Christ’s divine nature and mission of atonement. Ramsden’s sermon series appears to contradict this, as he encouraged his hearers to identify with Christ as a fellow sufferer.

The doctrine of perseverance demanded constant vigilance of the moral state. Righteousness had to be sustained throughout the whole of life, not just during services. Ramsden illustrated this need for perseverance with an everyday scene,

some there are that confine holiness only to the church even as swine that are fair so long as they are in a faire greene or new come out of a pond but when they come out into the street presently they are wallowing over head and ear in the mire for many are holy so long as they are in the church . . .

Those who did not follow Christ consistently were thus associated with the imagery of pollution and filth. This recalled an image which he had presented in his first sermon: ‘those that belong not to him [Christ], though they be never so glorious, he makes them as the dung of the earth, as base as the earth itself’. ‘Natural men’ would also be labelled as swine in subsequent sermons, recalling this image and association with dirt. This mental image of tangible, visible dirtiness dissolved the boundary between the internal and external and added a sensory tension to the quest for righteousness. Conversely, water and whiteness were used to represent positive states, as seen in the examples from Glover’s and Hudson’s sermons above.

The last section of the sermon series was intended to consolidate the new group of committed Christians, just as Saint Paul had originally intended. Ramsden exhorted his hearers to mutually support one another, although there is no evidence that they went as far as forming a separatist group. The last sermon hints at the self-defeating aspect of successful preaching, as Ramsden felt it necessary to warn his now informed hearers that they must not be tempted to try and interpret scripture themselves. Having affirmed the unique role of the preacher, consolidated


53 In this, Ramsden was following William Perkins, who had claimed that fellowship was the second most important act of worship, after hearing the Word of God and before communion, in his A Warning Against Idolatry, p. 247. For more on how semi-separatism worked in practice see, Collinson, ‘The English Conventicle’ and Walsham, Charitable Hatred, p. 211.
the group and warned of external dangers, the sermon series was then brought to a deliberate end. Ramsden was able to extract all the teachings necessary for an individual to become a professor of the true faith while staying close to the text, because his aims were congruent with those of Saint Paul in writing to the Colossians. However, the doctrines he taught were both difficult and abstract, and imagery helped to make them more concrete and embed them in the memory. He used scenarios from everyday life, words and short phrases as emblems and adaptations of medieval imagery. The whole process of acquiring knowledge was imbued with a sense of mystery, which only those chosen by God could see.

*Planning, speaking and hearing*

Ramsden’s sermon series tells us a great deal about his intentions to elicit an affective response in his hearers, but what can we say about the actual event of his preaching and its reception? By good fortune, in the course of this research, it has been possible to match up one of Ramsden’s draft sermons with notes taken by one of his hearers. The sequence of sermons on Colossians is interrupted between verses Col. 1: 23 and 24 by a sermon on Acts 23: 12,13, which is

> And when it was day, certain of the Jews made an assembly and bound themselves up with a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. And they were more than forty that had made this conspiracy.

The text proves to be a Gunpowder Day sermon and so the verses were appropriate as it dealt with a conspiracy by the adherents of false religion, the Jews, to harm the propagator of true religion, Saint Paul. It seems that Ramsden was asked to give this special occasion sermon and decided to use his usual notebook to write it out in preparation.

The matching source from the hearer’s side is to be found in the Shibden Hall Collection in Calderdale Archives. The sermon notes were taken by John Lister, part of a godly family of clothiers who lived at Shibden Hall in Halifax. There are nine volumes of contemporaneous sermon notes. Most of them are in shorthand and date from the 1650s, and are dated as such in the archive catalogue. However, the first volume contains notes of sermons from an earlier period, and these are in longhand, so presumably at that point the younger John Lister had yet to master the skill of shorthand. Although the words are abbreviated and the writing is difficult to read, they are fairly full notes. One of these early sermons is entitled ‘Mr Ramsden, Gunpowder Day, Acts 23.12.13’ and, the content indeed reveals this to be a match with the sermon penned by Ramsden in his Methley

54 The sermon notes of John Lister of Over Brea, WYAS (C) SH: 3/S/1. Hereafter referred to as ‘Lister sermon notes’.
notebook. The sermon can be approximately dated. It is alongside notes for a sermon by ‘Mr Garbut’ in Lister’s notebook, so, as Garbutt did not arrive in Yorkshire until 1625, and Ramsden died in 1629, the Gunpowder sermon was given in November 1625–28.

The first thing to note is that the Lister sermon notes are much more extensive than Ramsden’s draft. Full sermons penned by Ramsden could cover up to twenty pages in his notebook, but the Gunpowder sermon covers only four pages. This was not unique in Ramsden’s notebook, as mentioned above. The draft can be interpreted as the core material that he wished to convey, or a spine which he intended to expand upon in the pulpit. This expansion is illustrated in Ramsden’s initial division of the word ‘conspiracy’. Ramsden wrote ‘In which observe two general parts, first their communication, secondly their confederation’. In the Lister notes this became,

In conspirators 2 things. 1. Devilish Combination, combine tog. A knot of __ villains. Cruell associates like Simeon and Levi brothers _ in hellish fraternity. 2. Vowed persecution later to go and with their cruell conspiracy. did this with anathema . . .

Such expansions and the scriptural references that accompanied them, were valued by hearers. Ramsden also gave many examples from the ancient and contemporary world to illustrate his points. These expansions not only demonstrated a deep knowledge of scripture and learnedness, but added a feeling of spontaneity to the delivery. This made the speech more striking and authentic and encouraged the idea that the Holy Spirit was seen to be at work in the unfolding of the Word.

The above passage is typical of the hyperbole that runs through Lister’s notes to a much greater extent than Ramsden’s own draft. The spoken sermon made great use of rhetorical devices, such as alliteration, acoustic repetition and sibilance. ‘Conspiracy’ in the draft version became ‘cloudy conspiracy’ ‘cruel conspiracy’, ‘clandestine consultation’ ‘devilish combination’ and ‘hellish Fraternity’. Cruel became ‘cursed cruel’. The preponderance of the ‘c’ consonant and the sibilant sound of these words, leant them a coherence.

Other forms of acoustic repetition can be found in the spoken version but not the draft. Ramsden’s prepared phrase, ‘greatest friends who prove the cruellest and greatest enemies’, in the pulpit became ‘those who should be our best friends often prove our bitterest foes’, thereby allowing the repetition of the initial ‘b’ and ‘f’ consonants in ‘best friends’ and ‘bitterest foes’, linked by the ‘f’ in often. The words that start and end the phrase, ‘those’ and ‘foes’, probably rhymed, although there is always less certainty, as early modern vowel sounds varied.55 Likewise, the short ‘e’ vowel sound probably formed a repeated sound in the phrase. The phrase already mentioned,

‘Devilish Combination, combine together, a knot of villains’, was not in the draft version at all. It allowed the syllable ‘vil’ to be repeated at the start and end of the phrase. Again, the short ‘o’ vowel sound appears to make the phrase more acoustically coherent. Ramsden also appeared to put words together just because he liked the challenge of their acoustic complexity. He paired ‘ineligible with inknowlegable’, and ‘diligence’ with ‘indulgent’ and ‘delinquent’ with ‘malefactor’. To successfully navigate these potential hazards of speech demonstrated an eloquence that was not only enthralling, but suggested that God did indeed speak through the man in the pulpit. According to Ann Kibbey, this acoustic repetition in sermons had the effect of ‘exaggerating the material coherence of the words’ which made the spiritual world that they represented more real, as ‘they sounded like they had a meaning’ beyond their lexical sense.56

The spoken version of the sermon used sensory language and visual images not found in the draft. For example, the ‘temerity’ of the Jews in taking the decision to end Paul’s life was illustrated with the imagery of a man shuffling cards and dealing ‘what game he list’. Imagery used in the draft sermon was extended and made more sensory in the spoken version. Ramsden dwelt on the ways in which God would prepare his children for trials and suffering, and he painted a picture of a battle scene to illustrate this, as ‘a Captain, when he is about to go through great dangers and casually he speaks lovingly to his soldiers and saith come on my noble hearts and pluck up your courage that we may win the field’. In the pulpit, Ramsden added the imagery of soldiers having to ‘pass their pikes and fight in the mouth of canons’ to make this scene more vivid. He also added imagery of wrestlers at the Olympic Games and the practice of shipwrights weatherproofing boards by leaving them out in the sun to further make his point about preparation. In addition to visual imagery, Ramsden also made references to the senses of touch, taste and smell in the spoken sermon that were not in the draft version. He spoke of how the children of God were ‘Lilies among thorns. All thorns are of a prickly nature, but no thorns prick the lily so much as those that are nearest.’ Catholics might ‘drop words of oyle & butter’, but those of true religion would ‘taste them not’, as Catholics ‘smell ranke of gunpowder to this day’. The language of the spoken sermon was much more visual and sensory, and therefore, affective, than the draft version would suggest.

The Lister notes also contain much more vituperative anti-Catholic language than the Ramsden draft, to the point of dehumanising Catholics as ‘a company of vipers bred in our owne bowells’ and ‘Any that would destroy their own kind becometh a monster’. The comparison also shows that the particular forum in which a sermon was delivered and the attitudes and expectations of the audience were important factors in the sort of language used. Indeed, John Donne’s 1622 Gunpowder sermon uses very little defamatory language about Catholics, as it was intended to suit

56 Kibbey, The Interpretation of Material Shapes, p. 15.
the pro-Catholic policy of King James at that time, a policy seen in the 1622 Directions for Preachers. Ramsden clearly breached these directions in his spoken sermon, but knew he was safe to speak in this way for a Gunpowder commemoration given to the self-selecting godly audience of the Halifax Exercise. However, he did not wish quite such potent words to be circulated back in his own parish of Methley. The sermons on Colossians that Ramsden delivered there were much more circumspect in their anti-papery content. Catholics were criticised at the more abstract level of doctrine and practice, for example their use of images in worship. Criticism of Catholic persons was confined to attacks on the pope. This more moderate language helped in the performance of the wider pastoral duties required of a minister and in the maintenance of neighbourly relationships within the parish. For example, during Ramsden’s incumbency, a friend of the Catholic Shanne family was churchwarden and oversaw the installation of a gallery in the church.

The main finding from this very rare chance to compare what a preacher planned to say with what a hearer heard, is that a preacher’s own manuscript of his sermon may not fully reveal the quality of that experience. Ramsden used substantially more ‘savory’ language in the pulpit than he was prepared to record in his notebook. The consequence of this finding for the wider study is that the affective properties seen in the printed sermons and preacher’s own manuscript copies of sermons may be an underestimate of what was heard during the event of preaching. It may be that a particular set of circumstances has made this difference apparent. By 1625, Ramsden was a skilled, experienced preacher, and could add these embellishments at will, so he probably felt no need to write them in his notebook. Intellectual pride may also have discouraged him from creating a permanent record of such ornamented prose. At the same time, Lister was a young man, still acquiring the skill of taking sermon notes and so was trying to capture everything the preacher said. His notes can be contrasted with those of a more experienced hearer, Elkanah Wales, who took notes of another sermon by Ramsden at the Halifax Exercise. Wales’ notes are more typical of what usually remains of a godly, Calvinist sermon: the doctrines, uses and exhortations were recorded in very plain language. In contrast, Lister’s urge to capture everything that Ramsden spoke in his Gunpowder sermon, reveals a very different side to what we know of as ‘plain’ preaching.

---

57 Jean Shami, *John Donne’s 1622 Gunpowder Plot Sermon* (Pittsburgh, 1996); The 1622 Directions for Preachers are reprinted in *TOHEMS*, pp. 577–9.

58 In his *Churches of Yorkshire* (1844), Richard Taylor, recorded that the gallery in Methley church was inscribed thus: ‘John Holland was my name, who gave six pounds to this same, 1626. Richard Dickonson and Robert Fether, churchwardens’. p. 17. At the same time, Richard Dickonson was on good enough terms with the Shanne family to take part in their Whitsun week play, BL: Add MS 38,599, f. 71.

59 BL. Add MS 4933 b, f. 184.
affective aspects of plain preaching have recently been associated with the performative delivery of the sermon, in gesture and voice. The Lister notes show that the content of the spoken sermon could also be highly affective.

**Seeing the Body of Christ**

Hugh Ramsden’s teachings on images at the start of his sermon series were intended to prepare his listeners to see new layers of significance in language, revealing Christ through the Word preached. Ramsden claimed that Saint Paul had been capable of this, as ‘well might the apostle Paul extoll and magnifie the gospell, for if any ever gained by it was he, if ever any knew the worth of the gospell, or saw the bloody sides of Jesus Christ through the Gospell it was hee’. At the start of the series, Ramsden encouraged an affective response to the idea of Christ with the sensual language of the Song of Songs, describing the physical beauty of Christ, the beloved,

for who is it that sees and beholds beautie in Christ more than any other beloved, for if they did they would not ask what is thy beloved any more than any other beloved . . . oh thy fairest among women, what is thy beloved more than another beloved? That thou doest so charge us, my beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest among ten thousand . . .

The Song of Songs was well known example of scriptural language at its most figurative, interpreted as depicting the relationship between Christ and his Church as a marriage between man and woman. It was a highly affective, sensual part of scripture to use in explicating a letter of Saint Paul. The word ‘beloved’, repeated here six times, imbued this short passage with a highly affective quality. In a later sermon Ramsden expounded how the atonement won by Christ’s blood should

...teach Christians not to rest in the outside of Christ but to draw as it were the curtains from his body and see what a great worke there lies under his veil in a body of flesh even this great worke of reconciliation, look upon all the religions under heaven and every religion is more glorious on the outside, more pleasant to the eye and to flesh and blood than Christ’s religion . . .

Thus, a Christian would visualise their deepening knowledge of the Word as a way of unveiling and seeing the body of Christ. Sensual language of an embodied divinity was also used by Robert Parke,

---

in his sermon at Gorton in 1639. In an echo of late-medieval mystical devotional practice, he presented a sort of mystical union between the human soul and the Word,

another duty wherein we draw nigh to god is in hearing of the word, when we bring our heart close as it were to the mouth of god and fix our spirite on the lips of Christ, that so wee may close with every truth that comes from the mouth of god by his ministre. Its not enough to heare the word, there must be a sweete intercorse betwix the word and us and when the word draws nigh into us wee close wth it and it dwells richly in us in all spiritual wisdome and understanding . . . hee is never nearer to god than when the word come to his soule . . .*63

Of course, the union being talked about was not necessarily happening during preaching, but even talk of spiritual union was highly affective.*64

The presence of Christ in the exposition of the Word was reinforced by sacramental language in sermons. This encouraged the relocation of where the divine was to be encountered from communion to preaching, and so, although it was not entirely new in the post-Reformation period, the portrayal of the Word as bread took on much greater importance for progressive Protestants.*65

Mr Wolphet, preaching at the Halifax exercise in 1609, declared,

the angell brought a booke not shut but opened. This bread manna must be broken . . . whence beame of the word is not lockt from us, but we have it preached to us . . . we have it present among us . . .*66

The preaching of the Word, or breaking it open, was thus likened to the breaking of the bread at communion, in that this action released something that could then be distributed. William Aiglin, in a verse lament for the preacher Roger Breailey, compared his ministry to the ‘purest wheaten flower that could be had’.67 The parishioners that mourned their preacher at Sowerby, John Broadley, complained that, since his death

And who is he that doth not see
How preachers are supplanted
And how the people of the land
Are of there manna scanted . . .*68

*63 Marie Booth sermon notes, GMCRO: M/35/5/3/7. Sermon by Robert Parke at Gorton on the last part of Psalm 73, ‘It is good for me to draw nigh to god’.

*64 See Peters, *Patterns of Piety* p. 203.


*66 BL: Add MS 4933.


*68 ‘Sowerby verses’, WYAS (C): WYC/1525/10/1/8/2/1.
A more compelling way of visualising the body of Christ was through the imagery of the cross. A close study of two sermons shows the ways in which Calvinist preachers did this. The first example is from a printed sermon of Henry Ramsden (brother to Hugh), who was Vicar of Halifax between 1629 and 1638. His sermon, ‘The Wounded Saviour’, was preached on a Good Friday, probably in London between 1626 and 1629, before he returned to his native Halifax, but he may have preached the same or similar sermons from his Halifax pulpit. The sermon was printed as part of a collection of his works, *A Gleaning in Gods Harvest*, published posthumously in 1639. While it was clearly Calvinist, it was not a controversial work, as the treatise mainly dealt with mortification. To some degree, the handling of the suffering and crucifixion of Christ in the sermon is typical of Reformed treatments, in that the physical sufferings of Christ did not dominate the content of the sermon. However, Ramsden still intended to impress the horror of the crucifixion on his hearers, with the aim to make them repent of their sins, and he did this in a carefully structured way. Early in the sermon, on the eleventh page, Ramsden delivered a sequence that fixed images of redness and blood in the minds of his hearers, describing how ‘the blood of a mean man, unjustly spilt, is a crying sin, a scarlet sin, of a deep crimson dye, every wound is a mouth, and every drop a tongue to cry’. On the seventeenth page of the sermon he reiterated the Reformed stance towards the crucifixion, that ‘we are not to understand onely, nor principally (as some Popish writiers doe) the bodily tortures and torments of Christ that he as this day endured on the Crosse, but withall and especially those secret agonies and conflict of soul’. However, having spent the majority of the sermon driving home the message that it was the sins of his hearers that were responsible for Christ’s death on the cross, on the twenty-fourth page, he came to the climax. This began and ended with the requisite response of the hearer and sandwiched between them was a series of close up images of crucifixion that placed the hearer at the centre of the action. Firstly, using the proxy of St Peter’s converts, Ramsden demanded that his hearers should undergo the same weeping and piercing of the heart, For what did not Christ shed drops of blood for, our sins, and shall we not shed tears for them. Thus it was with the converts Acts 2.37 when Peter told them your wicked hands have crucified Christ, saith the text, they were pricked in their hearts; Nay, that is not all, they were pricked through their hearts, or violently: as it were all the floudgates of sorrow were opened, they were pricked thorow with sorrow . . .

---

69 See chapter one for more information on his time as vicar.
70 Karant-Nunn, *The Reformation of Feeling*, ch. 3.
72 Idem, p. 117.
73 Idem. p. 124.
Ramsden went on to make the guilt of his hearers even clearer, and through this gave a series of close-up images of the crucified Christ’s body,

> our hands are deeply imbrued in the blood of Christ as theirs [the Jews], our wicked thoughts are as thorns that gored his precious head, our wicked actions are as nails that fastened his hands and feet to the tree; our oaths and blasphemies are as swords and spears that pierced his sacred side.

This close-up imagery was a textual version of late medieval detailed visual depictions of Christ’s suffering. One such example is the Bouts Diptych, shown in Figure 20. The small, hinged, diptych could be held close by the viewer and the image of Christ offered detailed views of individual points of his suffering. For example, the shape of thorns underneath the skin of Christ’s brow are clear, and one thorn even re-emerges through the eyebrow. Such images were surely intended for close up observation of each separate element of torture. Ramsden’s verbal depiction of the piercing of parts of Christ’s body by thorns, nails and spear had a similar impact, and he told his hearers to ‘look upon Christ whom we have so cruelly crucified’. In the Reformed sermon, however, the hearer was placed at the centre of the action. The implements of piercing and torture were their own sins. The verse from Acts told the hearers that the only appropriate response to this was to feel the piercing themselves, as they should be pricked through their own hearts with sorrow for their sins.
The final part of the sequence brought the hearer back to the present situation of the preaching event, and its purpose to ‘prick’ their ears,

Oh can we choose but be pricked in our ears when we have crucified Christ! If Peter went out and cried bitterly when hee had denied Christ, what cause have we to weep, tears, not of brine, but of blood, when wee look upon Christ whom we have so cruelly crucified?\textsuperscript{74}

To be pricked in the ear was to allow the Word to enter physically into the heart, as Jennifer Rae McDermott has shown in her study of the intersection of religious and anatomical ideas.\textsuperscript{75} To really

\textsuperscript{74} Idem. p. 124.
hear the preacher’s words was to be pricked in the ear and this was to be pricked through the heart and suffer like Christ. Both Christ and the hearer were pierced, and the result was a release of fluid. The theme of flow ran throughout this sequence, with drops of blood, weeping tears, floodgates, and tears of blood. These all made the visualisation a highly affective experience, as the body and emotions were experienced as a flow. The final section of the sequence brought the hearer to a moment of catharsis as the elements of flow surged forth as rivers and fountains, flowing freely,

How can we choose but be sorrow, and compunction to us that occasioned so much anguish and torment to Christ! Oh that our heads were rivers, and our eyes fountains of tears, that we may weep day and night for our sins and transgressions.’

Ramsden’s use of imagery in this sermon was very limited and formed only a small part of the whole. But the careful link made between the hearer and Christ, piercing and flow made it an intense experience for anyone paying attention. The imagery was coupled with the rhetorical question: ‘how can we choose’, which created a feeling of letting go and submitting to emotion. Thus, a controlled use of images, set in the context of doctrinal knowledge, could have a greater impact on listeners than a simple barrage of images designed to elicit horror and sympathy.

An even more dramatic example of verbal imagery is revealed in the sermon given by Thomas Case on Easter Sunday in Manchester in 1637. This was one of five sermons recorded in a manuscript volume entitled ‘Marie Booth, her Booke’. They are not contemporaneous sermon notes, but transcripts of the sermon written up by the hearer some months after the event. The handwriting is seen to mature in the two year gap between the first two sermons and the last three, which, as Marie Booth was an adolescent in 1637, suggests that the sermons were written in her own hand. She was educated, having been tutored by her mother since 1629, when her father, who was a nephew of Humphrey Booth, the builder of Salford Chapel, had died. Thomas Case was a high profile preacher. A year after this sermon he would be prosecuted for preaching against the hierarchy, and would subsequently go on to be one of the influential preachers in the Westminster

---

78 GMCRO: M35/5/3/1 & 8. Grant of tutorship to Elizabeth Booth in 1629 and 1644, an agreement for Marie’s impending marriage to her step brother, Charles Worsley. Worsley was twenty-two at the time of the marriage, so Marie was probably about the same age. This makes her fifteen for the earlier sermons, and seventeen for the later three.
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Assembly at the start of the Civil War.\textsuperscript{79} His 1637 sermon illustrates affective preaching both for its vivid content and by its appearing to have an ebb and flow of intensity. In his manual on preaching, Richard Bernard had advised that the voice should be ‘tuneable, rising and falling as the matter requireth’, and the Case sermon suggests that he did indeed use this technique.\textsuperscript{80}

The text for the sermon was suitable for Easter, being Rev. 1: 18, noted by Booth as, ‘I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen’. The opening section of the sermon divided the text to extract doctrine concerning the resurrection in a measured way. Case then moved on to describe the battle that Christ had fought against ‘sin, death and hell’, which allowed vivid imagery to be used. In the same way that Henry Ramsden had deployed the sins of man figuratively as the implements of Christ’s torture, Case imagined an embodied sin, death and hell making a physical attack on Christ:

> for so it was there was in the passion there was a bloody conflict and hote encounter, the Lord knowes, and by a DIVINE dispensation the enemies got him downe under foote, used him shamefully and despitefully, but they could not hold him long in that hote and fearfull buckle, up hee got again, takes the enemy by the hair of the head, and tramples on them in his anger and treads them down in his fury till his garments be red with bloud. So in the: 63: Isay [Isaiah] wee may see him coming from Bozra all stained, why, I have trodden the wine press alone, they trode on him, he got up againe and treads on them againe, I have trode the wine press alone, first he was trodden upon but to ye cost of the enemy, then hee got up againe and trode them in peeces, till all his garments were died red with blood . . .

This confused and repetitious text is clearly not an exact transcription of the words spoken by Case, but is a good indication of the vivid imagery that struck Booth at the time of the sermon. It is dramatic, with violent actions of trampling underfoot and hair pulling, and garments described as red and sodden with blood. The elements of treading and wet redness are combined in the scriptural reference to treading the wine press. The notes convey the excitement with which the adolescent girl heard this passage, and it is worth noting that it is all recorded in the present tense, which made the action more immediate. It is easy to imagine Case using gestures as part of his delivery, but even if this was not so, this was a dramatic scene being painted for hearers.

Case followed this with a calmer phase of the sermon, in which ‘the grave’ was repeatedly mentioned, and Booth capitalised these words in her notebook, suggesting emphasis. The ‘grave’ here was used figuratively as the state of sin, with Case asking ‘have you buried yourselves in drunken company[?]’. Case then moved on to the resurrection, and explicated the doctrine that Christ, as the head of the Church, would rise first. He emphasised the full bodily resurrection of Christ and drew the hearers’ attention onto their own bodies in the process, by asserting ‘he doth

\textsuperscript{79} CRO: EDCS 1638, Manchester 112.
\textsuperscript{80} Bernard, \textit{The Faithfull Shepherd} p. 34.
not say here is my hand yt was dead and is alive, here is my tongue that was dead and is alive, here is my eyes yt were dead and are alive, but I am he yt lives and was dead’. These were all body parts that Case could visibly highlight from the pulpit, so he may have used gesture at this point. The next section of the sermon was concerned with the notion that hearers should imitate Christ in facing persecution fearlessly. This placed the hearer alongside Christ in suffering and brought the drama of the passion and resurrection into the context of the contemporary religious and political realities. The call to suffer and be fearless signalled another rise in the emotional pitch of the sermon, as hearers were called upon to bear witness. This appears to be an interactive, call and response section,

yet there is other witnessess that beare witnes to christ, tho christ need it not, therefore in this great and blessed truth tho you need no other witnesses why it is a truth of God yet you have multitudes of Amen, Amens of Ecces, Amens of prophecyes, Amens of Eye witnesses Amens of Eare witnesses, women Cry Amen, men Cry amen there are A thousand Amens at once . . .

The handwriting is slightly larger here, reflecting Booth’s memory of the rising level of sound and emotional engagement.

In the final part of the sermon, the imagery of the battle between Christ and his enemies was reprised, now with the victorious outcome emphasised, with blood wet garments replaced with a bed of roses,

Fear not death, for Christ by his death hath slaine death, damned hell, and buried ye Grave, hee hath perfumed it and made it a bed of roses to sleepe in, a pallace to dwell in, . . . hee hath gone through all the passages of death & Hell, hee knows the turneings of that dismal vault, hee will lead thee by the hand till hee bring yee to the resurrection . . .

These words are highly sensory, referring to the sense of smell in perfume, touch in being led by the hand, and visual in describing palaces, vaults and labyrinthine underworlds. The sermon ends with a triumphal image of Christ standing on Mount Sion shaking the keys that he has wrung from the jailor of hell and death. Just as they had suffered with Christ, the hearer was positioned as part of this triumph.

Case’s sermon displays many features that were designed to elicit an emotional response. The sermon was structured with an ebb and flow of intensity that gradually built tension, which was released in a cathartic interactive sequence. The battle and suffering of Christ at the start of the sermon was mirrored by the same scene painted in triumphal terms at the end. Vivid imagery,

81 Bishop Bancroft’s criticism of those who cried out ‘Amen, Amen’ shows that this did indeed happen, cited in Ryrie, Being Protestant, p. 360.
references to body parts, fluids and senses, created a virtual sensory experience. Finally, the hearer was not allowed to be just a sympathetic observer in all this. Their own journey of faith and fears of persecution were positioned as part of the great drama of Christ’s passion and resurrection. The preacher was therefore able to imbue the lives and actions of his hearers with spiritual significance.

This chapter has revealed some of the ways in which, while contained within an overall purpose to educate and embed doctrinal and scriptural knowledge, sermons could have highly affective qualities. Even the most didactic ‘plain’ sermons, contained affective elements. This potentially widened the appeal of sermons beyond the most religiously committed, and that this did indeed occur is evidenced by preachers complaining about sermons being sought and enjoyed for the ‘wrong’ reasons. John Angier protested that

An understanding judicious man may love preaching that is judicious and understanding, fit to increase knowledge, and to perfect his understanding. A man of meekness may delight in a sermon of peace, peace, (sic) may be refreshed with smooth soft, milde, quiet preaching. A temperate man may joy in a sermon that is tart and bitter against drunkennesse, uncleannes: the liberall man may delight in severe preaching against covetousnes . . . because these things suit with their dispositions. 82

This passage highlights the plurality of the experience of preaching and it could also appeal for a variety of reasons. Angier used the verbs ‘love’, ‘delight’, ‘refreshed’, and ‘joy’, which all point to preaching as an affective experience.

This chapter has shown that progressive Protestant preaching was not characterised by unfettered passion and theatre. The extracts from sermons examined in this chapter were usually only a minor part of the overall sermon, positioned within a broader context of rational, measured discourse designed to educate. However, this constraint and the focused purpose gave the emotional content of sermons great power. In the sermons examined here, rather than create a general sea of emotion, tension was built by such constraint, which was then released in a highly directed way, like a voltage shock to the conscience of individual hearers. The affective aspects of ‘plain’ preaching were more powerful for being limited and controlled. While sermons such as Case’s were dramatic in part, this was always contained and controlled by a primary aim of changing the perceptions of the listeners through embedding doctrinal truths deep within their hearts, minds and bodies. The existence of this very purposeful emotional impact does not, however, exclude the possibility, and even likelihood, that affective elements made the experience of sermons less painfully boring for those who could not, or would not, engage with the deeper rationale of what was happening during

82 HTBH, p. 406.
preaching. The affective aspects of sermons were one way in which preaching could appeal to both the most religiously committed and the less so, thereby blurring the boundary between them.

A variety of figurative devices were used to aid teaching, such as homely scenes depicting sins, allegorical devices using every day phenomena such as rain, trees and houses, and close up visualisations of parts of the crucifixion. The common factor was to place the sinner at the centre of the action, rather than as an observer. Emblematic phrases and meditative sequences gave words an iconographic quality that made them more than text and seared them into the memory, informing the consciousness in the rest of daily life. Images in progressive Protestant preaching were both something to be rejected (as wrong images) and something that required attention. In addition to figurative language, preachers also developed the idea that the Word was a great mystery that offered the faithful a special way of seeing. This encouraged the idea of limitless progress to be made, as there was always another layer of mystery to be encountered, which brought the worshipper a step closer to a glimpse of God. Thus the affective and cognitive aspects of preaching were inseparable and interdependent, and this directed the awareness of the individual onto their own life and state of grace as an embodiment of that mystery, to be constantly examined for the enactment of doctrine. How the body became the focus of attention in preaching is now explored further in the final chapter.
Chapter Six

Preaching and the Body

Preaching to a group of his fellow ministers, Hugh Ramsden described the process of unfolding the Word as a visual experience, (my italics)

So then if you ask me what it is to preach I answer yt to preach is distinctly to unfold explain cut and divide the word of god, the doctrine of grace and mistery of salvation before the eyes of the people...  

83

The process of preaching was therefore intended to be seen, as well as heard. In this chapter, the roles in which preachers presented themselves will be considered, with particular emphasis on the preacher as an intercessor who suffered physically in acting as a conduit for the Word of God. This was part of a wider theme of the body, illness and healing, that shaped preaching and encouraged an embodied, affective response in hearers. This chapter will build on the arguments of chapter two and five that have shown how preaching could be an affective event.

Clergy as varied as John Donne and William Perkins expressed the precept that, in some sense, God spoke through the preacher in the pulpit. 84 In the Pennine area, preachers spoke about their special role in sermons. Richard Heyrick, the Warden of Manchester, gave a sermon at an episcopal visitation in 1637. Heyrick entitled his sermon ‘The Honour of Preachers’ and chose as his text Ephesians 2:17, ‘and here he came and preached peace to them that were affar off and to them that were nigh’. 85 The sermon was a rebuttal to the Laudian policies being implemented by Church hierarchy at this time, which reduced the importance of preaching in worship and salvation. Heyrick reminded Bishop Bridgeman of the order of things by positioning the preacher within a broader field of heavenly beings and pointing out that Christ himself was a preacher,

The great bishop of the soul, Christ Jesus himself, hee hath the faithfull preachers of the church as stars in his right hand, not only to defend them from the tirany and malic of the wicked, but he holds them forth to show their glory. We are ambassadors of god, reconciliators, coworkers with god, what more this is sacred and honourable... Christ came to preach... heaven itself can not show forth a more excellent creature than a faithfull

84 Crockett, ‘Thomas Playfere’s poetics of preaching’, p. 68.
Heyrick presented the role of preachers as divinely ordained alongside the Apostles, as they too were called to be God’s ambassadors, able to ‘rapt and ravish the soul’. Heyrick warned that to think little of preachers was to think little of Christ, as ‘we are the ministers of god and glory of Christ and Christ will not suffer his glory to be trampled underfoot’. A preacher was the only means by which the sacred object of the Word could be unlocked for the people, and he was ‘the peacemaker between god and man’. Conscious that his claims could lead to accusations of vainglory, Heyrick went on to say ‘let not men think of us as proud, but as stewards of Christ, dispensers of the sacred mysteries of god . . . not the ordinary things of creation, but mercies as full of misteries as of goodness.’

Hugh Ramsden, in his sermons to his parishioners in Methley, emphasised the value of ministers and their role in the means of salvation. The text of Col. 1: 25, ‘whereof I am made a minister according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you, to fulfill the word of God’, allowed him set out what he called ‘the doctrine of the ministry’,

That a minister of the gospell, whether he be rich or poor, base or honourable, or in what state so ever he be, yet there is a certain reverence and due respect which belongs to him in regard of his office because he is a minister of Christ . . .

Ramsden developed the idea that ministers were spiritual stewards, the divinely ordained means of their hearers’ salvation. They had been entrusted with the Gospel, the blood of Christ, which was the ‘keys to the kingdom’ and had ‘full authority in God’s house to command, to threat, to charge, to exhort and admonish, all in the name of the master’. Ramsden echoed Heyrick’s words in warning that ‘whatever the steward does, god does, so woe unto them that despise the admonitions and threatenings of the steward’. Parishioners should appreciate their preaching minister and realise ‘thou owest him for heaven through whose ministry thou wast brought to heaven’. The role of a preacher was divinely ordained as ‘god’s calling to the ministrie is a calling to a special’ people, for wheresoever there is a candle there is a candlesticke’. He finished the sermon with a reminder of the preacher’s power, that, ultimately, ‘all spirituall things attending unto Salvation are dispersed and conveyed no other way then through the steward, therefore waite upon the ministrie of the word’. Ramsden’s lengthy discourse on the role of preachers in this sermon speaks of the difficulties that preaching ministry encountered in pastoral settings. By presenting their role as divinely ordained vehicles for God’s will, ministers such as Ramsden hoped to mitigate the effects of their pulpit

---

admonishments, thereby making the roles of preacher and peacemaker less contradictory in the eyes of his parishioners.

In other sermons, Ramsden insisted on the special role played by preaching in revealing the mystery of the Word. He expounded

What difference between reading and preaching, is not reading preaching, to which I answer reading in a large sense may be called soe, for reading doth declare and manifest something, or else to what end read we the scriptures, yet reading doth not unfold the word, but preaching doth make manifest and unfold the mystery of grace and salvation.

If the treasures of the gospell be hid, you must have one that can digg into the bowells of the scripture and discover the word of truth unto you. The reader, he is not a digger, but the preacher he doth digg and divide the word of truth . . .

Ramsden therefore made it clear that a preaching minister was the key to salvation. A key part of this was the idea that, in some sense, the preacher was a means of communication with the divine. This was a notion widely promoted by clergy such as Samuel Hieron, who declared in his *The Dignity of Preaching*, ‘it is the ordinance of God, that there should be a calling of men, to deale betwixt him and man’. In the Pennines, John Broadley’s parishioners saw him as a living intercessor, describing their preacher as,

| God’s Mouth to man he was on earth   |
| To explain and apply                |
| His word unto their consciences     |
| His name to magnify                 |

| Man’s mouth he was to God againe    |
| By prayer and supplication          |
| To reconsile his own elect          |
| By christ his intercession          |

The verse does not make it clear whether Christ or Broadley was interceding, but the agency of Broadley in the process is emphasised, and he was understood to be a means through which God and man communicated. This intercessory role echoed that of medieval sainthood, and in Broadley’s case the parallel was enhanced by the propagation of a semi ‘miraculous’ myth that persisted into the eighteenth century. The myth told how he had preached on the dial stone in the church yard for thirteen Sundays while Sowerby Chapel was rebuilt ‘without so much as a shower of rain to disturb

---

87 Idem. Sermons on Col. 1: 28 and Col. 2: 3.
89 ‘Sowerby verses’, WYAS (C): WYC/1525/10/1/8/2/1.
him’. As an intercessor, the physical person of the preacher was highlighted, and the next section will show how preachers encouraged attention to the body through their suffering and exertions.

**The person of the preacher**

The physical person of the preacher was a location for affective elements in progressive Protestant worship. Preachers could cut an imposing figure in their sombre black attire. The 1622 will of Bolton preacher, James Gosnell, shows that he possessed a ‘preacher’s gowne lined with lambe’ as well as two gowns and two other cloaks, including a ‘best gowne’, a ‘second gowne and grogram suite’, a ‘stuff cloke’ and a ‘mourning cloke’. He bequeathed all these to other preachers in the area. John Favour made a trip to London during which he bought substantial amounts of expensive fabric, including taffeta, ‘Philip and Cheyney’, velvet, satin, and ‘chalette’, as well as stockings. Favour’s funeral monument depicts him with ruffled collars and cuffs, dark undergarments, white surplice and a red cape, seen in Figure 17. So, although this evidence is rather scant, it does suggest that at least some preachers were conscious of their visual impact in the pulpit and had no qualms about dressing to make an impact. Their physical appearance was important too. John Angier’s appeal was aided by his looks, described as ‘of a clear complexion, red and white, of a cheerful countenance, and venerable aspect’. The parishioners of Sowerby attached significance to the physical presence of their preacher, John Broadley. Their verse lament told how

```plaintext
he did deck and eke adorn
Each place were as he was
That in his presence did appear
The character of grace . . .
```

Likewise, the epitaph on Broadley’s gravestone in Halifax Parish Church highlights the interplay between the aural and visual in his preaching and the importance of his physical presence with the lines ‘Who heard him, saw life in his doctrine shine; Who saw him, heard sound doctrine in his life’. This is all evidence that the ideals of clerical conduct and ‘comely bodily presence’ prescribed in

---

93 *Life of John Angier*, p. 87. Kate Armstrong notes the contemporary advice that only good looking sons should be sent to train as ministers in her ‘Sermons in Performance’, p. 136.
94 ‘Sowerby verses’, WYAS (C): WYC/1525/10/1/8/2/1.
works such as *The Faithfull Shepherd* found their way into the consciousness of progressive Protestant laity.\(^{95}\)

The event of preaching afforded opportunities for preachers to make their physical presence an important part of their appeal. There were some ritual-like aspects to the practice of preaching. Ian Green has listed these as prayer beforehand, the preacher’s ascent of the pulpit, the stages of the sermon itself, and the closing prayer and psalm or hymn.\(^{96}\) He has not yet taken this any further, but evidence from the Pennine area allows some exploration of this line of thought. The entrance of the preacher into the church and the progress towards the pulpit, was a moment of conscious attention, as already mentioned in chapter two. The entrance needed to be handled with care, though, as an overt display of pomp would be disparaged. Richard Murray, the warden of Manchester in 1606, was criticized for having required ‘the fellows, chaplains, singing men, choristers to goe before him to church and some gentlemen follow[ed] after’.\(^{97}\) Murray was known as a poor preacher, so this extravagance was harshly judged by his critics. The approach to the pulpit and ascent of the steps followed. A grave demeanour was expected at this time, although a visiting preacher’s gesture of reverence as he approached the pulpit was met with mockery from the more zealous parishioners at Leeds.\(^{98}\) The approach to the pulpit and ascent of the steps could be cast as a transformative moment in some sense, as the elevation of the pulpit symbolised the role of the preacher in communicating between heaven and earth. Susan Wabuda has pointed out that pulpits ‘heighten and enhance the congregation’s appreciation for the authority and the mystic power of the text, as well as the preacher, who walked in the footsteps of Christ and his apostles’.\(^{99}\) Pennine preachers occasionally commented on the transformative power of entering the pulpit. The elderly minister of Ashton, John Harrison, was so infirm that he could barely move, yet he pronounced ‘if I were in the pulpit I should be well’. The curate of Coley chapel, Richard Nichols, told his listeners ‘you must not heed me but when I get three feet above the earth’, meaning that his words had a veracity when delivered from the pulpit that was otherwise lacking.\(^{100}\) Being in the pulpit could transform a preacher into being slightly more than a man.

---

\(^{95}\) Plaque preserved at Halifax Parish Church; Bernard, *The Faithfull Shepherd*, p. 35.

\(^{96}\) Green, *Continuity and Change*, pp. 35,6.


\(^{98}\) *English Pharise*, p. 150.


\(^{100}\) *Life of John Angier*, p. 72; *Autobiography of Oliver Heywood* Vol. 4, p. 9.
The voice and manner of speaking of the preacher was even more important. John Barlow advised a strident, urgent style, calling upon his fellow preachers to be as ‘Cryers’ that sell their goods, even if some call them rude, indiscreet, passionate. Why? Can a Bell have too shrill a sound, an hound too deep or base a mouth? A peece give too great a report? Or a Cryer extend his voice too high . . . and shall not the preacher cry, roar, and like John, bellow like an oxe when men sleepe and sink in sin.101

However, preachers who adopted a gentler tone were also appreciated. Robert Booth was said to have ‘charmed his hearers into love and admiration’ when he spoke from the pulpit, and advanced from being curate at Sowerby Bridge to being the Vicar of Halifax in the 1650s. The charismatic preacher, Roger Brearley, was described as having ‘honye lips’ that ‘did make our hearts rejoyce’ in contrast to others who ‘make a shoute with roaring voyces’.102 The ability to switch between the two modes was the mark of a skilled preacher. John Broadley’s ability to do this was celebrated, as ‘Barnabas was he to the weak, and to the wounded spirit, Bonargas to the wicked sort to maze and make a fright’. Here, Broadley was probably emulating his old teacher, Richard Greenham, of Dry Drayton. Prior to taking up the curacy of Sowerby, Broadley had spent six years as school master at Dry Drayton, during which time he wrote down Greenham’s sayings, one of which was ‘God hath two hands; and in the one he holdeth a hammer to break the proud in pieces, and to bray them to pouder; in the other hand hee hath a horne, to powre Gods blessings upon the humble’.103 Likewise, John Angier’s preaching style was probably influenced by his earlier experience of a skilful preacher. He had grown up with the ministrations of the famous John Rogers of Denham, who was able to bring his hearers to tears. Angier would therefore have understood how to deliver a sermon in a way that engaged the emotions, and his pulpit presence was described as, ‘holding up his hands all the

time of his sermon, speaking with an even audible voice, with much ardency and intention both of spirit and speech".  

A preacher physically exerting himself was also appreciated. In part, this was a practical necessity, as to preach effectively to a large church was physically demanding. As shown in chapter three, the parish of Sheffield held trial sermons before appointing a preacher to make sure their voices would be sufficient for the large auditorium. In his autobiography, Henry Newcome expressed a concern that his voice would not be strong enough for Manchester Collegiate Church, and he received a letter by one who thought him ‘too weak in the body’ for preaching there. In addition to these practical reasons for exertion, the exertions and suffering of preachers were a recurring textual motif. Suffering marked the preacher as having a special calling from God and attested to the magnitude of the task being undertaken in the pulpit. This may be expected in relation to a charismatic preacher, such as Roger Brearley. His follower, Aiglin, depicted how the preacher was weakened in his work of curing souls and bodies,

not he the worker but the instrument by which the same was done: therein he spent his very heart, the cries of love did weare his earthly bodye, yet without feare he did continue till his care was runne ending his course even as he begun"

However, suffering was also a noted theme for more mainstream preachers. Joseph Lister recounted that Elkanah Wales was full of ‘prayer, tears and wrestling with god’ while preaching. John Angier’s physical collapse in the pulpit was the cause of his appointment at the newly built Ringley Chapel, when he swooned mid-sermon during a preaching visit. After the service, the local people rushed to the house where he was staying and begged him to become their permanent minister. Angier agreed and did not disappoint their expectations, as he was reputedly wet with sweat and ‘exceedingly spent’ after preaching, so much so that his descent from the pulpit was marked by being wrapped in a warmed, scarlet cloth to protect his health. John Angier’s ‘hands raised’ preaching posture, already mentioned, and the red cloak recall the fifteenth century Flemish diptych seen in Figure 20. It would be stretching this similarity too far to propose that Angier presented himself as a devotional image, but there are striking echoes in the features that triggered affective responses. Angier was far from alone in notable suffering. The account of his pulpit collapse bears similarities to the story of how Oliver Carter had collapsed while preaching in his Manchester pulpit in 1607, and died shortly afterwards. This event was still known nearly fifty years later, so that
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104 Life of John Angier, p. 71.
106 ‘William Aiglin lament’, Lambeth Palace Archives, MS 3461, f. 234.
Richard Hollingworth was able to include it in his history of Manchester, *Mancuniensis*. The verses composed about John Broadley suggest that he too put a great deal of physical effort into his preaching,

Where in there was a hour spent  
In exposition wise  
When he had time and health and strength  
Besides his preaching twice . . .

The verse makes a link between Broadley’s failing health and the potency of his preaching, as ‘his preaching was more powerful, when he drew near to death’. Broadley had learned to preach by observing Richard Greenham, who was described as taking ‘such extraordinary pains with his preaching that his shirt would usually be as wet with sweating as if it had been drenched in water so he was forced so soon as he came out of the pulpit to shift himself’. Preaching was also understood to have brought about the early death of Richard Garbutt of Leeds. Garbutt’s biographer noted ‘for with the vehemence of setting on his matter, he at length broke a vein within his breast, and spitted blood in such abundance that it brought him to a hasty consumption’. Although advised by physicians not to preach again, Garbutt would not be kept out of the pulpit and he died shortly afterwards.

Although it is not suggested that displays of suffering were ‘performed’, preachers had some awareness of the symbolic significance of being seen to suffer. In the preface to his printed sermons, Angier wrote ‘all that I now desire in recompence of my pains for your good in a time when my body was not very fit for it, is your purposed fervent praiers’, which points to him being aware that his parishioners knew of his exertions and the toll they took upon his body. Angier also described himself and other preachers as being, like the Apostles, ‘vessels to carry the word of god into the world . . . his name is called upon them, his commission is with them, nay his presence is with them’, emphasising the weightiness of their task. Hugh Ramsden held forth about his sufferings in several of his sermons on Colossians. He emphasised how his exertions began with the necessary preparations.

the minister hath wrestling with god before he come into the pulpit, when he is in it and after he comes out of it. It is said of Jacob and Isau that they wrestled with the Angell of the

108 ‘Sowerby verses’, WYAS (C): WYC/1525/10/1/8/2/1.
110 One Come from the Dead, preface.
111 HTBH, Epistle Dedicatory and p. 98.
Covenant a whole night. Also after his preparation he hath great wrestlings, with dispensation of the gospell the ministers may be compared to the painfull bee who labours all the day in the green meadow and comes home laden A weary creature all the night, so doth the minister labour in the large meadows of the scriptures and readeth the bookes of the prophets.  

‘Wrestling’ was a common motif used by progressive Protestants and was usually meant in a figurative sense. Here, in recalling the biblical story of Jacob and Esau wrestling with the Angel, Ramsden reminded his hearers of wrestling in the physical sense. He reinforced this by also comparing preachers with actual wrestlers, soldiers and childbearing women in labour. In other sermons, Ramsden elaborated on his sufferings and how he expended his strength,

and I will very gladly spend and be spent for you, though the more I love you the less I be loved . . . for the sufferings of ministers is very beneficial for gods people . . . because there is some more excellency in ye suffering of ministers more than any other men because that others will follow their example

he [the preacher] plows you and tills you by the ministrie of his words, and in that he serves you, and prays for you, he labours and spends his strength for you and in that he serves you if you have but eyes to see it . . .

The sight of the preacher wrestling with God and suffering for his task was therefore part of the experience of preaching and shows the importance of the pulpit as a visual focus of attention, as discussed in chapter one. The physical suffering of the preacher encouraged an understanding of their role as a conduit of communication with the divine, or intercessor. As they used their physical bodies to signal their special status and the magnitude of the task being undertaken, the person of the preacher was seen to be as a site of God’s action and communication. Of course, in reality, not all ministers would have been willing to stir themselves up to such exertions, at least, not on a regular basis. However, the ideals presented in literary sources were influential on the expectations and imaginations of progressive Protestants, so it is valid to further explore how the preachers exploited age –old links between cure of souls and cure of bodies to imbue their preaching with affective qualities.

**Physicians of the soul and body**

So far it has been established that preachers presented themselves and their fellow preachers as suffering bodily for their pains and their role as intermediary between God and man. This brought
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113 See Ryrie, *Being Protestant*, p. 252, for more on the metaphor of wrestling.

attention onto the body and resonated with the perennial association between religion and healing. In particular, preachers used language figuratively, addressing the subject of curing souls through imagery concerned with bodily illness and healing. It is proposed that this aspect of preaching had particularly affective qualities. Most of the scholarship on the interaction between religion and medicine has been written from the ‘history of medicine’ angle. The debate has focused on determining the religious background of physicians who adopted new medical ideas, such as those set forth by Paracelsus and Helmont, which challenged the traditional medicine of Galen. In the 1970s, Charles Webster argued that ‘puritans’ were at the vanguard of these new ideas, but this was subsequently challenged by Peter Elmer who claimed that, before 1640, the new medical ideas made little impression, and ‘puritan’ physicians were conservative and protectionist in outlook. The exception to this, he argued, was at the radical fringes of religion, where the new medical ideas chimed with the theological view that body and soul were much more closely integrated and a calling from God was valued above institutional learning.  

Other scholars have used religious sources to investigate the circulation of medical ideas. David Harley examined the use of anatomical, sickness and healing metaphors in sermons, with the purpose of understanding popular views towards medicine, finding that ‘the medical metaphors that they used in sermons drew on this close relationship [between body and soul] to encourage lukewarm Christians to trust in their ministers of religion as they trusted surgeons and physicians’. He did not develop this interesting proposition any further, as his concern was with the development of medical ideas, rather than the experience of religion. Similarly, Andrew Wear has studied the diaries of progressive Protestants for the integration of ideas on the cure of bodies and souls. Unsurprisingly, he showed that the diary writers had internalised a providential message, made great use of illness and medical metaphors and saw the body and soul as closely linked. Wear’s argument here was that understandings of illness were only partially spiritualised and that there was a plural approach to treating disease, with natural cures from apothecaries and physicians sought alongside divine help. Both Harley and Wear emphasise the separation and rivalry between the professions of minister and physician. In contrast, Patricia Ann Watson’s empirical study of
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115 Ole Grell and Andrew Cunningham, (eds), Medicine and religion in Seventeenth-Century England (Aldershot, 1996); Charles Webster argued that puritanism was conducive to advances in medicine in The Great Instauration (Bolder, 1976). For an alternative view see Peter Elmer, ‘medicine, religion and the puritan revolution’ in R. French and A. Wear, (eds), The Medical Revolution of the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 13–19.
physician ministers in New England shows how the cure of body and soul was fully integrated in those particular circumstances.\textsuperscript{116}

There have been very few studies of the links between preaching and healing from the point of view of discovering more about the experience of religion. This study will therefore seek to shed new light on how preaching could be an affective event due to the links between cure of body and soul being brought to the surface in sermons. There was no more affective mode of piety than one which engaged the body and hopes and fears about illness, and preaching provided the opportunity to do just that. The connection between religion, sickness and healing was ancient and during the post-Reformation period, the soul and body continued to be thought of as very closely linked. Nigel Smith describes how Pauline theology ‘envisaged all human forms and institutions as “bodies” within which the power of the Holy Spirit could or would reside. The human body as much as the physical building of a church itself could be the receptacle of the divine’. The process of preaching was ‘a search in the language of scripture for the external and internal truth of the way in which the divine resided in the individual human being’.\textsuperscript{117}

Preachers in the Pennines dwelt on the closeness of soul and body. One of Henry Ramsden’s posthumously printed sermons, ‘the Epicure’s Caution’, explicitly equated the heart with the soul, as he exhorted ‘Look what a milstone or a talent of lead is to the body.’ The same are these Sinnes to the Soule (which is meant by the heart, as St Peter saith, \textit{the hidden man of the heart}; that is, the hidden man of the soul.’ This being established, it made sense that the body weighed down by over eating and drinking would also lead to a soul weighed down and unable to reach towards God. Physical indulgences, he insisted, ‘burden the soul, not immediately, but by the body, they burden the body as the instrument of the soul, and so by consequence the soul, so that the soul can not lift itself to any spiritual duty’. A direct correlation was drawn between the state of the body and the soul, as ‘the fullest and fattest bodies, those that are given most to sensual appetite, they are troubled most with lusts that fight against the soul.’ The fat body and the burdened soul, unable to lift itself, were thus closely linked in the imagination.\textsuperscript{118}


\textsuperscript{117} Smith, \textit{Perfection Proclaimed}, p. 15.

Other preachers figuratively presented the soul as a physical organ, even a being that could move in the same way as the human body. Robert Parke, in his sermon on the verse ‘But it is good for me to draw nigh to God’, at Gorton in Manchester, described the soul’s motion,

*Internall is nothing else but the sweete working of the soule to God continually, a drawing up of the heart as the thing moves to its centre, as the body moves by a naturall motion, so the soule by a spiritual motion comes nearer and nearer to god. *

Parke extended the motion metaphor. To get close to God, an individual had to undertake a ‘holy spiritual walking’ back to God, so man could again ‘walk with God’ as he had done before the fall, while, at the same time, the wicked were presented as running from God.119

There was a tension in imagining the soul as in a sense part of the body, and in one sermon Richard Garbutt presented the body as both the temple of the Holy Spirit and the site of sin.120 In his treatise on the resurrection, he expanded upon the natural weakness and faults of the body,

*the present frailties and weaknesses and vileness of these bodies of ours; bodies that are so soon pulling and complaining for a little excess of cold or heat, a little defect of meat or drink; bodies that are so soon wearied and tired out with a little labour and pains in the course of one’s Calling; bodies that are soon withering and waxing old, and mouldring away; bodies every way so vile, that some have irked to have any pictures made of their bodies, as but the picture of their shame. *

However, a promise was held out to the elect of bodily rising as a member of Christ’s body at the resurrection, and it was important to ensure one was a fit candidate for this. Garbutt, therefore, gave his hearers a sort of fitness checklist,

*Think with thyself: when gluttony and drunkenness dishonours thy body, is this drunken body fit to be a member of Christ’s glorious body? When filthiness and uncleanness defiles thy body, is this filthy body fit to be a member? *

The same question was to be asked for sins associated with particular body parts: was the hand free of ‘bribery, injustice, cozenage and trading legerdemain’? Was the eye free from ‘pride, envy, avarice, and adultery’? Was the tongue furred by ‘profane and cursed speaking, horrible swearing, slandering, and back biting’? 121

Medical metaphors were frequently used to express the conflict with sin in sermons. Henry Ramsden declared that the wise would seek out the reproof of the minister, just as the ill sought

120 One Come from the Dead, pp. 40, 164.
121 A Demonstration of the Resurrection, pp. 160, 164.
medical help from a physician or an apothecary, ‘let us know and demean ourselves as those that are sicke and neede physick’. He, like many other preachers, used medical allegories when talking about sin. To avoid temptation ‘we must herein imitate Chirurgions, who when a man is taken with a dangerous bleeding of the nose, the Chirurgion opens another vein’. The sharpness of the reproof, he maintained, should be understood as ‘oil to a wound, as a fomentation to open the sore that the admonition may enter and have its due effect’. Ramsden’s brother, Hugh, used a similar image in his sermon on Col. 2:2,

the law is like unto the surgeons instrument that cutts and glancis the wound but heales it not, but the gospell is that oyle which is pourd into the wound , the law doth shew a man his misery but the gospell heals him of it, the law kills him, but the gospell doth revive him and quicken him again.

John Barlow warned his readers to ‘still have an eye to this physician, otherwise our patients will not be cured’ and later in his treatise likened the Word to a cure, expounding that ‘this salve is good for the fourefold, forenamed soare: This Physic, like Moses Rod, will remove all death whatsoever’. On the other side of the Pennines, Christopher Hudson exhorted,

for as we make haste having drunk poison to get an antidote and having a wound to get a surgeon, so, for as we all have drunk the deadly poison of original corruption and have wounded our souls to death by actual sins, it behoves us to make all speed to procure the antidote of Jesus Christ’s blood, as the great physician of souls.

Blissful unawareness of one’s sinfulness was the most dangerous state of all, and Henry Ramsden compared this to a consumption that was only noticed when it was too late to be cured.

God’s children were exhorted to undertake a process of ‘mortification of the flesh’, or the killing off of the worldly, carnal appetites, and this would set them apart from the unregenerate. The aim was that, eventually, a believer would reach a state of sanctification, in which the appetites were entirely spiritual. This was an ongoing process, because as the soul progressed towards

\[\text{\textsuperscript{122}} \text{ Gleaning in Gods Harvest, ‘The Epicure’s Caution’, pp. 145, 153, 58, 169.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{123}} \text{‘Hugh Ramsden sermons’, WYAS (W): WYW 1352/3/3/1/2/11, sermon on Col. 2:2.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{124}} \text{Barlow, Exposition of the Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to Timothy, pp. 269, 20.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{125}} \text{‘Christopher Hudson Sermons’, LCRO: DP353. ‘The best art of thriving’.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{126}} \text{Gleaning in Gods Harvest, ‘The Epicure’s Caution’ pp. 145, 153, 158, 169.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{127}} \text{See for example, the manuscript notes on mortification of the flesh made by John Lister in the same volume in which he made his sermon notes (WYAS (C): SH/3/S/1. This looks like it might be an early version of a printed treatise of John Preston’s Sins Overthrow: or a godly and learned treatise on mortification, (1633).}\]
sanctification, the body increasingly became a source of temptation and conflict. In a sermon delivered at Pudsey, Elkanah Wales warned: ‘we have that flesh within us that would cheat us at every end, we can turn us no way, but it is ready to put tricks on us, oh let us know it and bewail our miseries.’

Cornelius Glover of Hunslet pictured a battle with a personified sin, urging his hearers to ‘strike it in the blood, wound it in the head, and kill it in the heart’.

William Aiglin described the preaching of his mentor, Roger Brearley, using physical and healing metaphors,

the burning sword also through liver, harte and gaule did fearly goe . . .
with fullers sope he washt the leaprous skin from that pollution it was wrapped in . . .
and let them wash and rinse and sweep away that foule abomination . . .

Progressive Protestant laity made a strong link between bodily and spiritual illness, and therefore healing. Joseph Lister described how, in 1641, he

Fell sick and so came home to my mother, at Bradford, and then were my soul-trouble and fears revivied, and were more sharp and piercing than before; and my apprehensions of the approach of death, made the same cut more deep. In this ag[o]ny I lay some weeks oppressed under the burden of gilt, and a death-threatening distemper.

In the same way, a spiritual moment brought a physical relief

Yet at last God was pleased to step in with light, and love, and clear satisfaction; and I could not hold, but cried out aloud, “He is come! He is come!” which made the affliction on my body the more light and easy, the remainder of the time that I was under it, and in this sweet sense of comfort I walked many days . . .

This vivid depiction of the link between body and soul was used to describe the experience of preaching. John Broadley’s parishioners pictured him as physically cutting out their sins,

With levies knife he lanced deep
Into the inwards parts
And did discover secrite sins
Was harbourd in the hart . . .

The link made between preachers and physic was even applied by the laity to criticise preachers. John Walker drew on the parallel between preacher and physician in his critique of Alexander Cooke
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and his followers. He urged them to leave for the Americas, rather than ‘stay heere like an unskilfull physician’. Walker claimed that preachers such as Cooke ‘cure one soul and kill a thousand’.  

The obscuring of the boundary between cure of bodies and souls in sermons was reinforced by some degree of dual-professionalism in reality. This happened in two ways: formally and informally. Formally, orthodox, mainstream clergy were sometimes also practising physicians. John Favour continued to actively practise as a physician after his institution as Vicar of Halifax. He maintained a correspondence with other physicians, one of whom sent him a list of purgatives given to Queen Elizabeth. Halifax may have also provided a link that was formative for Sir Thomas Browne, the author of *Religio Medici* and exponent of new medical ideas. Recent scholarship on Browne has made a case for him having stayed with the Lister family during his time in Halifax during the mid 1630s. This study can contribute to this strand of research by highlighting a possible association between Thomas Browne and Richard Garbutt. As seen in chapter five above, John Lister kept a sermon note book and this contains a sermon by Richard Garbutt, the preacher at Leeds. Although Garbutt was dead by the time Browne arrived in Halifax, his possible connection with the Lister family is noteworthy because Garbutt too displayed a parallel interest in religion and chemistry. This is seen in a notebook kept by Garbutt in his earlier days at Cambridge, which contains lists of the miracle cures from Saint Matthew’s Gospel alongside lists of chemicals and their prices for the concoction of medicines. In the mind of the future preacher of Leeds, there was no boundary between the curing of bodies with chemicals and souls with grace and he possibly transmitted these thoughts to the Lister family, and subsequently to Browne. This example shows the close links between physical and spiritual healing, and how both clergy and laity were interested in this.

At the more radical end of the spectrum of preaching, there was a strong, though less formalised, link between preaching and healing. Large crowds of people were drawn to hear the
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134 John Favour of Halifax, Joseph Midgely of Rochdale, Timothy Bright of Methley, Richard Hall of Manchester and and John Webster of Kildwick were all clerics who at some time also practiced physic.

135 WYAS (C): SH/3/AB/1 Pocket book of Mathew Houldsworth contains a copy of a letter from Mr Morgan to Dr Favour listing all the treatments he had administered to Queen Elizabeth whilst the former was the Queen’s Apothecary.


charismatic Roger Brearley of Grindleton, who preached a form of mysticism and perfectionism.¹³⁸

Aiglin’s lament for Brearley celebrated the preacher’s healing of souls, but slips without a pause into describing how Brearley’s was also

skillful in phissicke was the man likewise and for that cause all quarters did arise opprest with sickness, not them did he miss to cure our malladies, for even in this he seemed wonderfull, for there came none with burning feavors, gripeing of the stone, drye coughs, consuming of the plume and the stitch beneath the liver which doe stand the plurisee burning soe neare the harte this flameing liver making all to smarte the troubled conscience working in the minde the appopoxie which sinnewes all doe binde, the burning harte which all the blood doth heate, and troubled brayne, whereas the pulses beate, the falling eyll which casteth all to ground, the timpan which doth make the belly sound, the palsye which doth make the limbs to shake, and lethargie that all the partes doe take. But they were cured all and many more . . .

This long list of specific illnesses does not sound like a metaphor for spiritual cures, but a roll call of Brearley’s abilities to cure people of physical ailments. This was possibly a large part of the attraction for the crowds that gadded to his sermons, as the next section of Aiglin’s eulogy describes,

no price they paid and all was cured as before I said, store of purgations in due tyme he gave and sought thereby their fainting lives to save the ill out from the good by force to drive must needs be done by eateing corrosion but when he did perseave the ill was gone with good restoratives everyone he healed also; that from him they went in perfect health, and still his harte was bent to do them good, but if the cause was soe the sicknes deadly was, he made them knowe before they went . . .

So Brearley is presented here as not only curing ills but offering some sort of prognosis. It is interesting that he is pictured ‘eating corrosion’, which was a common motif in medieval sainthood and suggests a very personal action of healing. Brearley is presented as a more proficient healer than others, prepared to use strong medicine where others refrain from doing so,

they seeke for comforte of their sore deseases of many I confess the world pleasures but their unskillfulness in many thinges confusion great in all their actions brings. Where they should purge, sweet medecines they use and when to vomitt pill they doe refuse, they make them sick, thus that before was sound and in the whole they also make a wound, thus everyman is left to live or dye be whole or sicke in his infirmitye . . .¹³⁹

¹³⁸ The most recent work on Brearley is that by Como, Blown by the Spirit. See also Geoffrey Nuttall The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (University of Chicago Press edition, 1992). On another radical preacher/healer, see Walsham, “Frantick Hacket”, p. 46.
It is not clear whether this was meant in a physical or spiritual sense, and this ambiguity is typical of Aiglin’s eulogy. Rather than view this ambiguity as frustrating, it is, in fact, revealing of the degree to which physical and spiritual illness and healing were interdependent at this time. The lines between preacher and healer were thus very blurred indeed for charismatic preachers on the margins of orthodoxy, and Brearley was not alone. David Como argues that John Webster should be seen as one of the heirs to Brearley’s style of antinomian, mystical, perfectionism. John Webster succeeded Brearley as curate of Kildwick in 1634, and was converted to Brearley’s perfectionist theology shortly afterwards. He remained in close contact with Robert Towne, a fellow antinomian who had probably known Brearley in his early days at Grindleton. Webster went on to become one of the promoters of Helmontian medicine, one of the new strands of medicine that gradually superseded the Galenic system.

It is apparent from this that the interplay between religion and physic was important for both mainstream progressive Protestant preachers and those at the margins of orthodoxy. To look for a direct causal link between religious radicalism and medical radicalism somewhat misses the central point of the great degree to which cure of souls and bodies was inter-dependent in the post-Reformation period. It would also be wrong to make too much of a distinction between the formal dual professionalism of ministers such as Favour and the more free-form dual healing of Brearley, as they operated in the same milieu and there were organic links between the two. Brearley originated from the parish of Rochdale and grew up under the compelling preaching of the non-conformist, preaching minister there, Joseph Midgely. When Midgely was suspended for non-conformity in 1604, he moved back to his family’s original home parish of Halifax, and practised medicine there with the blessing of Favour until his death in 1627. It is highly probable that Midgely had also jointly practiced as a minister and physician while at Rochdale. The less well educated Brearley could have been emulating the combined cure of bodies and souls that he had experienced as a member of Midgely’s parish in his youth.

141 Webster wrote in the preface to Towne’s *A Re-assertion of Grace, or Vindiciae Evangelli* (1654) that they had known each other for many years.
143 Raines, *Vicars of Rochdale Part I*, p. 75; Midgely’s powerful preaching is credited with the initial conversion of the famed preacher, Richard Rothwell, see Samuel Clarke, *The Lives of Thirty-two English Divines* (1677), pp. 67–74.
Some preachers presented their ministration as preferable to that of physicians. The Bolton preacher, Robert Parke, urged his hearers to turn to God in time of sickness,

Let every Christian if God cast thee on thy sicke bed lay up this for ye soule, ye first corse thou takes draw nigh to god. When men are surprised with sicknes they send for ye phisitian, I discomend it not but I pray thee Christian doe one thing first, seeke god, goe to god, presently lodge thy soule with god, pitch you him for thy physitian, for his counsell, for his counsell, for thy direction, ply god with suites, stay thy troubled heart.\textsuperscript{144}

Preachers presented themselves as intercessors in times of sickness. Samuel Wales, the curate of Morley and a regular preacher at the Halifax Exercise, in his collection of sermons, \textit{Totum Hominis}, instructed his hearers to turn to the minister when sick, and it is worth quoting his exposition on this in full,

\begin{quote}
\textit{it is a good and commendable custom to commend the afflicted in congregations to the prayers of the pastor . . . the Apostle wills the faithful, when any are sick among them, to call for the Elders of the Church, that they may pray over them . . . if thou wouldest have thy Teacher to be a Speeding Spokesman to God for thee, if either thou desirest or thinkest thou shalt ever need the relief of his prevailing prayers in the day of thy calamity, see that thou now obey from the heart the doctrine he delivers, submit as a good child to his Holy Counsels and admonitions.}\textsuperscript{145}
\end{quote}

This encouragement to come to the preacher as intercessor was, however, also accompanied with a warning that if the parishioner did not accept the teachings of the minister, such intercession would be withheld,

\begin{quote}
\textit{If thou continue to rebels against the word which he bring from God, it may be as the Lord God charged Jeremy, not to lift a cry for the Jews nor make any intercession for them, because he was determined not to hear; so he will lock the heart and close the lips of thy minister that though he would speak for thee he shall find neither words nor affection of prayer, God shutting the door of prayer against him, because he meaneth to shut up his mercy from thee, and not to be intreated to do thee good.}\textsuperscript{146}
\end{quote}

There are several points to be noted here. Firstly, Wales explicitly put himself in the position of intercessor, both from God to man in his preaching as ‘the word he bring from God’, and from man to God in prayer as a ‘speeding spokesman to God for thee’. Secondly, the prospect of his prayers in a time of sickness was used to motivate his hearers’ attendance at Wales’ sermons which suggests

\begin{footnotes}
\item[145] Wales, \textit{Totum Hominis} p. 10.
\item[146] \textit{Ibid.}
\end{footnotes}
that he knew the notion of the preacher as an intercessor was attractive. Thirdly, Wales disowned any personal choice in this qualification, assigning the caveat to the will of God. Wales’ evident expectation of compliance to his conditions demonstrates the powerful pull of the association of preaching and healing.

The relief from illness was considered particularly efficacious if the preacher offered his prayers from the pulpit. In his autobiography, the preacher Henry Newcome recounted how, in 1655, he was called upon to help a woman who was dying after childbirth,

The next day I went to her and prayed by her before and after the sermon in the afternoon. Died January 21st just after evening sermon, as near as I could gather, just when she was prayed for in the pulpit.147

Newcome thus locates the time of his prayers offered for the sick woman with reference to his sermon. Her death was not presented as a failure of those prayers, but the suggestion is that her passage was eased. The pointed reference to prayers being offered in the pulpit, before and after a sermon, implies an understanding of the two-way exchange between God and man via the preacher. This intercessory role, and the links between cure of bodies and souls, all increased the affective properties of preaching.

This chapter has examined the potential for preaching to be an affective and embodied experience by preachers presenting themselves as a man specially called by God to fulfil a mighty task of being a conduit with the divine. The preacher’s own body was presented as a site for God’s action, with the minister visibly suffering for this role. A preachers’ visible suffering was a popular trope and was understood as proof of their potency. This led to a focus on the person of the preacher which was enhanced through a blurring of the cure of the soul and body. Attention was brought onto the body for hearers, as sin was personified and located in the parts of the body. The sick were advised to seek the help of their preaching minister, who may also have been a physician. Even if he was not, there was substantial scope to call the body and healing to mind during preaching and some preachers were also sought as healers. The focus on the body and healing enhanced the affective qualities of preaching and increased its appeal beyond the most religiously committed, as sickness and healing were concerns for all early modern people. This appeal can be seen most prominently in the numerous crowds that flocked to Brearley and the continuing myths and tales of preachers that circulated long after their deaths, but it is also seen in a more indirect low key way by the popularity of preachers such as John Broadley and the reflection of the language of healing used by his parishioners. These affective qualities were another means by which preaching ministers mitigated

the difficulties of combining their duty to admonish their parishioners from the pulpit with their wider pastoral role as a reconciler and peacemaker.
Conclusion for Part III

This part of the study has shown that ‘plain’ preaching was intended to be both a cognitive and affective experience for the hearer. The didactic function of sermons was delivered through the familiar method of dividing a text to extract doctrines that were mainly of a Reformed, Calvinist tenet, which were then applied to the lives of hearers. Preachers employed various affective techniques to make sure their teachings were striking and memorable. Although there were few opportunities for the elements of worship that are traditionally associated with affect, such as ritual, sensory practices and material imagery, and hearers were largely confined to a pew, to some degree preachers were able to create an affective, sensory experience through the language of their sermons and behaviour in the pulpit. Imagery was used in several ways, including simple word-pictures, close up ‘views’ of Christ’s passion and through extended allegories of natural features, such as rain. While this appears to be an echo of late-medieval mysticism, in Calvinist preaching the hearer, through their sinfulness, was placed in the centre of the action and drama being described, rather than positioned as a sorrowing onlooker. This participatory role was extended through promotion of the doctrine that believers were members of Christ’s body, and hearers were encouraged to feel that they were sharing in Christ’s suffering. At a most advanced level, hearers were invited to see in new and metaphysical ways. This included an ability to ‘see’ Christ through the Word, which was presented as a great mystery that would only be revealed to the faithful. Furthermore, preachers used a more affective, rhetorical style of language in their sermons than has been previously recognised and the sermon sources surviving today may not reveal the full extent to which a highly rhetorical, embellished form of speech was used in the pulpit. Repetition could be used to imbue individual words or short phrases with a meditative quality, which subsequently made the words function emblematically, or as a shorthand for complex ideas. The acoustic shape of words gave them a memorable ring so they impressed themselves into the consciousness of hearers and informed the way they viewed the world, as the language used by preachers can be seen to be reflected back in sources produced by the laity. All this made ‘plain’ preaching both simultaneously didactic and affective for the more religiously committed. However, it is very probable that the imagery and affective language also had the effect of making sermons more interesting and enjoyable to the less committed laity.

Preachers also made sermons more affective by presenting themselves as the conduit for communication with the divine and bringing the focus onto the corporeal body. They let their hearers know how great a toll preaching took on their physical being and demonstrated these ‘wrestlings’ and sufferings visually in the pulpit. The traditional closeness between body and soul
became closer still as the language of sermons switched back and forth between the spiritual and corporeal, blurring the boundary between cure of souls and cure of bodies. At its most intense, the preacher’s role as a conduit for grace expanded to position him as an intercessor, and hearers were encouraged to feel that both soul and body could benefit from the event of preaching. The locating of contact with the divine in the person of the preacher helps to explain the actions of the laity in Sheffield and Halifax seen in chapter one, where the preservation of the preaching minister was of paramount importance to the parish.

Such affective preaching was clearly not available in every parish and chapelry. As the surveys of ministers made at the start of the seventeenth century show, the parish or chapelry may have continued to be served by a non-preaching minister, even while the neighbouring chapelries were taking voluntary action to bring preaching to their locality. What we see today can only be a small sample of a much wider culture. However, just as there were probably many cases of unrelentingly dull sermons, there were also probably many affective ones that were either not recorded or preserved in the archive. The main point is that these findings overturn assumptions about where affectivity was to be found in post-Reformation worship. Rather than being the least affective aspect of worship, it has been shown that there was in fact great potential for preaching to be affective. This has implications for understanding how the preaching clergy adapted to the problems and contingencies of parish ministry. It engages with the problem raised by Collinson, Carlson and Merritt by reducing the notion of a dichotomy between preaching and pastoral duties, as affective preaching could help maintain a relationship between a minister and his flock. For some ministers, such as John Broadley, John Angier and Elkanah Wales, the relationship could be intense and emotional.

To arrive at these conclusions, this study has used the words and actions of the preachers themselves, rather than prescriptive sources. Using the structure of sermons, it can be seen that, from the preacher’s point of view, the purpose behind these affective techniques was to embed doctrinal knowledge. For them, and probably for the most committed of their hearers, knowledge and affectivity were two sides of the same thing; as Ramsden’s sermon series has shown, to know more was to feel more. This combination could bring about an intense response in the religiously committed, as for them the great drama and mystery of salvation was uppermost in their minds. However, the response to these affective techniques was not limited by the preacher’s intentions,

---

148 The relative common occurrence of non-preaching clergy at the start of the seventeenth is seen in surveys undertaken around 1603. For Lancashire, see HMC, ‘The Manuscripts of Lord Kenyon’, pp. 6–3, and for the Doncaster Deanery, see BL: Add MS 4293. F. 41, transcribed in Newton, ‘Puritans in the Diocese of York’, appendix 1.
and the possibility should be considered that affective techniques made preaching generally more appealing as an event, even for the less religiously engaged. This unintentional result has to be inferred from reading other sources across the grain, such as preachers’ complaints about hearers enjoying sermons for the ‘wrong’ reasons, and the wide support for preaching, as shown in chapter three. This affective response was probably at a lower level and more intermittent, but had the effect of widening support for preaching and helping to mitigate any difficulties the preacher may have encountered due to their duty of admonition. Affective preaching thus helped to broaden the appeal of this sort of ministry beyond those who were the most committed and knowledgeable in Calvinist doctrine. The findings therefore further strengthen the argument that a clear division did not always exist between a ‘godly’ minority and everyone else.
General Conclusion

Over twenty years ago, Patrick Collinson made a plea for the ‘concomitants’ of preaching to receive more attention.¹ This study has taken up the task, and a wide range of sources have been used to investigate preaching from three angles: space, identity and affectivity. The results have been illuminating and substantive conclusions have been set out at the end of the three sections. This general conclusion will attempt to draw these together and present an overarching argument, along with some ideas for future development.

The first key argument of this study is that support for preaching involved a wide cross-section of the population and this fostered religious and local identities. A broad range of people were creatively involved in making preaching happen in some way, investing their resources, and acting collectively to create the necessary spaces and funds in their locality. A network of support for visiting preachers and exercises developed and this brought more preaching to those localities that had put themselves ‘on the map’. Communal support for preaching was a form of social institution and could therefore be one of the ways in which a sense of local identity and community was fostered. As it was also for a godly purpose, it is argued that such support was a way in which a nascent godly identity could be formed. This godly identity was dilute, dispersed, partial and permeable, in contrast to the binary of its literary construct. It could change over time and, in line with French and Barry’s definition, was created by people identifying with others through communal action.² It was one of multiple identities that meshed in the lives of early modern Protestants in the Pennines and was fairly inclusive: an upright Protestant who espoused Reformed doctrine could enhance their claim to godly identity through visible support for preaching of the Word of God. Just as their medieval ancestors may have simultaneously been parishioners, members of a guild, pilgrims and neighbours, identities arising from support for preaching were part of the social contingencies of everyday life.

This was as far as many progressive Protestants wished to go in defining who was potentially saved, but things did not always rest there. It is proposed that how things developed was largely down to local circumstances and personal agency. The preaching of predestination encouraged the creation of a more tightly defined, restricted circle of righteousness, which claimed godly

identity for its own and this had the potential to bring about community fracture. Preaching, therefore could both foster and disrupt a sense of local community. The process by which this came about has been explored in the Leeds case study, where Alexander Cooke transported the experimental Calvinism of the Halifax Exercise back to his parish pulpit without sensitivity to the wider demands of his pastoral ministry. Cooke’s encouragement of an exclusive construction of godly identity left some progressive Protestants, who previously considered themselves to be among the godly, on the wrong side of the divide. This was the root of a prolonged dispute. So another key outcome of this study is to present an alternative to the ‘godly versus others’ explanation for religious conflict, as it can be seen that both sides in the Leeds case study considered themselves to be godly Protestants. The significance of this is the light it sheds on the variety of lay religious identities, especially those previously lumped together and labelled ‘conformists’, and this complements studies of clergy occupying a similar position.3

This study has shown the extent to which preaching ministers were mobile and has mapped out some of the preaching networks geographically. These have been revealed largely through using churchwardens’ accounts, which are a source not usually associated with studies of preaching. It would be an ambitious but fruitful project to extend the geographical scope of this work. This would show whether the proposals put forward here are particular to the Pennine area or could be applied more generally. The existence of chapelries and the rapid growth of industrialising towns may have encouraged a horizontal communality in lay religious endeavour. It would be helpful to test out this thesis in areas where ecclesiastical and secular governance was applied differently. That said, however, it should be stressed that structural social factors were not deterministic of outcomes and the impact of personal agency can be seen to carry the strongest force in explaining how godly identity developed in any particular setting.

The second key argument of this study is that preaching-centred worship was affective. Conventionally, embodied, numinous, sensory and affective experience in Protestant worship has been considered to be located in the reduced ritual and ceremony allowed by the Prayer Book and sacraments. However, it has been shown here that a vibrant affectivity was to be found in attending the sermons of a skilled preacher. Recent work by Arnold Hunt and others has shown how important sermon delivery was in creating an affective response, and this study adds to this field in various ways. It shows that preaching-centred worship was not anti-material, in fact this study has shown that the desire to create the spaces for preaching incurred a substantial investment in church fabric. Church fabric expressed a particular conceptualisation of sacred time and space, enabling a sense of

the divine presence during worship congruent with Reformed theology. The study has shown how this was communicated by preachers and encouraged through prescribed behaviours that created a feeling of sacred time, as hearers were told that preaching was a time in which the divine might be present among them. Preachers had many years to introduce these ideas and find ways in which they could be anchored onto the existing understandings of their flock. The idea of a divine presence in ‘the house of god’ was probably something that could be built on to existing ideas. This was promoted by preachers using the ambiguity and plural meanings of ‘the house of god’, which could simultaneously be understood as a material building, the individual’s soul, and the collective body of true believers in assembly.

The next step is to set the findings from the Pennine area alongside other regional studies to build a national picture, but at present there is a paucity of similar studies. The need for further comparative studies also applies chronologically. While the structure of parish life was disturbed during the Interregnum, recent work has highlighted how parishes continued to function at this time. The study has shown how the 1650s saw a recovery in church fabric investment, to levels seen in the earlier decades of the century. Again, further studies are needed to determine the degree to which this was typical. It would be further illuminating to extend the chronology into the Restoration period to identify changes in priorities after many of the preaching ministers were ejected from the Church. A wider investigation into lay understandings of ‘the house of God’ is another area that would be fruitful, as this sort of adaptability and the ability to accept different ideas in parallel is a key feature to understanding the Reformation at parish level.

This adaptability is also illustrated in the development of a Reformed version of consecration, which, as this study has shown, developed from inaugural preaching events to an occasion sanctioned by the bishop but conducted by preaching ministers. These sorts of consecration events were very different from the formal ceremonies conducted by Laudian bishops, and this study has shown that some of the laity understood the difference. That said, the linguistic ambiguities employed by preachers may have resulted in some merging of ideas. Bishop Bridgeman’s anomalous attempt at hybridity between the two modes of consecration points to a rich area of future research into the way these different ideas of sacred space interacted. This has wider implications for understanding and clarifying the tensions between divergent strands of Protestantism in the early seventeenth century.

The content of sermons and the roles in which preachers projected themselves were also important in creating an affective experience. Just as the Reformation saw a relocation of where the divine was to be found in worship, imagery, and its affective impact, was also relocated in the sermon. This was a complex process and it is not argued that this was a straightforward transfer of
material image to textual image. However, some of the motifs and ideas used in highly affective, pre-Reformation devotion found their way into words spoken from the pulpit. Such imagery was a minor part of ‘plain’ sermons, and was contained within the didactic purpose of preaching. However, when it was used, it was affective, and in ways that were not bounded by preachers’ intentions. At the most intense level, religiously committed hearers were asked to ‘see’ in new, and more meaningful ways, but affective imagery also had the potential to make sermons more appealing to a wider range of hearers. Likewise, this study has shown that rhetorical language was also used to a greater extent than has previously been assumed to be the case for ‘plain’ sermons, especially in their spoken delivery. Attention was brought on the body, both of the preacher and hearers through sensory, corporeal language and associations with sickness and healing. Ultimately, preachers could present themselves as intercessors between their hearers and God. Preachers such as John Broadley, John Angier, Hugh Ramsden and Richard Garbutt managed to broaden their appeal through preaching that was affective in both the means of delivery and the use of language, and they did this while maintaining their primary task of teaching doctrinal knowledge.

A note of caution must be sounded. The sources used in this study represent only a small proportion of all the various experiences of preaching in the post-Reformation Pennines, and probably relate to those at the more accomplished end of the spectrum. Furthermore, while efforts have been made to use the sermon sources in this study contextually, a certain amount of ‘mining’ has been inevitable to extract their affective aspects. The argument is not that sermons were overwhelmingly affective, but that they contained affective features. For many early modern sermon hearers, dull preaching may have induced the boredom described so pointedly by Christopher Haigh, and in a more nuanced way by Alec Ryrie. It is not claimed that affective, striking preaching was typical, but it existed, even in small, poorly endowed chapels in the Pennines. People went to great lengths to either bring it to their locality, or travelled to experience it elsewhere. Similar close studies of non-elite sermons delivered elsewhere are needed to fully develop this picture.

Together these arguments challenge the notion of a boundary between the godly, who supported preaching and enjoyed sermons and the rest of the populace who did not. It has been shown that if such a boundary existed it was very blurred, fluid and permeable. This overarching argument addresses the ‘tightrope conundrum’. Instances such as the Cooke conflict are known to us because they were considered egregious by many early modern people and the majority of parishes or chapelries subjected to predestinarian preaching did not collapse into conflict. Attendance at services remained high, and this was especially so in parishes and chapels with a preaching minister.

---

This might seem surprising, as the preaching of predestination, nurturing of a ‘more godly’ group within the parish and admonishing all from the pulpit would seem to make it impossible for a minister to tend successfully to his whole flock and retain their support. Part of the explanation lies in the lay social institutions that supported preaching. As has been proposed, such communal involvement led to a sense of belonging and meant that the most religiously committed did not have the sole ownership of the notion of godliness. In the lived experience, godly identity could be manifested in multiple ways and was always in a state of becoming. As such, it had a degree of permeability that kept the majority of the parish on board and this helped the minister to keep his balance.\(^5\) None of this is to deny the tensions and stresses created by a Calvinist preaching ministry, but, rather, to relocate where those stresses arose from. The study has shown that consensus and conflict were two outcomes of the same process, not alternative frameworks of interpretation.

The minister’s balancing act was further aided by the wider affective response to sermons. Accessing the hearers’ responses to sermons has been one of the most difficult aspects of this study. Only the most intense reactions were likely to be consciously recorded, and these outputs were influenced by genre: the writers of verse laments knew what a verse lament should sound like. This does not mean that such sources should be dismissed, however, but rather that they should be understood as indicative of the ideals and goals of their creators. Like religious identity, emotional response was always a work in progress. However, a feature of this study has been to try and access the response of those who supported preaching but who would not conventionally be called ‘the godly’. Muted, partial responses rarely resulted in the creation of reflective texts, so a wide range of sources have been used to approach the target indirectly. Much has been inferred from what people did. Their attitudes to preaching are shown in their material support and the high levels of attendance in parishes where skilful preaching was to be heard. Where they chose to spend their resources is very revealing. This is not just an exercise in quantitative analysis (although that is useful), but in noticing the detail. The small chapel of Ecclesall was brought back into use by the communal efforts of almost all the local inhabitants by collections, which were at least partially voluntary. We have no record of the discussions subsequently held by the inhabitants regarding how to spend their limited funds, but we know that it was agreed to buy two silk tassels for the pulpit cushion. When the collection was repeated the following year, another two silk tassels were bought with the small surplus. These tassels made the pulpit cushion the only adorned object in the rebuilt chapel, and we should be alert to what this choice meant for the inhabitants. They may not have written holy Lives or composed verse laments, but their actions speak eloquently of the importance they attached to hearing the Word of God.
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## Appendix 1

### New and rebuilt chapels and their location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Chapel</th>
<th>Date built/rebuilt</th>
<th>Date consec'd</th>
<th>Nave w (m)</th>
<th>Nave l (m)</th>
<th>Ratio w / l</th>
<th>Chancel w (m)</th>
<th>Chancel l (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>1579-1595</td>
<td>&lt;1595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Rastrick*</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>+ 5.5 m</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Wibsey</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Ripponden*</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiseley</td>
<td>Horsforth</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Dean Head</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Headingley</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Sowerby*</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Didsbury*</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Luddenden*</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Ecclesall*</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestwich</td>
<td>Ringley</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiseley</td>
<td>Rawdon</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penistone</td>
<td>Denby</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Hunslet*</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Armley</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Attercliffe</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Turton*</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calverly</td>
<td>Idle*</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Coley*</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Briggate</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Bramley*</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Holbeck*</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Sowerby Br.*</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkburton</td>
<td>Holmfirth*</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Heywood*</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley</td>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley</td>
<td>Bramhope</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfield</td>
<td>Gt Houghton</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almondbury</td>
<td>Meltham</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>Stannington</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Chapel</th>
<th>Date built/rebuilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Bradley Hall</td>
<td>1590s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methley</td>
<td>Methley Hall</td>
<td>1590s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitkirk</td>
<td>Temple Newsam</td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Gt Lever Hall</td>
<td>1630s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 21. Locations of the new and rebuilt chapels.
Churchwardens’ Accounts in the Pennine Area (1580–1660)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish, or chapelry</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1580–1660</td>
<td>SA: CB 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>1580–1640</td>
<td>SA: PR 54/13/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>1586–1660</td>
<td>YAS: MS 815 transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-upon-Dearne</td>
<td>1590’s, 1615–1630,</td>
<td>Bi: CPH. 2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastrick (Halifax)</td>
<td>1602–4,</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP 52/115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1604–1660,</td>
<td>WYAS(W): WDP 99/1/1/1; 99/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emley</td>
<td>1604, 1606,</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP 2/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1620–1660</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP 53/7/1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough (Rochdale)</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Raines Lanc MSS, 15, f. 370, transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley Cawthorne)</td>
<td>1622,3; 34–6; 47–50,</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP 121 Add Box 8 transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall Sheffield)</td>
<td>1622–6; 32–1643,</td>
<td>ULBLS: Wilson MS 295. vol. 148, transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padiham (Whalley)</td>
<td>1623–1653</td>
<td>LCRO: PR 2863/2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley (Wigan)</td>
<td>1628 –1658</td>
<td>LCRO: DDHK 10/3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>1636–1660</td>
<td>LCRO: PR 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>1640–1657</td>
<td>Raines Lanc MSS, 1, f. 63-7, transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didsbury (Manchester)</td>
<td>1645 &amp; 1659</td>
<td>CS, OS, vol. 42, transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestwich</td>
<td>1647–1660</td>
<td>GMCRO: L160/2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elland (Halifax)</td>
<td>1648–1660</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP79/3/1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addingham</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>WYAS (B): BDP1/7/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651–1660</td>
<td>WYAS (B): BDP7/9/1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ardsley</td>
<td>1652–1658</td>
<td>YAS: DD 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whithkirk</td>
<td>1654–1660</td>
<td>WYAS (L): RDP 106/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Briggate (Leeds)</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Thoresby Soc SD VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1654–1659</td>
<td>Scholes, History of Bolton, transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>1656, 1660</td>
<td>LCRO (P): PR 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royston</td>
<td>1656–1660</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP 136/5/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pew Plans in the Pennine Area (1580 – 1660)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ripponden</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>WYAS (C): SH: 4/VL/1582/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elland</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP79/3/1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaithwaite</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>WYAS (K): KK 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methley</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Darbyshire &amp; Lumb, The History of Methley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Brad Cath: Index no. 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackley</td>
<td>1608, 1631</td>
<td>J. Booker, History Ancient Chapel of Blackley CS. OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didsbury</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>J. Booker, History Ancient Chapel of Didsbury CS. OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>WYAS (B): 81D85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Stone</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>BI: Chanc AB 17, f.184v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowerby</td>
<td>Pre 1620</td>
<td>BI: Y.M. EP.7.1 (a &amp;b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Br Sp Coll: Wilson MS 295. 148. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tong</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>WYAS (B): Tong/12b/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luddenden</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>WYAS (W): WDP39/156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowerby Bridge</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>YAS: DD99B20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>WYAS (B): BDP7/6/2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birstall</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>WYAS (W): Z162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>WYAS (B): JOW14/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightcliffe</td>
<td>1634, 1649</td>
<td>WYAS (H): Misc. 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping (Clitheroe)</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>LCRO: PR 3284/4/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>LCRO: DDSh 7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colne</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>LCRO: DDB 74/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptonstall</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>WYAS (W): C991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>CLA: Booth 2/2/3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmfirth</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>BI: Reg. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>SH: 3/L/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>J. Booker, History Ancient Chapel of Birch CS OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padiham</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>LCRO: PR2863/2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds (St John’s)</td>
<td>1647,1648</td>
<td>Thor Soc MS Box XII, Hornsey article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramhope</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>extant fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Houghton</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>C. Stell, Inventory of Nonconformist Chapels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>CS vol 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>SA: OD1–1594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Accounts of Consecration Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Who by</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ripponden</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Watson History of Halifax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Favour and More</td>
<td>BL Add MS 38,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luddenden</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>C. Greenwood</td>
<td>BL: Reg. 31, f. 230,1 &amp; WYAS (W): WDP39/103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringley</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Bishop Bridgeman</td>
<td>CS: Corres Nathan Walworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Archbishop Neile</td>
<td>Thoresby Society, Misc 1919, pp. 420-434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Bishop Bridgeman</td>
<td>Chet Lib: Booth 2/2/2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attercliffe</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Bishop of Sodor</td>
<td>Hunter, Hallamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wibsey</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Bishop of Sodor</td>
<td>WYAS (B): DB1/C1/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunslet</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Bishop of Sodor</td>
<td>WYAS (L): RDP44/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meltham</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Bishop of Elphin</td>
<td>Wickham Legge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2

### Sheffield Parish Church: Expenditure on Fabric 1580–1660

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rent income</th>
<th>Total expenditure</th>
<th>Total fabric expenditure</th>
<th>Total fabric expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure</th>
<th>Hard fabric: roof, windows, leading, stone work, paving</th>
<th>Bells</th>
<th>Clock</th>
<th>Pews, galleries, pulpit</th>
<th>Painting, liming, washing and other beautification</th>
<th>Other items, e.g. organ, vestments, cloths, books, locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>£32.6s</td>
<td>£32.5s</td>
<td>£3.7d</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18s.10d</td>
<td>£1.17s.2d</td>
<td>3s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Prayer books, 12d Total 1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>£32.15s.2d</td>
<td>£30.3s.2d</td>
<td>£1.18s.7d</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8s.4d</td>
<td>12s.8d</td>
<td>17s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>£33.14d</td>
<td>£33.9s.9d</td>
<td>17s.4d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18d</td>
<td>2s.10d</td>
<td>12d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>New surplice, 12s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>£33.14d</td>
<td>£36.11s.9d</td>
<td>£3.4s.7d</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19s</td>
<td>£1.19s.3d</td>
<td>6s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>£33.14d</td>
<td>None given*</td>
<td>£1.12s.8d</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7s.9d</td>
<td>£1.3s.11d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chest, 10d; surplice 2d Total 1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>£33.4d</td>
<td>£44.2s.5d</td>
<td>£2.19s.9d</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4s.7d</td>
<td>£2.1s.4d</td>
<td>12s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Communion cup mended, 18d Total 1s.6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>£33.12s.9d</td>
<td>£27.17s.2d</td>
<td>£3.18s.3d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11s.6d</td>
<td>£3.6s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Locks, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>£33.12s.9d</td>
<td>£31.2s.9d</td>
<td>£1.18s</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5s.6d</td>
<td>£1.12s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Key, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>£33.12s.9d</td>
<td>£32.18s.5d</td>
<td>£3.2s.5d</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>£1.1s.9d</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Table cloth given, washed for 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>£33.12s.9d</td>
<td>£25.1s.5d</td>
<td>£1.5s.8d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5s.8d</td>
<td>19s.9d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lock, 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580-1589</td>
<td>£301.16s</td>
<td>£330.3s.7d</td>
<td>£23.17s.2d</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>£5.3s.11d</td>
<td>£15.1s.10d</td>
<td>£2.6d</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16s. 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>£36.6s.9d</td>
<td>£27.4s.6d</td>
<td>£1.8s.5d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6s.1d</td>
<td>£1.4d</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>£36.6s.9d</td>
<td>£47.6s</td>
<td>£29.10s.4d</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>£17.7s.2d</td>
<td>£1.1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organ mended £10.11s.6d organ loft made 10s.8d Total: £11.2s.2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>£36.6s.9d</td>
<td>£28.11s.10d</td>
<td>18s.10d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5s.8d</td>
<td>13s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>£36.6s.9d</td>
<td>£37.13s.5d</td>
<td>£5.11s.11d</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£4.8s.9d</td>
<td>£1.3s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>£36.1d</td>
<td>£30.19s.9d</td>
<td>£2.13s.5d</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11s.9d</td>
<td>£1.13s.10d</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Book, 4d, surplice, 7s.2d Total 7s.6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>£36.1d</td>
<td>£30.9s.3d</td>
<td>£2.13s.11d</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12s.1d</td>
<td>£1.9s.1d</td>
<td>1s.9d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BCP, 7s 10d, bolt and lock, 3s.2d Total 11s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>£48.16s.7d</td>
<td>£43.3s.8d</td>
<td>£4.10s</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>£1.10s</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bible, £2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>£48.17s.8d</td>
<td>£42.5d</td>
<td>£1.15s.5d</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7d</td>
<td>£1.14s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lock and keys 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rent income</td>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure</td>
<td>Hard fabric: roof, windows, leading, stone work, paving</td>
<td>Bells</td>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Pews, galleries, pulpit</td>
<td>Painting, liming, washing and other beautification</td>
<td>Other items, e.g. organ, vestments, cloths, books, locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>£48.17s.8d</td>
<td>£40.4s.6d</td>
<td>£2.17s.1d</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>£1.12s.3d</td>
<td>£1.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lock, 11d, organs mended 2s.7d, pewter cup, 8d, door 2d Total 4s.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>£48.14s.4d</td>
<td>£43.13s.11d</td>
<td>£4.9s.9d</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6s.10d</td>
<td>£1.19s</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organ mended £2, 2 pewter cups and tin bottle, 3s 9d Total £2.3s.9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590-1599</td>
<td>£412.13s.5d</td>
<td>£371.7s.3d</td>
<td>£56.9s.1d</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£26.6d</td>
<td>£11.10s</td>
<td>13s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£16.8s.11d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>£48.14s.4d</td>
<td>£54.4s.4d</td>
<td>£8.1s.2d</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5s.4d</td>
<td>£2.5s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Locks/bolt 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>£50.14s.4d</td>
<td>£48.13s.6d</td>
<td>£7.12s.9d</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5s.4d</td>
<td>£1.13s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Surplice 10s.8d, organs mended, 26s.7d Total £1.7s.3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>£50.14s.4d</td>
<td>£55.5s.3d</td>
<td>£9.9s.6d</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>£2.4s.7d</td>
<td>£1.3d</td>
<td>13s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lock, 12d, organs £5.10s.4d Total £5.11s.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>£49.7s.8d</td>
<td>£33.17s.8d</td>
<td>£1.3s.9d</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5s.4d</td>
<td>18s.3d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lock, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>£49.7s.8d</td>
<td>£43.3s.1d</td>
<td>£4.16s.11d</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£3.2s.10d</td>
<td>£1.4s.10d</td>
<td>13d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BCP, 8s.2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>£49.7s.8d</td>
<td>£57.15s</td>
<td>£23.12s.4d</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>£7.11s.11d</td>
<td>£2.2s.5d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BCP 16d, carpet for table, 20s, Pewter Stoupes 16s, Silvers cups and plate, £10.23d, fustian and box for storage, 3s.4d Total £12.3s.7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>£49.2s</td>
<td>Not given*</td>
<td>£17.16s.4d</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>£7.17s.7d</td>
<td>£3.11s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Table of gifts to church, 3s.10d Whiting of church, £3.13s.5d Sentences, 3s 11s Total £5.8s.3d</td>
<td>Communion table cloths, 18s.8d Communion ambie lock 3d key 3d Total 19s.2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>£49.2s</td>
<td>£48.45s.9d</td>
<td>£9.19S.9d</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>£8.10S.9d</td>
<td>13S.4d</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Church painted with</td>
<td>Door and lock 3s.9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rent income</td>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure</td>
<td>Hard fabric: roof, windows, leading, stone work, paving</td>
<td>Bells</td>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Pews, galleries, pulpit</td>
<td>Painting, liming, washing and other beautification</td>
<td>Other items, e.g. organ, vestments, cloths, books, locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>£49.2s</td>
<td>£50.8s.6d</td>
<td>£7.13s.6d</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£1.5s.2d (bell loft)</td>
<td>£5.18s.4d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Red lead, 6s.8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>£49.3s</td>
<td>£87.11d</td>
<td>£49.17s.2d</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>£4.14s.1d (bell loft)</td>
<td>£12.8s.11d</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td>7s 6d. Loft, £26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, £3.6s.10d, Bk C Pr 8s.10d, Bk of Canons 11s Total £4.6s.8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1609</td>
<td>£494.15s</td>
<td>£536.8s</td>
<td>£140.3s.2d</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>£27.17s.2d</td>
<td>£34.13s</td>
<td>£3.12s.9d</td>
<td>£35.15s.1d</td>
<td>£7.10s.4d</td>
<td>£25.14s.7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>£49.3s</td>
<td>£48.2s.10d</td>
<td>£10.18s</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4s.8d</td>
<td>£2.10s.4d</td>
<td>£5.19s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Communion table, 12s, &amp; covering 18s.8d. Organs, 13s.4d Total £2.4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>£49.3s</td>
<td>£50.5s.8d</td>
<td>£12.8s.5d</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11s.5d</td>
<td>£4.3s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pulpit, 39s.10d, partition, 11s, lofts £3.7s.6d Total £5.18s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d, surplice 22s Total £1.15s.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>£49.3s</td>
<td>£48.4s.4d</td>
<td>£6.5s.10d</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>£1.9s.8d</td>
<td>£3.5s.9d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d, surplice 13d. Total 14s.5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£66.15s.2d</td>
<td>£23.2s.8d</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>£17.8s.5d</td>
<td>£3.9s.9d</td>
<td>16d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d, Jewel’s Bk &amp; BCP, 28s, Brass candlestick, 12d, Bible stoope, 10d Total £2.3s.2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50.13s</td>
<td>£9.7s.5d</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>£2.1s.6d</td>
<td>£4.2s.8d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d, bible, 48s, skin and chain for Jewel’s work, 23d Total £2.3s.3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>£50.8s</td>
<td>£50.12s.4d</td>
<td>£4.4s.1d</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6s.10d</td>
<td>£2.17s.11d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pulpit cloth, 6s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>£81.18s.7d</td>
<td>£69.3s.3d</td>
<td>£24.5s.1d</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>£18.14s</td>
<td>£4.9s.11d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stairs to pulpit, 6s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d, lock, 16d Total 14s.8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>£93.4s.2d</td>
<td>£43.8s.5d</td>
<td>£5.5s.3d</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13s.2d</td>
<td>£3.18s.9d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organs, 13s.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>£93.2s.1d</td>
<td>£76.11s.1d</td>
<td>£7.7s.11d</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£1.9s.4d</td>
<td>£2.18s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>whiting, £4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>£100.7s.3d</td>
<td>£90.12s.4d</td>
<td>£15.12s.11d</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7s.3d</td>
<td>£15.5s.8d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610-1619</td>
<td>£666.1d</td>
<td>£594.8s.5d</td>
<td>£118.17s.7d</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£23.12s.3d</td>
<td>£41.12s.9d</td>
<td>£6.4d</td>
<td>£7.4d</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£9.11s.10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>£100.7s.3d</td>
<td>£43.7s.9d</td>
<td>£17.1s.2d</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>£7.18s</td>
<td>£3.19s.8d</td>
<td>9s</td>
<td>Loft partition, 37s</td>
<td>Painting £2.1s, writing</td>
<td>Decision to cease organs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rent income</td>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure</td>
<td>Hard fabric: roof, windows, leading, stone work, paving</td>
<td>Bells</td>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Pews, galleries, pulpit</td>
<td>Painting, liming, washing and other beautification</td>
<td>Other items, e.g. organ, vestments, cloths, books, locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>£100.7s.3d</td>
<td>£112.13s.3d</td>
<td>£15.6s.9d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£4.19s.4d</td>
<td>£2.8s.10d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total £1.17s</td>
<td>inscriptions 6s.6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total £2.7s.6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>£100.7s.3d</td>
<td>£133.12s.1d</td>
<td>£41.2s.1d</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>£29.19s.1d</td>
<td>£2.12s.2d</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stalls, £7.5s.1d</td>
<td>Kings Arms 10s.3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£7.17s.3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>£100.7s.3d</td>
<td>£89.15s.4d</td>
<td>£4.9s.3d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>£1.6d</td>
<td>£3.8s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Turned pillar, 13s, quire doors 25.9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 155.9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>£100.7s.3d</td>
<td>£88.15s.7d</td>
<td>£8.15s.4d</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£2.17s.9d</td>
<td>£3.17s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>New loft and pews, £1.18s.7d. Pulpit covering mended, 2s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Key, 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>£100.5s.3d</td>
<td>£82.7s.10d</td>
<td>£4.2s.8d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>£1.17s.2d</td>
<td>£2.5s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£170.19s.6d</td>
<td>£5.13s.5d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£2.4d</td>
<td>£2.19s.1d</td>
<td>2s.8d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Co. Tab. clo, 115.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£136.8s.9d</td>
<td>£19.7s.7d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£16.15s.4d</td>
<td>£2.12s.3d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>£104.17s.3d</td>
<td>£81.6s</td>
<td>£2.9s.11d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1.9s.11d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>£104.2s.3d</td>
<td>£116.8s.2d</td>
<td>£24.18s.6d</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>£11.10s</td>
<td>£1.12s.2d</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620-</td>
<td>£1016.15s.6d</td>
<td>£1055.14s.3d</td>
<td>£143.6s.8d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£79.17s.6d</td>
<td>£27.4s.11d</td>
<td>£1.11s.8d</td>
<td>£21.18s.2d</td>
<td>£10.4s.9d</td>
<td>£2.95.8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>£104.2s.3d</td>
<td>£117.7s.1d</td>
<td>£17.10s.3d</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£1.12s.6d</td>
<td>£1.2s.6d</td>
<td>New clock, £14.14s.9d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BCP mended, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>£104.2s.3d</td>
<td>£104.16s.3d</td>
<td>£18.17s.3d</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£3.3d</td>
<td>£2.1s.10d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>New Pulpit, £12.2s. stools, £1.5s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>£104.2s.3d</td>
<td>£103.18s.3d</td>
<td>£14.6s</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£11.5s.8d</td>
<td>£2.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Homilies and Canons £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£88.15s</td>
<td>£7.3s.5d</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£3.11d</td>
<td>£2.10s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pulpit covering, £1.12s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£104.10s.4d</td>
<td>£14.5s.5d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£7.17s.11d</td>
<td>£1.17s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whitening, £4.10s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£102.10d</td>
<td>£14.15s.4d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£2.1s.10d</td>
<td>£1.12s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pews £7.1s.9d loft removal, 11s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Font cover rope, 125.6d, surplice 455. Removing rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rent income</th>
<th>Total expenditure</th>
<th>Total fabric expenditure</th>
<th>Total fabric expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure</th>
<th>Hard fabric: roof, windows, leading, stone work, paving</th>
<th>Bells</th>
<th>Clock</th>
<th>Pews, galleries, pulpit</th>
<th>Painting, liming, washing and other beautification</th>
<th>Other items, e.g. organ, vestments, cloths, books, locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£97.18s</td>
<td>£17.3s.7d</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£5.19s.3d</td>
<td>£2.10s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whitening and painting and painting Kings Arms £8.14s</td>
<td>in chancel, 10s.11d Total £3.85.5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£102.10s</td>
<td>£2.12s.5d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1.12s.5d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>£102.17s.3d</td>
<td>£96.11s.10d</td>
<td>£2.18s.7d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1.18s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£105.6d</td>
<td>£6.2s.9d</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>£3.14s.8d</td>
<td>£2.8s.1d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630-1639</td>
<td>£1031.10s.3d</td>
<td>£1023.8s.1d</td>
<td>£115.15s</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£40.13s</td>
<td>£19.13s.9d</td>
<td>£14.14s.9d</td>
<td>£22.12s.7d</td>
<td>£13.3s.12d</td>
<td>£4.16s.11d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>£111</td>
<td>£105.9s.1d</td>
<td>£3.7s.3d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£1.1s</td>
<td>£2.3s.3d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Painting posts, 3s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>£132</td>
<td>£99.2s.1d</td>
<td>£4.9s.4d</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>£1.15s.4d</td>
<td>£2.5s.5d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>£141.11s.7d</td>
<td>£121.7s.1d</td>
<td>£9.10s.9d</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£9.8s.3d</td>
<td>£2.6s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>£144.8s.2d</td>
<td>£94.7s.5d</td>
<td>£5.2s.10d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>£3.8s.4d</td>
<td>£1.14s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>£144.5s.2d</td>
<td>£92.3s.5d</td>
<td>£4.17s.7d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>£1.12s.1d</td>
<td>£2.15s.7d</td>
<td>7s.6d</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>£148.8s.2d</td>
<td>£116.18s.6d</td>
<td>£2.14s.1d</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>£1.3s.3d</td>
<td>£1.10s.10d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>£148.8s.2d</td>
<td>£82.17s.4d</td>
<td>£1.1s.3d</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1.1s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Hour glass, 1d</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>£148.8s.2d</td>
<td>£197.13s</td>
<td>£3.12s.8d</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>£2.18s.2d</td>
<td>£4.6s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>£148.8s.2d</td>
<td>£121.7s.3d</td>
<td>£2.16s.7d</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>£1.12s</td>
<td>£1.46s.7d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>£148.8s.2d</td>
<td>£136.1s.5d</td>
<td>£2.5s.11d</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1.3s.1d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Pewter basin, 2s.8d</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640-1649</td>
<td>£1415.5s.9d</td>
<td>£1167.16s.7d</td>
<td>£39.9s.8d</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£23.18s.5d</td>
<td>£14.15s.7d</td>
<td>7s.6d</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>2s.9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>£148.8s.2d</td>
<td>£154.19s.2d</td>
<td>£8.11s.6d</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£7.11s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>£153.7s.2d</td>
<td>£130.14s</td>
<td>£11.15s.1d</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>£5.19s.1d</td>
<td>£4.9s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Carpet, £1.6s.10d. lock, 2d</td>
<td>Total £1.7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>£153.7s.2d</td>
<td>£187.17s.5d</td>
<td>£86.4s.7d</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>£36.4s.8d</td>
<td>£45.5s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dressing the church, £4</td>
<td>Great Book, 14s.11d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>£153.3s.10d</td>
<td>£144.9s.10d</td>
<td>£11.1s</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£4.19s.6d</td>
<td>£2.16s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cleaning £4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>£153.3s.10d</td>
<td>£146.4s</td>
<td>£6.8s</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>£3.9s.8d</td>
<td>£2.17s.10d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 hour glasses, 6d</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>£153.3s.10d</td>
<td>£153.19s.3d</td>
<td>£29.3d</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>£20.18s.7d</td>
<td>£6.19s.10d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>£153.3s.10d</td>
<td>£172.5s.4d</td>
<td>£24.19s.4d</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£22.18s.6d</td>
<td>£1.14s.2d</td>
<td>6s.8d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>£153.3s.10d</td>
<td>£171.2d</td>
<td>£8.9s.6d</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>£6.3s</td>
<td>£2.6s.6d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>£155.15s.6d</td>
<td>£167.15s.5d</td>
<td>£3.8s.4d</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>£1.12s.2d</td>
<td>£1.16s.2d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rent income</td>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure</td>
<td>Total fabric expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure</td>
<td>Hard fabric: roof, windows, leading, stone work, paving</td>
<td>Bells</td>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Pews, galleries, pulpit</td>
<td>Painting, liming, washing and other beautification</td>
<td>Other items, e.g. organ, vestments, cloths, books, locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>£133.5s.6d</td>
<td>£175.7s</td>
<td>£21.11s.8d</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>£12.5s</td>
<td>£2.4s.8d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whitening £7.2s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1659</td>
<td>£1510.2s.8d</td>
<td>£1604.11s.7d</td>
<td>£211.9s.3d</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>£115.10s.2d</td>
<td>£77.5s.6d</td>
<td>£1.9s.4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£15.1s.2d</td>
<td>£2.2s.3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580-1659</td>
<td>£6879.7s.8d</td>
<td>£6683.17s.9d</td>
<td>£849.8s.3d</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>£362.8s.1d</td>
<td>£253.14s.12d</td>
<td>£30.11s.5d</td>
<td>£87.16s.2d</td>
<td>£50.4s.1d</td>
<td>£64.13s.6d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For decade totals, the previous year’s expenditure is taken
** The clock and bells are now looked after by the clerk
*** The ‘bellman’ also paid to keep the church clean
Appendix 3. Pennine Pulpits 1580–1660

Midhope, nr Penistone. Elizabethan pulpit

Braithwell, near Rotherham. Panels from Elizabethan (1574) Pulpit inlaid into modern pulpit

Deane, nr Bolton. Elizabethan pulpit.
Marr, nr. Doncaster, Elizabethan.

Rotherham. 1606.

Woodkirk. Nr Morley, Jacobean.
Panels from a pulpit inlaid to churchwardens’ pew, Radcliffe, near Bury. 1606.
St John’s, Leeds 1634.

Temple Newsam House, near Leeds, 1636.

Ribchester, nr Blackburn. 1636.
Great Houghton, near Barnsley, 1650.

Bramhope, near Leeds 1649.
## Appendix 4

### Ecclesall communal expenditure for preaching

*(Total raised £23 18s 6d from 181 households)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of inhabitant</th>
<th>For chapel repair</th>
<th>1622 to pay wages</th>
<th>For the chapel bell</th>
<th>Paid for a seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Jessop Esq</td>
<td>6s 8d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Eire, gent</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bray, gent</td>
<td>3s 4d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bright and his mother</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Taylor</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>6s 8d</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holland and his son</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Dale and his son</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Emmott and Jewase Lee</td>
<td>6s 8d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>6s 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Dale and his son</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Bright and his son</td>
<td>4s 2d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Dent and his son</td>
<td>4s 6d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>1s 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Bright</td>
<td>2s 4d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Brelsforth</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antho. Bright and his son</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Firth and his son</td>
<td>2s 8d</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichol. Stannyforth</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Machen</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Fox</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maline Stacie</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Batt</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Gill</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stone</td>
<td>1s 8d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Wright</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Pearson</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Crosbie and his son</td>
<td>8d</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Moore</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Spooner</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Eatine</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen. Lort</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Pearson</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Clayton</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Woodroffe</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Heawood</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Stowe</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Head</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wid. Creswicke</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Quicksall</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of inhabitant</td>
<td>For chapel repair</td>
<td>1622 to pay wages</td>
<td>For the chapel bell</td>
<td>Paid for a seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ottrell</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Newton</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Barnsley</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Storke</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>8d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Clayton</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Rollinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>5s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell Burrowes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>2s 3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Fox of Milnehouse lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Brightedge</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Smain</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bromeley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Hoyland</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Offerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Hoole</td>
<td></td>
<td>8d</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Nowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hoole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Beresford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Brelsord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>8d</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Unwynne</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Webster</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Brooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Brooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>4s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Brooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1s 1d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Scargill</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>9d</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tho. Firth (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen. Mawre</td>
<td></td>
<td>10d</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Milward</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennys Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Bushop</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Crooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Unwinne</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>8d</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Stannysforth</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of inhabitant</td>
<td>For chapel repair</td>
<td>1622 to pay wages</td>
<td>For the chapel bell</td>
<td>Paid for a seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja. Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Fox</td>
<td>10d</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>9d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Wainwright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Dall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Fowler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Trivell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen. Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Holland</td>
<td>8s</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Roper</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>9d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Bower</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Ludlam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja. Webster</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>9d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Stannyforth edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Oates</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Dent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Ludlam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brian Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Gill</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Blith</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Ludlam</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas More</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Rotherham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Phillipott</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphray Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Machon</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Geo. Jessop</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 2d</td>
<td>1s 3d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Wild</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Bright</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Capper</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Woodroffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Revell</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Rawson</td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Hadfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Unwine</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of inhabitant</td>
<td>For chapel repair</td>
<td>1622 to pay wages</td>
<td>For the chapel bell</td>
<td>Paid for a seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt. Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>3s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thomas Riles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Offerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Brooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th. Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Weates</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Crooke</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. Offerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Offerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm Throope</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Twivell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Belford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Thorne</td>
<td></td>
<td>8d</td>
<td></td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob. Auferton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2s 9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Earatt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Crooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Crooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nich Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Riles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Downe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen. Auferton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Mookeson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Hine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Michell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm Hoole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robt Mittchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Michell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth. Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Blyth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Mosley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Butt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widdow Crooke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Twigge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob. Buckstones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widdow Dowre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of inhabitant</td>
<td>For chapel repair</td>
<td>1622 to pay wages</td>
<td>For the chapel bell</td>
<td>Paid for a seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Wotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob. Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willm. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Jefcocke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Yates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed. Downes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Hoyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Mookeson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tho. Bellie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. Downe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4 9s 1d</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7 17s 8d</strong></td>
<td><strong>£3 8s 2d</strong></td>
<td><strong>£8 3s 7d</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5

Expenses for visiting preachers (plus sources of information for Figure 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name of preacher</th>
<th>Expenditure on meals and drink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addingham</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4S, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Mr Micklethwayt</td>
<td>10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Mr Bennson,</td>
<td>10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Mr Beane</td>
<td>10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Mr Turton</td>
<td>10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Mr Harbert</td>
<td>10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Mr Rookes</td>
<td>10S, 1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr O'Ilire</td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2S in wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Sayles and Mr Waterhouse</td>
<td>1S, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Moore</td>
<td>2S, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Both Mr Townes</td>
<td>3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Both Mr Townes</td>
<td>3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Smythe</td>
<td>3S, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Towne</td>
<td>4S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Coare and Mr Egland</td>
<td>4S, 11d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Both Mr Townes</td>
<td>5S, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Towne and Mr Taylor</td>
<td>6S, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Holdsworth</td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Hitch</td>
<td>3S, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Fairebanckes</td>
<td>16S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsterstone</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mr Greene,</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Mr John Towne</td>
<td>18d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Mr Barden</td>
<td>18d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Mr William Dawson</td>
<td>18d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Mr Warde</td>
<td>2S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>2S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Preacher from Cawthorne</td>
<td>2S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Mr Doughty</td>
<td>2S, &amp; 18d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Mr Ellis</td>
<td>2S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Mr John Towne</td>
<td>3S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Mr Barmby</td>
<td>4S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Mr Edward Hunte</td>
<td>4S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Mr Edward Hunte</td>
<td>12S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name of preacher</td>
<td>Expenditure on meals and drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Mr William Dawson</td>
<td>8d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr William Dawson</td>
<td>6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr Mellor</td>
<td>3s, 6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr Barfoot</td>
<td>3s, 8d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr John Newton</td>
<td>6s, 8d, 2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>7s, 4d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Mr Samuel Newman, cur. Midhope</td>
<td>12d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Mr John Towne</td>
<td>18d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2s, 4d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Minister preached</td>
<td>3d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>1s, 2d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Mr Batson</td>
<td>3s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>3s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Exercise, 6 ministers</td>
<td>5s, 3d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Exercise, 7 ministers</td>
<td>7s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Mr Batson</td>
<td>8s, 3d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Mr Batson</td>
<td>9s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Samuel Newman</td>
<td>2s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Edward Hunte</td>
<td>2s, 6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Baslow</td>
<td>5s, 6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Clarke</td>
<td>5s, 6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>6s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>6s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>6s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>7s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>8s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mr Humes</td>
<td>1s, 6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mr Samuel Newman</td>
<td>1s, 6d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mr Attay</td>
<td>3s, 4d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>A strange preacher</td>
<td>3s, 10d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4s, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>4s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Mr Attay</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Mr Bradshaw</td>
<td>18d,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name of preacher</td>
<td>Expenditure on meals and drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Bradshaw</td>
<td>2s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr West</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Clarke</td>
<td>4s, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Bradshaw</td>
<td>4s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Mr Batson</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Mr Revell</td>
<td>12d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Mr Revell</td>
<td>18d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mr Hill</td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mr Moore</td>
<td>1s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mr Richard Northope</td>
<td>2s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Batson</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Tormor</td>
<td>1s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Rickard</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Worall</td>
<td>2s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Toytell</td>
<td>4s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Mr Attay</td>
<td>1s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Cart</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Bankes, 2 days</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Wright</td>
<td>1s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Bankes</td>
<td>1s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Templer</td>
<td>1s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Shaw</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Childe</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Broadhead and Mr Laightstone</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Hancoke and 3 other ministers</td>
<td>3s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Readman</td>
<td>2s, 6d &amp; 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr Tylston (Vic Rochdale)</td>
<td>1s, 9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padham</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Booth</td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padham</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Preachers</td>
<td>5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestwich</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>£1. 6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitkirk</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitkirk</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitkirk</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Preachers and Mr Jackson at the visitations</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Charges at the exercise</td>
<td>£1. 5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name of preacher</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Mr Burton</td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Mr Burton</td>
<td>1s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Mr Lodlam</td>
<td>1s, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Mr Hetfold</td>
<td>4s, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Coare and Mr Egland</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Fetherston</td>
<td>2s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Egland</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Tompson</td>
<td>5s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Mr Sayles and Mr Waterhouse</td>
<td>9s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Mr Townes, 2 sermons</td>
<td>1s, 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise, Mr Coare and Mr Thomson</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Mr Towne</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Mr Towne the younger</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise Mr Thomson and Mr Coare</td>
<td>2s, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise, both Mr Townes</td>
<td>2s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise, both Mr Townes</td>
<td>2s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise, Mr Coare and Mr Thomson</td>
<td>2s, 10d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise, Mr Sommerton</td>
<td>1s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Exercise, Mr Towne</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Mr Moore</td>
<td>1s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Mr Towne,</td>
<td>1s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Mr Crooke</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Doughty and Mr Thornton</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Kennion</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Walker</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Holdsworth</td>
<td>£1 for 4 Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Aeach, ‘the Scotchman’</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Mr Fairbancke,</td>
<td>15s for 2 Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsterstone</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Toytall</td>
<td>12d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsterstone</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Mr Hurst</td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Mr Bouth</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Mr Edward Hunte</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Mr Benbrige</td>
<td>7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Mr Gillott</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Mr Cowper</td>
<td>2s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Mr John Newton</td>
<td>2s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Poor travelling minsiter</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Minister that preached in the afternoon</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name of preacher</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Minister preached</td>
<td>1s, 18d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Minister preached</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Mellor</td>
<td>12d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Shaw</td>
<td>18d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Clapham</td>
<td>12d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Batson</td>
<td>2s, 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Abram Greene</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mr Moore</td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>A minister that preached at even prayer</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Booth</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Toytell</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Tormor</td>
<td>2s, 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Mr Tormor</td>
<td>2s, 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Mr Mellor</td>
<td>1s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>3 poor ministers which would have preached</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Poor minister</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Shorrock, 1st day</td>
<td>1s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>A preacher</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Botts, 5 times</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Fisher of Rotherham, 2 days</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr John Crooke, 7 days</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>2 preachers</td>
<td>5s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Mr Barfoot</td>
<td>4s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Preacher, 2 sermons</td>
<td>6s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Mr Burdett, 2 sermons</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Mr Hill</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Mr Holland</td>
<td>1s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Poor preacher</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr Browne, curate sick</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Mr Walker</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padfield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Walch, several times</td>
<td>6s 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Mr Halsell, a poor minister,</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Mr Holmes</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Mr Northropp</td>
<td>6s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>A minister that preached</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>A minister that preached</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Mr Leeson</td>
<td>6s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>A preacher</td>
<td>6s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Blind preacher</td>
<td>7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Mr Bridges, 2 sermons</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3 minister, preach on trial</td>
<td>£2. 10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Kitson</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name of preacher</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Pryme, trial sermon</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Fisher, for preaching at Ecclesall</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Mr Ogden, 1 day</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprotborough</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Pierrson, 3 sermons</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>A poore preacher</td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>One that made a sermon</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Scottish preacher, several times</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Humes</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Humes</td>
<td>1s, 1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Hill</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Mr Humes</td>
<td>1s, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mr Jackson</td>
<td>1s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Poor minister which came to preach and did not</td>
<td>1s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mr Hill</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mr Shawe</td>
<td>3s, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>A preacher that should have preached and did not</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Mr Humes</td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath-U-Dearne</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Mr Leadbetter, several times</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitkirk</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Mr Sowell</td>
<td>9s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Mr Harbor</td>
<td>3s, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>2s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Preachers</td>
<td>4s, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>A preacher</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragby</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mr Clarke</td>
<td>4s, 2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 12. Sources used in determining from where preachers travelled to preach at Bradfield.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borthwick Institute, Add. MS/158  Fasti Doncaster Deanery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library, Add MS 4293 Birch Collection (1604 survey of the Deanery of Doncaster)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale, B., Yorkshire Puritanism and Early Non-conformity: Illustrated by the Lives of the Ejected Ministers, 1660 and 1662 (Bradford, 1909)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood, J., History of the Parish of Ecclesfield, in the County of York (1862)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, J., Hallamshire (London, 1819)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, J., South Yorkshire (London, 1828-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, J. A., ‘Yorkshire Puritanism 1603- 1642’ PhD University of London (1956)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Venn, J. A. Alumni Cantabrigiensis , a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900. Part 1, vols 1- 4 (Cambridge, 1922 – 27) | }
Appendix 6

John Harrison libel case

National Archives: STAC 8/167/27 (May 1621)

‘in most humble wise complayninge sheweth and informesth yr Majestie: yr loyall and obedient subject John Harrison of Leeds in yr Majesties Countie of Yorke gent that whereas yr said subject hath from his infancy lived . . . elected chief constable of Wapentake of Skyrake . . . so it is that William Key (the elder and younger), Alexander Smith, John Watson, Peter Jackson, William Boyes, Edward Harman, William Morley, John Raymer, Richard Sikes, George Hargrave, Christopher Smith, William Pulleyn, Richard Casson, Lawrence Walker. And others as they shall be discovered...[the following names were inserted later]: Alexander Cook, Rafe Cook, Mansfield Hapell, Thomas Woodcooke, Abraham Jenkinson, Elizabeth Sykes, Hry Smythe, having constantly conceived great hatred and malice against the said subject, and much enyinge yr subjects prosperitie and good estate . . . at diverse tymes . . . in last 4 years ... confederated and combyned and wickedly abused their witte and conferred and consulted together to contrive and publish scandalous and infamous libells against yr said subject . . . though they know the law and penalty of libel, yet hoping that their maliciousnes and wickedness be kept secret . . . so that it could not be knowen who were the authors . . . and to spread and disperse false rumours, and so sedition, discord and debate . . .

Two false slanderous lewd and seditious libells against yr subject and diverse others in forme following:

“whoever heard of any soe madd
To stabbe themselves and laugh and bee glad
And him extoll was always false lad
What witt is in this good neighbours

What now becomes of all idle talke
In alehouse and taverne and as ye’ doe walke
Where some payed money and some did but chalke
What wise mirth is this good neighbours

You rage and maline him that did saye
The parish had right and would have a daie
Would not this yield matter to make a stage play
For rapr witt good neighboures

Some looke bigg as though eaten Bull beefe
Somem made honeste bawde, where and the ofer
And Tom Brooke was feasted even of the cheefe
What witt was in this good neighbours
Some left their labour and did resort to the alehouse and taverne
To heare reporte and joyed in shadowes
Yet wanted the forte
What witt was in this good neighbours

You sent Robin Benson to London in poste
And for his newes you were at great cost
But what doe you nowe when all is lost
But see your owne follie good neighbours

The end and begyninge all is but one
Rashnes begune it by councell of John
Fye of such councell that after breedes none
And makes men buy witt good neighbours

Though nowe somethinge late take counsell by mee
Hath vertue, hath vice, lett all lovers bee
What’s past its past lett’s all now agree
And love one another good neighbours

Love them that’s worthie withall your harte
For knaves and dunces more take theire parte
doctor dodopoll is worse than bachelors of Arte
who knoweth not this good neighbours

leave entereyning knaves at yor dore
gallopp not to meete whome you were sawe before
as of late you did score after score
but counted more fooles good neighbours

but in conclusion, since things doe them fadge
and an ape an ape though were a guilt badge
hangue upp all whores Grace Beatrice and Madge
and all drunken knaves good neighbours

had wee bene thankfull to God above
and to th’old knight whome wee did prove
did us protect and defend with love
then had wee bene wise good neighbours

have wee not had old Cooke to preach
non worse then unthankfull wch maie us teach
to requite good turnes if it bee in our reache
then whose fooles and knaves good neighbours

did not many preachers both learned and wise
oft resort hither and devise
to make us love and not to despise
_ur Pastor and teacher good neighbours

But since note you are all overrun
I’ll leave you to the vicar of Hartburne
And goe to Poules and there take a turne
Meane tyme bee more wise good neighbours

Though nowe you rage it is noe wonder
The devill would have you not parte a sunder
But flye his baite hee is a confounder
And heate but yor bloud good neighbours”

And the other saide scandalous libells followeth in these words:

“He that doth brave and slander men
And urgeth them with spight
To collo’ to advantage give
But darenot wth them fight

Hee that byes lands and purchance
Gette by decept and shift
And useth cunninge not to paye
Wth nought but tricks and drifte

Hee that hath uphalden bene
And graced by his better
Doth falsifie comitted trust
And still remained his detter

Hee that will slander those that’s good
And yet keepe a mynion
Maye well bee sayd to have small grace
And lesser of religion

Hee that still walkes and proudly sitte
That all may see and cye him
And yet prove hollowe in the touch
And true to none that tries him

Hee that old matters takes in hand
And saith hee will make an end
But leaves them to the lawe at length makes worse
But naught doth mend

Hee that canne Cardinall Confute
And Bellarmyne himself
And yet takes counsell of a knave
And of a popish elf

Hee that speakes one thing with his tongue
And yet doth thinke another
Hee is a knave of knaves I dare affirm
Although hee were my brother
Hee that hath gott some store of land
Would govern all a towne
And yet’s ill bred and manners wante
A knave a very clowne

Hee that upon the rich doth frowne
But spighteth them that’s poor
And hates them both and loveth none
But flatterie and a whore

Hee that is rich and is supposed
by honest wit and paynes
And so reg intall renders hate
And losse in stead of gaynes

Hee that a danger avoide
By meanes doth speake reliefe
But kyndly used unthankfull proves
And still deteynes his griefe

Hee that abnsts men of worth
Or knowledge and of arte
And for to please a butchers wife
Doth terme a coach a carte

Hee that with all these canne bee charjged
Noe further shall hee have
But while hee lives shalbee esteemed
Of knaves the very knave.”

[An attached slip, dated 15 May nineteenth James (1621) shows the date for the court hearing.
William Kaye defended himself by not denying the libels, but claiming them to be of too trivial a matter for the Court of Star Chamber.]