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This study is an outgrowth of some general reading I did during the 1963-64 academic year on the Anglican Parish Vestry in Colonial Virginia. The influence which vestrymen were described as having possessed in secular as well as religious life interested me, and I felt that a study of the composition and functioning of a particular vestry in the early colonial period would broaden my understanding of this institution. Moreover, the idea of making an in-depth study of an aspect of local history had much appeal, since I am convinced that such studies are the necessary prelude to the re-interpretations of American history which historians now recognize as both warranted and desirable.

Christ Church Parish, Middlesex County, was the locale selected for the study because the parish and county records for the area were unusually complete. The vestry book (1663-1767) and parish register (1653-1812) were among those collected in the nineteenth century by Bishop Meade, who deposited them for safekeeping with the Episcopal Theological Seminary. Both vestry book and register have subsequently been published, and were therefore conveniently available for use. The Middlesex County records for the period under study were also readily available on microfilm from the Virginia State Library.

At the suggestion of my advisor, Dr. John E. Selby, I decided to make a comparative study of the Christ Church vestry at two periods; first at the time of the parish's establishment about 1663 until about...
1680, then at the turn of the eighteenth century, from 1695 until 1710. In this way it was possible to investigate the extent to which there was continuity in the membership, as well as in the functions of vestrymen.

The fact that there was no published history of Middlesex County from which to work was both a blessing and a curse; a blessing because the subject could be approached without preconceptions, a curse because virtually everything had to be established through time-consuming work in original records. Doubtless there are errors — particularly in the biographical material pertaining to the various vestrymen; it was necessary to rely upon a multiplicity of sources, some of them (such as family genealogies) undocumented.

Many people have assisted me in gathering material for this paper. Time has dimmed my recollection of the contributions made by some of them, yet I am particularly indebted to Dr. Selby, to the former director of graduate study, Dr. W.W. Abbot, and to Dr. Jane Carson of the Colonial Williamsburg Research Department. Finally, I owe a great debt to my wife, Ruth Cox Page; without her capable assistance this project would never have been completed.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to compare the composition and role of the vestry of Christ Church Parish, Middlesex County, Virginia during two periods early in that body's existence -- 1663-1680 and 1695-1710. The study is set against a background of some general remarks about Virginia vestries; it has been carried out in part by collating material from secondary sources including family genealogies, but consists principally of data taken from the vestry book and register of Christ Church Parish and from the appropriate Middlesex County records.

On the basis of the study of Parish records, it can be stated that the Christ Church vestry functioned well as an administrative unit, although in practice the churchwardens in any given period appear to have assumed overall responsibility for vestry chores.

There was distinct continuity in the membership of the vestry from the earlier period to the later one -- a continuity which, in part, resulted from the many instances of intermarriage between representatives of the leading Middlesex County families. Of the sixty men who served on the Christ Church vestry between 1663 and 1680 and 1695 and 1710, slightly more than half were found to have been related through direct ties of blood or marriage.

Of the forty-eight vestrymen who also are known to have held political office, more were chosen to vestry service after their elevation to political office than before -- particularly in the later period. Thus, although vestry membership was a "stepping stone" to political power, it was more frequently an honor bestowed upon those who had already achieved a measure of political prominence.
THE ROLE OF THE VESTRY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY VIRGINIA:
CHRIST CHURCH PARISH, MIDDLESEX COUNTY
1663-1680 and 1695-1710
CHAPTER I

THE VIRGINIA VESTRY IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The Virginia colony, we are told in textbook generalizations, was established by "gentlemen." And the characterization holds true -- up to a point. But even before the dissolution of the misfortune-plagued Virginia Company in 1624 and the consequent extension of royal control, the group of "gentlemen" returned to England, to be replaced by recruits from below. Many of the leaders of this new stock were drawn from "the toughest and most fortunate of the surviving planters whose eminence by the end of the thirties had very little to do with the transplantation of social status." Indeed, for some thirty years after the dissolution of the Virginia Company:

The private interests of this group, which had assumed control of public office by virtue not of inherited status but of newly achieved and strenuously maintained economic eminence, were pursued with little interference from the traditional restraints imposed upon a responsible ruling class. Engaged in an effort to establish themselves in the land, they sought as specific ends: autonomous local jurisdiction, an aggressive expansion of settlement and trading enterprises, unrestricted access to land and, at every stage, the legal endorsement of acquisitions.

These, then, were the sort of men who controlled the Virginia vestries in the mid-seventeenth century.

Thus began what a recent historian of colonial Virginia has termed a "quest for power... the manifestation of the political ambitions of the leaders of emerging societies...." The quest began in this
parvenu society at the local level. One who had achieved a measure of economic or social success might serve as a vestryman or militia officer, become a justice of the peace, sit on the county court, and ultimately hope to serve in the Assembly. The Assembly, by the mid 1650's, "was in effect a league of local magnates secure in their control of county institutions."

However, even as this ruling class was taking shape, it was threatened by a new group of immigrants who came to the colony at mid-century. Comprised largely of younger sons "without prospects" at home, this new group arrived in the colony with both ample cash and land claims; it wasted no time in absorbing and subordinating its predecessors, and it laid the basis for the establishment of Virginia's eighteenth-century oligarchy.  

Almost at once the distinction between local and central authority was shattered and, as the new arrivals (by means of kinship and patronage) took control of the latter, the older settlers determined to develop the power of local institutions. Nowhere was this determination to consolidate local control more evident than in the parish vestries.

It was taken for granted by the founders of colonial Virginia, themselves no partisans of religious reform for the most part, that the Church of England would, as a matter of course, become the established church in the colony. But just as wilderness conditions forced the colonists to re-think their social and political institutions, so seventeenth-century Virginians soon found themselves forced to re-think their previously unquestioned acceptance of the patterns of English religious life. Virginians thus "avoided the temptation of making imitation a dogma or building by a blueprint of English life."
The difficult conditions of life on the frontier, coupled with geographical separation from England, and the absence of an adequate episcopal organization in the colonies led the colonists to find pragmatic solutions to their problems. "The Assembly, the governor, and, most important in the development of local self-government, the parish vestry, assumed essential roles in the emergence of the Anglican Church in Virginia."

From the settlement in 1607 until the colony came under royal control in 1624, the church was maintained under the close supervision of the Virginia Company. Between 1610 and 1617 there were only three ministers in the colony -- one each at Jamestown, Kecoughtan, and Henricus. By 1619 the church had two ministers "without orders," evidence of the fact that ministers of Genevan or Presbyterian ordination were licensed to hold parishes in Virginia -- a practice which continued (though infrequently) until after the Stuart Restoration.

It was at least partly owing to the King's distrust of low-church influence in the colony that James decided to dissolve the Virginia Company in 1624. The Virginia Church, thereafter, was gradually made a more nearly orthodox Anglican institution, but the roots of local control had even then taken a hold too firm to be destroyed.

When the Assembly of the planters which King James had ordered to be called first met in 1619, that body endorsed the Church of England as the authorized religious organization in the colony. After the implementation of royal control in 1624, an act of the Assembly provided that there should be "uniformity in our church as neere as may
be to the canons in England; both in substance and circumstance, and that all persons yield readie obedience unto them under paine of censure." Clearly the English authorities had already perceived the trend away from strict adherence to English practice: the phrase "as neere as may be" left the Virginians the leeway which their frontier society demanded, but which might ultimately prove detrimental to the best interests of the church. The qualifying phrase provided evidence that the mother church realized that the absence of a resident bishop (or even of direct association with an English diocese), coupled with the shortage of ministers, and further complicated by untold environmental hazards, might well result in the development of a very different church in the colony. 

The seventeenth-century Virginia church, while eschewing in the main the separatist doctrines concurrently developing in New England, was conscious of the need to appeal to low-church enthusiasts in the colony by making room for all forms of protestantism except those avowedly disloyal to the King or government of the colony. The spirit of the controversy raging in England early in the century between Puritans and Arminians over the relative virtues of a low-church or high-church establishment inevitably spread to the Virginia settlement. Ultimately, of course, the Virginians remained within the Church of England but the Puritan movement "found expression in the institutional organization of the church, where parishes and their vestries effectively developed local political and social control." 

Professor Curtis Nettels has suggested in *The Roots of American Civilization* that local vestry rule and the absence of a church hierarchical structure "gave American Anglicanism an independence
Be that as it may, it is certain that the failure of the home government to provide for an Anglican episcopate in Virginia meant, ultimately, that the House of Burgesses became responsible for ecclesiastical policy.

The House of Burgesses established new parishes and consolidated others, defined parish boundaries, fixed the salaries of ministers, outlined requirements for collection of parish taxes and, in substance, fulfilled those responsibilities which, in England, would have rested with an established diocesan organization or ecclesiastical synod.

Until the office of Commissary was created in 1689, the royal governor of the colony was delegated to serve as the liaison man for the Established Church, though his role as arbiter was almost invariably a frustrating one. The difficulties of the position were particularly appreciated by governors bent on extending (or sometimes merely on sustaining) the royal prerogative. Often they found themselves contesting "an entrenched local self-government in church affairs which they challenged at their peril." The governor's office was responsible, in particular, for certain episcopal functions such as receiving the ministers upon their arrival in the colony, examining their "orders," and recommending them to the attention of vacant parishes.

The Virginia parish, then, represented a departure from its English counterpart in its lack of hierarchical control and in the absence of a bishop resident in the colony. "Freedom of action, which became an inherent principle in the development of the Virginia parish, brought about the predominance of the laity in determining church policy." Perhaps it is not suggesting too much to say that it may well have been this sort of revision of established English practices which, given more
than a century in which to mature, produced the "seeds of liberty" which historians have, of late, been seeking (and finding) in our colonial practices and institutions.

The existence of at least a crude vestry system in Virginia parishes can be traced as early as 1610 or 1611, originating in the "Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, & c." proclaimed by Sir Thomas Dale. Dale ordained that "fourre of the most religious and better disposed" men should be chosen by each minister "to informe of the abuses and neglects of the people in their duties, and service to God, as also to the due reparation and keeping of the Church handsome, and fitted with all reverent Observances thereunto belonging."17 Although the men so appointed acted in essentially the capacity of English churchwardens rather than vestrymen, the system represented an extension to the infant colony of the English laity's participation in local church government. Ultimately, of course, this participation was to grow far greater than that enjoyed in England.

The importance of the laity in the Virginia Church grew rapidly; "in the main it became accepted as a well-entrenched adjunct of other local governmental influences in the seventeenth century."18 Philip Alexander Bruce, the leading historian of colonial Virginia institutions, has characterized the Virginia vestrymen as follows:

Thoroughly understanding the local interests of their parishes, they showed...a determination to support these interests, whether or not their conduct was opposed to immemorial English custom, or brought them in direct conflict with the most influential personages of the colony.19

In the period following the first Assembly of the planters in 1619, what were to become vestrymen for each parish were apparently chosen by
the monthly (later county) court of the area in which the parish was
located. Statutes enacted in 1632 provided for a lay board in each
parish, comprised of commissioners (later justices of the peace), the
minister, churchwardens and a "chiefe of the parish." These arrange-
ments constituted a transitional phase in the evolution of the vestry,
for the first use of the word yet discovered in surviving records was
in September of 1635, in the Accomac County court records. "Bycause
there have heere to for been noe formall vestry nor vestry men appoynted
we have from this present day appoynted to be vestry men those whose
names are underwritten." The precedent was extended and in 1636 the
Assembly directed that a vestry be established in each parish.

The composition of such a body and the question of who was to
choose its members, however, were matters which could not generally be
agreed upon. The 1636 Assembly's action provided no basis for selection
of vestrymen; it apparently did not intend that the power be permanently
vested in the county court. Nor had the Assembly designated a specific
number of vestrymen, beyond the vague assertion that "the most suf-
ficient" men in the parish should serve. When a general revision of
the colony's laws was undertaken at the beginning of the Commonwealth
period in 1643, the law was clarified to provide that, in addition to
"the most sufficient and selected men," the minister and two or more
churchwardens (to be chosen from among the vestrymen) should serve.

Two years later popular election of the vestries was initiated when
the "major part of the parishioners" were allowed "to make choice of
such men as by pluralities of voices shall be fitt."

During the period from 1645 to 1652 the practice of free election
of vestrymen gradually fell into disuse, and the vestry became a self-perpetuating body, electing its own new members to fill vacancies. By 1662 the Assembly had legalized the practice of self-perpetuation by formally granting the vestries the right to select their own replacements when vacancies occurred. At the same session, the Assembly also ordained that no more than twelve men were to serve on each vestry.

Bacon's Rebellion in 1676, and the legislation enacted by "Bacon's Assembly" in the summer of that year, produced evidence of discontent with (among other things) the principle of self-perpetuation. But the reforms of Bacon's Assembly were dissolved by the next meeting of the regular Assembly, and self-perpetuation was resumed. One historian has suggested that the free election principle was not maintained largely because the duties involved took the form of service and takers were few despite the prospect of eventual political reward. Perhaps it was that the Assembly in granting the right of perpetuity, saw in the continuation of membership in the vestries a possibility for permanence in parochial organization that was not otherwise available, and the corporate existence of the vestries, like the county courts, was confirmed.

Whatever the reason there appears to have been little support for the idea that vestrymen were popularly chosen -- or even that a "say" in their choice was widely sought.

As has already been suggested, the vestryman in seventeenth-century Virginia had a variety of functions. At his election to the vestry, the new member was required to subscribe to the Vestryman's
The oath, however, provided only a very general statement of the vestedman's responsibilities; before the end of the seventeenth century that body had developed an impressive array of duties and responsibilities in both the ecclesiastical and civil realms.

The most important ecclesiastical function performed by the vestry was that of making the choice of a minister who, once selected, also became the presiding officer of the vestry. In the Company period the choice of ministers had rested with the governor, but in the period following (prior to 1643), the colony too often became the haven of ministers "who could roar in a tavern and babble in the pulpit." Virginians became exasperated with their dissolute ministry and in 1643 the Assembly acted to redress the difficulty. The vestries were given the power to appoint ministers, and were instructed to report instances of "neglect or misbecoming behavior" to the governor and council for appropriate action.

In practice, however, the law was more informally enforced since clergy were simply not re-hired at the expiration of their first year's employment. Again colonial experience departed from English practice and from English ordering of colonial policy. At home clergymen were chosen by the wealthy patron of the parish concerned and, once having
been inducted by the bishop, could not be removed except for serious moral offenses. In Virginia, although the governor held the power of induction, the vestries preferred to retain the ministers without inducting them -- on a year-to-year basis. This method of employing ministers was continually criticized; instructions were given to one governor after another providing that induction should be carried out, but to no avail. Governors found, upon arriving in Virginia, "that the sentiment of both vestrymen and members of the General Assembly was so strongly opposed to the enforcement of this instruction that it could not be effectively enforced." 32

That the ministers resented the sometimes arbitrary action of the vestry in refusing to extend their term of service is amply demonstrated by Robert Beverley's observation that the clergy in Virginia complained they are liable without Tryal or Crime alleged, to be put out by the Vestry: and though some have prevail'd with their Vestries, to present them for Induction; yet the greater number of the Ministers have no induction: But are entertain'd from year to year... 33

There can be little doubt that Virginia's failure to adhere to the induction procedures of the mother church caused at least some ministers bound for service in the colony to have second thoughts. Yet it should be observed that the "contracts" of most ministers were renewed without question. Nor did released ministers have far to seek for employment: in 1662, for example, there were only ten clergymen in the colony to serve more than forty-five parishes. Indeed, as one historian has observed, "the most significant fact about the clergy at this time is their scarcity; to debate their character is to obscure the major issue." 34

Late in the century Commissary James Blair undertook to interject
a greater degree of discipline into the Virginia clergy; particularly concerned was he with the low salaries paid clergymen, and with what had become a well-established custom of ignoring the induction requirement. The ministers, Blair lamented, were "to their several vestries in the nature of hired servants." But the dispute over induction continued to rage on into the eighteenth century; it was ultimately settled only when the Anglican church was disestablished on the eve of the American Revolution. Had the attempt been successful it "would have meant an interruption of a continuous colonial development of parochial autonomy in Virginia, especially through active intervention by a bishop in the appointment and tenure of ministers."  

A responsibility of the vestries closely related to the hiring of ministers was the requirement that they have charge of the parish real estate, including the church edifice and chapels (if any). The vestry was responsible for maintaining glebe lands, together with a house and the necessary outbuildings, as part of the minister's compensation. Thus in addition to the minister's "cash" salary (paid in tobacco, at a rate set by the Assembly), the vestry might, if it was anxious to hold a minister, offer additional perquisites in the form of a better glebe or glebe house. The vestrymen were also charged with responsibility for control of all lands willed to the parish. In addition, they were to provide interior "ornaments" such as a communion service, with cloth and napkins.  

Two of the vestrymen were ordinarily designated to serve the parish in the quasi-judicial role of churchwardens. These men were broadly responsible for the moral state of the parish. The churchwardens were
charged with making "presentments" of offenders to the county courts for violations of moral law. The churchwarden's oath, formulated by the Assembly in 1632, outlined the responsibilities which the position involved:

YOU shall swear that you shall make presentments of all such persons as shall lead a prophané or ungodly life, of such as shall be common swearers, drunkards, or blasphemers, that shall ordinariely profane the sabbath days or contemne God's holy word or sacraments. You shall also present all adulterers or fornicators, or such as shall abuse their neighbors by slandering, tale carrying or back biting, or that shall not behave themselves orderly and soberly in the church during devine service. Likewise they shall present such maysters and mistresses as shall be delinquent in the catechisinge the youth and ignorant persons. So help you God!

Small wonder that the office of churchwarden was unpopular with vestrymen! As a consequence of the onerous duties, the office was annually rotated. Perhaps, too, even the local leaders who comprised the vestry did not always feel sufficiently circumspect in their own actions to pass judgment on the behavior of their neighbors.

That the churchwarden's responsibilities were not to be taken lightly was indicated by the Assembly's warning (in 1645) that some wardens had been negligent in performing their duties. The county courts were given power to call them into question "and if just cause be, to punish or fine them as the offense shall deserve." While local governmental service could open doors to lucrative posts in the county and even at the level of colonial officialdom, neglect of duty usually brought censure and obscurity.

The churchwardens, together with the vestrymen, were also responsible for determining the needs of the poor and unfortunate, and for
seeing that they were met. In many cases the two duties of the churchwardens overlapped: because bastardy was one of the more frequent charges presented by the churchwardens, it is not surprising to find the care of bastard children a substantial parish expense -- one which perhaps inspired the churchwardens to pursue their investigative duties with more than usual vigor. These men-of-all-work were responsible for apprenticing bastard children under their control, until the children reached the age of thirty. Moreover, the churchwardens . . . were also required to report to the county court the existence of every case in which parents were unable to afford their children a decent maintenance; and under these circumstances, they were authorized to bind these children out for a long term of years in which to acquire a skill in trade.

Children who, in the opinion of the churchwardens, were being brought up in "bad courses" were also bound out in apprenticeship. Furthermore, responsibility for children bound out continued to rest with the churchwardens; in cases where the apprentices were cruelly treated the wardens were to report the facts promptly to the county court. When charges of mistreatment were substantiated the offending master was punished and the child transferred. The churchwardens were responsible for calling attention to all cases of extreme poverty in their respective parishes, and the poor were everywhere dependent directly upon the vestry's aid. At times the recipient of relief served the parish as sexton; he was thus enabled to earn his keep.

In order to meet its responsibilities to the ministers, provide for the upkeep of the church and glebe, and care for the poor of the parish, the vestry was, after 1642, responsible for laying the parish levy. After the vestrymen had reckoned the total expenditure of the
parish for a given year, they computed the number of "tithables" or taxable men (free white adult males and negroes over age sixteen) in the parish, and assessed each an equal share, computed in pounds of tobacco.

The collection of the parish levy was apparently no easier than collections of taxes usually have been, and the churchwardens were doubtless only too willing to surrender that responsibility to the sheriff by the middle of the century. The latter official, already experienced in collection of quit-rents and the county levy, assumed this added duty.\textsuperscript{44} The vestry had power to exempt any parishoner from taxation within the parish "on the ground that he was disabled by age or some physical defect from working in the fields."\textsuperscript{45}

The parish vestry, acting as the local governmental organization, also performed a number of routine secular duties, chief among which was the supervision of land processioning. A 1662 act of the Assembly provided that the vestries were to divide each parish into precincts once every four years, and freeholders of adjoining lands were to examine and, where necessary, renew the boundary marks. The same session of the Assembly provided for the annual appointment, by each of the county courts, of a surveyor of highways. When the surveyor so requested, each vestry was responsible for furnishing sufficient workmen (from among the tithables in the parish) to clear roads and to make or repair bridges.\textsuperscript{46} When a sparsely-settled parish extended to both sides of a river and could not afford to maintain a chapel, the vestry assumed responsibility for operating a ferry; the cost was levied on the parish as part of the annual assessment.
Acting from "a sense of public responsibility rather than from any effective means of accountability," the vestries assumed a vast array of responsibilities over local problems, assuring their solution at the local level where they could best be understood and dealt with. Thus in the colonial Virginia parishes (as was so often the case in colonial America) local conditions and personalities, rather than English precedent or inflexible procedure, determined the way in which each vestry conducted the business to come before it.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I


2 Ibid., 96.

3 Jack P. Greene, The Quest for Power (Chapel Hill, 1963), 11.

4 Bailyn, 98.

5 Ibid., 100.


8 G. M. Brydon, Virginia's Mother Church (Richmond, 1947), I, 28.

9 Ibid., 1, 9.


12 Ibid., 124.

13 (New York, 1939), 479.


15 Ibid., 126.

16 Ibid., 126-27.


I, 63.

20 Seiler, "The Anglican Parish Vestry," 311. The "chiefe of the parish" apparently referred to the chief layman of the parish -- later a vestryman.


22 Seiler, "The Anglican Parish Vestry," 312. A similar act may have been passed in 1634 when the counties were organized, but the records for the period are incomplete.

23 Hening, I, 240. Philip A. Bruce, Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century (New York, 1910), I, 63 gives the impression that the vestries were popularly chosen throughout the period and were "truly representatives of the people."

24 Hening, I, 290-91.


26 Hening, II, 144. The twelve member limit was not strictly adhered to, however. In 1663 one parish had six churchwardens and eighteen vestrymen.


28 **Id.**, 311.

29 The Vestry Book of Christ Church Parish, Middlesex County, Virginia, 1661-1667, ed. C.G. Chamberlayne (Richmond, 1927), 2.

30 Quoted in Brydon, I, 99.
31 Hening, I, 242.

33 The History and Present State of Virginia (Chapel Hill, 1947), 264.


38 Hening, I, 156.
39 Ibid., I, 291.
40 Charles S. Sydnor, Gentlemen Freeholders (Chapel Hill, 1952), passim.
41 Bruce, I, 83-87.
42 Ibid., I, 86.
44 Ibid., 328.
45 Bruce, I, 77.
CHAPTER II

THE PARISH OF CHRIST CHURCH, MIDDLESEX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Middlesex, a narrow crescent-shaped county in the Virginia tidewater region, stretches along the south side of the Rappahannock River to the Chesapeake Bay; the Piankatank River and Dragon Run form its lower boundary. The land area of this middle peninsula is 132 square miles; the soil is well-suited to farming; and agriculture is still the chief occupation. Much of the land is forest; both lumbering and commercial fishing are important sources of employment. Middlesex is bordered on the upper (north) end by Essex County, on the northwest by King and Queen County, and on the southwest by Gloucester County. Across the Piankatank River lies Mathews County and across the Rappahannock, Lancaster County. Urbanna and Saluda are the largest population centers in Middlesex; in 1950 the total population of the county was 6,715.

The Virginia census of 1703 indicated that Middlesex County consisted at that time of 49,500 acres of land and 1,632 people. One of the colony's frontiers in the mid-seventeenth century was this region, where settlement moved westward along the rivers. Captain John Smith, exploring the Chesapeake Bay area in 1608, landed within the present Middlesex County, but because of Indian problems substantial settlement was deferred until after 1649. Several land grants were made in that year, and afterwards growth was rapid. The Act of Cohabitation of 1680
provided for the establishment of a town within Middlesex County; the following year the land, purchased from Ralph Wormeley, was surveyed, and by 1684, a courthouse was begun. The town was named Urbanna in 1705.

Middlesex County was established as a unit separate from Lancaster County (of which it was originally a part) in 1668 or 1669. In the Lancaster County Court records is an entry under date of May 13, 1669, in which a case is referred to the "next Cort. for ye County of Midd." In November of that year the number of tithables for Lancaster County was reduced, and the vestrymen of Christ Church Parish (Middlesex) were no longer included on the list. Clearly the division had been completed by November of 1669. The change seems to have been considered as early as May 11, 1664, when it is recorded that "this day was presented to this Court an order of Assembly for the deviseing of this County into two Countys." The Vestry Book of Christ Church Parish includes the following entry under date of September 16, 1668: "It is Agreed upon that ye Petition Should be Delivered by the Consent of the Pish to the Grand Assembly for the Ratification of ye former Act Made for the County of Lancaster to be Divided into Two Countys."

The first entry in the Christ Church Vestry Book is dated November 19, 1663, and deals with the parish of Lancaster, one of four parishes in what was then Lancaster County. The beginnings of Christ Church Parish may be traced to January 29, 1666, when a general vestry meeting for the part of Lancaster County south of the Rappahannock River was held. At this meeting it was agreed that "ye Two PrishesFormerly called Lancaster and Peancketanck from hence forth be united
as one, and called Christ Church parish." When Middlesex County was established a few years later, the boundaries of county and parish became the same.

In response to an order given by Governor Francis Nicholson in 1700, this contemporary description of the new county was submitted:

Middlesex County is Bounded with Rappahannock River on the north East side and with Pankatanack River and part of the dragon swamp on the South West side thereof. It contains about thirty four miles in Length. . . the Whole County being one parish. . . . The Gleabe land in the said Parrish Contains about four hundred and twenty Acres, situate on Rosegill Creek Very Convenient and good Land. . . on which said Land there was a dwelling house built in the year 1698 which cost the parish seven thousand pounds of sweet scented tobacco. 10

The proximity of rivers, the principal arteries of transportation, was an important factor in the growth of the Middlesex region, and encouraged the development of the small isolated pockets of colonization that were characteristic of the tidewater region. 11

Churches and chapels in Virginia during the early period were usually situated for accessibility from the waterways, and later were often erected at a crossroads. This explains the isolation of many of the surviving structures, in contrast to the village-green location of the New England churches. 12 The "mother church" (edifice) of Christ Church Parish was built about two and a half miles from the present town of Saluda, on the north side of what is now Route 33. The brick church now standing in the village named for it is the second structure to be erected on this site and was completed in 1712.

The first business to come before the vestry of the newly-created parish in the 1660's was the building of this "mother church." Throughout both the early and later periods of this study, much time and
money were devoted to the construction and repair of church and glebe buildings and chapels. The model for the mother church building was to be the Middle Plantation (Williamsburg) church, and six months was the time specified for its completion. The church was placed halfway between the plantation houses of John Grymes and Ralph Worsley, the two most important men in the parish at the time of its construction. After the completion of the structure a committee of the vestry went to view the Williamsburg church in order to make a settlement with the builder. The church yard was then fenced in; communion plate, ornaments and a font were given or purchased.

This church building served as the principal center of worship for the parish until early in the eighteenth century. By order of the vestry at its meeting on January 4, 1710, three new churches were to be built in the parish, one in the upper precincts "instead of the chappell, now gone to ruin." At a later meeting (April 7, 1712) many details of the construction of the "great church" were outlined; this building, which still stands in somewhat altered form, was erected on the site of the seventeenth-century structure.

The vestry turned to the problem of finding a glebe in October of 1667, as required by order of the governor and council. It was decided that the minister, John Shepherd, would arrange to repair a house on the former plantation of Alexander Smith. By July of 1683 the glebe contained four hundred acres of land. A new house, constructed under the supervision of the churchwardens, was in progress by November of 1692. Forty by twenty feet, it had two stories, with two chimneys and plastered walls. Repairs were also noted at the upper and lower
chapels, and new fittings (including a communion table) were acquired. The following description of the glebe property a decade later appears in the Middlesex County records:

Gleab Land in the parrish of Christ Church in this County Contains four hundred acres which Iyes upon a Creeke with a new dwelling house upon it, of Vallye one hundred and thirty pounds sterling & /also/ one hundred acres of Land Given by William Gordon to the said parrish for a free Schoole about Sixteen yeares Since...

The records of the vestry in this parish indicate clearly the problems alluded to in the previous chapter concerning the securing of ministers and their induction. After the dismissal of the first minister, Richard Morris, in January, 1667 (for reasons which the record does not make clear), a new minister was sought. John Shepherd was engaged in June of the following year, and styled "clerk," or curate; he was continued in this position on a year-to-year basis. In 1677 the vestry voted him the usual pay of sixteen hundred pounds of tobacco even though in the previous year Shepherd had been: "Compelled Sometime to leave ye Pish by meanses and Armed Force of Ill Disposed prsons Then in Rebellion..."

Shepherd spent the rest of his days at Christ Church; his will was proved in Middlesex County Court on February 7, 1697/8. In a codicil which had been added to the will in 1682 he specified that, if he died without heirs, his land would devolve upon "the Church, that is to say to ye Minister Churchwardens and Vestrymen of Christ Church Parish. . .for ye use of ye said Church..." His will also listed English servants; county records include a certificate for the importation of twelve persons issued to John Shepherd on June 4, 1683.
Samuel Gray was appointed minister of Christ Church Parish between November of 1692 and December of the following year -- at the beginning of the second period under consideration in this study. He was never inducted, and was dismissed at a vestry held on November 15, 1698, after "relinquishing all Clames he hath to the Prish for the said Consideration of his Induction or otherwise." Doubtless his dismissal was a consequence of the "unfortunate accident yt was at Mr. Grays Concerning the death of his Nullato boy Jack." The county court ruled that the boy had died from blows received at Gray's hand; county records also reveal that a beating was inflicted by the clergyman upon another servant. His successor, Robert Yates, who was formally engaged at a vestry held on June 5, 1699, was granted an additional two thousand pounds of tobacco in excess of his salary in November of 1699. Clearly Yates met with the approbation of the vestrymen, although what had by then become custom dictated that they not grant the security of induction.

In 1702 Robert Yates "desire[d] for England," and a successor and kinsman, Bartholomew Yates, established himself in the parish by the following November. Recorded in the Vestry Book is the business transacted at a Council meeting held at Williamsburg on March 3, 1703. At this session Sir Edward Northey, the Queen's Attorney General, read his opinion that the vestries had the right to nominate and present ministers for induction; he further ruled, however, that the governor could assume these functions if the vestry did not act within six months. Although the effect of this opinion was apparently minimal in Virginia, it did bring a swift attempt at compliance at Christ
At the next vestry meeting a presentation to the governor requesting the induction of Bartholomew Yates as minister was drawn up. Yates remained with the parish for the rest of his life and, at his death in 1731, was interred at Christ Church. His epitaph, quoted below in part, chronicles his achievements:

He was one of the Visitors of William and Mary College / and also / Professor of Divinity in the Royal foundation / In the Conscientious Discharge of his Duty / Few ever Equalled him / None ever Surpassed him / He explained his Doctrine by his Practice / and taught and led the way to Heaven / Cheerfulness the Result of Innocence / Always Sparkled in his Face / and by the Sweetness of his temper / He gained Universall Goodwill. . . . He was Minister of this Parish upwards of 30 years. . . .

In addition to bearing the responsibility for providing church buildings, glebes, and clergymen, the men of the vestry arranged for and oversaw many other details involved in the operation of a parish. One of their important functions was the supervision of land processioning, for the purpose of determining property lines within the county. An order of the county court in November of 1701 describes this function: "Ordered that the Vestry for the parrish of Christ Church in this County devide the said parrish into precincts according to Law for the processioning of Lands and that the Same be accordingly done and performed by the Inhabitants of the said Parrish." Vestrymen chose clerks, appointed lay readers when ministers were not available to conduct regular church services, arranged for the procurement of communion wine, and the care of church linen, and administered the clearing of roads and repairing of bridges.

The care of the sick, the aged, and the poor came within their province; as early as 1667, one thousand pounds of tobacco was voted for John Blaikes, "a poor Decriped Man of This prish." The vestrymen
also provided medical care for parish charges. In November, 1708, the vestry directed that John Gibbs be paid seven hundred pounds of tobacco if he "make a perfect Cure of Christopher Kelshaw's Leg." Otherwise, no payment was to be advanced. Disbursements were made for the care of bastard children, and fines were collected from those who had produced such offspring. The binding out of orphans came within the jurisdiction of the vestry: "Ordered that the next Vestry bind George Comesings an orphan... till he attaines the age of one and twenty years."

The vestry was responsible not only for disbursing parish funds and settling the accounts, but also for collecting the levies which raised money for parish use. This right of taxation was an obvious and important source of the vestry's power. Parishes were ranked in size according to the number of taxable people (tithables) they contained; in 1703 Middlesex had 776 tithables -- the sixth smallest number in the twenty-five counties. The lists of tithables trace the growth of Christ Church Parish. When the listing began in 1667, there were 575. Since Lancaster in 1665 had about 900, the new parish received over half the original county's population. The parish levy and the county and public levies were reckoned on the same head count, and hence after the formation of Christ Church Parish and Middlesex County the numbers listed in parish and court records coincide.

The men of the vestry who were principally responsible for carrying out the wishes of that body were the churchwardens. Christ Church Parish had three -- one each for the upper, middle and lower precincts. Their selection was first mentioned in 1666, when they were directed to
"Collect the Leveys" in the parish. Eventually (1695) it was specified that the churchwardens would keep in their charge the levy for the poor and disperse it for necessary expenditures in each precinct. During the late-seventeenth century the sheriff collected the tithe, but in 1705 the three churchwardens were "Empowered and Authorized to Collect and Receive Ye Parrish Dues for this Present Year 1705 being 35 pounds of Tobaccolae pr poll And it is further Ordered that they Account for the Same in due time, to the Severall persons to whom it is proportioned; by the Aforesd Gentlemen of the Vestry."

Churchwardens appear in the county records in connection with the performance (or non-performance) of functions delegated to them by the church. In 1677 John Burnham, warden of the upper chapel, secured a judgment against one John Ferrill for failure to attend church and for profaning the Sabbath. The situation was reversed in 1708 when the court brought charges against the churchwarden of the upper district for not keeping the church there in good repair. Of the many vestry duties outlined above, most were actually the specific responsibility of the churchwardens. For example, Hening records legislation which required churchwardens to provide the accoutrements of worship for the churches. And Bruce specifically states that the churchwardens acted as the representatives of the vestry, performing the functions of that body.

The vestry as a unit of administrative organization proved quite satisfactory: evidence of accomplishments at Christ Church Parish certainly points to this conclusion. Delegating a few men to
carry the major responsibilities of parish management made it much more reasonable to expect that these duties would be carried out. A small attendance at vestry meetings was early recognized as a problem; in the meeting of May 11, 1669, the presence of four or five vestrymen was approved as a quorum for the conduct of vestry business. Some nine years later, fines for missing meetings of the vestry were instituted.

The power of the Christ Church vestry was considerable; virtually all important secular and ecclesiastical functions in the county and parish were performed by those who served as vestrymen at one time or another. In the two chapters which follow, an analysis of the individual members of the vestry during the two periods under consideration will be made. Such an analysis is essential to an understanding of the factors which might have shaped their perspectives and influenced their actions.
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CHAPTER III
MEN OF THE VESTRY, 1663-1680

Between the years 1663 and 1680, thirty-three meetings of the Christ Church vestry were recorded. Meetings were held annually for nine years and semi-annually for five years; three meetings were held in 1665, four in 1667, and seven in 1668 -- years when the parish was being established.¹

During this period thirty-nine men are listed in the Vestry Book as having been members of the vestry at one time or another. Six attended only one meeting; Major General Robert Smith, present at twenty-two of the thirty-three meetings, holds the attendance record. From ten to thirteen men were usually present at vestry meetings, but on occasion as few as seven or as many as eighteen are recorded as having been in attendance. Naturally in the case of those who attended comparatively few vestry meetings, any influence on and participation in vestry business was minimal; conversely, the duties of the vestry were assigned repeatedly to the faithful members who appeared regularly. The thirty-eight men of the vestry, to be discussed alphabetically, are the following: John Appleton, Robert Beverley, Edward Boswell, Francis Bridge, John Burnham, William Butcher, Henry Chicheley, Robert Chowning, Nicholas Cock, Henry Corbin, John Curtis, William Dudley, Anthony Elliott, William Gordon, John Haslewood, Humphrey Jones, William Leach, John Man, Patrick Miller, John Needles, Richard Perrott, Sr., Richard Perrott, Jr.,

John Appleton, a member of the county court, a commissioner, and high sheriff, was listed with Cuthbert Potter (q.v.) as one of the "undertakers" for the building of the mother church of Christ Church Parish in 1666. His term as sheriff had begun in 1664; he was serving as justice on the county court in 1665. 

Appleton attended only the vestry meeting held on January 29, 1666.

Major Robert Beverley (d. 1686), who attended eleven meetings between 1667 and 1680, was one of the most controversial figures in seventeenth-century Virginia. Born in Yorkshire, England, he arrived in the colony about 1663, "quickly took his place among the leading planters, accumulated property, held public office, and was politically active from the day he stepped on the shores of the colony until his death." He was the father of the historian of the same name. Major Beverley was elected clerk of the House of Burgesses in 1670 and was made a member of the Council in 1676. During Bacon's Rebellion he was staunchly on the side of the governor, commanded a force for the suppression of the rebels, and eventually became Berkeley's commander-in-chief. The royal commissioners appointed to investigate the rebellion found Beverley to have been "the Evil Instrument that fomented the ill humours between the two Governors [Berkeley and Jeffreys]..." Beverley's refusal to release to the commissioners the Journals of the
House of Burgesses led to a royal order for his removal from the Council. However, the command was rescinded. The burgesses supported Beverley's position throughout the controversy. In 1681 Robert Beverley was active in securing petitions for the calling of an Assembly to deal with the problems arising from the extremely low price of tobacco. The Assembly met, but did not order the hoped-for cessation of tobacco culture. A group of small planters led by Beverley then engaged in retaliatory plant-cutting. These activities led to Beverley's confinement in the custody of Major General Smith, and ultimately to his apology before the members of the Council.

As a vestryman of Christ Church Parish, Major Beverley acted as churchwarden for the lower precincts in 1667 and 1680, collected parish levies in 1670 and 1673, and in 1677 oversaw work undertaken at the lower chapel. His first wife, Mary Keeble (who died in 1678), was buried at Christ Church. At the time of his death in 1686 the value of Robert Beverley's personal property was estimated at about £5000, including furniture, silver, and slaves. He was one of the wealthiest planters of his era. The terms of Beverley's will indicate that his plantations in Middlesex County were only part of his vast holdings, which also included land in Gloucester, Rappahannock, and New Kent counties.

Edward Boswell was described as a "sidesman" or assistant to the churchwardens in the parish of Lancaster in 1657; he had owned land in Lancaster County as early as 1653, and was described in a deed of December 3, 1658 as having a plantation, livestock, and servants. He is not known to have been delegated any specific responsibilities in the parish of Christ Church.
Francis Bridge (d. 1677/78) held the county offices of justice of the peace (1675) and high sheriff (1677). At his death he left to his widow, Margaret, the "worldly estate wherewith it hath pleased God to endow me," including land in old and New England, Virginia, and Barbados. He was appointed churchwarden to replace Ralph Wormeley in 1677, the only year in which he was present at a vestry meeting.

John Burnham (d. January 4, 1680), a bachelor, in 1677 served as churchwarden and selected a chest for use at the upper chapel; later, he was buried in the chancel there. Burnham's father, Rowland, the first of the family in Virginia, came to York County, but had removed to Lancaster County by the time of his death in 1655. The elder Burnham was a member of the House of Burgesses for several terms during the 1640's. John Burnham, who was described as owning land in the upper part of Christ Church parish, was a member of the House of Burgesses in 1680. For the two previous years he had served as high sheriff for Middlesex.

William Butcher attended most of the vestry meetings held between 1666 and 1668, but we know little about the man. He appears to have been one of those who took no real part in vestry affairs, contributing scarcely more than his presence at meetings. He took the vestry oath on January 30, 1666.

Sir Henry Chicheley (1615-1682/83), one of the most influential and powerful men in Virginia in the second part of the seventeenth century, attended eight meetings of the Christ Church vestry between 1666 and 1680. The first meeting of the vestry of the newly-formed parish was held on January 29, 1665/66 at his residence. He served as
churchwarden in 1674, and in 1676 was reimbursed for shingling and other work done on the church and church yard.  

A graduate of Oxford, Sir Henry had been a royalist officer in the Civil War before coming to Virginia about 1649. He represented Lancaster County in the House of Burgesses in 1655 and 1656; some years later (1668), he headed the list of tithables in the south side of the county with forty-eight. Sir Henry was in England for a time in about 1660, and after his return to the colony his role in political affairs became increasingly important. Chicheley served on the Council, and in 1673 was commissioned lieutenant-general of Virginia forces under Governor Berkeley. As such, he was commander of the troops ordered raised by Berkeley to take action against the Indians in 1676. Sir Henry Chicheley had been appointed deputy governor of Virginia on February 28, 1673/4, and came into the office upon the death of Governor Jeffreys in 1678. During Governor Culpepper's absences from the colony -- as before his arrival there -- Chicheley filled the post of principal royal representative in the colony. In his Time the Assembly, for the greater Terror of the Indians, built Magazines...and furnished them with Arms, Ammunition, and Men in constant Service. In the course of Sir Henry's regime concern over the low price of tobacco became extreme. In compliance with several petitions and at the urging of Robert Beverley, he called the Assembly into session in 1682. When no solution was found, riots broke out and the militia had to be summoned to suppress the disturbance. Although Sir Henry Chicheley left no children, he was connected through marriage to the Kemp, Burnham, and Corbin families, as well as to the Wurmeleys.
Robert Chowning (d. before September, 1698) served as churchwarden for the upper chapel in 1668, although none of the six vestry meetings he attended were held in that year. He was appointed constable in March of 1685.22

Nicholas Cock (d. 1687) served as churchwarden for the upper chapel from 1668 until 1675 and again in 1680. He, together with Henry Thacker (q.v.) was charged in 1667 with the responsibility of comparing the newly-completed mother church with that at Williamsburg (the intended model) in order to settle with the builders of Christ Church. Ten years later he, with three others, went "to View ye work done on the Lower Chappell by Mr Richard Parrott Junr. . . . ."23 In the interim Cock had arranged for construction and repairs at the chapel in his own precinct. Cock, appointed in 1686 a surveyor of the highways in the upper precincts, was originally granted 600 acres of land in Lancaster County (1653); thirty years later he was granted an additional 346 acres in Middlesex.24

Henry Corbin (1629-1676) attended eleven out of the first twelve meetings of the Christ Church vestry, and was present at five additional meetings prior to 1674. Born in Warwick County, England, he came to Virginia in 1654, settling first in King and Queen County. He then removed to "Buckingham House," Middlesex. Corbin married Alice Eltonhead Burnham, widow of Rowland Burnham, in 1656.25 One of their daughters, Alice, married Philip Lightfoot, and another, Lettice, married Richard Lee, establishing early ties with other prominent Virginia families.26 Corbin, a justice of the peace in Lancaster County in 1657, served as a member of the House of Burgesses from 1658 to 1660,
and as a Councillor beginning in 1663. During the events of Bacon's Rebellion thirteen years later, he, like Ralph Worneley (q.v.) and others of the Virginia establishment, was clearly on the governor's side. He wrote as follows on June 5 of 1676:

"In Virginia not only the natives are at war with you, but yt wch is much worsese severall of the English to the number of abt 5 or 600 are in Rebellion to ye Governor, being headed by one of ye Counciill. . . .they have proclaimed Ther Leader Bacon by name, Governor, wt the Issue will be is uncertaine but surly the Consequence must be bad to the whole Country in Generall. . . ."

Until his death in 1676 Corbin was an active vestryman. The first recorded vestry meeting, on November 19, 1663, was held at his house; he was at that time chosen to keep the parish register until a clerk was appointed. In the next few years, he was involved in making arrangements with the minister, selecting a site for the church, and settling the boundaries of the parish. In 1666 he and Major General Robert Smith (q.v.) were "requested to move to the Assembly for Continuing the Union of the Two late Parishes of Pyancktanke and Lancaster." He was responsible for swearing in churchwardens for the upper chapel in 1671, and in 1675 was himself chosen a warden.

John Curtis, churchwarden in 1665, was charged with contracting with workmen for the building of the original mother church. He represented Lancaster County in the House of Burgesses in 1660, and also served on the county court.

William Dudley, warden in the lower precinct from 1668 until 1675, oversaw the completion of the chapel in that precinct as well as "payling in ye Church Yard and making ye Horse Block." His father was
probably Edward Dudley, who was living in York County by 1651. William seems to have moved from Gloucester to Middlesex, where he served as a justice in 1676.

Anthony Elliott (d. 1666), a member of the Council in 1657, died after having been in attendance at only one vestry meeting. A justice of the peace for Lancaster County in the year of his death, he was the second husband of Frances Armistead, who married (third) Elliott's fellow vestryman, Christopher Wormsley (q.v.).

William Gordon (d. before April 5, 1685) was present at meetings of the vestry only in November of 1670 and again in November of 1671. He was made churchwarden for "the great Church" in the former year. According to the terms of his will (1685), Gordon was the donor of two cows and one hundred acres of land "for ye use and bennifitt of a Free Schoole."

John Haslewood is a vestryman about whom relatively little is known: this lack of information may be explained at least in part by the fact that he probably left the colony for England in 1675. Haslewood was appointed churchwarden for the upper precincts on December 31, 1666, about six months after he was discharged from his constabulary and succeeded by Humphrey Jones (q.v.).

Humphrey Jones (d. 1684) attended twelve vestry meetings during this period. He was appointed churchwarden for the upper precincts in 1667 and 1679; in this capacity he is known to have taken part in the collection of the parish levy. Jones apparently lived near the upper chapel, where his wife was buried on January 12, 1678. Two years later he secured two forms, or benches, for that church; he had previously
(1677) "out of his pious Zeale and love to ye Church. . .bestowed a Silver Bowle. . .and a Pewter Flagon, and a pewter plate, for Communion plate. . ." upon the upper chapel. 40 Humphrey Jones served as surveyor of the highways in Middlesex County in 1679. 41

**William Leach** was living on the north side of the Rappahannock in Lancaster County in 1657, and was appointed a justice of that county in 1659. 42 He attended vestry meetings between 1666 and 1668, serving on the committee to arrange with the minister to stay on a yearly basis, rather than to require induction.

**John Man**, appointed churchwarden for the lower precincts in 1679, attended only two vestry meetings in the period under consideration. He served as justice of the peace for Middlesex in 1677, as surveyor of the highways in Piankatank (1679) and "undersheriff" (1676). 43

**Patrick Miller**, who preceded John Man as churchwarden for the lower precincts by ten years, also acted as surveyor of highways (1669). 44 His vestry service was in 1666 and 1667.

**John Needles** (d. 1691) was present at seventeen meetings of the vestry between 1666 and 1678. In spite of his noteworthy record of attendance, there is no record that he fulfilled any functions for the parish. Nothing is known of him except that he was living in Lancaster County by 1654. 45

**Richard Perrott, Sr.** (d. 1686), who probably came to Lancaster from York County some time prior to 1654, was appointed in turn high sheriff for Lancaster (1657) and Middlesex (1670). He was presiding justice of the county court in 1676 and 1677. 46 During the first years of Christ Church Parish he served the vestry as liaison man for ministerial affairs. In January, 1666, the vestry ordered a letter written to him, "now in England to procure us a Minister to come
Both Perrott Sr. and his son were appointed as churchwardens for 1677.

Richard Perrott, Jr. (b. 1657), the son of Richard Sr. and Margaret Perrott, was reputed to have been "the first Man child that was gott and borne in Rappahannock river, of English parents." As churchwarden for the lower precinct, he procured a chest for the chapel, work on the structure having been undertaken and completed. Prior to his vestry service he had been (in 1675) high sheriff of Middlesex County.

Cuthbert Potter (d. 1691) shared with Henry Corbin several committee assignments relative to the establishment of the parish; these included the arrangements with the Reverend Mr. Morris and the settlement of the parish boundaries. He also was one of the "undertakers" for the mother church, in which capacity he was delegated to assist in collecting the parish levy. In 1667 he was involved in finding a glebe, and later dispensed four thousand pounds of tobacco and £5 "for Ornaments for ye Church and for a funt." County records indicate that Cuthbert Potter was a member of the court of Lancaster County in 1653, a constable in 1656, and high sheriff in 1667 and for Middlesex County in 1682. In 1690 he was sent by Governor Francis Nicholson on a mission to New England, and the following year sailed for Barbados, where he died.

Christopher Robinson (1645-1693), a prominent member of a family that was well known in Virginia government during two centuries, took the oath as clerk of the Middlesex County Court on January 3, 1675/6. He represented the county in the House of Burgesses (1680-1682; 1685-1692), served on the Council, and in 1692-1693 acted as secretary of
state for the colony. One of the original trustees of the College of William and Mary, he lived at "Hewick" (ca. 1678), and married (second) the widow of Major Robert Beverley. He was voted onto the vestry in November of 1679 and served as churchwarden for the middle precinct in the following year.

Richard Robinson (whose possible relationship to Christopher is not known) was chosen a vestryman in 1671, and continued to attend meetings until the end of the period under discussion here. In 1673 he arranged for repairs to the mother church, and in 1679 served as churchwarden for the middle precincts. He was appointed sheriff for Middlesex in 1673, replacing Cuthbert Potter who was departing for England.

John Scarbrough, member of a family which was established in the colony by the 1630's, was present at four meetings of the Christ Church vestry; these meetings were held between 1667 and 1672. Upon his discharge from the office of constable in Lancaster County, he was succeeded by his fellow-vestryman, William Dudley.

Sir Gray Skipwith, a royalist, came to Virginia during the Civil War with his brother-in-law, Edward Dale. He married Ann, widow of Edmond Kemp, and mother of Matthew Kemp (q.v.). Sir Gray was the father of Sir William Skipwith (q.v.); concerning the family's position in Virginia Hugh Jones wrote: "there is one baronet's family there, viz. Sir William Skipwith's." During the years when Sir Gray's attendance at vestry meetings was recorded (1666 and 1668) his only specific duty was to serve on a committee to continue Richard Morris as minister in the parish on a yearly basis.

Major General Robert Smith (d. 1687) of "Brandon" attended
meetings of the vestry of Christ Church Parish over a period of thirteen years, and was usually listed first among those present. From January 29, 1666, through September 5, 1672, he was present at every meeting. During these years he was responsible for negotiations regarding a minister, for the swearing in of churchwardens, and for the procuring of "Ornaments for this great Church." 61 Robert Smith is recorded in the 1659 Lancaster County list as having twenty-five tithables. In 1663 he was chosen for membership on the Council. Three years later Smith was appointed a commissioner to negotiate with Maryland on the suspension of tobacco planting. 62 He was one of a committee that presented to the English court at Whitehall a land petition on behalf of Virginia in 1675. Acting on the governor's command, Smith in May of 1682 imprisoned on shipboard Robert Beverley, who had incited plant-cutting in the heated tobacco controversy of the previous year. 64

Henry Thacker (d. after 1673) was assigned duties regarding church property similar to those of Nicholas Cock. At the meeting of November 25, 1673, he was delegated to investigate the possibilities of securing the plantation of Alexander Smith as a glebe. However, he attended no more meetings, since his death occurred soon after that date. In 1673 he was also serving as a justice for Middlesex County. 65

Richard Thacker is a much less distinct figure than is his probable kinsman, Henry. He was present only at the vestry meeting of January 29, 1665/66 and is not known to have carried out any vestry assignments. Of his political life nothing is known.

John Vause (d. 1679), a constable in Lancaster County in 1663,
later (1673) became a Middlesex County justice. A kinsman of Christopher Robinson, Vause had a son of the same name whose activities are difficult to separate from those of the father. John Sr. attended seventeen vestry meetings between the first one and the year of his death. He served as warden of the "Great Church" during the 1670's.

George Wadding was chosen churchwarden for the lower precincts on December 31, 1666. Although he attended meetings frequently in 1667 and 1668, his role in the activities of the vestry is not recorded.

Thomas Warwick, warden for the upper chapel in 1670, was replaced in the following year by Nicholas Cock. He seems to have been present at only two vestry meetings.

Abraham Weeks (d. 1691/2), a justice of Middlesex County in 1673 and 1681 (as he had been for Lancaster in 1666), served in the House of Burgesses in the 1680's. During his several terms as churchwarden between 1665 and 1678, Weeks was responsible for the building of the mother church, and for finishing the chapel in the upper district. His concerns extended to the parish sick: on February 15, 1668 he informed the vestry of the illness of "Mr Morgaine," who was provided with a barrel of corn.

Walter Whittaker (d. July 27, 1692) also was a member of the House of Burgesses. He filled the post of sheriff of Middlesex in 1677, 1679, and 1685, and of a justice in 1673. No specific duties carried out by Whittaker, designated as churchwarden in 1675 and 1678, are recorded. He is referred to in contemporary records as "Doctor" or "Captain," and was apparently a physician by profession.

Thomas Willis was a sidesman (or assistant to the churchwarden)
in Lancaster County in 1657. In 1667 and 1668 he served as constable and as a burgess from Lancaster. Having lands in Middlesex as well as Lancaster County, he served as warden at Christ Church in 1668, and attended most of the vestry meetings prior to December of that year. Perhaps his disappearance indicates that he died at about that time, although his death is not recorded in the parish register.

Christopher Wormeley (d. 1701) owned land in both James City and Middlesex counties. Having served as a justice in Lancaster (1667) and Middlesex (1674), he became high sheriff for Middlesex in 1681. In this capacity he took to the governor the Middlesex County Protest, which urged the calling of an Assembly. Wormeley was also a member of the Council, and collector and naval officer of the Lower Potomac. He was added to the vestry in 1666, and in 1677 was commissioned to report on the work completed at the lower chapel under Richard Perrott, Jr., as supervisor. The relationship of Christopher Wormeley to the "Rosegill" Wormeleys is not clear.

Ralph Wormeley (1650-1701), who was added to the vestry on September 5, 1672, when he was twenty-two years old, was to serve during both periods of this study. He served as churchwarden in 1676 and in 1678 presented the parish with a "large Silver Flaggon for Common plate Subscribed (Christ Church in ye County of Middlesex) ... for the Use of the said Church for Ever." The son of Ralph I, who came to York County, Virginia, in 1636 and became a prominent planter, Ralph Wormeley was described in The Present State of Virginia and the College as "the greatest man in the government, next to the governor." One of the best-educated
native-born Virginians of his day, he studied at Oxford (and later sent his sons to schools in England); his large and well-chosen library reflected his many interests. The 5,200 acres he had along the Rappahannock was the largest single tract in Middlesex County and he owned additional land in other counties. "Rosegill" (ca. 1650), Wormeley's family seat in Middlesex, was a social center of the colony. The Huguenot, Monsieur Durand, who came to Virginia in 1686 and was entertained by Wormeley, recorded his impressions of his host's style of life:

He holds the highest offices, and owns at least twenty houses in a lovely plain along the Rappahannock River. He has rented his most comfortable house to the Governor. When I reached his place, I thought I was entering a rather large village, but later was told that all of it belonged to him.

Louis B. Wright styled Ralph Wormeley as being "nearest to the picture of the fabled Virginia cavalier," noting, however, that "he bore a full burden of civil, military, and religious responsibilities." As a member of the Council beginning in 1677 (and president of it in 1693), secretary of state of the colony (1693-1701), collector (of shipping revenues), and naval officer of the Rappahannock, he was possibly the most influential planter in the colony. He was, in addition to his governmental posts, named in the charter of William and Mary (1693) as one of the trustees of the college. On the local level, Ralph Wormeley was a colonel in the county militia, a justice of the county court, and, in the view of one historian, "the leading vestryman of Christ Church." In 1674 Wormeley, stepson of Sir Henry Chicheley, married Katherine Lunsford, the daughter of a royalist emigré. After her
death in 1685, she was buried in the chancel of Christ Church. Wormeley then married Elizabeth Armistead, daughter of another member of the Council and later wife of William Churchill (q.v.).

The future of his sons, Ralph and John, was referred to by Robert Carter as follows:

Ralph in Prospect will have a fine Estate, Jo[hn] a Tolerable good One; yet it will hardly be Con[man] believable in either of them, to follow their fathers stepp in all things. I will not undertake to prophecy that they will be Secretaries or Navall Officers.

Wormeley's daughters, Elizabeth, Judith, and Catharine (Corbin), as well as his widow and sons, were well provided for by the terms of his will. His estate was inventoried by William Churchill (q.v.), John Smith (q.v.), Harry Beverley (q.v.), and Christopher Robinson (q.v.). Its total value was £2861.6.0, including his library and some rather elaborate furnishings such as "1 Scrou[tor]desk and bookcase 2.0.0." Ralph Wormeley died in 1701, well into the second period of this study; he was present at meetings of the Christ Church vestry through 1698.
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CHAPTER IV

MEN OF THE VESTRY, 1695-1710

Twenty-nine meetings of the Christ Church vestry were recorded during the period from 1695 to 1710. These meetings were held annually for eight years, and semi-annually for four years; three meetings each were held in 1699, 1709, and 1710, and four in 1707. Twenty-four men are listed as having been members of the vestry at some time within this period. The names -- and in some cases even the individuals -- are familiar, many of them having appeared in earlier years. Beverley, Cock[, Corbin, Dudley, Kemp, Robinson, Skipwith, Thacker, Willis, and Wormeley represent a distinct continuity in the membership of this body. The twenty-four men of the vestry in this period will be discussed alphabetically. They are Harry Beverley, William Churchill, Maurice Cock, Gawin Corbin, Robert Daniel, William Daniel, Robert Dudley, John Grymes, Matthew Kemp, Richard Kemp, William Killbee, Christopher Robinson, John Robinson, William Skipwith, John Smith, Edwin Thacker, Henry Thacker, James Walker, Francis Weeks, Richard Willis, Christopher Wormeley, Ralph Wormeley, William Wormeley, and George Wortham.¹

Harry Beverley, one of the three sons of Major Robert Beverley, was sworn in as a vestryman in November of 1702, and during his several terms was churchwarden for the middle precinct, took bond for Richard
Kemp (q.v.), who kept the parish accounts in 1707, and received one thousand pounds of tobacco "for going to the Govern" in 1704. He also acted as surveyor of the highways in the lower precincts (1703), as a justice on the county court (1705, 1706), and as a member of the House of Burgesses (1705-1706).

William Churchill (1649-1711) is among the important planters included in the membership of the vestry during this period. Churchill first appears in public office as deputy sheriff in Middlesex County in 1674. He served in the House of Burgesses during 1691 and 1692, and from 1705 to 1710 was a member of the Council. As churchwarden for the lower precincts of Christ Church Parish in 1696 and 1704, he acted principally on behalf of the underprivileged. The case of William Churchill provides an interesting example of the interaction that could occur between vestry and county court. The records of Middlesex orphans' court for July 7, 1707, include a petition of one Thomas Griffin, who claimed he was illegally kept as a servant by Churchill. The court decreed that "said Griffin be discharged from his said Masters Service and that he go to ye next Vestry to be held for ye parish of Christ church to be bound out to a handy craft trade or mariner according to Law." At a vestry meeting on July 24 of that year Griffin was ordered "bound to William Churchill Esqr According to Law." By the terms of his will, dated November 8, 1710, Churchill gave £100 to Christ Church and specified that it be put to Interest and the interest money be given to the Minister or present Incumbent for preaching four -- Quarterly sermons yearly against the four reigning Vices, Vizt. Atheism and Irreligion Swearing and Curseing, Fornication and Adultery and Drunkeness and this I would have done forever.
The will of Elizabeth Armistead Churchill (who was the widow of Ralph Wormeley when she married Churchill about 1703) also included bequests to Christ Church. These were £10 to purchase a pulpit cloth, and £20 for "the poor widows of the said parish." The document also committed Armistead Churchill to the care and tutorage of Mr. Bartholomew Yates, minister of Christ Church, in respect to his education. . . . Yearly . . . shall be allowed and given . . . to the said Mr. Yates two of the best beves and four of the best hoggs . . . towards the maintenance of my said son over and above what the said Mr. Yates shall demand for his trouble of teaching and charge of board.

The household inventory of William Churchill of "Wilton" and "Bushy Park" is extensive. In addition to gilt-framed pictures, carpets, and many leather and cane chairs, an enormous quantity of silver is listed. The estate was clearly that of a well-to-do Virginian of the early eighteenth century.

Maurice Cock was the son of Nicholas Cock, a vestryman during the early period. He attended only one meeting, and is not recorded as having performed any specific vestry duties.

Gawin Corbin (1669-1744) was also the son of a former vestryman, Henry Corbin. He was added to the vestry in 1698, and chosen churchwarden for the upper precincts. In this capacity he was charged with responsibility for having the windows "mended" and any other necessary repairs carried out at the upper chapel. He also secured a new communion table for the building. In 1710 Corbin took part in negotiations for land and the construction of a new church in his district. A member of the House of Burgesses for several terms between 1699 and 1705 and 1715 and 1720, Gawin Corbin is described in the Middlesex County
records as a merchant. 15 His first wife was Catherine, daughter of Ralph Wormeley. 16

Robert Daniel (d. 1721) served the vestry as churchwarden for the upper precincts in 1702 and 1709. Probably the son of William Daniel (q.v.), his only other recorded vestry activity was as a member of a committee to oversee the building of the new church in 1710. 17 In spite of his seeming lack of participation in vestry affairs, he was diligent in his attendance, having been present at twelve meetings between 1702 and 1710.

William Daniel (d. 1698) may have played much the same role in vestry business as did his son; he attended only the first three meetings held in this period, and insofar as is known did not fulfill any specific functions for the parish. As a Middlesex County justice during the 1680's, William Daniel was one of a committee of two delegated to investigate building "a Court house and prison in Mr. Richd. Robinson's old Feild. . . ." 18 Captain Daniel received from Christopher Robinson the "Trumpetts, Drums, Coullours & other Trophies fitt . . . for . . . Troopes of horse & Companies of Foot. . ." which Robinson had procured from England for county use — probably in the militia. 19

Robert Dudley (d. 1701) was the nephew of William Dudley, a member of the Christ Church vestry during the 1660's and 1670's. Sheriff of Middlesex during 1691 and 1692, Dudley represented the county in the House of Burgesses at five sessions between 1685 and 1699. 20 In the latter year he was appointed a major in the Virginia militia, of which his fellow vestryman, Ralph Wormeley, was commander. 21 The inventory of Dudley's household goods, taken December 1, 1701, includes quantities of dry goods described as being in the store (or "old store"), an
indication that he was probably a merchant. Dudley was not present at vestry meetings after 1699.

John Grymes (1660?-1709), another influential planter, migrated from adjacent Gloucester County to Middlesex, where he established his residence at "Grymesby" on the Piankatank River. He was a justice of the county court (1699) and colonel of the Middlesex militia as well as a vestryman of Christ Church Parish (1695-1708). In November of 1695 he was appointed churchwarden for the middle precinct, and shortly thereafter was instructed to "take Speedy Care to Repaire the Church in the Said Precinct and to build a Stable of a Convenient Bigness, and to payle in a Church Yard..." Grymes supervised other repairs at the church and provided for certain sick parishioners during his tenure as churchwarden. In November, 1708, he refused to serve longer on the vestry, and a replacement was chosen. It is probable that Grymes's resignation was occasioned by ill health, since he died the following year: in his will, dated July 1, 1708, he describes himself as "sick & weak." By the terms of the will John Grymes left his lands in Richmond, Gloucester, King and Queen, and Middlesex counties to his sons, Charles and John. John (II) and his wife, Lucy (Ludwell), are buried at Christ Church, Middlesex; his epitaph proclaims that he "many Years acted / In the publick Affairs of this Dominion / With Honour Fortitude Fidelity. . . ."

Matthew Kemp (d. 1717) and Richard Kemp (q.v.) served concurrently on the vestry of Christ Church Parish during the period from 1695 to 1710. Of the two, Matthew seems to have been the more prominent. He served as a burgess from Middlesex County during three sessions between 1685 and 1697 and as sheriff for several terms (1687-1689; 1701, 1706).
Consequently, his name appears frequently in the county records; he was often involved in bringing suits, testifying, or obtaining judgments. As churchwarden of the lower precincts, he arranged for repairs to the chapel, provided wine for communion, and appointed a new sexton; his service as warden was in the years 1695, 1700, 1707, 1709, and 1710. Kemp became the object of specific vestry action in 1700 when it was ordered that Jane Floyd Serve It. Collo Kemp one yeare for her offence in haveing a bastard begotten by her Master and the said It. Collo Kemp doth promise . . . to pay the Prish Five hundred pounds of Tobacco this Ensuing Yeares, In Consideration of the said yeares Service. Kemp became the object of specific vestry action in 1700 when it was ordered that Jane Floyd Serve It. Collo Kemp one yeare for her offence in haveing a bastard begotten by her Master and the said It. Collo Kemp doth promise . . . to pay the Prish Five hundred pounds of Tobacco this Ensuing Yeares, In Consideration of the said yeares Service.

Like his kinsman Matthew, Richard Kemp served as churchwarden (1702, 1705, 1707) — but for the upper precincts. In 1707 the vestry directed that the new church in the district be built on his plantation, "near Pipers Spring." Kemp's chief vestry activities were the collection and distribution of the parish levy, and the boarding of several of the parish poor. His civil responsibilities included acting as surveyor of the highways (1702) and as sheriff (1710). William Killbee (d. 1705/6), who attended four vestry meetings between 1703 and 1706, acted as churchwarden for the lower precinct in 1705, and was one of a committee of three that collected the parish levy for that year. He was a justice of the peace in 1702 and surveyor of the highways two years later.

Christopher Robinson (1681-1727), son of the former vestryman of the same name, first appeared at a vestry meeting in 1707. For the next two years he was a churchwarden in the upper precinct, where he oversaw the glebe buildings and took bond with Richard Kemp, who was in 1707 responsible for the parish accounts. During this period (1708)
Robinson was appointed surveyor of the highways; he also served as a member of the House of Burgesses for several terms between 1705 and 1714. He married Judith, daughter of Christopher Wormeley, and lived at "Hewick," the Robinson family seat in Middlesex.

John Robinson (1683-1749), brother of Christopher, was educated in England and married Katherine, the daughter of Major Robert Beverley. The second son of this marriage was Speaker John Robinson, a familiar figure to students of eighteenth-century Virginia history. John himself served in the House of Burgesses from 1711 to 1714; in 1720 he was appointed a member of the Council, and in 1749 became acting governor. As a vestryman and warden of the middle precinct, his obligations were varied: he took bond for Richard Kemp's handling of the parish accounts (and later received the accounts), provided communion wine, oversaw the construction of the new church, and assumed responsibility for some of the sick parishioners. He was present at every vestry meeting from November 18, 1706 through 1710.

"Sir William Skipwith Kt High Sher. of this County" was the son of former vestryman Sir Gray Skipwith. In this post he was charged with receiving the parish levy in 1695, 1696, 1702, and 1704. On February 15, 1704, he was the signer of a petition to the governor requesting the induction of Bartholomew Yates as minister for the parish. Sir William was made churchwarden for the lower precincts of Christ Church Parish in 1708; he was a frequent attender at vestry meetings, being listed as present at sixteen sessions between 1697 and 1710.

John Smith (d. 1725) attended more vestry meetings than did any of
his colleagues; he missed only two between 1695 and 1710. In this respect he resembles his probable kinsman in the early period, Major General Robert Smith. Although the relationship between these two men has not been established, it is likely that the three separate families living in Middlesex about 1660 and bearing the surname Smith were related.\(^2\) John Smith's frequent presence at the meetings of the vestry is reflected in the many references to his duties which appear in the parish records. As warden in the middle precinct in 1696, 1705, and 1709 he was charged with overseeing the building of the church and the glebe, and with the repair of the latter. He was one of a committee of three who collected the parish levy in 1705, and in another year (1707) took bond on behalf of the parish to insure the proper collection and distribution of the levy. Smith also helped to provide for the parish poor.\(^3\)

Edwin Thacker (d. 1704) was clerk of the court of Middlesex County during the 1690's and early 1700's. He was a member of the House of Burgesses for two terms (1700-1702 and 1703-1705), but died before completing the second.\(^4\) In Christ Church Parish he was appointed churchwarden for the upper precincts (1695, 1700), and took some responsibility for the repairs needed at the chapel there.\(^5\)

Henry Thacker (d. 1713) also served in the capacity of churchwarden; his duties, however, consisted almost entirely of aiding the poor or sick of the parish. His activity as warden was confined to the years 1696 and 1707, although his membership on the vestry extended from 1695 through 1709; during this fourteen-year period, Thacker was absent from only four meetings. Henry Thacker was appointed surveyor of the
highways in 1691, and sheriff in 1694 and 1703; in the latter year he was specifically instructed to collect the parish levy.\textsuperscript{46}

James Walker (d. 1720) attended in this period only the vestry meetings held in 1710. He was chosen vestryman on November 2, 1708, "in the Room of Collnl [John] Grymes; who hath this Day Refused to Continue any longer. . . ."\textsuperscript{47} The duties assigned to Walker were related to the building of the new churches and to the settlement of parish accounts. The inventory of his estate, taken in 1722, included land in both Middlesex and Essex counties as well as thirty-three slaves. The total value of the estate was placed at £1683.10.0.\textsuperscript{48}

Francis Weeks, son of Abraham Weeks of the earlier period, served the county of Middlesex as a justice on the county court in 1700 and 1702 and as high sheriff in 1697. In the second capacity he collected the parish tithe.\textsuperscript{49} Weeks attended only two vestry meetings, one in 1698 and the other in 1703.

Richard Willis (1656-1700) was no doubt a kinsman of Thomas Willis, who was discussed in the foregoing chapter. The 1700 inventory of his estate totalled £1778.14.11; his widow later married Robert "King" Carter.\textsuperscript{50} The Middlesex records indicate that in May of 1689 Willis, who was then serving on the vestry, was tried and found guilty of concealing tithables from the churchwardens. For this offense he was fined 2000 pounds of tobacco.\textsuperscript{51} He served on the vestry until the year of his death, and was himself appointed churchwarden (for the middle precincts) in 1698.\textsuperscript{52}

Christopher Wormle of 1701 and Ralph Wormley (1650-1701), whose relationship to each other is not known, were members of the
vestry during the earlier period; they have been discussed in Chapter III. Since they both died in 1701, their influence in this period was considerably less than it had been previously. In the vestry records of these years the latter is usually listed as "the Honorable Ralph Wormeley Esqr," an indication of his rank among his peers.

William Wormeley, who attended meetings in 1698 and 1699, was the son and heir of Christopher Wormeley, who was not present at vestry meetings after January of 1696. William was a Middlesex justice in 1698, the same year that he was appointed churchwarden for the lower district. 53

George Wortham, who took the vestry oath on December 29, 1710, was also sheriff and constable during this period. In 1696 he had been appointed surveyor of the highways and ordered "to forthwith Cleare the same...Especially those Roads to the Church & Court house & to make Good Bridges over all." 54 Several references in the county records indicate that the courthouse stood on Wortham's plantation; other documents describe judgments brought against him by various individuals, including his fellow vestryman, John Grymes. 55
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CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Of Middlesex County, Virginia, it has been said that "there were more fine libraries, more fine carriages, more fine plate. . . than in all Massachusetts;" Christ Church Parish, Middlesex, had been described as "the abode of culture and refinement in early colonial days." Although these statements perhaps represent filiopietistic breast-beating more than documented research, the fact remains that the men whose careers are sketched in Chapters III and IV are, for the most part, figures of considerable wealth as well as social and political prominence. Their names are familiar in the annals of colonial Virginia history. Beverley, Churchill, Grymes, Robinson, Skipwith, Thacker and Wormeley -- all these served as vestrymen of Christ Church Parish, and were well-known throughout the colony.

The leaders of the Virginia colony and Christ Church Parish during the second half of the seventeenth century and the first years of the eighteenth were not the Englishmen who had come ashore at Jamestown. They were not, with few exceptions, the descendants of established planters of the 1630's. Only Ralph Wormeley, whose father had come to the colony about 1636, and John Scarbrough, whose family was established here by the 1630's, are known to have been in this category. Rowland Burnham, father of vestryman John, and Sir Henry Chicheley emigrated in
the next decade. Rather, the leaders were in most cases a new generation of immigrants who had come to the colony at mid-century (and later) and quickly rose to the top in the fluid colonial social structure through a combination of factors, which usually included some initial advantages along with a willingness to work hard to achieve their goals. Governor Berkeley himself recognized the home grown nature of Virginia aristocracy in his Discourse and View of Virginia (1663) when he remarked that "...it is hope and a proposed end that quickens our industry, and bridles our intemperance...We find...that if we will be provident and industrious for a year or two, we may provide for our Posterity for many Ages...".

The 1650's saw the arrival in Lancaster County (from which Middlesex was formed) of the families of Cock, Corbin, Dudley, Leach, Needles, Perrott, and Skipwith. These names were subsequently represented on the Christ Church vestry in the persons of Nicholas and Maurice Cock, Henry and Gawin Corbin, William and Robert Dudley, William Leach, John Needles, Richard Perrott, Sr., Richard Perrott, Jr., and Gray and William Skipwith.

Ralph Wormeley, a descendant of the early generation of immigrants, served on the vestry from 1672 until 1698; John Scarbrough, John Burnham, and Henry Chicheley, however, were not members after 1680. Cock, Dudley, Leach, Needles, and Perrott had vanished from the rolls before 1700; but the families of Corbin and Skipwith were represented until the end of the second period.

A total of sixty men served on the vestry of Christ Church Parish, Middlesex, in the years from 1663 to 1680 and 1695 to 1710. According to available information, thirty-four of them were related by direct
ties of blood or marriage; they knew each other as fathers, sons, nephews, brothers, cousins, and in-laws. Aided by such interrelationships, this group rapidly established predominance; its progeny consolidated and extended their inheritance. Acting from a sense of responsibility as well as from ambition, the so-called "plantation gentry" supplied most of the social and political leadership in both county and colony affairs.\(^5\)

The attendance of individual vestrymen varied in the periods under consideration in this study; some attended only a single meeting while others were present at virtually all meetings over a long period of years. As discussed in Chapter II, attendance was a problem; it was recognized as such as early as 1664, when the power of action was delegated to a few men whose decisions would be ratified by the whole vestry. It was also alleviated to a considerable degree by the existence of the important administrative office of churchwarden. A total of thirty-nine men held this office during both periods, many of them for several years. Although the warden's term of office was for one year, men were very often reappointed, with or without a break in their service.

The public offices held by members of the vestry were those of sheriff, constable, surveyor of the highways, justice of the county court, burgess, and councillor; in some instances (to be cited hereafter) administrative positions on the colony level or executive appointments were held by vestrymen. In twenty of the forty-eight cases for which evidence is available, vestry membership preceded the holding of political office on the county or colony level.\(^6\) For these men the vestry probably served as an introduction to political office and as the beginning of a career that might extend beyond the county level.
and ultimately lead to colony-wide prominence. In twenty-five cases
the reverse was true; vestry membership followed in the wake of other
office-holding. In the remaining three cases secular and vestry positions
were conferred or obtained in the same year. It should be noted that in
only two instances were those who were elected first to vestry service
sons of other vestrymen.

This tally provides the basis for an important corollary to the
theory that vestry membership was a stepping-stone to political power.
Vestry membership was also a badge of achievement which distinguished
those who had already attained a measure of political prominence. No
doubt it was a mixed blessing to many of those whose social or political
station carried with it a further obligation to serve the parish in a
position of leadership.

The number of those who were selected for vestry service after they
had attained political office was almost equally divided between the
early and late periods studied. However, those who served first on the
vestry and later achieved political posts were almost all in the first
period; only three out of twenty men were chosen for the vestry between
1695 and 1710 without previously having held secular posts. It would
appear that by the latter period vestrymen, who enjoyed the right of
choosing their own successors, selected them from acquaintances who
had already established themselves -- an indication of the oligarchical
nature of Virginia society in the eighteenth century.

The position of surveyor of the highways was held by ten vestrymen
during the periods of this study, and the office of constable by seven.
Seventeen served as sheriff of Lancaster (in the earlier years) or
Middlesex counties. The greatest duplication of vestry membership and
secular office occurred in the ranks of the county court, where a total
of thirty vestrymen (half of those studied) sat as justices. The Middlesex County records contain at least one graphic illustration of the duplication in membership on the vestry and county court. In May of 1707 the court ordered that "ye Churchwardens of Christ Church Parish be summoned to ye next Court to answer the Grandjurys presentment against them for not keeping the Churches and Church Yard in repair." At court the following month this decision was handed down: "The Grandjurys presentment against the Vestry is dismissed there not being a Court to try it without Vestrymen."

Many of the names appearing in county records are familiar from vestry book entries. Harry Beverley and Christopher and John Robinson, "Gentlemen Trustees in trust for the Townland in Middlesex County in behalfe of the Freeholders of the said County," held comparable positions as vestrymen and churchwardens. John Grymes, who is known to have been responsible for repairs to Christ Church, was -- together with George Wortham -- charged by the court with viewing "the Goal© of this County, Some time betwixt this & ye next Court and in case they find it worth Repairing to agree with Workmen to repair ye Same, or build a new one. . . ." In an earlier period (1684/5) Walter Whittaker and Matthew Kemp contracted with their fellow vestrymen Ralph Worneley and Robert Beverley on behalf of the court,

\[
\text{for ye building a good Strong Convenient & Sufficient Court© house the Walls thereof to be of Brick wth a good--framed roof© to be Covered wth good Cypress Shingles and to be at least of equall goodness and Dimentions wth ye Brick Court© house lately Built in Gloucester County. . . .}
\]

Political prominence on a higher level was attained by those men of the Christ Church vestry who served in the House of Burgesses or on the Council. Sixteen burgesses may be listed: Harry Beverley, Robert
Beverley (who was chosen clerk in 1670), John Burnham, Henry Chicheley, William Churchill, Gawin Corbin, Henry Corbin, John Curtis, Robert Dudley, Matthew Kemp, Christopher Robinson, Sr., Christopher Robinson, Jz, John Robinson, Edwin Thacker, Abraham Weeks, and Thomas Willis. Councillors were Robert Beverley, Henry Chicheley, William Churchill, Henry Corbin, Anthony Elliott, Christopher Robinson, John Robinson, Christopher Wormeley, and Ralph Wormeley (president of the Council in 1693). Six men, then (Robert Beverley, Chicheley, Churchill, Henry Corbin, Christopher Robinson, Sr., and John Robinson), were in turn both burgesses and councillors; all served first in the lower house.

The number of men who filled these political posts was almost equally divided between the early and late periods, except in the case of councillors, all but two of whom were appointed in the 1663 to 1680 period. Sir Henry Chicheley and John Robinson served as deputy governor (1673) and acting governor (1749) respectively. High administrative appointments which were bestowed upon vestrymen all came in the earlier period: Christopher Robinson and Ralph Wormeley were secretaries of state, Christopher and Ralph Wormeley were naval officers and collectors of shipping revenues; Cuthbert Potter acted as the governor's emissary to the New England colonies in 1690, the year before his death.

The leading historian of the Anglican parish vestry in colonial Virginia has observed that "by the closing years of the seventeenth century, affluent tidewater planters were prominent in the guidance of local affairs; in the following century they became a controlling class, in part through self-perpetuation in the vestry system."

From the evidence at hand it appears that in the case of Middlesex County a
significant percentage of these men had already established themselves within the "controlling class" before they entered upon vestry service.

Daniel Boorstin has postulated that

the upward political path from the seat of the vestryman or justice of the peace to the Governor's Council

was guarded all along the way by the local gentry.

Seeking a political career without their approval was hopeless.13

Granting that in Middlesex the path did not always begin with the vestry (particularly in the late period) it should be observed that the route was guarded by the ruling elite with its network of family ties and political power.

The controversial Sir William Berkeley was himself one of this dominant group, as was his kinsman and arch rival in the tumultuous events of 1676, Nathaniel Bacon.14 Robert Beverley, William Gordon, Christopher and Richard Robinson, Christopher and Ralph Wormeley, and Robert Smith were among those vestrymen who took the side of the governor during the rebellion.15 Conceivably there were also members of the Christ Church vestry who, rebelling at the privileged position of Berkeley's inner circle, supported Bacon -- although no evidence has been found to substantiate such a conclusion. The presence in Middlesex of Sir Henry Chicheley, Berkeley's deputy, doubtless helped buttress the governor's position there in his struggle with Bacon.

The present study appears to bear out Bernard Bailyn's view that Bacon's Rebellion subsided without the formation of strong factions on either side and without securing permanent reforms, partly because at the end of the seventeenth century as earlier, "there was an acceptance of the fact that certain families were distinguished from others in riches, in dignity, and in access to political authority."16
The vestry of Christ Church and the local officials of Middlesex County -- as well as a proportionate number of members of the colonial legislature -- were, it appears, if not always the same individuals at least representative of the same families and the same social strata.

Since the parish was a political subdivision of the county as well as an ecclesiastical unit, the power of the vestry extended into civil matters. In fact, the vestry, in the implementation of its role in maintaining religion and the church, extended its influence into almost every area of secular as well as religious life. The system of interlocking directorates between the county court and the vestry further intensified the extension of the powers of the latter. The power exercised on the local level by the group of men who constituted the Christ Church vestry cannot be emphasized too strongly: moreover, as the tumultuous events of the eighteenth century unfolded, that body would prove an important "bulwark against the extension of the royal prerogative."
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### APPENDIX A

**VESTRY ATTENDANCE, 1663-1680**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN OF THE VESTRY</th>
<th>1663</th>
<th>1664</th>
<th>1665</th>
<th>1666</th>
<th>1667</th>
<th>1668</th>
<th>1669</th>
<th>1670</th>
<th>1671</th>
<th>1672</th>
<th>1673</th>
<th>1674</th>
<th>1675</th>
<th>1676</th>
<th>1677</th>
<th>1678</th>
<th>1679</th>
<th>1680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boswell, Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge, Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnham, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicheley, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chowning, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cock, Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslewood, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Humphrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp, Matthew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needles, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrott, Richard, Sr.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrott, Richard, Jr.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter, Cuthbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarbrough, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidworth, Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thacker, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thacker, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vause, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadding, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittaker, Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlsey, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlsey, Ralph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No attendance recorded.

*Total attendance given, but only Smith listed by name.*
# APPENDIX B

**VESTRY ATTENDANCE, 1695-1710**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN OF THE VESTRY</th>
<th>1695</th>
<th>1696</th>
<th>1697</th>
<th>1698</th>
<th>1699</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1701</th>
<th>1702</th>
<th>1703</th>
<th>1704</th>
<th>1705</th>
<th>1706</th>
<th>1707</th>
<th>1708</th>
<th>1709</th>
<th>1710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverley, Harry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cock, Maurice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin, Gawin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grynes, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp, Matthew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killbee, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipwith, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thacker, Edwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thacker, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks, Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normley, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normley, Ralph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normley, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortham, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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