

The Later Non-Jurors, by Henry Broxap
(Cambridge, 1928).

APPENDIX II
NON-JURORS' DOCTRINE AND CEREMONIES

IT is proposed in this Appendix to give a few and not necessarily connected notes on various points of doctrine, discipline, worship and ceremonial as held and practised by the Later Non-Jurors. There is much information, some of which is very curious, to be obtained from a careful study of the Brett MSS.; it could not, however, be inserted in the text without unduly breaking the sequence of the story.

The first matter of importance is the doctrine held by the Non-Jurors concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. No subject which has engaged the thoughts of men can be said to lie outside the scope of the historian, and the doctrine of the Non-Jurors on these subjects should certainly be clearly stated and illustrated from the standpoint of historical research. The Caroline divines may be said to have endeavoured to restate these doctrines according to the Anglican standpoint which was being established after the welter of the controversies of the preceding century. The Non-Jurors were, in this sense, the successors of the theologians of the Restoration period. The difference between the two groups may be expressed by the statement that, while the earlier theologians were content to maintain a sacrifice in the Eucharist and a real spiritual presence in the Sacrament, the Later Non-Jurors attempted a more elaborate definition of their belief. The conclusions to which the Non-Juror scholars arrived are stated with great precision in Bishop Deacon's *Comprehensive View*: "The Eucharist is both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. Our Lord instituted the Sacrifice of the Eucharist when He began to offer Himself for the sins of all men, i.e. immediately after eating His Last Passover. He did not offer the Sacrifice upon the Cross; it was *slain* there but was *offered* at the Institution of the Eucharist." Bishop Deacon proceeds to describe the proper celebration of the Eucharist according to his standpoint. The priest

does as Christ did...he next repeats our Saviour's powerful words "This is my Body," "This is my Blood" over the Bread and Cup. The effect of the words is that the Bread and Cup are made authoritative Representations or symbols of Christ's crucified Body and of His Blood shed; and in consequence they are in a capacity of being offered to God as the great Christian Sacrifice....God accepts the Sacrifice and returns it to us again to feast upon, in order that we may be thereby partakers of all the benefits of our Saviour's Death and Passion. The Bread and Cup become capable of conferring these benefits on the priest praying

to God the Father to send the Holy' Spirit upon them. The Bread and Cup are thereby made the Spiritual, Life-giving Body and Blood of Christ, in Power and Virtue.

It may be claimed that this standpoint represents the view of the entire body of Non-Jurors. It is true that Deacon was not in some important respects in agreement with many of the most distinguished scholars of the body. The main difference, however, turned not upon the doctrines themselves, but on the point of their expression in the Book of Common Prayer as it now stands. Bishop Brett, for instance, completely changed his opinion on the true interpretation of the meaning of the English Prayer Book, but there is no reason to think that he would, even in his latest days, have had any difficulty in accepting the explanation of Eucharistic doctrine given by Thomas Deacon in his *Comprehensive View*. It is possible, nevertheless, to perceive a certain development of doctrine in the Later Non-Jurors which may be illustrated by some extracts from a controversy which arose on this subject between Bishops Collier and Brett. It may appear strange to ascribe an attitude of conservatism to Jeremy Collier in view of the part played by him in 1716, but he certainly belonged to the earlier school and manifested great anxiety in connection with what he considered rash developments of doctrine and practice. Complaints were often made that the Primus would not go one inch beyond the four points.

In the year 1722 Brett had proposed to publish a Thesis of which the following was the title:

Christ's sufferings on the Cross no distinct Sacrifice from the Oblation which He made in the Eucharist but the continuance or necessary consequence of that Oblation. In vindication of a passage in Dr Brett's discourse of the Necessity of discerning the Lord's Body in the Holy Communion, which has been misrepresented and charged as a dangerous doctrine by a late anonymous writer. By Thomas Brett, LL.D.¹

Collier had regarded some of the statements which Brett made in this Thesis as startling and likely to develop a new controversy.² Brett submitted to Collier the consideration that the difference between them, if any, was a "logomachy." For instance, Collier had expressed his thought in these words: "This voluntary offering on the Cross was a sacrificial oblation." Taking this statement as it stands, Brett thought that it might be regarded as inadequate. But Collier had continued "Twas typified and begun in the Holy Eucharist and continued on the Cross and by this last voluntary act our redemption was purchased." Brett comments on Collier's expression of belief as follows:

¹ Brett MSS., vol. xviii, f. i.

² *Ibid.* vol. v, f. 53. Collier to Brett, 25th October 1722.

This is directly what Mr Johnson and I plead for that it was begun in the Holy Eucharist and continued on the Cross and completed by the Resurrection and Ascension...in short, we allow that the oblation was continued on the Cross though begun in the Eucharist; but we cannot think it a distinct separate oblation.... I conceive we must say either that Christ did not offer Himself in the Eucharist or that He offered Himself twice or that the oblation in the Eucharist was continued on the Cross and so but one oblation and in this if I understand you we are agreed.³

Brett entered into some correspondence with Sir R. Cox, to whom he developed his views in a series of letters written in the year 1722, to which some reference has been made in the text. He makes a distinction between the voluntary sacrifice which Christ made at the time of the Institution of the Eucharist and the involuntary or passive sacrifice on the Cross.⁴

Brett's original position as apart from any controversy with Collier seems to be expressed in the following quotation:

I was once of the opinion that the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was reconcilable to the Communion Office of the Established Liturgy... but I have since seen my error and find that the notion of Christ's offering Himself on the Cross alone, exclusive of any other oblation,... is utterly inconsistent with any oblation made by Christ in the Eucharist and if no oblation is made by Christ in the Eucharist neither ought we to make any oblation there.⁵

With regard to the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, the conception of the Non-Jurors was expressed in the words that Christ was present in "power and effect," which may practically amount to what is sometimes called Virtualism. Transubstantiation was wholeheartedly renounced by all sections of the Non-Jurors. It may be remarked, with some doubt as to the wisdom of approaching the confines of philosophy, that the word substance with the Non-Jurors was used in a physical sense. There was

³ Brett MSS., vol. xvi, f. 267. Brett to Collier, 7th November 1722.

⁴ Ibid. f. 254. Brett to Sir R. Cox, 2nd November 1722.

⁵ Ibid. vol. xviii, f. i. It should be noted that these definitions of faith made by Brett are to be referred to that period of his life in which he had reached the extreme point of his career as a Usager. A full account of the Non-Jurors' doctrine on this subject is given by Bishop Dowden in his *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, Appendix K, pp. 227 *et seq.* Bishop Dowden points out an undoubted effect of these opinions which may be noted in the form of consecration in the Scottish Liturgy "who (by his own oblation of himself once offered) made a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice etc." The omission of the word "there" which is contained in the English Office is due to the Non-Jurors' contention that the offering was really made at the Eucharist. Bishop Dowden contends that although the Scottish Office bears undoubted traces of the influence of the Non-Jurors it is not necessary to accept their doctrine on this subject.

one notable member of the body who did not admire the phrase which was commonly used by his colleagues. Archibald Campbell held that the words “power and effect” or “virtually” were just as objectionable as the term “transubstantiation,” as being still another attempt to explain the *Modus*.

What Bishop Brett believed as to the effect of the consecration of the Eucharist may be illustrated by a further quotation from the letter of Sir R. Cox from which quotations have already been made. Brett’s opponent had maintained an argument against Infant Communion in the following terms: “Christ cannot be eaten in the Sacrament but by Faith; infants have no faith; Ergo.” Brett denied Cox’s “Major.”

If Christ can only be eaten by Faith, then it is not the consecration but the Faith of the communicants or of the single communicant for himself that makes the Bread Christ’s Body. If so, when Christ Himself consecrated the Bread and Cup at the institution, He did not make them His Body and Blood, but His disciples made them by their Faith. But Christ said they were His Body and Blood before His disciples could have faith to believe them to be so and therefore He made them His Body and Blood by Consecration; the disciples did not make them so by their faith and when Christ had made the Bread His Body and the Cup His Blood they eat and drink that Body and Blood with their mouths and not by their faith.⁶

This statement may be accepted as expressing the belief of the great majority of Non-Jurors through the whole course of the movement.

Further illustration may be given in the form of a letter of Dr Brett to his friend Campbell, written on the 21st February 1728/29:

We do adore Him. We draw near to the Holy Table or Altar with reverence and worship Him Whom we believe invisibly yet in a more especial manner present there...spiritually and sacramentally present though not corporally.⁷

The question of the Reservation of the Sacrament is not mentioned in the papers of the Brett MSS. There was, of course, a rubric at the end of the New Communion Office authorizing reservation where necessary for the purpose of communicating the sick. The probability is that the practice was more fully developed by Thomas Deacon and his followers. A small MS. book of devotions which, among other relics of Deacon, is now in the possession of the Society of St John the Evangelist at Cowley points to the possibility of communicants partaking of the Sacrament in their own

⁶ Brett MSS., vol. xvi, f. 254. Brett to Sir R. Cox, 2nd November 1722.

⁷ College Papers, f. i, No. 345. Correspondence of Brett and Campbell.

houses without the presence of a priest. The “Devotions” to the Sacrament which have been developed in recent times represent a conception of worship which was entirely unknown to all sections of the Non-Jurors.

No reference to the practice of Sacramental or Private Confession is to be found in the literature of the period excepting the case of the famous sermon by Dr Brett in 1711 (see p. 21). Certain charges were made and circulated by Roger Laurence in 1732 against Dr Brett for having broken the “seal of confession,” but the period at which the alleged offence (which was strongly denied by Brett) took place was previous to the reception of Brett into the Non-Jurors’ communion. The conclusion may be fairly drawn that the Non-Jurors practised Confession just so much or little as their brethren of the Established Church.

Reference has been made in the text to some divergence of opinion among the Non-Jurors concerning the Middle State. Jeremy Collier, in particular, was greatly disturbed by the use of the word “purification” which was frequently made by Campbell in his famous work. In this point, a development of opinion on the part of the Non-Jurors may be noted, and Collier’s conservatism was marked by his refusing to admit anything beyond “improvement.” Thomas Brett agreed wholeheartedly with Campbell in the statement that even in the “higher mansions” it was permissible to think of the souls of the departed receiving purification. A curious state of affairs arose in connection with a pamphlet of Dr Brett on this subject which was withdrawn at the request of the Primus, who considered it as likely to support “Mr Campbell’s heretical notions,” and by mutual consent a revised edition was prepared by Laurence.⁸

Campbell’s name is associated with a certain Religious and Philosophical Fraternity concerning which information is contained in a MS. Collection of Devotions written in Campbell’s own hand.⁹ It contains two Offices for the use of the Religious Society, the first of Thanksgiving, the second, of Penitence. There are also Morning and Night Prayers from various sources, a way of commending a departing soul; sundry prayers, *e.g.* for the Orthodox and Loyal bishops of the Christian Church who are now debarred from the public exercise of their function by a raging schism and a sinful rebellion and usurpation; prayers for the departed in which the need of purification is clearly taught; and a prayer for Dr Hicke’s, “Our spiritual superior in his last sickness.” Among other curious fragments is an argument against the use of pictures in churches. This little volume is

⁸ Brett MSS., vol. xvi, f. 247. Brett to Charles Wheatly, 8th October 1722.

⁹ The volume came from Mr Neill Menzies, nephew and joint-executor of Archibald Campbell, by various stages into the hands of the late Dr W. D. Macray of the Bodleian Library and is now in the possession of Mr F. R. D. Needham of Christ Church, Oxford.

interesting as showing a deeply spiritual side of the religion of Campbell and those who joined him in this Religious Society about which no reference is to be found in any of the correspondence of the period.

The word “Popery,” which is still called into the service of religious controversies, is not without a place in the writings of the Non-Jurors. It should be noted, however, that this term was, for the most part, used in a literal sense, and any departure from this rule of controversy was severely rebuked by the more responsible leaders. The word was properly used to indicate what appeared to the Non-Jurors to be the errors of the Church of Rome. George Smith was perhaps the only leading controversialist who made use of the term merely from a desire to excite prejudice. Smith was a hard fighter and at times displayed a certain tendency to hit below the belt, notably so in the attack which he made on Roger Laurence in 1734. Wagstaffe criticized this method of controversy in a letter written to Brett on 31st January 1731/32:” It is a method long since condemned among men of a moderate and candid disposition of mind to paint a writer as popishly inclined because he disagrees with us.”¹⁰

The significance which the Non-Jurors assigned to the corresponding word “Protestant” may receive a short notice in this connection. The main body did not hesitate to accept this name, although it is true that Thomas Deacon, with characteristic thoroughness, repudiated it entirely: “As to the name Protestant I never claimed it and own that I have no juster title to it than that of Papist. No, I disclaim them both.”¹¹ The Non-Jurors appear to have recognized that as an historical fact the terms Catholic and Protestant are not mutually exclusive. They would probably have accepted the statement that the true antithesis of Catholic is Heretic and that the term Protestant is only to be explained by the use of the opposing term Papist. As an instance, there are certain expressions of Campbell in a letter written when he was accused of being in schism because he had refused to agree to the terms of union made by five bishops:

I do believe the Holy Scriptures and the three Creeds as so many just summaries of the *Credenda*. I am in communion, as you lately was, with the primitive Fathers of the Catholic Church...by all which I observe so far as I am by God’s help able, the noble rule of the Church of England’s reformation from popery. I am in full communion with a whole National, Episcopal, Protestant Church.¹²

¹⁰ Brett MSS., vol. ix, f. 167.

¹¹ See Biography of Thomas Deacon, p. 182. Reply of Deacon to Dr Conyers Middleton.

¹² Brett MSS., vol. ix, f. 117. Campbell to Brett, 30th November 1732.

It is obvious that Campbell did not conceive of the word Protestant as directly opposed to Catholic.

It should, however, be noted that there was a certain apprehension that the use of the word Protestant might lead to misconception. Dr Brett indicated the need for caution in the use of the popular designation in a postscript which he desired to add to his *History of the Lutherans*:

There is one thing more that I think proper to observe to you at this time by way of caution that we ought to be very careful that we be not cheated with the words "Protestant Religion," which have been for some years past, very rife in the mouths of a certain party, as if there were some one particular religion to be called by that name, more than any other. The word protestant, indeed, is known and understood by us to signify a protester against popery, and therefore, all but papists may properly enough be called protestants; therefore, the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Anabaptists, Muggletonians, Socinians, Deists, nay, Atheists, all come under the denomination as well as the Church of England, but these are not one but several religions who differ from each other in fundamental points, so that to say the Protestant Religion, as denoting a particular church or sect, is absurd, because the word protestant, as it is vulgarly understood, signifies not any one church or sect, but is merely negative, and intimates that those so-called are not papists, but does not inform them what they are....But if there be a religion which is to be called protestant by reason of eminence as most remarkably so, as having in a particular manner publicly exhibited their protest against the corruptions of the Church of Rome, in a more solemn way than others have done, then only the Lutheran religion can be called protestant in this sense....But if we will understand the word protestant in its full latitude and as it commonly means, then we ought to say the protestant religions in the plural number, for Protestant Religion in the singular number, is in that sense absurd and nonsensical.¹³

Another subject on which many comments were made by various Non-Jurors turns upon the relation of the Church of England to the Catholic Church. It has been made evident in the foregoing pages that this distinction between the local and the Universal Church was carefully made by all sections of the Non-Jurors. It will here suffice to quote a passage from a letter of Brett to Sir R. Cox who had urged upon him the duty of obedience to our "common Mother." Brett explained his meaning as under:

But if you consult Bishop Pearson on the Creed upon that article, the Holy Catholic Church, you will find our common Mother is that Church which was founded by Christ and His Apostles at Jerusalem and from thence spread over the whole world. And this Church was united in the same form of government, the same faith and the same worship for three hundred years at

¹³ Brett MSS., vol. xv, f. 175.

least, as appears from the Union which was found to be betwixt all the Bishops of the world at the Council of Nice. And therefore if any particular church deviates from the faith, government or worship, then observed by the whole Catholic Church, we ought to leave that particular church that we may continue united to the Catholic and Apostolic Church which is the only Mother of all good Christians.¹⁴

On the question of Erastianism, the great majority of Non-Jurors were, as has been stated by various writers, on the side of the spiritual independence of the Church. It is, however, a question whether the Non-Jurors' belief in the inherent right of the Church has not been too much stressed. The whole movement represents a body of men who performed ecclesiastical acts in defiance of the civil power, but it must be remembered that the Non-Jurors did not recognize the Hanoverian government as that State with which the "Ante-Revolution Church" had been in close alliance. It is probable that some of those who claimed the right to act independently of the government which was in possession would have submitted with docility to the commands of a "rightful" government, even in spiritual matters. Bishop Hicke was the great champion of the rights of the Church as a spiritual body and those who followed Hicke most closely maintained or even developed his views on that subject. Brett had something to say on this point in a further letter to Sir R. Cox. Writing on the "independency" of the Church, Brett admitted that much power might be allowed both to heathen and Christian princes. The authority of both is the same—it is purely civil:

But it is contrary to the Law of God for the civil magistrate to make or ordain Bishops, Priests and Deacons, because Christ has committed that power to His Apostles and their successors. Neither can He dissolve the spiritual relation between them and their people because that was also committed to the Apostles and their successors.¹⁵

There is no reason to think that Brett would have modified this language in his later days, but the same remark can hardly be made of some expressions contained in a letter written to an unknown correspondent

¹⁴ Brett MSS., vol. xvi, f. 205. Brett to Sir R. Cox, 25th November 1721. It is again necessary to point out that this note was written at the time when Brett was at his greatest distance from Communion with the Church of England. It is possible that he would not have used the same form of words in his later developments, but it is at the same time not unfair to say that the statement made by Brett to Sir R. Cox would have received the approval of almost all Non-Jurors throughout the course of the movement, and it is certain that it expresses with great accuracy the sentiments of Bishop Hicke in his *Constitution of the Catholic Church*.

¹⁵ Brett MSS., vol. xvi, f. 295. Brett to Sir R. Cox, 26th January 1722/23.

apparently at this same time: “As to these things having been forbidden by the Act of Uniformity, we must obey God. A legal establishment of never so long a continuance will not alter the case.”¹⁶

The opinions of two other well-known figures in the story deserve notice. The first extract is from the pen of Matthias Barberry, one of the strangest characters in the movement, and who had taken up a position of great opposition to Collier and Brett in 1717. The language is quaint, but the meaning can be easily understood:

As to the justice of your cause I will never relinquish it, nor turn Church principles into faction, nor run back to Erastianism, from which I thought myself delivered when I was received by Dean Hickes. Those murmurers who would return us to the Egyptian bondage again, have a more wishful view to Pharaoh’s court than to the Heavenly Canaan.¹⁷

The second reference occurs in a letter of Laurence to George Smith, dated 31st October 1734:

I am against any principles or practices which make the necessities of the Altar give way to those of the Crown. And as I am free from any mercenary temporal expectations in either the one or the other so my dutiful regard for the latter must not swallow up and smother my bounden zeal for the former...I am determined to regard them both in due proportion.¹⁸

The later Non-Jurors of the succession from Campbell went, as is well known, to great extremes in refusing to allow to the civil power any right of interference with the Church. The present writer has dealt elsewhere with Deacon’s belief in the complete independence of the Church and it may suffice here to mention an expression of opinion made by Bishop Cartwright in a letter to Jonathan Boucher of the late period of April 1794, in which he severely criticized the Act of Parliament by which the Scots bishops obtained their freedom. “It is cramped with such restrictions as no Catholic Bishop ought to be bound by.”¹⁹ It should be noted in order to obtain a complete view of the opinions of the Non-Jurors on this subject that those bishops who took the line of opposition to the Usages were much more inclined than their opponents to entertain Erastian sentiments. Thomas Brett, in the course of a long and interesting account of the controversy given by him to his old friend, Johnson, of Cranbrook, stated “that the other side could not throw off the Erastian notions which they had imbibed in the days of Charles II.” Richard

¹⁶ Brett MSS., vol xvi, f. 311.

¹⁷ Ibid. vol. ix, f. 229. Barberry to Brett, 11th September 1733.

¹⁸ Ibid. vol. x, f. 115.

¹⁹ Add. MSS. D. 30, f. 67.

Rawlinson was, so far as it is possible to pronounce with certainty on the characteristics of so contradictory a person, an Erastian of a very pronounced type, and the extraordinary attempts made in the year 1743 to 1747 by Bishop George Smith to interfere in Scottish affairs, show very conclusively that whatever Smith's exact opinions might be, he was certainly no believer in the doctrine of "a free church in a free state."

One of the most interesting results of the study of the Non-Jurors by means of contemporary letters is to be found in the insight which is given into the little society as a working concern. Canons were made from time to time, and frequent appeals to the bishops are recorded, in very many cases for advice in difficult questions of marriage. The question of "mixed" marriages seems to have caused no small trouble to the clergy, particularly to those who adhered to Collier. Roger Laurence is responsible for the statement that "our Primus with some presbyters made a Canon against mixed marriages but afterwards abrogated it."²⁰ Probably this re-consideration of the matter was due to a remonstrance which was made by Brett who did not think that mixed marriages ought to be forbidden absolutely and gave as historical instances in favour of lenity, the cases of Queen Bertha and Clotilda. What appears to be a most extreme proceeding is recorded in a letter written by Wagstaffe on the 9th March 1727/28, to Brett as his bishop, acquainting him that "in obedience with the rubric I have expelled two persons from the Church." The offence for which this punishment was administered seems to have been that the parties concerned were married in the "public communion."²¹ Many similar cases are recorded and it is evident that an attempt was made to enforce severe discipline in questions of marriage.

Dispensations appear to have been asked for and given, e.g. Lewis Southcombe of Rose Ash, Devon, an original Non-Juror, applied to Bishop Brett on the 1st March 1716/17 for a dispensation or licence from strictly keeping Lent, so that he would only be obliged to keep the rule on Wednesdays and Fridays.²² Again, Samuel Jebb wrote on 3rd February 1728/29 asking for permission to "break the rubric" and to administer the Eucharist if only one person is present and a further letter of Jebb is preserved acknowledging with thanks the permission received from Bishop Brett.²³

The custom of catechizing children in church according to the rubric seems to have been maintained or revived in many congregations of

²⁰ Brett MSS., vol. vi, f. 259. Laurence to Brett, 25th January 1726/27.

²¹ Ibid. vol. vii, f. 153.

²² Ibid. vol. n, f. 323.

²³ Ibid. vol. xviii, f. 329.

the Non-Jurors. Thomas Deacon was a strong believer in this method of instruction, and maintained it in Manchester during the whole of his ministerial life. It will be remembered that his *Comprehensive View*, later known as *The Catholic Confession of the Orthodox British Church*²⁴, contains a “shorter catechism being suited to the meanest capacity and calculated for the use of children.” An interesting letter which Deacon wrote to Brett on the 6th April 1728 shortly after his return to Manchester from Stepney, where he had attempted to found a practice in 1727, contains the following passage:

I have often thought that it would be a very useful work to reform the *Catechismus ad Parochos*; or to form a book of the same nature upon that model, that would be a little body of Divinity and contain an account of Faith, Practice, the Sacraments, Church Communion, etc., and to lay down such principles that would guard the people against all modern sectaries. I think it would be more useful than the *Whole Duty of Man* for the common people and would be of good service in bringing up our own children in our own principles, who as they come out into the world, cannot be supposed to read all controversies; whereas such a book as this to be their constant companion and instructor might guard them from changing their principles. I cannot but think it would be a useful piece of work and wish I could see it well done. The *Catechismus* is a good model.²⁵

Deacon seems to have established a system of catechizing in the congregation at Dunstan’s Court, Fleet Street, of which he took charge at a very early age. It will be remembered that Thomas Wagstaffe took over the care of this congregation in 1722. On the 15th April 1730 an anonymous writer sent a complaint to Bishop Brett to the effect that there had been a total neglect of catechizing in that part of the Catholic Church over which it is presumed you preside or have the primacy. That worthy good man, now with God, I mean Mr Montgomery, but a little before his death, with grief observed to me that he saw a Laodicean temper was gone out amongst us.

The writer names as his chief point difficulties which had arisen in connection with the education of children of his communion in case of their being taken to the parish church for Catechism. He had promised to take his boy to say his catechism at Mr W.’s chapel, but found great difficulties in the way. “I was answered, not indeed by Mr W. but the chapel-keeper no such custom had been observed since Dr Deacon had officiated.”²⁶ Brett regarded the matter seriously and sent an episcopal admonition to Wagstaffe, who did not receive it with entire submission, as may be seen:

²⁴ See Add. MSS. D. 30, f. 57. Cartwright to Boucher.

²⁵ Brett MSS., vol. vii, f. 157.

²⁶ Ibid. vol. viii, f. i.

The letter came from Levine, whose character I believe you are not unacquainted with, a turbulent uneasy man upon whose account and for whose sake I have formerly had a great deal of trouble. Besides he does not belong to my congregation but to Mr L. I have had thoughts of mentioning catechizing to my congregation but as to the taking notice of it after the Nicene Creed in the manner you suggest I think there will be no need for it, since Levine for whose sake it is chiefly designed is never with me on a Sunday morning and very rarely on an afternoon.²⁷

There is a considerable amount of valuable information regarding the worship and ceremonial of the Non-Jurors. Reference has been made to the custom of daily Morning and Evening Prayer which was observed at the famous oratory at Scroop's Court, commonly known as Head Quarters. This was the use during the whole of the nineteen years in which Bishop Gandy served this chapel, but was dropped on his death. Rawlinson, in announcing this decision to Brett, mentioned that it had not been usual in the case of any other congregation. From the letter of Thomas Deacon to his father-in-law, written on the occasion of the death of his wife, it is evident that daily Matins and Vespers were accustomed to be said in the chapel in Fennel Street, Manchester.

It is, generally speaking, correct to say that the Holy Communion was celebrated by the Non-Jurors much more frequently than by the clergy of the public communion, but there was some considerable difference even in this respect between the various sections of the body. It was the custom of those who adhered to the communion of Jeremy Collier to celebrate the Eucharist on every Sunday and Holy Day, and this was regarded as a startling innovation by some congregations and led to complaints that it was an infringement on personal liberty. In reply to one of these complaints, Bishop Brett expressed his opinion that it was a strange kind of liberty which was offended by the offering of the privilege of weekly communion. Brett gave his ideal of the service for Sunday morning in a letter addressed to Collier at the time of the preparation of the New Communion Office.

As to the Introit, this is to be sung after the choir offices, while the priest retires to the vestry to put on the habit proper to the Communion (which as you know ought to be different from that he reads prayers in) and from thence proceeds to the Altar.²⁸

This arrangement was continued after the union of 1732 as appears from an anonymous defence of the Concordate which contains an account of Brett's own practice. The writer may possibly be Brett himself.

²⁷ Brett MSS., vol. viii, f. 3. Levine became one of the most violent opponents of the Union of 1732 which he seems to have satirized in some doggerel verses entitled "The Little Junto."

²⁸ *Ibid.* vol. xv, f. 325. Brett to Collier, 12th February 1717/18.

The water is put in the cup before Morning Service and at the Offertory the wine is poured in...between the Services an Introit is sung...Now I hope a prose Psalm may be said to be taken out of the Bible, more properly than the wretched lines of Hopkins and Sternhold.²⁹

A final illustration on this subject is taken from a letter of Brett to George Smith, written 16th June 1733. The writer is glad that Smith approves of the Psalm before the Communion Office. It is the intention of the Church of England to have an interval between Matins and Eucharist. Dr Heylin is quoted in support of this assertion as saying that the proper hour of Matins is between 6 and 7 and the Communion Service not till 9—“which is still the arrangement at Winchester, Southwell and elsewhere.”³⁰

The development in the direction of ceremonial went further than has generally been believed, but the evidence goes to show that the divergence from the ordinary use of the public communion was found principally in the Usager section of the movement. Those who had studied the first Liturgy of Edward VI were not ignorant of the rubric directing the use of the Vestment or Cope for the celebration of the Eucharist. Thomas Brett certainly had some knowledge of the proper habit of the minister according to the directions of the first English Prayer Book. The following words are from a letter addressed to Roger Laurence about the end of the year 1724.

I am bold to trouble you with a piece of silk which I desire you to get dyed for me and made into a cope for me as soon as conveniently you can. As the rubric at the end of the first Liturgy of Edward VI directs the same officiating habit at the ministration of the Communion, viz. a surplice or alb and a cope or vestment, whether the person that celebrates be of the higher or lower order, I think it may not be improper for us to preserve a distinction of the orders by the colour of the cope, if our primus and you approve of it. And therefore as you and our brother Wagstaffe have red copes, let mine be a fine purple.³¹

For the cost of dyeing and making up the silk Brett enclosed the sum of one guinea which he thought might be sufficient. He further expressed the opinion that no other habit is required for a bishop. “For the rochet, lawn sleeves and chimere are indeed no other than the bishop’s ordinary dress as the gown and cassock is the priest’s.”³² In the following year Campbell appears to have corresponded with Brett on this subject and to have sent to him a parcel of purple cloth to make a cope in the selection of which

²⁹ Brett MSS., vol. X, f. 11.

³⁰ Ibid. vol. xvii, f. iii.

³¹ In a letter to Campbell, 6th February 1724/25 (College Papers, No. 176), Brett says that Mr W.’s and Mr L.’s copes reach to their knees.

³² Brett MSS., vol. xvii, f. 37.

Campbell stated that he had taken as much care as if his old friend were Archbishop of Canterbury.³³ The word chasuble is seldom used, but from an expression in another letter of Campbell, it appears that the distinction between cope and chasuble was clearly understood. "By our rubric cope, I reckon, is meant either the true cope or the vestment, that is, the upper officiating habit."³⁴ Laurence himself had some aspirations in this direction. In a letter written on the 28th July 1726 he sent to Brett a sketch of an alb and ventured to presume leave to wear one, although Mr Collier never would give his consent.³⁵ There is no evidence that Collier wore any Eucharistic vestment. It may be that his somewhat eclectic conservatism would be displayed in this matter. In a letter written to Campbell in January 1725 Brett made the suggestion that the people ought to be asked to buy a cope for the Primus, as a surplice or alb and cope are the only officiating habits for a bishop. Nothing is regarded of the result of this appeal except that it did not "take on very well" and drew from Laurence a most unusual appeal in favour of a tender consideration for prejudices. "Would not a bishop's dress such as is usually worn by the English reformed bishops be more suitable?" Laurence thought that people would contribute more readily for what they were accustomed to.³⁶ When Laurence became a bishop it appears that he made some advances in ceremonial. A letter which was written by Brett to Mrs Blackmore shortly after the death of Laurence in 1736 may be read with some interest and amusement:

I remember Mr Laurence, some years before he bought his set of vestments (for that is the right name, the cope being made in another fashion like a mantle), had one of crimson. But afterwards by consulting the Roman Missal and perhaps discoursing with some Roman priests about their habits, he learned from them that they used copes and vestments of different colours, according to the different seasons of the year, which if I remember right are green for Spring, white for Summer, scarlet for Autumn and purple for Winter; whereupon he provided himself with a set of all these colours. Though I believe the Church of England either before or since the Reformation never directed these different colours.³⁷ I suppose Mr L. might give Mr Campbell that odd vestment which Mr L. bought before the others for I suppose he would not break the set.³⁸

³³ *Ibid.* vol. vi, f. 9.

³⁴ Brett MSS., vol. vi, f. 29. Campbell to Brett, 5th June 1725.

³⁵ *Ibid.* f. 167.

³⁶ *Ibid.* f. 183.

³⁷ This "sequence" of colours may appear curious but it probably refers to the ordinary Roman use. The words "spring," etc., are an unintelligent misunderstanding of the word "seasons."

³⁸ Brett MSS., vol. xix, f. 115.

After the death of Laurence the cross and candlesticks used by him were by some means or other acquired by Richard Rawlinson, who, according to information given by Mrs Blackmore, his inveterate enemy, acted the part of the dog in the manger with regard to these ornaments. "Mr Laurence's cross and candlesticks he will not suffer Mr Gordon to use, but he has laid them up with his grid-irons."³⁹ The same lady informed Brett in a letter of about the same date that "poor Mr Gordon was very much disappointed that the candlesticks were not for our Altar."⁴⁰

Some evidence is available regarding ceremonial practised by Bishop Deacon and his successors in Manchester. The present writer expressed elsewhere the opinion that the services conducted by Deacon "were very simple in character,"⁴¹ but there is a statement made on the authority of Mr Seddon and contained in the papers of the Rev. H. H. Norris that "the congregation of Dr Deacon used candles, vestments, etc. as the Papists do, but they do not believe in transubstantiation."⁴²

One point of ceremonial which came to be developed in the course of the preparation of the New Communion Office may be regarded with some surprise. In the rubrics of this Liturgy the priest is directed to stand always at the north side of the Altar, which did certainly not mean the north end. This particular direction is one of the results of the influence which Thomas Brett exercised from time to time upon the preparation of the Office. On the 12th February 1717/18 Brett wrote a long letter to Collier containing various suggestions, some of which have already received notice in the text. With regard to the position of the celebrant, Brett considered that what is called the eastward position is "shocking," and he strongly advised that the direction as to the north side should be

³⁹ Brett MSS., vol. xix, f. 123. Brett to Mrs Blackmore, 9th September 1736. The following extract from a MS. Letter Book of Dr Rawlinson now in the Library at St John's College, Oxford, will be read with interest in this connection. The book is almost entirely concerned with Rawlinson's tenants etc. on his estate at Wasperton in Warwickshire, which he left to St John's. On the 24th August 1736 (f. 230), Dr R. writes to a Mr Wright who was probably his agent at Warwick: "For the Church between ourselves, at present a secret, I design two brass branches of candlesticks and a fine marble table for their Altar. These came to my hand by accident and at a reasonable rate and will be ornaments few of our country churches can boast." In a further letter, 11th January 1738/39 (f. 229), Rawlinson notes that the brass branches as well as the marble table were too small for the small church of Wasperton. It is at least possible that these ornaments may have been part of the furniture of Bishop Laurence's oratory.

⁴⁰ Brett MSS., vol. x, f. 430.

⁴¹ Biography of Thomas Deacon, p. 100.

⁴² Add. MSS. D. 30, f. 17. 5 Brett MSS., vol. xv, f. 325.

made perfectly clear. Brett's objection to the position ordered in the first English Liturgy rested on the fact that it would make it necessary at certain points of the service for the celebrant to turn his back upon the Altar "while the tremendous gifts were lying upon it⁵." It is interesting to note that later in the same year Brett wrote to Charles Wheatly and developed his views on this subject. He suggested that in his forthcoming work Wheatly should make it clear that those of his communion "who consecrate with their back to the people are wrong."⁴³ There is no evidence regarding this particular point in the later stages of the movement. The two sections who came together in 1732 would both be in the habit of celebrating at the north side of the Altar, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that those who followed Campbell and Deacon would adopt the position "in the midst of the Altar" as directed by the first English Prayer Book and as ordered in the Clementine Liturgy.

A first-hand account is preserved of the difficulties which the Non-Jurors experienced in the conduct of public worship during the excitement which reached its height at the execution of Hall and Paul in the year 1716. It is given by Thomas Wagstaffe in a letter addressed to Brett on the 20th October of that year:

There were a number of them that mixed themselves with the congregation before Divine Service began, and like wolves in lambs' clothing forbore to disclose themselves till the reading of the Prayer for the Royal Family at which they nois'd out "King George and the Royal Issue etc." But good Mr Gandy continued his prayers as long as was possible for him to be heard. In short, they proceeded to such a degree of insolence that they held out their swords (though I think they were not drawn) towards him and endeavoured to threaten him into the cry of King George. But their noise and their threats were equally ineffectual. Mr G. out-braved their insults and showed them that he had the meekness to suffer without resistance, yet he had the courage to refuse though he suffered. Nor were these all; for there were great numbers posted in Scroops Court, who, upon hearing the cry of drawing swords, ran upstairs to the assistance of their fellows. The occasion of which was this; a gentleman laying his hand upon his sword to dispose it in a more convenient manner was immediately set upon by them as if he were going to draw his sword." Knock him down " was the general cry...in a word, after this barbarous usage they haled him downstairs and carried him before the Lord Mayor, who after a great deal of opprobrious language committed him to Newgate, from which he has since been discharged on bail...I cannot tell whether this gentleman is of our communion. I don't meet with anyone that knows... his name is Poole.⁴⁴

Thomas Brett suffered some persecution on account of his ministrations as a Non-Juror priest and bishop, but the trouble appears to have been limited to a short period at the beginning of the reign of George

⁴³ Brett MSS., vol. xvi, f. 9. Brett to Wheatly, 26th April 1718.

⁴⁴ Ibid. vol. n, f. 305.

I. The following letter was addressed to Brett on 11th August 1718 by a member of his flock at Feversham whose name is not easy to decipher, but is probably a lady of the name of Sieve:

Rev. Sir,—We have thought fit to let you know that Mr Cook's discourse this day hath been about you being heard and that he does not like you meddling with other men's matters, nor your praying for the dead, and annoying them with oil and was in a great pashun and said he would not go to Spring Grove but he would go to Lambeth, so that he hath made a great noys in the town so that we think it not safe for you to cum a Tuesday.⁴⁵

The proper setting for this letter is found in the sketch of his own life given by Brett to Rawlinson in 1732. After describing to his friend that he had been accustomed to go to Feversham every fourth Sunday, Brett continued:

but after I had gone in this manner to Feversham and Canterbury for about two years I was sent on August 7th, 1718, to visit a sick woman at Feversham who had been a constant communicant with me between three and four years. Accordingly I went as desired, prayed with her, administered the Eucharist to her till August 9th, and then she died and I returned home. I had none with me at prayers and Sacrament but her husband and his brother and one more of my constant communicants. However, Shadrach Cooke (who had been himself a Non-Juror twenty years and upwards but had then complied and taken the oaths) being at that time Vicar of Feversham, the next day in his pulpit took occasion to rail at me for visiting sick persons in his parish and said he would not go to Spring Grove to complain but he would make his complaint at Lambeth, and accordingly did so. And the Archbishop told some Kentish gentlemen who acquainted me with it that if he heard more such complaints of me he should be obliged to acquaint the King and Council with it. However, I continued to go to Feversham as I had done before and Shadrach made no more complaints, finding he had not pleased his neighbours in what he had done. And I heard nothing more from the Archbishop. On November 4th, 1729, Mr Smith of Feversham who married Mr Wagstaffe's sister sent me to desire me to bury his wife and got the minister of Norton near Feversham to give me leave to perform the Office in his church which I did on November 17th. I cannot learn who wrote a letter to my Lord Townsend to acquaint him with the matter. His Lordship sent his letter to the Archbishop who ordered his Archdeacon to write to Mr Simpson, the Vicar of Norton, to reprove him for letting me officiate in his church. Mr Simpson sent a submissive letter in answer to the letter of reproof and there was an end of the matter. This I thank God, is all the disturbance has yet been given me as a Non-Juror.⁴⁶

There is some further information concerning Mrs Smith given in a letter of Brett to Campbell dated 17th January 1729/30. There had been inscribed on the tombstone the words "For whose soul pray ye that survive" headed by a cross. This provoked something in the nature of a popular demonstration, and it was afterwards erased. Brett advised as a

⁴⁵ Brett MSS., vol. in, f. 297.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* vol. xix, f. 33. Brett to Rawlinson, 20th June 1732.

preferable form “the Lord grant unto her that she may find mercy in that day.” This inscription actually appeared on the tombstones of a considerable number of Non-Jurors, notably Bishop Deacon and Bishop Brown of Manchester.⁴⁷ This desultory account of some of the out-of-the-way doings of the later Non-Jurors may be closed by a reference to an act on the part of Thomas Brett which appears from the modern point of view inexplicable in the case of a man of undoubted learning and scholarship. Reference has been made in the text to Mrs Kennett, a widowed daughter of Thomas Brett. She had one son who received his grandfather’s name of Thomas, and both mother and son were the cause of endless trouble to Thomas Brett and his wife. The lad suffered from a scrofulous affection of the leg and it was determined that he should be sent into France to be “touched” by the titular James III. Information on the matter is given by Brett in a letter written to his son Nicholas, then at Angiers, on Nov. 18 O.S. (29 N.S.) 1736. “Tommy” Kennett had been sent into France to be “touched” for the “King’s evil,” and Brett had sent him a prayer to be used in the interval and had also asked Mr Williamson (Wagstaffe) to look after him. He had also forwarded to his grandson for necessary expenses the sum of £15, which must have been a considerable drain on his slender resources of ready money. It is regrettable that there is no copy preserved of the prayer which Brett composed for his grandson or of the further progress or result of the enterprise. The trend of Brett’s opinion on this subject has, however, received sufficient illustration, and it may well be regarded as an extraordinary thing that a man who deservedly held a high place in the “commonwealth of learning” should maintain a strong belief in the healing power of the touch of the “Royal Hand.”

⁴⁷ College Papers, No. 355. Correspondence of Brett and Campbell.