

KATHARINE AND PHILIP HENRY AND  
THEIR CHILDREN:  
A CASE STUDY IN FAMILY IDEOLOGY.

*Patricia Crawford, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.*

Historians are currently debating the nature of English families in the early modern period. In his ambitious study of the family from 1500–1800, Lawrence Stone has argued that there was a transition from families in which there was little love between spouses, little affection between parents and children, to ones in which love was important.<sup>1</sup> His critics have argued that the picture is not so black as he has painted, and in the most recent study of the English family over a similar period of time, Ralph Houlbrooke has rejected Stone's depiction of change and argued rather for continuity of patterns of affection.<sup>2</sup>

There is a danger in the general discussion at present that by focussing on questions about the degree of happiness within families, to which ultimately there can be no answers, historians will be diverted from the more important questions about the ways in which ideas influenced the lives of men and women in the past, and how the family transmitted values from one generation to another. In particular, the family taught children their place in the world: their social position and their gender. Yet, what we know of individual families and their dynamics in the early modern period is still fairly limited. Alan Macfarlane's pioneering study of the Essex clergyman, Ralph Josselin, is deservedly widely cited, but we still need further studies to allow us to assess whether Josselin was a typical or unusual individual.<sup>3</sup> Miriam Slater has assessed Stone's general conclusions through the records of one upper gentry family, the Verneys, and Vivienne Larminie has concluded, from her study of another gentry family, the Newdigates, that the personalities of individuals influenced the effects of patriarchal ideas in families.<sup>4</sup> It is only on such detailed studies that the broad generalisations can rest.

Furthermore, too little attention so far has been devoted to questions of the differing experiences of men and women. It has been argued that Protestantism enhanced the position of women,<sup>5</sup> although the distinctive contribution of Protestant and Puritan belief to family life is debatable. Margo Todd, for example, has suggested that before the work of the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, Catholic ideals of family life were not so very different from those of later Protestants, and Kathleen Davies has questioned whether the Protestants had ideas substantially different from those of Catholics about the status of women within marriage.<sup>6</sup> But the women's perspective upon the family has been neglected so far, partly, no doubt, because it is more difficult to explore women's lives than those of men of the same social level. However, there is source material which can be used.

The family upon which this study is based is that of a Nonconformist minister, Philip Henry, and his wife Katherine in the later seventeenth century. Their son Matthew was a well known Nonconformist minister in Chester. Through a discussion of the surviving material, three main questions will be explored. First, there is the question of the ideals and practices of the godly family. In neither attitudes nor behaviour do the Henrys seem atypical of seventeenth-century English Puritans, but there was, I shall argue, an intensification of some aspects of Puritan belief after the Restoration which affected their attitudes to the family. Secondly, because the women left records as well as the men, we can explore more closely the question of how Protestantism influenced their daily lives. The material reveals how Protestant Nonconformity could, in fact, make life very difficult for women in the family compared with men. And finally, since families and the ideology held by them do, it will be argued, change over time, the ways in which the Henrys' papers were collected and selectively published over the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century enable us to trace a changing ideology of the family which was offered not just to Nonconformists but to persons of the middle rank in English society.

## I

'It is not so much what we are at Church as what we are in our Families' was the message preached by Philip Henry<sup>7</sup>

The public defeat of Puritan policies in 1660 privatised many ideals. Among the Henrys, the family became more important as the men's role in public life declined. Early in the seventeenth century,, one of the most influential writers on the family, William Gouge, had taught that the family was 'a little Church, and a little common-wealth'.<sup>8</sup> He saw the family rearing good Christians and good citizens, thereby contributing to the wider world, but at the end of the century, Philip Henry's emphasis was different. Individuals were to be judged less on their public roles than on their conduct at home.

The Henrys were of the lesser gentry.<sup>9</sup> Born in 1631, Philip's early education was fairly typical of a gentleman – Westminster school, and Christ Church Oxford. He moved to Flintshire in 1653 as a tutor to the family of John Puleston, a judge in the court of common pleas, where he was ordained by the Presbyterian classis of Bradford north, Shropshire, in 1657. Under the Pulestons' patronage he became a chaplain at Worthenbury,<sup>10</sup> from which position he married a wealthy gentlewoman, Katharine Matthews, who was three years older than he. Ministers marrying above themselves were a not unfamiliar prospect,<sup>11</sup> and not surprisingly Katharine's father disliked the match. He probably liked it even less when Philip Henry refused to conform to the restored Anglican church and was ejected from his living in October 1662.<sup>12</sup> For the next twenty-five years Philip was virtually unemployed. The family was safe from penury, thanks to Katharine's dowry, and moved to a farm at Broad Oak, just outside Whitchurch, where they lived for the rest of their lives. Six children were born (see select genealogy). The first, John, born in 1661, died aged nearly six, but the other five children all lived to marry between 1686 and 1688. Matthew, the eldest and only surviving son, was a minister in Chester until he moved to London in 1712. He published extensively, but is best known as a Biblical commentator. Sarah, the third child, married a widower, John Savage, and lived nearby on a farm at Wrenbury Wood.<sup>13</sup> Katharine married a physician, John Tylston, who had studied medicine with the famous Thomas Sydenham, and who subsequently published a book entitled *Country Practice*.<sup>14</sup> Eleanor and Ann both married tradesmen in Chester.<sup>15</sup> All these marriages produced children, but my concern is largely with the first and second generations.

Source material about the Henrys is voluminous. There

are diaries and fragments of diaries and transcripts of diaries across three generations, an autobiography, letters, commonplace books, accounts and genealogies.<sup>16</sup> Philip left many sermons in manuscript, Matthew many in print. The creation and keeping of these records was important for the family's sense of identity. The outside world could not be changed, but through their letters and diaries the Henry family attempted to define and order a world for themselves.<sup>17</sup> Written records were to bear witness to the truth of Nonconforming Christianity, as can be seen in the surviving diaries of three members of the family. Philip Henry 'began to keep an Account of my Time in this method' in 1657.<sup>18</sup> Of maybe thirty-nine volumes which he kept until his death in 1696, only twenty-two survived into the late nineteenth century,, of which I have been able to trace only ten.<sup>19</sup> His entries were brief, usually of outward events such as the weather, family details and general news. He was especially interested in recording those happenings which he could interpret as providential. For example on 15 December 1662, John Wickstead, a drinker, was found dead: 'he had been receiving rents . . . on the sabbath day'. On 13 February 1662, John Bickley's sister was distempered with melancholy which came 'at first breaking of her arm at which she was discontented and fretted agt [against] God and say'd as much as if she thought God had done his worst & shortly after her husband dyed left her 6 children and more in debt than his personal Estate will amount to pay besides other encumbrances - the Lord is righteous'.<sup>20</sup> His son Matthew began to keep a diary, of which only one original volume survives, as an account every night 'of how the day has been spent'.<sup>21</sup> Likewise, only the first volume of Sarah Savage's original diary survives. She began in August 1686: 'I have had lon[g] upon my thoughts to do something in ye Nature of a Diary - being encouraged by the great advantage others have got thereby & by ye hopes yt I may thereby bee furthered [in] a godly life.'<sup>22</sup> Two eighteenth-century transcripts provide evidence of her continuing struggles to keep an account of her time and her spiritual state.<sup>23</sup> Her diary reveals her as more introspective than her father or brother, although surviving fragments of her sister Ann's diaries suggest a similar pattern of reflection. Another sister, Katharine, left only brief general comments.<sup>24</sup> In addition, as members of the family were seeking salvation, their letters to each other contained pious thoughts for the recipients to treasure. All of this indicates a

deliberateness and a self-consciousness in the making and keeping of evidence which we must bear in mind.

Nonconformity was a central, essential part of the Henrys family life. Since Philip Henry could not accept reordination nor swear that there was nothing contrary to the word of God in a prayer book he had not seen, he was suspended and afterwards ejected.<sup>25</sup> He and his family were removed from their former parish and often at odds with neighbours who viewed them with suspicion.<sup>26</sup> Philip was fined for preaching, and after he refused to pay, his goods were distrained. He was twice imprisoned, once in 1663 and again in 1685 at the time of Monmouth's uprising.<sup>27</sup> From being an esteemed minister in a parish, he became an outcast. As the years passed, he grew more and more bitter, 'of little or no use in my generation'.<sup>28</sup> His diary reveals his attempts to justify himself and to live such a life of piety as would confound his Christian enemies. It was an unhappy time, for while there were other ejected ministers nearby and in adjacent counties, the Non-conformists were divided over their tactics. Revisionists today may wish to qualify the sense in which the years 1662 to 1685 can properly be described as 'the great persecution', but for Philip Henry and his family they were, even though restriction fluctuated and there were periods of de facto toleration.<sup>29</sup> After 1689 the Dissenters were tolerated and Philip resumed his ministry and his son was appointed to a congregation in Chester. But the previous years had left their mark, for the Henrys were never sure how long their liberty would last.<sup>30</sup> Nor, despite toleration, did their sense of being a minority for religion's sake, evaporate. They still lived in a community in which their separation was criticised and their scruples of conscience mocked.<sup>31</sup>

Yet from the first, Philip Henry had one refuge from the world: his family. In 1662 he noted in his diary 'comfort in wife and child'.<sup>32</sup> With the wider community hostile to him, Philip Henry developed an ideology about the family which was partly a response to the national crisis of Puritan belief and his own personal crisis of ejection. His ideas were not, of course, new in themselves, but were rather an intensification of many general Protestant views about domestic conduct. What was new was the emphasis upon the performance of family duties. 'Relative duties' as they were called became the measure of the individual's Christianity.<sup>33</sup> 'We are', Philip Henry taught, 'really which we are relatively.'<sup>34</sup> As he preached, so he struggled in his

own household to practise Christian precepts for family life: loving husband and obedient wife; children reared in godliness who respected and obeyed their parents; servants who were religious. Even after circumstances changed, and there was the opportunity for public witness through preaching after 1689, 'relative duties' remained important. Matthew Henry in his public ministry, influenced by his family of origin, taught the same precepts as his father. Family behaviour was the measure of the individual's Christianity: 'The truth and example of Religion is seen in a becoming temper and conduct towards our Relatives.'<sup>35</sup>

In his nuclear family, Philip Henry developed a present identity. His family became his congregation, and as he preached and prayed with them daily 'he had a Church in his House'.<sup>36</sup> The family became 'a Pattern of that Primitive Christianity'.<sup>37</sup> He had a calendar of significant days, a mixture of public and private events. He remembered the day of Charles I's execution as well as the silencing of the ministers; his ordination and his ejection, wedding anniversaries and his own and his children's birthdays.<sup>38</sup> Reflecting upon the private occasions strengthened family bonds, for the dates had meaning only in the domestic circle. Philip also looked beyond his own nuclear family, to his ancestors and his extended family. He began seeking records of his descent in 1662, finding out about his grandfather.<sup>39</sup> His mother died in 1645, and after his father's death in 1652, he had taken in his two younger sisters. Throughout his life he retained contact with them, and in her will his widow remembered them too.<sup>40</sup>

Not only did the family provide the minister with an identity and individuals with valuable roles: it also offered family members a future. In 1662 the outlook for Nonconformists was uncertain, and even around 1700, the future was bleak. They saw many of their leading adherents fall away or die, and by that date it has been estimated that they were only 5% of the population.<sup>41</sup> Even after the Toleration Act it was difficult to enjoy public office, for although many Dissenters, including the Henrys, attended Anglican worship to show their common Protestant sympathies, this was suspected, and Parliament sought to forbid it.<sup>42</sup> In this context the family could provide for the time to come, becoming that 'arrow through time' of which Natalie Davis has written.<sup>43</sup> The births of children multiplied the number of Christians who would continue to witness to the tradition of their forbears.<sup>44</sup> Families were

'the Nurseries and seminaries of piety'.<sup>45</sup> Philip rejoiced at the building up of his house by the marriages of his children: 'so many Swarms (as he us'd to call them) out of his Hive'.<sup>46</sup> Matthew congratulated his father on the birth of his first grandchild.<sup>47</sup> In this provision for the family's future, Philip Henry thought that sons were more important than daughters. He believed that he himself 'might bee sayd to bee the chief of their [his parents'] strength, being their first born son'.<sup>48</sup> In an undated sermon he preached the same message:

The more children there are – the more of them are males,  
the more likely the family is to bee built up by them . . .  
whence tis so, they are Gods gift.<sup>49</sup>

Thus through the family's continuance the Henrys saw that there was a future. There was no greater misfortune than the barrenness of the wife, and the premature deaths of children could occasion much unhappy heart-searching. They knew, of course, that goldliness could not be bequeathed,<sup>50</sup> but despite this the ministers taught parents, as other preachers did, to bring up their children in godliness.<sup>51</sup> 'Children are very apt to do as their fathers did, and as they themselves were taught to do when they were young'.<sup>52</sup> The parents were responsible for the behaviour of their offspring, as Philip Henry preached: 'the Miscarriages of children do often times reflect reproach upon their honest parents',<sup>53</sup> and in later years his daughter showed that she accepted the rightness of his view noting that children were 'Arrows in ye hand & need to be rightly guided'.<sup>54</sup>

Because Philip Henry hoped to bear witness to the truth of Nonconforming Christianity through his family, he sought the right ordering of his household. There he constantly prayed that individuals 'might have grace to carry it as a minister, and a minister's wife, and a minister's children, . . . that the ministry might in nothing be blamed'.<sup>55</sup> Not being blamed was important: individuals sought personal rectitude and public approbation. The 'family' who had to behave properly extended beyond immediate kin and included servants. Philip Henry was troubled at a drunken servant because he demonstrated that all was not well under the minister's rule.<sup>56</sup> Later, in 1708, Matthew Henry was in deep distress when a man-servant got their cookmaid pregnant and disappeared. 'O how it discompos'd me! Lord that such wickedness should be committed in my house'. Two days later he recorded

gloomily in his diary that his family was the talk of Chester: 'Friends pity mee. Enemies triumph'.<sup>57</sup> But far more than to servants, the family was vulnerable to the behaviour of children, so that training and disciplining the young were constant preoccupations. Even a visit to a grandmother allowed no relaxation of discipline: 'Kate must have a rod sometimes', wrote Ann Hulton to her mother of her six-year-old, 'shee requirees it'.<sup>58</sup> At adolescence, parental anxiety magnified. As Philip noted in his diary, they 'begin more now than ever yet to bee the bearers of our own cares and fears'.<sup>59</sup>

One special advantage of looking at the families of ministers is that there are clear, formal statements of precepts for domestic conduct as well as evidence of practices. In some cases, this can provide a pleasant contrast: Philip Doddridge, for example, stern in precept, revealed himself in his correspondence in the 1730s and 40s as a warm, loving father and affectionate, even playful husband.<sup>60</sup> In the case of the Henrys, precept and practice were more of a piece. As the ministers preached, so the families struggled to practise. The circumstances were of course different: the years after the ejection of the ministers were not a time for jesting. They were years for bearing witness, for holding firm while the Lord tested, a time to remember that the Lord chastened those whom he loved. The records of the family show individuals striving to meet the standards of piety which the ministers imposed.

Disobedience to a father, always a serious matter in early modern England, was presented in the Henry family as disobedience to the Lord. Philip, as minister, was the expositor of the Word. This enhanced his authority. Indeed, Philip commended family worship to other men, saying that 'a Master of a Family never looks more great than when he is going before his house in ye worship of God'.<sup>61</sup> Later, his son Matthew was to publish a sermon exhorting family worship in 1704 with a similar message: 'would you keep up your authority in your Family? You cannot do it better than by keeping up Religion in your Family'.<sup>62</sup>

Yet even in principle, the ministers' attitudes to paternal authority were ambivalent, if not contradictory, as can be seen in the matter of marriages. Woman was made as 'an help-meet' for man, and marriage was instituted by God before the Fall.<sup>63</sup> The parental role in the marriages can be explored to some extent, although the financial arrangements remain obscure. Only the settlement at

Matthew's marriage survives.<sup>64</sup> Each of the children had £100 from their grandfather Matthews and in addition Matthew inherited land when he came of age.<sup>65</sup> Philip seems in his precepts to fit the pattern which Professor Stone has described: companionate marriage with an increasing role for the children in their choice of marriage partners.<sup>66</sup> He told his children, and they said that he repeated it often, 'Please God and please your selves, and you shall never displease me.'<sup>67</sup> Yet even here there was ambivalence, for the parent, especially if he were the minister, retained a role: he decided what was pleasing to God.

Paternal initiative was considerable in the case of Sarah, the first of Philip Henry's children to be married. Initially, she was unhappy when a match with a relative, John Savage, a widower with a young daughter, was proposed in November 1686. Sarah's objections were answered by her father, but in December she was still 'much perplexed' at the prospect of changing her condition. Her purchase of some new clothes in February disturbed her, perhaps because it occasioned trouble, or more likely because she feared the approach of marriage. She was 'comforted' by a letter from her brother. However, when her father contracted her to John on 23 March 1687 and appointed the marriage for two days later, it was 'a surprise to mee to have it so soon'. Married on the 25 March, she left Broad Oak reluctantly on 19 April: 'ye saddest day that ever came over my head, my heart ready to burst'.<sup>68</sup> Her marriage was a long and happy one, even if her role in her choice of a marriage partner was more limited than her father's comment might have encourage her to anticipate.

In practice, men differed in their views of patriarchal authority and children's freedoms depending on whether they themselves were in the position of parent or child. Thus they claimed power as fathers while denying it when they were suitors. In Philip's own marriage, we have, it seems, an assertion of the importance of love. I have already mentioned that Katharine's father disapproved of the match. A family mythology developed later among the Henrys that although she could not answer the question of where her suitor came from she answered that she knew where he was going and intended to accompany him.<sup>69</sup> Subsequently Philip's relationship with his father-in-law was a difficult one. There were vexations over Philip's payment of £800 for Broad Oak (more of a purchase than a dowry, he protested).<sup>70</sup> Daniel Matthews was so offended

that Philip refused to allow his first-born son to take Matthews's surname, a custom less unusual in Wales than in England, that he never entered their house again.<sup>71</sup> Matthews told a friend that he believed that Katharine and Philip hindered his plans for remarriage.<sup>72</sup> Understandably, Philip never won his father-in-law's affection.<sup>73</sup>

Similarly, when Matthew Henry sought to marry Mary Hardware, whom he met through the local gentry family of the Hunts at Boreatton in 1687, there were objections from the girl's mother. She knew that her daughter could marry a wealthier man. Mrs. Hardware's demurs were not heeded, and after the couple were married, she perceived the error of her ways.<sup>74</sup> When her daughter died of small pox in childbirth eighteen months later, she helped Matthew to remarry, this time to a daughter of the Warburton family of Hefferston Grange from whom Matthew Henry's son Philip would in time inherit a large estate.<sup>75</sup> In both the cases of Philip and Matthew Henry, it seems as if love had triumphed.

Yet when Philip and Matthew were fathers themselves, they behaved much as other parents. In the case of Philip and Katharine's youngest daughter Ann, the parents had no part in the initial choice, and were surprised when Ann wrote from Chester to tell them of the proposal of marriage she had received from John Hulton in 1688.<sup>76</sup> Hulton was a tradesman, and probably already sympathetic to the Presbyterian faith.<sup>77</sup> Philip told his daughter that it was her duty to get to know the man, to see if their tempers would agree, while he would decide if the marriage were suitable. Meanwhile she was to be careful to make no promises nor to compromise herself by any impropriety. Her brother Matthew noted a month later that his sister was anxious about the proposal, since she had encouraged Hulton to continue his addresses.<sup>78</sup> Fortunately, her father was satisfied, and the couple were married on the Henrys' own wedding anniversary, 26 April 1688.<sup>79</sup> Again, as a father, Matthew Henry's position was different from that he had adopted when he was marrying well. In 1708 he was very disappointed when he found that he consented to the marriage of his eldest daughter, Katharine, before he discovered that the man's fortune was smaller than he believed. He could not retract, but noted his disquiet in his diary: 'Katy is in such a fret about it that it cannot go off, so must make the best of it.'<sup>80</sup> His relationship with his son-in-law was later strained.<sup>81</sup>

The doctrine of 'please God and please yourselves and you will never displease me' was a less straightforward one for children than it appeared. Obviously the Henrys were concerned about the piety of potential spouses, but even when that was secured, and the children were choosing with prospects of future happiness, parents continued to worry about the financial aspects. A minister, Thomas Holland, applied to John and Sarah Savage for their daughter Mary in February 1717. The parents were very surprised, suggesting that they had no part in the proposal.<sup>82</sup> Sarah hoped that it would pass, but Holland renewed his address in June. Although the Savages were concerned at the girl's youth (she was 22), they were more worried at their friends' comment that Holland had scarce a competency in the world.<sup>83</sup> Parental difficulties were compounded by their daughter's tractability: 'she would be guided by us'. Eventually, after 'careful tho'ts', weighing Holland's character - 'I have reason to think him pious, humble, & serious' - and the worldly concerns, the Savages consented and the couple were married in November.<sup>84</sup> The delay was not an unreasonably long one, but parental approbation was not lightly given.

The risks of defying parents and marrying without consent were terrifying. Another of the Savages' daughters, Hannah, married into the Witton family, where her mother-in-law's diary commented on a daughter leaving her father's house without his approval to marry: 'If G[od] be pleased to pardon her breaking his commandment I shall be glad'.<sup>85</sup> It does not seem surprising that there were no conflicts of this kind over the marriages of the Henry children. Sons and daughters sought marriage partners of whom their parents would approve. If the material gains for the Henry husbands were greater, they accepted this as the work of the Lord, as Matthew Henry, in writing of his father's unequal marriage, declared: 'Providence . . . provided a Help-meet for him'. 'She was reserv'd to be a Blessing to this good Man, in things pertaining both to Life and Godliness'.<sup>86</sup> As parents, they were less happy when the Lord bestowed their daughters on poorer men.

## II

In discussing the godly family from the perspective of the women, we face the problem that the sources are, as usual,

less adequate than for the lives of men.<sup>87</sup> Since letters from either of the two ministers were more important than those of anyone else, people treasured their writings. Nevertheless, women's letters and diaries survive in sufficient quantity to allow us to consider whether Protestantism did, as the Henrys themselves certainly believed, enhance the status of wives and mothers. Matthew Henry, preaching his mother's funeral sermon in 1707, contrasted her virtues with those which the Roman Catholic church had allowed:

This virtuous woman was not a recluse, one shut up and cut off from the business of this life, and the affairs of a family, under pretence of devotion and separation to God. The church of Rome makes such only their religious. . . . But the Scripture canon gives other measures.

Yet although he praised his mother for her care of her family and household, the crown of all, the virtue without which all the rest were 'of small account', was her constant devotion to 'the work of heaven', to secret prayer and meditation.<sup>88</sup> Protestantism may have improved the status of married women compared with those of a fugitive and cloistered virtue, but it will be argued that women's roles were still defined in such a way that they remained the inferiors of their husbands in the work they performed.

Ministers declared that childbearing and childrearing and care of the household were women's tasks, and the Henry women accepted these. We can see Sarah, for example, after family prayers at which her father presided, resolved to follow his four rules: obedience to her husband, chastity in conversation, sobriety in adornment, and a 'meek and quiet spirit'. Within the family, there was a division of labour between the sexes. Women's responsibility was the bearing and rearing of children and running the household. Their highest achievement was to be 'a fruitful vine and a nursing mother'. Sarah Savage's first diary reveals her anguish as month followed month after her marriage in 1687 and she failed to conceive. She could not reconcile herself to being barren, and had 'serious thoughts' about why the Lord allowed her sister married later than she to be pregnant.<sup>89</sup> Women accepted that families should be 'Nurseries and Seminaries of piety', as the ministers said, and that their family's existence through time depended upon their success in bringing up godly children. Yet the roles which the ministers taught and the Scriptures justified created conflicts for wives and mothers.

Firstly, there were women's duties to members of their immediate family, their 'Relative Duties'. Women were to

be loving wives and mothers. The danger was that their love might be too great, that 'too much Creature love' would imperil their salvation.<sup>90</sup> Twelve months after her marriage, in 1689 Sarah returned from a visit, meeting her husband with great joy; 'I begin to fear over loving' she wrote in her diary.<sup>91</sup> But more than love for a husband, love for her children placed a woman in jeopardy. By 1702, Sarah confessed that her greatest sin was 'too much love of, and too many cares for, my children'.<sup>92</sup> Furthermore, the Lord might take that child because of too much creature love, the child which was the best which a woman could offer both to her family and towards her salvation. When Sarah's only son died of smallpox in 1721 at 21 years of age, she was deeply shaken but comforted herself with the reflection that she could not be blamed. Neither she nor her husband had been over-fond, 'nothwithstanding we had five daughters before'.<sup>93</sup>

Ann Hulton went through at least seven pregnancies in her marriage before dying of small-pox in childbirth at the age of 29.<sup>94</sup> Awaiting the birth of her first child, she saw her sister-in-law and her closest friend die in childbirth. Although she was safely delivered herself, her baby died. This she felt as 'the bitter fruits of the sin of my grandmother Eve'. 'Was it all lost labour?' she questioned, and comforted herself with the hope that Heaven was the fuller for her babe.<sup>95</sup> And if the children did live, the mothers found that all was not joy. 'I heartily sympathise with you in the tediousness of your nursery', Ann wrote to her sister, but reminded her that these 'nursing inconveniences' were part of a woman's good works.<sup>96</sup> They had servants to assist, of course, and the women sent their own servants to each other in emergencies, such as after the birth of a baby, but there were some tasks which only a mother could perform. Mothers interpreted their difficulties in a Biblical context. 'The tediousness of nursing we owe to sin' Ann believed.<sup>97</sup> Babies were cross, slept unquietly, teething, 'more tedious than usual',<sup>98</sup> yet 'a Tender Nursing Mother', wrote Sarah Savage, 'goes on in Nursing tho her sleep broken Hands fowl'd'.<sup>99</sup> Mothers consoled themselves with the hope that 'we are nursing em for God to bear up his Name in ye World'.<sup>100</sup> But they were also under pressure to produce males who would bear the Henry name. After her third daughter was born, Mary Henry, her husband reported to his father, 'would have been very glad to have brought a namesake for you'.<sup>101</sup>

Women accepted that they were to bear children for the Lord. Sarah Savage said that she had 'oft, prayd yet with submission if be ye will of God I might not bear or nurse any yt shall dishonour him.'<sup>102</sup> As children grew older, maternal anxieties intensified. What suitable calling would the children find? Daughters were destined to be wives and mothers, but sons needed a calling. Around 14 was 'this critical turning time of life'.<sup>103</sup> Sarah Savage worried because she found her son Philip at that age was careless and slothful.<sup>104</sup> Plans for his education were disrupted by the proposed act restricting non-conformist schools, and he spent time with a godly family in the hope they would help him.<sup>105</sup> In 1719 Sarah fretted because he would not do as she wished.<sup>106</sup> His parents disliked the idea of his becoming an attorney, and at the time of his death at 21 he was living in Chester.<sup>107</sup>

The hopes of the older generations were focussed on Matthew's only son, Philip, named for his grandfather. Sarah Savage, his aunt, hoped that he would be a minister like his father and grandfather.<sup>108</sup> But in 1719 Philip Henry (II) was apprenticed, and a fragment of his diary reveals that the young man's preoccupations were less with godliness than whether he could persuade his mother to settle the Grange upon him, and her possible remarriage.<sup>109</sup> Subsequently, he inherited Hefferston Grange from the Warburtons, changed his name to theirs, became an Anglican and member of parliament in 1742. He never married.<sup>110</sup> Although no family reaction to this appears to survive, in 1742 there was a comment upon another young man who disappointed his Tylston relatives in their expectation he would become a minister. The verdict on Randle Vawdry, who said he would be unhappy for life as a minister and preferred to be a surgeon, was harsh: 'I am afraid he has not virtue sufficient for it.'<sup>111</sup> Despite all the best efforts of mothers, the family might be disappointed. Children were indeed 'Arrows in the hand', but they might wound as well as go forth for the future.

Women from the Henry family helped each other through the difficulties of childbirth and with the care of young children. Mothers usually attended their daughters' lyings-in and stayed to be of assistance with the family.<sup>112</sup> Their letters to their daughters show interest and solicitude. Sarah Savage advised Hannah about how to wean her baby Philip, albeit with some scepticism: 'when you wean him let it bee in ye old of ye Moon - when ye memory is more weak - which old Mrs Starkey adviz'd - & I thought there was

someth[ing] in it – tho' others are otherwise minded'.<sup>113</sup> Katharine Tylston found a servant for her daughter-in-law who was said to be 'very fond of children'.<sup>114</sup> Sisters, also helped each other with babies – as happened after Katharine Tylston's first son was born, when Ann stayed until another sister, Eleanor, came to relieve her<sup>115</sup> – or as companions. When Sarah was first married, one or other of her sisters stayed at her new home with her for the first three weeks.<sup>116</sup> Sisters-in-law shared in the circle. Matthew Henry in 1688 pleaded for permission for Ann to stay longer with his wife: 'for as things are my wife will bee very lonely without her'.<sup>117</sup> Women applied to each other for practical help. Ann Hulton wrote to her mother about problems with servants and children, Sarah Savage wanted slips for her new garden – clove, thyme and lemon thyme.<sup>118</sup> Requests for children's aprons, cowslips for wine, and other commissions passed to and fro in the correspondence.<sup>119</sup> After they had successfully reared children who became parents in turn, women found the role of grandmother a good one, just as they had heard it was. Katharine Tylston told her son 'there's nothing so minute relating to your Family, but it is pleasant to me to hear off'.<sup>120</sup> And Sarah begged her daughter to buy her baby Philip a new cap, '& let him wear it for my sake'.<sup>121</sup> In old age they could be more lighthearted and relaxed, just as when they had been as girls at Broad-Oak, before the responsibilities of maternity. But for thirty years or so after marriage, the women were preoccupied with their children.

If their affective role in the family was woman's main duty, in the Henry family it was always of secondary importance compared with working towards salvation. The ministers preached, and tried to practise, the belief that love and affection belonged to the world. They could not escape into their studies fast enough to 'redeem the time' by writing their sermons or Biblical commentaries.<sup>122</sup> Philip Henry's diary records many a happy day at home in his study, as for example, on 5 September 1662: 'spent at home in study, time is precious. Lord make me wise to redeem it'.<sup>123</sup> Matthew Henry's diary was increasingly an account of his daily study in the chapters of the Old and New Testaments. His wife's sickness and child-bearing were disturbing intrusions. In October 1705, when Mary miscarried, he observed that her illness, which continued into November, was 'a great distraction to me', and he was 'much Hindered by my poor wife's weakness'.<sup>124</sup> She

miscarried again in October 1705, in 1706 and 1707,<sup>125</sup> but on 14 February 1708 Matthew recorded in his diary that after a lying-in of three to four days she gave birth to a daughter. At 3 p.m. he wrote 'while my wife was ill, I returned to my study to seek God for her. and then being *willing to redeem the time* [emphasis mine] did a little of my exposition.'<sup>126</sup> Earlier in his commentary on Genesis III.16 he had written of the text on women's sorrow in childbirth: 'every Pang and every Groan of the Travelling Woman speaks aloud of the fatal Consequence of Sin'. Her sorrows were multiplied as she suffered 'not only the travelling throws, but the breeding Sickness before . . . and the Nursing Toils and Vexations after'.<sup>127</sup> The suffering of Mary Henry in fulfilling her appointed role makes a sad contrast with the pleasure with which Matthew performed his work in his study, knowing that 'whatever Help is offered to good Christians in searching the Scriptures, is a real Service done to the Glory of God . . . Every Man that Studies hath some beloved Study which in his Delight above any other, and this is mine'.<sup>128</sup>

The ministers Philip and Matthew preached that the right spending of time was vital for women as well as for men. Their views created a double-bind situation for the women. Household cares were women's responsibility, just as child-care was, but they were worldly and interrupted more important work for salvation. 'She that is married careth for things of the world' was both a description of the wedded state and a criticism.<sup>129</sup> Women's plans for prayer and meditation were constantly interrupted by their housewife or shopwife responsibilities. Sarah Savage's arrangements for the Sabbath would be disturbed by the duties of the dairy, the visits of relatives, a cow falling in the water.<sup>130</sup> She intended to fast in 1722 on the anniversary of her son's death, but was 'forced to be employ'd in house concerns, by things unforeseen'.<sup>131</sup> Marriage, Ann Hulton saw, involved selflessness for women: it provided the opportunity to do good to others, but less to help their own salvation:

'Because through the necessity of my outward affairs, my secret duties are commonly limited and contracted more than formerly, I have been ready to fear that I have declined in grace.'<sup>132</sup>

Women occasionally meditated upon that blessed state where there would be neither marrying nor giving in marriage.<sup>133</sup> They looked back longingly to the days of their

youth before the cares of marriage. As helpmeets to man, the harder they tried to fulfil the role of godly wife and mother, the more likely they were to be sinfully preoccupied with worldly concerns. No doubt they had heard many times Philip's story of his visit to a 'Religious Woman' whom he found in her closet at prayer, late in the day, 'the House sadly neglected, Children not tended'. What, said he, 'is there no fear of God in this House?'<sup>134</sup> A final chastening thought for women was that as helpmeets they were expendable: returning from journeys, Ann Hulton found that she was not so much missed 'as through my pride, and minding my things, I thought I was'.<sup>135</sup>

For those in the country, neighbourliness was important, and women depended upon each other for help in crises. Neighbours often provided the same kind of aid as female relatives. Sarah Savage was regularly called out to attend other women at their lyings-in.<sup>136</sup> Women read prayers together, and kept each other company.<sup>137</sup> They developed specific skills. Mary Savage learnt a remedy for agues which, her mother said, made her recognised as 'a sort of doctress to many'.<sup>138</sup> Sarah's diary records years of visiting the sick and dying, attending funerals and taking in motherless children for months at a time.<sup>139</sup> When she herself was sick, she found relief 'by something that my neighbour Mrs. Voyse sent me'.<sup>140</sup> Yet even here, in the reciprocity of neighbourliness, there was guilt. Matthew had printed a sermon on the right managing of friendly visits so that people might understand that too much time could be wasted in idle talk.<sup>141</sup> Sarah confessed that she was robbed of preparation time for the sacrament by the visit of a neighbour.<sup>142</sup> And at the end of a busy week of caring for others, alone at her private prayers while the healthier members of the family rode off to church, Sarah would be overwhelmed with sleep. Sloth she mourned as her gross life-long sin, contrasting her state with the zeal of her youth.<sup>143</sup> Good-neighbourliness, like child-rearing and housewifery, were occasions of sin. There was little scope, in this context, for what has been described as 'the ideal of domesticity' for women which gave value to friendships and to women's relationships with their own sex.<sup>144</sup>

Nor did women value themselves highly in their relationships with the opposite sex. In the 1680s when Matthew went to London, the girls knew that their father missed his son. We 'wish we were better company for him' wrote Sarah, and that 'the History of Q.Bess' which their

father read 'were in a known tongue or we were capable of understanding it'.<sup>145</sup> The sisters likewise found a young male relative staying with them impossible to handle in the absence of their father and brother.<sup>146</sup> Women lacked authority in dealing with the world, or its representatives in the form of tradesmen. Two workmen were daubing around, Katharine Henry reported to her absent husband in 1671: 'they want your oversight for you know that I understand little in thos things', she wrote apologetically.<sup>147</sup> Later as a widow, Katharine was respected by her son Matthew, but Matthew was the effective head of the family.

The Henry women constantly showed that they accepted that the ministers were the centre of family life. When her father died, Sarah wrote that 'the glory is departed' from Broad Oak even though God and her mother were still there. She knew that her mother loved her brother Matthew best, but she 'was so far from envying' that she loved him too.<sup>148</sup> Mothers taught daughters to shape their lives around those of their husbands, even though in some ways daughters were lost to 'the family' as only sons carried on the name. Women's 'relative duties' pulled them in two directions between their families of origin and their new kin groups. We have seen Sarah Henry troubled at her approaching marriage and her prospective roles as wife, daughter-in-law and step-mother. Her mother Katharine, however, helped her to make the break, encouraging her with the assurance tht she could do more good elsewhere than at home.<sup>149</sup> Yet all her life, Sarah Savage identified with her family of origin, mourning in 1714 that she and her sister Katharine Tylston were 'all ye Branches left of dear Br[o]ad] Oke'.<sup>150</sup> If Sarah's mother suffered at losing her daughter, the records do not tell of it, and doubtless she, like her daughters in turn, repressed her own felings. In 1717 when her own daughter married, Sarah 'was grieved to part, yet we put on a chearfulness'.<sup>151</sup> Mothers' feelings for daughters were not recognised in the marriages. The formation of the new nuclear unit took priority.

None of this is to say that women were not loved and esteemed by their husbands, fathers and sons. There are no signs of any quarrels between spouses, and many signs of closeness. For example, when his wife was feared to be seriously ill, Philip Henry found himself 'loath to say my life is bound up in her life, but the comfort of my life is'.<sup>152</sup> Twenty years later Philip acknowledged to his son that he respected his wife's reasons against Matthew's moving to

Chester, for she had 'in other th[ings] many times sway'd with me, against my own [reason], & it hath done well.'<sup>153</sup> Philip Henry also recognised the role of his godly mother in his spiritual development,<sup>154</sup> and Matthew mourned the loss of his mother's advice after her death in 1707: 'she was my skilful counsellor'<sup>155</sup> Nor is it to say that the women were incompetent or weak-minded. Far from it. They were capable and energetic. Katharine was head of the household at Broad Oak after her husband's death until her death eleven years later. Yet even when women asserted themselves, it was in a restricted framework. For example, when Sarah Savage attended the Anglican church on 13 January 1717, she disliked the minister's text and his severe reflections 'on them yt differ from ye established Church as guilty of great pride'. Examining her conscience, she felt herself not guilty of arrogance, but still she could not sleep, so the next day 'I wrote my mind to Mr N. the minister & sent it privately. I expect not that it can much avail, but give vent to my troubl'd tho[ugh]ts'. Apparently he answered 'largely & mildly'.<sup>156</sup>

In the Henry family, religion increased the distance between the prestige of the men's and women's domains. Women performed their relative duties, but they knew that compared with the ways in which the men spent their days, their time was spent on unimportant domesticity. Sarah Savage, for example, wrote a letter to her daughter full of family news and children's behaviour but apologised for writing of 'such trivial things'.<sup>157</sup> A few years later she gave a charming account of her grandson Matt who, hearing the story of Samson, said that he believed that God could make him 'strong enuff' to fight the Spaniards. 'But alas,' she continued, 'you must excuse this & ye like impertin[ences] – what is something to Mothers & Grandm[others] is nothing to others'.<sup>158</sup> As compensation for the lack of significance the women perceived in their own lives, they concentrated on collecting information about the lives of the two ministers, Philip and Matthew, which explains why it is now easier to focus upon the men's position in the family than it is to attempt to piece together something about the women. Yet ironically, it was through the women and their adherence to the Henry family of origin that the memories of Philip and Matthew were kept alive.

## III

The history of publications about the Henrys forms an epilogue to this account which is of interest in showing how the values of late seventeenth-century family life were publicised and adapted over time to suit changing social circumstances. Over the next two centuries the Henrys' records were weeded and culled in order to portray ideal family life. And, just as the lives of the seventeenth-century family were shaped by their experience of Nonconformity, so the subsequent recasting of the story was influenced by the position of the old Dissenters in eighteenth and nineteenth-century English society.<sup>159</sup> Philip and Matthew had both tried to avoid religious controversy and to appeal to a common Protestantism. Matthew Henry's extensive publications sought to develop individual piety through the proper understanding of the Scriptures.<sup>160</sup> He particularly came to stand for educated and informed Dissent to which the enthusiasm of Wesleyanism would have little appeal. The other influence upon the shaping of the family's history was the changing structure of English society. People of what the Henrys called the 'middling sort' were increasing in numbers. As it was to this social group that the old Dissenters chiefly belonged, the values which the Henrys had preached and tried to exemplify had application to a wider range of people than the Nonconformists. The Henrys were uneasily conscious of their social position between the great and the poor. The metaphors in which both Philip and Matthew preached were those of the town and the shop.<sup>161</sup> Both were suspicious of wealth and rank believing that they exposed their possessors to temptations. Matthew rejoiced that he was not of noble family, and directed his published work to those whom he termed 'plain people like myself'.<sup>162</sup> Sarah Savage too was thankful that she was of 'a middle state in ye world' as was her sister Katharine Tylston who numbered among God's mercies that her position in the world was 'neither poverty nor riches'.<sup>163</sup> Perhaps they protest too much. Like many others in English society, the Henrys were sometimes uncertain in their middling position, and it was to this wider audience outside the narrower confines of Dissent to whom publications about them were addressed.

The history of the publication of details about the family, the myth making, began in 1698 with Matthew Henry's anonymous publication of his father's life. He wanted, he

said, 'to exhibit to the World a Pattern of Primitive Christianity', and so to do good to plain people.<sup>164</sup> This writing of a godly life for practical ethical purposes was part of the post-Reformation tradition of which Patrick Collinson has written. Instead of a life of a saint, the reader was offered an account of the virtues of a religious life which was the achievement of human character, not of conversion of grace.<sup>165</sup> In this tradition daily accounting for time was to be more significant than the drama of conversion depicted in a spiritual autobiography, but the pattern was still sufficiently new for individuals to wonder about the origins of their faith. In 1687 Sarah Savage confessed she was sometimes discouraged because she was 'not able to make out ye Partic. time of my Convers[ion]' and decided that the date at which she was first admitted to the Lord's table was significant.<sup>166</sup> Increasingly, a religious life was the product of education and effort, and Matthew Henry's life of his father was in this genre. Written soon after his death, like a funeral sermon, it was intended to edify and the audience for whom it was especially designed was 'those that were acquainted with him'. Although a work of filial piety, Matthew sought verisimilitude, using diaries, papers, and such letters as he had to hand for 'by them his picture may be drawn nearest to the Life'.<sup>167</sup> The book proved popular, and was subsequently reprinted in 1699 and under Matthew's name in 1712. Matthew also wrote, but declined to publish, a memoir of Ann Hulton.<sup>168</sup> In 1765 Job Orton, who also wrote a life of Philip Doddridge, brought out a new edition, offering Philip Henry's example across classes 'to Persons, especially Householders, of every Rank' for emulation. Orton removed the material about the sufferings of the ministers after ejection, referring his readers to Calamy's work, and also modified some of the wording.<sup>169</sup> William Tong's biography of Matthew Henry, published in 1715, followed the biographical tradition but this work never achieved the same success as Matthew's life of his father.<sup>170</sup>

The great revival of interest in the Henry family in the nineteenth century owes most to the work of one individual, John Bickerton Williams.<sup>171</sup> As a descendant, he continued the tradition of biography from within the family. He began by publishing Philip Henry's sermon notes. In 1818 he published a life of Sarah Savage in which he emphasised the importance of a godly family for early piety. In her life a reader could find 'female virtue repeated exhibited . . . for the imitation and guidance of succeeding generations'. Four

further editions of Sarah's life appeared, and the life of another sister, Ann, was added.<sup>172</sup> In 1825 and 1828 respectively Williams republished both Philip's and Matthew's lives with additional manuscript material. Christian memoirs, he believed, 'conduce, in a very high degree, to the best interests of man'.<sup>173</sup>

Although Williams's accounts of the Henrys were primarily intended to show the moral value of nonconforming Christianity, his work had significance for domestic life because the virtues were displayed in a family context. In nineteenth-century middle-class households, the division of labour between men and women was necessary for the family's economic survival. For men to be free to engage in paid employment, women had to perform the essential tasks of reproduction and household management. Just as the daughters of the Henry family learnt to accept their roles, so girls of the nineteenth century could be socialised by their example to accept responsibility for children and households. Publications about the Henry family encouraged the definition of an ideology of service.

There were also genealogical publications about the Henrys in the nineteenth century. In 1844 Sarah Lawrence, another descendant, published *The Descendants of Philip Henry* to incite each member of this kin group 'to a more faithful imitation of his bright example'. She firmly rejected the notion of ancestor worship based merely on rank or situation, celebrating qualities of mind and character.<sup>174</sup> Individuals in the nineteenth century could do nothing about the accidents of birth which left them in the middle classes. What they could do was to suggest that rank counted for nothing compared to godly virtue. Here we can see again how publication about the Henry family promulgated a convenient ideology for the middle classes. Sarah Lawrence's genealogy also shows that she accepted the idea of the family as a line of descent. Names changed, but the godly arrow continued through time. In taking this perspective, she obscured much about the lives of her seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century female forebears. The children listed were those who survived, but the letters and diaries show that years of those earlier women's lives were taken up with pregnancies, miscarriages, and deaths of babies at birth or soon after. For example, the genealogists' entry about Katharine Henry, Matthew's eldest daughter, who married three times, is terse: 'No issue'.<sup>175</sup> Yet from her father's diary, which covers only a few years of her first

marriage, we know that she bore one child who lived for two weeks, miscarried of a dead daughter at six months, and gave birth to another daughter who did not live long.<sup>176</sup> The genealogists' principle, that only the links in the chain mattered, dismissed a great part of a woman's life as irrelevant. Sarah Lawrence both demonstrated that she had accepted the ideals of the patriarchal family and contributed to their promulgation in the nineteenth century.

Others who wrote about the Henrys in the nineteenth century sentimentalised and harmonised the godly family. A collection of Philip Henry's sayings, published in 1848, was said to reveal 'one of the loveliest examples of virtuous contentment ever exhibited among the happy homes of England.'<sup>177</sup> More scholarly was the publication in 1882 of the manuscript diaries of Philip Henry by a descendant, Matthew Henry Lee. Surviving original manuscripts show that family loyalty still required a certain kind of editing.<sup>178</sup> Quarrels, some financial transactions and farming details were often omitted, as were some personal matters such as Philip's purchase of clothes, and his medicines for ailments, with their effects. Several instances of what might have been deemed superstitious to nineteenth-century readers – such as tales of dreams, of witches and of bleeding corpses – also disappeared. The omissions are not a substantial proportion of the diaries, but they alter the record. Since Williams was more interested in piety than money, the Henry's financial transactions appeared less in his work than in the original documents. This allowed the reader to ponder, under his guidance, whence came 'this comparative indifference to all things earthly.'<sup>179</sup> Values which were attractive for the nineteenth-century middle classes were those which editors emphasised. We need the memory of our pious forebears, said one descendant, 'in these days of *material* improvements and material prosperity'.<sup>180</sup> However, the image of the godly family was also a product of the very deliberate efforts of the seventeenth-century Henrys themselves; the records which survived had been self-consciously created and preserved. What individuals revealed in their diaries was what they were prepared to allow other family members to see or transcribe.<sup>181</sup> The diaries were a limited exposure only, as were the godly letters which were written in the knowledge that they would be read to others and circulated.

## IV

The Henrys were not an atypical family in the later seventeenth century, but their Nonconformity made them unusual. Unlike the Puritan families before the civil wars, who had looked to a wider transformation of society, the horizon of this embattled Nonconformist family was much narrower, for in order to come to terms with the public defeat of Puritanism in 1662, they made the family the world. They hoped that the family would bear witness that the truth of religion was to be seen in a becoming temper and good conduct towards relatives. Their ideal was based on respect for the minister's authority, and it justified the obedience of women. Unlike religious ideologies which might, in extreme cases, drive women from their families to deliver a Quaker message far afield, the Presbyterian faith ensured that women stayed at home. The wives and daughters of ministers had a special view of the superior value of men's labours and a sense that the household, while necessary, was less important. The ideology of service which men defined for women was publicly held up during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as an improving example to all women. The typicality or otherwise of the Henrys may not be the most useful notion to pursue, for what needs to be understood is their values, and how they were transmitted to the next generation. Through this case study, we can see how the godly Protestant family contributed to the maintenance of a patriarchal society.

## NOTES

- 1 Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and marriage in England 1500-1800* (London, 1977).
- 2 See review of Stone by Alan Macfarlane, *History and Theory*, VIII (1979), pp.103-26; Ralph A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700* (London 1984).
- 3 Alan Macfarlane, *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin. A Seventeenth Century Clergyman* (Cambridge, 1970).
- 4 Miriam Slater, 'The Weightiest Business: Marriage in an Upper-Gentry Family in Seventeenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 72 (1976), pp. 25-54; *id.*, *Family Life in the Seventeenth Century. The Verneys of Claydon House* (London, 1984). See also, Sara Heller Mendelson, 'Debate. The Weightiest Business: Marriage in an Upper-Gentry Family in Seventeenth-Century England', and Miriam Slater, 'Debate. A Rejoinder', *Past and Present*, 85 (1979), pp.

- 136–40. Vivienne Larminie, 'Marriage and the family: the example of the seventeenth-century Newdigates', *Midland History*, IX (1984), pp. 1–22.
- 5 C. L. Powell, *English Domestic Relations, 1487–1653* (New York, 1917); L.L. Shucking, *The Puritan Family: A Social Study from the Literary Sources* (1929; London, 1969); Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London, 1964), pp. 443–481.
  - 6 Margo Todd, 'Humanists, Puritans and the Spiritualised Household', *Church History*, 49 (1980), pp. 18–34; K.M. Davies, 'Continuity and Change in Literary Advice on Marriage', in R.B. Outhwaite, ed., *Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage* (London 1981). A comparative study of Catholic and Protestant control of marriage in south-west Germany in the later sixteenth century suggests that there was no great difference in the emotional texture of marriage between the two; Thomas Safley, *Let No Man Put Asunder. The control of marriage in the German Southwest. A comparative study 1550–1600* (Kirksville, Missouri, 1984), p. 181. For an important discussion of the differing effects of two kinds of Protestant theology upon the social roles of women in early colonial America, see Mary Maples Dunn, 'Saints and Sisters: Congregational and Quaker women in the Early Colonial Period', *American Quarterly*, XXX (1978), pp. 582–601.
  - 7 [Matthew Henry], *An account of the life and death of Philip Henry, Minister of the Gospel* (London 1698), p.75. Further editions London 1699, 1712, 1765; Edinburgh, 1797; 1804, 1818; enlarged by J.B. Williams, 1825; [1832].
  - 8 William Gouge, *Of domesticall duties* (London, 1622; STC 12119), pp. 18–19, preface sig. 2v.
  - 9 Details about the family are most easily available in J.B. Williams, *The Life of the Rev. Philip Henry* [London, 1825]; *id.*, *Memoirs of the Life, Character and Writings of the Rev. Matthew Henry* [London 1828]. Both were reprinted in one volume in 1974 by the Banner of Truth Trust. See also *Dictionary of National Biography*; and A.G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised. Being an Account of the Ministers and others Ejected and Silenced. 1660–2* (Oxford, 1934).
  - 10 Worthenbury was a chaplaincy of the rectory of Bangor. In 1658, when it was made a parish, the Pulestons gave Philip Henry £100 as minister and built him a house; Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp.22–30.
  - 11 Other examples of upwardly mobile ministers: Stephen Marshall, George Fox and Richard Baxter.
  - 12 Philip Henry took the oath of allegiance in November 1660. His annuity was suspended soon after, and he was dismissed by Dr. Bridgeman on 27 October 1661; [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 94–102.
  - 13 Sarah Henry referred to John Savage as 'cousin' before their marriage; Chester City R[ecord] O[ffice], Diary of Sarah Savage, D. Basten 15, f.11.
  - 14 D. Williams's Library, London, 'A brief account of the Life and Death of Dr. John Tylston, who departed this life at Chester, Apr. 8 1699', by Matthew Henry, (copy), Henry MS 91.25. Tylston studied physic at Trinity College Oxford, then with Dr. Blackmore and with Sydenham. In 1687 he and Sydenham's son both went to Aberdeen to take their degrees, and in May 1687 Tylston began to practise at Whitchurch. He moved to Chester. He married Katharine on 27

- June 1687; Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, f.16 Their first child was born in March 1688.
- 15 Samuel Radford was listed as a linen draper in 1692; Chester City R.O., apprenticeship record, M/AP/B.
- 16 One of the difficulties in studying the Henry family is the extensive and scattered nature of the surviving documents. The following is a list of the main locations of the collections: B[ritish] L[ibrary]; Bodl[ician Library, Oxford]; Chester City R.O. and Dr. Williams's Library, London which now includes collections formerly at New College and the Congregational Library; Clwyd [County] R[ecord] O[ffice]. There are also manuscripts at the National Library of Wales; The J[ohn] R[ylands] U[niversity] L[ibrary], Manchester and Boston Public Library. In addition, there are manuscripts in private hands.
- 17 P.L. Berger & T. Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality* (Harmondsworth, 1971), pp. 33-48.
- 18 *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry . . . 1631-1696*, ed. M.H. Lee (London, 1882), p. 32. For motives of diarists, see Owen Watkins, *The Puritan Experience* (London, 1972); G.A. Starr, *Defoe and Spiritual Autobiography* (Princeton, 1965). J[ohn] B[eadle], *The journal or diary of a thankful Christian* (London, 1656), recommended diary keeping as a good means of accounting for time.
- 19 The following are the diaries which survive in manuscript and their locations: 1661, 1662 (Stedman transcript), 1663, 1667, 1671, 1672 (Mr P.J. Warburton-Lee); 1673 (Shrewsbury School, MS James xxviii); 1674, 1678 (Mr. P.J. Warburton-Lee); 1680-1684 (Dr. Williams's Library, formerly Congregational Library). All except the latter were kept in Goldsmith's almanack books. Searches through the National Register of Archives, the *Times Literary Supplement* and descendants have failed to reveal others.
- 20 MS Diary, 15 Dec. 13 Feb. 1662 (Stedman transcript).
- 21 William Tong, *An Account of the Life and Death of the Late Reverend Mr Matthew Henry* (London, 1716), p. 110; Bodl., Diary of Matthew Henry, 1 Jan. 1705 - 31 Dec. 1713, MS Eng. misc. e 330, part of his diary, transcribed by his niece, Hannah Savage (afterwards Witton), is in Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 90.7.48. This portion covers 30 Jan. 1704 to 13 Jan. 1706.
- 22 Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, 8 Aug. 1686, f.1.
- 23 Bodl., Diary of Mrs Sarah Savage from 31 May 1714 to 25 Dec. 1723 (eighteenth-century transcript). The amount of space for each year ranges from 77 pages for 1715 to 15 pages for 1723. The diarist herself may have made briefer entries as she grew older, but the character of the entries suggests that the transcriber may have selected the more general entries, omitting daily events. Dr. Williams's Library, Mrs Savage's Journal, vol. 13, 13 Apr. 1743 to April 1748, Henry MS 2. Sarah Savage's commonplace book is also at Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 3.
- 24 B.L., Devotional journal of Katharine Tylston, 1723-1728, Add[itional] MS, 42,849, ff. 145-168v.
- 25 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 68-9.
- 26 Philip Henry embarked on a law suit with the Pulestons over the payment of his annuity; *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 86. 'some busie people' among his neighbours presented him in September 1660 for not reading the Book of Common Prayer; [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p. 96. He claimed that Broad Oak was just under six

- miles from Worthenbury and therefore he did not have to move even further away after the Six Mile Act, but 'there were those near him' who insisted that six miles meant six reputed miles: *ibid.*, p. 115. Philip Henry was also named as a tax collector which implied that he lacked ministerial status; *ibid.*, pp. 97-8.
- 27 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, pp. 148-9 (Nov. 1663); Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 158-60.
  - 28 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 186.
  - 29 For the family's view of these years, see especially [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, ch. 5. In 1672 Philip Henry took out a license under the King's Declaration to preach at Broad Oak; Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, p. 129. William Urwick, *Historical Sketches of Nonconformity in the County Palatine of Chester* (London, 1864); G.R. Cragg, *Puritanism in the period of the great persecution, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1957); M.R. Watts, *The Dissenters* (Oxford, 1978). For a reassessment, see Anthony Fletcher, 'The Enforcement of the Conventicle Acts 1664-1679', in *Persecution and Toleration. Studies in Church History*, XXI (1984).
  - 30 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 4.4.
  - 31 In October 1687 Sarah Savage's diary recorded 'wee daily hear of ye scoffs & scorns of our Neighbors'; Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, f. [22v]. In June 1716 she recorded 'I incur ye hatred of many by going from our parish church'; 'sometimes a little concern'd to see our neighbours look shy, & cold on us (as we are Dissenters)'; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, MS Eng. misc. e 331, pp. 105, 97.
  - 32 MS Diary of Philip Henry, 1662 (transcript), 2 Sept. 1662.
  - 33 The term 'relative duties' was used by others. See, for example, Richard Steel, *The Husbandman's Calling* (London, 1668), p. 265, where he advises husbandmen to purchase Gouge's *Domesticall duties* 'to teach your whole Family their Relative Duties'.
  - 34 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p. 75.
  - 35 Tong, *Life of Matthew Henry*, p. 25. See also Matthew Henry, *The Communicant's Companion* (London, 1706), pp. 86-7.
  - 36 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p.75.
  - 37 *Ibid.*, preface sig. [A 5]. Matthew Henry believed that family worship was introduced by 'the first Reformers' in the time of Henry VIII; Clwyd R.O., D/DM/86,9.
  - 38 Birthday, 24 August; ordination, 16 September; wedding anniversary, 26 September; see *Diaries of Philip Henry*, pp. 85, 192. Both his daughter Sarah and his son Matthew followed his habit of remembering significant days. By the 1740s Sarah observed also many 'dying days' of family members.
  - 39 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, pp. 1-2.
  - 40 Bodl., Papers of the Henry family, MS Eng. misc. c 293, f. 185v, Matthew Henry's copy of Katharine Henry's will.
  - 41 Alan D. Gilbert, *Religion and Society in Industrial England. Church, Chapel, and Social Change, 1740-1914* (London, 1976), p. 16.
  - 42 Bills were proposed 1702-4; Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London, 1973), pp. 39-40.
  - 43 Natalie Zemon Davis, 'Ghosts, Kin and Progeny: Some Features of Family Life in Early Modern France', *Daedalus*, (1977), pp. 87-114.
  - 44 Matthew Henry, *Christ's Favour to Little Children* (London, 1713), esp. p. 19.
  - 45 M. H[enry], *Family-Hymns* (2nd edn, London, 1702), preface.

- 46 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 123-4 (1699 edn).  
 47 B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.8, 27 Mar. 1688.  
 48 Bodl., Eng. misc. MS 293, f. 57. His own elder son he described as 'the beginning of our strength'; *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 198.  
 49 J.R.U.L., Manchester MS 346/185b, sermon notes by Philip Henry.  
 50 Matthew Henry,, *A Church in the House* (London, 1704), p. 21. In a funeral sermon for Francis Tallents, whose son was no comfort, he preached that 'Grace doth not always run in the Blood'; Matthew Henry, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Funeral of the Reverend Mr. Francis Tallents* (London, 1709), p.47. Esther Bulkely, Matthew Henry's grand-daughter, repeated the same view later; Williams, *Memoirs of Matthew Henry*, p. 300.  
 51 Matthew Henry, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 59-62 (1699 edn.).  
 52 Clwyd R.O., D/DM/86.  
 53 Cambridge U[niversity] L[ibrary], Add. MS 7339, Genesis 34.  
 54 Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, pp. 285-6. Sarah saw her diary as a means of helping her children after her death, 'to hold out in ye narrow way'; *ibid.*, p. 172.  
 55 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p.87.  
 56 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 217 (9 Dec. 1669). On 25 December 1669 he parted with the servant 'not unwillingly'. His daughter confessed that she was more troubled at the public disgrace rather than a servant's sin: 'I was not rightly affected, afraid of reproach to ye Family, but did not as I shd grieve for ye dishonour done to God'; Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, f.10v.  
 57 Bodl., diary of Matthew Henry, f. 53v. (20, 22 July 1708).  
 58 B.L., Add. MS 42649,, f.20 Ann Hulton to Katharine Henry, 8 June 1697.  
 59 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 281.  
 60 *The Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge*, ed. John Doddridge (5 vols, London, 1829); Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge DD (1702-1751)*, Northampton Record Society, 29 (1979)  
 61 Flintshire R.O., MS sermons of Philip Henry, D/DM/86.9.  
 62 Matthew Henry, *A Church in the House*, p.47. See also p.13, masters of families 'must be as Prophets, Priests, and Kings in their own Families'.  
 63 Philip Henry, *Exposition of Genesis* (London, 1839), Genesis 11.18, p. 54.  
 64 Bodl., MS Eng. misc. e 293, ff. 163v-162, 'a copy of my father Warburton's deed of settlement in 1690'.  
 65 Eleanor was only to receive her bequest if her parents named her Eleanor; *ibid.*, f.185v., copy of Daniel Matthews's will.  
 66 Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*, ch. 8.  
 67 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p.124 (1699 edn.). Parents, Philip Henry said, 'should study to oblige their Children'; *ibid.*, p. 124.  
 68 Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, entries 29 Nov. 1686 to 19 April 1687, *passim*. Years later she recollected that her sister had tried to encourage her by saying that there was a great difference between those who rose in the morning to be married and to be executed, an unhappy comparison; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, 24 March 1717.  
 69 Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 64-5. In January 1658 when he proposed to marry Katharine his prospects may have seemed better

- than in 1660, for the Pulestons were supporting him with their patronage and the earl of Pembroke was his godfather.
- 70 MS Diary of Philip Henry, 2 Sept. 1662. See also Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 65–6; Bodl., MS Eng. misc. c 293, ff. 6–9.
- 71 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, pp. 55–6; MS Diary of Philip Henry, 8 Aug. 1662.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 2 Sept, 1662.
- 73 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 94 (28 Aug. 1661); p. 146 (8 Sept. 1663). MS Diary of Philip Henry, 19, 21 Apr., 19 Oct. 1662. Philip said that he 'had common respect and countenance from him & that was all'. On 10 March Matthews asked Katharine to return two rings which were her mother's; *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 81.
- 74 Tong, *Life of Matthew Henry*, p. 23. See also Williams, *Memoirs of Matthew Henry*, pp. 55–6.
- 75 *ibid.*, pp. 57–8.
- 76 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 90.7.3, Philip Henry to Ann, 17 Feb. 1688; printed Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 200–1.
- 77 H.D. Roberts, *Matthew Henry and His Chapel, 1662–1900* (Liverpool, 1901), p. 88.
- 78 B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.7, Matthew Henry to Philip Henry, 1 Mar. [1688].
- 79 The text which Philip Henry chose for his daughter's wedding sermon was from Ephesians V.24, 15: 'as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be subject to their own husbands'. Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 409–10.
- 80 Bodl., MS Eng. misc. e 330, Diary of Matthew Henry, ff. 56–58v (15, 30 Nov., 2 Dec. 1708). The couple were married on 22 Dec. 1708; f. 58v.
- 81 Matthew Henry complained in his diary of Witton's 'ill carriage to me' in October 1713; *ibid.*, f. 131.
- 82 Bodl., MS Eng. misc. e 331, Diary of Sarah Savage, 20 Feb. 1717, p. 139.
- 83 *Ibid.*, pp. 150, 152, 157, 166 (8 May, 21 July, 13 Oct. 1717).
- 84 *Ibid.*, pp. 157, 168.
- 85 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 91/18, 'Extracts from Grandmother Witton's diary' by Hannah Savage, f. 4v.
- 86 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, pp. 72–3.
- 87 See Patricia Crawford, 'From the Woman's View: Pre-industrial England, 1500–1750', in Patricia Crawford (ed.), *Exploring Women's Past. Essays in Social History* (Sydney, 1984), esp. pp. 70–78.
- 88 A sermon preached at Broad Oak, June 4, 1707, on . . . the death of Mrs Katharine Henry, . . . by her son, printed in Williams, *Life of the Rev. Philip Henry*, pp. 315, 325.
- 89 Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, see esp. entry for 24 Nov. 1687. For an analysis, see Patricia Crawford, 'Attitudes to Pregnancy from a Woman's Spiritual Diary, 1687–8' *Local Population Studies*, 21 (1978), pp. 43–5.
- 90 B.L., Add. MS 42849, extracts from Sarah Savage's diary, 1699, f. 88v.; 1701, f. 91.
- 91 City of Chester R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, 13 Mar. 1688, f. 32v. Similar fear on her wedding anniversary, 28 Mar, 1688, f. 33v.
- 92 J.B. Williams, *Memoirs of the Life and Character of Mrs Savage*. (London, 1818), p. 187. Further editions 1819; 1821 (life of Ann Hulton added); 1829, 1848.
- 93 *Ibid.*, p. 78. This passage which Williams quotes is not in the only

- extant transcript of her diary for this date (Bodl., MS Eng. misc. e 331).
- 94 The following details are derived from various sources. Ann Hulton, b. 25 Nov. 1668; m. 26 Apr. 1688; first child, 29 July 1689, died; 28 Apr. 1690, small-pox and maybe miscarriage; 29 July 1691, son who died young; 3 Apr. 1693, da. baptised Katharine; 1694?, daughter Mary; 19 Nov. 1695, a son who died at 9 days (B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.13); a son, Edward, before June 1697; died, 6 Sept. 1697.
  - 95 Williams, *Memoirs of Mrs Savage*, p. 287 (1821 edn).
  - 96 *Ibid.*, p. 314 (1821 edn). Philip Henry preached that a mother was bound to breast-feed her baby; Cambridge U.L., Add. MS 7339, sermon 17, (Oct. 1658).
  - 97 Williams, *Memoirs of Mrs Savage*, p. 310 (1821 edn.). Matthew Henry thought that the sorrow of nursing was included in the general punishment of 'sorrow in childbirth'.
  - 98 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 4.2, Sarah Savage to her father, 19 Mar. [1692?]; *Ibid.*, MS 4.3, same to same, 9 Apr. [1692?]; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, p. 21, Oct. 1714; B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.21, [Ann Hulton] to Sarah Savage, 9 Aug. 1697.
  - 99 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 2, Mrs. Savage's journal, 25 Feb. 1746.
  - 100 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 4.14, [Sarah Savage] to her daughter [Hannah Witton], n.d.
  - 101 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 90.7.18, Matthew Henry to Philip Henry, 4 Apr. 1693. Mary Henry experienced at least thirteen pregnancies after her marriage in July 1690. Six daughters survived beyond infancy, but only one son. Her last child was born in 1711. Her husband's comment on her desire for a son was 'we will thankfully receive what God graciously sends.'
  - 102 B.L., Add. MS 42849, extracts from diary, f.87v.
  - 103 Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, 10 Feb. 1715, p.32.
  - 104 *Ibid.*, April 1717. See also earlier, 12 Apr. 1715, p. 39.
  - 105 *Ibid.*, June 1714, p.3, May 1715.
  - 106 *Ibid.*, Feb. 1716, p.217.
  - 107 He died of small-pox, 27 February 1721; *ibid.*, p.270.
  - 108 *Ibid.*, Feb. 1716, p.85.
  - 109 Fragment of MS diary, name on cover Philip Henry Warburton, 3 Nov. 1718 - 19 Oct. 1719; see esp. 17, 25 Jun 1719.
  - 110 In 1721 he went to Lincoln's Inn and was called to the bar in 1717. In 1742 he was returned to the House of Commons unopposed as a Tory and voted against the government in every recorded division; *The History of Parliament. The House of Commons 1715-1745* (London, 1970); J.S. Morrill, 'Parliamentary Representation', in B.E. Harris (ed), *The Victoria History of the County of Cheshire* (Oxford, 1979), Vol. 2, p. 135.
  - 111 Chester City R.O., Vawdry MS DMD/ 15 & 16. There may be a veiled reference to Philip Henry Warburton in the comment made by a grand-daughter of Matthew Henry: 'We have cause to lament, among many of us, much departure into the world; grace (added she) is not entailed as an inheritance: there are some of us, however, that still retain our religion'; John Griffin, *Memoirs of the Rev. Thomas English* (Portsmouth, 1812), pp. 88-9. John Bickerton Williams, *Memoirs of Matthew Henry*, p. 299 says that the younger Philip Henry 'forsook, it is to be feared, the God of his fathers'.

- 112 For example, 11 April 1716, Sarah Savage was sent for to her daughter Lawrence and stayed for a few weeks; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, pp. 96-7. In an undated letter to her sister, Sarah regretted the absence of her own mother 'to help to nurse & rock'; Dr. Williams's Library, Henry MS 4.29, [1707?]. Women helped more distant relatives also such as, for example, cousin Ashworth, 15 November 1716; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, p.124.
- 113 Dr. Williams's Library, Henry 4.15, Sarah Savage to Hannah Witton, 2 Apr. 1734. The child, Philip Henry Witton, was born 17 Nov. 1732. He was therefore 16.5 months old at the time weaning was discussed.
- 114 B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.43, Katharine Tylston to John Tylston, 16 Nov. 1726.
- 115 Bodl., MS Eng. lit. e 29, f. 67, Philip Henry to Matthew Henry, 26 Mar. 1688.
- 116 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 4.6, Sarah Savage to Matthew Henry, 10 Apr. 1687.
- 117 Bodl., MS Eng. Let. c 29, f. 58, Matthew Henry to Philip Henry, 17 Jan. 1688.
- 118 B.L., Add. MS 42849, ff.17,20; Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 4.1.
- 119 B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.33.
- 120 *Ibid.*, f. 50.
- 121 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 4.22, Sarah Savage to [Hannah Witton], 12 Feb. [1733]
- 122 Accountability for time was a major preoccupation which the Henrys shared with other godly families. For example, Philip Henry preached that to walk in the fields on the Lord's day 'will not pass well in our account of Sabbath-time' if merely for refreshment and not for prayer and meditation; Clwyd R.O., sermons of Philip Henry, 2, no. 34.
- 123 MS Diary of Philip Henry, 5/6 Sept. 1661.
- 124 Bodl., MS Eng. misc. e 330, Diary of Matthew Henry, f.12. On 15 Oct. 1705, Mary was unwell and feared a miscarriage. She deteriorated until she miscarried on 25 October. Although she was still unwell in December, Matthew does not mention her in his annual review, the first item of which was 'I have pleasure in my Study'; *ibid.*, f.14.
- 125 Mary Henry miscarried on 20 June 1706 & 23 Jan. 1707; *ibid.*, f.22, f.32v.
- 126 *Ibid.*, f.48v.
- 127 Matthew Henry, *An Exposition of the five Books of Moses* (2nd edn., London, 1710), Genesis II.16.
- 128 *Ibid.*, sig. [A3v.]; see also, Matthew Henry, *An Exposition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (2nd edn.; London, 1712), sig. [A4]: 'The Pleasantness of the Study has drawn me on'. This division of labour between the minister in his study and his wife in the household is not unusual. Peter Heylin's wife looked after husbandry without doors at well, thereby freeing him 'from that care and trouble, which otherwise would have hindered his laborious Pen from going through so great a work in that short time'; *The Life of . . . Dr. Peter Heylin in The Historical and Miscellaneous Tracts* (London, 1681), p.xix.
- 129 Williams, *Memoirs of Sarah Savage*, pp.296-7.
- 130 See for example, Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, 3 June

- 1688, f.38; Bodl., diary of Sarah Savage, pp. 39, 148, 195, 213.
- 131 *Ibid.*, p. 309; Williams, *Memoirs of Sarah Savage*, pp. 296-7 (1821 edn.).
- 132 *Ibid.*, p. 285.
- 133 *Ibid.*, p. 301.
- 134 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p.85 (1699 edn.).
- 135 Williams, *Memoirs of Sarah Savage*, pp. 321-2 (1821 edn.). See also, B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.13, Ann Hulton to Katharine Henry, 28 Apr. 1694, 'no uneasiness for want of me'.
- 136 Sarah was called out soon after her marriage; Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, June 1687. Prior to this, in October 1686, she had stayed at home at Broad Oak housekeeping while her mother attended a neighbour's lying-in 'all day'; *ibid.*, 30 Oct. 1686.
- 137 Bodl., Sarah Savage's diary, 2 Aug. 1716, p. 127; 11 Aug. 1717, p. 159.
- 138 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 4.16.
- 139 For example, in 1719 Sarah agreed to board Betty Motterhead, daughter of their former minister whose wife had just died, for the summer. She looked after Abby Robinson for a year, and a Tylston 'little one' for 6 months; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, pp.216, 224. She took her daughter to visit 'our old neighbours' in June 1716, p.106.
- 140 *Ibid.*, p. 159.
- 141 [Matthew Henry], *A Sermon concerning the Right Management of Friendly Visits* (London, 1705). If Matthew spent a day with friends he usually wrote in his diary 'much time lost in ye Enjoyment of Friends' or 'it would trouble me to spend many such days'; Bodl., diary of Matthew Henry, 20 Aug. 1708, 16 Oct. 1711.
- 142 Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, p. 100.
- 143 *Ibid.*, p. 107 (1716).
- 144 I.Q. Brown, 'Domesticity, feminism and friendship: female aristocratic culture and marriage in England 1660-1760', *Journal of Family History*, 1982, pp. 406-24.
- 145 Bodl., MS Eng. let. e 29, Sarah Henry to Matthew Henry, n.d., ff. 36-36v.
- 146 *Ibid.*, f.33, Eleanor Henry to Matthew Henry, 18 Feb. 1687; also, f.26v.
- 147 Roberts, *Matthew Henry and his Chapel*, p.24.
- 148 Williams, *Memoirs of Sarah Savage*, p. 163; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, p.5.
- 149 Williams, *Memoirs of Sarah Savage*, p. 195 (1818 edn.).
- 150 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 4.13, Sarah Savage to [Hannah] Witton, 12 July 1714.
- 151 Bodl., Sarah Savage's diary, p. 169 (1717).
- 152 MS Diary of Philip Henry (transcript), 23 Oct. 1662. Matthew Henry was not often apart from his wife, but in a letter from London in 1712 he addressed her affectionately as 'My owne deare love'; Bodl., MS Eng. let. e 29, f.131.
- 153 *Diaries of Philip Henry*, p. 357.
- 154 *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
- 155 Bodl., Diary of Matthew Henry, f.44.
- 156 Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, 13 Jan. 1717, pp. 134-5.
- 157 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 91.24 (9), [1734].
- 158 Bodl., MS Eng. let. e 29, f.9, Sarah Savage to her grand-daughter, Elizabeth Swanwick, 1 July [c. 1740] Matthew Witton was born 16 Aug. 1735.

- 159 For accounts of eighteenth-century Nonconformity, see Gilbert, *Religion and Society*; John Walsh, 'Origins of the evangelical revival', in G.V. Bennett & John Walsh (ed), *Essays in Modern English Church History* (London, 1966); John Walsh, 'Elie Halevy and the Birth of Methodism', *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser. 25 (1975), pp.1-20.
- 160 See, for example, Matthew Henry, *An Exposition of the Five Poetical Books of the Old Testament* (London, 1710), p.iv.
- 161 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, p. 126 (1699 edn); postscript (1712 edn.); Matthew Henry, *Self Consideration* (London, 1713). He wrote of a child's first seven years as 'an Apprenticeship to life'; Bodl., Diary of Matthew Henry, f. 36 (3 May 1707). Ann Hulston spoke of 'the trade of religion'; Williams, *Memoirs of Mrs Savage*, p. 285 (1821 edn.).
- 162 Matthew Henry, *Life of Philip Henry* (1712 edn.), preface.
- 163 Dr. Williams's Library, MS Henry 4. 13; B.L., Add. MS 42849, f.126. See also Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, pp. 156, 133 for her comments on visits to the houses of her social superiors: 'I envy not ye great man's estate'.
- 164 Matthew Henry, *Life of Philip Henry* (1712 edn.), postscript.
- 165 Patrick Collinson, 'A Magazine of Religious Patterns': An Erasmian Topic Transposed in an English Protestantism', in Derek Baker (ed), *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History. Studies in Church History*, 14 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 240-1.
- 166 Chester City R.O., Diary of Sarah Savage, 15 Nov. 1687.
- 167 [Matthew Henry], *Life of Philip Henry*, sig. [A5].
- 168 Williams, *Memoirs of Matthew Henry*, p. 258. A manuscript of the life and death of Ann Hulston survives among the British Library's printed books (number 1418 a 1). The preface by J.O. (probably James Owen), says that 'It was drawn for the use only of some near Relations'; f.iv.
- 169 Matthew Henry, *Life of Philip Henry* (4th edn., Salop, 1765), preface, pp. iv-v. [Job Orton], *Memoirs of the Life, Character and Writings of the late reverend Philip Doddridge. DD of Northampton* (Salop, 1766). The *Life* was also republished in Edinburgh in 1797.
- 170 William Tong, *An Account of the Life and Death of Mr Matthew Henry* (London, 1715); further editions 1715, 1833. The 'family' were said to have been disappointed with the work; Williams, *Memoirs of Matthew Henry*, p.vi.
- 171 *D.N.B.* See also R.P. Williams (ed.), *Extracts from the Diary of the late Sir John Bickerton Williams* (London, [1896]). The knighthood which the Duke of Somerset procured for him was chiefly for his book on Sir Matthew Hale but Williams presented the Duke with some of Matthew Henry's commentaries, the *Life* and some sermons. Williams's son was called 'Philip Henry'.
- 172 *Memoirs of Mrs. Sarah Savage*, preface p.vi. For dates of publication see note 92. Unselfconsciousness was valued in the nineteenth century, so that Jay claimed that nothing was further from Sarah's mind 'than the public exhibition of what she wrote'. Nevertheless, Sarah's diary shows that she wrote to benefit others, especially her children. 'I think my ability thus to think, remember & write is a talent I am entrusted with'; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, p. 172.
- 173 Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, preface p.xxi.
- 174 Sarah Lawrence, *The Descendants of Philip Henry* (London, 1844), preface, p.v. Limited edition reprinted for the Research Publishing

- Company [1972]. Other family genealogies were published in the nineteenth century.
- 175 *Ibid.*, p.2.
- 176 Bodl., Diary of Matthew Henry: Elizabeth, b. 13 Oct. 1707, d. 27 Oct. (ff. 72, 72v.); Mary b. 6 Oct. 1711 (f.105), d. Jan. 1713 (f. 122). Another Katharine, one of Sarah Savage's daughters, gave birth to twin boys 7 or 8 weeks early, of whom one was dead, the other lived only a short while, but neither of which appear in the genealogical record; Bodl., Diary of Sarah Savage, p. 269, 2 Feb. 1721. Katharine Savage married a cousin Savage on 3 Jan. 1718; *ibid.*, p. 172.
- 177 *The Life and Times of Philip Henry* (London, 1848), p. 113.
- 178 For locations, see note 19.
- 179 Williams, *Life of Philip Henry*, preface p.xxii.
- 180 Lawrence, *Descendants of Philip Henry*, preface p.v.
- 181 Matthew Henry used his father's diary after his death for the *Life*. Sarah read her son's diary after his death. Hannah Witton transcribed her husband's grandmother's diary as well as portions of her uncle Matthew's and her mother Sarah's.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the Nuffield Foundation and the Australian Research Grants Commission for their financial support for this research. Many librarians have been helpful. I am grateful to the Trustees of the Dr. Williams's Library and the Congregational Memorial Hall Trust (1978) Ltd. for allowing me to consult manuscripts, and to Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall for help with sources. P.J. Warburton-Lee Esq., of Redbrook, near Broad Oak, kindly allowed me to consult manuscripts in his possession. My thanks also to many friends for their comments, especially Ian Crawford, Sarah Mendelson, Carolyn Polizzotto, Wilfrid Prest, Lyndal Roper and Barry Smith; and to Ann Hughes for inviting me to give an earlier version of this paper to the Seventeenth-Century England Seminar at Manchester University.

Select Genealogy  
**KATHARINE AND PHILIP HENRY AND THEIR CHILDREN**



