

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/141473/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Bowen, Lloyd 2021. Preaching and politics in the Welsh marches, 1643-63: The case of Alexander Griffiths. *Historical Research* 94 (263) , pp. 28-50. 10.1093/hisres/htaa035

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1093/hisres/htaa035>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



## **Preaching and Politics in the Welsh Marches, 1643-1663: The Case of Alexander Griffith\***

In his *History of Modern Wales*, Philip Jenkins observes that it is ‘difficult’ for historians to ‘approach the critical years’ of the mid-seventeenth century ‘except through studies of the “saints”’.<sup>1</sup> This situation has come about as a result of the long-established fascination in Welsh historiography with the origins of the nonconformist culture that dominated society during the nineteenth and much of the twentieth centuries. Studies of the civil wars and Restoration have focused on leading nonconformists and the establishment of the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales (1650-53).<sup>2</sup> Such subjects are of crucial importance, of course, and demand further research and discussion, but the tendency of scholars to concentrate upon them so heavily has produced a curiously narrow perspective on mid-seventeenth-century Wales in which the fate of the Established Church has been largely overlooked. Recent scholarship has begun to redress the balance, with discussions of royalist and episcopalian actors receiving more attention, but much remains to be done and many gaps in our knowledge remain.<sup>3</sup>

One such lacuna relates to the Church of England ministers who were ejected by the parliamentary authorities, or who conformed quietly during the tumultuous 1640s and 1650s. In part their neglect has been the result of simple source survival. Religious radicals published a good deal more than their episcopalian counterparts, and as the governing group from the later 1640s they also produced the official documentation in church and state. The discovery in the Folger Shakespeare Library of a book of manuscript sermons composed between 1643 and 1663 by the leading opponent of the Propagation Commission, Alexander Griffith, then, promises to shed a significant amount of new light on a hitherto neglected dimension of British religious politics during the mid-seventeenth century, as well as offering a new source to help us

understand the nature and development of episcopalian identities and attitudes in this period.<sup>4</sup> The volume is particularly valuable as there has been no serious treatment of ‘episcopalian’ sermons in Wales during this period. The chapter on Wales in the *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, for example, is almost entirely concerned with nonconformist preaching during the mid-seventeenth century.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, there has been a tendency to discuss the sermons of the civil war and the Restoration periods in isolation from one another, while the Griffith volume offers the opportunity to see continuities and contrasts across this divide.

Griffith has been known to historians for his publications against the Propagation Commission in the early 1650s. However, concentration on this material has produced a jaundiced view of him as variously a ‘slanderer’, ‘rancorous’, ‘malicious’, ‘extreme’, ‘a most reprobate character’, ‘a prickly embittered man’, and ‘a malevolent cleric ... with an acute sense of grievance’.<sup>6</sup> The sermons, however, reveal another man who was a committed defender of his church and king, a diligent local pastor, but also a cleric capable of religious flexibility. This article considers Griffith’s career afresh in the light of these sermons, as well as providing some examination of his published work which has yet to receive sustained study. It deals primarily with those sermons which discuss matters of political moment and application and is less concerned with questions of theology. Griffith was a conservative who could cite Zwilingli and Calvin but was drawn more to Heinrich Bullinger.<sup>7</sup> In March 1647 he preached that God’s offer of salvation was general rather than to the elect only, adding that ‘remission of syns & eternal life is tendered to every one that believes & repents’.<sup>8</sup> He was critical of ‘outward, imp[er]fect, hypocriticall workes’ and ceremonies, but also spoke of a ‘saving righteousnes’ in which obedience to God’s law could bring ‘life everlasting’.<sup>9</sup> This was some distance from a strong Calvinist position although he was critical of Arminian doctrines about salvation too. Griffith

also held a fairly elevated view of the pastorate as the means for accessing grace through instruction and preaching. He does not seem to have set too much store in the finer points of doctrine and was wary of doctrinal controversy, however. On one occasion he was explicit about dealing with issues of election and justification only briefly and generally, as he thought them too divisive.<sup>10</sup>

The sermon book is a small but substantial manuscript volume of some 267 pages. Griffith filled it with extensive transcripts of sermons composed between 1643 and 1663, working both from the front and back of the volume. He usually indicated when the sermons were composed and/or preached and sometimes where. He also occasionally noted when sermons had been recycled at a later date, and the last such instance is recorded as 1674. The sermons have often been copied in date order and we find the consecutive recording of sermon sequences on particular themes. There are exceptions, however. For example, the first sermon in the volume is dated January 1647 but the address following it is from May 1643. This indicates that we are dealing with a later compilation in which Griffith was perhaps working material up from rough notes to collect in this volume. He did not do this systematically, however, and there is little sign of a clear organising principle. Moreover, the volume was clearly also a work in progress as there are deletions, amendments, repetitions and the movement of passages within individual sermons as well as between them. It is also clear that on at least one occasion a few pages of the volume have been removed; perhaps a sermon which was too controversial or embarrassing to retain. Griffith included relatively conventional pastoral sermons exhorting moral reformation alongside more polemical pieces and high-profile addresses. The volume, however, is clearly not a comprehensive record of his preaching in this era. We should also, of course, not assume an exact correspondence between the written record and the sermons' oral delivery.<sup>11</sup> As mentioned

below, there was probably a parallel delivery of some texts in Welsh which remains unrecorded. However, these are extensive transcriptions which possess the structures and rhetorical devices familiar from other sermons of the period,<sup>12</sup> and we can assume a close correspondence at the very least between what was recorded and what Griffith delivered from the pulpit.

This article grapples with the interpretative problems of discussing a life defined discretely by two very different types of source material. Our view of Griffith in the 1640s and early 1660s emerges from his sermon book, while for the 1650s we encounter him as an author recoverable only through polemical pamphlets. There are problems of trying to bring together such materials to tell a coherent narrative, but there are also continuities and contrasts here to suggest how Griffith's experience of the civil wars and his response to the interregnum regimes was rather more complex than has been suggested. Griffith emerges from this discussion as both more important and more complex than we have previously realised him to be. This article thus supports Anthony Milton's recent proposition that biographical approaches to figures who operate across the divide of the civil war might help reveal more about the elastic and complex nature of conformist religion as a lived experience.<sup>13</sup> Usually treated as an inflexible 'Laudian', the sermons suggest instead that Griffith was willing to compromise with moderate presbyterianism and even contemplated employment under the Protectorate. His religious position was consistent but shaped to the realities of civil war royalism, post-war compromise and Restoration Anglicanism. This article thus offers a new perspective on the challenges of episcopalian loyalty and identity formation during the civil wars, but also on the nature of religious politics and political engagement in a corner of the kingdom which has been understood almost entirely through the eyes of the 'saints'.

## I

Alexander Griffith was born at St Asaph in north Wales in July 1600. The son of a cleric, he attended Oxford where he was ordained deacon and priest as BA from Hart Hall in September 1620 (which was below canonical age), before securing a living at Trefeglwys in Montgomeryshire in the early 1620s.<sup>14</sup> The loss of diocesan records leaves us in the dark about his ministry, but the parish register records the metropolitan visitation which met at Dolgellau in June 1636, when the register's author, likely Griffith himself, described the 'excellent decrees' such as the railing of the altar which were enacted.<sup>15</sup> Although there is no indication of anything other than compliance during the Personal Rule, as we shall see, he became convinced that the civil wars were a providential judgement on the ceremonial excesses of the 1630s and developed into a critic of such Laudian policies. Griffith had family connections to the conservative ceremonialist Godfrey Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, and these facilitated a move in September 1639 to Glasbury, a parish on the Anglo-Welsh border near Hay-on-Wye.<sup>16</sup> The local squire was Henry Williams of Gwernyfed, the most powerful gentleman in Breconshire and *custos rotulorum* of the county bench.

Griffith's translation took place as the Covenanter crisis deepened and disquiet spread about Charles I's government and the direction of his Church. While Griffith probably looked on with dismay at political developments, there were others who saw the potential for a spiritual new dawn. The area around Glasbury was one of the few places in Wales which experienced nonconformist religious activity before the civil wars, and it is likely that from the outset Griffith's Glasbury ministry was shaped by an awareness of a growing local puritan threat.<sup>17</sup> Although such puritan networks were disrupted by the coming of civil war and the predominant royalism of the region, Griffith would find himself locked in a bitter struggle with forces of

puritan reform which eventually swept him from his living.

Breconshire and Radnorshire were secured for the king in the early days of the civil war.<sup>18</sup> Griffith was likely unmolested at Glasbury but the war was no distant prospect; there was regular skirmishing in the marcher counties. Against this backdrop Griffith preached the earliest sermon recorded in the Folger volume. It is dated 19 May 1643 and was almost certainly delivered at Glasbury. He took as his text James 1:12, 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation for when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life'. Referring to the current conflict, he exhorted his auditors to 'suffer afflictions that had or should befall them & ... not to be fainthearted but to hould to their burthen'.<sup>19</sup> He viewed such sufferings as purifying and strengthening experiences for the faithful and the Church of England more generally. Like many of his royalist (and moderate parliamentarian) counterparts, he saw the war as a providential judgement visited upon the country for its wickedness and immorality.<sup>20</sup> Complacency arising from the ease of peacetime, he said, had made the people neglectful of God and they had become 'effoeminates', but those who 'manfullie' suffered God's afflictions were encouraged in their faithfulness and conviction.<sup>21</sup> War and persecution thus tested the mettle of true Christians but also revealed their true loyalty as 'children of God' in the face of 'cursed men'; through their sufferings they would be glorified in the manner of Christ's own torments and ultimate triumph.

Griffith offered up an image of Charles I as one of 'Christs faythfull souldiers' in a line of rulers reaching back to Constantine who fought under the sign of the cross to defend the purity of the Church.<sup>22</sup> The sermon offered an expansive view of the king's prerogative and the subject nature of his people. Citing classic anti-resistance passages from scripture such as the injunction to be subject to governing authorities found in Romans 13:1-2 and the cautionary example of Absalom's rebellion against King David from the second book of Samuel, Griffith told his

audience, 'If my soveraigne be an heathen I am bound to suffer for Gods cause whatsoever he inflicts upon me'.<sup>23</sup> However, he was reluctant to press these points too far, professing his ignorance about 'how farr the kings prerogative reacheth over the subjects goods & liberties & how farr the law of the land gives libertie to the subiect to defend himself, his goodes & libertie'. This equivocal position, albeit balanced with a clear articulation of the sinfulness of rebellion against God's anointed, developed another strand of his sermon: the desire for peace. He wished the king and people could come together '& make good use of Gods iudgements that they may be blessed'.<sup>24</sup> His hopes for peace may have been buoyed by the negotiations at Oxford then underway between the king and parliament, although these would collapse in the following month.

These themes of atonement for sin and the desire for peace were picked up in two sermons Griffith preached in mid-1644. The first was delivered at the funeral of the powerful gentleman Sir Henry Jones of Abermarlais, Carmarthenshire, on 16 May 1644. Jones was a committed royalist who had received a baronetcy in July 1643. He was Henry Williams' brother-in-law and died at Gwernyfed on 14 May; Griffith witnessed Jones's will.<sup>25</sup> Griffith's address was a full-throated warning about earthly corruption, man's sinfulness and the hope of resurrection. He again brought up the necessity of moral and spiritual reformation to assuage God's wrath which had left society in a 'desperatt condition, every one bleeding by the hand of the other'.<sup>26</sup> This sanguinary image of a country being punished for its sins was probably sharpened by the fact that the royalist cause was suffering worrying reverses in many parts of the country, although the area around Glasbury remained solidly for the king. Griffith's next sermon of 6 June 1644 was composed against this backdrop, and although the hammer blow of Marston Moor had not yet fallen, concern among royalists was widespread after defeats in the Midlands and the north. His

theme once more was the desire for peace; his text was 2 Thessalonians 3:16, 'Now the Lord of Peace gives you peace always by all means'. He argued that peace obtained through ease and contentment was 'counterfeit' and encouraged sin, maintaining that the people should expect no end 'untill there is either an end of our heinous syns or an end of us all'.<sup>27</sup>

There is a hiatus in the manuscript before a fascinating set of sermons from January 1647. Since the last recorded address, of course, the royalist cause had been defeated and an uneasy peace established. Despite the end of royalist resistance, conservative forms of politics and religion held sway in this part of the Welsh marches.<sup>28</sup> A prominent figure was Sir Robert Harley, erstwhile sponsor of Welsh puritans, but now leader of the newly empowered presbyterian faction in the area.<sup>29</sup> Griffith was evidently a figure of standing in the region but was also palatable to presbyterian opinion, as is indicated by the fact that he delivered an assize sermon in the morning and afternoon of Sunday 17 January 1647 at Hereford Cathedral, quite possibly at Harley's invitation. Sir Robert and his son Edward were leading members of the local parliamentary committee which controlled preaching in the Cathedral from the spring of 1646.<sup>30</sup> It seems surprising that Griffith should have been invited to address the parliamentary-appointed judges and local justices after he had preached up the authority of the king and the irreligious nature of rebellion during the war. However, we are given only snapshots of his developing religious and political positions in these sermons, and a good deal of water had clearly passed under the bridge between 1644 and 1647. It seems his stance had developed with the times, and his selection as preacher may have reflected a desire to heal old wounds and encourage a degree of accommodation between presbyterians and ex-royalists. This address may also have been part of a circuit of sermons he was giving at the adoption of the *Directory for Public Worship* in the region. As we shall see, two days after his appearance at Hereford, Griffith was preaching in

Radnorshire at the removal of the prayer book and the taking of the Covenant.<sup>31</sup> The day before his Hereford sermon, meanwhile, Edward Harley received payment from the local committee for purchasing 200 copies of the *Directory* which were carried up to the Welsh Marches.<sup>32</sup> It seems very possible, then, that Griffith's sermon was delivered at the official adoption of the *Directory* in the city before the great and the good who would have attended the assizes.

We have two texts relating to this occasion: what appears to be a draft, much of which was discarded, and a fairly clean copy of the one preached. The two are very different, however, and their relationship remains conjectural. The draft demonstrates a striking departure from the kind of uncompromising Laudianism with which Griffith has traditionally been associated. It begins with a theme familiar from his earlier sermons: that the recent conflict was a divine chastisement provoked by people's sinfulness, particularly, Griffith noted, their contempt of God's word, and 'breaking thy covenants'. The term 'covenant' had taken on loaded political and religious meaning since parliament's signing of the Solemn League and Covenant with the Scots in September 1643, and Griffith had evidently come to see a rapprochement with moderate presbyterianism as the safest refuge for himself and like-minded fellows. His text discussed at length the positive benefits of alliance with the Scots, which would have been music to the ears of someone like Sir Robert Harley. Griffith described how the Lord had 'joyned this land together in one sacred & solemn vow & covenant to serve and obey' the Lord. Unity on this foundation would guard against 'schismes' and make the '3 kingdomes like Ezechiels wheeles, soe framed & sett together the one in the other in doctrine, worship, discipline & government that we may all rest & stand still'.<sup>33</sup> He asked the Lord to help prepare a highway 'out of Scotland into Ireland that the one may peaceablie travayle unto the other & England be a blessing in the midst of both. Bless them O Lord of hostes, saying blessed be Scotland my

people, Ireland, the worke of my hands, & England mine inheritance'. A marginal note reads 'continue the Scotts in their fidelity towards us'.<sup>34</sup> This was a notable shift from the themes of his earlier sermons, and such accommodation with the presbyterians reminds us of Anthony Milton's arguments about the creative pliability of royalist religion in the 1640s.<sup>35</sup> There was also, of course, an element of realpolitik in such realignment. Following defeat, many in the royalist camp had recognised the need to deal with the Covenanters and English presbyterians, in the short term at least, in order to secure their position and that of their king. Episcopacy had recently been abolished by parliamentary ordinance and the threat of the New Model Army and their Independent allies probably encouraged Griffith to consider adopting this pro-Scottish stance.

There were significant caveats to the presbyterian position in the draft sermon, however, which indicate that Griffith was uncertain how best to navigate the complex and treacherous post-war religious currents. Indeed, his lack of conviction on these points seem to have been the reason why he discarded this text. Drawing on the image from Psalm 80 of an imperilled church which once flourished but was now destroyed, the draft called on God to 'blesse this litle flocke the Church of England ... defend us from all those wild boares of the forrest which would enter in upon us to roote up this thy vineyard'.<sup>36</sup> The phrase 'the Church of England' was interlined which suggests Griffith was uncertain whether to identify those he considered to be his 'flocke'. The 'wild boares', however, would have been readily acknowledged as the Independents and radical separatist groups which had emerged from the ferment of war. In the draft sermon, Griffith praised the (then Presbyterian-dominated) parliament and asked God to help them 'perfect the work which they have begun' for the good of Church, state and king. This necessary but vague formulation was rather undercut, however, by his call for blessings also to be given to

‘the reverend clergie the ministers of thy gossell (speciallie archbishops & c)’.<sup>37</sup> The word ‘archbishops’ was an interlineation, again suggesting that Griffith was grappling in this draft between matters of conviction and political reality; especially since archbishops had been abolished by parliament the year before. To have included a reference to archbishops would have undermined the sermon’s position on Scots presbyterianism, although it might have been intended as a gesture towards some kind of Ussherian limited episcopacy.<sup>38</sup>

The draft was also positive in its treatment of Charles I, then in the Scots’ hands although soon to be turned over to parliament. However, this was not the address of obeisance such as Griffith had given in 1643. Rather he called on the king to consider the Christian blood shed in his kingdoms and to ‘turne his hart towards his parliament & subjects’, trusting that ‘the hart of his parliament & subjects [would then turn] towards him agayne’ to establish true peace and prosperity. This passage had several deletions, one of which was a line urging the king to ‘remove from him all wicked Achitophell evill wicked [sic] counsellors’, which would argue that Griffith was deploying, somewhat inexpertly, the parliamentary language of counsel and playing to his audience’s concerns.<sup>39</sup>

The contradictions and inconsistencies in this sermon were too great to be comfortably bridged, and it is significant that this text eventually seems to have been discarded. There may have been other considerations to avoid too much praise of the Scots in Hereford at this time also. The city had suffered at the hands of the Covenanter army during the wars, and in 1645 had been subject to a destructive siege which had left a good deal of anti-Scottish sentiment in its wake. Perhaps mindful of hostility on this point as much as the awkwardness of his attempts to bring together presbyterian and episcopalian positions, Griffith produced a new text which evidently *was* delivered at Hereford Cathedral. Nothing remained of his effort from five days

previously and this sermon was less pro-presbyterian in tone and message but was more vehement in identifying enemies common to both episcopalians and presbyterians. A key theme was the necessity of rejecting the errors of Laudian churchmanship while arguing vigorously for the need to police radical religious opinions and defend a form of moderate orthodoxy. His text was Psalms 50:21 which promised God's arraignment and retribution for evil courses and actions. Griffith offered this up to the judges as a 'cleer patterne to direct you, which are meaner gods eaven lords on Earth to goe on with your assises'.<sup>40</sup> He argued that the Jews' transgressions had been in paying lip-service to laws while they remained inwardly unreformed. Thus, he reasoned, God was concerned more with true piety than with 'outward formes'. He developed this point to argue that God had punished the country for paying too much attention to externals rather than inner sanctification: 'we honoured ... buildings more than God whose buildings they are'.<sup>41</sup> He was critical of the theological drift of the pre-war Church, describing 'intollerable' opinions he had heard on matters of justification and lamenting 'our great grossenes & follie about altars & pictures & candlesticks', calling it 'renewing of superstition clean abolished'.<sup>42</sup>

This evidence of Griffith's critical attitude to Laudian policy is at odds with his note on the altar rails at Trefeglwys in 1636. In another address composed in 1647, Griffith endorsed emphatically the use of tables rather than altars which he described as 'the very reliques of idolatrie'.<sup>43</sup> Milton has been critical of the historiographical tendency which portrays royalist ministers in the 1640s as moderates reacting against the sacramental clericalism of the 1630s and embracing a de-Laudianised erastianism attentive to lay concerns.<sup>44</sup> However, such a characterisation fits Alexander Griffith well. Moreover, this does not seem to have been a rhetorical posture adopted for political convenience. Supporting the Laudian emphasis on outward forms during the Personal Rule was clearly seen in retrospect as types of national sin

meriting judgement by many English and Welsh men and women, and it was precisely on such matters that Church of England clergymen could make common ground with the presbyterians who controlled local government in the Welsh Marches in early 1647. While we cannot be certain, of course, that Griffith's anti-Laudian rhetoric was not simply a device to establish his credentials as a sound Protestant, his sermons reveal an authentic distaste for Laudianism from this point. That he should articulate similar positions in 1663, argues that this was indeed a shift in attitude brought on by the chastising experience of war.

Having dealt with some of the causes of recent troubles, Griffith called on the judges to be inflexible where they found evidence of impiety and religious extremism. Such an injunction would have gladdened the hearts of his presbyterian auditors and it anticipated the central theme of his Commonwealth pamphlets. In a rhetorical manoeuvre which he would employ on many occasions, Griffith yoked sectaries together with Catholics as insidious threats crept into the Church through the inattentiveness of lay and ecclesiastical authorities. He described how the radicals' false opinions were 'now publekelie sowed amongst Gods wheate without controwle'.<sup>45</sup> He warned of the anarchy and confusion that sectaries spread, and his sermon climaxed with an admonition to the judges to root them out of the Church.<sup>46</sup> Magistrates and ministers had to be vigilant as 'we are sett in the midst of soe many & great dangers'. He described the constant battle to defend the truth from superstitious Catholics and the 'libertines with their confusion', who threatened 'this litle flock which thou hast so often, soe miraculously defended & protected'.<sup>47</sup> The separatists Griffith had in mind may well have been those empowered by parliamentary order a few months earlier to provide itinerant preaching in Wales.<sup>48</sup> Two of the itinerants, Walter Craddock and Richard Symonds, were described in the final part of Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena*, published a month before Griffith's sermon, as dangerous antinomians.

Indeed, the entire Welsh itinerant initiative was seen by Edwards as a worrying innovation and he warned ‘the country and ministers ... to be ware’ of them.<sup>49</sup> Their appearance in the Welsh Marches likely added a degree of urgency and immediacy to Griffith’s warnings about the dangerous influence of such home-grown religious radicals. It seems telling, however, that Griffith’s position centred on a common opposition to sectarianism rather than any more positive impulses towards presbyterian government. His support for religious and political presbyterianism appears to have been borne from necessity against a common foe.

A robust defence of political presbyterianism in parliament and in the Welsh Marches in January 1647 probably seemed the best bulwark against such Independent initiatives as the sponsoring of Cradock and Symonds. Nonetheless, this remained a disorienting time for Church of England clergymen, and a sermon Griffith gave only two days after his assize address provides some arresting new evidence of post-war religious changes in Wales. Following the signing of the Solemn League in 1643 a national covenant was promulgated in England and, nominally at least, in Wales. In January 1645 the Book of Common Prayer had been abolished by parliament and *The Directory for Public Worship*, a Presbyterian service book, was authorised in its place. On 19 January 1647 Alexander Griffith gave a sermon at Presteigne parish church in Radnorshire, ‘*cora[m] comittees* [before the committee men] att ye taking of ye Covenant by the cleargy of Radnor[shire]’, an occasion on which he also noted that the ‘comon prayer or service books & surplises were then taken from every parish church’. The removal of the prayer book in south Wales had been controversial and had recently occasioned Clubman-style revolts in some counties.<sup>50</sup> There is little evidence of any such resistance from the Breconshire-Radnorshire area although it is unlikely that moves to abolish the prayer book were welcomed. Indeed, the late administering of the Covenant to the Radnor clergy indicates clearly

how parliament was not in a position to impose its will in this royalist area until the war had ended.

As he had done in Hereford two days before, Griffith was preaching before a prestigious audience on a major set-piece occasion. He was clearly considered an influential figure, and his selection for this address reinforces the argument that he was seen as someone who might bridge the presbyterian-episcopalian divide. On this occasion he was preaching before the relatively new Radnorshire county committee which had recently been forced to defend itself against accusations that it was lukewarm in sequestering old royalists and extracting money for the parliamentary state.<sup>51</sup> Its members were at best moderate presbyterians, and many were considered suspect in their commitment to the cause.<sup>52</sup> They were probably sympathetic listeners, then, although it is much more difficult to guess the probable reaction of the clergy who were then present.

Griffith's sermon was based on a reading from the Book of Haggai: 'Is it a time for you O ye to dwell in your sealed houses and this house lie waste?' This was an appropriate text when addressing clergymen who likely did indeed consider their houses to lie in ruins, but Griffith's selection was probably because it was drawn from a book concerned with the imperative of true repentance to secure peace. He drew a parallel between God's judgement on the Jews who had turned from the true path and been cast out of Israel and the manner in which He had punished the people of England and Wales for their sinfulness and pride. In a critical review of recent church history he suggested that the positive reforms under Edward VI and Elizabeth I had not been met with sufficient gratitude, so that 'superstitions remained like dust & dirt caste behind the doores', and had spread over the kingdom since James I's reign. He claimed that Charles I had wanted a thorough reformation but this was not possible 'untill the purple rags of the

Babylonish whoore were wholie cast out into our streeites'.<sup>53</sup> Superstitious ceremonies, he averred, were like knives in babies' hands with which the people cut their own throats. Griffith argued that 'every Reformation att first is like bitter pills, very harsh to the taste', justifying this new 'Reformation' of abolishing the prayer book as a necessary purgation to assuage divine wrath.<sup>54</sup> He recognised the recent reduction of the Church to its foundations, but claimed this was an opportunity for its re-edification.<sup>55</sup> He was necessarily vague as to the exact nature of rebuilding required, but an accommodation with presbyterian practice was apparently unavoidable. Griffith identified the main threat to the project of saving the Church as 'soe many sects & schismes as Brownists & Anabaptists such fling braynes & light heads ... that ... make yearelie & monthlie fashions & faces of doctrine & discipline'.<sup>56</sup> Recycling some of the ideas, and indeed some of the language, from his recent assize address, he thus elaborated an anti-sectarian case for accommodating presbyterian reforms.

Griffith may have been seen as an effective sponsor of this presbyterian initiative, but he was not an uncritical one. Crucial here, and an issue which would resurface in his opposition to the Propagation Commission, was the provision of effective ministers for local parishes and their capacity to operate in a Welsh language milieu. He charged the committeemen in the audience that if the re-edification of God's house was to be accomplished, it was incumbent upon them to see parishes supplied, 'otherwise the church of God in many parishes through your negligence will lie waste'. This work required diligent and committed men and Griffith, as he would reiterate later, was strict about the need to winnow out unworthy timeservers who provided little spiritual succour. Ironically, therefore, he was sympathetic to the intentions behind what became the Propagation Commission which was charged with removing insufficient clergy, although he became violently opposed to its ideology, methods and ruthlessness. Griffith challenged the

Radnorshire committee to ‘weigh the condic[i]on of the countrey, to consider their language & to resolve this quare: How meer Welch cures may be supplied?’<sup>57</sup> This was a vital consideration. Although his sermon book is written in English, it is clear that Griffith also delivered sermons in Welsh. There are numerous marginal notations and interlineations where he translated particular words and phrases into Welsh.<sup>58</sup> Presumably he had the facility to translate as he read with occasional notes to assist the process. It is possible that Griffith delivered two sermons at Glasbury, one in Welsh and one in English, or that he held separate Welsh language sermons at his other living of Aberllyfni a few miles distant.<sup>59</sup> This was a pressing concern because, while the prayer book had been translated into Welsh in the sixteenth century and had become an object of cultural significance and affection, the *Directory* was only available in English. Griffith saw this linguistic problem not just as a serious obstacle to potential reform but as an omission that could well undermine religious provision in a country where the vernacular liturgical text was now prohibited.

Details of how such presbyterian reforms were accommodated, adopted or ignored in this part of Wales and the Marches are lacking, but the growing power of the Independents from mid-1647 and their support for Welsh itinerants stymied such initiatives and probably sidelined Griffith.<sup>60</sup> He continued to compose and deliver sermons through 1647 but for the most part these dealt with uncontroversial matters of parish piety and contained few allusions to contemporary events. The advance of Independency and the New Model probably encouraged prudence, or at least a degree of circumspection, in his recording controversial issues if they were indeed aired. The regicide passed unmentioned in the sermon book and one of the last sermons recorded prior to his ejection was dated 9 June 1649. In it he seemed to allude to the oppressed state of episcopalians in a passage that may have possessed an autobiographical

dimension. He described how the apostles ‘reioyced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Christ, being strengthened with all might unto all patience & long suffering with ioyfullness’. Holding up the example of Saint Paul, Griffith lauded him as ‘persecuted but not forsaken. Cast down but not destroyed’.<sup>61</sup>

The end for Griffith came with the establishing of the Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales in February 1650. This body, which effectively ran the country for the next three years, empowered radical Independency and adopted a model of congregationalism and itinerant preaching that was anathema to Griffith’s ministry and values. An important part of the Commission’s role was the removal of incumbents deemed unworthy because of delinquency, scandal or non-residency. It went zealously about this business, eventually removing 278 clergymen.<sup>62</sup> One was Griffith who was ejected from his livings on 7 December 1650. The reasons given were ‘drunkenness and lasciviousness’.<sup>63</sup> These were generic accusations framed against many of the clergy ejected by the parliamentary authorities in England as well as the Welsh propagators.<sup>64</sup> Whatever the truth of the accusations, Griffith was cast out of his church although he continued to live in Glasbury. All around him he saw the rise of the kind of sectarian confusion he had warned against from the pulpit. The loss of his ecclesiastical voice and his outrage at the direction of religious reform in Wales now drove Griffith to a more public forum: the printed pamphlet.

## II

Griffith’s printed works have been mined exclusively for what they tell us about his opponents rather than for his own positions and arguments. Moreover, they have been examined somewhat crudely as texts of a disgruntled and partisan attack dog. One historian, for example,

describes his publications as ‘an unsubtle admixture of truths, half-truths and untruths’.<sup>65</sup> While there is clear animus in these works, they are, in fact, fairly typical of the polemical pamphlets produced during the 1640s and 1650s. Indeed, if they are read for what they reveal about episcopalian opinion towards the Propagation Commission, they can tell us much about the simmering discontent over religious developments among a significant constituency in the Welsh Marches. Considered alongside Griffith’s pre- and post-war sermons, these works offer an unique opportunity to consider the mobilisation of moderate episcopalian opinion against the radicals who now controlled the church and local government. They also provide an intriguing counterpoint and complement to his sermons. In these texts we can see the continuity of themes and positions which he adopted in his sermons. However, they also reveal the ways in which these positions were sharpened and weaponised in a public battle with the propagators and their political masters. And Griffith certainly had the polemical tools for the job of attacking the propagators. His sermons adopt the register of the learned pastor but Griffith was evidently also at home with the biting vitriol of partisan print. His texts quoted Ovid and offered learned arguments based on Scripture, but also incorporated doggerel verse and scurrilous personal stories about his opponents. He also repeated salacious details of his antagonists’ lives but claimed that the ‘drolleries’ of such ‘stile’ were only repetitions of their own ‘obscean & violent discourses’.<sup>66</sup>

The Propagation Commission was officially active between 1650 and 1653, although its personnel continued to be enormously influential in Wales down to the Restoration.<sup>67</sup> Its leading light, and Alexander Griffith’s *bête noire*, was the Radnorshire Fifth Monarchist Vavasor Powell. Powell and the itinerants appointed under the auspices of the Propagation Commission were particularly active in the Welsh border counties of Radnorshire, Montgomeryshire and

Breconshire. In concert with sympathetic gentlemen from the region, Griffith now began to mobilise in print against those despoiling his Church. The first evidence of this was the presentation to parliament in March 1652 of a petition against the Commission from seven south Walian counties.<sup>68</sup> The petition defended the ejected clergy, who were said to have given many more sermons than the small number of itinerants now provided, and claimed that the displaced ministers' 'lives and labours did expresse as much power of godlines (quietly in their proper spheares) as any of your tinkling cymballs or wandering foolish fires'.<sup>69</sup> In a letter to Vavasor Powell included with the published petition, Griffith described how 'cruellie the ministers of Wales are and have bin used, their good names murthered, their very calling accounted a crime'. He recounted that he had been vilified in his absence by Powell at Glasbury and Hay-on-Wye, and offered a public disputation with him on the necessity and lawfulness of paedobaptism, the orthodoxy of episcopalian doctrine, and the fact that church separation was 'causless and unwarrantable'.<sup>70</sup> He offered vivid personal testimony of 'so many hundred souls within this parish ... whereof I was late vicar, fainting and scattered abroad like sheep without a shepheard, having neither the comfort of preaching nor praying, nor sacraments, nor visiting the sick, nor of any decency of burial'. He challenged the itinerants' characterisation of congregations such as his as ignorant and benighted, maintaining that they had been 'constantlie taught ... these twelve years [i.e. since Griffith's arrival] twice every Lords day; for many of us have laboured more abundantly than you all'.<sup>71</sup> Griffith clearly viewed preaching as a core part of his episcopalian identity and would argue in 1663 that the 'preaching of the gospel is to be compared to a pearl of incomparable value'.<sup>72</sup> His visceral reaction to the propagators was partly driven by their constant refrain that the principality was filled with non-preaching, indolent lackeys careless of their ministerial duties and the spiritual welfare of their congregations. This was obviously a

model he did not recognise from his own ministry and which the sermon book suggests was indeed wide of the mark.

This petition was part of a wider attempt to stop the Propagation Commission's renewal in 1653. By promoting it, Griffith allied himself with the Breconshire gentlemen John Gunter and Charles Roberts, as well with as the attorney general of south Wales, Edward Freeman.<sup>73</sup> In addition to Vavasor Powell, they were opposed by the leading propagator and Fifth Monarchist, Major General Harrison, and his local agents Richard Creed, Nathaniel Hancock and Hugh Rogers.<sup>74</sup> A struggle ensued between these parties over the parliamentary enquiry into the alleged abuses which followed the petition's presentation. While this controversy played out, around September 1652 Griffith produced another anti-propagation tract, *Mercurius Cambro-Britannicus, or, News from Wales*.<sup>75</sup> A key claim of this text, which was intended particularly to appeal to opinion in London, was that the Welsh radicals had designs on extending their project to England. Griffith piled on allegations of the commissioners' financial corruption and ministerial neglect.<sup>76</sup> This was a deeply-felt intervention and raises another theme which is often ignored in discussions of Griffith's pamphlets: his genuine concern for Wales's spiritual welfare. For example, he lamented that religion and learning were 'decaied' and the 'light of the Gospel almost quite extinguished' in parishes like his own, describing the Church in Wales as 'a meer carcasse'.<sup>77</sup> He was deeply worried that the sacraments, the efficacy of which he emphasised constantly in his preaching, were neglected and the people left bereft of guidance. He had certainly seen this in his own parish where the new minister, Richard Powell, rejected baptism down to the mid-1650s and did not administer communion.<sup>78</sup> Griffith's constant reference to developments in and around his own area of Breconshire-Radnorshire anchor his pamphlets in a world of daily experience. Although there was hyperbole and exaggeration in his publications,

historians should recognise that Griffith's motivations were those of a diligent minister who wished to save his flock from spiritual desolation and not simply products of rancour and malice.

The propagators did not remain silent in the face of these public attacks and launched a counter-offensive to argue for the Commission's renewal. Unsurprisingly, they turned their fire on Griffith.<sup>79</sup> One of their pamphlets took issue with a pro-episcopalian publication describing a public disputation between Church of England cleric and Restoration bishop George Griffith and Vavasor Powell at Newtown in Montgomeryshire in July 1652.<sup>80</sup> It seems likely that Alexander Griffith had a hand in composing the pamphlet which offended the propagators.<sup>81</sup> The author of the pro-Vavasorian text described the episcopalians' 'stoln, self-stuff'd sermons' which would 'verifie the confession of one of your brethren (that hath since left preaching to attend upon your pamphlet-presse, "I am a pen and inkhorne divine"': a clear reference to Griffith. The author then caricatured Griffith as the episcopalians' 'great Master-Minter', and rounded on the 'slight, superstitious, supercilious, self-exalting and sinner-hardning sermons' clergymen such as he delivered. Such barbs had a long pedigree in the history of puritan criticisms of the Welsh clergy, but the sermon book suggests that such accusations were not well founded in Griffith's case.

Griffith's tracts and the uncomfortable light he threw on the financial aspects of the propagators' work helped to undermine support for the Commission and the Rump Parliament ultimately refused to renew it. However, the itinerants continued to operate under the Protectorate, and principal among them was Vavasor Powell. In January 1654 Griffith produced his most controversial tract, an *ad hominem* attack on Powell whom he dubbed 'the metropolitan of the itinerants', entitled *Strena Vavasoriensis*.<sup>82</sup> At this time Griffith was in London, co-ordinating an assault on Powell and his associates. To this point, Griffith's life operated almost entirely within a Welsh context, excepting his studies at Oxford. However, he must have had

contacts and associations in the capital which would have helped his works into print. Although it is not entirely clear how this functioned, it seems that he fostered connections with opponents of the Propagation Commission from south Wales and the Marches, such as Edward Freeman and John Gunter, who had a London presence and these men may have assisted Griffith with publication.

Political developments had rendered Powell much more vulnerable to Griffith's attacks by this point. Powell had opposed the establishing of the Protectorate and at Blackfriars in December 1653 denounced Cromwell as a 'vile person' for which he was promptly arrested, although he was released and returned to Wales shortly afterwards.<sup>83</sup> Griffith had been present at Blackfriars and took notes on Powell's address which Griffith later presented to Cromwell. At this point he was lodging at Clifford's Inn with John Gunter, one of the solicitors for the 1652 petition against the Propagation Commission, and also receiving reports from Henry Williams and others about Powell's movements in Wales and his tirades against Cromwell.<sup>84</sup> On 17 March 1654 Griffith wrote to Cromwell himself in the guise of a Protectorate loyalist offering further details about Powell's seditious opposition in Wales.<sup>85</sup> Griffith informed the Lord Protector that he usually kept his son Henry Cromwell informed of Powell's movements in Wales, but as he was otherwise engaged at present, he thought it necessary to approach Cromwell himself. In *Strena Vavasoriensis*, Griffith played up his own loyalist credentials, stating 'we are assured the Lord hath and (doubt not) doth reign where kings or protectors do rule and govern'.<sup>86</sup> The claim was somewhat ambivalent in its reference to 'kings or protectors', but, along with his letter to Cromwell, it suggests his relationship with the Protectorate was not as hostile as some have imagined. Indeed, in a later publication, Griffith rounded on ministers who were ejected 'without any respect had ... to their ... submission to that present government'.<sup>87</sup> While hardly indicative

of enthusiasm for the Protectorate, it nevertheless suggests that he would consider employment under a moderate parliamentary regime that promoted stability and suppressed sectarian excess. Moreover, such a stance is of a piece with his accommodation with presbyterians in 1647. Such evidence paints a rather different portrait than the usual impression of Griffith as an implacable and unwavering opponent of *all* parliamentary regimes.

Griffith maintained his assault on the propagators and Powell in particular in two other 1654 pamphlets. One, *A True and Perfect Relation*, was written immediately after his letter to Cromwell, and provided a detailed account of the 1652 petition and the propagators', often unlawful, attempts to stymie the investigation that followed its presentation. The tract was addressed to Protector Cromwell presumably in the hope that the propagators' wings would be clipped and perhaps that loyal clergymen such as himself might be reinstated or allowed to work in other capacities under Cromwell's regime. It is worth recalling in this context other episcopalians such as Griffith's relation by marriage, Godfrey Goodman, and also Peter Heylyn, who also tried to influence Cromwell with printed works in this period.<sup>88</sup> In his text, Griffith included his name among a list of those who had never borne arms against the parliament and had been 'ejected on very slender accompt'.<sup>89</sup> This once more suggests that we should not necessarily collapse his hostility to the propagators into opposition to all republican regimes. His other 1654 publication, *Gemitus Ecclesiae Cambro-Britannicae*, lamented the propagators' excesses, but again appealed for consideration of ejected clergymen like himself. It was addressed to the Protectorate's recently established commission of 'Triers' and presented the 'poore ejected ministers of Wales' as 'brethren and fellow labourers in the truth and purity of Christs gossell'. In *Gemitus*, Griffith confessed that 'in the neatest garden there are some weedes', and argued that had the propagators winnowed out only the scandalous and unworthy

from the church, ‘they had done God and the church good service’. However, they had far exceeded their brief, driven by a lust for wealth and power, and consequently had done serious damage to the country’s spiritual welfare.<sup>90</sup> The positions he adopted in these publications were not simply ‘narrow, personal attacks on Powell’ as the most authoritative account of Griffith’s life has it, but rather were consonant with the sermons in which he suggested that unworthy ministers be removed from the Church.<sup>91</sup> Moreover, they suggest that there was a degree of sincerity in his appeals for some kind of return to ministerial duties under the Protectorate.

Powell’s supporters reacted with their own bitter attack and in March 1654 a group of ex-propagators and local notables published a reply to Griffith, *Vavasoris Examen & Purgamen*.<sup>92</sup> Griffith was branded ‘Alexander the Great Lyer’ and the ‘Arch-metropolitical lyar’, who had obtained a party of followers through circulating untruths. He was portrayed as a coward too timorous to put his name to the attack on Powell. The authors suggested that Griffith had ‘crowed up’ the ‘goddesse Diana’ of the Welsh people, the prayer book, although this seems unlikely given his politic stance when this text was removed from Radnorshire churches in 1647.<sup>93</sup> The tract maintained that it was a topsy-turvy world when Powell was condemned as malignant while Griffith was accounted ‘wel-affected’ to the government.<sup>94</sup>

There was a good deal of truth in their observation. However, the Protectorate’s drift away from the religious radicalism of the early 1650s occasioned some unusual reconfigurations. While there is no doubt that Griffith would have preferred a Stuart to a Cromwell as head of state, previous accounts have been too myopic in seeing him simply as the ‘arch-enemy of the puritan cause in republican Wales’.<sup>95</sup> His position was subtler than this and his sermons and pamphlets suggest that he was willing to consider working under republican authorities. As Fincham and Taylor have observed, ‘the willingness to compromise and work with the powers

that be is a neglected feature of episcopalian mentalities' in the 1650s.<sup>96</sup> Indeed, there are indications that he *did* resume some kind of ministerial role in Glasbury in the mid-1650s. In the Folger manuscript we find a sermon composed around a text from the Book of Job dated 20 May 1655.<sup>97</sup> Was this sermon delivered? If so, in what capacity? The evidence is insufficient to offer any certainty on these points, but it is worth noting that 20 May was a Sunday, and this might suggest he was working as some kind of clerical assistant in the parish.<sup>98</sup> Moreover, among the Glasbury parish muniments are accounts of charitable legacies which Griffith had signed off as minister. After a brief hiatus, in 1652 he resumed authorising these payments and continued to do so throughout the 1650s, although, unlike previously, he did not identify himself as the incumbent.<sup>99</sup> Although his exact status is unclear, he clearly remained involved in the charitable and spiritual welfare of the parish during the Protectorate. Such findings make his appointment by the Triers as schoolmaster at Hay-on-Wye, some four miles from Glasbury, in November 1658 less surprising.<sup>100</sup>

Griffith's interregnum pamphlets reveal him as an implacable opponent of the Propagation Commission and its millenarian satraps. However, they also show a man who was committed to preaching, to his fellow ejected clergy, and to his countrymen's spiritual welfare. His prominent local profile, as suggested by his sermons of 1647, show that Griffith did not materialize out of the ether to lead the opposition to the propagators in the early 1650s. Rather he was already a prominent cleric in the Welsh Marches connected to local presbyterians as well as to the episcopalian community. He was, for example, working alongside political presbyterians like John Gunter and Edward Freeman to undermine the case for the Propagation Commission's renewal. He was certainly a royalist who welcomed the return of Charles II, but he was also a minister who made friends as well as enemies on the parliamentary side during the 1640s and

1650s.

### III

Griffith's fortunes were transformed by the Restoration. As an ejected minister and leading critic of the propagators his stock was high, and he re-entered Glasbury in late 1660 or early 1661. He returned, however, to a changed world. The puritan currents of the late 1630s had been nurtured and much augmented by the propagators. Many nonconformists around Glasbury became part of a vibrant baptist community which developed from the mid-1640s.<sup>101</sup> Breconshire along with Montgomeryshire and Radnorshire had been a particular focus for the most radical millenarian elements under the propagators, and their legacies continued to trouble the Restoration authorities.<sup>102</sup> Although doubtless many welcomed Griffith's reinstatement at Glasbury, this was a profoundly different environment from the one he had entered as minister in 1639.

Griffith was a prominent local cleric in the early 1660s and was chosen to preach two assize sermons in 1663. Both were given at Brecon before the judges Sir Richard Lloyd and Arthur Trevor, on 14 April and 2 September. The two sermons took the same text for exposition and were designed to operate together. This was an unusual although not unique arrangement; James Strong, for example, preached two sermons before the Somerset assizes in March and August 1657.<sup>103</sup> In a recent study, Hugh Adlington has emphasized the neglected role of assize sermons in helping to forge and legitimate the post-Restoration settlement, with their emphasis on the links between the legal and ecclesiastical institutions and their bolstering the power and authority of the restored monarchy.<sup>104</sup> Griffith's sermons enjoined obedience to Church and state, but he also took these opportunities to diagnose some of the problems troubling the body politic in

Wales.

Griffith's two sermons took as their text Psalm 75:3: 'The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved: I bear up the pillars of it'. He drew on the imagery of pillars to describe the law and the church as supporting the crown, a fairly common analogy which can be found in other Restoration assize sermons.<sup>105</sup> In his first sermon Griffith described how the verse was penned for a renowned judge who 'in a troublesome time promised to repayre the disorders of a tottered state'.<sup>106</sup> His address was a paean to regal power, but it was also haunted by the recent collapse of royal authority, something he attributed, in part, to laxity in policing religious nonconformists.

Griffith argued that any resistance to the king was an assault on the state itself, asking rhetorically, 'What distempers & disorders are there in a countrey where a head is wanting?', and adding 'We have long felt the miserie thereof ... And why? We wanted a head, there was no king in our Israel'.<sup>107</sup> He then expounded a high-flown view of divine right kingship, describing Charles II as 'God on Earth'.<sup>108</sup> Kings, Griffith maintained, had no superior except God and were 'lyable only to the sanctions of Gods law'. As a result, even if the subject was faced with a tyrannical ruler like Nero or Julian he was not to be resisted but the people were to suffer passively: 'Iniustice in a king doth not warrant disobedience in a subiect'.<sup>109</sup> This position had been affirmed by primitive Christians who remained obedient to authority, Griffith averred, and harmony had reigned until the Jesuit and the 'fanatic' had corrupted the doctrine of loyalty.<sup>110</sup> The Brecon judges, he reasoned, thus needed to crack down on Catholics and dissenters who not only challenged the king's authority but, by extension, threatened once more to usher in political and religious anarchy. Griffith here echoed the voices in Anglican royalism which reacted against the experiences of the 1640s and 1650s by embracing Filmerian and patriarchal

conceptions of the state. He was one of Locke's 'drum ecclesiastic' who 'preach[ed] up passive obedience' and asserted that rulers were 'sacred and divine'.<sup>111</sup>

To safeguard the authority and integrity of the state, then, Griffith called on Trevor and Lloyd to help reform and police the clergy as well as the laity. 'Lett the scandalous be branded', he said, and castigated the 'dumb non-residing droanes who by their lazines starve the soules of 2 or 3 parishes'. He argued that these timeservers 'should be firreted out of their holes to their cures, that new governments be not againe modelled by non-conformists in their parishes'.<sup>112</sup> This was an arresting argument in this context, but it was also consistent with the position adopted in earlier sermons and in pamphlets such as *Gemitus Ecclesiae*: that insufficient and unprofitable ministers be removed for the good of the Church. In the mode of Anglican firebrand, Griffith then thundered that 'The glorious Act of Uniformitie, strengthened by the ever-renowned patriots of this present parliament with their invincible reasons (which have stabb'd the papiste & staggered the non-conformist), will be famous for the Protestant doctrine & discipline to succeeding ages. Next unto the blessed Word, itt is the Magna Charta thereof'.<sup>113</sup> He was convinced that the Lord's design was manifest in the return of monarchy and the actions of the Cavalier Parliament, and that God had shown His displeasure with the schism and separation that had been allowed to take root in His chosen Church.<sup>114</sup> Although there was nothing new here, there is a sense of Griffith's reinvigorated conviction that the Anglican Church was a repository of truth and light against the forces of darkness which had not only overwhelmed the country in recent times, but which remained all too present.

Turning to this threat, Griffith finished his sermon with a warning to the judges that 'ther [is] noe question but the growth of poperie [is] too prevalent in these partes & of schism & separation not yett reclaimed but repullulating in most parishes ... There are grand seminaries in

most hundreds'. The itinerants' legacy remained all too visible, and he cast this as an affront to God's manifest design and the likely cause of future catastrophe. He concluded with a supplication that the judges use their authority to help 'reduce to the obedience of the church ... five hundred in these two counties who contemn the authoritie & jurisdiction of the ecclesiasticall courts'.<sup>115</sup> The 'two counties' were Breconshire and Radnorshire, and evidence suggests that Griffith was right to be concerned. The religious census in 1676 showed that one-sixth of Wales's nonconformists were to be found in Breconshire.<sup>116</sup> Griffith's sense of the calamity that awaited the local community if they did not confront this threat was born of painful experience but also of present realities. Moreover, his awareness of those who ignored the authority of the church courts was probably sharpened by the fact that since 1662 he had sat on the Brecon consistory court as the archdeacon's surrogate.<sup>117</sup>

Griffith's second sermon to the Brecon assizes in September 1663 began as something of a re-run of his April address. He once more considered the psalmist's message regarding the dissolution of a state and the manner in which law and true religion could come together to repair and re-edify government. He then considered the proper order and constitution of this revived state and turned his attention particularly to the Church. He argued for the 'beautie' of the Church in its doctrinal truth but also its government and ceremony. His scepticism of Laudian churchmanship has been discussed above, and he seemed equally uncomfortable with its re-emergence in the Restoration. He considered church ceremony to be 'the ornament though not the perfection of the building', maintaining that Scripture was silent on exact forms of worship, only requiring authority to 'be carefull' that things be 'done decentlie & in order'.<sup>118</sup> Although he emphasised the necessity of public prayer and the sacraments, Griffith was non-prescriptive about matters such as the beautification of church interiors, the kinds of bread and wine to be

used in communion, or the gestures performed by minister and congregation.<sup>119</sup> He was also relatively non-dogmatic about forms of church government, maintaining that its particular form was obscure, ‘onlie humane’ and ‘comitted to the wisdom & power of the Church’, although ‘moderate episcopall divines’ agreed that episcopacy was ‘a prudentiall (though apostolicall) constitution’.<sup>120</sup> His less than full-throated support for the authority of episcopacy may be set alongside his willingness to accommodate presbyterian positions in the mid-1640s. Indeed, many of the points about ceremony and government he raised in this sermon echo those proposed by presbyterians as the basis of a reconciliation with the Anglican Church at Sion College in July 1660.<sup>121</sup> Despite this, he maintained that changing the Church polity would be dangerous ‘by introducing innovations of equalitie’, and acknowledged that episcopacy was a bulwark against schism, ‘a weed that will spring up in all ages, the remedie is now more necessary than ever’.<sup>122</sup>

The keynote in this discussion of church government and ceremony was a desire to maintain unity. His sermon thus echoed a powerful theme in royalist propaganda such as that of Roger L’Estrange who, in the same year as Griffith’s sermon, described religious uniformity as the ‘ciment’ of the ecclesiastical and secular estate, and without it ‘one piece falls from another’.<sup>123</sup> Griffith had seen the bitter fruits of schism and described ‘the unity of a multitude [as] ... Gods work’. Dissent was inherently fissiparous and entropic while God’s spirit imbued the unity of the Established Church.<sup>124</sup> ‘Watchmen’ such as the assize judges were necessary to ensure that prideful schismatics did not threaten this unity and topple the structures of the state.<sup>125</sup> Griffith’s erastianism viewed the Church as residing within the commonwealth and requiring defenders like the judges to protect its integrity. Submission to the law was the essence of the Act of Uniformity, and turning to the judges, Griffith cast them as Atlases, bearing up the fabric of both the secular and the ecclesiastical estates.<sup>126</sup> He called on God to bless Trevor and Lloyd’s

endeavours as ‘two loyal brands’, noting that in 1660 they had come ‘into distracted counties where ... religious & righteousness were, if not destroy’d, yet the beautie & glorie thereof wholie defaced’. He then painted a picture of the region at the Restoration which is worth quoting in full. He described how they found

The magistrate stript of his roab & the minister of his coate. You found turbulent spirits possessed with ambition & malice, rash without shame & bould without sense to speake or doe any thinge; you had timelie tryall of them att yor first entrance into these counties. In Church you found truth clipt with schism & heresy, clouded by non-conformity & embossed by anabaptisticall alloy & in very few a true stamp of loyalltie but either so[l]ddered with disobedience or embossed with selfe-ends or varnished with diffucacon.<sup>127</sup> & because not well discerned, truer hearts were too much neglected & the other more countenanced & intrusted. This disease was epidemicall without help which nothing but graduall discoveries can reform.<sup>128</sup>

This is a fascinating account of the immediate post-Restoration landscape in eastern Wales, albeit from a partisan witness. The Restoration government’s position on religious nonconformity was initially one of indulgence and ambivalence; incumbent ministers were not initially to be removed, for example, while those ejected clergy returning to their livings were to compensate those they replaced. Thus it was, presumably, that Griffith felt his opponents had been treated too leniently while loyal sufferers such as himself received scant reward. The Act of Uniformity, however, empowered an intolerant and anti-sectarian Church and placed into the judges’ hands a weapon that could be wielded against dissenters in places like Breconshire. Griffith thus pleaded with the judges to use their secular authority to uphold the ecclesiastical jurisdiction as it was ‘yett scarce crept out of the cradle & contemptuouslie sleighted’. Intriguingly, he also claimed that the bishops were mostly ‘men of meek & mild spirits ... more given to interceding & indulging then compelling. Most of them worn out by their late tedious threaldome’. Too much leniency, he argued, would be unseasonable, a ‘punishing mercy’, which would destroy the Church as the separatists had ‘made noe good use of your late indulgence &

clemency, but are rather become obdurate with their arrogance in contemning all authorities'.<sup>129</sup> He finished his peroration by asking God to assist the judges in tackling this dangerous situation and healing the kingdom's divisions.

Although Griffith's civil war inclinations seem to have been more ecumenical than they are often portrayed, this was no latitudinarian sermon of peace and reconciliation. The astringent remarks about the episcopate and the judges' duties are surprising, but they speak to his deep concern about the strength and growth of a particular brand of radical dissent in his community and the indulgent attitudes which allowed it to prosper. Such positions were born of painful experience, of course, and Griffith was here continuing his attacks on unfettered Independency which he had been articulating for over a decade. In its discussion of ceremonies and government, the sermon offers more evidence of common ground between Griffith and moderate presbyterian opinion. He was, it seems, not temperamentally inclined against all non-Anglican Protestants, but was rather opposed to the heirs of the Vavasorian radicals who had removed him from office and infected his country with a powerful strain of anti-formalist radicalism. It is telling that the kind of presbyterianism which Griffith might have accommodated did not gain a significant presence in Restoration Breconshire and Radnorshire; he had few potential allies of the Baxterian mould. His pleas to the bench, then, were for the suppression of the 'old leaven' whom, he believed, would tear down the fabric of Church and state once more if given the chance. Indeed, the rumours of plots and intrigues in eastern Wales involving these groups in the early 1660s likely added strength to his convictions and bite to his rhetoric.<sup>130</sup> The iron of intolerance had entered his soul at the hands of the propagators.

The Griffith manuscript records further addresses he gave to his parishioners at Glasbury and neighbouring Llanfyllin in 1663, as well as notes indicating those sermons he re-purposed into the 1670s. These were uncontroversial pastoral texts concerned with everyday religiosity and moral conduct. It is likely that he employed another volume for his post-1663 sermon notes as the current book has little space for further compositions. If he did, however, it is now lost. Griffith continued to preach until at least 1674, administered local charity money, and maintained the parish register down to mid-1675 when it seems ill health overtook him. He died on 21 April 1676 and was interred at Glasbury three days later.<sup>131</sup>

Griffith had witnessed remarkable events during his career and his sermon book provides a set of unique snapshots of one episcopalian clergyman's response to events during the mid-seventeenth century in the Welsh Marches. It corrects impressions of him as simply a malevolent and prejudiced Anglican who stood in the way of Wales's nonconformist destiny. This text also offers an unusual opportunity to examine a career that straddles the civil wars and the Restoration. It additionally provides some insight into the process of forging an Anglican identity from the tribulations of the civil wars. It is unique in providing such a perspective from the proving ground of the propagators who have, almost exclusively, held historians' interest in this period. The sermons offer a fascinating counterpoint to Griffith's better-known published works, but also allow a more thorough contextualisation and nuanced reading of those texts. While it is true that these were the works of an episcopalian propagandist, it is also the case that we should recognise the degree to which Griffith was willing to compromise with moderate parliamentary regimes. Although his enemies' enemy may not have been his friend, his appearance as a Protectorate supporter was not entirely a posture for public consumption. Griffith valued a national church under a supreme governor which would afford some refuge for moderate

religious opinion. He would have taken up employment under Cromwell had he been allowed.

An examination of Griffith's career through these sermons also reveals that his ecclesiology was more complex than the label of 'Laudian' which is often applied to him. Indeed, the book reveals the extent of his discomfort with Laudianism and his conviction that excessive attention to rails and altars had helped occasion the calamity of the 1640s. This attitude, along with his views on the adiaphora of ceremonies and church furniture, offered scope for him to move closer to the presbyterians, a move which is wholly unanticipated by the current scholarship on civil war Wales. Indeed, Griffith's case offers us a signal lesson in the dangers of trying to write history from a single set of polemical sources. His pamphlets during the 1650s are easily read as dyspeptic pieces of partisan vitriol, but a sense of what went before and after allows us to uncover the grey in these publications too; to see that anti-sectarianism was territory that brought together a wide range of opinions and did not simply reify into a hard-line 'Anglicanism' or 'royalism' under the Commonwealth and Protectorate. However, his career does illustrate a point raised recently by Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor that an important aspect of episcopalian identities across the mid-seventeenth century was change; the formulation and reformulation of identities in response to the unprecedented upheavals faced in the Church.<sup>132</sup>

The sermon volume also allows us to see Griffith as a more significant figure in mid-seventeenth century Wales than he has traditionally been portrayed. He gave assize sermons in 1647 but also twice in 1663 - quite a feat of political dexterity. The fact that he was invited to preach before the committeemen and clergy of Radnorshire at the taking of the Covenant is also noteworthy. Indeed, a recalibration of his status and prominence perhaps helps us see the pamphleteering campaign of the 1650s in a new light. Rather than simply being driven by the personal animus, his publishing efforts can be read as a mobilisation by a prominent cleric with

support from both episcopalian and presbyterian constituencies against radical Independency in Wales and the Marches.

So was Griffith merely a Vicar of Bray, willing simply to repeat positions he knew his audiences would favour? He certainly possessed a chameleon quality<sup>133</sup> and a capacity to shift his discourse across the 1640s and 1660s. However, an important trend in recent scholarship on royalist religion during this period is a recognition of its adaptability and responsiveness to changing political realities.<sup>134</sup> Griffith certainly tried to adjust to prevailing circumstances, but there was also a core set of beliefs which ran through his sermons. He supported an erastian national church centred on the parish and the liturgical core of the sacraments. The other lodestone of his religious compass was an inveterate hatred of and opposition to separation and schism. His praise for the Act of Uniformity probably looked like a betrayal of his onetime presbyterian associates, and it may be that his experiences of the 1650s led him to adopt a more rigid position against all dissenters. However, even his Restoration sermons suggest that his support for episcopacy and ceremonial conformity was secondary to the urgent need to combat sectarianism. Thus in 1663 Griffith likely remained temperamentally sympathetic to aspects of presbyterianism, but he considered the edifice of the Restored Church to be the best bulwark against anti-formalism. There is certainly an element of temporising in his sermons, then, but in this respect he was like many episcopalians who tried to pilot the turbulent political and religious waters of the mid-seventeenth century.

The sermon book is a major discovery in the history of mid-seventeenth century Wales. It offers us a new voice alongside those of the 'saints' in understanding the civil war and its aftermath. It represents a source base that has rarely been mined for the study of religion and politics in Wales: the manuscript sermon. Indeed, there are other examples of manuscript

sermons and listeners' sermon notes which might usefully be brought into dialogue with the Griffith volume in future studies.<sup>135</sup> The Folger volume also offers a new vantage point from which we can consider the manufacture and articulation of an episcopalian identity across the mid-seventeenth century conflict. At various times Griffith was the voice of militant royalism, presbyterian accommodation, anti-sectarianism, parish piety, and intolerant Anglicanism. All of these were authentic, but all were products of a particular place and particular set of political and religious circumstances. Contextualising Griffith in the various moments of the extraordinary times which overtook his ministry reveals some of the ways in which episcopalian clergy comprehended and responded to the upheavals of war and persecution.

---

\* I am enormously grateful to Kenneth Fincham, Ann Hughes and Mark Stoyle for their very helpful comments and suggestions on an early draft of this article. I would also thank the journal's anonymous readers for their thoughtful and constructive criticisms and comments. A version of the article was presented to the Tudor and Stuart Seminar at the IHR and I am grateful for the comments and suggestions it received from the audience there. The staff at the Folger Library were most accommodating in allowing me access to Griffith's sermon book when it was undergoing conservation.

<sup>1</sup> P. Jenkins, *A History of Modern Wales, 1536-1990* (1992), p. 419.

<sup>2</sup> T. Richards, *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales* (Liverpool, 1920); idem, *Religious Developments in Wales (1654-1662)* (1923); R.T. Jones, *Vavasor Powell* (Swansea, 1971); G.H. Jenkins, *Protestant Dissenters in Wales, 1639-1689* (Cardiff, 1992).

<sup>3</sup> S.W. Clavier, "Horrid rebellion" and "holie cheate": royalist gentry responses to interregnum government in north-east Wales, 1646-1660', *Welsh History Review*, xxix (2018), 51-72; P. Jenkins, 'The Anglican Church and the unity of Britain: the Welsh experience, 1560-1714', in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, ed. S.G. Ellis and S. Barber (1995), pp. 115-38.

<sup>4</sup> Folger Shakespeare Library, V.a. 616, hereafter 'Sermon book'. On episcopalian identities, see K. Fincham and S. Taylor, 'Episcopalian identity, 1640-1662', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism. Volume 1. Reformation and Identity, c.1520-1662*, ed. A. Milton (Oxford, 2017), pp. 457-82.

---

<sup>5</sup> S.K. Roberts, ‘The sermon in early modern Wales: context and content’, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. H. Adlington, P. McCullough and E. Rhatigan (Oxford 2011), pp. 303-25.

<sup>6</sup> T. Rees, *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales* (1888), pp. 87, 135; P. Davies, ‘Episodes in the history of Brecknockshire dissent’, *Brycheiniog*, iii (1957), 19; E.R. Morris, ‘Llanfyllin dissenting meeting house’, *Montgomeryshire Collections*, lxxi (1983), 11; G.H. Jenkins, *The Foundations Modern Wales, 1642-1780* (Oxford 1987), pp. 54, 59; idem, *Protestant Dissenters*, p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> Sermon book, fos. 66v-67.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., fos. 105v-109v.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., fos. 7v, 8v (reverse foliation).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, fo. 128v (reverse foliation).

<sup>11</sup> Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge, 2010).

<sup>12</sup> For the conventions of sermon structure and composition in this period, see M. Morrissey, ‘Sermon-notes and seventeenth-century manuscript communities’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxxx (2017), 294-8.

<sup>13</sup> A. Milton, ‘Arminians, Laudians, Anglicans, and revisionists: back to which drawing board?’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxxviii (2015), 739, 742.

<sup>14</sup> National Library of Wales, B/BR/2.

<sup>15</sup> Powys Archives, M/EP/50/R/A/1, fo. 1v, Trefeglwys parish register. The entry on this folio is badly damaged, and it is difficult to be certain of Griffith’s handwriting. However, as incumbent he would have been responsible for what was written in the register in any event.

---

<sup>16</sup> Griffith borrowed money from one of the Denbighshire Goodmans to fund a business transaction shortly he arrived at Glasbury: TNA, C8/101/223.

<sup>17</sup> See, for example the presentation of nonconformists to the Breconshire great sessions in June 1641: Nat. Libr. Wales, Great Sessions 4/348/4/100.

<sup>18</sup> The best account of local politics in the area is to be found in S.K. Roberts, 'How the west was won: parliamentary politics, religion and the military in south Wales, 1642-9', *Welsh History Review*, *Welsh History Review*, xxi (2003), 646-74. See also A. Rudrum, 'Henry Vaughan and Breconshire royalism: resistance, collaboration and silence', in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, ed. C.J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia (MO), 1999), pp. 102-18.

<sup>19</sup> Sermon book, fo. 7.

<sup>20</sup> Geoff Browell, 'The politics of providentialism in England, c.1640-1660', unpubl. PhD diss. Kent (2000), 25-6, 41.

<sup>21</sup> Sermon book, fos. 7, 14v-15.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, fos. 9v-10v.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 10v.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 12.

<sup>25</sup> Nat. Libr. Wales, SD1644/21, will of Sir Henry Jones.

<sup>26</sup> Sermon book, fo. 36.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, fos. 40v-41v.

<sup>28</sup> See, for example the discussion of Hereford and south Wales in Worcester College, Oxford, MS Clarke 16, fo. 50.

---

<sup>29</sup> On Harley, see J. Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1990).

<sup>30</sup> British Library, Add. MS 16178, fos. 41, 97, Herefordshire committee for sequestrations order book, 1646-7.

<sup>31</sup> For the continuities and consonances between the prayer book and the *Directory*, see A. Milton, 'Unsettled reformations, 1603-1662', in *Oxford History of Anglicanism. Volume 1.*, ed. Milton, pp. 77-8.

<sup>32</sup> Brit. Libr., Add. MS 16178, fo. 136.

<sup>33</sup> Sermon book, fo. 5.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 5r-v.

<sup>35</sup> Anthony Milton, 'Anglicanism and royalism in the 1640s', in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-1649*, ed. J. Adamson (Basingstoke 2009), pp. 36-60.

<sup>36</sup> Sermon book, fo. 5. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for pointing out the reference to Psalm 80.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 6.

<sup>38</sup> Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford 2007), pp. 236-46. It is perhaps worth noting that the only archbishop then alive was John Williams, a fellow north Walian, although no connections between the two have been established.

<sup>39</sup> Sermon book, fos. 5v-6.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 51.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 58v.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 60r-v.

- 
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., fo. 2 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>44</sup> Milton, 'Anglicanism and royalism', 62.
- <sup>45</sup> Sermon book, fos. 61, 66v.
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid., fos. 67v, 70, 71v.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid., fo. 71v.
- <sup>48</sup> Richards, *Puritan Movement*, pp. 60-1.
- <sup>49</sup> Thomas Edwards, *The Third Part of Gangraena* (1646), pp. 131, 162-3, 241.
- <sup>50</sup> Roberts, 'How the west was won', 663-6.
- <sup>51</sup> The National Archives of the U.K., SP 16/515, fo. 11, committee of accounts in Radnorshire to committee of the whole kingdom, Jan. 1647; SP 28/253A, fo. 28, committee of the whole kingdom to the committee of accounts in Radnorshire, Dec. 1646.
- <sup>52</sup> See British Library, Additional MS 46931A, fo. 66, FitzGerald correspondence.
- <sup>53</sup> Sermon book, fo. 78v.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid., fo. 79.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid., fo. 84. Cf. his sermon of 7 Mar. 1647: Ibid., fo. 104.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid., fo. 82r-v.
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid., fo. 84v.
- <sup>58</sup> See, for example, *ibid.*, fo. 26v (reverse foliation).
- <sup>59</sup> For such provisions from a later period, see E. White, 'The Established Church, dissent and the Welsh language, c.1660-1811', in *The Welsh Language before the Industrial Revolution*, ed. G.H. Jenkins (Cardiff 1997), pp. 235-87.

---

<sup>60</sup> Roberts, 'How the west was won', 666-70; idem, 'Propagating the gospel in Wales: the making of the 1650 act', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, new ser., x (2003), 65-6.

<sup>61</sup> Sermon book, fo. 30v (reverse foliation).

<sup>62</sup> For this body's activities, see Richards, *Puritan Movement*, passim; A.M. Johnson, 'Wales during the Commonwealth and Protectorate', *Puritans and Revolutionaries*, ed. K. Thomas and D.H. Pennington (Oxford, 1978), pp. 233-56.

<sup>63</sup> Bodl. Libr., MS Walker e.7, fo. 214, list of ejected clergymen in Wales, c.1652; Lambeth Palace Library MS 1027, fo. 43, sequestered livings in Wales, 1648-62, Glasbury return, 20 Aug. 1663. He was still signing parish documents as 'minister' in January and February 1651, however: Powys Archives, B/EP/33/K/X/1, pp 23, 76, Glasbury parish charity book; TNA, C8/101/223, Chancery suit, Thomas Sollers v Alexander Griffith and others, 1650-1.

<sup>64</sup> Fiona McCall, *Baal's Priests: The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution* (Farnham 2013), pp. 65-84.

<sup>65</sup> Jenkins, *Protestant Dissenters*, p. 18.

<sup>66</sup> [Alexander Griffith], *Strena Vavasoriensis, A New-Years-Gift for the Welch Itinerants* (1654), sig. A2.

<sup>67</sup> L. Bowen, "'This Murmuring and Unthankful, Peevish Land": Wales and the Protectorate', in *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, ed. P. Little (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 146-64.

<sup>68</sup> *The Petition of the Six Counties of South-Wales and the County of Monmouth* (1652); *Commons Journals*, vii. 103.

<sup>69</sup> *Petition of the Six Counties*, pp. 10-13.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Sermon book, fo. 124v (reverse foliation).

<sup>73</sup> Gunter and Freeman operated together as commissioners investigating sequestered ecclesiastical livings in Wales at the Restoration: Lambeth Palace Library MS 1027, fos. 5, 10-11.

<sup>74</sup> [Alexander Griffith], *A True and Perfect Relation* (1654), pp. 11-15. For Harrison and Creed, see D. Farr, *Major-General Thomas Harrison* (Farnham, 2014).

<sup>75</sup> [Alexander Griffith], *Mercurius Cambro-Britannicus, or News from Wales* (1652). The date on Thomason's copy is 4 Sept. 1652: Brit. Libr., E.674(25).

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., pp. \*2, 7.

<sup>78</sup> T.N.A., E134/15&16 Charles II/Hilary 8, Exchequer depositions by commission in Breconshire and Radnorshire, 1663.

<sup>79</sup> See also *A Perfect Diurnall*, cxliv, 6-13 Sept. 1652, 2155-6.

<sup>80</sup> *A Relation of a Disputation between Dr Griffith and Mr Vavasor Powell* (1653). The earlier publication was *A Welsh Narrative Corrected and Taught to Speak True English* (1652).

<sup>81</sup> Although there is no definite evidence of Alexander Griffith's authorship of *A Welsh Narrative*, it was written by an ejected divine, adopted similar themes and positions to Griffith's other pamphlets and, like those works, mixed Latin quotation and scurrilous verse, the low-brow and the high.

<sup>82</sup> [Griffith], *Strena*. The work's substantial print run, and hence its likely notoriety, is suggested by the numerous copies remaining in major libraries: English Short Title Catalogue, no. R19795

---

at <http://estc.bl.uk/R19795>. It is also the only one of Griffith's tracts which produced a direct printed response.

<sup>83</sup> T.N.A., SP 18/42, fos. 115-17v, information of a meeting at Blackfriars, 19 Dec. 1653.

<sup>84</sup> *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. J. Birch (7 vols., 1742), ii. 44, 124, 128.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 174.

<sup>86</sup> [Griffith], *Strena Vavasoriensis*, p. 17.

<sup>87</sup> Griffith, *Gemitus*, p. 7.

<sup>88</sup> K. Fincham and S. Taylor, 'Episcopalian conformity and nonconformity, 1646-1660', in *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, ed. J. McElligott and D.L. Smith (Manchester 2007), pp. 24-5; A. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 162-6.

<sup>89</sup> [Griffith], *True and Perfect Relation*, p. 29.

<sup>90</sup> [Alexander Griffith], *Gemitus Ecclesiae Cambro-Britannicae* (1654), pp. 1-4. Although this pamphlet is usually unattributed, borrowings from earlier publications reveals the author as Griffith.

<sup>91</sup> S.K. Roberts, 'Alexander Griffith', in *O.D.N.B.* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/11593>> [accessed 18 Jan. 2019].

<sup>92</sup> Edward Allen *et al*, *Vavasoris Examen & Purgamen, or, Mr Vavasor Powells Impartiall Triall* (1654). Thomason dated his copy as 30 March 1654: Brit. Libr., E.723(12).

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>95</sup> Jenkins, *Protestant Dissenters*, p. 2.

<sup>96</sup> Fincham and Taylor, 'Episcopalian conformity and nonconformity', p. 35.

- 
- <sup>97</sup> Sermon book, fos. 42-48 (reverse foliation). It is also the case that Griffith's opponents claimed he was preaching in Herefordshire in Sept. 1652: *A Relation of a Disputation*, p. 5.
- <sup>98</sup> T.N.A., E134/15&16Charles II/Hillary 8. For ejected ministers serving in such occasional roles, see McCall, pp. 236-7.
- <sup>99</sup> Powys Archives, B/EP/33/K/X/1, pp. 24-7.
- <sup>100</sup> Richards, *Religious Developments*, p. 57.
- <sup>101</sup> Davies, 16-26.
- <sup>102</sup> See, for example, T.N.A., SP 29/8, fos. 7, 35-36v, Col. Henry Williams to John Powell and the king, 19 and 23 Jul. 1660.
- <sup>103</sup> James Strong, *Justice Justified* (1658).
- <sup>104</sup> H. Adlington, 'Restoration, religion and law: assize sermons, 1660-1685', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. P. McCullough, H. Adlington, and E. Rhatigan, (Oxford, 2011), pp. 423-41.
- <sup>105</sup> See, for example, Henry Glover, *An Exhortation to Prayer for Jerusalems Peace* (1663), p. 3.
- <sup>106</sup> Sermon book, fo. 109 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 115v (reverse foliation).
- <sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 114v (reverse foliation). For such characterisations of the monarch, in other assize addresses, see B.J. Shapiro, 'Political theology and the courts: a survey of assize sermons, c.1600-1688', *Law and Humanities*, ii (2008), 6-8.
- <sup>109</sup> Sermon book, fo. 116r-v (reverse foliation).
- <sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 117 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>111</sup> M. Goldie, 'John Locke and Anglican royalism', *Political Studies*, xxxi (1983), 65.
- <sup>112</sup> Sermon book, fo. 118r-v (reverse foliation).

- 
- <sup>113</sup> Ibid., fo 119 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>114</sup> For this kind of resolute Anglicanism among those restored to their parishes, see McCall, pp. 247-63.
- <sup>115</sup> Sermon book, fo. 119 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>116</sup> Jones, 'Religion in post-Restoration Brecknockshire', 48.
- <sup>117</sup> T. Richards, 'Alexander Griffith', *The Dictionary of Welsh Biography* (Cardiff, 1959), p. 290.
- <sup>118</sup> Sermon book, fo. 125 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>119</sup> Ibid., fo. 125v-126 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>120</sup> Ibid., fo. 125r-v (reverse foliation).
- <sup>121</sup> John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England* (New Haven and London, 199), pp. 31-2
- <sup>122</sup> Sermon book, fo. 125v (reverse foliation).
- <sup>123</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *Toleration Discuss'd* (1663), p. 86.
- <sup>124</sup> Sermon book, fos. 130-31 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>125</sup> Ibid., fo. 132 (reverse foliation). In this, Griffith was echoing the charge Charles II had given to his judges in July to prosecute dissenters and Catholics: *Lords Journals*, xi. 579-80.
- <sup>126</sup> Sermon book, fo. 133 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>127</sup> This presumably should read 'diffidation', the dissolution of allegiance or trust.
- <sup>128</sup> Sermon book, fo. 133r-v (reverse foliation).
- <sup>129</sup> Ibid., fo. 134 (reverse foliation).
- <sup>130</sup> P. Jenkins, 'The "old leaven": the Welsh roundheads after 1660', *Historical Journal* xxiv (1981), 807-23.
- <sup>131</sup> Powys Archives, M/EP/50/R/A/1, fo. 4, Glasbury parish register.

---

<sup>132</sup> Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian identity’, p. 458.

<sup>133</sup> I have purloined this phrase from one of the reader’s reports.

<sup>134</sup> Fincham and Taylor, ‘Episcopalian identity’; eadem, ‘Episcopalian conformity and nonconformity’; Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, pp. 162-74; idem, ‘Anglicanism and royalism’.

<sup>135</sup> See, for example, the sermon volume preached at Maesmynis and Llanynis in Breconshire between 1655 and 1675: Bangor Archives, BMSS/217.