

The Lives of Ejected Hampshire Ministers after 1662

Rosalind Johnson

After the Restoration of Charles II in 1660, a resurgent Church of England was re-established. The early years of the Restoration saw numbers of ministers ejected from their livings; some when an incumbent ousted during the Interregnum reclaimed the living of his former parish, others when they felt unable to comply with the terms of the Act of Uniformity in 1662. Over 2,000 ordained ministers, including parish clergy, lecturers, university fellows and schoolmasters, were affected.¹ The experience of these ministers ejected from their livings in the early years of the Restoration remains an under-explored field, especially where provincial ministers are concerned.² Some studies have been made, including London, and the counties of Derbyshire, Kent and Surrey.³ But there remains considerable scope for further studies to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the lives and ministry of those ejected. This article aims to redress this imbalance by considering the situation of Hampshire's ejected ministers.

Many parishes had already seen the ejection of a minister in the 1640s and 1650s, when large numbers were ejected for failing to conform to the religious ordinances of Parliament. Other, more strongly Puritan

- 1 M.R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1978), p. 219.
- 2 D.J. Appleby, 'From Ejection to Toleration in England, 1662–89', in A.P.F. Sell (ed.), *The Great Ejection of 1662: its Antecedents, Aftermath, and Ecumenical Significance* (Eugene, OR, 2012), p. 82.
- 3 Appleby, 'From Ejection to Toleration', p. 83; R. Clark, 'How was the Church of England Restored in the 1660s? Bishop Hacket, the Act of Uniformity of 1662, and the Archdeaconry of Derby', *Midland History* 38 (2013), 16–35; G.F. Nuttall, 'Dissenting Churches in Kent before 1700', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 14 (1963), 175–89; D.L. Wykes, 'Early Religious Dissent in Surrey after the Restoration', *Southern History* 33 (2011), 54–77.

clergy – although they would have preferred the term ‘godly’ – were intruded into their vacant livings. It is estimated that almost two and half thousand English benefices were affected.⁴ Hampshire was no exception. Andrew Coleby has estimated that at least 72 livings were affected in the county during the 1640s and 1650s, representing 28 per cent of the county’s 253 parishes.⁵

Hampshire is a county whose Restoration nonconformity has not been extensively studied, perhaps because almost the only contemporary accounts of their lives come from Edmund Calamy’s biographies.⁶ But the lives of these ministers after ejection can be reconstructed through other contemporary sources, including wills, hearth tax returns, the 1669 conventicle returns, applications made under the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672–73 and the survey made of Presbyterian and Independent ministers in 1690–92.

Upon the Restoration of Charles II in 1660, many of those whose livings had been sequestered under parliamentary rule sought to repossess their former benefices. Some did so forcibly, a practice forbidden by a royal proclamation of 29 May 1660, but the right of sequestered ministers to their former livings was affirmed by the Act for Confirming and Restoring of Ministers, given royal assent on 29 December 1660.⁷ The publicity given to the ejections of 1662 has somewhat obscured the fact that many ministers were ejected from their livings in 1660. The total number of clergy, lecturers, university fellows and schoolmasters ejected in 1660–62 in England and Wales has been estimated at 2,029, with ‘[n]early a thousand’ of these ejected as a direct result of failing to subscribe as required by the Act of Uniformity in 1662.⁸ That means that about half those ejected in England and

4 A.G. Matthews, *Walker Revised: Being a Revision of John Walker’s ‘Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion’ 1642–60* (Oxford, 1948), p. xv.

5 A.M. Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649–1689* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 10. See also A. Thomson, ‘Continuity and Change: A Comparison of the Parish Clergy in the Diocese of Winchester, 1642–1663’, *Southern History* 30 (2008), 1–23.

6 E. Calamy, *An Abridgment of Mr Baxter’s History of his Life and Times* (London, 1702); E. Calamy, *An Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected or Silenced after the Restoration in 1660* vol. II, (London, 1713); E. Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges, and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected or Silenced after the Restoration in 1660, by or before the Act for Uniformity* (vol. I, London, 1727).

7 A.G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised: Being a Revision of Edmund Calamy’s ‘Account’ of the ministers and others ejected and silence, 1660–2* (Oxford, 1934), [hereafter *Calamy Revised*], p. xi.

8 Watts, *Dissenters*, p. 219.

Wales had been ejected prior to the 1662 ejections. Hampshire was no exception to the national pattern; 24 of an estimated 52 ejected ministers lost their livings in 1660.⁹ In Hampshire, most 1660 ejections of parish clergy appear to have been the result of a sequestered minister reclaiming his parish, rather than for any other disqualification, and this seems to have been the case elsewhere, as studies of Devon and Yorkshire have shown.¹⁰ However, surprisingly few of those affected in Hampshire seem to have acquired a subsequent living, let alone conformed in 1662. Richard Crossin, ejected from Fordingbridge when the sequestered minister was restored, may have obtained a living in Devon shortly after his ejection, and later became vicar of Otterton in that county from 1662 until his death in 1689.¹¹ It is not clear if Humphrey Ellis, preacher at Winchester Cathedral and rector of the parish of St Thomas in Winchester, was ejected in 1660, but he was instituted as rector of Langton Matravers in Dorset in December 1660. He may not have conformed in 1662, since a successor was instituted in February 1663, but he did conform subsequently, becoming rector of Mottistone on the Isle of Wight in December 1664.¹²

Double ejections, where a minister was ejected in 1660, obtained another benefice in a parish, only to be ejected for failure to conform in 1662, did occur, but seem to have been uncommon in Hampshire. Robert Lancaster, ejected from Amport in 1660, became curate of North Baddesley, also in Hampshire, from where he was ejected in 1662. Martin Morland, ejected from Cliddesden in 1660, was ejected in 1662 from Wield, another Hampshire parish. Another minister, Noah Webb, became curate of the Hampshire parish of Upton Grey in 1660, following his ejection from the parish of Chieveley in Berkshire when the sequestered vicar was restored, was likewise ejected in 1662.¹³

Nevertheless, most of those ejected in 1660 are not known to have obtained a second living. In a few instances there is evidence of how these ministers subsequently fared. John Farroll, ejected from Selborne when the sequestered minister was restored, went to Guildford in

9 *Calamy Revised*, p. xii.

10 P.W. Jackson, 'Nonconformists and Society in Devon 1660-1689', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Exeter, 1986, p. 26; A. Anderson, 'From Puritanism to Nonconformity, 1660-89; a study in the development of Protestant Dissent, with special reference to Yorkshire', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Hull, (1980), p. 12.

11 *Calamy Revised*, p. 149.

12 *Calamy Revised*, p. 182.

13 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 313, 355, 516.

Surrey, where he kept boarders who went to the free school.¹⁴ Urian Oakes, after his ejection from Titchfield, lived with Colonel Norton at Southwick. He became a schoolmaster there, and ministered to a dissenting congregation, before emigrating to New England by 1671.¹⁵ However, in many cases it is not always clear what happened to those ministers who were ejected in 1660 or 1661 in the period between their ejection and Black Bartholomew's Day of 1662. That few obtained a second living may be due to a number of reasons, they may have been unsuccessful in their efforts or may have chosen not to seek a further position. It is also possible that some may have obtained a new benefice but because they were subsequently ejected in 1662, their brief appointment has left little or no record.

Despite the earlier ejections, it has been the Great Ejection of 1662 which has come to achieve iconic status among Protestant dissenters. The Act of Uniformity, passed in April 1662, required all clergy, as well as university fellows, schoolmasters and private tutors, to declare their complete consent and assent to everything in the new Book of Common Prayer, to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant which they had previously been required by Parliament to sign, and to seek episcopal ordination, if they had not previously been ordained by a bishop. If they continued preaching without having given the required assent, they would be liable to three months' imprisonment.¹⁶ For fifteen years the official service book to be used in churches had not been the Book of Common Prayer, but the *Directory of Public Worship*, although actual religious practice varied considerably. The *Directory* gave individual clergy considerable freedom to interpret its directions as far as considered appropriate by them and for their congregations. To many clergy, the new Book of Common Prayer, with its prescribed ceremonies and liturgy, may have seemed a retrograde step, back to the pre-Commonwealth days of Archbishop Laud.

All those affected by the Act were required to assent to it by St Bartholomew's Day, 24 August 1662, or be ejected from their livings. Initially Bishop Morley of Winchester, whose diocese encompassed Hampshire, Surrey and the Channel Islands, was confident that the majority of his clergy had conformed after 24 August. Writing to the earl of Clarendon on 28 August 1662 he stated that only eight ministers in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight had not subscribed to the new

14 Calamy, *Account*, p. 344.

15 Calamy *Revised*, p. 370.

16 Watts, *Dissenters*, pp. 218–19; Calamy *Revised*, pp. xi–xii.

requirements, and just four ministers in Surrey. Ten days later he was still content in the belief that only 12 ministers in his whole diocese were not conforming, nine of them in Hampshire.¹⁷ As Andrew Coleby has commented, 'the diocesan machinery embarked falteringly upon its role of gathering information'.¹⁸ When James Creswick of Freshwater on the Isle of Wight continued preaching after Black Bartholomew's Day, a new incumbent having yet to be appointed, Morley only heard about it from the information of two parishioners who held a grudge against Creswick.¹⁹

Morley's initial optimism was mistaken. In *Calamy Revised*, A.G. Matthews' classic text on the ejections of 1660–62, Matthews estimates that 26 ministers in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight were ejected as a direct result of Black Bartholomew's Day alone. This was in addition to the 24 ejected in 1660, and two ejections of uncertain date. This gives a total of 52 ejected ministers. In addition to this figure were two ejected ministers who subsequently conformed.²⁰ If the number of parishes in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight can be taken as 253, then the proportion of parishes suffering the ejection of a minister was about one in five. One parish, Portsmouth, suffered the ejection of both its vicar and his curate.²¹

Andrew Thomson has calculated that in the diocese of Winchester five of the beneficed clergy ejected in 1662 had been in post in the diocese in 1642.²² However, in Hampshire the majority of those ejected were of a generation that had not entered active ministry until after the outbreak of hostilities in 1642. Most were admitted into the parish from which they were ejected, or are first recorded there, sometime in the 1650s. Although it is not always known where they had been ministering prior to that, the majority were not Hampshire born and bred; nevertheless, most still came from other counties in southern England. Few had been born in the Midlands or northern England, or

17 I.M. Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660–1663* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 151–52; Coleby, *Central Government*, p. 131.

18 Coleby, *Central Government*, p. 131.

19 Calamy, *Continuation*, pp. 509–10.

20 Calamy *Revised*, p. xii. Two Hampshire ministers are accepted by Calamy as subsequently conforming, Richard Crossin of Fordingbridge and Humphrey Ellis of Winchester. A third, George Jones of Elvetham and King's Sombourne, though listed by Calamy as ejected, did later conform. Calamy *Revised*, pp. lxvii, 149, 182, 302; Calamy, *Account*, p. 351.

21 Benjamin Burgess, vicar of Portsmouth, and his assistant Thomas Brag (or Brague). Calamy *Revised*, pp. 70–1, 87.

22 Thomson, 'Continuity and Change', 17.

were known to have had a ministry there. This may be compared with the situation in Leicestershire, where there was a slight tendency for those who failed to conform to be younger than the conformists, and to be recent arrivals from other counties.²³ A study of the age on ejection in Northamptonshire found, however, that of 44 ejected ministers, only 11 were under 40, but 29 were over 40 years of age. Sixteen had already reached the age of 50 or more.²⁴

This article will consider four themes concerning these ejected ministers: where they lived after ejection, to what extent they suffered for their beliefs, how many of them continued preaching after ejection, and how those who continued to exercise some form of ministry after ejection financed their calling.

I Ejected Ministers and their Places of Residence

How far ejected ministers remained in their parish after 1662 is not clear, and not all studies of ejected ministers have engaged with the issue. One study suggests that the majority of ejected ministers did remain in the vicinity of their old livings, but cites as evidence only two ministers who did so.²⁵ In Devon, a 1665 survey of dissenting ministers showed that a significant proportion still lived in or near a parish where they had been the incumbent. Of the 63 ministers appearing in the survey, 27 were still resident in a parish where they had previously been the incumbent, and a further 14 were living within five miles of such a parish.²⁶ The passing of the Five Mile Act in 1665, discussed below, may have made a difference, since Geoffrey Nuttall's study of ministers ejected in Kent concluded, from the evidence of applications for licences in 1672, that of 63 incumbents ejected from their benefices in 1660–62, only eight had remained in their parish and sought a licence in 1672.²⁷ In Surrey, the majority of ejected ministers left their parishes.²⁸ The evidence from Hampshire would suggest that most

23 J.H. Pruett, *The Parish Clergy Under the Later Stuarts: the Leicestershire Experience* (Urbana, IL, 1978), pp. 23–24.

24 P.M. Geldart, 'Protestant Nonconformity and Sectarianism in Restoration Northamptonshire', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Leicester, (2006), p. 182. The ages of four ministers are unknown.

25 Appleby, 'From Ejection to Toleration', p. 83.

26 Jackson, 'Nonconformists and Society', p. 45.

27 Nuttall, 'Dissenting Churches in Kent', 175–76.

28 Wykes, 'Early Religious Dissent in Surrey', 57.

ejected ministers did leave their parish, but not all did so. Of those that left, a number continued to minister to Hampshire congregations.

The Hampshire hearth tax returns provide an indication of who remained resident in their parish immediately after 1662. The 1665 returns for mainland Hampshire (excluding Southampton) show that at least seven ministers had remained as householders in their former parish up to that time. Robert Tutchin junior was at Brockenhurst, Noah Webb at Upton Grey and John Haddesley at Rockbourne.²⁹ Humphrey Weaver continued to reside at Crondall, and Benjamin Burgess, ejected from Portsmouth, also remained in his former parish.³⁰ Furthermore, the 'Mister Simons' who paid hearth tax at Southwick was probably the ejected minister of that parish, Richard Symmonds. 'Mister Tutchin' of Odiham is likely to have been Samuel Tutchin, its ejected minister, and brother of Robert Tutchin of Brockenhurst.³¹

On the Isle of Wight Robert Tutchin senior, ejected from Newport, remained in his former parish after ejection, and seems to have stayed there until his death in 1671.³² A Mr Pole appears in the hearth tax returns for the year ending Lady Day 1664, taxed on a property in Northwood, next to West Cowes. This may be the property of Simon Pole, former curate at West Cowes, though he was by then imprisoned in Somerset.³³ The hearth tax assessments for Southampton do not survive for 1665, but do for 1662 and 1670. These reveal that Nathaniel

29 *The Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment 1665*, edited by E. Hughes and P. White (Hampshire Record Series, 11, 1991), pp. 53, 71, 219; Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, pp. 240–1, 499, 516.

30 Humphrey Weaver appears in the hearth tax returns for Ewshot (or Ewshott) near Crondall, and 'Mister Burgis' at Copnor near Portsmouth, but neither Ewshot nor Copnor were separate parishes. *Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment*, pp. 13, 403. See the list of parishes in *Parson and Parish in Eighteenth-Century Hampshire: Replies to Bishops' Visitations*, edited by W. R. Ward (Hampshire Record Series, 13, 1995), pp. 347–52. See also Lambeth Palace Library, London [hereafter LPL], MS 639 *Miscellanies Ecclesiastical: An account of the Conventicles in Winton Diocese, 1669*, ff. 261–64; *Original Records of Early Nonconformity Under Persecution and Indulgence*, edited by G. Lyon Turner 3 vols (London, 1911–14), II, pp. 1035–52; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 87, 515.

31 *Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment*, pp. 10, 203; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 443, 498–99.

32 *The Hearth Tax Returns for the Isle of Wight, 1664 to 1674*, edited by P.D.D. Russell (Isle of Wight Records Series, 1, 1981), p. 71; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 498–99. Robert Tutchin senior was the father of Robert and Samuel; a third son, John, was ejected in Cornwall.

33 *Hearth Tax Returns for the Isle of Wight*, p. 19; *Calamy Revised*, p. 393.

Robinson ejected from All Saints, Southampton and Giles Say from St Michael's were both still living in their former parishes in 1670.³⁴

The Five Mile Act of 1665 made it an offence for an ejected minister to live within five miles of a former parish, or of a borough town, unless he swore an oath of compliance to the existing government of Church and state. The act applied to any parish in which a minister had served since the Act of Oblivion of 1660, not only to a parish from which he had been expelled.³⁵ However, the 1665 hearth tax returns are not conclusive proof of who remained in a former parish in defiance of the Five Mile Act since they cover the 18 month period up to Michaelmas 1665, and the Act was not passed until October 1665.³⁶ They also only list householders, so it is not possible to know from this source if any ejected ministers were living as a guest or lodger. As the hearth tax returns for mainland Hampshire (excepting Southampton) that survive for the 1670s are damaged in places, it is not possible to be certain from this source who remained in a former parish, as a householder, after 1665 from this source alone.³⁷

It is not clear exactly how many of those ejected in Hampshire remained in their former parishes, but left after 1665 as a direct result of the Five Mile Act. Calamy gave the names of two Hampshire ministers who moved on account of the act, Humphrey Weaver of Crondall, and Henry Coxe, ejected from Bishopstoke, but neither moved far beyond the five miles specified by the act, and both continued their ministry among their former parishioners.³⁸ Others also continued to minister in or near the parish from which they had been ejected. Benjamin Burgess remained in or near Portsmouth despite an earlier promise to the authorities that he would leave the town.³⁹ He is recorded in the 1665 hearth tax returns as living in nearby Copnor, and in the 1669 conventicle returns as holding meetings in Gosport

34 *Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment*, pp. 296, 303; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 413, 427–28.

35 Watts, *Dissenters*, p. 226; *The Statutes at Large, of England and of Great Britain: From Magna Carta to the Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, Volume III, from 12 Charles II A.D. 1660 to 6 Anne A.D. 1707*, edited by J. Raithby (London, 1811), pp. 127–28.

36 *Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment*, p. ix; Watts, *Dissenters*, p. 226.

37 The National Archives, London [hereafter TNA], PRO E179/176/569 Exchequer: King's Remembrancer: Particulars of Account: Hampshire hearth tax, [c. March 1673]; TNA, PRO E179/247/30 Exchequer: King's Remembrancer: Particulars of Account: Hampshire hearth tax, 12 January 1675.

38 Calamy, *Continuation*, pp. 507, 516.

39 *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles II, 1661–2*, edited by M. A. E. Green (London, 1861), p. 551.

that were attended by many Portsmouth inhabitants. By 1672 he was still holding conventicles in Gosport, and under the Declaration of Indulgence applied for licences to preach both there, and in his former parish of Portsmouth.

Those who did move may have done so because they felt called to continue their ministry, but found that there were better opportunities for preaching elsewhere, or because they required the financial support that could only be provided by a large congregation, and these were more likely to be found in the towns. This may be what happened to John Haddesley, ejected from Rockbourne, who by 1672 was living and preaching a few miles away in the Wiltshire town of Salisbury, to a congregation whose pastor he remained until his death in 1699.⁴⁰ Walter Marshall, ejected from Hursley was, according to the will of local landowner Samuel Dunch, still living there in 1667, which would have been in defiance of the Five Mile Act.⁴¹ By 1669 he was ministering to congregations in Andover and Winchester, and he later lived in Gosport as minster to the large Presbyterian meeting in the town.⁴² It should be emphasised that the Five Mile Act forbade ministers, unless they had signed the oath of non-resistance, from residing within five miles of a borough town, so any minister who moved to, or near, such a town to continue his preaching ministry would still have been in breach of the act. John Farroll moved to Surrey, where he was charged in 1669 for being within five miles of the borough towns of Guildford and Godalming.⁴³

It is clear from the licences applied for under the Declaration of Indulgence of 1672–73 that a number of those ejected from Hampshire parishes did continue to minister in the county, some to their former parishioners. During the period of Charles II's Declaration of

40 TNA, PROB 11/451/325 Will of John Haddesly, Clerk of Salisbury, Wiltshire, 11 July 1699; *Calamy, Abridgment*, pp. 294–3; *Original Records*, II, pp. 1067–68; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 240–1.

41 TNA, PROB 11/328/285 Will of Samuella Dunch of Badgley, Hampshire, 13 September 1668; *Calamy Revised*, p. 341.

42 S. Tomlyns, *The Faith of the Saints as to a Future House and Happiness in the Other World* (London, 1680), pp. 5–6. Both Tomlyns and Marshall appear in the 1669 conventicle returns, preaching at the same Presbyterian conventicle in Winchester. Marshall was also preaching in Alton. See LPL, MS 639, f. 263. Marshall's ejection from Hursley is recorded in *Calamy Revised*, p. 341. Marshall does not appear to have been preaching at Gosport in 1669, but the evidence for it being a large congregation is evident in the description of it being 'some hundreds of all sorts'. LPL, MS 639, f. 262v.

43 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 191–92.

Indulgence in 1672–73, nonconformists could apply for individual licences to preach or teach, and for licences for any premises that were being used for divine worship. Although the evidence of the 1672–73 licence applications has to be treated with caution, licences were applied for by or on behalf of 24 Hampshire ministers in order for them to minister in the county, though the majority were not ministering in their former parish.⁴⁴

II The Sufferings of Ejected Ministers

Subsequent generations of Nonconformists held the belief that ejected ministers suffered considerably at the loss of their livings, and for any subsequent preaching activity. In 1911 the Hampshire Congregational Union noted the importance of the forthcoming 250th anniversary of the 1662 ejections, writing that '[w]e cherish the memory of men and women who faced ridicule, opposition, and starvation rather than surrender at the bidding of a hostile power their high vision of truth and the sacred rights of conscience'.⁴⁵ Nonetheless, these ministers faced not only ejection from their livings but also became subject to the legal restrictions and measures intended to address the problem of religious nonconformity.

For some former clergy, their sufferings began with their ejection. Robert Webb of Droxford suffered a 'rough and violent' expulsion, according to Calamy, when the former incumbent was restored in 1660. For a time a local Roman Catholic gentleman gave shelter to him and his family, until Dorothy Cromwell, wife of former Lord Protector Richard Cromwell, sent her coach to convey them to a house in the parish where she lived, Hursley near Winchester.⁴⁶ Some parishioners from the Isle of Wight parish of St Lawrence carted in their corn before St Bartholomew's Day 1662, that the minister, Thomas Newnham, might have the tithe of it, but others, according to Calamy, allowed the rain to spoil their corn, in order to deprive him of the income.⁴⁷

Some ministers found themselves in conflict with the authorities within a few weeks of the implementation of the Act of Uniformity. In

44 *Original Records*, II, pp. 1035–52. The figure of nine ministers includes John Warren, ejected from Romsey, who applied for a licence for his house to be used as a meeting place, but not for a licence to preach.

45 Hampshire Record Office, Winchester [hereafter HRO], 127M94/62/56 *Annual Report of the Hampshire Congregational Union for 1911*, pp. 23–24.

46 Calamy, *Continuation*, p. 518.

47 Calamy, *Continuation*, pp. 510–13.

September 1662 Nathaniel Robinson of Southampton was accused of speaking some words against the king and the bishop of Winchester, but on payment of a small fine, the case was dismissed.⁴⁸ The ejected Portsmouth minister Benjamin Burgess was in gaol by November, when he was released on promising the authorities that he would leave the town, and not draw the inhabitants into nonconformity.⁴⁹

From the 1664 abstract of churchwardens' presentments for Hampshire it can be seen that a number of the county's ejected ministers were in trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities for failing to attend church. Eight ejected Hampshire ministers can be identified in this source. At Hursley, Walter Marshall was presented for this offence, as was Robert Webb, and also their wives.⁵⁰ Humphrey Weaver was presented by the churchwardens of Crondall for failure to attend church.⁵¹ John Haddesley was not presented for failing to attend church, but was presented for holding conventicles in his former parish of Rockbourne.⁵² On the Isle of Wight, Robert Tutchin senior was presented in Newport for failing to attend church.⁵³ Newport churchwardens also presented a Mr Wm. Biknell and his wife, possibly the same man as William Bicknell who had been ejected from Portsea on the mainland.⁵⁴ Martin Wells, who had been ejected from Yaverland on the Isle of Wight, was presented, with his wife, by the churchwardens of Arreton, another island parish.⁵⁵

Also appearing in the 1664 churchwardens' presentments was Nathaniel Robinson, presented by churchwardens in the parish from which he had been ejected for not coming to church. Later, after failing to appear for a third time at the bishop's court, he was pronounced excommunicate, and was ordered to be imprisoned.⁵⁶

There were other cases during the Restoration period of ejected Hampshire ministers presented by the churchwardens, or cited to appear before the secular or ecclesiastical courts. A particularly well-

48 *Mercurius Publicus* (25 September–2 October 1662), p. 644.

49 *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles II, 1661–2*, p. 551.

50 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, Abstract of churchwardens' presentments, 1664, f. 2r; *Calamy Revised*, p. 516.

51 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, ff. 5, 10v, 25v; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 413, 498–99, 515.

52 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, f. 7v; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 240–41.

53 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, ff. 5, 10v, 25v; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 413, 498–99, 515.

54 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, f. 10v; *Calamy Revised*, p. 53.

55 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, f. 9; *Calamy Revised*, p. 519.

56 HRO, 21M65/B1/37, ff. 5, 10v, 25v; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 413, 498–99, 515; HRO, 21M65/C1/38/1 Diocese of Winchester: Consistory Court: Office Act Book 1664–1665, f. 2.

documented case was that of the conventicle at Andover in 1673.⁵⁷ A congregation of Presbyterians was observed by informers on two separate Sundays, and a number of those attending the meetings subsequently fined. The Hampshire minister cited in this case was Samuel Sprint, ejected from Tidworth, about ten miles from Andover. He had been active in Andover at least since 1669.⁵⁸ Isaac Chauncey, who had been ejected from a Wiltshire parish, was also fined for preaching at the Andover conventicle.⁵⁹ Some testimony to the feelings some of the townspeople had towards the conventicle is evident in that one of the town constables, Richard Butcher, was present at the first meeting, but failed to give evidence to the justices that it had taken place, for which he was fined. Two churchwardens, John Bray and John Seagreave, failed to execute a warrant ordering them to suppress a subsequent conventicle, and were also fined.⁶⁰ The anonymous author of a pamphlet supporting the two ministers implied that the breaking up of the conventicle was the personal project of a handful of town officials, and took place in spite of the active objections of many townsfolk.⁶¹

The case of the Andover conventicle illustrated the ambiguity felt among those responsible for enforcing the law. As both Anthony Fletcher and P.J. Norrey have noted, attitudes of justices towards the enforcement of the statutes against dissenters varied considerably.⁶² Nevertheless, there were strenuous efforts made in some counties. In Wiltshire, an active campaign after the Second Conventicle Act of 1670 led eventually to several hundred convictions, but was partially thwarted by the lack of co-operation among the local constables. A similarly vigorous campaign in Sussex had little long-term impact on nonconformity in the county.⁶³

Though there may have been reluctance among some constables to inform on conventicles, ejected ministers appeared in the Hampshire court records throughout Restoration period. Thomas Newnham was convicted in 1671 for being at a conventicle on the Isle of Wight, and

57 HRO, 37M85/13/DI/1 Andover Borough: Dissenters: depositions in case, 1673.

58 LPL, MS 639, f. 261.

59 *Calamy Revised*, p. 112.

60 HRO, 37M85/13/DI/1.

61 Anon, *Don Quixot Redivivus* ([London?], [1673]).

62 A. Fletcher, 'The Enforcement of the Conventicle Acts 1664-1679', in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *Persecution and Toleration* (Studies in Church History, 21, 1984), pp. 235-46; P. J. Norrey, 'The Restoration Regime in Action: The Relationship between Central and Local Government in Dorset, Somerset and Wiltshire, 1660-1678', *Historical Journal* 31 (1988), 803-8.

63 Fletcher, 'Enforcement of the Conventicle Acts', pp. 244-45.

in the same year Nathaniel Robinson was again cited in the consistory court.⁶⁴ John Hickes, ejected from Saltash in Cornwall, was accused at the Portsmouth borough sessions for Michaelmas 1677 of preaching at a conventicle in the town.⁶⁵ Samuel Sprint appeared in the consistory court records in 1677 for holding a conventicle and for unlicensed teaching. He was excommunicated in 1679, as was Samuel Tomlyns, ejected from Crawley.⁶⁶ Prominent dissenting ministers continued to face the prospect of court appearances for their activities. In April 1682 Nathaniel Robinson was prosecuted again, this time before the secular courts.⁶⁷ In June 1683 he was seized as a known preacher at conventicles, and committed under the Five Mile Act.⁶⁸ He appeared before the Southampton magistrates in September 1683, charged with failing to attend church, but appears to have escaped a penalty.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, it seems that Hampshire's ejected ministers could only expect negative attention from the authorities if they continued to exercise an active ministry.

III The Preaching Activities of Ejected Ministers

Clearly, there were those Hampshire ministers who lost their livings in 1660–62, who in spite of being ejected, were not silenced. In fact, of Matthews' estimated 52 parish ministers ejected from livings in Hampshire, 16 appear in the 1669 returns as preaching at Hampshire conventicles.⁷⁰ In other words, almost a third of the county's ejected ministers appear as still preaching in the county in the 1669 conventicle returns. It should be noted that, for Hampshire, these returns incomplete as they do not include the Isle of Wight; for example, nor

64 HRO, Q1/4 Hampshire Quarter Sessions: Order book, 1658–1672, pp. 329, 344; HRO, 21M65/C1/42 Diocese of Winchester: Consistory Court: Office act book, 1670–1671, f. 22v; Coleby, *Central Government*, p. 137.

65 *Borough Sessions Papers 1653–1688*, edited by A. J. Willis and M. J. Hoad (Portsmouth Record Series, 1, 1971), pp. 65–67; *Calamy Revised*, p. 260.

66 HRO, 21M65/C1/45 Diocese of Winchester: Consistory Court: Office Act book 1678–1683, ff. 28, 63, 73v; HRO, 21M65/C13/1 Diocese of Winchester: Consistory Court: Excommunications, Nov 1663–Jan 1699/1700: List of excommunications, 1679.

67 HRO, 24M54/14, f. 26; Coleby, *Central Government*, p. 200.

68 *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles II, January–June 1683*, edited by F.H.B. Daniell (London, 1933), pp. 284–390.

69 Southampton Archives Services, SC9/4/19c Southampton Quarter Sessions: Indictment of Nathaniel Robinson, 1683; *Calamy Revised*, p. 413.

70 LPL, MS 639, ff. 261–64; *Original Records*, pp. 1035–52.

for the deanery of Somborne, which included the town of Romsey, a known centre of nonconformity. Thus the actual figures of Protestant dissenting conventicles and of ejected ministers preaching at them, is likely to have been higher.

The 1669 conventicle returns do provide sufficient evidence for the mobility of dissenting ministers. As well as those ministers ejected from Hampshire parishes, there are others from three neighbouring counties: Berkshire, Dorset and Wiltshire. Richard Avery, ministering in Hursley, may have been ejected from a Berkshire parish, though Matthews notes there is no evidence.⁷¹ Benjamin Woodbridge, ejected from Newbury in Berkshire, was preaching at Burghclere; Henry Blake (given in the 1669 returns as Thomas Blake), a former lecturer at Newbury and vicar of Cliffe Pypard in Wiltshire, was preaching at Kingsclere.⁷² Isaac Chauncey, ejected from Woodborough in Wiltshire, was preaching at Andover, and another ejected Wiltshire minister, Joseph Swaffield, formerly of Odstock, was ministering to a congregation at Fordingbridge.⁷³ The John Tucker who was preaching at Ellingham may have been the same man as the minister ejected from Horton in Dorset.⁷⁴ Since the 1669 returns are incomplete, other ministers are likely to have been active in the county. According to Calamy, John Hardy, who was ejected from Symondsbury in Dorset, died in 1668 or 1669, by which time he was preaching at Southwick.⁷⁵ Hampshire ministers had likewise crossed the county boundary by 1669. These included John Farroll, who was preaching in Surrey, Robert Rogers, once of Deane, but recorded in 1669 as active at Hungerford in Berkshire, and Andrew Rowel (or Ruell), ejected from Hayling, who was preaching in Surrey and in Sussex.⁷⁶

Evidence for the possible activities of ministers is found in the licence applications made under the Declaration of Indulgence of 1672–73, though these have to be used with caution, as applications were often made on behalf of a minister, rather than by him personally, and not all applications resulted in a licence being issued. During this period applications were made for licences for 24 ejected Hampshire ministers to preach or to hold meetings in the county.⁷⁷ This represented almost

71 LPL, MS 639, f. 263; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 19–20.

72 LPL, MS 639, ff. 261–61v; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 60, 543.

73 LPL, MS 639, ff. 261, 263v; *Calamy Revised*, p. 112, 470.

74 LPL, MS 639, f. 263v; *Calamy Revised*, p. 496.

75 Calamy, *Continuation*, pp. 414–15.

76 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 191–92, 415, 419.

77 *Original Records*, II, pp. 1035–52.

half of the ejected ministers, a decade after Black Bartholomew's Day. It seems that the majority of applications from Hampshire by or on behalf of ejected ministers did result in a licence being issued, although there is some doubt over whether or not William Bicknell received a licence to preach in Alton, and if licences were issued to Robert Tutchin junior for Lymington, or Robert Webb at Hursley.⁷⁸ One application at least was not approved, Samuel Sprint's application to preach in the town hall in Andover, though he appears to have been granted a licence for Clatford.⁷⁹

These figures may be compared with those of other counties. In Wiltshire, where Matthews gives a total figure of 60 ejections, Henry Lancaster has calculated that 13 of these men were issued with a licence to preach in the county in 1672–73.⁸⁰ In Northamptonshire, licences were issued to 44 'teachers' (21 Presbyterian, 19 Congregational/Independent and four Baptist) of whom half had been ejected from Northamptonshire parishes in 1661 or 1662, and four who had been ejected from parishes outside the county.⁸¹ A study of Yorkshire ministers calculated that 76 licences were issued in Yorkshire to dissenting ministers in 1672–73, of whom two had not been ejected, and 17 ejected outside the county.⁸²

But the Hampshire figures do not represent the total number of ministers ejected within the county who remained active after 1662. Some ministers are known to have continued preaching, but their names do not appear in the county records from 1669 or 1672–73. One of these men was John Hooke, ejected from King's Worthy, who spent some time out of the county before returning to minister to a Basingstoke congregation. In 1674 he was living in Wokingham in Berkshire, and he is known to have preached at that time at the house of the veteran Parliamentarian, Bulstrode Whitelocke, near Hungerford.⁸³ Others are also found preaching outside the county, such as Thomas Kentish, ejected from Overton, who was later active

78 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 53, 499, 516; *Original Records*, II, pp. 1037, 1040, 1042.

79 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 456–57; *Original Records*, II, pp. 1037, 1038, 1045.

80 *Calamy Revised*, p. xiii; H. Lancaster, 'Nonconformity and Anglican Dissent in Restoration Wiltshire, 1660–1689', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Bristol, (1995), p. 47.

81 Geldart, 'Protestant Nonconformity', pp. 194–95.

82 Anderson, 'From Puritanism to Nonconformity', p. 147, citing B. Dale, *Yorkshire Puritanism and Early Nonconformity*, edited by T. G. Crippen (Bradford, 1917), pp. 269–70.

83 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 273–74; Anon, *London Street Congregational Church* (Basingstoke, 1963), pp. 2–4; HRO, 1710A/48 Will of John Hooke of Basingstoke, Hampshire,

in London and John Farroll, who was preaching in Surrey in 1669, and later licensed there under the Declaration of Indulgence.⁸⁴ Simon Pole returned to his native Somerset where, according to Calamy, he was arrested for preaching and gaoled for seven years.⁸⁵ Two left England; Urian Oakes of Titchfield for New England, while Samuel Tutchin of Odiham, recorded as preaching in Gosport in 1669, later became chaplain at Fort St George in Madras.⁸⁶

An examination of the entries in *Calamy Revised* indicates that of all the ministers who were, or who may have been, ejected from a Hampshire parish and did not afterwards conform, in only eight cases is no reference made to them continuing to exercise a ministry, or being at least active nonconformists, at some point after their ejection, either in Hampshire or elsewhere.⁸⁷ It is not always known what happened to them. They may have lived quietly, as did John Harmer, former professor of Greek at Oxford and ejected minister of Ewhurst, who retired to Steventon, where he died in 1670.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, the majority of ejected ministers in Hampshire clearly still identified with their position as having a calling to minister, if not within the Established Church. Furthermore, there were those among the laity who made it possible for them to enact that calling, as will be discussed below.

IV The Economic Situation of Ejected Ministers

The question remains of how these ministers supported themselves after ejection, without a regular stipend. In the absence of any Presbyterian or Independent church books for the period for Hampshire, we do not know for certain to what extent ministers were supported by their dissenting congregations before the Act of Toleration in 1689, though there is some evidence that they were. Calamy states that Robert Tutchin was so well thought of by his former parishioners of Newport on the Isle of Wight that they maintained him until he died with the same stipend.⁸⁹ The evidence of the 1669 conventicle returns

cleric ('clerk'), 1710; *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675*, edited by R. Spalding (Oxford, 1990), p. 836.

84 Calamy *Revised*, pp. 191-92, 306.

85 Calamy, *Continuation*, p. 514.

86 Calamy, *Account*, pp. 345, 349-50; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 370, 499.

87 *Calamy Revised*, pp. 164, 229, 248, 296, 313, 318, 477, 510.

88 *Calamy Revised*, p. 248.

89 Calamy, *Account*, p. 340.

suggests that some conventicles were sufficiently large to provide at least some financial support to a minister, though the estimates given of the size of the congregations need to be treated with caution.⁹⁰ Some conventicles were being supported by local gentry, or at least by those with the means to be supportive. In Basingstoke, the Presbyterians met at the house of 'one Acton', described as 'a rich fellow'. Dorothy Cromwell, wife of former Lord Protector Richard Cromwell, hosted meetings at her house in Hursley, where her chaplain ministered, and at Ellingham the meetings were held at the home of Alice Lisle, widow of the regicide John Lisle, whose chaplain was also one of the regular preachers.⁹¹

However, in the years after the act, which permitted most Protestant dissenting meetings, the position regarding the support of ministers becomes clearer. The survey of Presbyterian and Independent ministers made in 1690–92 showed that, of the 17 ministers in Hampshire, at least 12 had some means of their own. Nine of these 17 ministers had been ejected from a Hampshire parish 30 years earlier, and of these at least seven had some form of private income.⁹² This varied from the comfortable circumstances of Humphrey Weaver, who was able to refuse any recompense from his flock, down to Thomas Clark, formerly of Godshell on the Isle of Wight, and now at Portsmouth, who had 'but little of his owne'.⁹³ The situation regarding the personal estate of the remaining two ministers is less clear. No information was given in this source about the private means, if any, of Thomas Warren, originally ejected from Houghton and now ministering in nearby Romsey, but his will indicates that he owned his house and garden in the town, as well as land in Andover.⁹⁴ There was some doubt about whether or not John Hooke had any means of his own or not.⁹⁵ The evidence of his will suggests that his means were limited; he left five pounds to each of his three daughters, and a shilling to each of his five grandchildren, with the unspecified residue going to his wife.⁹⁶

90 LPL, MS 639, ff. 260–64.

91 LPL, MS 639, ff. 261v, 263, 263v.

92 *Freedom After Ejection*, edited by A. Gordon (Manchester and London, 1917), pp. 100–1; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 120, 341–42, 413, 456–57, 488–89, 515, 519.

93 *Freedom After Ejection*, pp. 100–1.

94 *Freedom After Ejection*, p. 101; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 511–12; TNA, PROB 11/421/4 Will of Thomas Warren, Clerk of Romsey, Hampshire, 2 March 1694.

95 *Freedom After Ejection*, p. 101, *Calamy Revised*, pp. 273–74.

96 HRO, 1710A/48.

The evidence of ministers' wills shows that some were fairly comfortably off at their death, in spite of their ejection. Samuel Tomlyns lost a living worth £300 a year, yet at his death in 1700 he was able to leave freehold land in Eling, copyhold land there and Upham, as well as cash gifts totalling £251 to various beneficiaries.⁹⁷ John Haddesley had been ejected from a living reputedly worth £200 year, but following his death in 1699 he bequeathed £200 to an unmarried granddaughter, having already settled the same sum upon another granddaughter.⁹⁸ James Terry, ejected from Michelmersh, was, according to Calamy, able to exercise his subsequent ministry in Odiham without charge to his flock.⁹⁹ In his will, Terry left his wife an income of £30 a year, and a total of £900 in marriage portions to those of his daughters as yet unmarried; he also left land, goods and money to other beneficiaries.¹⁰⁰

Not all ejected ministers were as wealthy. There is anecdotal evidence from Calamy that some ministers suffered genuine deprivation. John Pinckney, ejected from Longstock, had 'but little towards the maintaining himself, and a Wife, and three small Children'.¹⁰¹ Simon Pole 'had a pretty considerable Family, and was very poor'; he was often relieved by Samuel Dunch, a Hampshire landowner who aided a number of ejected ministers.¹⁰² Dunch also supported Robert Webb, who, like Pole, had a large family and was very poor.¹⁰³ Seven ejected Hampshire ministers benefited from Dunch's will on his death in 1668, included Pole and Webb.¹⁰⁴

Though some ministers suffered financially, they seem to have avoided actual destitution. Simon Pole, though alleged to be 'very poor', was able to leave his heirs a leasehold property in Devon and a copyhold property in Cowes. He had also bought in reversion two houses in Cowes. His will does not imply great wealth, but neither does it suggest abject poverty.¹⁰⁵ Nathaniel Robinson was assessed at five hearths in September 1662, and four hearths in 1670, which may

97 TNA, PROB 11/458/126 Will of Samuel Tomlyns, Clerk of North Newnton, Wiltshire, 18 November 1700; *Calamy Revised*, pp. 488–89.

98 TNA, PROB 11/451/325; *Calamy, Account*, p. 337.

99 *Calamy, Account*, p. 347.

100 HRO, 1681B/62 Will and inventory of James Terry of Odiham, Hampshire, cleric ('clerk'), 1681; *Calamy Revised*, p. 480.

101 *Calamy, Account*, p. 348.

102 *Calamy, Continuation*, p. 514.

103 *Calamy, Continuation*, p. 518.

104 TNA, PROB 11/328/285.

105 TNA, PROB 11/337/74 Will of Simon Pole, Clerk of Motston in the Isle of Wight, Hampshire, 1 August 1671.

suggest some reduction in his circumstances, but not a cataclysmic one.¹⁰⁶

Although Weaver and Terry were able to refuse any financial contribution for their ministry, it was more usual for congregations to contribute financially, and the fact that they were doing so at the time of the review in 1690–92 suggest that ministers were being supported prior to the Act of Toleration; indeed, they could not have continued their ministry without the assistance of the laity.¹⁰⁷ Nathaniel Robinson received £30 a year from his congregation. Not all congregations could raise this sum. Thomas Warren was in receipt of only £16 a year at Romsey, described as a 'poor maintenance', and other places also offered a meagre stipend; John Hooke was described as having 'but Small recompence of his labours from ye people' at Basingstoke.¹⁰⁸ From 1690 onwards, Presbyterian and Congregational ministers with a low stipend were supported by a national Common Fund – later two separate denominational funds – but this was not in operation prior to this date.¹⁰⁹

It seems likely that the loss of a parish living would have resulted in a reduced standard of living, but there is little quantitative evidence to suggest how far each minister was affected. As some ejected ministers had an independent income, it may be that some of those who refused to conform were those who could afford to do so, but this was not necessarily the case for others, who may have been obliged to seek some form of remuneration if they were to continue preaching.

V Conclusion

The Act of Uniformity may have put an end to Puritan hopes of comprehension within the Church of England, but it did not put an end to their godly ministry. Ejected ministers continued to serve congregations of men and women seeking an alternative to the Established Church. The ministers of Hampshire were no exception, and the proportion that lost a living in 1660 or 1662 was broadly comparable with the proportion nationally. But attempts to compare Hampshire with other counties have to be undertaken with caution,

106 *Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment*, pp. 290, 296.

107 Wykes, 'Early Religious Dissent in Surrey', 58.

108 *Freedom After Ejection*, pp. 100–1.

109 Dr Williams's Library, London, MIC 79 Congregational Fund Board Minutes, 1695–1705, 1737–1807; MIC 82 Presbyterian Fund Board Minutes, vol. 1, 1 July 1690–26 June 1693.

since county studies of ejected ministers are not always comparable with each other.

Nevertheless, certain observations can be made regarding Hampshire ministers following their ejection. It is noticeable that there was a regional bias among the ministers, both before and after ejection. While many were not native to the county, the majority were born and bred in southern England, and those who continued their ministry outside the county after 1662 invariably, with a handful of exceptions, continued it within the southern half of England. This regional mobility also operated in reverse; ejected ministers from outside Hampshire who became active in the county tended to come from the neighbouring counties of Berkshire, Dorset and Wiltshire. The reasons for this are obscure, but are likely to be connected with existing personal and professional networks.

Though some ejected ministers exercised their vocation beyond the county boundaries, many ministers continued to minister in Hampshire, even if most did not remain in their former parish. Yet how far removal from a former parish had any connection with the Five Mile Act remains conjectural. Even Calamy cited only two Hampshire ministers who moved on account of the act. The evidence is that ejected Hampshire ministers often ended up ministering in borough towns, where the act also forbade their residence. It seems likely that ministers moved to urban areas since the congregations were larger, and they were more likely to receive some remuneration for their work. There may also have been the possibility of supplementary sources of income, such as teaching. By the eighteenth century, Protestant dissent in Hampshire was almost entirely concentrated in the towns, and this corresponded with a tendency nationally for dissent to be found in urban areas.¹¹⁰

Ministers who continued to exercise an active ministry after 1662 placed themselves at risk of prosecution for a number of offences. Yet what is noticeable, despite the undeniable fact that fines and occasional imprisonment were suffered by Hampshire's ejected ministers, is the number of large congregations in the 1669 conventicle returns, and the existence of established congregations in the survey of 1690, all with regular, if not resident, ministers. It seems that, in practice, Hampshire ministers and their congregations were largely unmolested, and this facilitated the establishment and growth of conventicles.

Those clergy who failed to conform in 1662 faced a possible risk of prosecution, but a certainty of a loss of income. The possession of private means, however modest, would have provided at least some financial security. While some did follow their conscience at significant personal cost, it may be that others conformed because they had no reliable means of maintenance without their clerical living. Though it is clear that later congregations did provide support to their ministers, this could not have been taken for granted by a minister contemplating an uncertain future in August 1662. The continued activity of so many ejected ministers in Hampshire is testimony to their faith, and the need felt by the laity for their ministry.